

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Minutes of Work-Study Session  
Thursday, August 19, 2004  
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Carol Johnson, Bruce Gair, Dick Allen and Chairman Paul Kadzik. Commissioners Kathy Franklin, Theresa Malich, and Scott Wagner were absent. Staff present: Steve Osguthorpe, Rob White and Diane Gagnon.

**CALL TO ORDER:** 6:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Move to approve the minutes of August 5, 2004 Johnson/Gair – unanimously approved.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Commissioner Gair asked that a copy of the letter sent to the City Council on behalf of the Planning Commission regarding the update of the Design Manual be provided to the Planning Commission members. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe stated that he would make sure everyone got a copy.

**WORK-STUDY SESSION – 6:00 pm**

**Don Huber, P.O. Box 64160, Tacoma WA 98464 – PCD-RMD** – Proposed Amendments to Gig Harbor Municipal Code Section 17.21 to set a specific density range for the zone, reduce setback dimensions, and to modify the application of the impervious surface standards.

Senior Planner Rob White went over his staff report outlining the proposed text amendment to the PCD-RMD zone. Mr. White summarized by saying that this proposal was to amend the performance standards of the zone. Those performance standards are density, minimum yards, maximum lot area coverage, landscaping, and circulation/roads/streets. He further explained that the applicant was hoping to achieve a small lot single family development in Gig Harbor North. He then explained to the commission that the current code minimum is 8 dwelling units per acre and doesn't define maximum. As this relates to the buildable lands inventory for GMA we need to reach 4/units per acre. He then stated that he had discussed this with Mr. Osguthorpe since writing his staff report and discovered that this zone is unique in that it defines a minimum where other zones have a maximum, so when calculating the number of buildable lands for other zones we are using the maximum to calculate the amount of buildable lands and for this zone we are using the minimum. Mr. White then stated that he was changing his recommendation from denial to establishing a range of density for this zone. He then pointed out that this section of code has a density bonus and density credit transfer and if you don't have a maximum why have these incentives, therefore, it seems clear that there is a conflict.

Mr. White went on to say that in regard to minimum yards the current standards seem to be geared toward multi-family development and don't work for small lot single-family development. He stated that it would be very difficult to achieve the density with these standards and that rather than recommending outright approval he was recommending that the setbacks reflect the standards set in 17.99 for consistency. Chairman Kadzik asked what the setbacks are in 17.99. Planning Manager Osguthorpe replied that they are as follows:

Front – 26' to garage  
          20 to house  
          12 to porch  
Rear – 30'  
Side – 8'

Addressing the maximum lot area coverage proposal, Mr. White stated that again this would apply to a multi-family development rather than each single family lot and it that the intent statement of the zone says that the intent is high density housing and you can't achieve that and still meet this performance standard.

Mr. White went on the address the landscaping proposal and stated that currently this would be treated like any other residential plat and would be required to have a 25' buffer. He further stated that the applicant is requesting consideration to reduce to 10' when adjacent to another similar type of plat and 25' when the uses are not similar. Mr. White pointed out that he did not provide a recommendation as he felt this item needed further discussion.

Commissioner Allen asked what we were buffering from if they are both residential uses. He then stated that he didn't see the need to buffer from like uses.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe stated that he assumed the requirement was put in to maintain some trees and vegetation in a plat. He further stated that 10' is not really a substantial buffer and that there are blow down issues even with 25'.

Addressing the proposal to amend circulation/roads/streets, Mr. White stated that current code allows the public works director to waive the requirements for sidewalks if paths are more of an appropriate means. He said that the applicant has proposed a definition for street widths and planter strips and pointed out that these things are regulated in Title 12 and the public works standards and this is not the appropriate venue for changing those standards.

Chairman Kadzik asked for some clarification from Carl Halsan, the representative of the proponent Don Huber.

Carl Halsan, P.O. Box 1447, Gig Harbor – Mr. Halsan stated that the proposal is to take the medium density zones in Gig Harbor North and develop a small lot single family such as Poulsbo Place or Fircrest Commons rather than doing apartments. He stated that none of the zones in the city will allow what we are proposing and GHN seems the appropriate place for this type of development. He also stated that he is aware that the

road standards are a public works issue and he is working with them on these changes.

Commissioner Allen asked about minimum of 5 dwelling units per acre and maximum of 8 and whether this was all single family. Mr. Halsan said it can work up to 12 per acre. He went on to say that when the lots are this small it would be difficult to meet this standard and perhaps this could be applied over the whole project and that the yards as proposed by staff will not work on these small lots. Mr. Halsan then stated that he had just finished working on a committee in Pierce County writing standards specifically for this kind of zone with strict design standards.

Mr. Halsan then showed the Planning Commission the plan for what the applicant is proposing in Gig Harbor North. He pointed out the pocket parks and courtyards with the smaller homes facing the courtyard. He stated that this particular plan accommodates the 25' perimeter buffer, but proposes 5' setbacks from each house to their lot line for a total of 10' between houses. Mr. Halsan went on to say that right now the density is at approximately 6 dwelling units per acre but once the roads are subtracted they should be at about 8.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe asked if they were proposing a PRD to get flexibility on the setbacks. Mr. Halsan replied that they were not, because they would have to provide 30% open space.

Commissioner Gair asked what the overall affect would be on the entire city's density. Mr. Osguthorpe stated that the difference here was that this was the only zone that set a minimum density, and that they could change that to a maximum and eliminate the bonus density option or we could have a range and retain the bonus density. He further explained that under growth management act we will have to show the state our reasonable measures to reach the 4.0 dwelling units per acre and we may be forced to adopt minimum densities. Mr. Osguthorpe went on to say that what the applicant is proposing would at least achieve the minimum densities under GMA.

Chairman Kadzik asked if this type of project would help to alleviate minimums in other zones. Mr. Osguthorpe replied that it may help to have higher minimum densities in one area in order to allow less in another area, but that in no case can we restrict density to less than 4 units per acre in any zone allowing residential development.

Kadzik then asked the applicant why they were proposing to go from minimum of 8 to minimum of 5 and maximum of 8. Mr. Halsan replied that these regulations would only apply to two properties and it works for both of those properties.

Commissioner Allen expressed his belief that the intent of this zone was for multi-family development. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe stated that this amendment helps clear up inconsistencies. Chairman Kadzik stated that it seemed that this kind of project is what was envisioned for the area surrounding Gig Harbor North.

Mr. Osguthorpe asked the applicant why they could not achieve the currently required 8 units per acre if, as the applicant stated, it was achievable in Poulsbo Place. Mr. Halsan stated that it was not possible in Gig Harbor due to road standards and setbacks.

Mr. Osguthorpe explained to the Planning Commission that currently the city is averaging 2.4 dwelling units per acres overall and it was unknown what reasonable measures will be imposed to accomplish the 4.0 units per acre and that it may be to impose minimum densities. He went on to say that right now if we were to achieve the 8 units per acre in this zone along with what we are currently allowing in other zones we would be right at the goal.

Commissioner Gair asked about the current water issues. Mr. Osguthorpe replied that if we find through our comprehensive plan update that we don't have the capacity to serve then we should inform the county of that ask for a reduction in our population allocation, which may force us to reduce the area of our UGA.

Commissioner Allen asked what it means when you say we "allow" for so many units per acre. Mr. Osguthorpe replied we are not mandating someone to build 4.0 units per acre, we allow at least 4.0 dwelling units per acre across the board.

Commissioner Johnson asked if staff was concerned that stating minimum in this zone would have a cascade affect and Mr. Osguthorpe replied that, no, it was a matter of if we eliminate a minimum we may end up reimposing minimums later.

Chairman Kadzik asked about the setbacks and stated that staff is recommending that we adopt the standards in 17.99. Senior Planner Rob White pointed out that the recommendation had been changed since the staff report was written. Chairman Kadzik what is the advantage of consistency other than just convenience. He further pointed out that staff was recommending approval initially so it must have made some sense from a planning standpoint aside from the consistency issue.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe pointed out that this proposal would require an update to the Design Manual. Commissioner Allen asked if the 5' side yard was a fire hazard. Mr. Osguthorpe replied that it was not a fire issue and that there were no additional construction standards until it gets down to 3'.

Commissioner Johnson stated that this is a different kind of community, it's a bridge from apartment living so the setback are a less and asked the applicant how many acres are needed to create a project like this.

Mr. Halsan responded that about 20 acres is needed for this density, but for higher density you could do it on less acreage.

Senior Planner Rob White explained that the Planning Commission should also consider that this zone has some PRD-type elements in it and that if the applicant did apply for a PRD there are no setbacks at all.

Mr. Osguthorpe stated that other projects in this area are proposing a PRD with the 30% open space and that there are many ways to achieve the 30%.

Chairman Kadzik asked if the 25' foot required buffer would count as open space. Mr.

Osguthorpe replied that, yes, it can count toward open space requirements but it must be platted separately. He then read the open space requirements for the commission.

The commission decided to bring this item back for a public hearing on September 2, 2004. Chairman Kadzik indicated that he would not be able to attend the meeting on September 2<sup>nd</sup> and Commissioner Gair stated that he would not be attending the meeting of September 16<sup>th</sup>.

A five minute recess was held at 6:55 pm.

### **PUBLIC HEARING – 7:00 pm**

**Sheila Kosciak, 739 7<sup>th</sup> St SE Apt 911, Puyallup WA 98372** - Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe briefed the Planning Commission on the proposal to add a rounding provision to the zoning code allowing rounding up from .5 and above and rounding down below .5 when calculating density for a property. Additionally Mr. Osguthorpe informed the Planning Commission that the SEPA comment period was not over and that any recommendation they made tonight should be based upon no adverse comments on the SEPA determination.

Chairman Kadzik revealed that he had a professional relationship with Mrs. Kosciak; however, felt that he could fairly discuss the proposal. He then asked the public if there were any objections to his involvement and there was none.

**Mary Souza, 5624 43<sup>rd</sup> Ave NW, Gig Harbor** – Ms. Souza stated that the existing 3.0 dwelling units per acre is inconsistent with the 12,000 square foot minimum lot size. She further stated that that this proposal would help bring the city into compliance with the GMA requirement of 4.0 dwelling units per acre.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed at 7:07 pm.

Commissioner Allen stated that he still felt that anyone with a fraction over a whole number should be allowed to round up. He said that there would not be much net change whatever the fraction was.

**Motion:** Move to recommend the City Council add a rounding provision for calculating density allowing any fraction over a whole number to be rounded up to the next whole number, providing there is no adverse comments on the SEPA determination. – Allen/

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe pointed out that if someone had 4.01 this would allow them to round to 5 and asked the Planning Commission if this was their intent.

**Motion died** – Lack of a second

Commissioner Johnson stated that rounding up from .5 was a standard and is what Pierce County uses.

**Motion:** Move to recommend the City Council add a rounding provision for calculating density allowing rounding up from .5 and above and rounding down below .5, providing there are no adverse comments on the SEPA determination. Johnson/Gair – Motion carried with Johnson and Gair voting in favor of and Allen voting against.

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

September 2, 2004 at 6pm – Work-Study Session and Public Hearing

**ADJOURN:**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 7:15 p.m.  
Johnson/Gair – unanimously approved

CD recorder utilized:  
Disc #1 Tracks 1 & 2