

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

**PRESENT:** Commissioners: Harris Atkins, Joyce Ninen, Jill Guernsey, Jim Pasin, and Jeane Derebey. Commissioners Dick Allen and Theresa Malich were absent.  
Staff Present: Tom Dolan, Emily Appleton, Pete Katich and Diane Gagnon

**CALL TO ORDER:** Acting Chair Harris Atkins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Move to approve the minutes for August 21st, 2008 as written.  
Ninen/Guernsey – Motion carried.

Commissioner Harris Atkins went over the changes that he had suggested for the September 4<sup>th</sup> minutes.

**MOTION:** Move to approve with suggested changes. Guernsey/Ninen – Motion carried.

**WORK-STUDY SESSION**

Planning Director Tom Dolan thanked the commission for coming at 5:00 pm and asked that they discuss some other issues prior to discussing the Comprehensive Plan amendments at 6:00. He noted that at the end of last meeting they had talked about some text amendments that could be done via direct consideration by the City Council. He reminded the Planning Commission that for the amendment for cemeteries they had already agreed to direct consideration. He stated that the next amendment was regarding density in Gig Harbor North. He then stated that they had Councilmember Derek Young present to join in the discussion of the text amendment proposed by Gateway Capital LLC. He explained that they are asking that the city amend the parking regulations for shopping centers that have daytime and nighttime uses to accommodate shared parking. He noted that he had distributed a copy of the application. Mr. Dolan went on to say that the Planning and Building Committee had received a copy of this and they had asked that he bring it to the commission with a request to allow for direct consideration due to the fact that the Planning Commission has a very full schedule.

Commissioner Jill Guernsey asked why they wanted it considered more quickly. Mr. Dolan explained that the Hogans have plans for additional construction on the site that cannot occur because they have only six surplus parking spaces. He went on to say that they are saying that a parking garage is not necessary because there is a substantial amount of parking that is not being used. Mr. Pasin said that his immediate

reaction was that it should not be heard as direct consideration since it had some far reaching impacts. Mr. Dolan asked the Commission if Councilmember Young could discuss his concerns and everyone agreed.

Mr. Young voiced his desire to not influence their decision and suggested that perhaps there was a way to manage this so that the commission could look at it in a brief manor. He stated that the Uptown development has a lot of momentum and it would be lost if they had to halt construction and he noted that it has spawned redevelopment of other sites (i.e. Safeway) and that redevelopment would also have to be over parked. He said there are huge sections of the Uptown parking lot that are not getting used at certain times of the day. Mr. Young stated that his interest is in keeping the momentum going in that neighborhood and said he would like to do a little more research to perhaps limit it to certain zones and perhaps limit its actual impact and then allow the Planning Commission to look at it further. He stated that he believed that a sea of asphalt was not in keeping with what Gig Harbor wants for its design. He gave the example of a church and a school being built next to each other and how it would be absurd to have parking for both. He noted that the Planning Commission has a lot on their plate, along with the Shoreline Master Program.

Ms. Guernsey suggested that the Planning Commission could hold a couple of special meetings to get this through. She said that she had concerns and that the developer told everyone that they were going to build a parking garage. She also said that she saw some issues in the draft proposal. Mr. Young said that it is more about the redevelopment of the other areas surrounding Uptown. He noted that most cities do have some sort of shared parking regulations. Mr. Pasin said that recently the commission has had some discussions about mixed use developments in Gig Harbor North and this parking issue is a piece of that. He also felt that if it is done right there is an opportunity to address the parking issues in downtown. He thought that the issue needed to be looked at on a larger scale. Mr. Young explained that he didn't want to see the issue get bogged down for too long. Ms. Derebey said that she didn't like the idea of pushing anything through for just one developer. Ms. Ninen said that it was going to take some research and she would like to find out what other communities are doing. Mr. Dolan noted that he had worked with Tacoma's codes and that it worked in shopping centers but didn't work in areas like downtown where there are individual parcels and uses. He continued by saying that the downtown parking solution will probably need something more. Ms. Derebey asked what happened to the parking garage and Mr. Young said he didn't know. Mr. Young said he would like to get this done by the end of the year. Mr. Dolan said that the applicant is stating that they don't need the parking garage. Ms. Guernsey said she wasn't sure if the city was requiring too much parking.

Acting Chair Harris Atkins suggested that they pick a meeting where the commission could discuss how they could get this through with special meetings. Mr. Dolan said that he could provide additional information to the Planning Commission and they can discuss it with the City Council at their joint meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup>. He noted that

the big tenants are not going to go in where they do not have enough parking. Mr. Young thanked the Planning Commission for their time and consideration.

Mr. Dolan then briefed the commission on the Safeway proposal and also explained that Canterwood had submitted an application for annexation.

Mr. Dolan introduced Senior Planner Pete Katich to discuss the minimum density proposal. He noted that at the last meeting they had discussed the idea of potentially letting the City Council have direct consideration of the PCD-RLD density regulations proposing an amendment that would set a minimum and maximum of 4 dwelling units per acre. Mr. Katich stated that in the last several months the city has had discussions with a developer of a 200 acre site and if that is developed under 4 dwelling units per acre it could affect our overall density. He noted that he had prepared a memo as requested. Mr. Pasin asked if having a maximum of 4 was appropriate or if perhaps it should be more. Mr. Dolan said that the property is owned by Olympic Property Group and they have met with staff and have plans to file for a plat shortly after the first of the year. He further stated that there is no indication that the plat will go below 4 units per acre but their belief is that the market is better for larger lots. He explained that the discussion had been that that Gig Harbor North was the place for additional density. Ms. Guernsey said that she was fine with letting it go to the City Council, Ms. Ninen, Ms. Derebey and Mr. Atkins all agreed that they could increase the minimum density but not touch the maximum for one year as a temporary fix while the commission looks at the rest of the issue. Mr. Pasin said he would like to suggest to the City Council the thought of possibly increasing the maximum to 6. Ms. Ninen, Mr. Atkins and Ms. Derebey all said they did not agree.

**MOTION:** Move for direct consideration by the City Council for setting a minimum density of 4 units per acre for the PCD-RLD zone. Guernsey/Derebey - Motion carried

Acting Chair Harris Atkins called a short recess at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 6:10 p.m.

**1. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**  
(COMP 08-0008) – Transportation Element Update.

Senior Engineer Emily Appleton introduced Evan Dust from HDR Engineering. She noted that she had sent out the updated version of Chapter 11. She suggested that they run through the highlighted yellow items and how they had addressed them in the revision.

Mr. Dust then went through each comment. He stated that for comment number five they had gone through all the costs and made them internally consistent. For comment number ten regarding the revenue forecast Mr. Dust stated that they had added the hospital benefit zone information as given to them by city administration. On the comment regarding the 20 year improvements and it's consistency with table 11-11 they

changed that table to make it more consistent. Ms. Appleton stated that they would address item 17 before they do the final when they update the accident information. Mr. Dust stated that for item 22 the additional non capacity projects had been added.

Discussion continued on sources of income and Mr. Dust noted that they had added a new table 11-10 entitled funding sources by forecast category which added some explanation for what those categories for forecast mean and that there was a new paragraph.

He stated that he believed that covered all of their comments. Ms. Appleton stated that regarding Item 6, showers and lockers for bicyclists which they had discussed, she wanted the commission to know that there are bike lockers and that perhaps they should just remove the showers. Everyone agreed.

Ms. Ninen noted that on page 11-88 where it talks about the hospital benefit zone that the base year says it is 2008 and actually it should be 2007. Ms. Appleton agreed it should be 2007.

Mr. Atkins asked for clarification in the goals and policies section where it talks about levels of service standards in table 11-4. Mr. Dust explained that it is a measure of what the roadway should be able to handle, it's not the city's level of service and whether that is met, it is not a concurrency measure. Discussion followed on concurrency and the level of service. Ms. Appleton stated that there are criteria for everywhere besides the downtown area and there are other things that can be required in the downtown area such as pedestrian amenities. Mr. Atkins voiced his concern with traffic concurrency in the Gig Harbor North area and its impact on the downtown.

Mr. Atkins asked if there were any of the criteria that someone felt that the transportation element did not meet. Hearing none he stated he would entertain a motion.

**MOTION:** Move that this element be forwarded to the City Council for approval. Ninen/Guernsey – Motion carried.

**2. Harbor Reach Estates LLC, PMB 79, 5114 Point Fosdick Drive, Gig Harbor, WA 98335 (COMP 07-0005) – Gig Harbor Wastewater Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Sewer Basin C14**

Mr. Dolan reminded them that this is an amendment to change sewer basin 14 to allow for the provision of a pump station and to slightly reduce it in size. He didn't think that there had been any testimony at the public hearing by anyone other than the applicant. Ms. Nine clarified that this will be fully paid for by the developer and Mr. Dolan affirmed.

**MOTION:** Move that this item be forwarded to the City Council for approval. Derebey/Ninen – Motion carried.

**3. MP8 LLC and Pioneer & Stinson LLC, 363 7<sup>th</sup> Lane, Fox Island, WA 98333**  
(COMP 08-0001) – 3700 Grandview Street Comprehensive Land Use Map  
Amendment

Mr. Atkins pointed out that the Planning Commission had received a copy of the revised development agreement. Carl Halsan speaking on behalf of the applicant pointed out the changes. He stated that on page 2 they added the note that the units would be for sale; on page 5 they added the section where they would take the project to the Design Review Board and on page 9 they added the unified control and development agreement that they would bind themselves to pursue the development jointly. Mr. Pasin asked Mr. Halsan if on the property description on the last page if that was the property description for the two parcels, and Mr. Halsan said it was for both parcels. Mr. Pasin asked Mr. Dolan if it was okay that there was one description. Mr. Halsan explained that this is the description of the property covered by the development agreement that is why it is explained together and Mr. Dolan agreed. Ms. Guernsey clarified that the Planning Commission is not reviewing the development agreement and Mr. Dolan said that the Planning Commission does not review the agreement. Mr. Dolan asked Mr. Halsan if they still wanted each property considered separately. Mr. Halsan agreed. Ms. Ninen asked about item number 5 on the application where it asked if there is public support for the proposed amendment. She stated that they had answered that discussions with neighboring property owners indicate support; she said that she didn't get that impression from the public hearing and did the applicant know how many neighboring property owners were contacted. Mr. Halsan said they had talked to the commercial property owners across the street and the lady who owns the triplex below this property and one other single family owner on Butler. Ms. Derebey said that there had been some testimony about the tree retention and asked what was going to be done along Grandview. Mr. Halsan said that they will meet the city standard and will try to clump the trees. Mr. Pasin said he agreed that at the public hearing they did not hear public support for this and in item H of the checklist where it asked if this proposal will it create a demand to change land use designations in other areas, he felt that it would. Ms. Derebey said that she was curious what could be done on the property. Mr. Dolan said that the southerly two acres are zoned RB-1 and could be developed as single family homes; however, he believed that they would build offices on the front two acres. He continued by saying that on the northerly two acres they would be required to build 8 single family homes. He stated that Uddenberg's property is smaller and they have two office buildings on it. Mr. Atkins pointed out that the current zone is not compatible with the current land use designation. Mr. Dolan said that the southerly two acres is currently zoned RB-1 but he thought that when the Planning Commission looked at that they had decided that RB-1 was appropriate there. Mr. Atkins said that it is the northerly piece that is more concerning and that almost anything that gets built there is going to seem huge to the downhill neighbor. He also stated that people should have some confidence that they are going to have their single family zoning. He said he had gone through the Comprehensive Plan and there were a lot of goals that were not met by this proposal. He said that approval of southerly portion and disapproval of the northerly portion gives the developer the opportunity to develop the property in a way that would still be cohesive with the adjacent neighborhood. Mr.

Pasin said that the northerly portion should remain single family; he didn't see a need for changing. He didn't like what the southern part was but he would leave it. Ms. Ninen agreed with Mr. Pasin and said that she had a lot of concerns about tree retention and water run off. She noted that even if it is developed as single family there will be improved water retention and trees and she didn't feel that they could ignore the voice of the neighbors. She said she would keep it as it is. She also felt that RB-1 was fine on the southerly portion. Ms. Guernsey said that she felt that the southerly portion should go to Residential Medium to make it more consistent with RB-1. She also felt that they would hear the same concerns if a subdivision were proposed. She wondered if they should allow duplexes as a cushion between the single family and the office buildings. Mr. Atkins said that the only real conflict is the northern piece and the existing single family. Ms. Derebey asked if maybe part of the answer was to not have as many duplexes. She also wondered if it is single family then they will be next to commercial and wouldn't it be better to have a transition between the single family and the commercial. Mr. Pasin said that the reality is that the neighbors don't look at duplexes as buffer between them and commercial. Mr. Atkins also said the other issue is do they want multi family to continue down the hill. Ms. Derebey said that there is a Growth Management Act requirement that the city have some more multi family and higher density. Mr. Dolan noted that the intent statements for RB-1 and RB-2 state that they are supposed to be adjacent to residential uses. Ms. Guernsey said that they seemed to have done that with the Uddenberg building. Ms. Ninen said that they have to take the neighbors viewpoint into account. Ms. Derebey said that they also have to listen with a grain of salt because the neighbors don't want anything changed. Mr. Dolan noted that if the entire property changed from RL to RM he would expect that there would probably be a proposal for a rezone for the property. Mr. Atkins asked what the development agreement said about the buildings on the southerly portion. Mr. Dolan explained that it was proposed for mixed use with office and residential. Mr. Atkins asked for a poll. Mr. Pasin said he would like to leave it as it is, Ms. Guernsey said she would change the land use designation of the Grandview property to RM and the downhill portion she would leave as it is, Ms. Ninen stated she would leave it as it is, Mr. Atkins said he would leave it as it is, Ms. Derebey said she would change the land use designation to RM for the uphill portion and on the northerly portion she was not sure, perhaps she would agree to the change if there were less duplexes.

Mr. Atkins suggested that when they meet with the council on the 29<sup>th</sup> that they go through the amendments and explain their rationale for their recommendations on each.

**MOTION:** Move that Comprehensive Plan Amendment 08-0001 be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation for denial and remain with its current land use designation, noting that two commission members have suggested that the southerly portion be designation RM. Pasin/Ninen – Motion carried.

Acting Chair Harris Atkins called a recess at 7:15 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 7:20 p.m.

**4. Michael Averill of Lighthouse Square LLC, 3720 Harborview Drive, Gig**

\_\_\_\_\_ (COMP 08-0003) – 3720 Harborview Drive Land Use Map  
Amendment

Mr. Atkins asked if there were any questions regarding this application, there being none he then asked if there was any item of criteria that this amendment did not meet. Ms. Ninen said that she would have trouble saying that this amendment would meet adequate infrastructure since she kind of questioned the amendment because they have operated as a legally nonconforming use for many years they are not intending to change anything and she was wondering why they were wanting to do this. She thought it was more appropriate to see how the park is developed and how it affects this property. Mr. Pasin asked what she was suggesting could happen there. Ms. Ninen said that it was hard to foresee but it could become a very important corner and it could ultimately become a usable parcel by the city. Mr. Pasin asked why it would be okay for the city to increase the use rather than a private owner and Ms. Ninen said that she just wanted to wait and see. Ms. Derebey said she was not opposed to changing it, she didn't see that any future use the city might have would prevent this. Mr. Atkins said that no matter what gets done it will be less intense than it is now. He said he was inclined to agree with the change. Mr. Dolan explained that currently either there could be two single family homes or they could leave it the way it is, if the change is approved it would allow for the possible future rezone to RB-1 to allow for the redevelopment as a modest office building. Ms. Derebey said she would vote to approve, Ms. Guernsey said she could see how it would not be pleasant to live next to this nonconforming use and it's not suitable for single family residences. She explained that the city should try to phase out nonconforming uses so it seems that the land use designation should be changed. Mr. Pasin said that given the circumstances he would change it.

**MOTION:** Move to forward a recommendation to the City Council to change the land use designation from RL to RM for COMP 08-0003. Guernsey/Derebey – Motion carried.

**5. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**  
(COMP 08-0002) – Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element (PROS).

Acting Chair Harris Atkins asked if there were any criteria that this amendment did not meet. Mr. Dolan noted that the concurrency will be reviewed as part of the land use permitting process.

**MOTION:** Move to forward to the City Council a recommendation for approval. Ninen/Guernsey - Motion carried.

**6. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**  
(COMP 08-0004) – Area-Wide Land Use Map Amendments.

Area 1 – Mr. Atkins noted that there were several members of the public who came and spoke on this area. Mr. Dolan noted that Mr. Bauer's application for a rezone was not

complete and if this comprehensive plan amendment was approved it would mean that Mr. Bauer's property could not be rezoned.

**MOTION:** Move to forward a recommendation that the Area 1 land use designation be changed to Residential Low. Pasin/Guernsey - Motion passed

Area 2 – Mr. Pasin said that in this area he wanted to note that the southerly piece should be excluded from the change to Residential Medium. Mr. Dolan said that the testimony was that it is currently single family homes and they want it to stay that way since that street is a private road.

**MOTION:** Move to forward a recommendation that Area 2 be changed from Residential Low to Residential Medium excluding the six southerly parcels along Grandview Place. Ninen/Guernsey – Motion carried.

Mr. Dolan suggested that letters go out to those property owners so that when the matter comes before the council they are aware.

Area 3 – Mr. Dolan noted that this area was mostly the 96<sup>th</sup> Street annexation and was being proposed to be consistent with the proposed annexation zoning to R-2.

**MOTION:** Move to forward a recommendation to the City Council that Area 3 be changed from Residential Low to Residential Medium. Ninen/Pasin – Motion carried.

**7. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335**

(COMP 08-0005) – Gig Harbor Wastewater Amendments to Sewer Basins C1, C5 and C8.

(COMP 08-0006) – Utilities Element Update.

(COMP 08-0007) – Capital Facilities Plan Update.

Mr. Dolan noted that the Planning Commission had a detailed discussion and everyone seemed to agree with these amendments.

**MOTION:** Move to forward a recommendation for approval to the City Council of COMP 08-0005/08-0006/08-0007. Ninen/Guernsey - Motion carried.

Discussion followed on changing the meeting time to 5:00 p.m. Everyone agreed to the change. October 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting will start at 5:00 p.m..

Acting Chair Atkins suggested a matrix to indicate the changes they had made and what areas were not met in the criteria. He went over the agenda for the joint meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup>. He stated that they will discuss the comprehensive plan amendments, work program and direct consideration items.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS**



Mr. Dolan stated that on October 2<sup>nd</sup> they will talk about permitted uses in the ED and the PCD-BP.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 7:55 p.m. Derebey/Ninen – Motion carried