

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
Civic Center
February 27, 2014
5:00 pm**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Lindsey Sehmel and Jennifer Kester.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of January 16, 2014 as written. Pasin/Baldwin – Motion carried.

WORK STUDY SESSION

The Harbor – 2014 Comprehensive Plan Amendment –

Staff will provide a summary table of all comments received to date. Staff will lead the commissioners through the comments; commissioners will deliberate and finalize text amendments in preparation of the presentation of final recommendation to City Council on March 3rd, 2014.

Mr. Atkins noted that they had yet to go through the general comments and three issues remained from the last meeting.

Senior Planner Lindsey Sehmel suggested that they begin on page 17 comment 112. Discussion followed on parking and transportation options and how they affected the walkability of the harbor. Mr. Atkins wondered if they needed to be more specific about creating a link between Gig Harbor North and the downtown or residential areas. It was decided that 3.1.2 or 3.2 might be an appropriate place for some additional language on walkability.

Comments 113 and 114 were determined to be not applicable to what was being done at this time.

Comment 115 stated that the document was too big and contained overlapping and duplicative language. The commission discussed where these policies would be implemented and the work program associated with those changes. Mr. Atkins wondered if the document needed to be paired down and perhaps was too specific. Mr. Gagliano expressed concern for creating the code amendments in an efficient manner.

Mr. Atkins noted that Mr. Coughlin had arrived and asked that Mr. Coughlin address any

of his comments after they finished the review as he was unable to attend the last meeting.

Comments 116, 117 and 118 were determined to have been already incorporated into the element.

Mr. Gagliano noted that several commenters were referencing words chosen in the visioning process but were also leaving out several words and phrases that people felt were important.

Comments 119 and 120 were discussed and no changes were made.

The commission felt that they had addressed the comments in 121.

Comment 122 was in attached emails and no changes were made.

Comment 123 was discussed next. Mr. Atkins suggested some language to support entertainment venues in 3.14.5, "Encourage the establishment of small scale entertainment venues for little theatre and musical performances". Everyone agreed with the addition. Discussion was held on possibly adding some language regarding balancing intensity under 3.7. It was decided that it was already covered.

Comment 124 related to minor grammar and text changes to the introduction.

Comment 125 had been addressed in previous comments.

Ms. Sehmel directed everyone to attachment 8 regarding comment #126. Discussion was held on the newly proposed language regarding limiting trees in view corridors.

Comment 127 was discussed next. The commission agreed with the three issues raised in these comments and noted that they had previously identified these same issues. The first issue being scale in respect to lot size, second was vegetation and the third concern is multi-family dwellings. Ms. Kester talked about how some of these issues could be addressed on the upcoming work program.

It was decided Comments 128 and 129 did not require changes to be made.

Comment 130 was discussed next. The overlapping and redundant language was talked about. It was pointed out that there is a difference between a regulatory document and a policy document and that there may be some overlapping language.

Comments 131, 132, 133 and 134 had been talked about previously.

Ms. Sehmel pointed out that comment 135 really couldn't be solved as legally the city cannot prohibit someone from building on the water side of Harborview.

Comment 136 was an observation that really had no solution.

Discussion was held on night time activities in the harbor in relation to comments in #137. It was decided to add the word encourage in the language pertaining to night time activities.

Comments 138 and 139 were duplicative.

The Planning Commission discussed some reorganization suggestions that had been made. Ms. Kester talked about how this document needed to be understood by the general public; however, the people who read this document in order to formulate regulations may have a more difficult time with this type of reorganization.

Mr. Coughlin went over his suggested changes and which of them the commission had addressed at the previous meeting.

The commission then went over the 3 outstanding items. They discussed goal 3.2 first. Mr. Atkins had drafted a rewrite of the goal. Mr. Gagliano suggested a slight change and everyone agreed. Further discussion was held on the remainder of the section. The commission added language about promoting a clean and healthy walkable environment.

The commission then discussed whether to keep 3.6 about promoting a balance of uses. Mr. Ekberg suggested that if they wanted to keep it perhaps it could become 3.5.5. It was decided to incorporate it into 3.11.

Discussion was held on possible incentives for putting properties on the historic register.

The introduction was talked about next. Mr. Atkins stated that he felt it could be shortened. It was decided that staff would work on a rewrite. Discussion was held on what could possibly be removed and/or reworded.

The commission discussed the next steps in the process and what to bring to the joint meeting with the City Council.

Tree Preservation and Retention amendments –

Staff provided commissioners the public hearing draft of the amendments in preparation of the Public Hearing noticed for March 6, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

Move to adjourn at 7:35. Gagliano/Pasin – motion carried.