

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session
Thursday, June 17, 2004
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners Theresa Malich, Carol Johnson, Dick Allen, Bruce Gair and Chairman Paul Kadzik. Commissioner Kathy Franklin was absent. Commissioner Scott Wagner and arrived at 6:15. Staff present: Steve Osguthorpe.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of June 3, 2004
Gair/Malich – unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

WORK-STUDY SESSION

City of Gig Harbor, Update of Design Manual

Chairman Paul Kadzik asked Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe to give the Planning Commission an update on the Building Size Analysis meetings. Mr. Osguthorpe briefed the Planning Commission on the Building Size Analysis issues and the public meetings that are being held. He outlined items in the Design Manual update which may have an impact on these issues.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe presented two additional items to be discussed in the Design Manual update:

Elimination of increased height allowance in the Height Overlay District

Mr. Osguthorpe pointed out that this item had come to light in the Building Size Analysis meetings and so as yet had not been discussed with the Design Review Board. The Planning Commission expressed their consent to this change.

The Ordinance which incorporates the Design Manual into the zoning code.

Mr. Osguthorpe stated that this ordinance was to eliminate any inconsistencies between the zoning code and the design manual and to provide a cross reference. He also pointed out the removal of the allowance for someone with a corner lot to choose which side is their front yard and standardizes it so that it is always the shorter of the two frontages.

Commissioner Allen expressed concern with removing the property owner's ability to choose. Mr. Osguthorpe explained the difficulty in keeping track of what the property

owner had chosen and the neighbor's right to know how development could occur on adjacent parcels. Various examples were discussed. The Planning Commission expressed support for the change

Chairman Kadzik identified the issues which still needed discussion and reminded the commission members that all of these items had been considered at length by the Design Review Board and suggested that the Planning Commission restrict itself to examining only those items that they have alternatives for.

Recommendation to the City Council regarding right of way issues

There are requirements in the manual that pertain to the right of way and our city attorney has advised that they should not be there, they are engineering items and it is being proposed to eliminate all things pertaining to right of way. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe pointed out that the Design Review Board didn't want to eliminate these requirements but went along provided that a strong recommendation to the City Council be drafted recommending that the PW standards be updated to reflect these design issues. Mr. Osguthorpe clarified that buildings would still have to comply, this only applied to right of way issues such as landscaping and/or walkways.

Zone Transition

This requirement only applies when two differing zones meet. When a property is abutting a different zone an applicant must average the building footprint and height, or provide substantial buffering. The question has been raised as to what is substantial buffering so a definition has been written. Mr. Osguthorpe read the current language in the manual to illustrate the difficulty in interpreting the current language.

Commissioner Wagner expressed concern for large parcels with small residential properties next to it. Mr. Osguthorpe stated that it seemed that that situation was rare and that perhaps that it was appropriate for properties neighboring residential development stay small rather than dwarf their neighbor. Additionally he pointed out that if they have a large property it shouldn't be too much of a hardship to provide the substantial buffer. He further stated that he had had Jennifer Sitts, the city's associate planner who is a landscape architect come up with the plantings that would be required and it just wasn't possible to achieve this within the current 30 foot requirement. The DRB had discussed 80 feet and reduced it down to 40 with the required plantings.

Commissioner Allen expressed concern for the situation where an R-2 development would have to buffer itself from R-1 where a duplex is not necessarily any larger than a single family home. He stated that he agreed with the requirement for screening commercial from residential but not residential from residential. He suggested that this requirement not apply if both uses are residential. Mr. Osguthorpe suggested the following language; "zone transition standards do not apply to development that is permitted under the development standards of the opposing zone or between any two residential uses".

Discussion followed on the implication of buffering multi-family uses versus buffering a

duplex from single family residential. Mr. Osguthorpe illustrated a possible solution using a perimeter only approach, putting smaller accessory-type buildings on the side abutting R-1 (i.e., a clubhouse or a couple of single family homes).

Commissioner Gair pointed out that the Planning Commission is to consider the average case and exceptions were for the DRB or variance procedure.

Chairman Kadzik stated that he did feel that screening residential from residential really seemed onerous, but did feel that zone transition from commercial to commercial was necessary to retain the appropriate scale. He further suggested that the Planning Commission come up with some appropriate language.

Commissioner Wagner suggested a radius rather than every lot within 200'. He illustrated how this would work. Commissioner Allen pointed out that it is still the first person to develop receiving the most benefit.

Chairman Kadzik pointed out that we must consider the streetscape in addition to just protecting the single family residential.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe proposed language stating that any structure in an opposing zone, within "x" number of feet of site. Chairman Kadzik stated that he felt that that may have been the intent. Theresa asked for an example drawing of whatever wording is proposed.

Mr. Osguthorpe proposed the following language, "Building footprints shall be no larger than the average footprint size on all buildings in opposing zones located within 300 feet of the subject site" eliminating the words "and that are contiguous to the transition zone boundary".

Discussion was held on how many feet would be appropriate. It was decided to change the distance to 200 feet and to add the words "and that are on parcels contiguous to the transition zone boundary" in order to protect only the closest parcels.

Mr. Osguthorpe brought the discussion back to the use issue and screening between uses. It was proposed that the zone transition standards do not apply between R-1 and R-2 zones or R-2 and R-3 zones.

Commissioner Wagner asked about screening between commercial uses and residential, such as between RB1 and RB2.

Chairman Kadzik pointed out that if there is a street in between it's also about preserving the street face. Mr. Osguthorpe suggested that perhaps this issue could be further examined at the council level on an annual basis.

Industrial Building Exemption for parking lot landscaping

Theresa asked for an update as to what had been discussed previously. Mr. Osguthorpe explained that Commissioner Wagner had been concerned about large

truck turnarounds and how that would impact parking lot landscaping. Wagner suggested that the parking lot landscaping only be required on the perimeter for industrial buildings to prevent large trucks destroying the landscaping.

Mr. Osguthorpe reminded the Commission that loading requirements are in addition to parking requirements and that it should be demonstrated through the site plan process that the two requirements can be met or do not conflict.

Commissioner Wagner stated that he did a study of parking requirements comparing other cities and didn't see the need for the requirement for curbs and trees in industrial settings.

Chairman Kadzik noted that Industrial Building Exemptions were things that were practical and don't recall a DRB discussion about the trees, however, it does make sense.

Mr. Osguthorpe read from the Design Manual Page 27 section 2, provide continuous tree canopy throughout parking lot. Consensus was reached to provide an IBE exemption for this item. Chairman Kadzik suggested that the trees be required to be placed elsewhere.

Commissioner Gair asked what we were shading. Mr. Osguthorpe replied that in addition to aesthetics, this may also be an environmental issue because asphalt is known to reflect heat. Commissioner Johnson stated that it seemed unreasonable to obstruct someone's ingress and egress but yet reasonable to provide additional trees elsewhere to mitigate the loss. Kadzik suggested that an item c) be added that states that an industrial building exemption could be obtained by providing the same quantity of trees be provided elsewhere.

Mr. Osguthorpe proposed the following language: c) for industrial buildings only, a continuous canopy of trees is not required if the number of trees otherwise required on a) or b) above is provided on the perimeter of the property.

Alders and Maples as significant vegetation.

Mr. Osguthorpe explained that these trees were excluded from the definition of significant vegetation in order to better assure retention of conifers.

Commissioner Allen pointed out that these trees are just as natural to the area as conifers. It was further pointed out that there are situations where this may be the only type of tree on the property.

Chairman Kadzik offered an example where there are a lot of trees on a large site they could fulfill the entire significant vegetation requirement with alders and maples and take down all the conifers. Commissioner Wagner offered that maybe the requirement should be for the Alders and Maples to be larger in order to be significant. Chairman Kadzik proposed a vote.

Commissioner Wagner offered that trees in a wetland be excluded in order to prevent someone from only keeping trees in the wetland and clear cutting the rest of the site.

It was decided that public input was needed before making a decision on this issue.

Expansion of the Historic District

Mr. Osguthorpe drew an illustration of the boundaries in the area of Stinson and Rosedale where Commissioner Allen had a concern, explaining that the goal was to maintain like uses and design on both sides of the street. Mr. Osguthorpe also stated that a notice has been sent out to owners of all properties being considered for inclusion in the historic district, announcing the public hearing to be held on July 1st, 2004.

Commissioner Gair pointed out that not all the boundaries cover both sides of the street and Mr. Osguthorpe explained that along North Harborview Drive one side of the street was excluded due to the topography and the neighboring residential properties. It was agreed that the proposed expansion of the Historic District seemed appropriate.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

July 1, 2004

Public Hearing

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 9:00 p.m.
Malich/Johnson – unanimously approved

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Track 1
Disc #2 Track 1