

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session
June 18, 2008
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners Theresa Malich, Dick Allen, Jill Guernsey, Jim Pasin, Harris Atkins, Jeane Derebey and Joyce Ninen. Design Review Board member Rick Gagliano. Staff present: Jennifer Kester, Tom Dolan and Diane Gagnon.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Discussion began on the minutes from June 5th, 2008. Several grammatical errors were noted and corrected.

MOTION: Move to adopt the minutes of June 5th, 2008 as amended.
Atkins/Malich – Motion carried.

1. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335** – ZONE 08-0003 – Appropriateness of RB-1 zoning district locations and allowed uses in the RB-1 zone. Senior Planner Jennifer Kester noted that per the matrix that Commissioner Jeane Derebey had provided the majority of the Planning Commission felt that a rezone may be appropriate for the following locations:

Purdy Dr and 144th
Sehmel Dr
Peacock Hill Ave and Ringold Ave
Stinson Ave
Grandview and Stinson, except for that area along Grandview
56th St and 38th Ave

Ms. Kester recommended that the next time this item is discussed she bring a map and they can have some more detailed discussion of how these areas should be rezoned. Additionally she suggested that they look at the uses in the RB1 zone for those areas that they decide to keep RB1. The next time we look at this will be after comprehensive plan updates at the end of 2008. She noted that at the joint Design Review Board/Council Meeting there was discussion that the Planning and Building Committee look at the work program again for some prioritization, so at the July 7th meeting they will look at the work program again. Commissioner Jim Pasin said he was disappointed at not being able to bring this to conclusion. Ms. Kester also noted that some of the rezones might require a Comprehensive Plan amendment which will take even longer. Commissioner Harris Atkins noted that they had discussed this at some length and asked if there were any areas that could be completed now. Mr. Pasin said that on the Stinson (old Spadoni) site there have been issues with its current zoning and projects wanting to go in. Ms. Ninen noted that this site really seems to be located in the wrong

place. Mr. Pasin said that he felt that the property owner wanted to do something more so if there were a rezone the site might be redeveloped. Ms. Kester suggested that perhaps they look at the uses and the Stinson site first. Mr. Pasin said that he would rather look at the zoning rather than the uses. Ms. Ninen asked if the comprehensive plan designation was Residential Medium and Ms. Kester said yes so it could be zoned R-3. It was decided to address Stinson first when the item is discussed at the next meeting.

2. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335 – ZONE 08-0007 – ED and PCD-BP Intent and Allowed Uses.

Ms. Kester noted that at the last meeting there had been discussion of what should be the intent of these two zones and how do we differentiate between the two. She pointed out that she had worked on an intent statement and Ms. Ninen had worked on the language as well. Ms. Kester went over her proposed intent statement for the ED. She stated that she wanted to know if they wanted some kind of a design statement to be in the intent statement. Mr. Gagliano suggested that it say it is intended to have limited nuisance factors and hazards and then in the PCD-BP the intent statement would say devoid of nuisance factors and hazards. Mr. Pasin said he had a problem with the statement about high public facility demands and reduce the demand for vehicular access. Ms. Kester said that her intent was to avoid something that would take a large amount of infrastructure, lots of traffic, water, etc. Mr. Pasin asked what if someone has 1000 employees, which may also have impact on the infrastructure. Mr. Atkins asked why have statements about what we don't want, and suggested they put a period after hazards since the uses will be controlled through the matrix. Ms. Kester asked how they would look at a zoning code text amendment for something not allowed when there is not a statement about what is discouraged. Mr. Gagliano suggested they remove the phrase "and to reduce the demand for vehicular access". Mr. Atkins said that lots of intent statements stated that the secondary uses are only there to support the primary use so perhaps they should strengthen the statement about that. Mr. Pasin suggested that it say, "limited business and support services are allowed that serve the needs of the employment district tenants and patrons". It was decided to end the sentence after the word "opportunities" and remove "and to reduce the demand for vehicular access". Discussion followed on the purpose of allowing contractor yards and Ms. Kester said that they are classified as an Industrial Level Two use and this is the only zone that allows them. Mr. Pasin suggested that the opening sentence should say the district is intended to contribute to the employment needs of the community and remove the phrase "long term". Mr. Gagliano said that he felt that long term indicated that this zone is intended to evolve over time. Everyone decided to remove the words "contribute" and "long term" so the sentence read "the district is intended to meet the employment needs of the community". Mr. Atkins suggested "The Employment District is intended to provide suitable areas to support the employment needs of the community". Mr. Gagliano asked about adding a statement regarding design and landscaping and asked if this intent statement would be used to write the mini design manual for this area. Ms. Kester said that the design manual will be neighborhood specific not zone specific and they had written statements for each of those neighborhoods. Mr. Atkins said that it

seems like whatever is needed to define our vision needs to be in this paragraph. Mr. Pasin pointed that within the community as a whole these things are promoted so why make the statement only in the ED zone. Mr. Gagliano agreed that this zone should not have any higher standards than any other area in the city. He suggested that there be space left to write something in this intent statement if they get through the design manual and find that they need more direction. Ms. Kester agreed that they could leave the sentence out then add something later if necessary. Ms. Derebey and Ms. Guernsey agreed that the sentence didn't belong.

They next discussed the intent statement for the PCD-BP. Ms. Kester went over her proposed intent statement. She noted that technology research and development facilities as stated in the intent statement may not be an allowed use any longer since they had removed Industrial Level One from the allowed uses in this zone. Ms. Guernsey said that it seemed that there needed to be more of a general intent sentence in the beginning. Ms. Kester read the Planned Community Development intent statement from the comprehensive plan. It was decided to just say professional offices and delete "services". Mr. Pasin asked Ms. Ninen why she had said "integrated grouping of small to medium size businesses". She said that she felt it was very visual and she liked business parks developed in that manner. Ms. Kester suggested removing small to medium. She said that in the performance standards of the zone there is language that would support that standard.

Ms. Guernsey suggested taking out technology research and development facilities. Ms. Derebey suggested just removing the word "development". Ms. Kester asked about the phrase "providing major employment opportunities in Gig Harbor". Ms. Ninen suggested adding a reference to the Planned Community Development within the statement. Ms. Kester said that originally the whole Planned Community Development area was all one zone and that within the Comprehensive Plan there are percentages of residential, commercial and employment. She suggested a sentence which read "the business park district is intended to provide employment opportunities within the planned community development area". Ms. Ninen suggested that it say "suitable areas" rather than "employment opportunities". Mr. Gagliano agreed that it should say "suitable areas". It was decided to change "to serve" to "that serve" and to move "are allowed" to the end of the sentence. Ms. Kester stated that only when someone needs a conditional use permit would the intent statement be used as guidance. Mr. Pasin said he didn't like the word "compatible". Ms. Guernsey said she didn't like "potentially high public facility demands". Everyone agreed to remove that statement. Ms. Guernsey suggested that it should say "compatible with adjoining residential uses". Ms. Kester displayed the criteria for approval of site plans. Mr. Pasin said that he had a problem with it saying compatible with a residential area and it was suggested that it say compatible with adjacent uses. Ms. Kester brought up the map and pointed out what was surrounding the PCD-BP area. Ms. Derebey asked what was wrong with being compatible with the residential area. Everyone agreed that since there was more than residential surrounding the area to say compatible with adjacent uses. It was decided to keep the phrase "retail uses are not encouraged in order to preserve this district for employment opportunities".

Discussion was held on the definition of personal service and business service. Ms. Kester explained the two definitions she was proposing. Mr. Pasin asked why they would want to exclude a barber from being in a business park. Mr. Gagliano asked if ancillary services would cover it. He noted that Mr. Pasin's statement seemed inconsistent with his earlier comment to want to attract large corporate employers. If the business park is filled with these types of uses then there will be no room for the uses intended. He also pointed out that there are other areas within the PCD that would allow for those types of uses. Ms. Malich suggested adding "such uses include but are not limited to" and everyone agreed that it was implied. Discussion followed on changing cleaning services to janitorial services. Ms. Guernsey asked about financial institutions and Ms. Kester pointed out that financial advisors were listed in professional services. She noted that at this time the PCD-BP does not allow drive throughs. Mr. Atkins suggested that financial institutions could be listed in personal services and business services. Ms. Guernsey said that she didn't feel that these services listed were necessarily only for support of businesses. It was decided to remove the word "support" and "primarily" and to add "individual".

Ancillary services were discussed next. It was decided that the statement about exterior signage shall have its own sentence stating, "ancillary services shall not have exterior signage". It was decided to delete "for the employees of an office building" since it was already stated in the earlier sentence. Ms. Derebey suggested adding the phrase "examples of such uses include" and everyone agreed. It was decided to put "for the benefit of the employees of an office building" back in to clarify. It was decided to add "primarily" and to change "primary" to "principal".

Mr. Gagliano asked if anyone had done their edits for the Design Manual and were they going to get to it tonight. He also asked if it was appropriate for other design review board members to come to the next meeting on the 30th and Ms. Kester cautioned that only one more member could attend in order to not have a quorum.

Rick Gagliano and Tom Dolan left at 8:00 pm.

Use and performance standards were discussed next. Ms. Kester went over the changes to the matrix. Ms. Guernsey suggested adding business services to the PI zone. Ms. Kester read the intent of the zone and then the discussion moved to why not allow the ancillary services. It was decided to not allow business services in the PI. Mr. Pasin asked why they were allowing a commercial child care center to be a conditional use when they had just allowed it as an ancillary use. It was decided to leave that issue for after the public hearing on June 30th in addition to a further discussion of restaurants and the performance standards.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 8:25 p.m. Derebey/Atkins – Motion carried