

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session and Public Hearing
Civic Center
August 15, 2013
5:00 pm**

PRESENT: Harris Atkins, Reid Ekberg, Craig Baldwin, Rick Gagliano, Pam Peterson, Bill Coughlin and Jim Pasin.

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Lindsey Sehmel, Jennifer Kester and Diane McBane

5:00 p.m. - Call to order, roll call

Approval of minutes

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of July 18, 2013 as written.
Pasin/Gagliano – Motion carried.

WORK-STUDY SESSION

1. **Harbor Vision Policies** – Review the Draft Element responding to changes and edits from the 7/18 meeting. Prepare for upcoming open house.

Ms. Sehmel went over the goal for the work study session. She stated that this was still a high level review of the policies, not focusing on spelling, etc.

Mr. Atkins said let's begin with Goal A, he stated that he felt that the wording was too specific and should just say "other areas of Gig Harbor". Mr. Coughlin agreed

Support walkability: Mr. Coughlin felt it was similar to A and could possibly be combined. Ms. Sehmel said that at the last meeting it had been noted that a separate goal needed to be added for walkability since it was mentioned the most in the public meetings. Mr. Gagliano felt that number 2 of the policies was too regulatory. Mr. Atkins said that he felt that the reference to the Harborview master plan within number 4 should be removed or referenced differently since there really was not such a document. Ms. Sehmel said she would work with the Public Works Director to see whether they are including some of the elements of the Harborview Drive and Judson Street Improvement Master Plan in their improvement plans.

Goal C: Reid and Rick both said that it could be entirely removed with the exception of policy number 2. In general the commission felt that it was duplicative and too specific to public works standards. Number 2 needs to be rewritten to clarify that we are okay with the level of service being less than what is accepted in other areas of the city. Mr. Atkins emphasized that the commission is writing a vision, not public works standards.

Goal D, Balance the natural beauty of vegetation: Mr. Atkins said he liked the wording that emphasizing the protection of the view rather than balancing vegetation. Mr. Gagliano said he like the word “balance”. Mr. Atkins said that he felt that views were very important to the community. It was agreed to leave the word protect and then mention balance with vegetation within the policy. It was decided to remove the words “more general” within policy #4.

Goal E: Mr. Coughlin mentioned that No. 5 should have more of a positive tone to emphasize the importance of trees within the view. Policy No. 6 was removed since it appears elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Gagliano felt that if we removed 6 then we should remove 5 as well. Discussion followed and everyone agreed that only 6 should be removed.

Goal G: Mr. Atkins suggested that we remove the word necessitate. Policy 2.c. Mr. Coughlin felt that it was too specific and suggested that it just say environmentally friendly pavers. Mr. Ekberg suggested that they add a policy regarding shared use parking. Everyone agreed. Mr. Coughlin felt that policy #4 didn't belong here. He stated that #5 was too regulatory and perhaps only the last sentence could remain. It was decided to move #4 to a different area on boating. Everyone felt that policy 8 could be removed.

Goal I: Mr. Coughlin asked about what it meant to say duplicative services and active recreational uses should be avoided within the park system. It was decided to make the sentence more positive by saying “balance active recreational uses and services within the park system”. It was decided to remove #4. Discussion of excess use of the park. Ms. Kester asked if they wanted a policy that addressed the overuse of a park by private entities. Ms. Kester explained the difference between special events and individuals using the park. Mr. Ekberg suggested that the policy state parks are intended to be for the greatest public benefits of all the citizens and visitors. It was decided that #3 was mostly unnecessary and reworded to state, “Coordinate with outside park districts to acquire and preserve additional shoreline access.”

Goal B:

Mr. Gagliano said that both policies 1 and 3 were good but the a, b, c under each was too regulatory. Ms. Kester suggested that they just beef up 1 and 3 with additional language that generally covers a, b and c.

Goal C:

It was decided to remove the word “activate”. Mr. Coughlin noted that 2 a should be changed to say “improve”. Mr. Atkins wondered if a and b should removed and everyone agreed.

Goal J: Remove It is the goal of the City to” under all the goals. Mr. Coughlin stated that he felt there should be more than 4 policies to retain traditional characteristics. Mr. Ekberg noted that he also noted that “scale” needs to be addressed.

Goal L: Floor area ratios were discussed. Discussion was held on whether J and L should be combined. Mr. Gagliano felt that it was too much to be combined. He felt that it should be broken up in a goal about land and a goal about buildings.

A 5 minute recess was called to move into the council chambers for the public hearing at 5:55.

6:00 p.m. - Public Hearing

2. **CITY OF GIG HARBOR, 3510 Grandview St, Gig Harbor, WA 98335** - Application for a Gig Harbor Municipal Code text amendment (PL-ZONE-13-0005) to consider recommendation on code amendments regarding Marijuana Related Uses in the Employment District (ED), Commercial District (C-1), and General Business District (B-2) zones of the City.

Ms. Sehmel went over the proposed standards for Marijuana related uses. She also noted that regulations for collective gardens will be incorporated into this Chapter. She went over the site plan review requirements for marijuana related uses and the zones being proposed for these uses. Ms. Sehmel also went over the 1000 foot buffer which is in line with the state law. She then went over the definitions that will be expanded as a part of this ordinance. Ms. Sehmel went over the areas within the city where marijuana related uses may be allowed. Ms. Kester noted that the map was for discussion purposes only and could change over time and that as each application comes in a site by site review will be done. Mr. Gagliano asked about the parking standards. Ms. Sehmel went over the parking requirements and noted that marijuana uses had been added to current parking requirements for other uses. Mr. Pasin asked whether it was possible for the city to prohibit all three types of operations. He stated that he had thought that perhaps they could not. Ms. Sehmel stated that the city has been advised by their counsel to take the safe approach to avoid lawsuits, by allowing these marijuana uses. Mr. Coughlin asked about other locations within the city where these uses might be allowed. Mr. Pasin noted that in reading the initiative he stated that he discovered that the stores can also sell the paraphernalia along with the product. Ms. Kester went over what would be required for Major Site Plan review.

Mr. Atkins opened the public hearing. At 6:10 p.m. There being no public comment. The public hearing was closed at 6:12 p.m.

Ms. Kester asked if there were further discussion.

MOTION: Move that the interim ordinance be extended and the proposed ordinance not be put forward. Pasin/Baldwin. Discussion followed. Mr. Pasin said he felt that the interim ordinance was serving its purpose and it was clear that there were

very few areas where this was even possible. He also stated that the liquor control board was still trying to figure out what the regulations would be and that they were considering allotting each county a certain number of facilities. Mr. Ekberg pointed out that the interim ordinance only dealt with collective gardens. Ms. Sehmel noted that without this ordinance it could be argued that retail outlets may be allowed in any retail zones. Ms. Kester cautioned the Planning Commission on their heavy work program following and they may not have a chance to weigh in on the adopted rules. She also went over the schedule for the liquor control board adoption of regulations. Ms. Kester stated that these regulations wouldn't go into effect until this time.

Motion failed with 4 nays Baldwin abstaining and Pasin in favor

MOTION: Move to recommend adoption of the proposal and move to council for their consideration. Ekberg/Gagliano. Friendly amendment to allow Mr. Atkins to sign the recommendation. Ekberg/Gagliano.

Mr. Ekberg stated that it was important to have this in place prior to people coming forward with applications. Mr. Gagliano said that he didn't feel their workload should dictate; however, there has been a vote on I-502 and he felt that it was appropriate to move it forward to the City Council. Mr. Atkins noted that there may be changes that will need to be made to the regulations in the future but that it was a good framework. Ms. Sehmel said it would go before the City Council on Sept 23rd. Ms. Kester noted that if more changes come from the liquor control board they will consult with legal counsel and may have to delay bringing it before the city council.

Mr. Baldwin noted that he was in support of the action of the Planning Commission, but did not support I-502

Motion carried with Ekberg, Peterson, Gagliano and Coughlin voting yes and Baldwin and Pasin voting no. The Chairman voiced his support of the motion.

6:26. Moved back into work study to further discuss harbor policies.

The commission picked up their discussion on Goal J and the districts within the harbor. It was decided to add some language to the goal to emphasize that there are differences between the districts within the harbor.

Goal L was discussed next, along with ways to communicate the policies more accurately. It was decided to move the goal to create a consistent and compatible streetscape, into A.

The commission made several small changes to the wording in Goal P and its policies. Mr. Coughlin pointed out that policy 7 might be duplicative.

Mr. Ekberg stated that he felt that Goal D was confusing and Mr. Coughlin said he had marked for rewording as well. Ms. Sehmel suggested some changes to the wording.

Housing types and where different types were most appropriate, was discussed next. Ms. Kester asked if they wanted to make a policy or let it just be market driven. It was decided to remove Policy 2.

It was decided to combine Goals M and J. In addition it was decided to put Goal O within L.

Ms. Kester stated that she felt that Goal Q was really broad and could possibly be moved to the introduction. Mr. Coughlin said that he felt that it should stand alone. It was decided to reorder the policies to move from a broader prospective down to specifics.

Ms. Sehmel asked if within Goal R policies 2a and b should be combined and everyone agreed. Discussion was held on home occupations and how to encourage them.

It was decided to make the goal "Increase nighttime activities in the commercial districts by allowing uses to utilize hours later than currently established", a policy within Goal R.

The commission reworded the policy regarding the opportunity to construct a fuel dock to make it more supportive.

Discussion followed on the goal regarding transient moorage. It was decided that it could be moved into Goal T as a policy. Ms. Sehmel said she would rewrite it to make sure that it was clear that it was about facilities for moorage not moorage itself.

Schedule was discussed next.

Ms. Kester went over some other issues that may be coming before the Planning Commission in the coming months.

ADJOURN

Move to adjourn at 7:30 p.m. Ekberg/Peterson – Motion carried.