MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 3, 2011

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Landmarks & Design Commission

THROUGH: Brandi Eyerly, Planner

RE: Draft Land Development Code Update Review - Comments & Recommendations

For the Planning Commission's information, please find below portions of the October 18, 2011 Minutes and the November 1, 2011 Draft Minutes of the Landmarks & Design Commission (L&DC). The L&DC has begun its review of the Draft Land Development Code and has completed those portions of Articles 2 and 3 that pertain to the L&DC's Declaration of Purpose and Powers and Duties. The minutes provided are comments and recommendations from review of those articles.

Landmarks & Design Commission, October 18, 2011 Minutes

NEW BUSINESS

a) Draft Land Development Code Update Review - Comments & Recommendations to City Council
- Article 2 Permits & Procedures
  - 15.25.030 Design Review Type II review process & 15.28 Ellensburg Landmark Register & Procedures

At the September 27 meeting, a brief summary of Article 2 was presented by Planner Eyerly. At this meeting, the Commission began its discussion of Article 2 at Permit Type II, which would have the Commission as an advisory board to the Community Development Director who would make the final decision. However, to comply with the Certified Local Government agreement, landmark designation, and protection processes may be advisory only to the local legislative authority, City Council, and the permit would most likely be a Type 4.

Discussion of the proposed permit process found that it would be cumbersome and time consuming for the applicant. That it would 1) add another layer of review; adding time delays to the process; and (2 recommendations that were now given for projects such as sign design and exterior paint color would be required to go through another review for final approval.

Commissioners restated their concern that though the current City Council understood the importance of historic preservation future Council's may not; landmark designations could be thrown out by a future Council if for some reason historic preservation did not fit into its agenda. The same held true with design review recommendations going to a future Community Development Director. A Commission appointed by City Council comprised of professionals in the design and preservation fields following design guidelines approved by City Council and the Secretary of the Interior ensures the applicant a fair and impartial decision.

The Landmarks & Design Commission finds that its makeup of preservation professionals meets the required qualifications as set out in ECC 1.45.160 and NHPA Section 310(13) and whose basic collective knowledge is applied to commission's decisions; therefore,

MOTION10:18-01 Christina Wollman moved the Landmarks & Design Commission recommends to City Council that the Commission remain a decision-making body on landmark and design review

applications. Ben Oblas seconded. Motion carried.

In the matter of major and minor design review, the Commission found that Maker's Consulting firm had planned for larger communities where 15,000 square foot buildings were the norm. In Ellensburg, the local trend was much smaller buildings. Ellensburg's architectural character, its identity were buildings between 3,000 and 5,000 square feet. By raising the threshold for design review to 15,000 square feet there would be many medium sized to larger buildings that would not have the benefit of design review, thus jeopardizing Ellensburg's architectural identity.

MOTION10:18-02 David Cross moved the Landmarks & Design Commission recommend to City Council to leave the design review threshold at 4,000 square feet, which is more appropriate to the community scale. Christina Wollman seconded. Motion carried.

- Article 3 Zoning Districts & Land Uses
    - 15.33Density Bonus Incentives F Historic Preservation

The Commission thought the bonus was rather meager, providing for only 50% for an acre of development. Table 15.33.020 was confusing and perhaps a better definition was warranted. Staff was asked to clarify the density bonus at the November 1 meeting.

Landmarks & Design Commission, November 1, 2011 Draft Minutes
(Staff comment: At the November 1 meeting due to time constraints the Commission briefly began review of Article 5. No formal motions were made, but a list of concerns/issues was begun. Further discussion was continued to the December 6 meeting.)

- Article 5 Project Design
    - 15.51.040 Street frontage type maps

1) In reviewing the street frontage type maps the Commission thought the maps difficult to read. The individual lots should be deleted because they made the maps too "busy." It was the streets and their designations that needed to stand out.

2) Storefront Street designation should continue north on Main Street to 7th Avenue. The two blocks from 5th Avenue to 7th Avenue are partially inside the Downtown Historic District and part of the Central Business District. New development should be held to that standard.

3) Secondary Street designation should be required throughout the Central Commercial II (C-CII) Zone because this is the expansion area of the commercial core. Selecting only those streets that currently reflect the characteristics of the Secondary Street design will create a hodgepodge design. Future development planning should encourage this type of street frontage to ensure a consistent commercial design throughout the CCII zone.

4) Beginning at the West Interchange Dolarway to 5th Avenue to Kittitas Street should be designated a Gateway Corridor. University Way does lead the traveler to the University and is probably the University's first choice but the Dolarway leads the traveler to Downtown Ellensburg and to shopping and restaurants. Once the construction is completed on Dolarway, it will be the more attractive of the two. The City could have two gateways from the West Interchange depending on the traveler's destination.