

**City of Gig Harbor
Design Review Board
Gig Harbor Civic Center
January 13th, 2011**

**Present : Chairman Darrin Filand, Vice Chair, Rick Gagliano, David Fisher, John Jernejcic, Kae Paterson, Warren Balfany, Michael Fisher
Staff Present: Senior Planner, Jennifer Kester & Associate Planner, Kristen Moerler.**

Call to Order: 5:00 pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of _____ as written. Filand / Gagliano
Motion: passed

1. **Property Development Centers, - David Zylstra, 5918 Stoneridge Mall Rd, Pleasanton, CA 94588-3229** – Application for Design Review (DRB 09-0016) requesting design alternatives and overall site design approval.

December 15, 2010 Meeting Summary and Draft Findings:

The DRB heard a presentation from the applicant regarding the changes in the proposal since the December 1, 2010 meeting. The DRB then started discussion of the proposed design; the discussion is summarized below under the applicable design requirements.

Site Related Review Items – Motions made

1. Prominent Façade related requirements:

- a. **17.99.160E** Screen or enhance building design.
- b. **17.99.400B** Apply all design criteria to prominent facades.
- c. **17.99.400A** Provide consistent architectural interest to all prominent facades.

AND

2. Location of service area related requirements

- a) **17.99.160D** Orient service and delivery area away from Enhancement Corridor. Issue: Service area of Safeway.
- b) **17.99.440D** Orient service and delivery areas away from the street. Issue: All buildings which border Olympic or SR 16. DRB will review.

DRB Discussion:

The DRB discussed the prominent façade issues and the location of services areas (items 1 and 2 above) together. Discussion related to service areas included the loading docks on the back of Safeway, Retail A and Kohl's as well as service areas for the smaller tenants. There was also discussion regarding the draft findings prepared by staff and a request to re-work the findings related to how the design meets the intent of the regulation.

MOTION: Move to approve the design as proposed, direct staff to prepare revised findings. Motion carried (5 yes, 0 no, 1 abstained).

Gagliano / Jernejcic - Motion passed

Draft Findings:

The Design Review Board finds that the proposed site plan meets the intent of the general requirements and represents a superior result to strict conformance as the development is bound on all sides with rights-of-way and the site has been designed to provide prominent facades and a public face toward both Point Fosdick and 48th Street, the two rights-of-way which provide access to the site. While service areas and backs of some buildings are oriented to Olympic Drive and SR-16, these areas are generally screened by a combination of topography and vegetation. The revised plans include additional design details on the rear/side of buildings facing SR-16 and Olympic which improve their appearance including the use of the same cornice and wainscot as is used on the front facades.

Requiring that no service area be visible from any public right-of-way would cause the development to be centralized to the middle of the site with parking fields adjacent to all rights-of-way, similar to an interior mall, which is not consistent with the Design Manual. Furthermore, the development is oriented appropriately given the topography of the site and the location of existing significant vegetation. In general, the grade is much higher than the site along Olympic Drive and SR 16 and it is along those rights-of-way where significant native trees exist. Requiring buildings to front those streets would require significant grading and tree removal.

Staff note: the plans submitted 1/11/11 do not reflect the cornice details shown to the DRB in the 12/15/10 PowerPoint presentation by the applicant. The applicant is planning to provide several revised pages at the meeting that will show the cornice as previously discussed.

Parking Related Review Items

**3. GHMC 17.99.330E Minimize parking in front of buildings;
AND**

22. GHMC 17.99.330G Minimize driveway encroachment into setback areas.

DRB Motion: Approve the design as proposed for items #3 and #22, and accept the draft findings prepared by staff. Motion carried (5 yes, 0 no, 1 abstained).

Findings: Review items 3 and 22

The DRB finds that the applicant has treated the Point Fosdick frontage as a “front” by incorporating a vegetated 20 foot building setback, maintaining existing significant vegetation near Retail D, and placing buildings and plazas along Point Fosdick. Parking does not occur in front of the buildings along Point Fosdick. The larger landscape area along Point Fosdick reflects similar landscaping as is located across the Point Fosdick and maintains the character of the area better than location of such landscaping along 48th. The treatment of Point Fosdick is appropriate as the public will perceive this side as the “front” of the site. The DRB finds that that the proposed treatment of Point Fosdick as a front and placing the parking behind the buildings along Point Fosdick better meets the intent of the manual than strict conformance.

The board also found that the proposed retaining wall and deep landscape bed along 48th Street will visually separate the main parking lot from the street so that a large field of parking is not perceived as a dominant feature of the design when viewed from 48th Street. As the applicant

has minimized the appearance of the parking from both Point Fosdick and 48th, the proposal represents a superior result than strict conformance with the administrative standards.

Furthermore, the retaining wall and deep landscape bed mitigates the encroachment into the setback area of the south drive aisle. The proposed south drive aisle location meets the intent of the requirements and represents an equivalent solution as more than the code required 10-foot landscape bed will be provided; however it will be partially on ROW which the City never intends to develop.

Prominent Parcel Related Review Items

4. **GHMC 17.99.220C** Provide a stately appearance to structures;
 5. **GHMC 17.99.220D** Keep structures in the foreground;
 6. **GHMC 17.99.220F** Use landscaping to “frame” buildings and to screen parking appurtenances;
- AND**
7. **GHMC 17.99.300B** Locate structures near front setback line.

DRB Discussion:

The board discussed the summary in the 12/14/10 memo. The board briefly reiterated the existing topography and vegetation preventing Retail A from fronting directly on to Olympic Drive. The DRB discussed the revised plaza/pedestrian access along with the revised architecture. In general the DRB comments from the initial meeting had been incorporated and addressed in the revisions. The board also discussed the west side of Retail A and the need for additional glazing. In particular direction was provided to add one additional window bay on the west side of Retail A (approximately where two people were shown standing in the rendering of this elevation).

MOTION: Accept the current proposal with additional horizontal glazing to be incorporated on the west side of Retail A, and direct staff to prepare findings.
Motion carried (5 yes, 0 no, 1 abstained).

Gagliano / Jernejcic - Motion passed

Draft Findings:

The Design Review Board finds that the existing topography and vegetation warrant a deviation from strict compliance with the requirements to front a structure on Olympic Drive. Furthermore the applicant has provided an equivalent design through the landscape and architectural treatment of the northwest corner of the site and along the Point Fosdick frontage in keeping with the intent of the requirements.

The common area adjacent to the corner of Point Fosdick and Olympic provides a dedicated pedestrian entrance into the site anchored by Retail A and B. The architecture of Retail A and B meets the intent to provide a stately appearance though the detailing of the two tower elements, material choices, and location of glazing which work with the pedestrian access and building entries. The tower elements provide different roof/cornice and material details which complement each other, without competing visually for prominence with the primary structure (Safeway).

The landscape treatment along Point Fosdick is intended to coordinate with the large setback existing across Point Fosdick from this site. Native vegetation is proposed so that in time the materials will further contribute to the established pattern of native vegetation in the Olympic Drive / Point Fosdick Activity Center. Retail B and D additionally provide the street presence intended by the requirements to locate structures on the front setback and in the foreground of the view.

The alternative design respects the intent of the regulations for this site while providing a superior design solution that utilizes the existing topography and accesses to provide a public front to the development.

Staff Note: DRB should review the revised elevation and renderings of the west elevation of Retail A. Should the revised glazing be acceptable, staff recommends moving to revise the current motion so that the condition is removed

Architecture Related Review Items –only those items for which motions were made

8. GHMC 17.99.330F Avoid Parking in front of building entrances.

MOTION: Move to accept the proposed location of parking and entrances of Pads 1, 2, and 3 and Retail B, C and D as there is adequate space between parking stalls and entrances. Motion carried (5 yes, 0 no, 1 abstained).

Gagliano / Jernejcic - Motion passed

Draft Findings:

The proposed design provides larger sidewalks than required (secondary structures are required to be connected by sidewalks not less than 3 feet in width; proposal includes 6-20 of sidewalk depth). The sidewalk area generally includes street trees that additionally separate the parking from the entry. The proposed separation between the parking and the entrances is adequate to meet the intent of this provision and results in an equivalent design.

Other Review Items

1. GHMC 17.99.340A Choose fence materials carefully.

Motion: Approve the proposed use of black vinyl coated chain link fencing with matching posts and rails for the storm pond, and adopt the draft findings prepared by staff. Motion carried (4 yes, 1 no, 1 abstained).

Findings:

The DRB finds that the proposed fencing meets the intent of the general requirement as the dark color is intended to minimize the visibility of the fence and allow it to blend into the adjacent vegetation. Further the proposed fence material is superior to the specific language as use of all black fencing will better minimize the visibility of the storm pond than the use of wood posts and rails.

For the remaining items, no prior motions have been made to accept the proposed design alternative. Staff has provided a brief summary of prior discussions.

Hierarchy of Structures- Related Review Items –No motions made

9. **GHMC 17.99.390A2** Design primary structures as focal point;

AND

10. **GHMC 17.99.390C** Integrate primary structure design elements into secondary structures.

DRB Discussion: Safeway

The DRB felt that while improvements had been made that help the Safeway building read as more prominent; the elements required additional work so that the building would read as the focal point of the site. The bulk of the discussion focused on the NW corner of the Safeway building and the adjacent common area.

The landscaping along the main drive aisle and common area adjacent to Safeway were improved since the initial review, however no access was provided into the building from the common area. The board encouraged the applicant to incorporate an entry at this corner to facilitate the use of the common area as the deli counter is located in this corner of the building.

The cornice of the Safeway tower element was also discussed. The board encouraged the use of the most substantial of the cornice elements on this tower, or possibly a more embellished cornice at this location. When the board considered the NW corner of Safeway alongside the SW corner of Retail E the board felt that the tower on Retail E overshadowed the Safeway tower. The Board felt the tower element on E should be revised so the towers would not compete visually.

The board discussed the need for the upper portion of the Safeway tower element to have a purpose. Discussion included locating a sign, artwork or possibly a clock on the North and West facing sides of the tower.

The board also discussed the common area and suggested potentially extending the special paving into the drive area as a larger pedestrian crossing area. The idea was that the paving would help to reduce vehicle speed and add emphasis to the activity occurring in the common area.

At this point in the meeting the DRB turned to a general discussion regarding the Kohl's building proposal.

DRB Discussion on the Kohl's Building:

The DRB reviewed the revisions to the Kohl's building and while they felt there was better integration of materials throughout the site, they were concerned that, overall, the changes made from the last meeting were not moving the building in the right direction.

Regarding Material Choices: The DRB was happy to see that the sign box was the same siding material as portions of Safeway. The DRB also discussed the proposed cornices and whether the cornices on Kohl's should be the same cornices used elsewhere on site. No specific direction was provided on cornices. The DRB did feel that the use of painted, textured tilt-up concrete as the field of the Kohl's front façade was inappropriate. Such treatment may be acceptable on the back (north elevation), but the DRB felt they would need to see the overall revised design before giving specific comments. In discussion of the EFIS material as the front

entrance, the DRB was split on whether too much EFIS was being used or that the accent material was appropriately used.

Regarding the Architectural Modulation: The DRB looked at the newly proposed corner towers and felt that the corner towers represented a different architectural style than the rest of the building. Specifically, the corners were too “old fashioned” compared to the contemporary entrance and sign box. They also felt that the detailing of the corners draws one’s eye to them, but no activity occurs at those corners. In general, the DRB felt that the corner towers should be removed. The DRB also looked at the relationship of Retail F with Kohl’s since they abut. The DRB felt that the two architectural styles need to be better coordinated and integrated. By integrating the architectural detailing of Retail F into Kohl’s, the Kohl’s building would better relate to the entire site. Finally, the DRB looked at the north façade of the building and suggested that the parapet return on the NW corner extend on the north façade further than the six feet proposed.

Regarding the Pedestrian Walkway: The DRB liked the increase in landscaping along Kohl’s façade. However, they felt that the proposed landscaping and trellises were not consistent with the vocabulary of the rest of the site. The trellises were too traditional and not used elsewhere on site. The DRB suggested using similar paving patterns and street tree patterns along Kohl’s edge or extending the pedestrian paving into the drive aisle to “announce” this area as a place for pedestrian activity.

Regarding Solid/Voids Ratios: The DRB expressed desire to see more “holes cut” in the front façade in the form of windows. The Kohl’s architects explained that behind the front façade of Kohl’s (the south façade) was the “back of house” activities – offices, storage, etc. and windows into those spaces were not possible. The DRB requested that the architect look at ways to provide more windows in the front façade even if they were small or high in the building viewing into plenum. The DRB felt that the front façade needed more windows to hint at that fact that activity occurs in this building. Members of the DRB stated that the glow of the windows invites users into a place and provides animation to the building.

MOTION: No motions were made or acted on for this item as the applicant was encouraged to revise the proposal (see discussion).

Architecture Related Review Items

12. GHMC 17.99.390C Integrate primary structure design elements into secondary structures.

DRB Discussion:

The initial review discussion (12/1/10) included discussion that the secondary buildings were generally well integrated with the material palette of the primary structure (Safeway), with the exception of the Kohl’s building.

On 12/15/10 the DRB discussed that the revised Kohl’s building incorporated larger amounts of the materials used elsewhere on the site. However as the Board provided direction to revise the design, no motion was made on this item.

14. GHMC 17.99.380A Avoid long, low wall planes

15. GHMC 17.99.380B.1 Provide substantial shifts in walls and roof surfaces. Horizontal shifts;

AND

16. GHMC 17.99.380B.2 Provide substantial shifts in walls and roof surfaces. Vertical shifts.

DRB Discussion:

The DRB discussed that the changes in the cornice detail (depth, height and material) was a good alternative to the use of modulating the height of structures as required to meet prescriptive standards. The changes in the cornice detail generally coincide with, and enhance, the horizontal modulation provided. The DRB commented that the screening along SR 16 and Olympic Drive supported the request to minimize horizontal and vertical modulation of the facades facing those rights-of-way provided that key details were continued.

Staff Note: see staff note under review items 4-7 regarding the lack of cornice in the 1/11/11 plan set. Revised drawings are anticipated at the meeting that include this detail.

17. GHMC 17.99.380C Avoid false-front look on building.

DRB Discussion:

The DRB reviewed the initial proposal to return parapets generally 6 feet back from the front façade. They felt that the 6 feet seemed appropriate for the smaller buildings but noted that the parapet return depth should be deep enough to convey the feeling of true mass.

While this item was not discussed in depth at the 12/15/10 meeting, it should be noted that the tower elements are generally shown as four sided and there are larger returns called out for Kohl's.

18. GHMC 17.99.380D Provide visual terminus to tops of buildings.

DRB Discussion:

The DRB felt that while the proposed buildings were not two-stories, the buildings were tall enough to provide the massing of two-story buildings and, therefore, a flat roof treatment was appropriate.

The DRB also reviewed the proposed cornice details. The DRB generally like the typical cornice details and felt the depth of the cornice, at greater than required, made up for any deficiencies in height. The DRB felt the lack of a cornice on the Kohl's building sign panel was a nice contrast to the heavy cornices elsewhere on site.

19. GHMC 17.9.410B Conform to solid/void ratio requirements

AND

20. GHMC 17.99.420A Use siding material that convey the same visual qualities as wood, brick, stone, stacked masonry or (in limited application) other unspecified materials.

DRB Discussion:

With the exception of Kohl's as discussed above, and the west side of retail A, the DRB discussion indicated general acceptance of the proposed glazing and openings in the building facades across the site.

The DRB felt the use of a concrete base was appropriate as it is a modern take on a traditional wainscot. The DRB was most concerned about the materials used on the Kohl's building as

previously discussed. The DRB was also somewhat concerned with the materials used for the backs of the buildings, particularly Retail E and F due to their potential visibility and suggested that the materials used on these buildings should be consistent front and back.

Please note that no review findings are provided, or needed, for items #8 or #11 as those were references to other sections in the initial staff memo dated November 26, 2010 and did not represent actual items for review.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

January 27th, 2011 – Continue review of Point Fosdick Square Redevelopment (Safeway)

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Move to adjourn. **Jernejcic / Filand** – Motion passed.