

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Minutes of Public Hearing  
Thursday, July 1, 2004  
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Carol Johnson, Kathy Franklin, Bruce Gair, Dick Allen, Chairman Paul Kadzik. Staff present: Steve Osguthorpe .

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Deferred until the next meeting as not everyone had a copy.

The Chairman opened the public hearing at 7:02.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Dale Pinney, Proposed text amendments reducing setbacks requirements in the PCD-BP (ZONE 04-03) –**

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe gave a staff report giving the history of the PCD-BP zone and the current proposal. He stated that in 1997 Gig Harbor North Development regulations were adopted. The idea at that time was a planned approach to the entire area coordinate uses amongst uses, carefully mixed and integrated. Large setbacks were intended for where intense uses were abutting residential zones. The current proposal is to create two categories of uses which place more impacting type of uses in one, less in another. The proposal defines different setbacks for each category with more impacting uses having a larger setback. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission conduct the public hearing and forward a recommendation for approval to the City Council.

Chairman Paul Kadzik opened the Public Hearing

Dale Pinney, First Western Development, 1359 N 205<sup>th</sup>, Shoreline

Mr. Pinney stated that he felt that the ordinance as drafted meets with what was discussed in the work session with the Planning Commission and that the proposed setbacks were more appropriate and accomplished the city's goals.

Commissioner Allen asked staff at what point would each site be classified. Mr. Osguthorpe replied that a site would not be classified, it depends on the use and that the use would be classified more or less at the time of application.

There being no further comment Chairman Kadzik closed the public hearing at 7:07

**Motion:** Move we recommend adoption of the ordinance as written.  
Johnson/Franklin – motion carried unanimously.

## **Design Manual Update -**

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe outlined his staff report stating that the Design Review Board has been working on the update for over 2 years resulting in a major rewrite of the formatting and some substantive changes. Mr. Osguthorpe then distributed a summary of the proposed changes, highlighting the incorporation of the design manual into the zoning code and the correction of inconsistencies between the design manual and the zoning code. He reported that staff believes this is a positive change in the administration of the design standards and the Design Review Board voted unanimously to recommend approval to the Planning Commission. As a result of the previous work sessions held with the Planning Commission the only changes recommended are (1) the elimination of provisions for extra height on primary structures within the entire height restriction area rather than just on parcels within defined view corridors, (2) an additional Industrial Building Exemption for interior parking lot landscaping provided that additional trees will be provided in the perimeter landscaping (this was done to provide for maneuverability of large semi trucks), (3) to redefine transition zone standards to not apply between R-1 and R-2 and R-2 and R-3 zones and (4) only those buildings within 200 feet of subject site would be used for calculation of building footprint size in zone transition areas.

Additionally, Mr. Osguthorpe stated that the Design Review Board had proposed exclusion of alders and maples from significant vegetation and the Planning Commission had expressed concern with that proposal.

Mr. Osguthorpe distributed a letter he had received from Wade Perrow and reminded the Planning Commission of a letter from Lita Dawn Stanton which was e-mailed or delivered to them. He further stated that the City Attorney had drafted a response, of which he then gave a copy to Ms. Stanton and the Planning Commission. He stated that the response basically reiterated the need to be specific in our standards due to state case law and also included a full copy of the article referenced in Ms. Stanton's letter.

Chairman Paul Kadzik asked if staff could remind everyone of the schedule set forth by the city council for adoption of the Design Manual. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe replied that the next scheduled work session with the Planning Commission is July 15<sup>th</sup> at which time they should finalize their recommendation to the City Council. The City Council has directed that this item be brought to them on August 9<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2004.

Chairman Kadzik opened the public hearing with a limit of 10 minutes per person.

**David Fisher, North Pacific Design, 2727 Hollycroft, Gig Harbor**

Mr. Fisher submitted two letters, one from Gordon Rush and one from himself. He stated that he had gone through the design manual changes and noted that it seemed clearer and more organized and felt that this would help streamline design review. Mr. Fisher expressed his concern that prescriptive review could prevent a better design and

suggested that there be a time limit such as; 20 business days for staff review, 20 days for a report and if necessary 20 days for the Design Review Board report. He pointed out that on page 8 of the manual there is a reference to the DRB not recommending approval for dimensional standards and that a variance is required. He recommended that these standards be in the municipal code. He felt that the introduction was clear on the two paths of design review. However, there should be more options and suggested that the Planning Commission delete the alley requirement. Mr. Fisher went on to say that he was concerned with the zone transition standards and comparing one's building size and height to that of one's neighbors. If the building is right next door (within 100') it may make sense but 200' away does not seem reasonable. He felt that there should be an option to increase the size by about 1/3. He further stated that the exterior materials section should not be specific but rather have two categories (premium and commodity) and proposed that at least 50% of the building be premium materials (premium being brick and stone). Additionally he suggested providing options for de-emphasizing garage doors.

Commissioner Bruce Gair asked Mr. Fisher about the delays he had experienced and what he felt had caused them. Mr. Fisher stated that he felt it was a lack of clarity and SEPA not running concurrently with the Design Review Process.

Jake Bujacich, 3607 Ross Ave., Gig Harbor

Mr. Bujacich wished to comment on the proposed expansion of the Historic District and observed that when this is adopted there will be approximately over 100 homes in the historic district. He noted that there were approximately nine building lots without homes not counting the parcel behind Yacht Club and the Franich residence. He noted that there are new houses that have been built and according to this manual those houses would not be able to be built because of the setbacks. Now according to this manual you can build as close as 3' from the rear lot line or 5' from the side. Mr. Bujacich stated that it seems almost impossible to build and that this document makes it take too long. He then cited a case where he had to plant 9 trees for taking down a Madrona without a permit. He felt that we should use the height restrictions and zoning to regulate and stated that we created this quaint little village without any of these regulations.

Mr. Osguthorpe stated that the update addresses the tree issue as the Design Review Board has recommended a selective thinning and maintenance provision.

Wade Perrow, 9119 North Harborview Dr., Gig Harbor

Mr. Perrow thanked Mr. Osguthorpe for sending an early copy of the Design Manual for review and said that up to this point we haven't been able to comment. Mr. Perrow went over his written comments and suggested the city hold a work study session like what is being done with the Building Size Analysis so that we can have more of a dialog. He pointed out that his comments only encompass the introduction and stated that he still needed to take the time to thoroughly review the manual. Mr. Perrow cautioned that once this manual is codified it's a zoning ordinance and you will have to go to the Hearing Examiner and the DRB won't have any authority. He asked how do

you define equivalent or superior design solutions. He stated that in the update 50% of the lots have to have an alley and asked what if you are on a steep hillside and can only have 25%. He noted that now that it's codified the DRB can't rule. This is legislating good taste. He suggested that the city get a land use attorney other than Carol Morris to review it so that we can have real design review instead of legislating it. Design is art and art needs to be flexible. He cited an example of metal siding which can only be on certain parts of the building and pointed out that Albertsons and Home Depot have metal siding and everyone thinks it looks great.

Chairman Kadzik asked to let the record show that Commissioner Scott Wagner arrived.

Lita Dawn Stanton, 111 Raft Island, Gig Harbor

Ms. Stanton stated that her comments were not intended to derail the design manual, however she did have concerns for the process. She voiced her hope that there will be changes to manual along with a hope that there be a good look at the process. She thanked Carol Morris for the lengthy response. She then noted that on page 5 of the manual in the overview item c) originally said facilitate early and ongoing communication, a dialog among project proponents, neighborhoods and city's design review board in a public meetings setting. She stated that the Design Review Board had changed that language and until tonight she didn't realize how important the word neighborhood is. She then noted that some of the staff don't live in this area and don't know what's in your backyard and don't know what Gig Harbor North looks like. She said that if you take the public out of the process you will lose resources and insights about those properties. I can't tell you what color to paint your house and I shouldn't have that authority in my opinion. Ms. Stanton told the Planning Commission they could pass either manual as far as she was concerned and with as much time as it's taken to get this far she would assume you would because there are some good things in the manual. She noted that Seattle has a process in place and that they are 10 years ahead of us and they've got some good things to look at. She pointed out that on the Design Review Board agenda it states: all public attendance is encouraged, and that this is a public meeting not a public hearing; public testimony will not be accepted at this time. This is our manual, this is our town and we should say what it looks like, and if you are not opening the doors and encouraging public input in some capacity then you shut the door on your own community. Ms. Stanton further emphasized that she didn't mean to say that things in it aren't valid but she thought that the process was broken and encouraged the commission to please, caveat your decision with some kind of work sessions or some kind of ability to review other cities and their procedures.

Jason Fowers 18526 Newell Rd, Poulsbo

Mr. Fowers noted that he doesn't live in the community, however, loved it here and have been designing here for the last couple of years and wanted to continue to do so. He stated that his comments were from experiencing Design Review. He then went on to explain that in his reading of the Design Manual and the section on retention of 20% retention of significant vegetation, if that happens to be in the middle of your lot you are out of luck and can't replace with like kind. He then asked if that is that different now.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe responded that the three-tree replacement issue pertains to trees that were required to be retained but which were subsequently lost. It was not intended to allow a replacement process without efforts to retain what exists.

Mr. Fowers stated that he didn't mean to throw out the design manual as some have here tonight, and further stated that he actually thought a lot of it was good. He then went through his outline which was submitted to the Planning Commission. He voiced his concern with zone transition buffer and stated that he had encountered problems especially for commercial lots when the 40% buffer is in a zone across the street from a residential zone, when doing a commercial project if your project doesn't have frontage you tend to lose that street presence and without that street presence the business will fold. He continued to say that then he would have to make the building the same size as the residence across the street within 200' feet and, again, commercially speaking, if there is a 1700 sq ft residence across the street it becomes a lot more expensive to try to build multiple small 1700 sq ft buildings as opposed to a larger building. He pointed out that when you are in the same zone you could build a 6000 sq ft home right next to a 1700 sq ft home but not a commercial building. He proposed to allow commercial across from residential and to use modulation like we have done in the past. He continued with his next item which was the 20% retention of significant vegetation. He pointed out that commercial developments usually need the center of their lots. He expressed that he did not understand the proposal to perhaps exclude alders and maples and asked why save one species of tree and say another doesn't matter, voicing his opinion to have that deleted. Mr. Fowers went on to explain his recommendation to allow replacement of like kind vegetation during the construction process not just after it, along with a requirement to put an 8' or 12' tree. His next issue was the modulation of all facades and ridges. He quoted from the manual and stated that the problem again is more a functional one, to make all facades fit within this requirement, stating that he agreed that it is important on prominent facades but to also require it on the non prominent facades is a waste of material.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe pointed out that facades which are not prominent do not have to comply with the design standards.

Randy Boss, Seattle Pacific Realty,

Mr. Boss stated that he had sat in with several of the design review sub-committee meetings with planning staff and expressed his pleasure with being able to have an opportunity to talk rather than listen. He further stated that one of the issues that came before the city council during the west side rezone and building size discussion was the 65,000 sq ft boxes that were going to be allowed over on the west side and that discussion at that point was that the city council eliminated the PUD process for any developments that went into that development then came back at the end of the day and said okay PUDs would be okay except that we can't change the box size through a PUD. He thought that some of the comments that came out tonight could be addressed through the PUD process, stating that the planning department and the city could to take a look at a project using the design manual as a guideline and someone who wanted to vary would have the opportunity for a PUD process that would then invite the public to the table and give the planning department and the public input on that project.

He encouraged a discussion or a blending of those two and somehow get the PUD process incorporated into the design manual because he thought that it would address some of the concerns that the public has about the process and the restrictions that they perceive would be imposed by this manual. He then stated that he had 40 complaints but would limit those to less than a dozen tonight and speak on them quickly. He noted that the code says that your building can't be any bigger than the building adjacent to it and can't be any taller than the building next to it if you're next to a transitional line. He felt that that would place a real burden on property owners not just commercial property owners but any property owner. He had talked to the real estate director for Safeway and he said he was not happy about their recent remodel. He wanted to tear the structure down and build a new Safeway, even though they spent 3 million dollars on it. When he went to the City they handed him the new design manual which isn't in affect yet and told him if he was going to do this you might as well comply with this manual which required him to take his building and push it up to the front setback line with the parking behind the store. Even with that the buildings across the street were a gas station and a bank existed, the transitional zoning wouldn't have allowed the building to be built. He thought this was detrimental to the city and one of the unintended consequences of the design manual. He then addressed the requirement for no retaining walls to be over 6 feet tall. He continued to say that Costco is now in the process of trying to get a site plan approved with the city and they have a 27 foot grade elevation change so they have to build a retaining wall on the back in order to get a flat site. If there is no modification to this or if Costco is required to comply with this requirement it would eliminate the Costco from that site. Furthermore, in talking with the developer on that site, Costco is the primary structure on that site and therefore would have to be on the front property line and the city wasn't happy with having a 130,000 square foot building on the front property line and of course this is heresay, but I understand that Costco is going to be required to apply for a variance to move their building to the back of the property so as not to have such a massive structure up on the street. He felt that this was a ludicrous regulation to have to comply with. He stated that the PUD process would have worked to resolve that issue. Mr. Boss then addressed common areas equal to 10% of the gross square footage of the project. He explained that on Pt Fosdick there is 30 acres where the WalMart/Fred Meyer site was and if you joined that with Safeway you have about 47 acres. He went on to explain that if you were to redevelop that whole property obviously there's 4700 square feet of required common area which is over an acre of common area that would have to be developed. That's an extreme taking that someone has to pay commercial property taxes on. He pointed out that shoppers park at the front door, go in the store and then go home and that nobody takes their groceries and then sits and has a sandwich before they go home. He admitted it may be a nice amenity for the community but if you go up to Gig Harbor North there is never anyone there. It looks nice but the cost is too high.

Continuing, Mr. Boss stated that one of the parties that's interested in bringing a new theatre to Gig Harbor would have to have the front of their building facing Pt Fosdick with a 40' buffer in front of it so the front door of the theatre is behind 40' of trees with the parking to the side or behind the building. He guaranteed that the theatre is never coming to Gig Harbor with that design requirement in place. He felt that there should be some review criteria and suggested that maybe it's the PUD.

Commissioner Allen asked in the case of the theatre illustration what is it that drives the 40' buffer?

Mr. Boss replied that it was the property line setback requirement.

Mr. Allen further queried if it was in the transition zone. Mr. Boss replied that he understood that the entire perimeter must be retained.

Mr. Osguthorpe clarified that the zoning code requires that all significant trees within the setback be retained and that the design manual just states 20% retention, so the 40' requirement does not apply. He further pointed out that the front setback is actually 20' in the B-2 zone and if there were significant trees within that setback they would have to be retained. Additionally he explained that the side yard setback in the B-2 is 5' or 10' and the side would only be 40' if it was abutting a different zone.

Commissioner Wagner asked about the zone transition standards and would they apply to this site. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe answered that no, they were not abutting a different zone.

Mr. Boss further stated that he had heard that Costco was having difficulty in the process here in Gig Harbor and they originally wanted to go to Port Orchard but they were given headaches there and decided to come to Gig Harbor North but now have renewed their interest in Port Orchard. He felt that would be a significant loss for the revenue stream in Gig Harbor of over about a million dollars in sales tax revenue.

Chairman Kadzik asked if it was possible to have written comments from Mr. Boss. He answered that his comments tonight were off the cuff and he would e-mail written comments.

Chuck Hunter, 8829 Franklin Ave., Gig Harbor

Mr. Hunter stated that he was a member of the Design Review Board but was speaking on his own behalf. He stated that the Design Review Board had never held up a project more than over a couple of meetings. He explained that the requirements of the design manual are carried out by the staff and the applicant and that usually the DRB will deal with 3 or 4 items, sometimes 1 item and you can guess that one item isn't going to affect a project very much. He further stated that most of the time things have been resolved between staff and the applicant when it gets to us. He expressed that he would like to see the DRB be able to look at the entire staff report when a project reaches a certain threshold to provide a little oversight as to how staff is interpreting the manual. He further stated that in the manual itself he would like to see less formulas and no prohibited items and a chance for a little more creativity. He expressed skepticism about codifying the manual. He agreed that he couldn't argue with the staff or the city attorney about the good points and bad points about codifying it but thought that once it's codified it will be more intimidating and reduce creativity. Mr. Hunter recommended that there be some kind of standard operating procedure for staff and noted design review really went off the track here about 2-3 years ago when a couple of

projects in the view basin that we had a lot questions about resulted in a gag order. The next project we tried to review while not being able to have any dialogue with the applicant. It's impossible to negotiate and be able to have a dialogue. He went on to explain that he'd like to see some neighborhood participation on the design review board. He reminded the Planning Commission that the same requirement in downtown Gig Harbor doesn't necessarily work at Point Fosdick and stated that there was a need for a narrow scope in the view basin and then lessen the scope as you move outward until you get to the UGA. Continuing, he explained that Design Review was great and does good things but he would hate to see every building looking the same.

Dale Pinney, First Western Development, 1359 N 205<sup>th</sup> Shoreline Washington

Mr. Pinney stated that the city has a design manual because it has a general idea of what the city should look like and there are some good clinical examples of the pitfalls of trying to be too specific about how you get to your vision. He voiced his concern in regard to what Mr. Perrow was saying in that all regulations have of a little bit of wiggle room but the zoning code is pretty strict and how you would interpret "that the alternative design meets the intent of each general requirement". "Intent" is not a zoning code type of word, those are flexibility words. He stated that he went through two design review processes and they were more of an administrative process. The DRB had an administrative role to aid you in meeting the city's vision while having the flexibility to make it's own decisions. He noted that somebody said the theatre had to be on the front setback line and if we were to submit a building design that looks really good I'm not sure that if this is part of the zoning code the DRB would still have the flexibility to decide these things. He recommended that there be a vehicle in this document that specifically says the DRB has parameters, that they are not stuck with certain provisions. He cautioned the Planning Commission in their review of the residential sections of the manual and recommended that cottage design style and it's pedestrian features shouldn't be excluded. He went to say that in the parking garage section the Planning Commission should consider that any parking garage is probably more than 20 cars and asked if underground parking had been considered the same as a parking garage.

Jake Bujacich, 3607 Ross Ave., Gig Harbor

Mr. Bujacich asked if he has a lot in a residential district now and wants to build a 3500 sq ft building in Waterfront Millville and if the residences across the street within 200 feet are smaller, would he have to put in a 40' buffer.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe replied that under the proposed changes if the use is allowed in the opposing zone then the zone transition standards do not apply, yet if it's an office building across from a residence in a different zone the zone transition standards would apply and pointed out that you would have the choice to reflect the scale of the abutting buildings or buffering. He further stated that the current and proposed standards allow a smaller structure in front and a larger structure in the rear to reflect the scale.

Mr. Bujacich voiced his concern that we enjoy the view of the bay and if you start



building residences and putting up a buffer, you'll be building a wall. Additionally he noted that there should not be a choice to build as close as 5' to the side property line. He explained that if you have to put a driveway on one side and then you are forced to do the 5' on one side.

Commissioner Allen added that Waterfront Millville allows duplexes so all of the distance on the shoreline side of the street of Harborview from Rosedale to Stinson is Waterfront Millville. If someone wanted to build a 4000 square foot duplex and has a 900 square foot house across the street he has a problem.

Lita Dawn Stanton, 111 Raft Island, Gig Harbor

Ms. Stanton stated that she would like to comment on just one more thing. She stated that if you are taking the flexibility out of the manual by getting very prescriptive with your formulas where are you going to accommodate flexibility. She noted that in Seattle's municipal code they require a pre-application conference and these meetings happen early on. She expressed that if we don't have these meetings early on with neighborhoods we lose an opportunity and that this particular process works to include neighborhoods. She felt that if you restrict it to five people on a board and three staff members then you have to provide prescriptive mechanisms to kick into place because you don't have access to your neighborhood. She further pointed that the Design Review Board had unanimously agreed to send a letter to the Planning Commission regarding the public works requirements being taken out completely from the manual and voiced her concern with the Public Works department not having to comply with design review.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe replied that the Seattle Code is certainly worth looking at. Mr. Osguthorpe went on to explain that there are two processes in Seattle, with one being a Design Review Board process and the other being an Administrative Process very much like we have here. He explained that a project in which goes before the Design Review Board in Seattle does require both a pre-application conference and also what they call an early design guidance public meeting with the Design Review Board. The pre-application conference is a staff meeting the same as what we have here in Gig Harbor; not a neighborhood meeting. He further stated that we have pre-application meetings with applicants before they actually submit an application and that we certainly encourage those. Mr. Osguthorpe continued that the only time that you have to have the early design guidance public meeting in Seattle is if you choose the Design Review Board process and in both situations, however, whether it's administrative by the director or the Design Review Board, the Seattle DRB is also a recommending body only; not a decision making body. He noted the difference between Seattle and Gig Harbor is that unlike the Hearing Examiner making the final decision on design review based upon the DRB recommendation, Seattle's Planning Director makes the final decision based upon the recommendation of the DRB. He summarized by saying those are the two processes much like what we have here and that he would expect that probably the reason for the dual process in Seattle was the same as our concern for the need to provide specificity because the state has mandated a turnaround time for review. He explained that we have the 120 day requirement to turn a project around and you usually cannot do that with the DRB

process. Therefore, the alternate administrative process gives the applicant specific information to decide if they want to meet those or not which allows them the opportunity to meet that turnaround time. He closed by saying the Seattle process is definitely worth looking at as there are some similarities and some differences as well.

Dale Pinney, First Western Development, 1359 N 205<sup>th</sup> Shoreline Washington:

Mr. Pinney stated that he had just completed a 70,000 sq ft medical office building in the Northgate design review district in Seattle and that their design review method is very prescriptive. He said that they have a very different vision of what their city is going to be than Gig Harbor does. He noted that it was much easier to meet their standards and they have very wide tolerances and there is lots of stuff you can do but a totally different perspective. He felt that it was not a good comparison. He noted that the pre-design meetings were very different and the interactive process in Seattle was very much more impersonal, cold and calculating.

Commissioner Wagner asked Mr. Pinney, as a developer who has recently been through both processes, which process he enjoyed going through better and if the Seattle process was more timely. Mr. Pinney replied that the vision is different because their districts are set up throughout the city and their design manuals are set up differently. He stated that their Design Review Manual is part of their zoning code and you look at it and you know what you can do. He noted that here in Gig Harbor there are so many different alternatives to achieve your vision that he wasn't sure we should to try to be that narrow and prescriptive in how you want to do it or let the DRB give their opinion. He explained that the process in Gig Harbor was very difficult and time consuming for larger box-type projects because he couldn't build it the way the book said, so he had to work with the Design Review Board to come up with ways that met the intent or that the Board thought looked good and further explained that that inherently is going to take a lot more time. He emphasized that if he turned a project in that is a prescriptive project he'd probably go right through. The types of projects like Gig Harbor North, large medical projects or Safeways, don't fit your manual very well. He further stated that if you want to build a Costco or a Safeway or a large theatre or a big office building then the rules and the vision that Gig Harbor has doesn't fit that project very well.

Commissioner Wagner clarified that if you wanted to build Randy Boss's project in Seattle, a Safeway and a theatre and go through their process in a commercial zone would that be a lot simpler.

Mr. Pinney explained that Safeways and big theatres don't look like the Civic Center building, which he thought was what Gig Harbor wanted. Smaller buildings can meet your vision much easier.

Commissioner Allen asked who is making these discretionary calls when you have to tweak the system to build these buildings.

Mr. Pinney replied that the most difficult part for us has been getting through the Design Review Board because it's the most constraining element, so in our process it was staff,

the DRB and us putting up examples and trying to win DRB support for our ideas by making something fatter, taller, wider, different to the point that it was acceptable. He explained that zoning code review is clinical and that once you had design review approval the zoning code part was a lot simpler.

Commissioner Gair commented that the rules need to be formulated for the neighborhood. He noted that Seattle has been around a long time and have a lot of staff and they have a different approach for each neighborhood. He pointed out that we are trying to write one manual for all and cautioned that we have the potential to make a big mistake because we are growing.

There being no further testimony Chairman Paul Kadzik closed the Public Hearing. The next meeting is a work-study session on July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

Commissioner Wagner stated that there was a lot of discussion tonight on zone transitions and was wondering if there is a way to make a map to see all the properties that are affected by transition zones. He noted that the topic came up 60-70% of the time and asked if a staff member could make a map that shows this. Commissioners Gair and Allen agreed that it would be helpful to see this on a larger scale.

Mr. Osguthorpe stated that he would pull together something.

Commissioner Gair noted that this was a tough time of year to get everyone together and asked if there was any possibility that we could open up the next work session as a public hearing in case anyone else wants to say something.

Mr. Osguthorpe pointed out that as a work session you can still allow public dialogue. Commissioner Johnson reiterated that the City Council has given the Planning Commission an August deadline. Mr. Osguthorpe stated that the Council may want to have their own workshops or public hearings and that those work sessions with the City Council will need to have definite agendas so that discussion topics do not drift and repeat.

Commissioner Allen expressed a concern that we haven't received enough comments from citizens at large. He noted that there are some changes within the Historic District which really affect people's property and they don't realize it. He further stated that he didn't like these things happening without ordinary citizens being aware.

Commissioner Johnson asked what process had been used to solicit participation in the building size analysis. She further pointed out that she would really like to use the next work session to discuss the issues as a Commission so that they could formulate a recommendation and let the City Council hold a public hearing.

Chairman Kadzik expressed his wish to also get staff's input on the public comments received and their validity. He suggested that the next meeting be used to go over the comments presented tonight. Commissioner Wagner reiterated the need for time to discuss everyone's concerns.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe went over some of the comments presented and those which he would clarify further at the next meeting and pointed out that the design manual update was not initiated to create an entire new design review process.

Commissioner Gair suggested that the design review process be looked at separately from the design manual update.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe pointed out that specific notice was sent out to every property owner affected by the expansion of the historic district and staff received 3 or 4 phone calls but those residents did not show up at the hearing. He suggested that the requirement that all property owners meet the historic district standards be removed.

Chairman Kadzik stated that the next meeting would be a work-study session and suggested that if there is time we could allow for some input at that meeting.

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

July 15, 2004 at 6pm – Work Study Session

**ADJOURN:**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 10:00 p.m.  
Johnson/Allen – unanimously approved

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