

ANACORTES PLANNING COMMISSION



September 26, 2018

Municipal Building Council Chambers

6th Street and "Q" Avenue

AGENDA

6 P.M.

[VIEW AGENDA MATERIALS HERE](#)

1. **Roll Call**
2. **Minutes of August 22, 2018 and September 12, 2018**
3. **Correspondence**
4. **Old Business**
 - a. **Development Regulations Update:** Review of Title 19, Division 6: Project Design

The City of Anacortes encourages people with disabilities to participate in public meetings. For assistance with special needs, please contact the City Clerk at 360-299-1960 in advance of the meeting.



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for – August 22, 2018

This is not a verbatim transcript of the meeting and is written in an attempt to capture the general spirit of the discussion based upon notes and video observation by the author. To view the video recording of this meeting, click [here](https://www.anacorteswa.gov/700/Watch-Meetings), or go to <https://www.anacorteswa.gov/700/Watch-Meetings>.

Chair McNett called the meeting of August 22, 2018 to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners and staff sat in a round table format in front of the audience.

Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners Graf, Moffitt, Cleland-McGrath, Doll, Mount, MacKenzie, and McNett

Absent: None

Minutes

None

Correspondence

None

Old Business

Public Meeting – Divisions V of the Draft Development Regulations,

Libby Grage, Planning Manager, presented proposed code amendments within AMC Title 19, Division 5, Community Design. Bob Bengford, MAKERS, elaborated on the Division 5 proposal.

Steve Lange, Anacortes Public Works department, provided information about the sidewalk improvement program, which is currently on hold.

Commissioners had concerns about various proposed requirements for street improvements and supported the code providing opportunities for development to provide off-site improvements under certain circumstances. Staff stated they will research the City's authority for assessing improvement costs to a property owner (instead of requiring the improvement be installed) when a developing property is along the route of a project identified in the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP).

Cynthia Richardson, 315 V Ave. Ms. Richardson stated there should be a cost threshold to make sure the cost of the street improvements are proportionate to the cost of the development activity so people aren't discouraged from making improvements to property. She also supported reduced street widths, criticized increased sidewalk widths, asked about guest parking standards, voiced concern with max shared driveway lengths, and requested flexibility in setbacks with shared driveways. Staff responded that they will research options for

a project cost to street improvement cost threshold in determining street improvement requirements for remodels, the sidewalk width is associated with pedestrian accessibility and comfort and is applicable to new plats, that the max driveway length is based on fire code, and setback options will be researched.

Planning Commissioners requested staff bring back potential criteria for requiring different width sidewalks based on zone density and other factors.

Chair McNett called the meeting to a close at approximately 8:25 p.m. The next meeting to review the updates will be held on September 12, 2018, at 6:00 p.m.

To view materials related to the Development Regulations & Design Standards, click [here](#), or go to <https://www.anacorteswa.gov/202/Development-Regulations-Design-Standards>.



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for – September 12, 2018

This is not a verbatim transcript of the meeting and is written in an attempt to capture the general spirit of the discussion based upon notes and video observation by the author. To view the video recording of this meeting, click [here](https://www.anacorteswa.gov/700/Watch-Meetings), or go to <https://www.anacorteswa.gov/700/Watch-Meetings>.

Chair McNett called the meeting of September 12, 2018 to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Commissioners and staff sat in a round table format in front of the audience.

Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners Graf, Cleland-McGrath, Doll, Mount, MacKenzie and McNett

Absent: Moffitt

Minutes

Minutes of August 8, approved as read

Correspondence

None

New Business

Public Hearing – Port of Anacortes, Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP)

Pedestrian Catwalk Repair

Kevin Cricchio, Associate Planner, presented a proposal to install an aluminum pedestrian catwalk on a portion of the existing P/Q Pier of Cap Sante Marina.

At approximately 6:07 p.m. the Chair opened the public hearing.

With no public comments, the chair closed the public hearing at approximately 6:08 p.m.

Commissioner Cleland-McGrath made a motion to approve the SSDP subject to staff recommended conditions. Commissioner Graff seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Old Business

Public Meeting – Division VI of the Draft Development Regulations

Libby Grage, Planning Manager, presented proposed code on Division VI, Project Design. Bob Bengford, MAKERS, elaborated on Division VI.

Cynthia Richardson, 315 V Ave. Ms. Richardson questioned the need for block frontage design standards and supported allowing parking in front of businesses on the south part of Commercial Avenue.

Robert Festa, 207 E Park Drive. Mr. Festa supported the proposed regulations.

Staff stated they will research options for parking area location flexibility along the south Commercial Avenue corridor.

Chair McNett called the meeting to a close at approximately 8:35 p.m. The next meeting to review the updates will be held on September 26, 2018, at 6:00 p.m.

To view materials related to the Development Regulations & Design Standards, click [here](#), or go to <https://www.anacorteswa.gov/202/Development-Regulations-Design-Standards>.

DRAFT

Attachment 4: Corporate Architecture

Current Provisions

AMC Title 17: Current code has no specific provisions for building character related to corporate architecture.

Comprehensive Plan:

Goal LU-2. Community Design. Promote compatible pedestrian-oriented development that respects Anacortes's historic character and small town scale while strengthening its unique marine identity.

Draft Proposal

AMC 19.63.030 - Building character.

A. Purpose.

1. To promote buildings with an architectural character that reflects the region's aesthetic and is based on human scaled design details, durable high quality materials, sustainable design measures, and respond uniquely to the site's context.
2. To emphasize that high quality design is most critical to Anacortes's high visibility sites and corridors.
3. To avoid generic, corporate architectural design that degrades the character and identity of Anacortes.

B. Architecture that is defined predominately by corporate identity features and is difficult to adapt to other uses is prohibited. For example, some franchise convenience uses have very specific architectural features (such as a distinctive roofline design that functions as a sign) that reinforce their identity. As tenants change in these types of buildings, these corporate identity features can negatively impact the character of the area and identity of new tenants. These features can also be very expensive to reconfigure and adapt to new uses.

Public Feedback

Public feedback on this provision has been minimal. One commenter opposes the provision and suggests some corporate icons can be attractive and fit in, the ownership of the building is irrelevant, and wondered how the provision would apply to corporate uses like gas stations.

Examples

Below are examples of buildings defined predominately by corporate identity features and is difficult to adapt to other uses (including design features synonymous with the business' corporate identity that can be very expensive to reconfigure and adapt to new uses).



Burien's IHOP>Thai-HOP



Rite Aid that went out of business – the diamond windows are a reminder to previous use



McDonalds – design adjusted to meet local standards (Gig Harbor, Lone Pine CA)



McDonalds – design adjusted to meet local standards (Jasper AB, Montreal ON)

Arguments Against (or for adjustment)

- The formula restaurant/stores noted above have generally updated their franchise designs in a manner that's perhaps easier to convert to other uses (without huge cost to removing the key corporate identity elements).
- Perhaps given our block frontage standards along with the proposed façade articulation standards, that such standards are less necessary.
- Leaving such a provision out avoids potential future arguments on determining what elements are and are not corporate architecture.
- Perhaps such provision might be acceptable in downtown, or maybe South Commercial, but not along Highway 20?

Attachment 5: Façade Articulation

Current Provisions

AMC Title 17: Current code has some specifications for building articulation in the following zones: CBD, C, CM, CM1, CM2, and I.

If a building facade exceeds fifty feet in length, it shall be broken down into smaller elements by jogging the wall in or out a minimum of four feet for at least ten feet of length, or by adding an element such as a porch, recessed entry, bay window, projecting trellis or similar substantial architectural feature at least four feet deep by ten feet wide by one-story high, at intervals so that no continuous wall plane is more than fifty feet in length.

If a building exceeds twenty feet in height, its apparent height shall be modulated wherever it is within ten feet of a sidewalk, plaza, courtyard, or similar pedestrian area, by adding shorter (twenty feet or less) building elements such as a wing of the building, arcade, trellis, lower roof overhang, horizontal projection at least two feet deep, awning, balcony or other architectural feature to reduce the apparent height to a more human scale.

Comprehensive Plan:

Policy LU-6.1. Provide for a wide variety of housing types within the city to meet the full range of housing needs for Anacortes's evolving population. (Sub-points recommend building design standards, including façade articulation, for multiple housing types.)

Policy LU-6.4. Key concepts to emphasize in the design standards: Emphasize façade articulation consistent with neighborhood scale.

Policy LU 7.1.C: Craft and apply form-based design standards for downtown. Key concepts to emphasize in the design standards: Promote façade massing and articulation that complements historical context.

Policy LU 7.2.C: Craft and apply form-based design standards for South Commercial Avenue. Key concepts to emphasize in the design standards: Promote façade massing and articulation that reinforces Anacortes's character and scale.

Policy LU-8.4.D. Encourage building layout, orientation, modulation, and articulation to reduce the perceived scale of large buildings, add visual interest, and establish a distinct design character for the [central Fidalgo Bay waterfront]. Emphasize human scaled design components and details that add interest to facades and entries.

Draft Proposal

AMC 19.63.040: See the referenced code section for full details.

Public Feedback

There has been minimal public feedback specifically on the draft articulation standards, including why 30 feet is the length of the interval. Some comments have expressed general concern about potential limits on artistic creativity and risk of sterile design.

Examples



Notice the articulated elements in the older buildings downtown.



Façade articulation is important on South Commercial as well



Façade articulation examples on an industrial building



Façade examples that would not meet articulation standards



Non-Residential Façade Articulation Considerations

Consideration	Possible Benefits	Potential Drawbacks
5a Exempt buildings less than 60' wide from the provision.	Buildings are small enough where such treatments are less necessary. They still need to comply with other frontage, details, and materials standards.	Perhaps facades larger than 45 or 50' are still reasonably large and may warrant some articulation.
5b-1 Exempt development in the I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones.	Allows greater flexibility for new buildings in areas where it might be needed most, while permitted uses. Suggest that any blank wall	Perhaps allows too much flexibility?

Consideration	Possible Benefits	Potential Drawbacks
	provisions still apply – at least when across the street from the zones noted in 5b-2	
5b-2 Exempt development in the I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones, <u>unless such zones are across the street from a residential, CBD, or C zone.</u>	Allows greater flexibility for new buildings in areas where it might be needed most, while permitted uses.	Again - perhaps allows too much flexibility?
5c Increase the minimum articulation interval to 50' in the MMU zone and 75' in the I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones (when development in such zones is applicable to this standard) .	MMU zone, still with some potential for larger buildings may warrant greater flexibility. The I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones warrant even more flexibility.	Again - perhaps allows too much flexibility?



Attachment 6: Maximum Façade Width

Current Provisions

Same provisions as noted in Attachment 5.

Draft Proposal

AMC 19.63.050(E): See the referenced code section for full details.

Public Feedback

Public feedback on this specific provision has been minimal. However, in response to one comment, the dimensions in subsection (1) above were reduced from 10 feet to six feet deep and from 30 feet to 15 feet wide.

Examples



Façades that would not comply with the proposed standards.



While the upper level stepback helps, this building appears to go on forever. (There are other issues – for instance the ground level treatment wouldn't meet our proposed block frontage provisions).



A highly visible building in Seattle that also appears to go on forever. A tool such as the proposed maximum block width provision could have helped improve the design. (Again, there are other issues – the façade also wouldn't meet the articulation standards.)



However, boat storage/repair buildings such as this on R Avenue will obviously have some challenges with a provision like this.



Examples of large buildings we've used before that we think includes features that would either meet the base standards or qualify as a departure.

Maximum Façade Width Considerations

Consideration	Possible Benefits	Potential Drawbacks
6a-1 Exempt development in the I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones.	Allows greater flexibility for new buildings in areas where it might be needed most, while permitted uses. Suggest that any blank wall provisions still apply – at least when across the street from the zones noted in 5b-2	Perhaps allows too much flexibility?
6a-2 Exempt development in the I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones, <u>unless such zones are across the street from a residential, CBD, or C zone.</u>	Allows greater flexibility for new buildings in areas where it might be needed most, while permitted uses.	Again - perhaps allows too much flexibility?
6b Increase the maximum façade width dimension to 150' in the MMU zone and 200' in the I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones (when development in such zones is applicable to this standard) .	MMU zone, still with some potential for larger buildings may warrant greater flexibility. The I, LM, LM1, MS, AZ, and CM2 zones warrant even more flexibility.	Again - perhaps allows too much flexibility?

Attachment 7: Façade Details

Current Provisions

AMC Title 17: Same provisions as noted in Attachment 5.

Comprehensive Plan:

Policy LU-6.4. Key concepts to emphasize in the design standards: Integrate high quality durable building materials and human scaled detailing.

Policy LU 7.1.C: Craft and apply form-based design standards for downtown. Key concepts to emphasize in the design standards: Integrate high quality durable building materials and human scaled detailing.

Policy LU 7.2.C: Craft and apply form-based design standards for South Commercial Avenue. Key concepts to emphasize in the design standards: Integrate high quality durable building materials and human scaled detailing.

Policy LU-8.4.D. Encourage building layout, orientation, modulation, and articulation to reduce the perceived scale of large buildings, add visual interest, and establish a distinct design character for the [central Fidalgo Bay waterfront]. Emphasize human scaled design components and details that add interest to facades and entries.

Draft Proposal

AMC 19.63.050. See the referenced code section for full details.

Note that subsection B – Façade Details - non-residential and mixed-use buildings only applies to the C, CBD, MMU, CM zones and MED-O overlay zone.

Public Feedback

Public feedback has been generally concerned with the depth of the draft building design standards, with some commenters stating the standards are too restrictive or that a better balance is needed. Some are unclear on when certain standards may be waived and when standards apply to remodels and additions. MJB requests that buildings fronting private streets not be subject to the façade detail standards.

One comment desires clarification on how mirrored glass is defined. One comment requests the window design standards only apply to windows on the ground floor.

Examples



Façade examples that would not meet details standards





Planning Commission Agenda Bill

Meeting Date: 9/26/2018 **Agenda Item:** 4a

Subject: Development Regulations Update: Div. 6 Project

Design Staff Contact: Don Measamer, Libby Grage

Approved for Submittal to PC by	
	Laurie Gere, Mayor
x	Don Measamer, PCED Director
	Darcy Swetnam, City Attorney

Action Type	
	Public Hearing
	Staff Report
x	Discussion

Summary Statement: At the 9/26/18 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission will continue to review and discuss Division 6 of AMC Title 19 *Unified Development Code*. It is anticipated that the Planning Commission will ask questions, provide feedback, and that time for community member comments will be provided.

Please refer to the Division 6 Staff Report, provided in the 9/12/18 PC Packet, for additional information. It is requested that Planning Commissioners please bring your hard copy of the full 2nd Draft Development Regulations Update document, or your electronic device with access to the document.

Background: Since June 2018, the Planning Commission has been reviewing and discussing proposed updates to the development regulations (2nd Draft) contained in the Anacortes Municipal Code (AMC) Title 19. The goals of the proposed amendments are to provide clear, user-friendly development regulations and to implement key goals and policies of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.

The full 2nd Draft and additional project background information can be viewed on the [project website](https://www.anacorteswa.gov/202/Development-Regulations-Design-Standards). (<https://www.anacorteswa.gov/202/Development-Regulations-Design-Standards>)

Previous Council/Committee/Commission Action: None.

Competing Viewpoints Considered: Public comments have been submitted over the last 1.5 years and have contributed to the development of the 2nd Draft. Members of the public may provide comments at upcoming Planning Commission meetings during the PC's review of the draft, and may also submit written comments to Libby Grage, Planning Manager, libbyb@cityofanacortes.org at any time. A formal public comment period and public hearing will be advertised in the coming months. All comments received prior to the end of the advertised public comment period will be considered, summarized and responded to in a comment matrix, and forwarded on to the PC and CC during the review process.

Recommended Motion: None

Alternative Actions: N/A

Attachments:

None