

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Minutes of Work-Study Session and Public Hearing  
June 7th, 2007  
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Jim Pasin, Joyce Ninen, Jill Guernsey, Jeanne Derebey, Theresa Malich and Harris Atkins. Commissioner Dick Allen was absent. Design Review Board members John Jernejcic, Charles Carlson and Rick Gagliano were present. Staff present: Jennifer Kester, Tom Dolan and Diane Gagnon. Kurt Latimore from the Latimore Company was also present.

**CALL TO ORDER:** 5:30 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes from May 7<sup>th</sup> and May 17<sup>th</sup> were tabled until the next meeting.

**WORK STUDY SESSION**

1. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335** – Begin discussion of Phase 2 of the Design Review Process Improvements.

Senior Planner Jennifer Kester explained that Phase 2 was editing the Community Design Element of the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the intent is to look at the steps in order to put together a work plan and determine what the meetings over the next several months will look like. Ms. Kester stated that it needed to be done by the end of September. She stated that they had developed some Phase 2 items as they had been going through Phase 1 that needed to be categorized and prioritized. She pointed out that some of the list may not get accomplished within this phase. She went over the master list and talked about the sub areas (bull's eye approach). She emphasized that identifying these sub areas should probably be the first step in order to categorize the design standards for these sub areas. She talked about the formation of goals and policies and what those could be.

Jill Guernsey arrived at 5:40.

Ms. Kester explained that what is decided tonight will be used as a basis for noticing the public of a meeting in July. She also noted that citizens have until August 15<sup>th</sup> to turn in other comprehensive plan amendments, so those will also need to be processed in September.

Mr. Gagliano asked about whether there was consideration of whether the policies within the comprehensive plan may conflict with the code and Ms. Kester acknowledged that they will need to be researched on both levels. She stated that she thought that the broad policies within the comprehensive plan would be modified first and then implementation of code changes would follow. Mr. Gagliano asked if they were required to have these policies and goals and suggested that they create the sub areas and not write policies and goals for each. Ms. Kester said that she didn't feel that it would be supportable and that each sub area needed to have goals and policies.

Kurt Latimore said that sub areas are a well recognized approach to comprehensive plans. He noted that if there is already language that supports certain sub areas, then nothing will need to be changed; however, in the case where there is not language to support a certain sub area then they will need to add it. Commissioner Atkins said that it seemed that possibly when we finish this process in October we could have a set of rules that aren't matching. Ms. Kester assured him that immediately after the comp plan amendment the zoning code changes would get done. Ms. Kester said that if we had more time we wouldn't take the comp plan forward until we had the implementation code changes. Commissioner Jeanne Derebey asked why they were doing it this way and Ms. Kester said that there was a desire by the City Council to get this done. Planning Director Tom Dolan reiterated that he didn't think there would be much of a delay in between the comp plan amendments and zoning code changes.

Rick Gagliano arrived at 5:45.

John Jernejcic arrived at 5:55.

Jim Pasin said that he felt that they were going down a path that was too rushed and they needed to take a strong look at the maps. He then said that he didn't feel that they knew where they want business centers to be, etc. Mr. Gagliano said that this process is actually to make these decisions and look at the future of the city. He said that by deciding where these sub areas are it will create a vision and a plan. Theresa Malich asked if they will be looking at maps and deciding these things holistically. Ms. Kester said that yes, they will be looking at the maps and making these decisions at the next meeting. Ms. Kester stated that the Mayor was a strong supporter of sub area planning and sees the next move of the city is to have standards for each of these areas.

Commissioner Jill Guernsey noted that if you don't have policies within the comp plan then you are randomly picking which portions of the manual apply. Ms. Kester said that while the process of the comp plan amendment is going on, we can be processing text amendments at the same time so the lag time can be only a month or two. She stated that if they felt that they really wanted the implementing policies and the comp plan amendments to happen at the same time, she could take that back to the council. Mr. Atkins felt that he would like to implement them at the same time. Ms. Malich stated that perhaps each sub area could be done one at a time. She pointed out that it just depends on how long this will take. Mr. Gagliano pointed out that there are some standards that may need to be moved up in front of the comp plan amendment process. He suggested that they look at the rest of the list and see if there are some pressing issues. Mr. Dolan said that he felt it was difficult to do the implementing text amendments without policies to look to for guidance.

Commissioner Guernsey said she liked Commissioner Atkin's idea to do each of the sub areas one at a time with the comp plan amendments and zoning code text amendments. Ms. Kester noted that some of these decisions can be decided at the next meeting.

Ms. Kester then went through each topic; Category 1 - Natural conditions, Historic District; Category 2 – Housing Development Standards, Structures on the Front Setback Line, Zone Transition Policies; Category 3 ( implementing text amendments) – Criteria for Design Review Board Approval, Detail of Administrative Requirements along with items already addressed in Phase 1 and ideas not yet categorized.

Mr. Pasin emphasized the need to look at the Historic District. Mr. Gagliano said that he felt that they needed to know the volume of development that is going on in order to determine which of these issues takes precedence.

Mr. Gagliano asked if some of the standards would bring Engineering into the process. Ms. Kester said that they would need to stay out of right of way standards within the Design Review Manual. He then asked if the Chair could take a poll of the five elements and ask which of those five things they thought should be done first.

Joyce Nine – Housing Development Standards

Theresa Malich – Housing Development Standards

Rick Gagliano - Trees

John Jernejcic – Housing, then Natural Conditions, Zone, Setbacks, Historic District

Jill Guernsey – Natural Conditions

Jeane Derebey– Setbacks

Chuck Carlson – Setbacks

Harris Atkins – Natural Conditions

Jim Pasin – Housing Standards

Ms. Kester said that not including sub areas, it seemed housing development standards and natural conditions rose to the top with setbacks a close second and the historic district being not as important since there are already standards in place. She suggested moving housing development and setbacks into Category 1 and move the Historic District down to Category 2. Ms. Kester further explained that if they felt that the idea of neighborhoods was good then they would need to decide what those neighborhoods are. She then went through the proposed list of sub areas and what those areas may or may not entail. Mr. Carlson asked if in the Westside and Gig Harbor North it may be appropriate to have a residential and commercial sub area.

Chair Theresa Malich called a recess at 6:55 p.m. prior to the public hearing at 7:00 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Ms. Malich opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

There being no public testimony, the public hearing was closed at 7:07 p.m.

Ms. Kester noted that technically on the first item of the DRB quorum the Planning Commission did not need to make a recommendation.

**1. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335 – Zoning Code Text Amendment (ZONE 07-0026) amending the quorum for DRB Meetings.**

**MOTION:** Move to recommend adoption of the amendment to the DRB quorum.  
Atkins/Pasin – Motion passed unanimously.

**2. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335 – Zoning Code Text Amendment (ZONE 07-0027) updating the zone transition standards.**

Ms. Kester pointed out where she had made the changes as suggested at their last meeting.

**MOTION:** Move to recommend adoption of zoning code text amendment updating the zone transition standards. Atkins/Derebey – Motion passed unanimously.

**3. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335 – Zoning Code Text Amendment (ZONE 07-0028) clarifying standards that apply to prominent and non-prominent facades.**

Ms. Kester noted that she had added the language as they had discussed at the last meeting applying the same language as in 1996. Ms. Malich thought maybe it had changed because there were areas where there was no screening. Ms. Kester noted that all the commercial areas are in activity centers and in an activity center any façade visible must be treated as prominent.

**MOTION:** Moved to recommend the adoption of the proposed text amendment clarifying standards that apply to prominent and non-prominent facades. Atkins/Ninen – motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kester noted that she had sent them copies of the two ordinances that are going to council on June 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Atkins voiced the importance of communicating that this change will not affect the quality of development and that they would assess how the process was going. He also noted that it is crucial to provide adequate staffing levels to support that.

A poll was conducted as to whether or not sub areas should be tackled and which of the non categorized items deserves comp plan policy text development.

Jim Pasin – Number one should be housing development standards and sub areas should not be first.

Jeane Derebey – Creating the sub areas was important to do first and if we do other things before the sub areas we may end up going backwards.

Rick Gagliano – Housing development standards will affect the entire city.

Ms. Kester briefly went over what areas of the city are undeveloped and noted that there are 1500 units in the system right now and approximately 2000 coming down the pipeline. She also noted that there is a lot of undeveloped land in the UGA.

Jim Pasin - The housing item has major significance because of the lack of criteria in the UGA.

Ms. Kester pointed out that any development wanting our services, must meet our standards.

Harris Atkins – Housing standards first

Theresa Malich – Housing

Joyce Ninen - Housing, since we know where the housing will occur within the sub area  
Jill Guernsey – The sub areas are necessary but she didn't have a problem doing housing first  
Jeane Derebey – It's fine to do housing first, but she wants to know where it falls within the sub area.

Charles Carlson – Sub areas are very important but housing is the priority.

John Jernejcic – Housing

Rick Gagliano – Natural conditions and housing together.

Kurt Latimore commented that he heard from applicants that retaining walls were a big thing and they are part of the natural conditions. He also noted that zone transition was an area where many applicants were struggling on how to deal with those codes and he would recommend that we include those issues in the process discussions. He also noted that there seemed to be some rules that were written for the downtown that don't work outside of the downtown.

Mr. Gagliano agreed with Mr. Latimore that those three things rise to the top for applicants but they pale in the public reaction if we don't tackle these things first. Ms. Kester said that the sub areas are important. She said she was hearing let's talk about housing development and pull natural conditions for housing into that change and then talk about sub areas next. She also reiterated that structures on the front setback should be part of the sub area discussion and they should at least take a look at zone transition and there may be a larger discussion when we get into the design manual. Ms. Guernsey and Mr. Pasin stated that they would not be at the next meeting. Ms. Kester said that they could work on the list at the next meeting and then work on housing in July. Mr. Atkins emphasized that they need to think about how to involve the community. Ms. Ninen suggested that we have a handout available at the community forum.

Charles Carlson asked if roadway standards were off limits and Ms. Kester said she would double check with legal counsel but she understood that the right of way is an engineering issue. She said that the City Attorney has made it clear that any design standards for the right of way need to be in the public works standards and perhaps this group could lobby for getting that done.

Ms. Kester said that the next meeting will briefly deal with sub areas and a platform for public notice to the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. She then asked if there any things within the list in Item E that they need to look at for comp plan policies.

John Jernejcic – Renovations/remodels

Rick Gagliano - Renovation/remodel – What do we do with existing buildings, enhancement corridor standards.

Mr. Gagliano also mentioned that IBE should be added to the list. Ms. Kester said that she thought that could happen with the discussion on employment district.

Theresa Malich – Renovation/remodel

Ms. Kester said she would put the list into Category 2 and see how many we can tackle. She said she will pull renovation/remodel out of the list to be done first. She emphasized the importance of the Planning Commission spending some time doing research and homework outside of the

meeting and coming prepared. She also stated that it works better to start with broad strokes and then analyze the specific language.

Planning Director Tom Dolan pointed out the draft ordinance dated May 21<sup>st</sup> which is to allow for the combination of non conforming lots. Ms. Kester reminded them of the revision to the boundary line adjustment section. Mr. Dolan said that this language resolves the legal issue and he wanted them to know that this had been reviewed by the Planning and Building Committee and may go to the City Council via direct consideration; however they wanted it to at least be looked at by the Planning Commission to give them the opportunity to comment. Mr. Atkins suggested that a whereas be changed to remove the statement that the Planning Commission held a public hearing. Ms. Guernsey explained that there is case law that each lot had to meet minimum lot size requirements so we need to have an ordinance.

**MOTION:** Move to support direct consideration of the draft ordinance for legally non conforming lots. Guernsey/Ninen – Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kester said that there is a possible text amendment for direct consideration related to the Employment District zone. She stated that the Planning and Building Committee is looking at the proposal and there is an application in for an independent living facility in the ED, which takes up almost a third of our Employment District. She asked if the Planning Commission was okay with removing those three uses as conditional uses within that zone since neither our comp plan or the intent of the ED talk about residential uses in that zone. She noted that this was brought up in the land use matrix. Mr. Dolan noted that residential uses in the ED zone are not compatible and will create complaints. Ms. Ninen asked if there was a desire to incorporate a comp plan change and Ms. Kester said that there is a desire to look at the ED and BP zones, but more so a desire to make this change right now.

**MOTION:** Move to recommend approval of the proposed changed. Derebey/Ninen – Motion passed with Jim Pasin opposed.

Ms. Guernsey noted that she would be gone for the meetings of June 21<sup>st</sup> and July 19<sup>th</sup>.

### **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

July 5<sup>th</sup> – Cancelled

July 19<sup>th</sup> – Public Hearing

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 8:15 p.m. Atkins/Malich – Motion passed unanimously.