

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session
October 21st 2009
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners; Chairman Harris Atkins, Michael Fisher, Joyce Ninen, Jim Pasin and Jill Guernsey. Jeanne Derebey arrived at 5:06 p.m.

Staff Present: Tom Dolan, Jennifer Kester, Kristin Moerler, Jeff Langhelm and Cindy Andrews

CALL TO ORDER: 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Commission members discussed the minutes of August 20th, 2009, no corrections made.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of August 20th, 2009 as recorded. Ninen / Guernsey – Motion passed.

Commission members discussed the minutes of September 3rd, 2009, identifying a punctuation error on page 3, in first sentence.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of September 3rd, 2009 as corrected. Ninen/Fisher – Motion passed

Chairman Harris Atkins opened the meeting briefly outlining the agenda. Mr. Atkins summarized the amendments suggesting that the amendments be reviewed in the order listed also asking commission members if any changes should be made to the language presented in the criteria. Commission members had no changes and agreed to move forward with the recommendations in the order presented.

Ms. Kester discussed the process following recommendations by the Planning Commission, discussing the date of November 9th, 2009 for presentation before the City Council.

COMP 09-0002 - Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element:

Ms. Kester pointed out the only change to the amendment was at the bottom of the first page: a sentence had been added stating that the plan is in progress and will be adopted in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle.

COMP 09-0003 – Transportation Element:

Ms. Kester reviewed the changes to the Transportation Element. Ms. Kester discussed the removal of the Harborview Drive and Judson Street Improvement Master Plan from goal 11.1

policy 11.1.10 explaining that portions of the master plan have been incorporated into three new policies, 11.1.10, 11.1.11, 11.1.12 and existing policy 11.1.8.

COMP 09-0010 – Capital Facilities Element:

Ms. Kester summarized the remaining updates to chapter 12, Capital Facilities element discussing the updated project list, project timing, park descriptions, sewer, water, storm amendments and funding.

Ms. Kester asked commission members how they would like to precede. Commission members requested a few minutes to review the changes presented at the meeting. Mr. Pasin asked Ms. Kester to restate her comments relating to the water, sewer and storm amendments. Ms. Kester stated that with the adoption of the three comprehensive utility plans (water, wastewater and stormwater, future technical amendments to these plans would not be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Mr. Pasin expressed concerns related to future upgrades of water systems and potential impacts to developers. Mr. Atkins asked Commission members if they would be ready to review the notice of recommendation for the capital facility-related amendments. Commission members agreed and began with the Transportation Element.

Mr. Atkins discussed the recommendation for the Transportation Element and the condition to remove proposed policy 11.1.10. Mr. Atkins asked Ms. Kester if the condition could be removed or if the condition should be restated to include the two new policies, 11.1.11 and 11.1.12. Ms. Kester stated that the condition could be restated explaining that if Commission members made any changes, notations should be made under the condition explaining the reasons for the changes. Mr. Atkins asked Commission members if they had any concerns with the language of the Transportation Element. Ms. Ninen suggested removing the condition. Ms. Derebey disagreed, stating that the condition referenced the initial comp plan changes that had been proposed and that the condition should remain, also stating that she felt that the additional policies proposed should be included in the condition. Commission members and Ms. Kester discussed changes to the condition. Mr. Atkins proposed revisions to the language of the condition stating, "During the review of the proposed amendment the Planning Commission determined that the Harborview Judson Street Improvement Master Plan dated February 3, 2009 had not been formally approved by the City Council nor has it been reviewed by the Planning Commission while the Planning Commission supports the basic policy, i.e. improve the effectiveness of the road and sidewalk network in the downtown area and has substituted language to the effect, it has no basis for recommending this specific plan as a strategy for implementing the policy. For these reasons, the Planning Commission determined that it would be inappropriate to include it in the Comprehensive Plan policy statement by reference." Mr. Atkins asked for comments from Commission members. Commission members agreed with the statement.

Mr. Atkins asked Commission members for their comments on the remainder of the capital facility amendments. Ms. Ninen discussed the Peacock Hill project related to the stormwater Plan. Ms. Kester explained that it had been addressed in the Stormwater plan. Mr. Atkins

discussed the joint meeting of October 5th, 2009 pointing out that there had been a lot of conversation related to the water system plan. Mr. Pasin stated his concern with the water system plan as it related to the fire flow requirements stating that the requirement could potentially be a large burden on future development. Mr. Atkins suggested that Commission members should forward their concerns or opinions relating to any of the capital facility amendment recommendations in a letter to Ms. Kester and she would forward them on to the City Council. Mr. Atkins reiterated for Commission members that the recommendations only include the majority's opinion. Ms. Kester agreed stating that she would include minority opinion letters as part of her packet to City Council adding that she would need the letters by end of the day Monday October 26th. Mr. Dolan assured Commission members that the City Council members will receive and read all of the Planning Commission minutes related to the amendments.

Ms. Guernsey asked Ms. Kester if staff recommendations had been made on all of the Comprehensive Plan Amendments. Ms. Kester replied stating that formal staff recommendations had been made on only one amendment that had been presented on September 24th, 2009 meeting, also stating that it would be included in the packet to Council. Ms. Kester explained the process for presenting staff's recommendation in the council bill.

Mr. Atkins asked Commission members how they would like to proceed. Commission members asked to take a moment to review the changes to the capital facilities amendments. Ms. Kester summarized the changes, description changes in parks, updates to funding sources for projects, updates to the Capital Facilities project list, Parks and Open Space plan and the Transportation Plan; and no changes to the Wastewater, Stormwater or Water systems. Commission members discussed the changes. Mr. Atkins suggested that the Planning Commission members recommend approval of the amendments with reservations that the Planning Commission did not have the opportunity to compare the new and the old plan. Mr. Atkins continued explaining the changes proposed are budget changes, unless there had been policy concerns he felt it would be appropriate to recommend approval of the changes to the amendments. Ms. Kester pointed out that the budget was uncertain at this time and would most likely it would change before the amendments would be adopted. Commission members and staff discussed the budget concern and corrections. The Commission and staff discussed that the some of the criteria related to concurrency were not really applicable to the amendments that update the capital facility project lists. Ms. Derebey felt that the best approach would be to move the amendment forward with the suggestion that the Finance Department review the revenue growth projections and change the numbers to reflect present day. Ms. Kester agreed.

MOTION: Move to approve the capital facility amendments adding Mr. Atkins statement under the Transportation Element also with the conditions of removing the proposed policy 11.1.10 and replacing it with what is shown in the Transportation Element draft received October 21st, 2009 on page 11-60 and the statement by Jeane Derebey stating that the Planning Commission recognize that the Finance Department will update their

portion of the Capital Facility Plan that it is not accurate in several places that is provided in the recommendation. Guernsey / Fisher

Mr. Atkins called for discussion on the motion. Commission members discussed the motion. Ms Derebey asked to make an amendment to the motion.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: Move to amend the motion to break out the water system plan to be voted on separately. Derebey / Fisher - Motion passed

Mr. Atkins asked for discussion of the amended motion. Commission members and staff discuss the intent of the motion. Ms. Derebey explained her concerns with the water system plan and the intent of her amendment to the motion. Ms Kester suggested putting commission members vote at the end of each description of each amendment. Commission members agreed. Mr. Atkins asked for a 5 minute recess. Mr. Atkins resumed the meeting at 5:58 p.m.

Mr. Atkins reminded Commission members that a motion was pending on the Capital Facilities Plan and repeated the motion.

AMENDED MOTION: Move to approve the capital facility amendments, except the water system plan, adding Mr. Atkins statement under the Transportation Element also with the conditions of removing the proposed policy 11.1.10 and replacing it with what is shown in the Transportation Element draft received October 21st, 2009 on page 11-60 and the statement by Jeane Derebey stating that the Planning Commission recognize that the Finance Department will update their portion of the Capital Facility Plan that it is not accurate in several places that is provided in the recommendation. – Motion passed unanimously.

AMENDED MOTION: Move to approve the water system plan, COMP 09-0009. – Motion passed 3-2 (Mr. Fisher, Ms. Guernsey and Ms. Ninen voted in favor; Mr. Pasin and Ms. Derebey voted against the motion).

COMP 09-0001 – Wollochet Water System Service Area Amendment:

Ms. Kester reviewed the draft recommendation and proposed findings. Mr. Atkins discussed the Wollochet Water System amendment asking Commission members for their comments. Mr. Pasin discussed his concerns with the finding that stated that redevelopment of the property would be a value to this community. Ms. Ninen and Ms. Guernsey disagree. Mr. Atkins discussed the statement in the last sentence on the 3rd page under J, related to the water rights projected allocations asking if staff had provided the projections. Ms. Kester responded no and provided background for the projections. Mr. Atkins proposed additions to page 4. He suggested adding portions of statement e.1 from the executive summary paragraph 2 to the conditions. Mr. Atkins discussed a third condition proposed by staff that commission members elected not to incorporate, asking if a note of explanation should be added. Ms. Kester

discussed staff's recommendations. Mr. Atkins continued stating that he felt it would be important to include an explanation as to why the Planning Commission did not elect to move forward with a recommendation on the third condition. Staff and Commission members discuss the condition. Ms. Derebey asked if it would be appropriate to add a note to the condition. Ms. Kester replied yes. Ms. Guernsey proposed language for the note: "Note: Although staff recommended a third condition regarding the transfer of water rights, the commission did not recommend that condition because of their opinion that the staff was asking for something that the applicant did not have or control. The water purveyor testified that it did not have water rights to transfer and therefore this condition, if included, would render the amendment not viable."

MOTION: Move to adopt the COMP 09-0001 Wollochet Water System Service Area Amendment with Mr. Atkins addition to the last page of paragraph 2 section e.1 of the executive summary of the water system plan; the note that the Planning Commission added to page 1 of 4; and, the deletion of the last phrase and rewriting of the last statement in J so that the sentence reads," The City has a finite number of water ERU's to reserve to customers in the current service area, with over 1,000 water ERU's available.
Guernsey / Fisher – Motion passed unanimously.

COMP 09-0013 – Stroh's Water System Service Area Amendment:

Ms. Kester reviewed the draft recommendation and proposed findings. Mr. Atkins asked Commission members for their comments. Mr. Atkins suggested adding the same policy statement from e.1 of the executive summary that had been added to the water system plan to the Stroh's Water System Amendment. Commission members agreed.

MOTION: Move to adopt the COMP 09-0013 Stroh's Water System Service Area Amendment with the change to add paragraph 2 section e.1 of the executive summary of the water system plan to the applicable policies section of the recommendation. Guernsey / Fisher – Motion passed – Motion passed unanimously.

COMP 09-0004 – Sunrise Enterprises Land Use Map Amendment:

Ms. Kester reviewed the draft recommendation and proposed findings, stating that staff and the Planning Commission had the same recommendation. Mr. Atkins asked Commission members for their comments. Commission members and staff discussed compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan and residential use. Commission members made minor changes to the wording on one set of findings on page 4. Ms. Derebey discussed the appropriateness of the criteria. Staff and Commission members reviewed the criteria and the findings contained in the recommendation.

MOTION: Move to approve the recommendation of COMP 09-0004 Sunrise Enterprises Land Use Map Amendment with the changes discussed removing the phrase “to the North” on page 4. Guernsey / Ninen – Motion passed unanimously.

COMP 09-0005 – Haven of Rest Land Use Amendment:

Ms. Kester reviewed the draft recommendation and proposed findings. Ms. Kester reviewed the suggestion of Ms. Ninen that the recommendation clearly state that the development agreement proposing limiting the rezone to R-2. Ms. Derebey discussed the duration of the development agreement. The minutes of September 24th, 2009 stated that the Commission recommended a duration of 5-10 years.

MOTION: Move to approve the recommendation for COMP 09-0005 Haven of Rest Land Use Map Amendment with the addition of the 5-10 year development agreement criteria. Ninen / Guernsey – Motion passed unanimously.

COMP 09-0012 Grandview Land Use Map Amendment:

Ms. Kester reviewed the draft recommendation and proposed findings. Mr. Atkins asked Commission members if they felt that staff had captured Planning Commission’s intentions. Mr. Pasin replied yes, however he felt that the language may not been specific enough although he would accept it. Commission members discussed buffer and zone transition and asked for clarification on the findings for criterion F. Ms. Kester clarified. Mr. Atkins agreed the statement appeared accurate, adding that he would like to exchange “as proposed” for “model.” Mr. Pasin discussed the findings for criterion E in regards to the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, stating that he disagreed with the statements. Mr. Fisher suggested adding to the findings for criterion E: the city requirement of height restriction has defined scale and by the fact that this development meets that then it meets the scale requirements. Mr. Atkins disagreed explaining that the current land use would not support that statement. Commission members discussed the findings for E. Mr. Fisher suggested adding goal 6.1 and policy 6.1.1 as a goal to the statement. Ms. Kester revised the policy and goal statement noting that she would also include goal 6.2. Commission members discussed the changes. Mr. Atkins asked Commission members if they all were in agreement with the changes. All agreed. Commission members discussed the idea of scale being defined by height. Ms. Guernsey suggested a sentence should be added to the findings of criterion E defining scale. Ms Guernsey proposed new language: “The Planning Commission finds that city’s regulations regarding height restrictions meet the city’s definition of scale.” Commission members discussed the statement; staff expressed their disagreement with the statement. Commission members suggested adding the language: “although large, the buildings do not visual appear out of scale compared to neighboring buildings.” Commission members continued to revise the language. Ms. Kester read the final version. Commission members agreed with the new language for the findings of criterion E. Commission members discussed the findings for criterion G related to suitability of the project with the land and surrounding area. Mr. Pasin asked if the statement would be

suitable for the area. Commission members suggest reorganizing the statement. Commission members discussed the findings for criteria H, I and J agreeing they had no concerns. Ms. Kester reviewed all of the changes.

MOTION: Move to recommend the approval of COMP 09-0012 3700 Grandview land use map amendment as written with a fourth condition that the duration of the development agreement be 10 to 20 years and the finding changes as discussed and agreed to by the majority of the Planning Commission. Fisher/Guernsey. Motion passed. 4 – 1 Mr. Pasin opposed

Mr. Dolan suggested that due to time concerns the remainder of the agenda be moved to an additional meeting. Ms. Kester reviewed the meeting dates available, Commission members agreed on November 5th, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. Mr. Dolan discussed the recognition of Dick Allen at the City Council meeting of November 9th, 2009 encouraging all to attend.

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 7:53 p.m. Ninen / Guernsey