

## Gig Harbor Peninsula Advisory Commission (PAC)

### November 28, 2018, Meeting Minutes

*Minutes of the PAC are not verbatim. Recorded copies are available upon request.*

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Garth Jackson  
Lucinda Wingard  
John Conway

#### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Patricia Peterson (excused)  
Gordon Ballantyne (excused)

Secretary Wingard called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. A quorum was present.

#### NEW BUSINESS

##### Shoreline Substantial Development/Shoreline Conditional Use/Environmental Review: [Bear](#) Applications 894574, 894575, 894576

Applicant: Lance Bear and Linda Pai  
Planner: Ty Booth, ty.booth@piercecounitywa.gov  
Request: Construct a joint-use dock, boathouse, and utilize the second floor of a detached garage for living space. Located at 1309 and 1315 Kamus Way in the Rural 10 and Rural-Residential zone classifications of the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area, in Council District #7.

**Garth Jackson was the case reviewer.**

*Staff presented the case.*

#### **Robert Perez, Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation of proposal and summarized Initial Project Review.**

- Completed SEPA, Notice, Public Comment (none received), agency comments (some received)
- Showed maps and photos of site preparation and location of cabin
- Overview application history 4/2018 to 10/2018
- Site plan overview of proposed living space over garage, boathouse and dock system
- Applicant will get more depth data on proposed dock construction before building
- Staff has reviewed against Shoreline Management and preliminary observations and recommendations would recommend approval for dock and living space above garage but asked for more clarification on dock systems (such as will there be bathrooms included in boathouse)
- Clarification is needed around the grading happening at site
- Planner is still determining whether archaeological survey is required, but there is excavation happening and gravel covering everything, however the wooded areas might be useful for survey
- The second smaller lot is proposed to be sold but no current buyer; if second lot is sold, this would be a joint dock for two lots, which the County encourages
- Planner provided primary case planner's contact information

#### **APPLICANT TESTIMONY**

- Addressed questions about joint use agreement and intent to sell lot
- Increased parcel size so that buyer can build (after removal of cabin)
- Where the dock is proposed at the end of property is likely not important for archaeological survey
- Regarding site development permits, last week a biologist began dive survey to confirm depths provided by surveyor (to have the minimum of 4 ft of water underneath the dock at low tide)
- The 4-ft requirement drove the lengths of the project proposal, which were calculated using survey data
- Site development has begun almost immediately
- No boat lifts or buoys are proposed
- Joint-use agreement is proposed
- Boathouse plans are in the works and detailed plans will be submitted to the planning department soon, but it is not a joint-use boathouse and not expected to have bathrooms
- Depths will be confirmed with biologist

- Room above shop is designated as storage but intended to be a room with bed/bath but no kitchen
- Regarding overall length of joint-use facilities, since the County encourages joint use and bigger/longer docks, applicant plans to stick with that argument

**COMMISSION QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION**

- If the original length is 180 feet, and you give up that difference, do you still get the 4 ft of water? (showing cross-section of dock with water levels)
- The width of the L is 40 ft, for safety reasons
- If this is two lots, two moorages are needed, and applicant stated there is room
- There is concern because the pier next door is coming out at a parallel to property line, and the angle projected for this pier would be angled toward the pier next door; with the added L-shaped dock, it seems a bit close; a straight dock would keep from unnecessarily getting too close to neighbor
- Applicant plans for landscaping along the bulkhead (a FEMA protected area) including the landscape architect, who has been hired by owners and is planning right now
- The cabin (where living space above garage would be) is within the 200-ft shoreline jurisdiction
- No public comment, discussion closed
- Reviewer observed construction well under way: footing is being put in, bulkhead is new, excavated and put in; trees along shoreline have been preserved (saw no stumps); the spit may need archaeological survey but is adjoining, not on the applicant’s property; construction site has already been disturbed and covered with rock, and overall seems to be a quality job that has been responsible of development
- The neighboring dock is noticeably not perpendicular to the shore; putting the dock on the boundary line takes care of privacy, and the L does extend away from the neighbor. The state-owned tidelands are not owned by the owner, so there is a need to ensure that development does not impede tidelands flagged for FEMA protection for flood storage capacity
- Commission member does not see a need for the L-shape: while it gives the dock more space, it does not seem necessary for the project. This member would argue against, for mitigation’s sake and to avoid state tideland issues, but another member noted that the project is a full lot away from the state tidelands, and that the L allows for additional space without extending further into the bay

**Motion made (Wingard/Jackson) to recommend approve with conditions that 175-foot length is approved; boathouse with addition is approved; and that the dock be designed to be straight, without the L-shape at end.**

**Vote: Jackson – No, as written  
 Wingard – Yes  
 Conway – No**

***Motion failed 1-2.***

**Motion made (Jackson/Conway) to recommend approval for same motion but excluding the condition about the L-shape.**

**Vote: Jackson – Yes  
 Wingard – Yes  
 Conway – Yes, with comment: Owner needs to show that the L is a necessity for the project**

***Motion carried 3-0.***

**Shoreline Substantial Development/Shoreline Conditional Use/Environmental Review: [Larson](#)  
 Applications 884455, 884457, 886076**

Applicant: Robert and Jenny Larson  
 Planner: Mojgan K. Carlson, [mojgan.carlson@piercecounitywa.gov](mailto:mojgan.carlson@piercecounitywa.gov)

Request: 1) Construct a pool house and pool, 2) construct various retaining walls, pathways, and stairs for beach access, 3) Retain the bulkhead, stairs, retaining walls, landscaping, and gates, 4) Remove 2,129 sq. ft. of shoreline hardscape and existing boathouse, 5) remove and replace 277 linear ft. of existing bulkhead, 6) create 200 linear ft. of beach, and 7) plant 50 linear ft. of native vegetation along shoreline. Located at 4824 105<sup>th</sup> Ave Ct, Gig Harbor, in the Rural 10 zone classification of the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area, in Council District #7.

**Lucinda Wingard was the case reviewer.**

*Staff presented the case.*

**Mojgan Carlson, Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation of proposal and summarized Initial Project Review.**

- Complicated project including a pool house, pool, and hot tub, retaining walls (some already exist and will stay; new ones will be 50 ft setback from bulkhead), pathways with stairs to provide beach access; also proposed to remove concrete over section of shoreline and remove existing boathouse and marine railway
- Majority of site has already been cleared
- Site photos submitted with application shown to demonstrate location (existing and future, where boathouse and marine railway will be removed and replaced
- Proposed project would remove marine railway and the boathouse to restore beach and habitable area
- The replacement of structures normally would be a shoreline exemption but due to other activities, shoreline permits are needed
- Proposing to remove 132 ft of bulkhead to create beach and gravel sand area for the site, and to replant areas in corner of project site
- Three contiguous parcels all owned by property owner with slopes less than 10% towards water, but slope on back/east side is 40-45%
- Each parcel used to have a single-family residence that have been removed, but new applications are submitted for construction of a single-family (approved in 9/2018); middle parcel is vacant with a T-shaped dock (approved back in 1995); last parcel only has a half-demolished pool, and its shoreline has been improved with a bulkhead
- Vegetation on site is deciduous trees, and some have been removed
- No important navigation routes or regulated wetlands found within area.
- Surrounding properties are SF residences
- If approved, there will be no impact on surrounding neighbors' views, and no impact to adjoining neighbors
- Existing boat ramps would be removed to create beach area
- No comments from public or neighbors
- Located in Gig Harbor Community Plan area
- Can be approved with a shoreline conditional use permit and 50-ft setback; staff reviewed the project under Title 19D (Comprehensive Planning, Shoreline Master Program), Title 18A (Development Regulations-Zoning), Title 20 (Shoreline Management Use Regulations)
- Individual parcels may not meet 33.3% impervious coverage requirement, but altogether parcels do meet it if "declaration of restrictive covenant for multiple parcels under single ownership" is approved by the County
- No additional harm to aquatic environment but still needs approval by the Dept of Ecology

#### **APPLICANT TESTIMONY**

- Larson project agent completed testimony
- Timeline shown of project: customer met with staff in 10/2017, completed house demo 10/17-12/17, did project assessment and site visit for clarity on proposal, and then developed final and submitted in April, which was revised in 5/2018; the applicant moved houses off-site in 8/2018 and had site development and building permits approved in 10-11/2018

- Presented rendering of proposed development (house, beach, dock, pool) with impervious surfaces pre-development approximately 45%, but agent noted this would be 33.07% post-development
- Mitigation rendering showed proposed residence with proposed native planting along shoreline
- IPR page 7 says swimming pool has been removed- not yet removed but is in process
- Applicant is proposing to replace existing turf with pervious turf, so much of what is concrete will become pervious turf or part of beach restoration
- Boathouse will be moving back some feet and will be farther from the beach than currently
- Applicant reviewed WAC Mitigation Sequence Code 1-6--- all mitigation proposed falls in 2 & 3 (minimizing impacts, and rectifying by repairing, restoring, etc.)
- Shoreline mitigation measures were explained in depth, i.e. through reduction of shoreline hard-arming, reduction of second boathouse, reduction of shoreline hardscape, and an increase of new beach habitat (2338 sq. ft.), and native vegetation (2500 sq. ft.) where there is none existing now
- The top of the existing boathouse has deck and rails, but proposal would remove those items to introduce a green roof and replace existing lawn and turf with pervious turf
- Preliminary mitigation plans with native vegetation chart presented
- Regarding the boathouse, conditional use criteria was explained, and applicant/agent showed how it will meet it and discussed plans to monitor stormwater and pollution runoff
- Agent stated that applicant looked at combining the lots, but the existing dock is too long to meet the requirement for a single-use dock

#### **COMMISSION QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION**

- Commission discussed that what was a joint-use dock is now a single-use dock, which brings up the question that, what if in the future, the southern parcel (with less development) is decided to be developed with a house- would they be able to apply for a dock there? Planner informed that the applicant has stated they will not sell any of these properties, per recorded document (declaration of restriction of covenant for multi-parcels under single ownership)
- Close of public comment and moved to approve proposal as is

**Motion made (Wingard/Jackson) to recommend approval of proposal as is.**

**Vote: Jackson – Yes**  
**Wingard – Yes**  
**Conway – Yes**

***Motion carried 3-0.***

#### **Shoreline Substantial Development/Environmental Review: [Gier](#) Applications 894975, 894977**

Applicant: Hoyt and Donita Gier  
 Planner: Robert Perez, robert.perez@piercecountywa.gov  
 Request: Construct a new single-family residential dock system which consists of a residential 4-ft x 67-ft timber framed pier, a 3-ft x 40-ft aluminum ramp, and an 8-ft x 30-ft float. Located at 7302 Plant Dr. NW, Gig Harbor, in the Rural 10 and Rural Residential zone classifications of the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area, in Council District #7.

**John Conway was the case reviewer.**

*Staff presented the case.*

Robert Perez, Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation of proposal and summarized Initial Project Review.

- Planner presented proposal of new dock for single-family residence, which was reviewed under all applicable regulations and plans
- Presented ortho photos with pertinent information

- Photos submitted with application were shown
- Proposal contains approximately 156 ft of tidelands
- Parcels improved with single-family home, and all have bulkheads as well
- May be inconsistency in the IPR with distance between the dock to the north and dock to the south; first submittal was with 15 ft, the second with 50 ft
- Proposed single-use dock would be 131 ft long into water with no expected impacts on neighbor views
- Dock would be perpendicular to the shore, located in cove, and would not impact traffic
- Should the County approve this dock, other approvals from state agencies are still needed
- No dive survey has been done, so there is no accurate depth yet
- The dock to the west is 134 ft, not 98 ft as stated in the IPR

**APPLICANT TESTIMONY**

- Applicant agent addressed that on second page of IPR, it names different; Agent clarified that they have not yet been to the site
- Agent stated that they recommend native plants to all clients, but agent hasn't had chance to review this case yet; once agent visits site, recommendation will be made
- Only 125 ft of the dock will be over water (134 ft total), and grading will be 79.5%
- There was concern about the dive study, so agent will check on that
- Agent stated that even at zero tide, it should meet the 4 ft requirement

**COMMISSION QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION**

- Member noticed scuba survey hung under this application, but not the other one- Is that typical?
- Confusion on where dive survey should occur; it was done at 15 ft (instead of 50 ft), which doesn't apply
- Did planner speak to applicants about replanting at bulkhead where there is vegetation?
- Planner has not yet discussed native replanting because no clear indication of where dock would be yet
- Commission reviewer stated that upon observation, it meets the requirements, even though there are a lot of docks there already
- Member recommends approving as projected but with condition that applicant replaces/restores native plants back in; moving to approve but with replacement/restoration of native planting

**Motion made (Conway/Jackson) to recommend approval of proposal as proposed/projected with the condition that a landscape plan with native plantings be included on either side of the dock.**

**Vote:** Jackson – Yes  
 Wingard – Yes  
 Conway – Yes

**Motion carried 3-0.**

**OLD BUSINESS**  
**Minutes**  
 (November 14, 2018)

**Motion made and seconded to approve the November 14, 2018, minutes as amended per Commissioner Wingard's request. Motion passed unanimously.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- Commissioner Wingard discussed two proposals put forth to the County Council by Councilmember Derek Young.
- One proposal would require shoreline permits (for docks, piers, etc.) to continue to go in front of the Gig Harbor Peninsula Advisory Commission.
- The second proposal addresses discrepancies between the Shoreline Master Program and the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan regarding docks and piers in the Conservancy Shoreline. Councilmember Young proposed a six-month moratorium on approvals of docks and piers in the conservancy area until the issue is resolved.

- Commissioner Wingard would like the discussion of the two proposals to be added to the December agenda and the other two commissioners present supported the discussion in December, time permitting.

***Meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.***