

From: Eve AUSTIN [mailto:ebgolf@msn.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 6:54 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments

Planning Department.

I recently received some very disturbing news which I hope will not affect the Northshore Golf Course issue.

"Say it isn't so."

I understand that there are ammendments being made to the Comparehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code. People over here are in fear that these changes will affect negatively what little open space remains here.

Frankly, I don't believe the City would do this to 6,000 people here. The injustice would just be too much.

I am protesting anything that would destroy what little open space we have in NE Tacoma.

I also can't imagine the City considering the "Gulch" near the tide flats as part of open space for NE Tacoma either, or some of what have been called parks over here." It really is ludicrous.

If the City wishes to allow the building of homes on the golf course and take away our open space, I believe that all those being affected by a bad decision should be paid the market value for their homes by the City of Tacoma in order that they can restart their lives in a more life affirming area.

Eve Austin

From: theostrich1@comcast.net [mailto:theostrich1@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 9:57 PM
To: bbaarsma@cityoftacoma.org; bbaarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Stenger, Donna; Huffman, Peter; Boudet, Brian; Frantz, Shanta
Cc: dave & Michele Radford; john lovelace
Subject: Re: Revisions to PRD regualtions

Mayor Baarsma, Councilman Fey, Planning Department Personnel,

I reside in North East Tacoma and for 20 months have been involved with the Moratorium, changing of the PRD's, which many, including members of the Council and Planning Department said were overdue. I am very disappointed to again find, it appears, the elected officials of the City of Tacoma and various departments attempting to pass regulations affecting it's citizens without proper notification. It would appear City of Tacoma Officials and Staff were being sneaky since the regulations were just changed and less than a year later we find out proposals are in place negating every thing done less than a year ago. Members of NE Tacoma have been contacting the Land Use Department at minimum twice a month for over a year. The same questions are asked, is there any update or changes being considered that wou! ld affe ct NE Tacoma. The answers have been, basically, there are meetings regarding mitigation that can't be discussed and NO there is nothing taking place that would affect NE Tacoma. It appears now based on what we have learned that again, just as in the original application for the Northshore Golf Course development, the Citizens of NET have been kept in the dark while discussions were held and proposals were being made to reduce open space requirements, reduce set backs, reduce lot size, etc. I am disappointed and personally very upset to find this occurring. Not a call or a note from our elected representative, not a word from departmental personnel when asked, and they have known about this I understand it since the spring. Words that come to mind are shady, sneaky, betrayed, unethical.

Many of the Citizens of NE Tacoma have been on a list, for over a year, requesting notification of any and all information regarding these issues in writing. No written or even verbal notification was provided regarding these proposals. I understand that since someone did find out about these proposals and did raise specific

questions regarding notification requirements the proposals are being taken off the revision to PRD regulations for a period of time. In addition, we have been assured in the future when Citizens ask about these issues they will be advised and written notification would be provided sufficiently in advance, to those who have requested, of any formal discussion in order for interested Citizens to participate.

My understanding is the specific code changes proposed involving open space, reduced lot size, reduce setbacks are covered by these sections of the code. These are the changes I understand that are now tabled until proper notification can be provided to those affected. Sections of the code: 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140. I am requesting notification via e-mail if there are any other proposals being considered that would change PRD code affecting residents of NE Tacoma.

The Citizens involved with Save N. E. Tacoma are still here and still actively following these issues. I am truly disappointed to again find, or it would appear, we can not trust those elected to represent us.

If I am mistaken about the Council Members or Departmental Personnel being aware of these proposed changes I would appreciate hearing from them.

Charles Babers
4407 Country Club Dr. N. E.
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: John Barnes [mailto:John.barnes7@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 1:46 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code

Mayor Baarsma, Councilman Fey, Planning Department Personnel,
My husband and I reside in North East Tacoma and for 20 months have been involved with the Moratorium, changing of the PRD's, which many, including members of the Council and Planning Department said were overdue. We are very disappointed to again find, it appears, the elected officials of the City of Tacoma and various departments attempting to pass regulations affecting it's citizens without proper notification. It would appear City of Tacoma Officials and Staff were being sneaky since the regulations were just changed and less than a year later we find out proposals are in place negating every thing done less than a year ago. Members of NE Tacoma have been contacting the Land Use Department at minimum twice a month for over a year. The same questions are asked, is there any update or changes being considered that would affect NE Tacoma. The answers have been, basically, there are meetings regarding mitigation that can't be discussed and NO, there is nothing taking place that would affect NE Tacoma. It appears now based on what we have learned that again, just as in the original application for the Northshore Golf Course development, the Citizens of NET have been kept in the dark while discussions were held and proposals were being made to reduce open space requirements, reduce set backs, reduce lot size, etc. We are disappointed and personally very upset to find this occurring. Not a call or a note from our elected representative, not a word from departmental personnel when asked, and they have known about this we understand it since the spring. Words that come to mind are shady, sneaky, betrayed, unethical.

Many of the Citizens of NE Tacoma have been on a list, for over a year, requesting notification of any and all information regarding these issues in writing. No written or even verbal notification was provided regarding these proposals. We understand that since someone did find out about these proposals and did raise specific questions regarding notification requirements the proposals are being taken off the revision to PRD regulations for a period of time. In addition, we have been assured in the future when Citizens ask about

these issues they will be advised and written notification would be provided sufficiently in advance, to those who have requested, of any formal discussion in order for interested Citizens to participate.

Our understanding is the specific code changes proposed involving open space, reduced lot size, reduce setbacks are covered by these sections of the code. These are the changes we understand that are now tabled until proper notification can be provided to those affected. Sections of the code: 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140. We are requesting notification via e-mail if there are any other proposals being considered that would change PRD code affecting residents of NE Tacoma.

The Citizens involved with Save N. E. Tacoma are still here and still actively following these issues. We are truly disappointed to again find, or it would appear, we can not trust those elected to represent us. If we are mistaken about the Council Members or Departmental Personnel being aware of these proposed changes we would appreciate hearing from them.

Sincerely,

John and Mary Barnes
5422 21st Avenue Court NE
Tacoma, WA. 98422

From: Jillian Lamont Bates [mailto:Jillian@nventure.com]

Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 1:11 PM

To: Planning

Subject: 2008 Code Amendments

Hello –

I am a homeowner in the North Slope Historic District at 819 North J Street.

Re: proposed updates to our HMR-SRD zoning, especially allowing construction of detached accessory dwelling units:

Please DON'T change our HMR-SRD zoning. Accessory dwelling units would be damaging to any historic neighborhood. This is already a very densely populated area and our zoning is working nicely now as is. Please don't change HMR-SRD zoning.

Thank you,

Jillian Lamont Bates
819 North J Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
253-761-8179

From: dshlock@comcast.net [mailto:dshlock@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, September 07, 2008 3:07 PM

To: Planning

Subject: Public Comment, Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment

I have just had the opportunity to review "Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment" and the sweeping changes it encompasses. I only wish I had received the very nicely laid out "public notice post card" so that I could have been there to listen, I may have an inadequate grasp of the proposals from reading them.

There are several points that concern me:

- ☐ A re-occurring theme is the description of Tacoma as urban verses suburban. Our city and its neighborhoods are composed of both low density housing areas with a more suburban feel and areas of higher density with a more urban feel to them. I strongly see the advantages to creating a city core and some other areas with higher density and I was under the impression that the flexibility in our plan assured that public open space was preserved while allowing for denser housing.
- ☐ I am quite concerned that these changes not only apply to new developments but to existing developments. Meaning that those who have purchased properties with the expectation that nearby open spaces (those in there development) would be there for their use so they have settled for less personal space will no longer necessarily have that space.
- ☐ As I read through the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment I noted many new descriptions on Open space / public use space i.e. Walkways meeting rooms and many others and I do like there inclusions. I even agree with the addition on some small retail that is based on pedestrian traffic although I would like more understanding of percentage of land compared to living space. What I don't understand is that it appears that the definition of what is to be included have greatly increased while the percentage o! f land set aside for these "Public spaces" has shrunk considerably.
What I envision is a much smaller amount of space without buildings and even less "Green Space" weather that be lawns and shrubs or natural vegetation for the public to look at or walk on.
- ☐ A re-occurring theme is that these changes are needed because most of the available land in Tacoma is small in size the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment implies small as less than 3 acres. And yet many of the examples i.e. retail, walks to parks with a percent less than our current plan seem impossible were as these might fit in a larger development. Why not split the two? Making the needed changes for small developments but leaving larger ones. But in the end the proposed changes seem to be more app! licable to larger than smaller so I don't understand the argument.

Over all I read lots on nice talk about possibilities for flexibility that are not backed up by regulations. Over the past year and a half I have learned that what a builder can and cannot do is based on things like setbacks, and percentages not words like "promotes a more desirable living environment" although many things outlined sound good I don't see the teeth that builders would have to stick to in order get their applications accepted.

I want to thank-you for responding to your error in notification it has restored my confidence that no one is trying to "pull a fast one" at the communities expense.

Sharon Blaylock
Resident of Northeast Tacoma

From: Deborah Cade [mailto:dlcade@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 6:49 PM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 amendment

I went to send this last night and the Tacoma website did not appear to be working.

I am writing to comment on the changes regarding conditional uses in the new residential code amendment. First, I find the "table" format to be somewhat confusing and misleading. I suggest that you retain the narrative descriptions of both the zoning categories and the uses allowed in each. The table is simply not clear by itself. Second, the conditional uses contained in the table for the HMR-SRD zone include a number of uses that were eliminated from our zone when this zoning category was created. These include retirement homes, nursing homes ("continuing care retirement facilities"), student housing, "educational and philanthropic institutions," and wireless towers. We worked with the city planners to eliminate these conditional uses from this zoning category because they are completely inconsistent with the idea of preserving a historic residential neighborhood. Many of these are large, semi-commercial institutions, and create problems with traffic, parking, noise, lighting and aesthetics that are inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and with the goal of historic preservation. After our years of hard work in achieving changes to our zoning category, it was to say the least disappointing that the City was so quick to disregard all of that effort and put those inconsistent conditional uses back into this zoning category. Please correct this code amendment to be consistent with the conditional uses that are currently allowed in the HMR-SRD zone and do not use this opportunity to put uses back in that we worked to remove in our efforts to continue historic preservation in this neighborhood.

Deborah Cade
908 North M Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
253-593-4569

From: Brianna Charbonnel [mailto:bcharbo@rei.com]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 4:20 PM
To: Planning
Subject:

To the Board of Commissioners,

I attended the Public hearing on September 3rd, but had to leave before I could speak. I am a citizen of the city of Tacoma and a member of the Green Tacoma Partnership Steering Committee. I would like to write to say that I am in support of the OSHRP. I am very appreciative of the collaborative efforts of people throughout the community to create a plan that strives to save our critical habitat and green corridors.

Thank-you,
Brianna Charbonnel

From: Lois Cooper [mailto:loiscooper@harbornet.com]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 10:57 AM
To: bbaarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Julie.Anderson@cityoftacoma.org; jfey@cityoftacoma.org; cladenbu@cityoftacoma.org; mlonerga@cityoftacoma.org; Spiro.Manthou@cityoftacoma.org; lwalker2@cityoftacoma.org; mstrickland@cityoftacoma.org; rtalbert@cityoftacoma.org; Planning; lwung@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: Changes to PRD regulations

To All Concerned:

I am amazed that the Planning Commission would even attempt to change the regulations just put in place less than a year ago, and that they would do so with disregard to the requirements of the law that the City of Tacoma had established. I guess the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing! Also I think none of the members could have ever visited NE Tacoma where the city's largest PRD is located. This is also the 2nd highest tax base with-in the city jurisdiction. If the PRD regulations need to be updated, then make changes apply to new PRDs only, if no sites are available for large PRDs, then write regulations specific to the small sites that do remain. It would seem to me that higher density housing should be located on major bus lines so there would be transportation available. Let us maintain some usable open space within Tacoma city limits.

Sincerely,
Lois Cooper
4309 Fairwood Blvd. NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: tallinn222@aol.com [mailto:tallinn222@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 11:45 AM
To: Planning
Subject: changes in PRD open space requirements

Planning Department,
We wish to register our concern that there would be consideration of lowering open space requirements in PRDs and that such a consideration would take place without notifying the citizens who have made their interest abundantly clear. When the entire nation is concerned with maintaining open green space we are baffled that people who are educated in planning would indicate support for removing restrictions that require open space. We are firmly against decreasing open space requirements and adamant that the community be informed when such inane ideas are being sent to the City Council.

Thank You,
George and Carla Curtis
3509 33rd St NE
Tacoma WA 98422

From: Michael Dolan [mailto:mdolan@harbornet.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 9:16 PM
To: Planning
Subject: how could you do this, it is illegal!!

Mayor Baarsma, Councilman Fey, Planning Department Personnel,

I reside in North East Tacoma and for 20 months have been involved with the Moratorium, changing of the PRD's, which many, including members of the Council and Planning Department said were overdue. I am very disappointed to again find, it appears, the elected officials of the City of Tacoma and various departments attempting to pass regulations affecting it's citizens without proper notification. It would appear City of Tacoma Officials and Staff were being sneaky since the regulations were just changed and less than a year later we find out proposals are in place negating every thing done less than a year ago. Members of NE Tacoma have been contacting the Land Use Department at minimum twice a month for over a year. The same questions are asked, is there any update or changes being considered that would affect NE Tacoma. The answers have been, basically, there are meetings regarding mitigation that can't be discussed and NO, there is nothing taking place that would affect NE Tacoma. It appears now based on what we have learned that again, just as in the original application for the Northshore Golf Course development, the Citizens of NET have been kept in the dark while discussions were held and proposals were being made to reduce open space requirements, reduce set backs, reduce lot size, etc. I am disappointed and personally very upset to find this occurring. Not a call or a note from our elected

representative, not a word from departmental personnel when asked, and they have known about this I understand it since the spring. Words that come to mind are shady, sneaky, betrayed, unethical.

Many of the Citizens of NE Tacoma have been on a list, for over a year, requesting notification of any and all information regarding these issues in writing. No written or even verbal notification was provided regarding these proposals. I understand that since someone did find out about these proposals and did raise specific questions regarding notification requirements the proposals are being taken off the revision to PRD regulations for a period of time. In addition, we have been assured in the future when Citizens ask about these issues they will be advised and written notification would be provided sufficiently in advance, to those who have requested, of any formal discussion in order for interested Citizens to participate.

My understanding is the specific code changes proposed involving open space, reduced lot size, reduce setbacks are covered by these sections of the code. These are the changes I understand that are now tabled until proper notification can be provided to those affected. Sections of the code: 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140. I am requesting notification via e-mail if there are any other proposals being considered that would change PRD code affecting residents of NE Tacoma.

The Citizens involved with Save N. E. Tacoma are still here and still actively following these issues. I am truly disappointed to again find, or it would appear, we can not trust those elected to represent us.

If I am mistaken about the Council Members or Departmental Personnel being aware of these proposed changes I would appreciate hearing from them.

Mary Dolan
NE Tacoma resident

From: Rodger Dukehart [mailto:duker37@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 10:43 AM

To: Bill.Baarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Rick.Talbert@cityoftacoma.org; Julie.Anderson@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Connie.Ladenburg@cityoftacoma.org; Mike.Lonergan@cityoftacoma.org; Spiro.Manthou@cityoftacoma.org; smithtmore@aol.com; dboe@boearc.com; smgaffney@earthlink.net; phuffman@cityoftacoma.org; dstenger@cityoftacoma.org

Subject: 2008 Annual Amendment Package.

Mayor Baarsma, City Councilmen and Planning Department Personnel:

We are watching !

Perhaps someone believed NE Tacoma citizens would not notice all of the proposed changes affecting legacy PRD's within the "Trojan Horse" style 2008 Annual Amendment Package to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code.

Known NE Tacoma "interested parties" were not given notice of proposed changes as required by law. Drastic revisions to Open Space Requirements, Setbacks and Lot Sizes neatly camouflaged by obvious distractions likely to be highly controversial such as Detached Accessory Dwelling Units all buried in a 21 page proposal (#2008-11)

offered for adoption along with six other significant amendment applications.

Outrageous !

Fortunately, objections by alert NE Tacoma citizens appear to have successfully delayed consideration of these proposed changes to sections 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140 for the upcoming 2008 Annual Amendment Package.

WE ARE WATCHING !

Rodger Dukehart
4302 - 40th Ave N.E.

From: Irishquilter@aol.com [mailto:Irishquilter@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 6:16 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Annual Comprehensive Plan Development

I strongly protest changing the open space requirement from 33% to 4%. This would have a severe, negative impact on the only remaining open space in the City of Tacoma.

The City took this action without contacting interested parties, of which I am one. This is the same type of action the City took in dealing with a developer for six months before NE Tacoma people even heard about their plan to do away with our open space.

I am admantly opposed to reducing the open space requirements and you should be also. If you travel to parts of our area that are now concrete you will see the environmental damage that's been done. If you remember Katrina you should know that removing the wetlands for "development" directly impacted New Orleans' ability to withstand the storm.

In view of all the data available regarding the importance of green spaces, I am disgusted that you would even think of putting yet more concrete into our city. Have you not done enough to damage it already?

Shame!!!

Shirley Durgan

**4714 Fairwood Blvd NE
Unit 1102
Tacoma, WA 98422**

From: gfenn777@comcast.net [mailto:gfenn777@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 4:26 PM
To: Planning
Subject: PRD Zoning Codes

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It has been brought to my attention that discussions to change the PRD zoning codes affecting open space requirements for NE Tacoma have been occurring since early summer. Residents of NE Tacoma were not made aware of these proposed changes and by law should have been. The past year we worked hard with department heads and city leaders to change these codes. Although these changes will not be recommended to the City Council next month, it is hoped changes reducing open space requirement from 33% to less than 8% in NE Tacoma will be off the table for good.

Sincerely,

Gary Fennell

From: Gillard, Jeff
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 8:20 PM
To: Barnett, Elliott
Subject: OSHP Comments

Elliott,
I would like to point out a portion of the Open Space Habitat Recreation Plan that is counter to the function of a utility right of way. OS-GI-2 calls for planting trees in utility rights of ways. The R/W is there to provide power, water, gas, rail service, etc. to Tacoma. Trees in the R/W would, at most threaten those services, and at least increase maintenance costs substantially. In many circumstances there are laws that restrict trees in the R/W. I'm sure TPU is not opposed to allowing utility R/W to serve a dual purpose and provide habitat and open space, where feasible. It would just be a matter of determining what plants are compatible (shrubs, ...) or who does the added maintenance. In fact, Tacoma Power currently has a process in place for addressing similar questions pertaining to new housing developments.

The utility right of way language should be removed, or at least add the words "where feasible", or "as approved by the R/W holder" should be included.

Jeff Gillard
Tacoma Water
253 502 8731

From: Ray Helt [mailto:ray@hksalesllc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 9:09 AM
To: 'Bruce and Marcie'; Planning; Lauren.Walker@cityoftacoma.org; Spiro.Manthou@cityoftacoma.org; Mike.Lonergan@cityoftacoma.org; Connie.Ladenburg@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Marilyn.Strickland@cityoftacoma.org; Julie.Anderson@cityoftacoma.org; Bill.Baarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Rick.Talbert@cityoftacoma.org
Cc: 'Diane Thynes'; 'scott Phillips'; 'Kathy Kleeberger'; 'Kenneth and Ann Porad'; 'John & Stacy Geyer'; 'Richard Hybak'; 'John Mouser'; 'Bill and Diane Swoveland'; 'Frank Evans'; 'Tim Lynch'; 'Carol Turney-Loos';

'John Mouser'; 'Jonathen Reed'; 'Fred Gillis'; 'Tom Hagen'; 'Maryanne and Greg Murdock'; 'Dennis and Liz Bod'; 'Gary Neiss'; 'Todd and Sarah Massengill'; 'Randy and Lisa Kurosky'; 'Steve Barkley'; 'Kathryn Antonetti'; 'Terry Kleeberger'; 'Michael and Michelle Faulkner'; 'Phil Rosser'; 'Rich Davis'; 'Kathy Helt'; 'Jennifer and Randall Hopkins'; 'Tony Wong'; 'Chris Cornell'; 'Darcy Gregg'; 'Lorrie and Harry Rempher'; 'Dan Hallin'; 'Aine Boden'; 'Dick Gould'

Subject: RE: Proposed Changes to the PRD

To: All

The letter issued by Bruce and Marcie McCandliss to the officials of Tacoma, reflects the exact position that my family takes. We are very disappointed regarding the nature of how the business was conducted by the elected city officials regarding our NE Tacoma neighborhood. Please add our names to any action and files that reflect our disapproval of the City of Tacoma elected officials.

Regards

Ray & Kathy Helt
4421-36th Ave. NE
Tacoma, WA. 98422

-----Original Message-----

From: Bruce and Marcie [mailto:yofive@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 7:33 AM

To: Planning@cityoftacoma.org; Lauren.Walker@cityoftacoma.org; Spiro.Manthou@cityoftacoma.org; Mike.Lonergan@cityoftacoma.org; Connie.Ladenburg@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Marilyn.Strickland@cityoftacoma.org; Julie.Anderson@cityoftacoma.org; Bill.Baarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Rick.Talbert@cityoftacoma.org

Cc: Diane Thynes; scott Phillips; Kathy Kleeberger; Kenneth and Ann Porad; John & Stacy Geyer; Richard Hybak; John Mouser; Bill and Diane Swoveland; Frank Evans; Tim Lynch; Carol Turney-Loos; John Mouser; Jonathen Reed; Fred Gillis; Tom Hagen; Maryanne and Greg Murdock; Dennis and Liz Bod; Gary Neiss; Todd and Sarah Massengill; Randy and Lisa Kurosky; Steve Barkley; Kathryn Antonetti; Terry Kleeberger; Michael and Michelle Faulkner; Phil Rosser; Rich Davis; Kathy Helt; Ray Helt; Jennifer and Randall Hopkins; Tony Wong; Chris Cornell; Darcy Gregg; Lorrie and Harry Rempher; Dan Hallin; Aine Boden; Dick Gould

Subject: Proposed Changes to the PRD

Tacoma Public Officials - Please read, review, comment and file accordingly the attached letter in your public records regarding recent proposed PRD change activity within the Tacoma City Government offices.

Thank you.

Bruce and Marcie McCandliss
3611 44th St Ct NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: bnbjohnson1 [mailto:bnbjohnson1@mac.com]

Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 10:38 PM

To: Planning

Subject: 2008 Code Amendments

To whom it may concern,

Please leave the narrative words in HMR-SRD so that we can protect our historic neighborhoods. Urban density is a great thing, but the North Slope Historic District is already one of the highest density neighborhoods in Tacoma. Parking is already very difficult because of the lack of off-street parking, and the proposed update will make things worse.

Thank you,

Bryan & Betsy Johnson
1001 North 9th Street

"Lorraine, you are my density!" - Marty McFly

From: Chad Johnson [mailto:Chad_Johnson@sumner.wednet.edu]
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 12:12 PM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 Code Amendments

To Whom It May Concern:

I just wanted to let our families position be know (we live at 724 North J St). We would like to keep single family neighborhoods from becoming multifamily neighborhoods. Accessory dwelling units would be damaging to any historic neighborhood. So in conclusion, please leave the narrative words in HMR-SRD. Thank you for your time.

Chad & Kate Johnson
(253) 756-9633

-----Original Message-----

From: kcjohnson@nventure.com [mailto:kcjohnson@nventure.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2008 8:47 PM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 Code Amendments

Planning Commission & City Council Members,

It has recently come to my attention that you, as a group, are planning to change the residential zoning category of the North Slope Historic District. Since tomorrow is the first day of school, I will be unable to attend the meeting with other North Slope residents who do not want a change in zoning.

The North Slope has worked long and hard with the city to develop appropriate zoning to protect the historic nature of our district. These codes are new and do not need amending at this time. We already have high density in our neighborhood, and increasing that density will mean a loss of historic homes and increased pressure on street parking. Therefore, it is important to keep the zoning as HMR-SRD with the narrative commentaries.

Thank you,

Kate Johnson
NSHD resident

From: rajohnson [mailto:rockyrajpb@wamail.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 11:50 AM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 Amendment

Commissioners,

As the Chairman of the Landmarks Preservation Commission I am voicing my

personal opinion that the proposed changes to the HMR-SRD zoning would put the entire district in jeopardy and discourage other areas within the city from seeking historic status.

Historic districts are widely considered to be very desirable places to live and they contribute to Tacoma's entire civic conscious. Pride in ownership and pride in the city are the underpinnings in livability: to put these in harms way is to threaten the city.

Thank You,

Roger Johnson

From: Bill Johnston [mailto:wfjohnston@wamail.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 8:43 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Zoning Hearing and Proposal - 2008 Amendment

"Amendment" - sounds as if our Historic District Zoning and the years of effort we put into it to protect the quality of life in our neighborhood will simply disappear.

What screw ball planning wonk came up with this - has to be someone on the take from developers!

Bill Johnston
705 North J
Tacoma 98403

From: Kelli Johnston [mailto:kelli@zakster.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2008 4:32 PM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 Code Amendments

I am writing to express my concern about and opposition to the proposed "updates" to the residential zoning categories for the city. The HMR-SRD zoning category was designed to protect and preserve residential historic districts. The proposed changes regarding accessory dwellings would effectively make our historic neighborhood a more densely populated neighborhood than it already is and go against the intent of our historic status. Our neighborhood already has it's share of multi-family dwellings and the Planning Commission should work to ensure the protection of the historic district of this city.

I urge you to leave the narrative words in the HMR-SRD. It works well and protects our neighborhood.

Thank you

Kelli Johnston
1020 North J
Tacoma WA 98403

From: Huffman, Peter
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 2:15 PM
To: Kammerzell, Jennifer
Cc: Wung, Lihuang; Barnett, Elliott; Brown, Dana; Stenger, Donna
Subject: RE: Complete Streets Police in Transportation Element

Wung and Donna, please accept this as formal testimony from PW regarding the annual amendment. Maybe the policy should be revised to reflect the appropriateness and financial feasibility of project. Add to the testimony hopper. Thanks.

From: Kammerzell, Jennifer
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 11:05 AM
To: Huffman, Peter
Cc: Wung, Lihuang; Barnett, Elliott; Brown, Dana
Subject: Complete Streets Police in Transportation Element

Peter,
In light of the Green Ribbon Climate Action Task Force and discussions with the Environment and Public Works Committee, we feel that this would be an appropriate time to include a policy related to the support of Complete Streets in the Transportation Element. A Complete Streets policy will support future updates to the Design Manual and engineering standards.

In general, we support the below policy as drafted by CEDD. We do want to ensure that the policy recognizes that the concept of Complete Streets may not be appropriate or financially feasible for all transportation projects.

Jennifer Kammerzell
Associate Engineer
253.591.5511

From: Barnett, Elliott
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 11:56 AM
To: Parvey, James; Kammerzell, Jennifer
Cc: Huffman, Peter
Subject: complete streets policy

Jim and Jennifer,

Based on discussions from the Environment and Public Works Committee, Public Works may wish to provide a comment on this year's annual amendments to the Comprehensive Plan related to complete streets. We'd discussed the option of inserting a complete streets policy into the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan (there currently isn't one). Below is suggested draft language for such a policy. If you wish to proceed on this path, please provide us with an official Public Works comment to that effect.

DRAFT POLICY:

The Complete Streets guiding principle is to design, operate and maintain streets to enable safe and convenient access and travel for all users -- pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and people of all ages and abilities, as well as freight and motor vehicle drivers -- and to foster a sense of place in the public realm. The City shall use this guiding principle to appropriately accommodate all users, moving by car, truck, transit, bicycle, wheelchair, or foot to move along and across streets. The guiding principle shall be used, where appropriate, in the planning and design for new construction, reconstruction and major transportation improvement projects. Major transportation improvement projects include but are not limited to street and sidewalk construction; street and sidewalk lighting; street trees and landscaping; street amenities; drainage, pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements; access improvements for freight; access improvements, including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act; and public transit facilities accommodation including, but not limited to, pedestrian access improvement to transit stops and stations.

The City shall use the Complete Streets guiding principle to evaluate potential transportation projects, and to amend and revise design manuals, regulations, standards and programs as appropriate to create over time an integrated and connected network of complete streets that meets user needs while recognizing the function and context of each street.

From: Jim or Renee Lyons [mailto:reneeandjimlyons@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 9:04 PM

To: phuffman@cityoftacoma.org; bboudet@cityoftacoma.org; Planning; dstenger@cityoftacoma.org

Cc: Jake Fey; Bill Baarsma; Julie Anderson; Mike Loneran; Weed, Marion

Subject: Comments on Proposed PRD Regulations

Planning Commission and Staff,

Although the recently proposed changes to the PRD regulations have been postponed until next year, I would like to provide comments on the staff justifications for those changes for your consideration.

The City of Tacoma staff provided the rationale for proposed changes to the current Planned Residential Development regulations in a Project Status Overview to the Planning Commission for its meeting of 7/16/08. In my opinion this rationale is weak in several areas.

1. In explaining why the regulations should be changed now the staff states, in part, “the existing regulations are no longer applicable to most areas inside the city limits. They apply to a suburban model of development that is inappropriate for the urban character of Tacoma today.” This statement is not applicable to Northeast Tacoma, which is a unique district, unlike the rest of the city. The City of Tacoma’s own website states Northeast Tacoma is “A low-density residential district” with an action strategy that emphasizes “the preservation of remaining open space”. The Comprehensive Plan also recognizes the unique character of this area. The citizens of Northeast Tacoma want this suburban character maintained.
2. If the proposed changes are applied to existing PRDs the effect would be to encourage redevelopment of these sites to higher density. These are Planned Residential Developments. The people who live there bought into that plan by purchasing homes. It is wrong to change the plan after so many have made a huge financial commitment they considered a lifetime commitment. The regulations that apply to existing, legacy PRDs should be grandfathered to the original plan.
3. The staff states that sites for large PRDs are no longer available within the city, and that rules are needed to encourage innovative infill of smaller lots to higher densities. If this is the case, a new section of the regulations should be written that applies directly to infill of small lots rather than trying to force small lot rules into the PRD section intended for large sites.
4. The existing regulations on common open space specify: “A minimum of one-third of the gross site area of the PRD District shall be provided as common open space.” The staff recommends converting to a per unit requirement depending on zoning designation. For example, districts zoned R-2 PRD would require 400 square feet of open space per unit. Since existing regulations for this R-2 PRD zone specify 5000 square feet of gross site area per dwelling unit, this calculates to 400/5000 or 8% common open space. Further, the staff proposes density bonuses for amenities of up to 150%, which would reduce the common open space to 5.3%. The only justifications provided for this change from 33% to 5.3% are examples of open space regulations from Pierce County, Seattle, and Federal Way that apply to small lots or “cottage housing”. This level of justification is insufficient. This type of major change should have substantial and compelling justification, much more than a simple comparison to small lot regulations in other jurisdictions.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Lyons

4230 40th Ave NE

Tacoma, WA 98422

From: Perry and Sandra MacDonald [mailto:aspmacdonald@msn.com]

Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 1:30 AM

To: jward@cityoftacoma.org; bbaarsma@cityoftacoma.org; jfey@cityoftacoma.org;
dstenger@cityoftacoma.org; dstenger@cityoftacoma.org

Subject: public comment re: proposed PRD changes

Dear Mayor Baarsma, Councilman Fey and Jennifer Ward, I am shocked that the City would contemplate making changes to the PRD that would impact NE Tacoma residents.

I realize people make mistakes, but there have been enough mistakes impacting NE Tacoma! A misfiled appeal, not notifying NE Tacoma residents that developers had been talking to the City about the 'biggest proposed planned residential development ... just to name a few of the errors.

Someone needs to be assigned to closely coordinate every piece of development/zoning change that could impact NE Tacoma.

We want to work together. Yet, it is imperative that a closer eye be taken in affairs that impact NE Tacoma and the proposed golf course development.

School just started last week.....Did you know that Meeker Middle School has 773 students!! You should see the halls. Most of my daughter's classes have 28 students in them. There are only 56 spots for Highly Capable children, but the principal has had 150 requests for students to be in the HC program. Moreover, the halls are so jammed that my physically disabled daughter has to leave her classes 3-5 minutes early to avoid getting knocked over in the halls. Then there are the elementary schools.....Tacoma started free full-day kindergarten.....so, any excess that the City thought there might be in NE Tacoma schools is totally nonexistent. Also, how do you mitigate for years of busing? Or the future need to add crosswalks??

We have a problem with making changes to the PRD.....Two Januarys ago, I canvassed my neighborhood to get sufficient signatures to get a moratorium on PRDs. Yet, the builder still 'slipped' in his application at the ninth hour. I have felt that the City realized all of its previous errors, and in good faith I trusted that we had a new start with the City and that we would be consulted (or as a minimum, notified directly of any proposed PRD changes.) It is appalling that the City didn't notify NE Tacoma about the impending proposed PRD changes.

What is the rationale for changing common open space from 33% to less than 8%?!!

We appreciate Donna Stenger's letter of apology; however, an apology isn't good enough. We need someone who can truly watch out for our community. We have been repeatedly told that there isn't room in NE Tacoma for a high school. (As I understand it, enrollment at Stadium hit 2,000!!!) Imagine all those NE Tacoma students bussed across the busy tide flats sharing the same roads that the expanding Port of Tacoma is also using. How is the City or schools going to "mitigate" for the potential lost lives if (or should I say when....because it is just a matter of time) before a serious bussing accident (or a new driver driving to stadium collides with another vehicle) coming out of NE Tacoma to the 'other side' of Tacoma. It truly is time that the 'other side' of Tacoma pay closer attention to NE Tacoma residents.

I am sorry.....normally I am more respectful ... especially to people in office; however, I am very frustrated about this oversight and that lack of planning.

So, you added your error, and a city employee wrote a letter of apology... AFTER NE Tacoma alerted you. What if we didn't hear about the changes?

There is a limited amount of land in NE Tacoma.....we are unique from the rest of Tacoma, and we pay lots of taxes. We are hard working individuals who chose to live in NE Tacoma because it feels like the suburbs (and it is remote from the rest of Tacoma). You can't fix an error of overdevelopment here....so, please do not make any more errors or oversights.

Lastly, I attempted to make comments through the City's website (www.cityoftacoma.org) as well as the website that Ms. Stenger referenced in her letter (www.cityofdestiny.com); however, (maybe it is just my server connection; however, I deleted my 'cookies' and 'temporary internet files'), but I repeatedly got the following error:

Server Error in '/' Application.

Cannot open database requested in login 'COT_db_gate2k01'. Login fails. Login failed for user 'COT_DB_user'.

Description: An unhandled exception occurred during the execution of the current web request. Please review the stack trace for more information about the error and where it originated in the code.

Exception Details: System.Data.SqlClient.SqlException: Cannot open database requested in login 'COT_db_gate2k01'. Login fails. Login failed for user 'COT_DB_user'.

Source Error:

An unhandled exception was generated during the execution of the current web request. Information regarding the origin and location of the exception can be identified using the exception stack trace below.

So, is this simply 'another error' or an intention to limit public comments?

Sincerely,

Sandra MacDonald
3302 49th St NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: Charles Mann [mailto:charlesmann2@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 12:04 PM
To: Planning
Cc: julie.anderson@cityoftacoma.org; bill.baarsma@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: Residential Code Amendments

Re: Opposition to expansion of Attached & Detached Dwelling Units
As you are likely aware, the Tacoma Neighborhood & Housing Committee is currently updating the residential zoning code in which the city is reviewing, modifying or expanding the permissible construction of attached and/or detached

dwelling units by houses.

I oppose any expansion of the permissible attached or detached dwelling unit for the following reasons:

First, the city council has already designated 14 mixed use centers as well as an expanded downtown for future growth.

While I believe American cities need to build vertically to reduce their profile (expansion), exploit mass transit along lines-of-communication and integrate clean manufacturing/service industries & residential, expansion of ADU criteria would not achieve the same objective.

Second, increasing the allowable size, number or height of ADUs essentially converts single family residential to duplex, multi-family zoning. I believe this contradicts the council's unanimous passage of Resolution 37070 on December 19, 2006, enacting a guiding principle to "protect neighborhoods" when the larger designation of downtown was passed.

Third, expanding accessory dwelling units would change the character of much of the North End from a primarily owner-occupied neighborhood to an absentee-owner, especially around the University of Puget Sound.

In summary, I believe the current building code is adequate and expanding the permissible ADU that could be built would be detrimental.

Sincerely,

Charles Mann

4519 N 29th Street, Tacoma, Washington 98407

253.759.4823

From: NorthwestMusher@aol.com [mailto:NorthwestMusher@aol.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 12:09 PM

To: Planning

Subject: 2008 Amendment

To the City of Tacoma Planning Commission

Mr Thomas M. Smith, Chair

We are writing to you for the purposes of outlining our objections to proposed changes to the 2008 Residential Code Amendment.

As regards the proposed density changes to the NSHD, we categorically opposed the city's proposed changes regarding accessory dwelling structures in the NSHD. Our objections are outlined as follows:

- It could pave the way for the elimination of single family neighborhoods citywide
- Create an enforcement nightmare for the DADU
- The proposed revisions would create loss of open space, yards, and trees
- HMR-SRD category would be gutted
- Backyard construction in the historic districts would downgrade historic properties

The proposed changes to our city code are outrageous. They have no rightful place no in our historic community and are misguided as are those individuals who drafted this proposal.

Shame on the authors of this proposal for creating a vehicle to downgrade the fine quality of our unique neighborhood that we have struggled for years to preserve and protect, not only for our families and current community residents but for the benefit of untold generations to come!

This proposal is a travesty to our neighborhood and we will steadfastly oppose it.

Von & Judith Martin

Homeowner Residents - Tacoma North Slope Historic District

From: Milne, Kenneth (GE Healthcare) [mailto:Kenneth.Milne@ge.com]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 7:42 AM
To: Planning
Cc: Milne, Kenneth (GE Healthcare)
Subject: Browns Point Boulevard

Planning Committee,

I am writing to confirm some opinions about this proposed project that the Methodist Church is proposing in the Browns Point area.

1. I feel that single family housing is where this area should be and continue to be now and into the future. Mixing density levels in this view area just does not make since and there is a real possibility that mixed use will devalue our property.

2. From past experience with the Methodist Church, I feel that they have not been very neighborly in dealing with their surrounding border owners. They do not consult with us at all, on this or other ideas that they have had including planting a tree fence of Douglas firs on part of their parking lot, which are now impacting our views in a view sensitive area.

3. Your invitation to a hearing was the first time we had heard about their idea of the future. If they wanted our input, you would think they would have had a community meeting first, before this initiative went to the planning committee.

Conclusion- I am not for adding 120 rooms in a dormitory style manor housing complex for older citizens in the middle of single family dwellings. I know that the strip of row houses were put in a few years ago, but again, that project is now a detraction from the general area of single family housing. The same will be said about this project if completed. What were they thinking? I would rather have single family housing on that hill side that would capture the essence of the Browns Point experience.

Ken Milne
Property owner adjacent to the east of the Methodist Church.

From: Greg Murdock [mailto:GMurdock@cdcseattle.com]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 8:53 AM
To: Planning
Cc: Lauren.Walker@cityoftacoma.org; Spiro.Manthou@cityoftacoma.org; Mike.Lonergan@cityoftacoma.org; Connie.Ladenburg@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Marilyn.Strickland@cityoftacoma.org; Julie.Anderson@cityoftacoma.org; Bill.Baarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Rick.Talbert@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: Proposed PRD revisions

City of Tacoma officials,

We are being informed by our Save NE Tacoma group that the planning department and city council were intending to act upon changes to the recent PRD amendments regarding open space. Furthermore, this was being moved through the council with improper or delinquent notification efforts. If true, this is an intentional slap in the face to your NE citizens after all of our involvement and effort to get the PRD amendments revised. It has also been alleged that once questioned and exposed the effort has been removed from the city council near term plans.

Is all of this true? We fully expect to be advised and need to hear a response from the planning department and city council regarding this situation. The NS golf course development, and the front end compliance by the city is well known. Your back end switch to stop the effort apparently based solely on pressure from constituents was transparent to us all. And now we find out, there was a plan in place to go back to the ridiculously specified PRD language in a back door fashion. This certainly is going to taint NE Tacoma relations with city that were improving with recent joint efforts to defend the NS development.

Is your desire for development and associated taxes so all consuming that you cannot discern what is best for the city in the long term? As it turned out, market forces saved our open space, and SB Homes will not be able to execute the application submitted. Open space is a valuable part of quality urban planning and this real estate mess should be seen as an opportunity to acquire more and protect what we have. I read that many cities across the country are acquiring land because the market has finally dropped back to an affordable level.

It cannot be easy to see the revenue short falls coming in the door. But other ways of balancing costs are needed short of going back to the pro development heavy density zoning of previous days. There is not going to be a market for this type of housing product for a long, long time, so we better head an alternate direction in our planning efforts.

We look forward to and expect an explanation of apparent recent efforts to revise PRD regulations.

Sincerely,

Greg and Mary Anne Murdock
3617 44th St Ct NE

From: Mike Ness [mailto:legendssports@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2008 10:28 AM
To: Planning; jfey@cityoftacoma.org; bbaarsma@cityoftacoma.org
Cc: newstips@thenewstribune.com; DMRadford@Harbornet.com
Subject: NE Tacoma - Proposed Changes to PRD
Importance: High

To whom it may concern,

Here we go again! Another “oops, we forgot to notify you” letter from the Planning Commission. How can anyone trust the P.C. or the Tacoma City Council/Mayor when there is ANOTHER oversight on such a critical issue to the good citizens of NE Tacoma.

It is just another slap in our collective faces that code changes so critical to our way of lives are being “slipped” though.

The citizens of NE Tacoma were not notified in writing as is required by law.

2. The changes affect sections of the code: 13.04.240 (C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140.

These codes were the very ones we worked so hard a year ago to change with our City Leaders and Department Heads.

The proposed changes: The impact is how they calculate open space in a Planned Residential Development :

They want to change the percentage of open space in a

PRD from 33% to 4%!

It is borderline on the old days of carpet bagging! How in the world can anyone fathom that 4-8% open space in a neighborhood is acceptable? Would you want that for your neighborhood. NE Tacoma is a very unique area to the city. It is a suburban neighborhood!! The PRD that will be affected by these proposals (North Shore G.C.) will have nothing but a negative affect on the whole community.

The proposed change to the PRD regulations on common open space leaves the North Shore Golf course vulnerable to re-development. This is not fair to the property owners in this PRD that purchased their homes because it is a golf course community. Any change to reduce the open space requirement will open the golf course to high density housing, small lot development, or other undesirable housing. These property owners should expect the city to protect their rights and not look at property tax dollars that this negative housing will provide. Additional Public Services that will be required will more than offset any gains in tax dollars!

NE Tacoma has NO developed city parks sports fields for our kids to play on (we are at the mercy of the School District for field use).

If anything, the golf course could be converted to a park. At least that would allow those property owners to have the open space they were promised decades ago! Convert the club house to a senior center. Convert the driving range to lighted baseball/soccer fields for the neighborhood. Use the golf course greens as nice picnic areas and the cart path would make an excellent track for schools to run cross country and a great path for strolling on a warm summer night. And make this park available to ALL Tacoma citizens. There are numerous open space areas in the rest OUR city "across the bay" Why not here in NE Tacoma? I will answer why not....\$\$\$\$!!

Overcrowded Schools! Overcrowded streets! The roads in this area are marginal at best with the number of homes already here. Add the additional traffic and "Pothole City" will have more expenses to deal with! Adding an additional 600 to 900 homes will do nothing but destroy the last open space left in NE Tacoma. We strongly urge the Planning Commission & the City Council and Mayor to step up and do the right thing and reject these changes for what they are. **LANDGRABBING BY DEVELOPERS!**

Regards,
Mike & Dee Dee Ness
NE Tacoma residents

From: Ken Peachey [mailto:ken.peachey@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2008 7:43 PM
To: mharris@cityoftacoma.org; elliot.barnett@cityoftacoma.org; phuffman@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: OSHRP comment

Ms. Harris, Mr. Barnett, Mr. Huffman:

Please forgive this overkill; however, it was not clear to me from the website precisely how to submit my comment, so rather go short I played long. I hope I have made clear how much I appreciate the work you have done. Thank you.

My comment:

I applaud the work done by all parties who have contributed to the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Plan.

With all due respect, I believe the OSHRP suffers because it does not address two land use behaviors typical in Tacoma. In part I suspect these omissions stem from the somewhat restrictive definition of Open Space, pages OS-5-6, and the discussion on the Open Space System that follows, pages OS-6-8.

Quoting from the Introduction to the Plan, page OS-3

Create an integrated system of habitat and recreation lands and facilities in Tacoma that defines and enhances the built and natural environment, supports and nurtures plant and wildlife habitat, offers a well-balanced range of recreation opportunities and enriches the lives of Tacoma's current and future citizens.

The Plan is restrictive because its definition of open space fails to be integrate within its scope certain public lands and fails to consider the interactive relationship these omitted lands have with those considered. In essence, the Plan defines its way around some challenges such a plan could, and I believe should, consider.

The Plan might question

- Mown grass as a tenable ground cover on any lands owned or maintained by publicly held organizations. Not only does mown grass require periodic fertilization and chemical weed controls of suspect value to their ultimate destination, Puget Sound, mown grasses must be mown once a week and so they have a high carbon footprint. They also must be irrigated.

This is not to imply that mown grass is never suitable as ground cover. Obviously it is hard to beat on playfields. However, alternatives exist that offer smaller carbon and chemical footprints for areas such as the lawn of the Metropolitan Parks of Tacoma. Some of these actually draw carbon; some build soil nitrogen rather than deplete it, thus improving soil health; they provide cover for much beneficial insect life; and they each do all this without increasing cover for humans of questionable motive. Water requirements are diminished too.

Five examples:

Kinnikinnick (*Arctostaphylos uva-ursi*)
creeping thymes
creeping Oregon grape (*Mahonia repens*)
periwinkle (*Vinca minor*)

clovers

There are more but a long list might confuse the issue.

Depending upon preferences when designing and installing new landscapes, man hours required for maintenance can remain the same, become more or decrease.

Secondly, the Plan might also

- Advocate residential landscape and maintenance practices that appreciate the values of the OSHRP vision.

Of course this does not imply that the OSHRP should over-expand its scope. However, a carefully crafted recommendation that reconsiders commonly held, culturally shared practices inside the boundaries of each residential habitat might inspire a healthier Tacoma and help decrease the City of Destiny's carbon footprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Peachey
1830 North Skyline Drive
253-389-8765

From: Scott Phillips [mailto:fastlanephillips@comcast.net]

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 10:11 AM

To: Bruce and Marcie; Planning; Lauren.Walker@cityoftacoma.org; Spiro.Manthou@cityoftacoma.org; Mike.Lonergan@cityoftacoma.org; Connie.Ladenburg@cityoftacoma.org; Jake.Fey@cityoftacoma.org; Marilyn.Strickland@cityoftacoma.org; Julie.Anderson@cityoftacoma.org; Bill.Baarsma@cityoftacoma.org; Rick.Talbert@cityoftacoma.org

Subject: Re: Proposed Changes to the PRD

Tacoma Public Officials:
September 9, 2008

Subject: Revisions to the PRD Code

I reside in Northeast Tacoma. For the last 20 months I have supported and been involved with the building moratorium, clarification and maintenance of the existing associated PRD's for our community. The building moratorium and PRD clarification is supported by many community neighbors and members of the Council and Planning Department.

I was disappointed to recently learn the elected officials on the City Council and various departments within Tacoma City Government attempted to pass regulations affecting its citizens without proper notification. It would appear City of Tacoma officials and staff did not want to communicate the proposed changes to the community, which if passed, would change and negate the PRD wording that was put in place within the last year. Members of NE Tacoma have been contacting the Land Use Department at least twice a month for over a year. The same question was asked: "Are there any updates or changes being considered that would affect NE Tacoma." The answers have been, basically, there are meetings regarding mitigation that can't be publicly discussed and "NO, there is nothing taking place that would affect NE Tacoma."

It appears, based on what we have learned, just as in the original application for the Northshore Golf Course development, the Citizens of NE Tacoma were not communicated with while discussions were held and proposals were made to reduce open space requirements, reduce set backs, reduce lot size, etc. I am disappointed and upset to find this type of behavior occurring within the Tacoma City Government of elected officials. We did not receive a call or any notification from our elected representative, nor a word from any questioned departmental personnel when asked, regarding any proposed changes to the PRD that might affect NE Tacoma. My understanding is that many City Government Officials and Departments have known about the proposed changes since the spring of 2008.

Unfortunately, the characteristics that come to mind when observing this type of behavior are unethical behavior for public officials and not being good public servants and stewards of the constituents that elected you to office. Many of the Citizens of NE Tacoma have been on a communication list for over a year, requesting written notification of any and all information regarding these issues. No written communication was provided regarding these latest proposals, and that is unacceptable.

I understand that since the information regarding the recent PRD proposals was discovered and questions were raised regarding notification requirements, the proposals were removed from upcoming City Council agendas for a period of time. In addition, we have been assured that when citizens ask about issues which may affect their community, they will be advised of any proposals in work and advance written notification would be provided to those on the communication list in order to solicit input from interested citizens.

I believe the specific code changes proposed involving open space, reduced lot size and reduced setbacks are covered by the following sections of the PRD code: 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140. I am requesting notification via e-mail if there are any proposals being considered that would change PRD code affecting residents of NE Tacoma. The Citizens involved with Save NE Tacoma are actively following these issues and wish to be communicated with if there are any proposed changes that might take place.

I am truly disappointed to think we can not trust those elected to represent us. The behavior of elected officials is in the limelight and negative behavior to the community can be reflected in the upcoming November elections. If I am mistaken about the Council Members or Departmental Personnel being aware of these proposed changes I would appreciate hearing from them. Please file this correspondence appropriately for public record review and comment.

Scott and Kathy Phillips
3320 49th St NE
Tacoma Wa, 98422

From: Jacobs, Charleen
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2008 3:11 PM
To: Barnett, Elliott
Subject: New Open Space Plan

Dear Elliott:

Please find a response from Tacoma Power below regarding the new open space plan. This is the only comment that I have received to forward to you. We regret missing the September 12 due date and any inconvenience our delay may have caused. We hope you are still able to use this information. Sincerely, Charleen

Charleen Jacobs
Tacoma Power Superintendent's Office
253.502.8205

From: Porter, Hal
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 9:32 AM
To: Collins, Robert
Cc: Ross, Tim
Subject: RE: New Open Space Plan

Rob:

The city of Tacoma will be updating a number of older City ordinances. Some of these include the Urban Forestry Department, permits and enforcement procedures for tree and vegetation management. Tacoma Power is currently working with the City Forester to implement Utility Friendly trees in the Right Tree/ Right Place concepts. The processes and procedures established in these new ordinances are said, will be the ones used in the development of open spaces and Green-Scapes.

The Updates to the open spaces will not change the permit notification process where Tacoma Power has notice of permitted developments of activities in Utility ROW areas.

It is recommended that Tacoma Power forward to Elliot Barnett for inclusion in the Draft Proposal:

1. Request continued notices to Tacoma Power of changes along Utility Rights of Ways of all permitted or unpermitted developments and open spaces.
2. Allow comment to determine the safety or specific needs of the Utility for each stated purpose of open space usage.
3. Prevue the selection of vegetation material to be used in Tacoma Power R.O.W's for comment.
4. Identify Utility overhead power lines as infrastructure of an area to be used.

Also FYI:

**OS-GI-2 Tree Planting and
Maintenance**

Engage in, encourage and work with partners to preserve existing large trees and to plant and maintain native and climate-adapted trees and plants city-wide, prioritizing street and freeway rights-of-way and including utility rights-of-way, parks, school sites, and other public property. Develop an incentive and/or outreach program to encourage voluntary plantings on private property.

Hal Porter

T & D Arborist

Certified Arborist / Utility Specialist

Tacoma Power

253-381-7744

hporter@ci.tacoma.wa.

From: Pierce, Ramie

Sent: Monday, August 25, 2008 2:41 PM

To: Barnett, Elliott

Subject: Comment on OSHRP

I think it would be wise to create or include a stance on the harvesting of specialized (or secondary) forest products (SFP) from Open Space land- including, but not limited to the harvest of: mosses, salal, huckleberry plants and berries, sword fern fronds, mushrooms, brush from Doug Fir or Western Red Cedar...etc.

In my humble opinion, I think all commercial harvesting of SFP should be forbidden, since it does not seem to support the intent behind having and managing Open Space for the public benefit. I think "personal use" (to be defined later during the code aspect) should be allowed within reason, of course. I did the research, and there is no state law requiring local municipalities or individuals to allow the harvest of SFP (just like there isn't a law requiring individuals to allow timber harvesting on their land). We could go the route of allowing some commercial harvesting...but then other details need to be answered...such as who would administer the permits, how much would they cost, how much is allowed to be harvested, how many permits would be granted per year, who would enforce, etc. Even with the personal use, I think if the definition of that expanded beyond enjoying a berry or two while out hiking/walking, then written permission or a limiting quantity should be discussed and articulated.

Overharvesting of SFP can and has created vast ecological damage on both State and Federal lands. I think we would be remiss if we didn't address and protect this element of our resource.

I hope that makes sense, please feel free to contact me for more info!

Ramie Pierce
Urban Forester
ISA Certified Arborist
PN-6334A
253.591.2048 voice
253.591.5533 fax

NEW Urban Forestry Website!

<http://www.cityoftacoma.org/Page.aspx?hid=9219>

From: Radford, David [mailto:david.radford@diebold.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2008 9:26 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comprehensive Plan

I feel your commissions plans to change the City of Tacoma's Comprehensive Plan to allow density changes of a PRD, zoned R-2-PRD to a sliding scale based on the number of dwellings and not stating as one-third of the gross site area of a PRD District are a huge mistake. Your recommendations to the city council will only set them up for lawsuits due to previous interpretations as well as the secession of NE Tacoma from the City of Tacoma. I am a very active member of the Save NE Tacoma Coalition and we are 500 Citizens strong. We are watching what is happening in City Hall and not happy!

We ask that you keep the City Comprehensive Plan as it stands and NOT SCREW US. I read the paper yesterday. The Tacoma News Tribune stated the city is dramatically short of taxes- A \$ 7.2Million shortfall - rezoning of a plot of land to allow for slums will NOT be allowed.

The City Council Members will be receiving this same email. Just because we have not stormed City Council Meetings or Planning Commission Meetings do not think we will do it again. See you soon!

We ask that you take into account a citizens concern and not a builders lobbying.

Regards,

Dave Radford | SaveNETacoma Coalition
www.SaveNETacoma.com
Tuscany Neighborhood
Phone: 253.943.1164

From: Radford, David [mailto:david.radford@diebold.com]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 11:56 AM
To: Huffman, Peter; bboudet@cityoftacoma.org
Cc: Stenger, Donna
Subject: RE: Meeting with Save NE Coalition regarding changes to PRD in the comprehensive plan

[Mr.. Huffman,](#)

Thank you for your response and the copy of Ms. Stenger's email. I would suspect you will still get comments as we have already kick-off an email campaign asking for our members to make comments on the proposed changes as well as make comments to city council members voicing our concern over the lack of notice and lack of involvement from citizens over something that impacts us greatly in NE Tacoma - that bus has left the station.....

Anyway - Friday would probably be the best day. Can we get on your calendar and I will work with our folks. I would suspect 5-6 of our team will attend. Could you confirm for me the correct location (floor, address, ect) for us to meet with you?

Thanks again,

Dave Radford | SaveNETacoma Coalition
www.SaveNETacoma.com
Tuscany Neighborhood
Phone: 253.943.1164

From: Huffman, Peter [mailto:phuffman@ci.tacoma.wa.us]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 10:57 AM
To: Radford, David; bboudet@cityoftacoma.org
Cc: Stenger, Donna
Subject: RE: Meeting with Save NE Coalition regarding changes to PRD in the comprehensive plan

Mr. Radford we'd be more than happy to meet with you to discuss this topic. Some times next week that work are Wed. 9/10 10:30-11:30 am or Friday 9/12 9:30-10:30am. Let me which works for you.

In regards to having the removal of the proposed PRD revisions from the Comp Plan explained in writing, please see the attached e-mail sent by my senior planning Donna Stenger to a concerned citizen.

From: Stenger, Donna
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 10:35 AM
To: 'theostrich@comcast.net'
Cc: Huffman, Peter; Boudet, Brian; Frantz, Shanta; Wung, Lihuang
Subject: Revisions to PRD regulations
Nancy,

Thank you for bringing to our attention your concerns about the proposed revisions to the PRD regulations and public notification. Based upon your comments and after a review of our records, it is clear that you and others should have been identified as "interested parties" and therefore provided notice of the proposed changes. This was an oversight on our part and we apologize. In light of this error, we will remove from further consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council any proposed revisions to the Land Use Regulatory Code that would change existing regulations pertaining to PRDs as part of the 2008 amendment package. These changes affect the following sections of the code: 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140.

The proposed PRD revisions will be considered through a separate public review process with notification to all known interested parties. The schedule for this review will be determined at a later date but likely will not occur until 2009. We will notify you when a review schedule is developed and when the Planning Commission discusses any revisions to the PRD regulations. It is our intent to inform the Planning Commission concerning the above actions at their next meeting which will occur on September 17, 2008.

In the meantime, you and your neighbors may submit comments about the current draft regulations with

the understanding that these comments will not be addressed during the 2008 amendment review but will be provided to the Planning Commission for their consideration when a new schedule for PRD review is developed.

Thank you for your understanding. Your willingness and desire to work with City staff on re-evaluating the proposed revisions is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donna Stenger

Community and Economic Development Department
747 Market Street Rm. 1036
Tacoma WA 98402
253.591.5210
253.591.2002 (fax)
www.cityofdestiny.com

From: Radford, David [mailto:david.radford@diebold.com]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2008 10:26 AM
To: phuffman@cityoftacoma.org; bboudet@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: Meeting with Save NE Coalition regarding changes to PRD in the comprehensive plan

Mr. Huffman and Mr. Boudet,

I left you both voicemails and wanted to follow up via email. I am the PR chair for the SaveNETacoma Coalition. I understand there was a meeting last night regarding the proposed changes to the City Comprehensive Plan and the impact to PRDs. We had representation at the meeting and had been told by your department that these changes would NOT impact our area - our representative found out that in-fact that is not the cause. As your well aware these changes have a direct impact to our fight to save the North Shore Golf Course and over development of NE Tacoma. I would like to understand why we were not notified as required by law. I would also ask that the PRD changes be removed from these recommendations due to the cities lack of public notice. I believe this has now become an legal issue.

We would also like to schedule a meeting with yourself, our core team and our attorney for a day next week - before the end of public comment. We will be asking for something in writing that states these will be removed from the recommended changes because of this lack of proper public notification as well as some form of confirmation that our coalition will be involved in any discusses that impact PRD or the NE Tacoma area going forward.

Looking forward to your response,

Kind Regards,

Dave Radford | SaveNETacoma Coalition
www.SaveNETacoma.com
Tuscany Neighborhood
Phone: 253.943.1164

From: Jennifer Reed [mailto:jenn.reed@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2008 10:22 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code

Mayor Baarsma, Councilman Fey, Planning Department Personnel,

My husband and I reside in North East Tacoma and for 20 months have been involved with the Moratorium, changing of the PRD's, which many, including members of the Council and Planning Department said were overdue. We are very disappointed to again find, it appears, the elected officials of the City of Tacoma and various departments attempting to pass regulations affecting it's citizens without proper notification. It would appear City of Tacoma Officials and Staff were being sneaky since the regulations were just changed and less than a year later we find out proposals are in place negating every thing done less than a year ago. Members of NE Tacoma have been contacting the Land Use Department at minimum twice a month for over a year. The same questions are asked, is there any update or changes being considered that would affect NE Tacoma. The answers have been, basically, there are meetings regarding mitigation that can't be discussed and NO, there is nothing taking place that would affect NE Tacoma. It appears now based on what we have learned that again, just as in the original application for the Northshore Golf Course development, the Citizens of NET have been kept in the dark while discussions were held and proposals were being made to reduce open space requirements, reduce set backs, reduce lot size, etc. We are disappointed and personally very upset to find this occurring. Not a call or a note from our elected representative, not a word from departmental personnel when asked, and they have known about this we understand it since the spring. Words that come to mind are shady, sneaky, betrayed, unethical.

Many of the Citizens of NE Tacoma have been on a list, for over a year, requesting notification of any and all information regarding these issues in writing. No written or even verbal notification was provided regarding these proposals. We understand that since someone did find out about these proposals and did raise specific questions regarding notification requirements the proposals are being taken off the revision to PRD regulations for a period of time. In addition, we have been assured in the future when Citizens ask about these issues they will be advised and written notification would be provided sufficiently in advance, to those who have requested, of any formal discussion in order for interested Citizens to participate.

Our understanding is the specific code changes proposed involving open space, reduced lot size, reduce setbacks are covered by these sections of the code. These are the changes we understand that are now tabled until proper notification can be provided to those affected. Sections of the code: 13.04.240(C), 13.06.100B (9), and 13.06.140. We are requesting notification via e-mail if there are any other proposals being considered that would change PRD code affecting residents of NE Tacoma.

The Citizens involved with Save N. E. Tacoma are still here and still actively following these issues. We are truly disappointed to again find, or it would appear, we can not trust those elected to represent us.

If we are mistaken about the Council Members or Departmental Personnel being aware of these proposed changes I would appreciate hearing from them.

Sincerely,

Jonathen & Jennifer Reed
3521 46th Street NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: NStag@aol.com [mailto:NStag@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 10:09 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code

Dear Planning Commission Members:

As an NE Tacoma resident and property owner in a Planned Residential Development (PRD), I was disappointed to learn of significant proposed changes to the Planned Residential Development regulation by happenstance, rather than directly from the City of Tacoma as required by law.

The PRD proposal may result in a reduction of a common open space requirement in NE Tacoma from 33% to 4%, which serves no decent, useful purpose. How can such a large proposed reduction in common open space be determined to not have a significant or probably significant adverse impact on the environment as indicated on your website? Wiping out virtually ALL of the open space in NE Tacoma should require a full Environmental Impact Statement at the very least.

Further, the proposed change to the PRD regulation leaves the North Shore Golf Course vulnerable to redevelopment. Property owners in this PRD purchased their homes because of the golf course, its deeded and sole dedicated use as a golf course, and the open space it represents. The property lots were designed based on the golf course's very existence and its offsetting open space. This proposed change will open the golf course to high density housing, small lot infill development, or other incompatible land uses that are outside the current, natural qualities that presently exist in NE Tacoma.

Additionally, this proposed open space reduction is in direct conflict with the established goals for the health, welfare, and quality of life of Tacoma residents through the Open Space Habitat and Recreation Plan (OSHRP) as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. We already have open space in NE Tacoma that supports the Plan's "green infrastructure" as shown in Tacoma's Open Space System. It makes no sense to diminish, change, or jeopardize it. Open space needs to exist in areas other than just along steep slopes around and along Commencement Bay to preserve our quality of life, welfare, recreation, health, etc.

In closing, if the goal is to truly achieve the outcomes identified in the Plan, then please leave our common open space in the NE Tacoma PRD alone! It is the RIGHT THING to do. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,
N. J. Stagliano
4162 Augusta Dr. NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: Carl Teitge [mailto:teitge@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2008 4:45 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Residential Zoning Code Update

Dear Planning Commission,

I like the concept of the potential for the 10% smaller lot size and lot width with the design requirements. I would like to see this applied equally City wide.

I have a concern with one of the design requirements. D. 5 Rooflines. The code says rooflines **shall** run perpendicular to the street. The examples in the material are in conflict with the code requirement. Some of the highest rooflines in the examples are horizontal to the street. I wonder if the stated reason for roofline orientation (to not shadow the neighboring lot) does not depend more on the house orientation to the sun than the street.

The open space requirement of 10 % contiguous area in the rear yard on a 25 foot lot will cause a problem. This combined with some porch and front door location requirement will drastically limit the building pad. The homes I have seen built by Tacoma Home Ownership may become economically difficult to justify because the house will be so small.

Carl D. Teitge

815 N. Stadium Way
Tacoma WA 98403
cell: 253-377-0492
fax: 253-572-5530

(Staff Note: There is an attachment to Mr. Tomberg's e-mail. It is the same document distributed by Mr. Marshall McClintock on 9-8-08, as compiled in the "Letters" portion.)

From: Ralph Tomberg [mailto:rtomberg@nventure.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2008 11:34 AM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 Annual Amendment

I believe that the North Slope Historic District would be severely and adversely effected if the changes proposed by the Residential Development Regulations in the 2008 Annual Amendment Package are adopted.

Before going in to detail, permit me to say that there is not much point in creating a historic district and a bureaucracy (Historic Preservation Officer and the Landmarks Preservation Commission) to ensure its preservation if, simultaneously, changes to the Land Use Regulatory Code are created that renders the original creation moot. I believe that the City created historic districts to preserve them, uniquely, as they were when created.

I believe every aspect of the 2008 Residential Code Change (with the possible exception of Multi-family Development Standards) degrades the intent current HMR-SRD zoning. A discussion and recommendation for each element of the Staff proposed changes follows.

--SMALL LOT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS; --TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (STANDARD SIZE LOTS); and --GENERAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (ALL RESIDENTIAL ZONES):

These provisions are all unneeded in the HMR-SRD zoning district. The MR-SRD zoning currently has it's own code established standards, designed to meet the Districts historic preservation requirements, and enforced by the City's Historic Preservation Officer and the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission. *HMR-SRD zoned districts should be exempt from the provisions of these sections.*

--ACCESSORY BUILDINGS:

The proposal to change accessory building height limits from 15' to 18' outright could significantly and adversely change the appearance of the North Slope Historic District. *Any accessory building height above 15' within HMR-SRD should continue to require a variance.*

--DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS:

Permitting Detached ADU's would effectively make all zoning districts multi-family. Accessory buildings with a height limit of 25 feet would be authorized without variance. Up to four people would be permitted to live in each unit. The unintended adverse consequences (parking problems, view restrictions to mention just two) of creating detached ADU's is immeasurable. *They must not*

be permitted outright anywhere in the city.

--PRD's:

The North Slope Historic District is, essentially, already a PDR. The only significant difference between the current District's zoning and what would result from the PDR process is that the North Slope Historic District was created by a group of citizens concerned with historic preservation not a developer. *HMR-SRD zoned districts should be exempt from the provisions of this section.*

-- CODE REFORMATTING:

1. Districts established/intent.

In the "Districts established" portion of the proposed changes, the Staff proposal modifies the original *intent portion* of current HMR-SRD zoning significantly degrading the original intent of HMR-SRD zoning. *I propose that the "intent" for the HMR-SRD zoning district be changed to reflect and reinforce the original intent.*

2. Conditional Uses.

Reformatting the residential zoning portion of the code could constitute an improvement in clarity *except* for the fact that it significantly changes the emphasis on what is different about each zoning district. Traditionally, only permitted uses were listed under each category in the R-1, R-2, R2-SRD and HMR-SRD categories. The Staff proposed changes this concept by listing not only permitted but non-permitted and conditional uses in their new *use tables* as well. This technique completely changes how one perceives *uses* within each category, diluting the distinction intended between zoning districts as described in the narrative description portion of the proposed code. *I would suggest that only permitted or non-permitted uses be listed in the use table, CU's could and should be listed as they currently are, in narrative "intent" portion of other portions of the code as they are now. Additionally, the Staff proposal adds certain conditional uses into the use tables that are not now permitted in HMR-SRD, these should be removed.*

--Building envelope standards:

In accordance with the above recommendations, *the building envelope standards tables should be modified to reflect no changes in the standards (heights, lot sizes, setbacks, etc.) currently set for districts zoned HMR-SRD and to remove Townhouse dwelling lot area (3000) from the HMR-SRD column.*

--16.05.020 Notice Process:

For all applications for conditional uses and variances within City designated historic districts add the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission to the list of entities to which notification is required. Under current procedures, the Landmarks Preservation Commission is not usually informed of variance or conditional use applications until after the ruling by the Land Use Administrator. The Commission should be in the process from the first so that the Land Use Administrator may be made aware of any restrictions that may ultimately be imposed on the applicant by the Commission during its final review of the application.

Ralph Tomberg
510 N. Sheridan Ave

From: bnbtunstall@comcast.net [mailto:bnbtunstall@comcast.net]
Sent: Mon 9/8/2008 3:22 PM
To: jward@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: proposed changes to PRD's

Planning Commission

I am upset that we were not notified here in Northeast Tacoma of the proposed change to the PRD regulations on common open space.

The proposed change to the PRD regulation on common open space leaves the North Shore Golf Course vulnerable to re-development. This is patently unfair. Property owners in this PRD (**myself included as I own a condo on the golf course -why I bought in the first place**) purchased their homes because it is a golf course community. This change will open the golf course to high density housing, small lot infill development, or other undersirable housing. **I would be looking at three story low income housing, a far cry from trees and the golf course view that I bought. Leave our neighborhood alone! WE ALREADY HAVE PIM ESTATES AND OTHER LOW To MID INCOME HOUSING-CHECK THE CRIME RATE THERE-WE DO NOT NEED ANY MORE DENSE LOW INCOME HOUSING IN NORTHEAST TACOMA!!!!**

Most of the proposed changes to the PRD regulations are based on comparisons with regulations in nearby jurisdictions for small-lot developments. The North Shore PRD is not a small lot development and small lot ideas do not work for this PRD.

A PRD is a Planned Residential Development. "Planned" means planned. Don't change the plan after people have purchased homes based on the original plan. **Again, I bought with the commitment of a golf course in perpetuity, no idea you could take it away from us.**

If the PRD regulations need to be updated, then make the changes apply only to new PRDs. If, as the city staff claims, there are no sites still available for large PRDs, then write regulations specific to the small sites that do remain. Distinguish between existing, legacy PRDS and new small-lot developments.

After citizens complained, the City has decided to delay considerations of changes to the PRD regulations. You should justly be criticized for not informing residents of PRDs about significant changes being considered for their neighborhoods. But you should also be commended for recognizing your error and taking appropriate corrective action.

The City staff justifies most of their proposed changes to PRD regulations by claiming Tacoma is no longer a suburban community and now has an urban character. But North East Tacoma is different from the rest of the city. We are still a suburban area and land use regulations should recognize that fact. **We are seperated vastly from the City of Tacoma in all aspects, I feel like a step child and an afterthought in all dealings with the city.**

What is the justification for reducing common open space from 33% to less tha 8%? This type of major change should have substantial and compelling justification, not simply a comparison to small lot regulations in other jurisdictions. This lower percentage would be even further reduced if roads and bonus density provisions are factored in. Do not shrink our common open space to almost

nothing!!.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth M. Tunstall
4714 Fairwood Blvd. NE Unit 1605
Tacoma, WA 98422

From: Susie Turner [mailto:sjturner@live.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 06, 2008 9:39 AM
To: Planning
Subject: 2008 Amendment

Don't change our HMR-SRD zoning.

From: pricedritecars@aol.com [mailto:pricedritecars@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2008 11:28 AM
To: Planning
Subject: RE ZONING

To whom it may concern,

Regarding re-zoning between 64th-72nd and South Puget Sound. I own 6610, 6614, 6620 south Puget Sound Avenue. I don't want the area in question to be re-zoned. I feel it is in the cities best interest to make it C-2. I know Jerry Ross on the corner of 68th and S Puget Sound has his property zoned C-2. I feel that should open up the whole block between 66th and 68th. Why should one piece of property on the same block be C-2 and not the whole block? I am concerned about this re-zoning. My pieces of property have no alley between the existing business in the rear, facing S Tacoma Way.

From,
Kurt Zimmermann
6619 s tacoma way
Tacoma Wa 98409
253-232-5878

