

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Minutes of Work-Study Session  
August 21st, 2008  
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

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

**CALL TO ORDER:** Acting Chair Harris Atkins called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Move to accept the minutes of June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2008 as written.  
Pasin/Guernsey – Motion passed.

For the minutes of July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008 Mr. Pasin noted that on page 4 in the last line it should be “the city” rather than “they city” and that on page 5 in the first paragraph, on the 10<sup>th</sup> line an “if” should be added.

**MOTION:** Move to approve with the changes noted. Guernsey/Ninen – Motion passed.

Next discussion was held on the minutes of August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008 and the following changes were suggested:

Page 1 - call to order should say Acting Chair and it should be Jeane Derebey not Jeanne.

Page 1 – change to state Mr. Pasin asked if it was left as is.

Page 2 - remove the “to”.

Page 3 – add “and the applicant” and rephrase to “he stated that the existing uses are not allowed uses in RB-1”.

Page 5 - 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph change to Mr. Pasin asked if what has been presented moved ahead how that would impact Mr. Stewart. Remove the “and” so that there are separate sentences.

Page 6 – 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph 2<sup>nd</sup> line change to “assumes”.

Page 7 - 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph 8<sup>th</sup> line add an “if”. In the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph 3<sup>rd</sup> line it should read Ms. Appleton rather than Emily. Two lines after that put a comma after point

Page 8 - 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph where it starts “Mr. Pasin suggested that there be a particular heading regarding the hospital benefit zone” add “as an additional revenue source”. In the last sentence in that paragraph reference 11-1 as a figure. The next paragraph should say August 21<sup>st</sup> and private “amendments” rather than “amendment”.

In the item on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan change the wording to say, "Planning Director Tom Dolan said this was a minor amendment and they were asking the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to amend the PROS to include specific properties which have been or may be acquired".

**MOTION:** Move to approve the minutes of August 7<sup>th</sup> with the above changed. Guernsey/ Pasin – Motion passed.

## **WORK-STUDY SESSION**

Commissioner Jim Pasin asked if the items that staff was to provide would be discussed individually or with each item and Acting Chair Harris Atkins said they would deal with them along with the appropriate item.

### **1. Consideration of City Sponsored Comp Plan Amendments**

Planning Director Tom Dolan stated that comprehensive plan amendments are subject to compliance with a number of criteria. He asked how they wanted to look at the amendments and the criteria. Commissioner Jill Guernsey said she would like to look at some generally and some in detail and everyone agreed.

Mr. Dolan said that COMP 08-0002 could probably be looked at generally since that is a minor change to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space plan. He pointed out where the criteria were listed. Mr. Atkins asked if anyone had any objections with proceeding to the next one. Mr. Pasin felt that there needed to be some minor discussion about this item and stated that he felt that there was a problem with the additions meeting concurrency especially in Gig Harbor North. Ms. Guernsey asked what land use permits would be needed to make these properties into a park. Mr. Dolan said possibly conditional use permit, site plan review, and SEPA and added that concurrency would be addressed at that time. Mr. Dolan said that the criteria are more oriented to when you change land use to something more intense. Commissioner Jeane Derebey clarified that these changes don't need to be addressed at the time of acquisition but rather at the point of development. Mr. Atkins said that it really is a question of whether this criterion is appropriate. Senior Engineer Jeff Langhelm clarified that in GHMC 19.10 it says capacity evaluation is required for increased density of development. Mr. Pasin said that he didn't really agree but if this were a private request and we didn't meet that criteria then we would have reason not to approve it and he wanted to be sure there was consistency. Ms. Guernsey said that sometimes the criteria does not apply to every amendment but since you don't need concurrency at this time then the amendment does meet the criteria. Mr. Atkins said that they didn't need to make a final decision tonight, but rather go over the comments heard from the public hearing. Mr. Pasin stated that he felt it did not meet the requirement for concurrency.

(COMP 08-0005) – Gig Harbor Wastewater Amendments to Sewer Basins C1, C5 and C8 – None of the commissioners expressed concern with any of the criteria.

(COMP 08-0006) – Utilities Element Update – None of the commissioners expressed concern with any of the criteria.

(COMP 08-0007) – Capital Facilities Plan Update

Mr. Pasin asked if the proposed amendment stamped the 14<sup>th</sup> of April was the final one and Ms. Appleton said no, they still needed to verify information with the transportation element. Ms. Derebey asked if the properties recently purchased were in this capital facilities plan and Mr. Dolan pointed out where they were located. Mr. Pasin asked if this capital facilities plan had taken into consideration other projects that are being amended. Mr. Dolan said that there really is no infrastructure necessary. Jeff Langhelm answered that there is no outlay for the installation of a pump station by an applicant. Ms. Derebey asked about the reclamation of water and did that require that we know about funding and Mr. Atkins said that there are not really any costs at this time since this is just a goal.

Ms. Ninen referenced Jennifer Kester's memo of July 9<sup>th</sup> and that it stated that staff would provide the analysis if this criteria had been met. Mr. Dolan said that the last staff report did contain an analysis from staff. He also pointed out that this is just a plan and there may be changes. Mr. Pasin said he recognized that; however, in the last 8 or 10 years the city has gone through several moratoriums and each of these have a huge impact on the community and he was hopeful that they could think broadly enough so that they could have a plan that would eliminate these shortcomings.

(COMP 08-0008) - Transportation Element Update

Planning Director Tom Dolan stated that Ms. Ninen had sent an e-mail to Ms. Appleton with some concerns and changes and Ms. Appleton said that they would incorporate all the errors that were found. She said she was compiling a list that will summarize all these revisions and will distribute a revised Chapter 11 with the list of changes. Mr. Dolan noted that they are scheduled to have a final decision on Sept 18<sup>th</sup> and asked if Ms. Appleton could have it ready by the 4<sup>th</sup> and she agreed.

Ms. Ninen asked how the economic down turn could affect this plan. Mr. Dolan noted that sales tax revenue is up in Gig Harbor. Ms. Derebey pointed out that state revenue was down and that we count on them for some of these projects. Ms. Appleton said that they don't always get funding from the state however; they coordinate with our finance director on these issues. Mr. Atkins said that they needed to consider to what extent they had already committed traffic CRCs and asked if perhaps Ms. Appleton could categorize that for them. Mr. Pasin said that one of the revenue sources is impact fees and asked where that was accounted for and Ms. Appleton that she has that as a comment and will consult with finance on that.

(COMP 08-0004) – Area-Wide Land Use Map Amendments

Area 1 – Mr. Atkins said there was a comment by Mr. Stewart regarding the Bauer property and they were asking that the property by Spinnaker Ridge be excluded. Ms. Ninen said that Mr. Bauer had referenced 38 acres but it is really 3.8. Mr. Pasin said he is looking for the city attorney's input as she is saying that rezones do not vest and they currently do not have a complete application so therefore he felt that it was reasonable to move ahead. Ms. Ninen said that it appears that they were trying to use the designation as a buffer from the businesses. Mr. Atkins said that he thought that someone probably thought since there is multi-family in the area it made sense. Ms. Ninen asked if there was a deadline on filing a complete application. Mr. Dolan said no we don't have a process for returning projects that have not been acted on. Mr. Pasin said that he recalled that this neighborhood has used this argument for and against this issue. Mr. Atkins said that the comprehensive plan talks about valuing single family properties, this is a small piece of property and in order to get multi-family on it you would have to really cram them in there and it doesn't mesh with the rest of the neighborhood.

Area 2 – Mr. Dolan said that is the property currently zoned R-2 for the most part but has a residential low comprehensive plan designation so we are proposing that the designation be changed to residential medium. Mr. Pasin said that there is a set of lots on the downhill side of Grandview Place and asked if the line be at Grandview Place. Mr. Dolan said that the city attorney had advised that the Planning Commission can amend its proposal but they should ask that the council initiate an area wide down zone to change the R-2 zoning to R-1. Ms. Guernsey said that she agreed and pointed out the areas on the map and where the disparities are clear. She said it makes sense to keep it as residential low except for the corner and then pursue a rezone down to R-1. Mr. Atkins pointed out that there were several multi-family developments in that area. Mr. Pasin stated that he still felt that the strip of lots along Grandview Place should be kept residential low and change the zoning to R-1.

Area 3 – Mr. Dolan said the 96<sup>th</sup> Street annexation was part of this area and the Pierce County Council has invoked jurisdiction so the appropriateness of the annexation will go to the Boundary Review Board for consideration. He went on to say that the Haven of Rest cemetery has been determined to be an illegal use in the City of Gig Harbor and that staff will be proposing an amendment that will make new cemeteries illegal making Haven of Rest a legal nonconforming use; however, they have plans for expansion and nonconforming uses cannot be expanded. Mr. Dolan explained that it will be addressed as to what is the best way to allow for the expansion of the cemetery. He concluded by saying that this proposal is to allow for R-2 zoning.

Acting Chair Harris Atkins called a 5 minute recess at 7:30 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 7:35 p.m.

Planning Director Tom Dolan gave a brief introduction Senior Planner Pete Katich and Mr. Katich gave a brief background on himself.

**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 went over the proposal to make an amendment to the sewer basin to allow for a pump station for development in that area. Ms. Ninen verified that the cost was being borne by the developer and Mr. Dolan said yes. He explained that the alternative would be to install a gravity system which would be expensive to install and difficult to maintain. Mr. Atkins asked if there were any criteria that anyone felt had to be addressed. There were none.

**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. Dolan went over the proposal and also noted that the applicant was asking that the Planning Commission consider the application in two parts and he had talked to the city attorney and concurred that the applicant can modify their application and ask that the Planning Commission consider it in two parts. He stated that he had asked the city attorney to look at the proposed development agreement. In response to a question at the previous meeting Mr. Dolan stated that the comprehensive plan designation for this property was established as residential low in 1997 when the first comprehensive plan maps were produced and the RB-1 zoning was established in 1966. Mr. Atkins asked for clarification on the two separate parcels. Mr. Dolan said the portion of the project on the bottom of the map will be for commercial development. Mr. Pasin pointed out the black and white map. Ms. Ninen asked about the duplex development and its access. Mr. Pasin said that even though the applicant makes some good points he has concern for the creep of commercial along the ridge and abutting residential. Ms. Ninen said in the new urban development concept that the GMA has mandated they want people to live and work in the same area and the city has to follow that. Ms. Derebey further pointed out the large buffer that would be between the development and the residences. Mr. Dolan said that there will be a public hearing on September 4<sup>th</sup> and asked if it would be helpful to have the maps on the screens for the public hearing. Mr. Atkins asked that perhaps there could be a composite map with all the information on it. Mr. Pasin asked if there were some issues with the intersection of Stinson and Pioneer with regard to traffic. Mr. Dolan said he would find out, but he understood that Ms. Appleton had reviewed all of the proposals and found no fatal flaws. He stated that he would ask if she can attend the hearing. Mr. Allen asked about the current zoning of the area and Mr. Dolan went over the request and current designation. Ms. Guernsey illustrated the area and the current and proposed land use designations. Mr. Allen asked what the impact would be if the RB-1 would remain rather than RB-2. Mr. Dolan said the uses would be restricted. Mr. Allen clarified that the size of the building would not be any different. Discussion followed on the merits of separating the two pieces and why the applicant wanted to separate them. Ms. Ninen pointed out that the height limit is 35 feet in both RB-1 and RB-2.

**4. Michael Averill of Lighthouse Square LLC, 3720 Harborview Drive, Gig Harbor WA 98332** – (COMP 08-0003) – 3720 Harborview Drive Land Use Map Amendment. Mr. Dolan noted that there had been some confusion on the applicant's part that they would be able to rezone after this amendment and that would allow them

to be conforming and that is not possible. He pointed out the letter and they now understand that this amendment will not get them to a conforming status; however, the property is not suitable for single family development so they are asking for the change to residential medium to allow a rezone at a future date to RB-1 in that they have plans to relocate their business and in selling the property having a different zoning class will allow them to sell. Ms. Ninen asked why they were asking for a change to RM when RL could allow RB-1. Ms. Guernsey asked if this property had been zoned R-1 since 1962. Mr. Pasin said that this piece of property doesn't seem to have the right zoning designation and this is a historical corner and if this were a residence of this age we would try to protect it. He asked everyone to think about that as it has some bearing on the historic value of downtown. He said he would hate to see it destroyed. Ms. Ninen was asking why they are asking for a comprehensive plan amendment when they just want to go to RB-1. Mr. Atkins noted that whatever business goes in there needs to be low intensity because of the location. Ms. Derebey said that it seems silly that it's R-1 since it's always been commercial. Mr. Atkins asked if there had some conclusion as to how best to help do what they want to do. Mr. Dolan said that he would talk to the applicant more; however, he did still think they are confused about their ability to rebuild or change use. Mr. Atkins pointed out that they are asking for a change to RM which could potentially allow them to have duplexes or fourplexes and Mr. Dolan said no because the site is not big enough to be anything else but RB-1. Ms. Guernsey noted that the Haub property that is RB-1 is a similar kind of area.

### **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008 – Work study session and public hearing.

Mr. Dolan said that he had met with one of the owners within the ED zones and Mr. Perrow would like come to a meeting and share his concerns when the commission discusses this next. He suggested that perhaps they would want to consider a second public hearing. Mr. Pasin said that he felt that any input should be accepted and encouraged. He stated that he was thinking that that may occur in November.

Ms. Guernsey stated that she would not be able to attend the September 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and would like a CD of the public hearing. Ms. Derebey said that she would not be attending the meeting of October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Atkins said that Ms. Appleton will have some of transportation information together and we will use the work study time from 6 until 7 to go over that. Mr. Dolan also said that at the end they could make a formal recommendation on some of the amendments.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 8:25. Derebey/Ninen – Motion passed.