

City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
September 16, 2010
Planning & Building Conference Room
4:00 pm

PRESENT: Harris Atkins, Bill Coughlin, Jim Pasin, Ben Coronado

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Tom Dolan, Peter Katich, Kim VanZwalenburg

CALL TO ORDER: at 4:00pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of minutes of September 2nd, 2010. Mr. Atkins noted that on page 5 item number 17 under 3, the phrase “probably with your firms assistance” needs to be deleted.

MOTION: Move to adopt the minutes of September 2nd, 2010 as amended. Coronado /Coughlin – motion passed.

Completion of the review of the restoration plan:

Mr. Katich brought the Planning Commission up to date on the outside agency review, noting that the deadline is the 17th and as of yet he has received no comments. **He suggested that he could send out a reminder and extend the deadline. Everyone agreed.**

Mr. Katich then brought up the issue of providing incentives in the restoration plan and asked if the commission was still interested in pursuing incentives. He noted that they had discussed some zoning incentives for restoration that was not required. Mr. Atkins suggested that they look at what other jurisdictions had done. Further discussion was held on possible incentives such as waiving fees and streamlining the process.

Mr. Pasin asked about what timeframe we were expecting people to restore to and Mr. Dolan explained that the goal is the restoration of ecological function not to a specific time period.

Chapter 5

Mr. Katich stated that staff is creating larger scale maps and also verifying parcels and their designations. He also noted that discussion needed to be held on a new designation for the Purdy area.

5.2.2 Mr. Atkins noted that there was an inconsistency as in some areas we say “designation” and sometimes we just say environment. It was agreed that the word “designation” should be added after the word “environment”. Under item D. Management Policies Mr. Atkins asked why we were using the word “should” and Mr. Katich explained that in this document “should” is defined as “shall”. **Mr. Atkins suggested changing the last word of item 3 to “designation”. Mr. Pasin suggested that it say “natural environment designation”. Everyone agreed.**

5.2.3. D. Management Policies.

Mr. Atkins noted that in item 2 he didn't really like the use of the word "inform", it seemed like guide would be a better word to use. Mr. Pasin felt the whole statement was clumsy. Mr. Katich suggested saying, "utilize a variety of approaches such as" and remove the word "regulate". Ms. VanZwalenburg pointed out that in her December 7th 2009 letter she had commented on this section and felt that it diluted the policy. **She noted that the policy in the guidelines states, "Standards should be established for shoreline stabilization measures, vegetation conservation, water quality and shoreline modifications within the urban conservancy designation these standards shall ensure that new development does not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function or further degrade other shoreline values". It was decided to replace the language in D.2 with this language.**

Mr. Coughlin asked about what passive public access was as referenced in item 3. Ms. VanZwalenburg said that it was bird watching and other such activities. **Mr. Dolan suggested that they remove the words "and passive" so that it just stated low intensity public access. Everyone agreed.**

5.2.4 Low Intensity Environment

Mr. Pasin confirmed that the parcels within each designation are being verified.

5.2.5 Mr. Atkins noted that this designation will be changed to City Waterfront Environment. **Mr. Coughlin noted that under Management Policies item 3 that the citizens should be listed first and the tourists second, everyone agreed.** Mr. Pasin noted that in the purpose statement there is a phrase about the character of the Gig Harbor waterfront and he had a note that this wording was going to be changed. Mr. Katich said that they needed to have a larger discussion about defining the character of the downtown area so that we can align the marine setback requirements. Mr. Coughlin asked about the adaptive reuse of historic net sheds and went over their locations and designations. He wanted to make sure that they were all being protected not just the ones within the City Waterfront designation. **Everyone agreed that was the intent, it was decided to add the phrase "in this environment as well as others" in item 2.**

5.2.6 Mr. Pasin asked if they should have a definition of deepwater. Mr. Atkins stated that it is somewhat defined within the designation definition as that is the only place it is used. Mr. Atkins also noted that under C and in the purpose it should state that this applies to areas in the Urban Growth Area. **Ms. VanZwalenburg suggested just removing the word "bay". Everyone agreed.**

Chapter 8 Administrative Procedures

Mr. Atkins asked Mr. Katich if he knew what was new in this section. Mr. Katich said that it was not much different from the existing shoreline master program. Ms. VanZwalenburg noted that in item 14 the city may want to change the month that they report and perhaps it shouldn't be in the shoreline master program. It was decided to remove the words "in February of". Mr. Katich noted that section 8.2.4 will need to be modified as we have changed the code to not require a

permit for something that's exempt. Mr. Katich then discussed the changes to non conforming regulations as they relate to 8.12. He noted that the city had adopted these changes locally but had not sent it to ecology, so this is basically a re-adoption of what was done in 2005. He noted that there are some additional changes that may be necessary in order to be more consistent with 17.68 the non conforming section of the zoning code. He went over some of the inconsistencies. He summarized by saying that overall the shoreline master program was a little more flexible. **Mr. Dolan explained that staff was suggesting that the master program be modified to be more like the zoning code with some additional time allowed for extensions. Everyone agreed.**

Ms. VanZwalenburg suggested that some of the language in 8.7 be removed and that it just refer to the rule. She said she would provide the rule to Mr. Katich.

Chairman Atkins called a five minute recess. The meeting was reconvened at 6:10

Section 8.5.2. Mr. Atkins asked about the placeholders indicating that exemptions were going to become a Type II permit and what that meant. Mr. Katich explained that it would be a director's decision.

8.11 Critical Areas:

Mr. Atkins asked about the red text in Appendix C and what that indicated. Mr. Katich stated that he felt that attaching Appendix C was a little confusing and asked the commission if it could just be another chapter and he wanted to discuss that at a future meeting. Discussion continued on the critical area regulations in Title 18.

Mr. Katich went over the schedule for the upcoming meetings and the talking points for the joint meeting with the City Council. Ms. VanZwalenburg noted that net sheds should be added as an issue and Mr. Atkins suggested that some of the points be combined.

MOTION: Move to adjourn. Pasin/Coronado, motion passed.

Summary of 9/16/10 Meeting Outcomes:

1. Revise the first sentence in subsection 5.2.2.A to include state, "The purpose of the "Natural" environment **designation**"
2. Revise subsection 5.2.2.D.3 to state, "Single-family residential development may be allowed as a conditional use within the "natural" environment if the density and intensity of such use is limited as necessary to protect the ecological functions and be consistent with the purpose of the **natural** environment **designation**."
3. Revise subsection 5.2.3.D.2 to state, "Standards should be established for shoreline stabilization measures, vegetation conservation, water quality and shoreline modifications within the urban

conservancy designation. These standards shall ensure that new development does not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions or further degrade other shoreline values.”

4. Revise subsection 5.2.3.D.3 by removing the words, “and passive” that follow the first two words of the sentence.
5. Revise all references from “Historic Waterfront” to “**City Waterfront**” in entire draft smp (chapter, section & subsection) including subsection 5.2.5.
6. Revise subsection 5.2.5.D.2 by adding the words, “In this environment as well as others” at the beginning of the sentence.
7. Revise subsection 5.2.5.D.3 to state, “Commercial and recreational development should serve both the citizens of Gig Harbor and tourists.”
8. Revise subsection 5.2.6.A by deleting the word, “Bay” from the end of the sentence.
9. Revise existing draft smp Section 8.12 by replacing it with Gig Harbor Municipal Code (GHMC) Chapter 17.68 (nonconformities). Revise all sections to conform with formatting of draft smp and draft chapter 8. Revise current GHMC subsection 17.68.040.B (relocated to draft smp) to provide for 2 one-year extensions to the 12 months currently allowed to reestablish a nonconforming structure damaged by fire, act of nature, etc. (see language in draft smp subsection 8.12.3 for approach.)
10. Revise Section 8.7 (Appeals) by quoting new DOE rule that addresses same (Kim will provide a copy of the new rule).