

City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
October 14, 2010
Planning & Building Conference Room
4:00 pm

PRESENT: Michael Fisher, Jill Guernsey, Harris Atkins, Jim Pasin, Ben Coronado and Bill Coughlin.

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Tom Dolan, Jennifer Kester and Kim Van Zwalenburg from the Department of Ecology.

CALL TO ORDER: at 4:00 pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of the minutes of October 7, 2010.

Mr. Pasin stated that his comments on page three were a personal statement and he would rather they were stricken.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of October 7, 2010 as written.
Guernsey/Fisher. Motion carried.

Mr. Atkins noted that tonight's goal was to go through the rest of the holding pen items. Mr. Dolan stated that there were approximately nine issues to go through; however, there may be some items that could be consolidated. Additionally he noted that shoreline armoring will be discussed at the next meeting when Mr. Katich is back and it will probably be a pretty large issue. Mr. Coughlin asked about discussion of the setbacks and Mr. Dolan stated that he had thought that the commission had wanted staff to develop the alternatives discussed. Mr. Atkins stated that he understood that staff was going to come back with those alternatives and there may be further discussion at that time. Everyone agreed. Mr. Pasin stated that he wanted to have further discussion on the vegetative buffer requirement related to those alternatives. Mr. Dolan went over the schedule for the public hearing on November 18th. He noted that if the hearing goes long they may have to hold two public hearings with the second one being December 2nd with another work study session on December 16th.

Moorage: Ms. Kester noted that Mr. Katich had provided the marina survey. Ms. Kester asked if they wanted to remove that from the holding pen list and Mr. Atkins said that they had wanted to wait to get feedback from the public hearing. He stated that it should remain on the holding pen list. Discussion followed on commercial fishing boats and having the fishermen come to a meeting and what type of information they could provide regarding the number of boats.

Setbacks for off street parking areas: Ms. Kester asked if they wanted to maintain the current proposed language or should it be the same as the building setbacks and alternatives that they will be developed. Discussion followed on the functionality of off street parking and their relationship to marinas. Ms. Kester suggested that since the landscaping code requires 5 feet and the minimum marine setback being proposed is 10 feet and perhaps one of those

numbers is appropriate. **Mr. Atkins stated that if they had decided that with the alternatives that the minimum was 10 feet for marine setbacks why wouldn't it be the same for parking and everyone agreed. Ms. Guernsey stated that there should be a distinction between parking and loading areas and everyone agreed. It was decided to say "landward of any buffers" in 7.20.2 item C. Everyone agreed that there should be another sentence saying, "this shall not preclude the development of a loading space in proximity to the walkway for temporary parking".** Discussion continued on the requirement for loading stalls for marinas and Mr. Dolan suggested that this be further discussed at the time that downtown parking is discussed.

Ms. Kester brought up the next issue regarding additional studies needed for marinas and what these were. She stated that this was a question brought up by Mr. Fisher. Ms. Guernsey pointed out that this it is not needed as it could be asked for under SEPA. **Everyone agreed that item 8 on page 7-29 should be removed.** Discussion continued on items a through e and whether they were covered under SEPA. Everyone agreed that a through d were covered. Further discussion was held on item e. Ms. VanZwalenburg stated that it may have come from the stakeholders meetings due to a concern for navigation when more structures are placed within the harbor. **It was decided to remove item e until after the public hearing.**

Mr. Fisher asked Ms. VanZwalenburg if there was some way to learn about the impacts of marinas on the harbor. She stated that there are differing impacts and Mr. Fisher clarified that he wanted to know the cumulative impact on the no net loss of ecological function in order to determine when is the number of marinas too many. Mr. Atkins stated that from his discussion with the health department it seemed we were already there but he would like to know more about what an acceptable number is. Ms. VanZwalenburg said one of the issues is over water coverage in relationship to the depth of the water, another is water quality impacts.

Boat launch ramps: Mr. Dolan went over some of the issues regarding boat launches and that the commission had wanted to develop a definition. Ms. Kester directed the commission to 7.4.6.1 where it says private boat launch facilities shall not be allowed in any shoreline environment and then on page 7-8 there is an inconsistency in urban conservancy. She noted that on page 2-4 there is a definition of boat launch ramp which is new to this draft. Ms. Guernsey pointed out that sometimes the term boat launch ramps is used and sometimes the term boat launch facilities is used and asked that it be consistent. **It was decided that the term should be boat launch ramps.** Mr. Fisher asked why rails were prohibited. Mr. Atkins pointed out that no private launch ramps are allowed so we are only talking about rails for commercial launch ramps. Mr. Fisher said that rails were still the least intrusive. The commission then decided to determine by shoreline designation whether public or private boat launch ramps should be allowed, whether the ramps should be hand launch only or allow licensed trailers and what the ramps should be made of (concrete, rails, planks (pads, mats, planks, etc.) or graded slopes). The Commission made the following recommendations:

Natural Shoreline Environment Designation (SED):

Private Boat Launch Ramps: Prohibited

Public Boat Launch Ramps: Prohibited

Urban Conservancy SED:

Private Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch only. The Commission did not decide what the ramps should be made of, except to say that concrete ramps should be prohibited. The Commission will take up the issue again after the discussion on shoreline armoring at the next meeting.

Public Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch only made of rails or graded slopes. Concrete and planks should be prohibited.

Low Intensity SED:

Private Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch only made of rails or planks. Concrete ramps should be prohibited. The Commission will take up the issue of graded slopes after the discussion on shoreline armoring at the next meeting.

Public Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch or licensed trailer made of concrete, planks, rails or graded slope.

City Waterfront SED:

Private Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch only made of rails or planks. Concrete ramps should be prohibited. The Commission will take up the issue of graded slopes after the discussion on shoreline armoring at the next meeting.

Public Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch or licensed trailer made of concrete, planks, rails or graded slope.

Marine Deepwater SED:

Private Boat Launch Ramps: Prohibited.

Public Boat Launch Ramps: Hand launch or licensed trailer made of concrete, planks, rails or graded slope.

The following are a summary of comments made during the development of the above recommendation:

- Ms. Guernsey asked if they should allow some private boat launch ramps in certain shoreline environments. She stated that it didn't seem appropriate in the natural environment and perhaps just hand launch in the urban conservancy.
- It was noted that the ramp would have to end at ordinary high water.
- Mr. Fisher pointed out that there a lot of rail systems in Henderson Bay and it's in urban conservancy. He additionally noted that he couldn't visualize a system where the rails

ended at ordinary high water that would work. Additionally he stated that there are boat trailers that are not road worthy that are meant for basically just assisting in hand launching.

- Mr. Atkins asked perhaps this is not an issue because private boat launches don't use trailers other than the type Mr. Fisher was talking about.
- Ms. Kester said that we could write a definition that excludes licensed trailers.
- Regarding graded slope ramps: The Commission looked at the section on fill and excavation on relation to graded slopes, noting that you can't allow graded slopes in Urban Conservancy if you don't allow fill and excavation. Mr. Dolan noted that we haven't even discussed the fill and excavation. He further noted that fill and excavation was in the holding pen and they would discuss this during the discussion on shoreline armoring. It was agreed to table the discussion of graded slope boat launch ramps until the shoreline armoring and fill/excavation discussion occurred.

Aquaculture in Henderson Bay: Mr. Dolan went over what Pierce County currently is proposing. He noted that where aquaculture is permitted it is conditionally permitted. Mr. Dolan noted that there is a small portion of the city limits in Henderson Bay. **Everyone agreed to use Pierce County's regulations for aquaculture in the SMP update recognizing that the language provided at this meeting is still in draft form and the City's regulations may need to be updated during our review process to reflect the final County regulations.**

Portal signs: Mr. Dolan went over the recent code change allowing publicly owned docks and piers to have portal signs. He asked the commission if they wanted to consider allowing it for other docks and piers. Mr. Pasin said that he felt strongly that if the city can do it then other marinas should be able to have a sign. Discussion was held on the need for transient moorage to have some kind of informational signage. It was noted that an amendment may need to be made to the sign code. **It was decided that staff would come up with language to allow for transient moorage to have signage on a piling at the end of the marina.**

Beach access structures: It was noted that this was being discussed as a result of any changes in the public access section that may affect this. Mr. Dolan suggested that perhaps the commission needed to study Chapter 6.5 to determine if there are any conflicts with 7.14. **Everyone agreed to study those chapters and discuss this at the next meeting.**

Discussion was held on the remaining items needing discussion prior to the public hearing. It was noted that it was shoreline armoring and the marine setbacks (including vegetation). Mr. Dolan went over the schedule for the next few meetings and for public notice of the public hearing. Discussion followed on the meeting to be held with the fishermen on the 4th and the goals for that meeting.

Ms. VanZwalenburg also noted that she had checked on the subject of uses being defined by referring to the zoning code and if there is a change in the zoning code there would have to then be a change to the master program. Discussion was held on ways to create the references to

minimize shoreline amendments. Additional discussion was held on the process for the final adoption of the master program and the timing of comments from the Department of Ecology. The Commission then talked about the public hearing and how to address some of the larger issues. Mr. Dolan said that staff would try to develop a summary of the issues in order to inform the public of the topics.

MOTION: Move to adjourn. Coughlin/Coronado – Motion carried.