

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Work Study Session  
March 3, 2011  
Community Rooms A/B  
4:00 pm**

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Staff: Jennifer Kester, Peter Katich, Kim Van Zwalenburg from the Department of Ecology and Teresa Vanderberg and Reema Shakra from ESA Adolfson.

**CALL TO ORDER:** at 4:00 pm

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Move to approve the minutes of February 3, 2011 as written. Guernsey/Pasin – motion carried.

**WORK STUDY SESSION**

1. Shoreline Master Program Update
  - a. Review GIS data and preliminary findings for revised Cumulative Impact Analysis Report

Senior Planner Peter Katich briefed the Commission on the revisions prepared by ESA Adolfson and the data collected by Senior Planner Jennifer Kester. Ms. Kester then stated that it had been decided that there needed to be a parcel by parcel categorization of how setback averaging would affect no net loss of ecological functions. She explained the process she used for the categorization. She stated that based on the way the proposed code is written the only way a building could get closer to the shoreline is if setback averaging is employed. She further stated that out of all the vacant properties, only 11 were eligible for setback averaging. Mr. Pasin asked about the difference between the use of the phrase buffer averaging and setback averaging and Ms. Kester said that in this table the terms are interchangeable but that she would modify them to just say setback averaging.

Ms. Kester then went over the data on nonconforming structures.

Ms. Shakra then briefed the Commission on the proposed revisions to the Cumulative Impact Analysis Report to more accurately reflect the intent of the Commission based on the new G.I.S data prepared by staff. Mr. Katich said that the Commission will have the revised CIA prior to the next meeting. Ms. Shakra went over their analysis as to whether setback averaging would result in no net loss of ecological function. She stated

the number of vacant properties that would be eligible for setback averaging was so small that they determined they would have no impact on ecological function. She then went over the impacts when redevelopment occurs and identified impacts within the proposed Natural Environment Designation as a concern. She reviewed the options for the Planning Commission to consider in order to resolve the potential problem with impacts to existing ecological functions within the Natural Environment Designation. Option one is to not allow a change to the minimum setback. Option two would be to require property owners to prove that the minimum nonconforming structure setback will not impact ecological functions. The third option would be to create a net gain in the other proposed shoreline environmental designations and expand the scope of the proposed restoration plan.

Mr. Dolan asked if a possible fourth option could be requiring that the square footage of undeveloped land area within the setback area remain the same. Ms. Shakra stated that it could work if there was also a requirement for vegetation retention. She stated that in City Waterfront Designation there was no net loss and, possibly, some net gain. In the proposed Purdy Commercial Designation, no net loss while maintaining existing ecological function. In the Historic Working Waterfront Designation the same result as in the City Waterfront Designation. The proposed Low Intensity and Urban Conservancy Designations are very close to meeting no net loss, with the amount of allowable impervious surface the last concern. Ms. Shakra noted that the Natural Designation is the largest concern, and that typically exceptions to regulations are not provided within a Natural Environment Designation because it should have the highest level of protection.

Mr. Fisher asked where the numeric standards were for no net loss and Ms. Vanderberg stated that there are no standards for this analysis it is simply a professional opinion based on expertise. Mr. Dolan pointed out that the area they were mainly talking about is an area along the Tacoma Narrows and mostly within the city's UGA and unincorporated Pierce County. Discussion continued on how the evaluation of no net loss is conducted and the assumptions used for the evaluation. **Mr. Atkins suggested that they adopt Option #1 and monitor what Pierce County adopts when it addresses the issue as part of the county update effort. If the county creates an approach less restrictive than the city's, the city's master program could be amended consistent with the county approach. Everyone agreed that such an approach should be used.**

Ms. Shakra went over the concerns for increased impervious surface and the options they were proposing to address this issue. Mr. Dolan suggested they offer all the options and let an applicant decide. There was general agreement to this approach with further discussion of non-conforming situations. The Commission discussed a development regulation that would require the "balancing" of impervious surfaces on a given development site to ensure there would not be a net increase. Mr. Pasin said that he had a problem with no increase in impervious surface, and Ms. Guernsey said that she would combine options 1 and 2 separated by an "or". Mr. Coughlin and Mr. Coronado agreed with Ms. Guernsey and Mr. Fisher said he didn't like them at all. Mr.

Atkins stated that it seemed they had a majority agreement to require no net increase in impervious surface. Mr. Fisher suggested that they allow incidental increases in impervious (i.e. 1% or 5%) to address such improvements as a concrete pad for a heat pump unit. Discussion continued on what incidental would mean. **The Commission decided that the impervious coverage allowance for incidental increases in impervious surface would be 1% of the site within shoreline jurisdiction or 50 square feet, whichever is greater.**

**Mr. Atkins then polled the Commission on the setback issue for structures that are nonconforming. Mr. Fisher stated that he liked option 1 which was just to remove the exception within the natural designation; Mr. Coronado agreed and confirmed that if Pierce County changes something then we can modify that; Mr. Pasin agreed with option 1; and Ms. Guernsey agreed with option 1.**

Mr. Katich then summarized for the record by stating that in regard to the setback issue for structures, including those that are nonconforming to the minimum structure setback and those that are located within the area between the high water mark and the nonconforming structure setback, the Commission decided to use Option 1 for the Natural Designation which addresses the removal of the exceptions to the minimum structure and nonconforming structure setback requirement, and also note that if the county adopts something different in their shoreline master program the city will revisit this issue and potentially revise the city master program consistent with the county approach.

Mr. Katich continued his summary by noting that in the Urban Conservancy, Low Intensity and Natural Designations, a combination of options 1 and 2 will be utilized; that the first bullet under option 2 would be deleted, and that additional language addressing the incidental increase of impervious surface of up to 1% or 50 square feet whichever is greater will be added to the exceptions.

- b. Review Dennis Reynolds request on behalf of Stanley and Judith Stearns dated November 18, 2010 to re-designate property addressed as 9110 Randall Drive from its proposed Urban Conservancy Environmental Designation to a requested Low Intensity Designation

Mr. Katich went over this proposal and reviewed the previous discussions held by the Planning Commission at the work study session held on December 2, 2010. He noted that the Pierce County designation for this area is Low Intensity and they are proposing a setback of a 100-feet. Ms. Vanderberg noted that she had performed a site visit with Mr. Dolan and noted the two streams located on the property. She noted that these critical areas would restrict future development of the parcel regardless of the shoreline regulations. Discussion continued on the surrounding area. Mr. Pasin said that he thought it was fine to change it to Low Intensity; Mr. Coronado said that he felt that given the critical areas it was a better fit in the Urban Conservancy. Mr. Fisher asked about the current location of the house and Ms. Vanderberg stated that the house was now located approximately 50.6-feet from the stream located on the northerly portion of

the parcel. Ms. Guernsey had to leave the meeting at this point. Mr. Fisher said that as a practical matter the applicant is not going to be able to do much with the parcel regardless of the designation; however, his use of the property may be more restricted under Urban Conservancy. He stated he would change it to Low Intensity. Mr. Coughlin said that he felt it belonged in the Urban Conservancy. Mr. Atkins said that he was concerned with changing it when there were other properties with the same features and the same designation. He said he would keep it Urban Conservancy. **After each member was polled on whether to retain or change the designation, it was decided to keep the property in the proposed Urban Conservancy designation.**

Mr. Katich then went over the changes to the section on the replacement of existing bulkheads, as requested by the Commission. He also noted that Mr. Fisher had inquired about how the open house would be facilitated. Mr. Fisher stated that he was developing a “write up” for all the Commissioners to utilize as to why the city is updating the master program. Discussion continued on how best to communicate the work put into the draft and the science behind it.

Mr. Coughlin noted that he wouldn't be in attendance at the next meeting. Mr. Dolan then went over the upcoming meeting schedule. He noted that in May the Planning Commission will go back to hearing other issues and they will need to decide if they want to continue meeting at 4:00pm. Mr. Dolan noted that the first issue will be the 2011 Comprehensive Plan Amendments and developing some interim downtown parking regulations which would allow existing downtown buildings to change from one use to another without having to add parking as long as the new use retains the same parking as provided by the former use. He noted that one of the other issues is the gross floor area change proposed for the car dealership properties located west of SR-16. He also noted that he had received a text amendment application for property located within the WM Waterfront Millville zoning designation. Mr. Atkins asked about the new Planning Commission member and Mr. Dolan said that a new member would probably join them around the first of May.

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn. Fisher/Atkins – Motion carried.

### **Summary of 3.3.11 Meeting Outcomes:**

1. Revise subsection 6.2.3.3.1 (Marine-Vegetation Conservation Strip Modifications) by removing setback exceptions for Natural Environment Shoreline Designation.
2. Revise subsection 6.2.3.2.2 (Marine-Vegetation Conservation Strip) by adding additional standards to address impervious surface coverage within the proposed

Natural, Low Intensity and Urban Conservancy Environment Shoreline Designations.