

GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JULY 11, 2005

PRESENT: Councilmembers Young, Franich, Conan, Dick, Picinich, Ruffo and Mayor Wilbert. Councilmember Ekberg was absent.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Law Enforcement Support Agency

Mike Davis, Chief of Police, introduced the director of Law Enforcement Support Agency, John Pirak, who give a presentation on the services that LESA provides the city including internet service, records service, and 9-1-1 dispatch service.

CONSENT AGENDA:

These consent agenda items are considered routine and may be adopted with one motion as per Gig Harbor Ordinance No. 799.

1. Approval of the Minutes of City Council Meeting of June 27, 2005.
2. Correspondence / Proclamations: a) Letter from Dr. Russell Barber; b) Letter from Reyhner; c) Our Army: Celebrating 230 Years of Patriotic Pride.
3. Briarwood Pedestrian Improvement Project - Bannon Engineering, Inc. Contract.
4. Participation in the Law Loan/Government Purchase Plan Offered by the Yamaha Motor Corporation.
5. Wheeler Street End Park Landscape Design – Consultant Services Contract.
6. Approval of Payment of Bills for July 11, 2005:
Checks #47550 through #47665 in the amount of \$217,394.55.
7. Approval of Payroll for the month of June: \$253,394.40 checks #3798 through #3836 and direct deposit entries.

MOTION: Move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.
Picinich / Franich – unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Third Reading of Ordinance – Amendment to GHMC 17.98 Design Review Standards and Review. Rob White, Planning Manager, presented this ordinance that would allow the Design Review Board an opportunity to hold design review pre-application meetings and encourages DRB members to provide input on all non-residential, multi-family, and planned residential development.

MOTION: Move to adopt Ordinance No. 1006 as presented.
Young / Conan – unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. First Reading of Ordinance – Adopting Finding and Facts Supporting the Continuation of a Moratorium on the Acceptance of Applications for New Development

of Non-Residential Structures or Certain Types of Re-Development on Non-Residential Structures in the Waterfront Millville Zone for a Period of Two Months.

Councilmember Franich said that the draft ordinance “hit the high points” discussed during previous meetings and he looks forward to passing this at the second reading.

2. First Reading of Ordinance – Limiting the Size of Structures in the Waterfront Zones. Rob White, Planning Manager, explained that the Planning Commission felt it was important to address not only the WM zone, but the Waterfront Residential and Waterfront Commercial zones to ensure consistency. He gave an overview of the Planning Commission recommendations for building sizes in these three zones. He said that a comment from Mr. David Morris brought to light the possibility that the proposed ordinance may have unintentional affects on commercial areas in the UGA. Mr. Morris recommended that the Purdy area be addressed within the WC development standards.

Dave Freeman –Snodgrass Freeman Architects, 3019 Judson Street. Mr. Freeman presented information to Council regarding parking cars on commercial lots that would not reduce overall building size. He proposed an amendment to the Downtown Business District to include internalized or buried parking garages, but exempting them from the calculation of the overall building size. He said that this would allow a practical solution for parking without adversely impacting the intent to maintain smaller scale buildings. He read the proposed amendments and used drawings to illustrate the intent. Mr. Freeman then addressed questions from Council.

Councilmember Franich asked for clarification on whether the gross floor area of 6000 s.f. in the downtown area included parking garages, as “floor area” in the definitions section exempts garages. John Vodopich explained that the point being made by Mr. Freeman is that multiple buildings on the same site must be separated by non-penetrable firewalls, making it impractical for a parking garage.

Chuck Carlson - no address given. Mr. Carlson talked about the discussion by the Planning Commission to revise the Shoreline Master Plan to allow for rebuilding a non-conforming structure in the case of destruction in the residential zone. He voiced his concern that if this ordinance is passed, there would be nothing to protect the property owners in the interim. He said that he would feel more comfortable if language could be added to assure the ability to rebuild.

Councilmember Franich said he would like to arrive at a solution to address Mr. Carlson’s concerns. He then asked for clarification for why gross floor area is not part of the recommendation for single-family in the Waterfront Commercial zone.

Dick Allen, Chair of the Planning Commission, explained that it is because this is a more intense zone than the others, making the increase in density more acceptable than in the other zones.

Councilmember Franich said that language needs to be added to clarify the intent. He then stated that it doesn't make sense to allow 6000 s.f. gross floor area per structure for commercial structures and attached residential in the WC zone, but only 3000 s.f. for single-family, adding that he is not in favor of limiting residential structures. He said that he would like to see consistency.

Councilmember Young asked Mr. Allen for clarification on why the building size limit is larger in the WR zone than in the WM zone. Mr. Allen responded that primarily, the lots in the Waterfront Millville zone are 50 feet or smaller. The buildings are older and smaller than what is typical in the WR zone.

Councilmember Franich continued to say that excluding parking structures will lead to the same oversized building problem that started this process. He added that he would only support this if the parking garages were underground. He then asked about Section 17.50.040 in the WC development standards in which a paragraph has been added regarding separation between structures abutting the DB district.

Rob White explained that this is a footnote added from another part of the code as it was more appropriate in this section. It was pointed out that the language may be in error and should read "not required" rather than "only required" in this paragraph. Staff was directed to take a look at this before the second reading.

Councilmember Franich said that the area north of Eddon Boat needs to be taken into consideration as well. He continued to say that he would like further discussion on the exclusion of parking garages in the WC zone, adding that parking garages are going to influence the face of Gig Harbor.

Mr. Allen explained that the Planning Commission had only been tasked with the Waterfront zones and not the Downtown Business. What drove the thinking about garages is the intensity of use. WM and WR are residential areas and they wanted to control the intensity of activity in these areas. Councilmembers discussed the need to further define underground parking garages.

Councilmember Franich then asked for clarification on the 3000 s.f. per structure for single-family in the WC zone, adding that he would like to see it increased to 6000 s.f. gross floor area, including garages. Councilmembers further discussed making it the same as the other structures in the WC zone.

Councilmember Dick said that there should be a difference in commercial and residential structures, as commercial properties are required to provide public amenities that residential properties are not.

Rob White explained that the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit allows the city to require commercial development to provide shoreline access or viewing opportunities. In addition, commercial developments are required to provide common

areas through the design manual. These are just two public amenities that would come from commercial development that are not required for residential.

Councilmember Franich restated that he would like to include garages in calculating the gross floor area in the WC zone until further work could be done on the definition of undergrounding. Rob White said that the appropriate place to address this would be in the design manual, and not in the development standards or the definition of gross floor area. Councilmember Franich said that he would support the ordinance if the word “underground” could be added. If the parking structure is above the ground, it has to be included in the calculation of square footage. He then asked staff to make that change to the draft ordinance before it comes back for the second reading.

Jeanne Dereby – 9221 Peacock Hill Ave. Ms. Dereby asked if an underground parking garage would be limited by the footprint or if it could go beyond the structure. Councilmembers said that this issue would have to be addressed by staff.

Councilmember Young recommended inclusion of the language recommended by Mr. Freeman regarding parking required for the structure. He reasoned that he did not want to create a market for a parking garage.

Jill Guernsey – 3224 Shyleen Street. Ms. Guernsey stressed that parking remains an issue and encouraged Council to address this with a separate ordinance. She then addressed Mr. Carlson’s concerns about rebuilding after a disaster and before the ordinance can be approved by DOE. She suggested that an application could be taken in and held until the non-conforming/re-build ordinance has finished its course. Ms. Guernsey then thanked Chairman Allen for his leadership on the Planning Commission.

Doug Sorensen – 9409 North Harborview Drive. Mr. Sorensen asked Council to consider excluding daylight basements as well as garages in calculations in the Waterfront Residential District. Councilmembers pointed out that you can see a daylight basement from the water side, adding that they had discussed changing the ordinance so that a parking garage would have to be completely hidden from all sides. Mr. Sorensen said that regulating residential square footage is ridiculous, as it hasn’t been necessary so far. He then talked about the 70 foot width along the waterfront residential area, stressing that there are very few that meet this size. He said that most lots are 25 feet wide and the houses in Ardena are non-conforming because the lots have never been combined. A 4000 square foot house would not be allowed on these small lots.

Councilmember Franich commented that the same rationale could be used for basements in calculating square footage if they are totally underground.

Councilmember Young talked about the need to regulate structures that are totally out of character and scale for the neighborhood. He added that a 3600 s.f. residence does not harm the character of Gig Harbor. He suggested raising the limit to a 2500 s.f. footprint and a 5000 s.f. total. He said that he would like to see any data that the Planning Commission may have in regards to their recommended limits. If nothing

exists, then perhaps staff could compile information on the existing structures in the waterfront zones to review before the ordinance is adopted limiting residential to 3500 square feet.

John Vodopich said that staff had distributed a map that showing building footprints. Councilmember Young said that the footprint doesn't show overall size.

Councilmember Franich agreed, adding that he has a problem with limiting single family residences. He said that he would also like to understand how the Planning Commission arrived at the recommended size limitations.

Chuck Carlson – 3505 Harborview Drive. Mr. Carlson spoke in favor of exempting basements in the calculation of single family dwellings if Council adopts the proposed limitations on size.

Rosanne Sachson – 3502 Harborview Drive. Ms. Sachson reminded Council what had occurred last summer when many citizens showed up to the meetings and Council promised to hold a charrette. She stressed that the city cannot keep focusing on just one area, as the whole town needs to be addressed. This should be done with a facilitator so that everyone can be heard. She talked about her house which is small in size but the tallest structure on Harborview, adding that because of the double lot, a very large house could be built that would block views. This type of issue should be considered as part of the "big picture" that involves all of Gig Harbor. She then talked about regulating vegetation and what would be the result of allowing 6000 s.f. for both commercial and residential buildings in the waterfront areas. She encouraged Council to pass the RFP for the charrette in order to get the process going.

STAFF REPORT:

1. Edwards Street Speed Study. John Vodopich explained that the results of the report indicate that over the seven-day period there was no excessive speeding on Edwards Street. He added that additional signage will be installed.
2. John Vodopich, Community Development Director: Draft RFP for Building Size Charrette. John Vodopich explained that a draft proposal had been circulated within the Community Development Committee and staff is asking for direction of whether to proceed.

Jeanne Dereby – 9221 Peacock Hill Avenue. Ms. Dereby spoke in support of the charrette, but asked for clarification for the purpose. She explained that the charrette concept was a result of the citizens requesting input into the process to determine a vision for the future of Gig Harbor. She said that limiting the charrette to building size was not the desire of the citizens or the Council, and without a vision for the future, only half the job will have been done. She recommended moving forward with a visioning charrette.

Councilmember Ruffo asked for clarification on how long the charrette process would take, and then voiced concern with the timing as there may be new Councilmembers on January 1st. Councilmember Conan said that he shares the same concern. He said that he would like to see the process postponed until after the first of the year to allow the new Design Review Manual to be tested, to complete the work in the view basin and to wait for the new Council.

Councilmember Franich said also agreed about the timing of the charrette. He said that he respects the comments made by Ms. Sachson and Ms. Dereby, adding that many community concerns came out during those workshops. The community questioned the direction that staff and the Council were taking as well as interpretations of the code. Much work has been done on design review since that time, and the community should be proud of the results when it is completed. He said that he also would like to give some time to see the results of these efforts and agreed with the comments to postpone the charrette process until after the election.

Councilmember Young said that the main concern that brought about the work sessions, the downtown building sizes, is now being addressed. He agreed that there are broader issues city-wide. He suggested that during the upcoming budget cycle, that the amount to complete the charrette process be increased to encompass the entire city.

Councilmember Franich asked why Council, staff and the community could not come together and do this without spending \$50,000 or \$100,000? Councilmember Young said that it is because of the way you obtain the information and what you do with it.

MOTION: Move to discuss the scope and intent of the charrette process as part of the upcoming budget cycle and that the process move forward in January, 2006.
Ruffo / Conan – unanimously approved.

3. Mike Davis, Chief of Police: June Stats. No verbal report given.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Rosanne Sachson. Ms. Sachson said that she had been involved in a number of charrettes, and said that Councilmembers should have looked into what a charrette process involves before taking action. She recommended that they do so before the discussions take place during the budget cycle. She said that if a visioning charrette had already taken place, the ideals would be well-known for those citizens who will be campaigning. She warned Council about “boxing in” the process adding that there are many more people out there with lots to say. She suggested having staff do a preliminary charrette as it has been a year since it was promised.

Councilmember Franich said that he would contact her to learn more about the charrette process.

COUNCIL COMMENTS / MAYOR'S REPORT:

Mayor's Report – Vision for Moving Forward. Mayor Wilbert asked Council to review the last few Mayor's Reports to gain insight on what the public has asked of her. These items will be discussed at the upcoming Council Retreat.

Councilmember Paul Conan reported that he serves on the Chapel Hill Church Board, and offered to give a tour of the completed expansion project. He said that Wednesday night at 5:00 p.m. he and Chuck Hunter will walk a group through the project.


ANNOUNCEMENT OF OTHER MEETINGS:

Council Retreat – August 8, 2005. Civic Center Community Rooms A & B at 12:00 noon.

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 9:04 p.m.
Franich / Ruffo – unanimously approved.

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Tracks 1 – 20.
Disc #2 Tracks 1 – 16.



Gretchen A. Wilbert, Mayor



Molly Towslee, City Clerk