

Gig Harbor Peninsula Advisory Commission (PAC)

October 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jack Conway
Lucinda Wingard
Patricia Peterson
Darrell Johnson
James Peschek
Peter Clement

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Gordon Ballantyne (excused)
Garth Jackson (excused)

Commissioner Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm. A quorum was present.

NEW BUSINESS

**Shoreline Substantial Development/Shoreline Administrative Conditional Use/
Environmental Checklist: Scott & Mary Griffin
Applications 916406, 916407, 917618**

Applicant: Scott & Mary Griffin
Planner: Robert Perez, robert.perez@piercecountywa.gov
Request: Installation of a 150-ft overwater pier/ramp/boat/dock system to consist of a 4-ft x 86-ft aluminum pier, a 3-ft x 42-ft aluminum ramp, and an 8-ft x 30-ft boat support, located in Hale Passage at 715 Chinook Dr, Fox Island, in the Rural 10 zone classification, the Residential Shoreline Environment, the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area, and Council District #7.

Staff presented the case.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- No set metric for measuring cumulative effects. Figured on a case-by-case basis and on variables like location, etc.
- This dock is similar to nearby docks.
- They have identified the presence of eelgrass and plan to deal with it accordingly.
- Plantings have already been put in place.

Motion made (Johnson/Conway) to recommend approval of the proposal, as is. *Motion passed unanimously.*

**Shoreline Variance/Shoreline Exemption: Geiger
Applications 916496, 916495**

Applicant: Terence Geiger
Planner: Dan Buhl, dan.buhl@piercecountywa.gov
Request: Construct a new single-family residence, clear a view corridor, construct a trail to the shoreline, and construct a firepit near the shoreline. Located at 9204 82nd Ave NW, Gig Harbor, in the Rural Sensitive Resource zone classification, the Conservancy Shoreline Environment, the Gig Harbor Peninsula Community Plan area, and Council District #7.

Staff presented the case.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS

- Commission would have liked to know the planner's conditions prior to the LUAC meeting.
- Some documents seem to be missing in the online Document Center.
- The wetland overlay does not appear to be up-to-date, making it difficult to study this proposal.
- The report has location on west shore of Lay Inlet. Believe that is incorrect and that it's streamside.
- Curious when the wetland was last delineated.
- Asked about the drain field in relation to the wetland buffer.
- Inquired about how significant trees are determined.

- Inquired why the applicant needs two pathways.
- Worried about excessive tree removal. Inquired about a wildlife survey for shorebirds.
- Inquired about “view corridors”.
- Questioned if the size of the house is reasonable.

AGENT TESTIMONY

Carl Halsan, *PO Box 1447, Gig Harbor*, explained the property is almost totally encumbered. The question before this Commission is whether the chosen location is a reasonable place to put a house. The questions the Commission is asking regarding wetland buffers and shoreline edge, etc. are thorough, and will be worked out with the applicant, County staff, and the Hearing Examiner. Mr. Halsan stated that he believes the proposed location of the house is reasonable because there is nowhere else to put a residence. This is saltwater Puget Sound waterfront, although it isn't called Lay Inlet. A Wetland and Fish and Wildlife study were done last year by Scott Sissons. He came up with what he felt was the appropriate wetland buffer, but the Examiner still needed to approve. Then new shoreline rules went into effect. Therefore, they are not asking for a Wetland Variance, but a Shoreline Variance. They are requesting a view corridor that avoids two significant trees. No trees are proposed to be removed for the two proposed pathways. They propose two because the shoreline is so heavily vegetated. They have one leading down to creek and one to open water. The drain field location is proposed to keep it furthest from critical areas. A drip system is proposed, which allows vegetation to grow up through it. Staff has determined this is the least intrusive and most viable option for the placement of the home.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No members of the public testified.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

- Maybe having the septic further away from the wetlands and the house further down the hill is an option.
- This is a challenging property from a construction standpoint because the parcel is very environmentally-sensitive.
- Lots of ivy choking out other vegetation.
- Reasonable use means property owner can utilize land while not being detrimental to the community.
- Trails, view corridors, and fire pit are within Commission's purview.
- Concerns over potential removal of wildlife and endangered/protected species habitat.
- Not sure if reasonable use applies to the fire pit, trails, or view corridor.
- Width of view corridor compared to house seems excessive.
- Fire pit is not a water-dependent activity.

Motion made (Peschek/Peterson) to approve the Variance with the following conditions: no clearing or tree removal in wetland or shoreline buffers, if trail is approved by the Hearing Examiner then the PAC requests only the west trail be approved to keep additional intrusion out of the Estuarine environment and protect from erosion, the trail entering the wetland should be constructed boardwalk-style with plans to be approved by County staff, the planting of 29 western red cedars as shown on the site plan dated October 20, 2018 shall be done as mitigation, and the fire pit be denied. *Motion passed.*

OLD BUSINESS

Minutes

(August 28, 2019)

Commission made an Out-of-Order Motion to amend an adopted Motion that was neither rescinded, nor reconsidered and rejected after adoption, making the Motion null and void.

(September 11, 2019)

Amendments:

Under Other Business, state that Commissioners received copies of the Community Plan and will review and consider possible changes for Chapter 1-Introduction to be considered at future study sessions as time allows.

Motion made (Wingard/Clement) to approve the September 11, 2019 minutes as amended. *Motion passed.*

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioners Peterson and Wingard both received compliments from a handful of citizens regarding the professionalism displayed by the Commission at the September 11 meeting.

Commissioner Wingard reached out to Stephanie Lyle of the History Museum to review the Historical section of the Community Plan Introduction. Ms. Lyle will advise of any missing or incorrect information.

Commission discussed the BMA mapping in regard to a case coming before the PAC soon.

Heard that PenMet Parks has changed their proposal to a steel structure.

Motion made to adjourn at 8:01 p.m.