

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session
June 5, 2008
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners Dick Allen, Jill Guernsey, Jim Pasin, Harris Atkins, Jeane Derebey and Joyce Ninen. Design Review Board member Rick Gagliano. Commissioner Theresa Malich was absent. Staff present: Jennifer Kester, Tom Dolan and Diane Gagnon.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of April 3, 2008. Ninen/Allen – Motion carried.

It was noted by Commissioner Joyce Ninen that on page 3 in the last sentence in Item 2 of the April 17th minutes the “that” needed to be removed.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of April 17th with the noted correction. Ninen/Pasin – Motion carried.

Commissioner Ninen noted that in the May 15th minutes it neglects to mention that Commissioners Pasin, Guernsey and Atkins were absent. Additionally, she noted that on the 1st page there was an extra “e” in employment, on page 2 under Sales Level 1, 2 and 3 on the 4th line the word should be “discussed”. Ms. Ninen also noted that there was no adjournment time listed at the end of the minutes; however she believed it was approximately 8:40 p.m.

Commissioner Harris Atkins said that he hadn’t seen any further discussion of how the commission responded to Mr. Perrow’s proposal reflected in the minutes. Senior Planner Jennifer Kester said that it was more of an informal suggestion, not a formal application; therefore, there was not any further discussion.

Ms. Ninen reminded staff about the page numbering of the minutes and several commissioners that were absent stated informative the minutes were.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of May 15th with corrections. Ninen/Derebey – Motion passed with Mr. Pasin abstaining.

1. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335** – ZONE 08-0007 – ED and PCD-BP Intent and Allowed Uses

Senior Planner Jennifer Kester went over her memo on this topic. She discussed the need to differentiate between the ED and PCD-BP and the Planning Commission’s

desire to rewrite the intent statements of the two zones. She noted that she had provided copies of several cities codes on business park and employment districts. She had also pulled some design standards on light industrial buildings.

Mr. Pasin stated that he would like to hear everyone's vision of the two zones. She noted that she had sent a summary of what the Planning Commission had discussed, to some key stakeholders and invited them to comment and attend the meetings. She agreed that it might be good to start with each commissioner expressing their view of the zones. Mr. Atkins noted that it did seem that there had been some discussion at the last meeting on changing some of the uses. He noted that personal services were not allowed; however they seemed to be the same concept as having a deli. Ms. Kester explained that it had been discussed at the last meeting and there could be an ancillary type use of a gym but not a separate commercial gym.

Mr. Pasin asked why you wouldn't want to have a full restaurant or a gym in a large business park. Planning Director Tom Dolan said that it was decided that the primary intent of the zone was to bring employment uses and not several restaurants and also there may be more traffic with the retail type uses. Planning Commissioner Jeane Derebey said she also had questioned that but then had considered the other issues like it could turn into restaurant row. Mr. Pasin said perhaps his vision of a business park was different than some people. He saw multi story buildings with commercial on the bottom. Mr. Gagliano pointed out that they would have to define it so that they would not dominate the park. Mr. Pasin pointed out that there was still the issue of building size. Acting Chairman Harris Atkins said that his primary concern was that we not prohibit a company from having services for its employees. Commissioner Jill Guernsey noted that unless the company is supporting a day care they would need to take children whose parents don't necessarily work there. She cautioned against looking at them the same as restaurants. Mr. Dolan asked if they were suggesting that a full restaurant be allowed as long as it didn't exceed perhaps 10% of the building. Ms. Kester suggested that through the definition of professional office you could allow the ancillary use or perhaps making an ancillary use category with some restrictions. Ms. Guernsey said that she also liked the idea of limiting the size.

Ms. Kester asked Mr. Pasin about his vision of the PCD-BP zone; he said multiple story office buildings housing larger sized tenants, corporate headquarters or large law firms. Mr. Atkins agreed except he didn't see a restaurant in that building as a destination but rather for the use of the people in those buildings. Mr. Pasin used the office building on Kimball with Harbor Rock Café on the lower floor as an example and he felt that the Gig Harbor North environment would support it. Ms. Derebey said why not have a destination restaurant in the bottom floor of a business park building. Ms. Kester noted that it could be limited. Discussion followed on the need for several uses within the business park.

Mr. Pasin suggested that there could be a minimum square footage for the building in a business park. Mr. Gagliano suggested a floor area ratio.

Ms. Kester asked if the intent statement reflected these issues. She read the PCD-BP zone intent statement. She asked that they look at Poulsbo's business park zone. She read the intent statement from Poulsbo. She noted that it also said what it is not intended to do. Mr. Pasin said that he did not support not allowing general retail to support the general commercial needs since it is located in an area surrounded by residential and retail. Ms. Kester said that maybe then this is not the right zone for this area, rather than turning the BP into another commercial zone. Mr. Pasin said he was not in support of changing the designation of this area. He noted that if you build it appropriately people could live close to where they work. Mr. Atkins stated that they can't let the definition of the zone be driven by a specific piece of property. Ms. Kester noted that this was really the only piece of PCD-BP left. Mr. Atkins pointed out that our urban boundaries could change. Ms. Kester agreed that the zone needed to stand on its own. Ms. Ninen said that Poulsbo allowed restaurant uses in their Business Park zone. Mr. Gagliano pointed out Mill Creek's intent and that it seemed close to what they had been talking about. Ms. Derebey noted where it said that it was limited. Discussion followed on the several different versions. Ms. Derebey pointed out Lacey's as being close to what they needed and Ms. Kester said that yes, there were several performance standards that could be put in place. Mr. Gagliano directed everyone toward the Bainbridge Island intent statement and how different it was. Ms. Kester said it was much broader and Mr. Gagliano said it would be tough to legislate. Ms. Derebey said that she was surprised to see industrial uses in a business park; they belong in an industrial park. Mr. Pasin agreed that the more industrial uses belong in the ED. Discussion followed on the economic development of the city.

Ms. Kester summarized their comments. Mr. Atkins stated that he felt that there was a more basic question in that we have some specific areas and do we want to base our intent on what should happen here and here alone, ignoring the larger picture. Ms. Ninen asked if the property owners had an opinion. Eric from Olympic Property Group said that the more flexible the uses the more chances for economic development. Mr. Dolan said that one of the parcels has been sold to a church/performing arts center/community center along with a couple of small office buildings. He continued by saying that they have been advised that neither a church nor a performing arts center is an allowed use in the zone. Mr. Dolan asked if they wanted to open up the uses in the BP, leave it as a more standard BP zone or make it another zone. Ms. Derebey said that she felt that we needed to keep the BP zone. Ms. Kester said that she felt that she had some good input to start drafting some intent language. Ms. Guernsey said that her feeling was that while she didn't think only restaurant level one should be allowed it should be broader along with a floor area ratio or something and in terms of intent she said she like the statement in Poulsbo's intent. Mr. Gagliano asked should they require the restaurant to be part of a larger building. Ms. Kester said that there could be a footnote in a zone or a performance standard.

Ms. Ninen noted that she thought there should be some type of lodging in the area. Ms. Guernsey agreed but not necessarily in the BP. Discussion followed on the neighborhood center in Gig Harbor North.

Ms. Ninen brought up the idea of having a booth at the grand opening of Uptown to gather thoughts and ideas on the planning of the city.

Ms. Derebey said she would like to read all the different cities codes and look at some of their performance standards. Mr. Dolan said after everyone had had a chance to read it all to please e-mail Ms. Kester with parts that they really liked.

Ms. Kester said she would like to also look at the ED intent statement. She pointed out that the ED has the exact same intent statement as the BP. She also said that perhaps it's not devoid of nuisance factors. She asked if they wanted to allow some of the retail/restaurant uses in the ED. There was some agreement that restaurants be allowed.

Mr. Gagliano pointed out that they may want to remove light industrial and warehouse. Ms. Guernsey pointed out a sentence in the Dupont code and Ms. Kester read it aloud. Everyone liked it with some minor changes. Ms. Kester pointed out that Dupont had some different zones other than their industrial district. Mr. Pasin thought it worked. Ms. Derebey pointed out the list of nuisance factors they had listed and stated that she liked that description. Mr. Gagliano said that he felt that moderate nuisance factors were okay in this area, but wondered if restaurants were okay. Mr. Pasin said that this area is more blue collar and perhaps more likely to bring their lunch or utilize a deli.

Ms. Kester asked if industrial uses should be prohibited in the BP and everyone agreed. Eric from Olympic Property Group said that economics would not allow industrial uses to go in the BP. Discussion continued on the different uses and definitions. Ms. Kester suggested that perhaps the definition could be changed, or add a new definition of business services and everyone agreed. Everyone agreed to take Industrial Level One uses out of the BP zone.

2. **City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA 98335** – ZONE 08-0008 – Design Manual standards for Bujacich Road/NW Industrial neighborhood design area

Ms. Kester noted that they had seen a slide show of some industrial buildings and that they had used landscaping and architectural embellishments to improve the look of the buildings. She noted that she had pulled Sumner and Bainbridge Island as an example. Mr. Gagliano said that last time they went over the list of industrial building exemptions it did seem that this area did lend itself to its own specific set of guidelines. He went on to say that although they may not want to write a specific set of guidelines for each neighborhood, this one might need it. Ms. Kester read the section out of the comprehensive plan on the neighborhood design area and the common set of features. Mr. Atkins noted that we don't need to reinvent the wheel; we could put together something as a starting point. Ms. Kester said that she did not really see a manual that she liked. Ms. Gagliano said that given that, maybe our own code was the best example. It was suggested that the members go through the design manual and mark the requirements to either eliminate, edit or modify certain code requirements for the

industrial neighborhood. Ms. Kester said that she could set that up and use the design manual checklist. Mr. Gagliano said that this would be very good practice for the other neighborhoods. He reminded the commission that the original goal was to cut back on the standards. Jeane also suggested taking that checklist and seeing if they could build a building that they liked. Mr. Atkins suggested that everyone do it individually and then go over it with the group at the next meeting. Ms. Kester pulled up a page from the design manual to demonstrate how they could mark it up for edit, delete, or keep.

Ms. Kester then went over the review process and Mr. Atkins suggested that if they decided to edit things then have a suggestion for what the edit should be.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Ms. Kester went over the schedule for the rest of the second quarter. She reminded everyone that the meetings on June 18th and 30th are at 5:30. She noted that the 17th of July will be the beginning of comprehensive plan amendments. She noted that they could hold a public hearing on the 30th of June in order to forward some of this to council. She noted that probably the design piece was more likely to be after the comp plan amendments.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Derebey distributed a table of everyone's comments on the RB-1 amendment. Mr. Atkins said he would like to finish RB-1 at the next meeting and then the ED/BP intent. Ms. Kester asked if they liked the idea of having a hearing on the 30th and everyone agreed.

Design Review Board member Rick Gagliano left at 8:20.

Ms. Ninen asked about having an information booth at Costco to get public input on what people would like to see in that area. Eric from Olympic Property Group offered that they had a lot of that information from their open house.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 8:30 p.m. Derebey/Ninen – Motion carried