

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
Civic Center
February 20, 2014
5:00 pm**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Lindsey Sehmel.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of January 16, 2014 as written.
Pasin/Baldwin – Motion carried.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of January 30, 2014 as written.
Baldwin/Ekberg – Motion carried.

WORK STUDY SESSION

Tree Preservation and Retention amendments – Staff provided the commissioners with the public hearing draft of the amendments in preparation for the public hearing on March 6, 2014.

The Harbor – 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Staff provided a summary table of all comments received to date. Mr. Atkins went over the layout of the table, noting that the commissioners also have copies of the original comments.

Mr. Atkins asked that the commission be aware of areas where a goal for the overall comprehensive plan does not necessarily apply to the waterfront.

Recommendations:

#1 – Add sentence to paragraph referencing location of Historic survey. Mr. Atkins stated he felt a reference could be added. Mr. Pasin felt that it was getting too specific in an introduction section. Mr. Gagliano felt that it could be added as a footnote and everyone agreed.

#2 – In 3rd paragraph of the introduction, reference GHMC 17.99 in regards to the design guidelines. Mr. Pasin again emphasized it's too specific for the introduction. Everyone agreed a reference was not necessary.

#3 – 5th paragraph, 1st sentence, replace the word “appreciated” with either of the words “desire” or “favor”. Ms. Sehmel pointed out that the question asked during the visioning process it was asked of the public, “what do you appreciate”. Mr. Pasin said that the goal was tied back to meeting the desires of the community. Everyone agreed to change the word to “desire”.

#4 – Page 3-2 1st paragraph, replace the word “reproduction” with the word “duplication” in reference to the incorporated goals and policies from other parts of the comprehensive plan. Everyone agreed “similar to”, was a more appropriate phrase.

#5 – Page 3-3, under map have the language read, “The Harbor area as discussed in this chapter is outlined in blue on the map above”. Everyone agreed with this change.

#6 – Page 3-2; adoption of the 2009 downtown historic inventory via incorporation by reference. Inventory was never presented to City Council, DRB or Planning Commission upon completion, therefore adoption by reference may not be appropriate through this avenue. Everyone agreed.

#7 – Minor language changes recommended. Add the word “waterfront” to the 3rd paragraph in reference to preserving “waterfront’s” history. Mr. Pasin felt that the vision is about more than the waterfront. It was agreed to leave the wording as is.

#8 – Add following language: The visioning process was done with the citizens input and it is recognized the goals, policies and guidelines must meet the needs and desire of Gig Harbor Citizens. Mr. Pasin stated that he felt that the word “must” was too strong although he understood the idea. Mr. Gagliano stated that there were also many more aspects to this process. Mr. Baldwin didn’t feel that it was needed and everyone agreed.

#9 – Language edits to the 1st paragraph – Change “bay” to “areas” and change Harbor Bay to “Harbor’s waterfront”. Everyone agreed with the change.

#10 – Goal 3.1 – Remove “The Harbor shall”, add “in the Harbor” to the end of the goal. Ms. Sehmel noted that comments 10 and 16 both apply to this goal. Everyone agreed with the change proposed in comment 10.

#16 - Handicap accessibility – both walking and wheelchair, recreational accessibility/bike riding. Better lighting along walking, riding areas. Ms. Sehmel suggested that this be a new policy rather than part of the goal. Mr. Atkins also stated that it might be more appropriate in 3.2. Mr. Gagliano mentioned that it needs to not just be on the shoulders of each individual developer.

#11 – Do not require public access provisions of the private property owner on or off the waterfront. If the shoreline public access plan requires such of the property owner please eliminate this section. Ms. Sehmel noted that the shoreline master program does require public access on commercial properties. It was decided to reword the

section to say, “Facilitate pedestrian access throughout the harbor by linking the public park system to create an inviting pedestrian experience”.

#12 – Put the word “waterfront” in place of the word “harbor” in Policy 3.1.1. Decided to leave it as written.

#13 – Keep this section only if it does not impede upon the normal flow of everyday drivers of cars and trucks. 3.1.2, decided to leave it.

#14 – Policy 3.1.2 – Remove “continuously”. Agreed with the change.

#15 – Policy 3.1.2 – At the end of the policy add the following language, “and other residential/business locales throughout the city”. Mr. Ekberg suggested just adding “to and from”. Mr. Gagliano suggested that the wording should be changed to indicate all public transit rather than just Pierce Transit and everyone agreed.

#17 – Goal 3.2 – Should the goal address the need for “walkability” projects to be developed in a manner that is in keeping with The Harbor’s character and scale? Mr. Atkins felt that 3.2 should be restructured. He passed out some suggested wording. Mr. Gagliano said that some of this was addressed in the Design Manual. Lighting was discussed. It was decided to set this section aside for further discussion and skip to comment #28.

#28 – Goal 3.3 – Add the word “area” after the first use of “The Harbor”. Everyone agreed with the change.

#29 – Policy 3.3.1 – Eliminate this section. See 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 comments. A fair requirement of the builder would be building height restrictions so as to not block others waterfront views, especially other property owners, public or private. Ms. Sehmel noted that this exact language is in the Shoreline Master Program so either keep it or remove it. Everyone agreed to keep the language.

#30 – Policy 3.3.2 – Incentives must not be a requirement. If it is, eliminate this section. Control view corridors to a reasonable level, through lot sizes/roof lines, etc. Mr. Atkins said that it was worded wrong and Mr. Gagliano suggested removing “for development” and “in exchange”.

#31 – Remove completely policy 3.3.2. Commenter noted that incentives don’t work. The commission had already addressed this and want to still offer incentives.

#32 – Policy 3.3.3. Commenter noted: mandate undergrounding when roadways are expanded and poles must be removed. Mr. Pasin noted that it is cost prohibitive to the property owner. It was decided to leave the language as written.

#33 – Policy 3.3.3. Eliminate section, unnecessary rate increase for utilities. This was addressed through the previous discussion.

#34 – Policy 3.3.4. Delete completely. Commenter noted “Delete this entire wording as it is counteractive to goal 3.3 and in no way supports “a vibrant place where residents, visitors and boaters enjoy a walkable waterfront, picturesque views and the natural environment”. It should read: Establish landscaping standards that support the citizens desire to view the bay while walking and driving through downtown. Establish landscaping standards that support citizens’ desire to view Gig Harbor and Harborview Drive from their boats in the bay”. Mr. Pasin said the wording worked however it should probably be broadened to include more than just citizens. Mr. Gagliano stated that they had also received comments about landscaping softening edges and vegetation creates a natural environment. It’s bad stewardship to make this just roofs and pavement. Mr. Atkins also noted that the Shoreline Management Plan requires a vegetative buffer. Mr. Gagliano pointed out that a view lacking a foreground or a background gets boring really fast. A view with a tree within it keeps the eye more active. Mr. Ekberg said he didn’t feel that it should be written with the intent that the view is the most important. Ms. Sehmel said that they could add a 3.3.5 to address the preservation and maintenance of views. Discussion was held on possible removing item C within 3.3.4. Everyone agreed to remove C and staff will work on the language for a new policy 3.3.5.

Chairman Atkins called a 10 minute recess.

#35 - #37 – Addressed through the previous discussion.

#38 – Goal 3.4. The term “over development” is a subjective term. It was agreed to remove the term and add the word “and”.

#39 – Policy 3.4.1 Eliminate this section. “Green and Sustainable building practices/codes are not to the advantage of the Gig Harbor community as a whole. It was decided to leave the policy as written.

#40 – Policy 3.4.2 Too restrictive on choices for the private property owner. This policy can be applied to public parks/property etc., not private property. For the private property owners focus the policy from the restrictive side, on preserving a view corridor, for one example. “Preserving and protecting habitat” places undue burden on the private property owner, and therefore at most, should only be recommendations, not requirements. To be on the safe side and for the benefit of all in the Gig Harbor community 3.4.2 should be eliminated. Decided that this language is from the Shoreline Master Program and needs to remain as written.

#41 – Policy 3.4.2. Add phrase “low rise” after the word “maintaining”. Also, requests removal of the phrase “create views or”. Staff pointed out that this language is also from the Shoreline Master Program and therefore needs to remain. Everyone agreed.

#42 – Policy 3.4.3. Eliminate this section. Everyone agreed to keep this policy.

#43 and 44 – Policy 3.4.4. Out of place, more appropriate in the Shoreline Master Program. Mr. Atkins suggested that as noted in the next comment the areas that aren't within the harbor should be removed. Ms. Sehmel said she would ask the attorney since it's wording out of the SMP. It was decided to leave it as written and staff will check on the removal of the reference to the creeks not within the harbor.

#45 – Policy 3.4.4 Add language “and open waters”, after the phrase “preserve and protect habitat”. Discussion was held on placing the language in another section. Mr. Gagliano suggested placing language in 3.4.1 stating “encourage open waters and sustainable land development”.

#46 – 3.4.6 – New policy: Encourage retention of buildings and landscapes that support The Harbor's traditional uses, e.g., commercial fishing, boat servicing, repair and building, and marine fueling. Everyone agreed that this language would fit better within 3.10.

#47 – Goal 3.5 – Recommend removing the term “parks” from community waterfront properties. Mr. Ekberg suggested leaving the term parks and adding “and community waterfront properties”. It was decided that within the goal to just use the phrase “community properties along the waterfront” and reference parks within the policy.

#48 – Goal 3.5 Respect the neighborhood residential characteristics where appropriate. Discussion was held on whether this was better included in a policy or the goal. It was decided to add language to the end of 3.5.2.

#49 – Policy 3.5.2 – Remove the term “recreational” in regards to uses. Everyone agreed to keep the term.

#50 – Policy 3.5.3 – Add language “and open waters” before the word access. Everyone agreed with the change.

#51, 52 and 53 – Policy 3.5.4 - Recommend deleting or various wording changes. Ms. Sehmel noted that the Parks Commission has been working on this issue of limiting activities in parks. It was decided to revise it to read, “Maintain that publically owned parks are available for public use and uses that provide the greatest public benefit of citizens and visitors alike”.

Mr. Atkins pointed out that there had been a previous comment about limiting festivals to a certain area. Everyone agreed that it wasn't necessary.

#54 – Policy 3.6.1 - Add k, “open space for boating and recreation”. It was noted that this was provided for in other areas. Mr. Pasin pointed out that it is addressed in 3.16. It was discussed whether to strike F and J. Mr. Atkins wondered why have a list at all. Mr. Gagliano wondered whether the entire 3.6 was needed. Mr. Atkins suggested that the idea that this section be deleted, be set aside for now. Everyone agreed.

#55 – Policy 3.6.2 Consider moving to Goal 3.4. Everyone agreed to delete it.

#56 – Goal 3.7 It was decided to add to the goal a phrase that states “historic business”. The commission agreed with adding the phrase “development regulations” after “design standards”. Discussion was held on whether to add a subsection “encourage new development to be compatible with existing homes in area”. Mr. Atkins felt that 3.8 already addressed it and everyone agreed. It was decided to rewrite the language within b).

#57 – Goal 3.7 At end of goal add the language “to meet the desires of the community”. It was noted that this was within the intent and is implied. Decided not to add this language.

#58 – Policy 3.7.3 Add word “establish” to beginning of policy. Remove word “shall” and replace with “that”. Everyone agreed.

#59 and 60 – Add language “to meet the desires of the community”. This is implied, decided to not add this language.

#61 – Policy 3.7.4 – Add word existing prior to the term “historic design”. Mr. Gagliano suggested using the terms “existing massing, roof styles and scale”. Mr. Ekberg stated that perhaps the design manual covers these issues and this could be removed. It was decided to make the suggested change, adding the word existing.

#62 – Goal 3.8 – Add word “If” at beginning of second sentence, add “ensure that” to “redevelopment” and remove word “shall”. Everyone agreed with the change.

#63 – Policy 3.8.1 – Delete this policy. Commenter noted that it potentially violates IBC the City’s adopted building code. It was agreed to keep the language.

#64 – Policy 3.8.7 – 2009 Downtown Historic Inventory was never presented to City Council for approval/blessing of the research. Ms. Sehmel noted that she has already removed references to the inventory.

#65 – Policy 3.8.9 – At end of policy add the following language, “when they meet the desires of the community”. This is the intent of the entire document, already addressed under previous comment as it is implied.

#66 – New Policy 3.8.10 – Refine historic district “zoning” boundaries to better reflect each historic district or neighborhood. It was agreed to add this new policy.

#67 – Goal 3.9 – It was decided to leave the language as written.

#68 – Goal 3.9 – At end of goal add the following language, “as they meet the desires of the community”. Previously addressed, implied goal.

#69 – Policy 3.9.3 – Remove words “landscaping shall”, replace with “Design landscaping to”. Agreed with the suggested change.

#70 – Policy 3.9.4 – Remove (a). Decided not to make the suggested change as it may impede new businesses to move into the downtown.

#71 – Policy 3.9.4 – Add d) “Parking standards shall respect neighborhoods and limit impacts”. Revise parking standards to respect residential neighborhoods and limit impacts was discussed as possible wording. Mr. Atkins wondered if it should be placed in another section. It was agreed to add the wording as revised.

#72 – Goal 3.10 – Add phrase “and environmental” between the words cultural and heritage. It was decided that there are already environmental related goals and policies.

#73 – Policy 3.10.1 – Consider moving to Goal 3.17. Everyone agreed.

#74 – Policy 3.10.1 – Commenter voiced support for this policy.

#75 – Policy 3.10.2 – Replace terms “human history” with human ecology. Ms. Sehmel noted that this is a dual policy from the SMP. Decided not to change.

#76 – Policy 3.10.3 – Remove term park system and replace with public waterfront. Decided to make the change to the language to be consistent with earlier comment.

#77 – Policy 3.10.4 – Commenter voiced support for this policy.

#78 – Policy 3.10.6 – Is this in addition to already existing bonuses for access? Ms. Sehmel stated that this is a duplicate policy from the SMP.

#79 – New policy 3.10.6 – Support and promote landmark signage to educate the public on Gig Harbor’s culture and history. Everyone agreed with the added language.

#80 – New policy 3.10.7 – Support efforts that conserve important cultural traditions (e.g., commercial fishing, boatyards, marine services) to exist and evolve. It was pointed out that there is similar language in other policies. It was decided to add the words “promote the evolution” into policy 3.10.2.

#81 – Policy 3.11.1 – Commenter noted that the term “commercial” is too open ended for the Millville area. It was decided that this wasn’t just about the Millville area, no change.

#82 – Policy 3.11.1 – Remove the word “tourist” from the policy. The commission agreed with the change, removed the last sentence and added the word retail.

#83 – Policy 3.11.3 – Commenter noted that this was a really important policy.

#84 and 85– Goal 3.12 – Remove this goal. Not appropriate in all areas of map. One commenter noted that this encourages multi-family and high density housing and is inconsistent with set historical objectives for the harbor. It was suggested that the word “consistent” be added and everyone agreed.

#86 – Goal 3.13 – At end of goal add the following language, “based on the needs and desires of the community”. This is an implied goal.

#87 – Policy 3.13.1 – Gig Harbor would or could cease being the harbor with an open ended goal statement such as this. It was decided to leave the policy and add the words “and procedures”.

#88 and 89 – Policy 3.13.3 – Supports the building of a parking structure downtown. It was decided to not add this until this has been decided to be a goal by the City Council.

#90 – Policy 3.13.4 - Add term “and cultural conservation” to policy. Everyone agreed to add the language.

#91, 92, 93, 94, 95 – Policy 3.14.5 – Remove this policy or add “and other entertainment venues”. It was decided to discuss this with the Council at the joint meeting.

#96 – Goal 3.15; Policy 3.15.2 – Concerned with the reduction of permit fees and waiving land use performance standards to attract new businesses. Decided no language change is necessary.

#97 – Policy 3.15.1 – Considering adding (a-d) of 3.15.2 under 3.15.1 as well. Decided that the language does not need to be duplicated.

#98 – Policy 3.15.1 – Remove the word “districts” and call them business properties. Decided to not make the change as this is a universal word used throughout various land use documents.

#99 – Policy 3.15.2 – Delete a), b) and c). Commenter notes that they are illegal. Ms. Sehmel noted that state law allows for all three of these tools for cities to use in order to support economic development. Language to remain.

#100 – Policy 3.15.2 – There are many ramifications with this language. Not the right forum to discuss this. Language to remain.

#101 – Policy 3.15.3 – Not the right forum to discuss this. Decided to keep the language.

#102 – Policy 3.13.3 – At end of policy add the following language, “and the needs and desires of the community. This is implied.

#103 – Policy 3.16.1 – Insert the word commercial between the words “valuable” and “fishing”. It was decided to leave the language as written.

#104 – Policy 3.16.2 – Remove this policy, confusing language. How do you have a dock and open water surface? Another commenter suggested “retain the open surface water area for watercraft circulation”. It was decided to keep the language as written.

#105 – Policy 3.16.4 – Amend “commercial fishing fleets” to the commercial fishing fleet. Agreed to the suggested language change.

#106 – Policy 3.16.5 – Delete and replace with “define and protect adequate navigation corridors and access within the bay”. Agreed with the suggested change.

#107 – Policies 3.17.1 and 3.17.2. The word “allow” has no teeth – policy largely ineffective. Use of the word “promote is better or shall is best. Ms. Sehmel said the language was from the SMP, it was decided to leave the language.

MOTION: Move to extend the meeting past 8:00 to complete the last four items. Gagliano/Baldwin – Motion carried.

#108 – Policy 3.17.4. Include the term “the economic” as an important component. The commission agreed to the change.

#109 – Policy 3.17.5. Delete completely. Commenter notes that incentives almost never work and only surprise neighbors. The commission agreed to delete this policy.

#110 and 111 – Commenter voiced support of various goals.

MOTION: Move to continue this meeting to the February 27th to address the general comments and the three items that were set aside regarding the comments on the Harbor Element. Gagliano/Ekberg – Motion carried at 8:10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Move to adjourn at 7:04. Baldwin/Ekberg – motion carried.