

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission**  
**Work Study Session**  
**September 23, 2010**  
**Planning & Building Conference Room**  
**4:00 pm**

**PRESENT:** Michael Fisher, Jill Guernsey, Harris Atkins, Jim Pasin, Ben Coronado and Bill Coughlin.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Staff: Jennifer Kester, Tom Dolan and Peter Katich

**CALL TO ORDER:** at 4:00pm

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Approval of the minutes of September 16, 2010.

**MOTION:** Move to approve minutes of September 16, 2010 as written. Pasin/Fisher. Motion carried.

Mr. Atkins asked for everyone's opinion of how the joint meeting with the City Council went. Everyone who attended thought it was a good meeting. Discussion continued on the Comprehensive Plan amendments and other items discussed at the meeting.

1. Review Zoning Code Amendments related to master program update

Senior Planner Jennifer Kester went over the reasons for these amendments and explained that staff was looking for direction from the commission on these issues.

Impervious coverage; should existing maximum impervious coverage requirement in waterfront zones be revised to address both upland and tideland areas of potential development sites? Discussion was held on the definition of tidelands. Mr. Fisher expressed that he felt there were enough regulations and that it should be left alone. Mr. Dolan said that he agreed. Ms. Guernsey clarified that tidelands are included in the site area calculation but are not considered impervious and Ms. Kester confirmed. Mr. Coughlin stated that he wanted to make sure that we were protecting the ecological function. Ms. Kester suggested that they could exclude tidelands from the site area but then they may need to change the site coverage limitations. Mr. Dolan stated that with buffers, setbacks and landscaping requirements he didn't see a need to have impervious surface maximums and gave some examples. He suggested that perhaps there could be different regulations for lots along the waterfront and upland lots. Ms. Kester felt that you could get to the same result by saying tidelands are pervious and leave the impervious at 50%. Mr. Katich explained how the regulations work now and said why create an issue. **It was decided to keep it how it is but clarify the definition of impervious to exclude tidelands.**

Marina parking requirements: should the current marina parking requirement for the WC zone also apply to the WM zone? Discussion was held on the impact to WM properties if you have to meet both parking requirements in addition to increased setbacks. Mr. Atkins stated that he didn't see much of a positive impact for the community by changing the parking requirements in WM. Mr. Atkins pointed out that this could encourage office uses along the waterfront which is not what the shoreline master program is encouraging. It was decided to poll all the

Commissioners. Ms. Guernsey said that she didn't think the two areas were that different in terms of parking so she didn't feel strongly one way or the other. Mr. Pasin said he would make the regulations the same in each zone. Mr. Coughlin said he would leave it the way it is. Mr. Fisher said he would make the regulations the same in each zone. Mr. Coronado said he would make the two zones consistent. Mr. Atkins suggested that they could encourage underground parking. **Ms. Kester said that she would draft some language to make them the same and let the commission know that they will be looking at parking in the downtown next year.**

Mixed use development parking standards in the waterfront zones: should the mixed use development "joint parking" requirement of GHMC 17.72.080 be applied to the WC and WM zones? Ms. Guernsey asked how the joint use parking was working in other zones and Ms. Kester said that it was working well for Uptown. Mr. Dolan explained that it was anticipated that the discussion of including these provisions in these zones would happen at this time during the shoreline master program update. Discussion followed on whether it was a good idea to do this at this time prior to the downtown parking study. Mr. Fisher suggested that they allow joint use parking in these zones in the meanwhile. Mr. Atkins expressed his hesitance at permitting it in WM. It was pointed out that there are time restrictions in WM that may prohibit actually having joint use. **It was decided to defer this issue until the overall downtown parking study is done.**

Building size within waterfront zones: should the definition for "gross floor area" be revised as it applies to the waterfront zones in a manner consistent with that provided in GHMC 17.04.360 B for non-waterfront zones (excludes underground floor area?) If not, should the maximum gross floor area requirement of the waterfront zones be revised? Mr. Fisher said that he didn't think that gross floor area calculations should include space not being occupied by people such as storage, etc. Ms. Kester stated that is also a matter of mass and scale and asked the Commission if it should be the same in all zones. Mr. Katich asked should it only apply to zones that allow for commercial uses, not residential zones? Ms. Kester gave a brief history of the gross floor area limitations along the waterfront. Mr. Pasin noted that part of the issue is that we need more of a vision for the downtown. Mr. Atkins felt that we do have a vision. Consensus was reached that the definition of gross floor area be revised in waterfront zones to be consistent with other zones. Ms. Kester then asked if waterfront residential zones should be different. **It was decided that all the waterfront zones would be same and eliminate underground floor area in the gross floor area calculation.**

Principal use commercial parking lots in the WC District: should GHMC 17.14.020 be revised to prohibit commercial parking lots within the WC zone as a principal use and remove footnote #19 from the matrix as only parking associated with a water oriented use is allowed by the existing and draft shoreline master program? **Everyone agreed it should be revised.**

Pedestrian walkway width: should WM and WC zones be revised to require 6 foot wide walkways in order to be consistent with the shoreline master program? **Consensus was reached that the width in the shoreline master program should be revised to 5 feet to be consistent with the WM and WC zones.**

Museums: should museums be allowed in the WC zone as a conditional use or should they be allowed as a permitted use in both C-1 and WC? Ms. Guernsey said that she felt that museums should be allowed in the waterfront zones, perhaps outright in WC and conditionally in the other zones. **Everyone agreed.**

Chairman Atkins called a recess. The meeting was reconvened.

Further discussion was held on museums in the waterfront zones and it was decided that some additional research needed to be done on zoning conditional versus shoreline conditional uses. The issue was if you allow museums are outright permitted in the shoreline master program can you or should you then make them conditional in the zoning code?

Off-street parking requirements for liveaboards, should the zoning parking requirements for marinas set forth in GHMC 17.72.030 be revised to address a new parking requirement for liveaboards? Ms. Guernsey asked how we would know how many liveaboards would be at any marina and pointed out that it is very hard to track. Mr. Pasin said it seemed like most marinas have more than enough parking and didn't see the need to provide more. **Consensus was reached that it did not need to be revised.**

Restoration Plan –

Mr. Katich noted that he had only received comments from the West Sound Watershed Council on the draft restoration plan. He stated that they were supportive of the draft. Additionally he stated that comments were just clarification items, nothing substantive. He further went over the changes that the Planning Commission had asked the consultant to make in the plan and possible ways of including incentives. Discussion followed on bulkheads and seawalls and possible techniques for restoration and incentives. Mr. Katich suggested that staff could put together a list of possible incentives such as if you take out a bulkhead you could get increased setbacks or a non-water oriented use and also examining fee reductions. **Mr. Dolan suggested that perhaps that the required portions get finished first and then if there is time before November 18<sup>th</sup> we formulate some incentives as these could still be worked on after we get the draft Shoreline Master Program update to public hearing. Everyone agreed.**

Mr. Katich went over the issues to be discussed at the next meeting. He stated that the consultant will be present for the discussion on setback regulations and the science behind them. Mr. Katich went over the materials that will be distributed prior to the meeting for the commission to study. Mr. Fisher mentioned that uses still need to be discussed and Mr. Katich stated that the city intern has been working on collecting this data and it will be presented during the discussion on the holding pen issues.

Mr. Dolan noted that the draft master program had been mailed out and asked that the commission look at it and determine that it reflects what they had discussed to date.

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn – Guernsey/Coronado. Motion carried.

### **Summary of 9/23/10 Meeting Outcomes:**

#### Zoning Code Amendments & Draft Shoreline Master Program Revisions:

1. Amend the definition for “impervious surface” set forth in Gig Harbor Municipal Code (GHMC) 17.04.420 to specifically exclude tidelands from what is considered to be impervious surface.

2. Amend the marina parking requirement for the WM District consistent with the marina parking requirement set forth in the GHMC for marinas in the WC District.
3. Defer action on revising the parking requirements for the waterfront zones to allow the use of the “joint parking” requirement set forth in GHMC 17.72.030 until the Commission reviews parking requirements for the downtown area.
4. Amend the definition for “gross floor area” for the waterfront zones to be consistent with the definition set forth in GHMC 17.04.360.B for non-waterfront zones. This would result in the exclusion of “underground floor area” from the calculation to determine the gross floor area for a building.
5. Amend GHMC 17.14.020 to prohibit commercial parking lots within the WC District as a permitted use and remove footnote #19 that allows such parking areas only when associated with a water-oriented use.
6. Revise the draft master program public access walkway requirement from 6 feet of width to 5 feet consistent with the zoning code requirement. See draft smp subsection 6.5.3.1.b and 6.5.3.2.a & b.
7. Determined that the off-street parking requirements of the master program and zoning code do not need to be revised to address liveaboards as sufficient parking is already being provided to serve marinas and all of the associated marina uses.

Holding Pen:

1. Planning staff will further review the shoreline master program use matrix and zoning code use matrix to determine if all land uses within the jurisdiction of the shoreline master program should only be addressed by the shoreline use matrix, or if the current approach of using both the shoreline master program and the zoning code use matrix should apply to regulating permitted, conditional and prohibited uses within the area regulated by the master program.