

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
January 6, 2011
Planning and Building Conference Room
4:00 pm**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Jeff Langhelm, Wayne Matthews, Dick Bower, Jennifer Kester, Tom Dolan, Peter Katich, and Kim VanZwalenburg from the Department of Ecology.

CALL TO ORDER: at 4:00pm

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mr. Atkins wanted to clarify the statement on page three in the third sentence where Ms. Guernsey suggested, it should say “that after review, the Planning Commission agrees with staff to make the requested change to the draft to address the comment” and everyone agreed. In the fourth paragraph he wanted to stop the sentence with a period after “rebuild” and take out the “and”, and in the last sentence it should say Mr. Long’s concerns rather than his. On page 5 item 6 in the second sentence the third word should be “that” rather than “the”. It was decided to come back to the minutes once everyone had read them.

WORK STUDY SESSION

1. Shoreline Master Program Update
 - a. Review city departmental comments on draft master program

Mr. Katich noted that city staff was present to answer any questions that the Commission might have for them. Mr. Pasin asked about Mr. Bower’s comments regarding structural materials. Mr. Bower stated that the language in the master program states that any structural materials in contact with the water must come from a list provided by the state and he was wondering where he could find such a list in order to determine if there was some adjusting to that list that was needed. Mr. Katich said that he would provide that list to Mr. Bower and the Commission.

Mr. Fisher asked about the coordination with various jurisdictions comment in the public works comments and the need for coordination with Kitsap County. Mr. Matthews and Mr. Langhelm of the city’s Public Works Department, Engineering Division, noted that they are currently coordinating with them and it is strongly encouraged. Mr. Fisher expressed that he just didn’t want to make something required. Mr. Katich emphasized the need for consistency between the city’s stormwater manual and the shoreline

master program. Mr. Pasin also expressed concern over requiring the coordination and Ms. Kester noted that it is a policy not a requirement. Mr. Langhelm noted that Kitsap County is included in the watershed with the city. Mr. Matthews explained the benefits in coordinating with other jurisdictions and Mr. Dolan noted that the city will be coordinating with other jurisdictions whether the master program has a policy or not. Mr. Langhelm noted that it would be acceptable to just add Kitsap County to the list and leave off the more specific information about the stormwater regulations. **It was agreed to just add Kitsap County to the list.**

Dawn Stanton, the city's Historic Preservation Coordinator then joined the meeting to answer any questions the Commission had about her comments on the draft. Discussion was held on Ms. Stanton's comments regarding adding landmarks and their adaptive reuse and whether landmarks could be added without additional regulation. Further discussion was held on non-structural landmarks (i.e. the fishing vessel Shenandoah) and whether this applied to them. Ms. Stanton stated that if the scope was too large and caused issues in other parts of the master program then she didn't feel that adding language regarding landmarks was worth it. Mr. Katich stated that he didn't think there was any harm in adding it. Discussion was then held on what would happen if there was a greater use allowance for a building that was on the historic register that the building owner subsequently decided to de-list from the register thereby leaving the building with an illegal use. **Mr. Dolan suggested that perhaps it should be identified exactly how many buildings would be affected by this proposal and the Commission agreed to defer this issue until they looked at a list of affected buildings.**

b. Additional discussion regarding proposed changes to Donkey Creek area Urban Conservancy Designation.

Senior Planner Jennifer Kester went over the Donkey Creek day lighting project as the Commission had proposed some changes to the Urban Conservancy shoreline designation that includes the project site. She noted that the end result of the city's project will be to expand the scope of the critical areas regulation on this property as the estuary will be expanded. Mr. Katich noted how the buffers will change per the critical areas ordinance. Ms. Kester stated that it seemed that the zoning was wrong in this area. Mr. Pasin expressed his general opposition to the project. Mr. Katich asked if the Commission thought that the designation or zoning needed to be changed. Mr. Fisher had concerns about rezoning property and what the impact on the buffers would have on surrounding properties. Mr. Dolan noted that in Urban Conservancy there is setback averaging and there would probably have to be variances granted. Mr. Atkins noted that the process would probably be the same regardless of designation. Mr. Dolan suggested that staff do an analysis of the different alternatives to see the possible impacts. Mr. Pasin asked what possible impacts this would have on the museum. Mr. Dolan stated that the museum has been involved in the Donkey Creek day lighting project and are not opposed. **Mr. Atkins clarified that tentatively they were going to retain the boundaries of the proposed Urban Conservancy designation in order to**

properly address the restoration project limits and that staff is going to bring back additional analysis on the impacts of rezoning.

The Commission called a short recess.

c. Complete review of December 2, 2010 oral/written comment memorandum – address Guy Hoppen’s comments on draft master program

Discussion was held on Guy Hoppen’s comments and the staff response. Mr. Katich went over Mr. Hoppen’s comments on limiting marinas and encouraging water dependent uses. Mr. Katich first addressed Mr. Hoppen’s comment regarding the parking exemption for marinas with moorage of fishing vessels and noted that the parking exemption was intended for the moorage for commercial fishing vessels not for the entire marina. Mr. Atkins suggested that they go through the comments one at a time.

Definitions

Dock – Mr. Hoppen suggested that the definition of dock be changed to a landing and/or moorage facility rather than one or the other. Everyone agreed that was a reasonable change.

Educational Facilities - Next Mr. Hoppen wanted to add the words “and heritage facility” after the word education and Mr. Atkins suggested that it say “the” museum rather than “a” museum. Mr. Pasin said that he would rather end the statement at the word “value”. Discussion was held on educational facilities including sites and it was decided to leave out the words “and/or site”. It was decided to add “such as the Harbor History Museum”.

Float - They then discussed the definition of a float. It was decided to leave the definition as it is.

Marina - Mr. Hoppen’s next suggestion was to add the word “docks”, everyone agreed with the change.

Maritime Facility - Next was the addition of the word “heritage” so it would read Maritime Heritage Facility and everyone agreed the change was not necessary.

Public Access - Mr. Hoppen’s suggested change was discussed and it was decided to remove the word “utilize” and leave the remaining language.

The Loading and Unloading – Pier/Dock/Float definition was discussed next. It was decided to discuss the definition when they discussed the companion policy.

Mixed Use Waterfront was discussed next. Mr. Fisher stated that he was not in favor of the definition as it just adds further restrictions and negates all the work they have already done on waterfront uses. Everyone agreed the definition wasn't needed.

Mr. Hoppen had suggested a definition for marina dependent waterfront shops and services and it was agreed that this was no longer needed given the new definitions.

The Commission then discussed Mr. Hoppens comments on the inconsistent use of the term mixed use and decided there was no need for a change as they were talking about a mix of uses. Mr. Hoppen had recommended deleting the use of the word tourism as a use and Mr. Atkins said that it is used as a descriptive term not a use and Mr. Katich agreed. Mr. Fisher noted that tourists are not going to be satisfied with just the historical fishing aspect of tourism, they want places to shop and dine.

4.2.1 – Policy – Shoreline Management. It was decided that there would be no change as this was language was based on that set forth in the State Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58.020).

5.2.6 – City Waterfront Environment. In the first paragraph of the purpose statement it was decided to leave the language as stated. On page 5-22 it was decided that the addition of the words “boatyards and marinas” was acceptable and the language that Mr. Hoppen proposed to be deleted would remain.

Page 5-24 D. Management Policies. It was decided that the language would remain as written.

6.1 Shoreline Use and 6.1.1 Policies A. Preferred uses on Gig Harbor shorelines. The Commission decided that the language would remain as written.

C. Mixed use waterfront in Gig Harbor Bay. Mr. Fisher suggested that the title be changed to say Waterfront uses in Gig Harbor Bay. It was then decided that the first sentence would read, “Retain a mix of uses along the waterfront in Gig Harbor Bay including commercial endeavors such as commercial fishing, boating, marine shops and services, restaurants, and retail shops, as well as residential uses which provide the bay's unique appeal” so as to not refer to restaurant and retail as tourist uses and to leave the language in the rest of the paragraph as it was written.

6.4 Historic, Cultural, Scientific and Educational Resources. It was decided that the language on this page would remain as written.

6.5 Public Access. The Commission decided that the goal language would remain the same.

6.5.1 Policies. Mr. Hoppen had suggested that a paragraph be added for Loading/Unloading Pier-Dock-Float. Mr. Katich didn't feel that this was an appropriate

place for this language. Discussion was held on the city's proposed dock. It was decided to leave a placeholder for this subject.

Mr. Hoppen had also suggested that there be a Harbor Commission created. The Commission decided that this was not necessary.

An item 11 was suggested by Mr. Hoppen and Mr. Dolan pointed out that this would be a policy without a regulation. Mr. Fisher noted that we had not decided whether they were going to implement a working waterfront designation so this would not be appropriate at this time. It was decided to not add item 11.

6.8 Quality Waterfront Development along Gig Harbor Bay. Mr. Hoppen had suggested some additional language. It was decided to use the language from 6.1.1 C Waterfront uses in Gig Harbor Bay to follow the words, "This goal will be achieved through a balance of several different uses including". Mr. Atkins noted that it will be truncated because it will not need to say "that provide the bays unique appeal".

7.1.1 Permitted Use Tables. It was decided that this would remain as written.

7.3 Aquaculture. Mr. Hoppen had suggested that there be a more clear distinction made between fish hatchery/salmon enhancement and fish farming. Mr. Katich said he didn't see how this language promoted fish farming and everyone agreed that the language should remain.

7.4.2 It had been suggested by Mr. Hoppen that language be added to put a cap on recreational marinas and the Commission decided that they did not want to add such language. It was also decided that there did not need to be a distinction about recreational marinas.

C. Joint Moorage facilities. Mr. Hoppen had suggested that joint moorage facilities be allowed rather than encouraged. Mr. Dolan didn't feel it made a difference. It was decided to leave the language as written.

7.4.10 Regulations – Commercial Fishing Moorage. It was decided to use the language from the current shoreline master program regarding the parking issue as they had previously decided in order to exempt only the slips used for commercial fishing vessel moorage.

Mr. Hoppen was also suggesting that a second paragraph be added that allowed commercial fishing moorage in low intensity or urban conservancy in order to allow a fisherman to moor his boat at his residence. Mr. Pasin pointed out that sometimes these vessels are quite noisy along with the loading and unloading, etc. Mr. Fisher and Mr. Coronado agreed with Mr. Hoppen that fishermen should be allowed to moor their boat at their residence. It was decided to add the suggested language.

7.6 Commercial Uses. It was decided to use the language from 6.1 regarding uses.

7.6.1 Policies. A. Preferred uses. It was decided to leave the language as written.

7.6.3 Regulations – Non water oriented Use/Development. It was noted that this section had been deleted.

7.7 Commercial Fishing. Mr. Hoppen was suggesting that the sentence regarding the decline of the fishing industry be deleted and everyone agreed. It was additionally decided to delete the phrase “in comparison to the fleet of two decades ago”.

7.7.1 Policies. It was agreed to add the word “unloading”.

7.7.2 Regulations. Mr. Hoppen had suggested that the word “may” be deleted and “should” be added and everyone agreed that the language would remain as written.

7.9.1 Policies and 7.9.2 Regulations. It was decided to leave the language as written.

7.11 Historic Net Sheds. The Commission decided to leave the language as written.

7.11.1 Policies A and B; it was decided to leave the language as written.

7.11.2 Regulations item 1 Mr. Hoppen had suggested that restaurants and retail shops be added as examples of adaptive reuse and the Commission decided that the change was not appropriate. Also for item c. the language would remain as written.

7.12 Industrial Development. The language will remain as written. It was noted that Mr. Hoppen did not have the addendum in which some changes had already been made.

7.15 Recreational Uses and Development. Mr. Hoppen was suggesting that the word “active” be added and the Commission decided that the language would remain as written. The language regarding loading/unloading pier-dock-float that Mr. Hoppen was suggesting was being addressed in another section at a later date.

7.16 Residential. It was decided that the language would remain as written.

Election of Officers

Mr. Atkins noted that officers needed to be elected for 2011 and that he and Mr. Pasin were willing to continue as officers in order to maintain continuity throughout this process.

Motion: Move to have Harris Atkins remain as the Chair of Planning Commission for 2011 and that Jim Pasin remain as Vice Chair. Fisher/Coronado – Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Katich passed out a new schedule and noted that if the Commission decided to change the code to address a new designation after Ms. Stanton's presentation it would change the schedule. Additionally he noted that the public hearing won't be able to be held until March, 2011. Mr. Atkins expressed concern for having time to develop a Working Waterfront designation at this stage. He felt that the most he was willing to propose to the City Council was that they undertake this. Additionally he noted that he thought it was a good idea but it needed to be done right. Mr. Katich also agreed that it was difficult to incorporate this at such a late date.

Discussion continued on the schedule and the format for the workshop. Mr. Fisher said that he would work on an outline for the workshop. Mr. Dolan noted that the consultant was working on modifying the cumulative impact analysis now that they had a better understanding of the shoreline setback averaging requirement. Mr. Katich asked about the second public hearing and whether the Commission wanted all the revisions made to the document as a result of the first hearing. Everyone agreed that it could be done in an addendum or summary format rather than creating a new version of the entire master program.

Move to adjourn. Coronado/Fisher - Motion carried.

Summary of 1.6.11 Meeting Outcomes:

1. Revise policy 6.6.1.C-Water Quality Basin Plan to include Kitsap County as one of the local jurisdictions that the city of Gig Harbor should coordinate with in the development of a water quality baseline study.
2. In response to her comment to revise policy 6.4.1.B-Protection of Resources, to address "landmarks", the Commission directed Dawn Stanton, Historic Preservation Coordinator, to develop a list of buildings within the jurisdiction of the master program that could potentially be added as a landmark to the city's Register of Historic Places. The Commission deferred action on amending the policy until after reviewing the list of buildings.
3. The Commission directed staff to retain the existing, originally proposed boundaries of the Donkey Creek area Urban Conservancy Environment, and analyze the effect of down zoning the underlying WC District zoning designation to WR Waterfront Residential to address consistency between the shoreline and zoning designations.
4. In response to Guy Hoppens' comments in his letter dated November 18, 2010 and related attachments, the Commission directed staff to revise the November 4, 2010 draft master program as addressed on pages 3-6 of these meeting minutes.