

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session
Thursday, May 6, 2004
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners Kathy Franklin, Carol Johnson, Theresa Malich, Bruce Gair, Scott Wagner and Chairman Paul Kadzik. Commissioner Dick Allen was absent. Staff present: Steve Osguthorpe and Diane Gagnon.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of April 1, 2004 Franklin/Johnson – unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

WORK-STUDY SESSION

Dale Pinney, Proposed text amendments reducing setback requirements in the PCD-BP (ZONE 04-03)

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe briefly outlined the staff report and stated that the setbacks, when applied to a smaller lot, seem restrictive. They are, however, more reasonable for the remainder of the property in the PCD-BP.

Dale Pinney then distributed maps of all the sites affected by his proposal with the setback areas highlighted in blue.

The Planning Commission invited the applicant, Mr. Dale Pinney to address the commission regarding his proposal.

Dale Pinney, 1359 N 205th, Shoreline WA - Mr. Pinney stated that his biggest concern with his parcel was road access to the residential development on lot 4 and how that would impact the setbacks. Other buildings in the area (i.e., Washington Mutual, etc.) are on 1-2 acre lots. This parcel should support more than one building. Mr. Pinney questioned why such a burden was being placed on the PCD-BP area with setbacks so much larger than in the rest of the city with really no benefit.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe stated that if Mr. Pinney felt that his parcel was different than other lots and more encumbered he should consider applying for a variance. Mr. Pinney acknowledged that that may be necessary.

Mr. Pinney went on to state that the setbacks they are asking for are comparable to other business park zones. He said that the price of this property dictates higher end uses rather than industrial and asked what we are buffering from if surrounded by commercial.

Commissioner Johnson suggested that perhaps the text could specify different setbacks for smaller lots and additionally stated that the buffer has a higher function to provide ambience and green space.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe replied that it would be highly unusual to base setbacks on lot size as no matter what the size of lot you would still want residential buffered from a commercial use.

Chairman Paul Kadzik commented that when this area was annexed it was all forested and that it was the intent to maintain some of the green space.

Commissioner Scott Wagner asked why there are different setbacks for parking lots versus buildings.

Mr. Osguthorpe read from the intent section of the PCD-BP Chapter 17.54 and stated that the increased setbacks were to protect surrounding residential uses from industrial uses, however, it was adopted prior to the design manual.

Mr. Pinney added that the design manual dictates all these issues such as location of buildings, landscaping and setbacks. He pointed out that the setback behind Target and Albertsons is only 30' and that he felt that the city had all the tools in place in the design manual to accomplish the goals of the PCD-BP.

Discussion followed on the possibility of getting a variance for Mr. Pinney's site. Mr. Osguthorpe read the variance criteria and Mr. Pinney expressed his doubt that he could meet the "reasonable use of the land" criteria.

Planning Manager Osguthorpe suggested to the Planning Commission that they go back to the intent of the zone and use that as a guide and decide what they want to encourage in this zone.

Commissioner Johnson then asked if other cities have attached setbacks to use. Mr. Osguthorpe answered that he believed that reasonably you could assume that.

Mr. Pinney asked why heavy industrial uses were even allowed in the PCD-BP zone.

Commissioner Wagner added that he agreed that larger warehouse uses won't go into Gig Harbor North because they don't pencil financially. Mr. Wagner further stated that he felt a 30' buffer between residential and commercial is more reasonable and supported the idea to make it use specific.

Commissioner Malich pointed out that one of the sites that this amendment would affect borders on residential low which is what we really want to protect.

Commissioner Gair stated that the difference between 30' and 40' is hard to tell and cautioned the Planning Commission to not depend on the design manual as it has a lot of flexibility.

Discussion followed on the road placement and the applicant's concern that if they put in a private road and develop the site as a PRD (which requires 30% open space) the road placement would obliterate the lot.

Mr. Pinney stated that he felt that he could solve the road issue and asked which uses the Planning Commission would consider for reduced setbacks.

Mr. Osguthorpe read the allowed uses in the PCD-BP zone and then the Planning Commission went through the list one at a time and came to an agreement on those that they would consider for a reduced setback.

- A. Research and development facilities – Not reduce
- B. Light assembly and warehousing – Not reduce
- C. Light manufacturing – Not reduce
- D. Service and retail uses which support and are ancillary to the primary uses allowed in the business park district – Reduce
- E. Professional offices and corporate headquarters – Reduce
- F. Distribution facilities – Not reduce
- G. Vocational, trade and business schools – Not reduce
- H. Book and magazine publishing and printing – Not reduce
- I. Financial and investment institutions – Reduce
- J. Commercial Photography, cinematography and video productions facilities – Reduce
- K. Reprographic, computer, courier services, mail and packaging facilities – Not reduce
- L. Trails, open space, community centers – Not reduce
- M. Schools, public and private – Not reduce
- N. Public facilities – Not reduce
- O. Adult family homes and family day care – Reduce

As a conditional use:

- A. Hospitals – Not reduce

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe asked what the Planning Commission was proposing for the reduction and pointed out the Design Review Board is recommending a proposed definition of a dense vegetative buffer which may work in this instance also and provide continuity between the regulations.

Discussion followed on the buffers for parking lots.

Chairman Kadzik suggested a 75' setback for those uses allowing the reduction along with 30' of that being retained landscaping.

Mr. Pinney stated that he felt that 40' was a reasonable compromise and would bring back a proposal maintaining the current parking lot setback and allowing a reduced setback of 40' for those uses listed.

It was decided that this item would be brought back for a public hearing on June 3rd, 2004.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

May 20, 2004
June 3, 2004

Meeting Cancelled
Public Hearing

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 8:00 p.m.
Johnson/Malich – unanimously approved

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Track 1