



**City of Gig Harbor Design Review Board
Meeting of October 27th, 2011
Civic Center, 3510 Grandview Street**

5:05 p.m. - Call to order, roll call

Present: Board Members –Vice Chairman Rick Gagliano, David Fisher and Kay Paterson

Staff Present: Kristin Moerler and Dennis Troy

New Business

Chairman Filand opened the meeting introduced the project and Associate Planner Kristin Moerler for staff's presentation.

1. **Landmark Development Group – Brett Jacobsen – 2711 West Valley Highway N, STE #200, Auburn, WA 98001** - Application for Design Review (DRB-11-0072) for the Harbor Hill Apartment Complex for the proposed development of 174 new residential apartments on an approximately 9.5 acre parcel within the Harbor Hill Residential Final Plat. The lot proposed for this development was identified as lot M1 in the preliminary plat documents. The project is located on the north side of Borgen Boulevard approximately 500 feet east of the intersection with Harbor Hill Road.

Staff gave a brief presentation regarding the application and prior pre-application reviews with the DRB, before turning the presentation over to the applicant for their presentation to the DRB. Applicant described the proposed apartment complex, requested review by the DRB, and changes since the last pre-application review.

The DRB discussed the proposed 100% design review and approach used by staff to document compliance for their review. Staff indicated that the use of the worksheet was intended to facilitate their review by documenting where administrative compliance was proposed, not to remove those aspects from the DRB's review. Staff then described the permitting process for the subject site as the lot proposed for development will be created by the Harbor Hill Plat and that the applicant has chosen to pursue DRB review ahead of site plan review due to

the timelines involved in the establishment of the lot. Any changes made to the project after review by the DRB to achieve compliance with zoning standards, will be reviewed for consistency with the discussion with the DRB tonight.

Concern was expressed in particular about the details of the landscaping proposal not being fully expressed in the DRB application by Vice Chair Gagliano and the integral relation of the landscaping to the design of the project as a whole. Ms. Moerler identified that the details of the landscape review are zoning standards, not design standards. However, inasmuch as the landscaping is involved in any findings or substantial discussions related to the DRB's review of the design, significant changes in the landscaping approach, would require further review by the DRB prior to approval of the design review application.

The discussion then turned to the design of the recreation building and the proposed entry lighting fixture proposal. Entry lighting is proposed to be a custom fixture designed as an integral aspect of the interior design of the building. A specific design is not available yet for this fixture given the design stage, however the applicant submitted a fixture used in a recent complex to demonstrate their general intent and concept, although the design may not be similar to the fixture shown. The applicant is requesting flexibility on the downward directional requirement for this fixture as the fixture will be located under the entry portico, above the main entrance to the building. Discussion included the ability of the portico to provide substantial cutoff of the light consistent with the intent of the manual and the desirability of providing a focal feature at the entrance to the largest shared building for residents.

The discussion then turned to the decorative entry and deck lighting proposed for each residential unit. The board discussed the location of the lighting and intensity of the proposed lighting.

MOTION: Move to accept the proposed exterior lighting per staff's recommendation. Fisher / Patterson: Motion passed unanimously.

The DRB moved on to discussion of the proposed modulation of the buildings. The applicant presented the use of changes in the roof form and detailing used to mitigate for the lack of modulation. The DRB questioned if the recreation building met administrative modulation standards, and staff indicated that the rec building was compliant with the administrative standards due to the modulation proposed and relative small size.

MOTION: Move to approve the modulation specific to the residential buildings based upon staffs suggested findings and that the shifts provided are adequate. Gagliano / Fisher: Motion passed unanimously.

Moving to the next item in the staff report, the board discussed solid/void ratio compliance. Discussion included improvements that provided additional functional lighting into the residential units and that the covered porches provide additional voids in the design. The board then discussed windows on the garages, and incorporating small high windows into the design, perhaps one per bay on the back and on the ends. Applicant asked about intended size and location of the desired windows; DRB suggested approximately 18" square windows very high on the elevations.

MOTION: Move to accept staff's recommendation for solid voids as presented with the following condition affecting the garages:

1. Applicant shall incorporate roughly square and fairly small windows on the blank back and side elevations.

Gagliano / Fisher: Motion passed unanimously.

The DRB noted that there was no item D in the staff report and moved on to discuss item E, siding materials.

The applicant described their request to utilize vinyl siding above the belly band on the structures, exceeding 20% of some elevations. Regarding garages, board directed findings to include use of vinyl siding above the belly band on the garages as well as the residential structures. The board discussed the use of rockeries for the proposed retaining walls, the lattice style railings and decorative truss details. Discussion about the truss detail included concerns that the proposed detail would appear too thin from below. The proposal to use 5/4" thick material appears inadequate, discussion of use of a 2" lumber product needed. Board also discussed the proposed materials to be utilized for the underside of the eaves with the applicant.

MOTION: Move to accept the proposed use of materials per staff's recommendation, analysis and findings with the following condition:

1. Applicant shall utilize a 2x in lieu of the proposed 5/4" on the truss type features located in the gables.

Fisher / Patterson.

Friendly Amendment to the Motion: Amend the motion to include the following additional conditions of approval related to materials:

1. Underside of the eave overhangs shall have a higher grade of plywood than OSB.
2. Further that the retaining walls facing residential buildings shall be rockeries.

Gagliano; Amendment accepted and seconded by Fisher / Patterson. Motion passed unanimously.

The DRB then discussed the proposed tree retention and landscaping plan for the complex. The DRB noted the lack of a detailed landscape plan and a desire to see a native planting plan utilized thorough out the complex to compliment the tree retention.

MOTION: The DRB agrees with the attached presentation of the attached staff worksheet itemizing the standards the applicant has satisfied. In addition the DRB agrees with the current site plan, building footprints, parking lot layout, location of driveways, walkways and the recreation center. The DRB also agrees with the proposed tree retention both in the perimeter buffer and interior to the project. In the ensuing landscape plans to be submitted to staff, the DRB requests that the applicant to utilize as much native plantings as possible; and staff is directed to re-convene with the DRB as necessary if the Applicant does not comply with this request.
Gagliano / Patterson: Motion passed unanimously.

After the review item was closed, a member of the public addressed staff and the board regarding the lack of opportunity to provide testimony on the proposal. The member of the public was very angry about receiving notice of the meeting, but not being given the opportunity to comment on the proposal and stormed out of the meeting room. Acting Chair Gagliano addressed the issue on the record, indicating that this is a public meeting and not a public hearing and asked staff to confirm that public notices related to DRB clearly indicate that DRB meetings are not public hearings. Staff indicated that the notices should have included such language already, but with recent notice changes she would review the templates being used to assure that DRB notices clearly indicate that it is a public meeting and not a public hearing.

Other Business

Approval of Minutes for August 11, 2011 deferred to a future meeting as a number of the members who attended the August meeting were not in attendance tonight.

Discussion of upcoming meetings.

Adjournment at 7:10pm