

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
Civic Center
June 20, 2013
5:00 pm**

PRESENT: Harris Atkins, Reid Ekberg, Craig Baldwin, Rick Gagliano, Pam Peterson, Jim Pasin and Bill Coughlin.

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Lindsey Sehmel and Jennifer Kester

5:00 p.m. - Call to order, roll call

Approval of minutes

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of June 6, 2013 as written.
Pasin/Peterson – motion carried.

WORK-STUDY SESSION

Harbor Vision Policies – Review of the draft element beginning under the “Quality Design” section. Commissioners will discuss their notes and suggestions regarding the draft element, as assigned at the 6/6/13 meeting, as we review each applicable section over the coming months.

Mr. Atkins gave an overview of what had already been accomplished on the draft element and the goals for this meeting.

Ms. Sehmel stated that she would like to get everyone’s comments on the policies and then she would finalize the language further and they would have another couple opportunity to further finesse the language.

The commission began their review on page 3-5. Mr. Coughlin noted that there was nothing about the accessibility of the water side.

Moving on to the section on quality design, Mr. Pasin didn’t think the heading was appropriate. Ms. Sehmel thought that as they develop these policies a better term will be generated.

Ms. Peterson mentioned that it probably wasn’t necessary to list telephones as something that would be encouraged as there are no phone booths anymore.

Mr. Gagliano noted that the common area amenities should be encouraged in more than commercial development.

Mr. Coughlin suggested that there be more of a goal statement at the beginning of the section that would better define what quality design is. Mr. Gagliano said that 9.3.8 and 9.3.1 didn't seem to belong. Mr. Atkins noted that they will have to integrate the policies within the Shoreline Master Program.

Discussion followed on the section on view preservation. It was suggested that consider might be a better word to use in section 9.3.9 rather than preserve. It was noted that 3.4.2 was already dealt with in the Design Manual.

The commission discussed the conflicts between preserving trees and assuring that trees aren't planted that block views. It was decided that the header needed to include the tension between the differing regulations. Mr. Gagliano noted that he wanted to make sure that the portion that emphasizes that trees are part of the view; be retained.

The environment section was discussed next. Mr. Atkins wondered if this whole section wasn't best addressed within the Shoreline Master Program. It was decided to take the policies within the SMP and put those in this section.

The neighborhood character and traditions section was discussed next. Mr. Atkins talked about the difference between the view basin and the harbor. It was decided to place this issue in the "holding pen" to be discussed later. Mr. Gagliano suggested removing 3.9.3.

It was decided that the Planning Commission would discuss the size of residences in comparison to lot sizes further after the next draft.

Historic preservation and conservation was discussed. It was suggested that the City's Historic Preservation staff person Lita Dawn Stanton should come to the next meeting to discuss this issue further.

It was decided to consolidate the policies relating to historical structures. (section 3.18).

Working Waterfront and Cultural Heritage. 9.2.1 Fishing. Mr. Gagliano pointed out that preserving the commercial fishing fleet, was an economic issue. It was decided to change the wording to say "support".

In 10.9.2 it was decided to remove the phrase "and to provide a balanced social experience".

The section on "a place that supports and values local retail shops and services" was discussed next. Some minor edits to wording were made. It was decided to discuss home based businesses since they are regulated currently and are not specific to The Harbor.

It was pointed out that covered moorage is no longer allowed in the city, so that portion of the policy could be removed.

Ms. Sehmel said that she would make edits reflecting their policy comments and would distribute the next draft with the edits shown. She noted that the next step would be to identify if there were any gaps in the policies. Everyone noted that vibrancy and walkability were missing.

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 7:00 p.m. Gagliano/Baldwin – Motion carried.