

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Work Study Session  
Planning and Building Conference Room  
April 19, 2012  
5:00 pm**

**PRESENT:** Harris Atkins, Craig Baldwin, Reid Ekberg, Jim Pasin, and Rick Gagliano. Michael Fisher and Bill Coughlin were absent.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Staff: Tom Dolan and Jennifer Kester

**CALL TO ORDER:** at 5:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** Move to approve the minutes of April 5th, 2012 as written. Baldwin/Pasin – Motion carried.

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

1. **Zoning Code Text Amendments** – Discussion on text amendment process and potential code changes.

Ms. Kester went over the memo she had prepared for the commission. She further discussed the current process for text amendments. Mr. Atkins asked about the criteria for approval and where that was in the code. Ms. Kester stated that it was in several locations within the code. Discussion followed on the differences between private party initiated text amendments and city sponsored text amendments and that the criteria should be broad enough to deal with both. Ms. Kester noted that the criteria may be different for an area wide rezone. Mr. Dolan suggested that perhaps they should separate the area wide rezone from other amendments within the code. The commission then discussed how the City Council decides which applications are placed on the commissions schedule and the role of the Planning and Building Committee. Ms. Kester also explained how direct consideration by the City Council worked. Mr. Gagliano asked about time frames for approval and Ms. Kester explained legislative actions and emphasized that it is at the Council's discretion since these are policy decisions. Mr. Dolan explained the difference between quasi-judicial decisions and legislative decisions. Mr. Atkins asked how long it usually takes for someone to move up to the top of the list and Ms. Kester said that there really is no average as it varies greatly depending on how large of a subject it is or how important the Council feels it is for the community. Ms. Kester continued explaining how the process works once the application has reached the Planning Commission. Mr. Gagliano suggested that when the Planning Commission asks for further information from the applicant it be spelled out in the code that their application may be denied as a result. Mr. Dolan proposed the language, "In considering a private application the Planning Commission may request additional information from the applicant, failure to provide the requested information

may result in denial of your request". Everyone agreed to the proposed language.

Discussion then was held on codifying a public notice process. Ms. Kester went over how notice is done currently. She emphasized that they can always do more notice than what is required. She suggested that they adopt the noticing policy for the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Atkins agreed.

Ms. Kester then asked if they wanted to codify the opportunity for the applicant to present their proposal at the first work study session. It was agreed that this should be included. Discussion continued on open houses. It was decided that language would be added to say that at the Planning Commission's discretion an open house or informational public meeting may be held prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Ekberg suggested that when findings are written it could be provided directly to the Chair rather than bringing it back to the full commission. Mr. Gagliano thought that it should come back to the commission to make sure that the text matches what they had decided. Mr. Ekberg just wanted to make sure that there is not further debate on a subject without the public being aware. Discussion was held on whether only the commissioners who had voted in support of the language should review it. It was decided that it did not need to be codified.

Discussion was then held on what happens at the City Council level. Mr. Atkins noted that sometimes the Planning Commission and the City Council hold a joint work study session when it is a large issue.

Everyone agreed that the things they had decided on were applicable to both private proposals and city sponsored amendments.

The criterion for approval of a zoning code amendment was discussed next. Mr. Atkins brought up the subject of how you determine consistency with the code when you are changing the code. Ms. Kester gave examples. Each of the criteria were discussed. It was decided that there was not a need to state that it needed to be consistent with the County Wide Planning policies and Growth Management Act. Everyone agreed that there needed to be a criteria that dealt with infrastructure and some of the other nuts and bolts issues. Discussion was held on the criteria that states that it will not detrimentally affect the character of the community. Mr. Dolan asked that when Ms. Kester writes the proposed language she ask the commissioners if they have additional criteria they would like to add.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Kester said that their next meeting is a public hearing on collective gardens.

Mr. Dolan went over a proposal being made by the school district to allow schools as a permitted use in PCD-BP. He asked if the commission was okay with the City Council having direct consideration of this item. Everyone agreed that direct consideration was

appropriate.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.