TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Donna Stenger, Manager, Long-Range Planning Division
SUBJECT: Large Scale Retail Moratorium
DATE: October 12, 2011

On August 30, 2011, the City Council passed an emergency moratorium on the permitting of large scale retail uses (Ordinance No. 28014) and referred the matter to the Planning Commission to conduct a public hearing and develop findings and a recommendation on the moratorium by October 19. The Commission conducted its public hearing on October 5 and received substantial testimony in favor of maintaining the moratorium and extending its duration.

At the meeting on October 19 the Commission will review the drafts provided by staff, modify as appropriate, and then adopt their findings and recommendation regarding the large scale retail moratorium. Attached are four documents for your information and your discussion at the meeting:

1. Written public testimony submitted prior to the comment deadline
2. Draft Recommendation Letter to the City Council
3. Draft Findings and Recommendation Report
4. Draft 12-Month Work Plan

In addition, as requested at the last meeting, staff is providing a copy of the current Planning Commission Work Program. This document is largely as it was previously presented to the Commission except that the two new moratoria have been added to the program. This information is being provided in response to concerns about the capacity of staff and Commission to add new planning activities caused by the Council’s adoption of two moratoria. The moratoria planning activities will take precedence over other work activities causing delays or reduction of effort to these activities. Staff will discuss the anticipated impacts and proposed adjustments to the work program to enable the Council mandated priorities to move forward.

If you have any questions or requests, please contact Brian Boudet at (253) 573-2389 or by e-mail at bboudet@cityoftacoma.org.

Attachments (5)
c: Peter Huffman, Assistant Director
North End Neighborhood Council
Tacoma, WA

September 20, 2011

Re: Support of “Big Box” Moratorium and Ban in Tacoma

Tacoma Planning Commission, Mayor Strickland and Tacoma City Council Members

The North End Neighborhood Council (NENC) supports the current moratorium and a strong ordinance in Tacoma banning Big Box stores over 65,000 sq. ft.

The NENC has consistently advocated the construction of a walkable “pedestrian friendly” environment and against massive 1960 era surface level parking lots and sprawl. On July 7, 2007, the NENC wrote a detailed recommendation for Tacoma’s Mixed Use Centers which was submitted to the Planning Commission and the Tacoma City Council emphasizing these values.

The construction of massive one-story, car-centric Big Box stores set back from the street and with multi-acre parking lots are the antithesis of good urban design. Hence, many cities have rightfully banned such projects. The more appropriate development for this site would be a mixed use center with commercial and residential elements.

In addition, such a massive store on Union Avenue would likely have a very negative traffic impact.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Erik Bjomson

Chair, North End Neighborhood Council
To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to voice my opinion and concern for the Walmart building proposal at the Union Ave Tacoma Elks site. A Walmart at this site would result in too much traffic in that area and it would provide unfair competition for local businesses. Walmart's backdoor tactics for sneaking a building into our community sets a bad example. If Walmart wants to open a store (which is a different project than original proposal for a medical center) then there needs to be a new study into the environmental and community impact of this development.

Thank you for your time,

Jessica Brewer
October 1, 2011

TO: Planning Commission
747 Market Street - Room 1036
Tacoma, WA 98402

Re: Ordinance No. 28014 - Moratorium on Large Scale Retail

NO MORATORIUM

DON'T BE A GHOST TOWN SUPPORTER!

Large Scale Retail = JOBS! JOBS! JOBS!

Patricia S. Lowry, a senior citizen for future Tacoma growth
3712 Tacoma Av S. Tacoma, WA 98418
Mailing: P.O. Box 8747 Tacoma, WA 98419
(253) 475-4491
From: sem3@u.washington.edu [mailto:sem3@u.washington.edu]  
Sent: Saturday, October 01, 2011 9:23 AM  
To: Planning  
Subject: Large Scale Moratorium

Tacoma has not yet reduced our negative air quality rating. Large scale retail venues located adjacent to a freeway system with minimal public transportation will further contribute to an increase in the release of carbon monoxide. Another disadvantage is the ability to recycle large shells once the original occupant closes. Typically, these sites become isolated high-crime areas. Most importantly, uni-purpose shell structures do not contribute to Tacoma's vision of mixed-use development.

Susanne E. Marten
Dear Leaders,

I would like to express my concern about a six month moratorium regarding large scale retail establishments. Although I am all for thoughtful development, we are in an emergency situation and I don't support taking six months to develop findings. We are badly in need of economic development and jobs. Unemployment is the root cause of multiple devastating problems for individuals, families and the society which take years to solve. I understand the jobs created may be low paying but they could be, for example, the difference for a college student struggling to go to college. Please, don't be disconnected from the reality of people's lives. Your job is to lead us to a better life.

Bree Lafreniere
Planning Commission  
City of Tacoma  
747 Market Street  
Tacoma, WA 98402  

Re: Large-Scale Retail Moratorium  

Dear Planning Commissioners:  

I write on behalf of UFCW 367 whose members have a profound interest in assuring development in the City adheres to central tenets of the Comprehensive Plan. Unions members live, work, shop, and recreate in the City. They care about the City and care about how it develops.  

In particular, the Union supports the Comprehensive Plan’s focus on mixed-use centers which are to include a “dense, well-integrated variety of development types, combined in such a way that it is pedestrian-oriented and transit supportive.” Properly developed, mixed-use centers can provide great opportunities for affordable residential living within walking distance of places to shop, eat, and play.  

Unfortunately, the existing regulations for mixed-use centers do not assure that development will be consistent with this Comprehensive Plan vision. As currently written, the City development regulations allow suburban-style shopping centers and “big box” retail establishments to be newly created in mixed-use centers. These Code provisions are inconsistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan which repeatedly stress the importance of developing mixed-use commercial areas in a pedestrian-oriented manner. See, e.g., LU-UAD-11. The Plan calls for streetscape design which “promote[s] pedestrian-activity” and which will “reinforce/enhance the character of individual neighborhoods within the City.” LU-UAD-10. Mixed-use centers are supposed to be places that are “distinctive, attractive, and rich in amenities.” Comprehensive Plan at LU-20. They are to include an “increased mix of uses,” “higher density housing,” and “community gathering space.” Id. “Buildings should be sited and designed to encourage walking.” LU-21. Different land uses (e.g., commercial and residential) are to be integrated “within the same building or site in order to maximize efficient land use, foster a variety of developments, and support multi-modal mobility.” LU-MU-3. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes that “[l]arge parking areas disrupt the continuity of the streetscape and development pattern, and provide formidable barriers to pedestrian movement.” LU-23.
These laudatory Comprehensive Plan policies are, unfortunately, not carried through into the existing development regulations. For instance, one of the mixed-use center districts is the CCX, the Community Commercial Mixed-Use District. The Zoning Code currently allows shopping centers to be developed within these mixed-use districts. A suburban style shopping center is anything but “mixed use.” It does not contain a mix of residential and commercial uses. It does not promote pedestrian activity.

In like manner, the regulations impose no size limits on retail establishments in the mixed-use zone and, in fact, do not even require that developments contain a mix of uses (contrary to the express guidance in the Comprehensive Plan). The only exception is that the Zoning Code establishes a 7,000 square foot maximum for retail in the HMX District. Inexplicably, none of the other mixed use districts contain any limitation on the size of retail nor do they include other measures to assure a mix of uses that accomplish the above-referenced policies and goals of the Comprehensive Plan. For instance, Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) 13.06.300.E establishes no maximum floor area for buildings in most of mixed-use districts and does not restrict the size of potentially massive parking lots. Nor does that section require that projects in the mixed-use districts include any residential use.

The discrepancy between the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the regulations in the Zoning Code are dramatic and threaten severe harm to the City’s development and planning efforts. As currently written, the development code allows suburban style shopping centers and big box retail to invest tremendous sums in new buildings that will move the City away from its pedestrian-oriented, mixed use goals, instead of towards them.

The City Council correctly determined that action was needed to correct the inconsistencies between the Comprehensive Plan and the development regulations. The City Council also correctly perceived that it was important to put a moratorium into place while the staff and the Planning Commission worked on the issue. As you know, without a moratorium, property owners can vest development rights under the existing Zoning Code. That means that property owners could secure the right to develop suburban style shopping centers and big box retail at the very time that the City was working to re-write its regulations to address that issue in the context of the Comprehensive Plan’s call for mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented development in these zones. Staff has advised that there are at least two property owners who were, in fact, indicating an interest in submitting applications for just that kind of development. The City’s efforts to reexamine and, potentially, revise its development regulations to address developments of that sort would have been undermined if a moratorium had not been adopted. The City Council was clearly well justified in adopting a moratorium to preserve its options and protect the integrity of its Comprehensive Plan and its forthcoming planning efforts.

In an effort to have this letter submitted to you for your hearing on October 5, 2011, I will not go into greater detail at this time regarding the justifications for the moratorium. I will attempt to provide you with additional information of that type before the close of the period for submitting written comments this Friday.
You have been asked to address not only the need for the moratorium, but also its length. As staff has advised, a moratorium can be imposed for up to six months and, if a work plan is adopted, for up to 12 months. Staff has drafted a work plan which suggests that the work necessary to review the Zoning Code can be completed in six months. While we appreciate the staff’s efforts to avoid a moratorium any longer than necessary, it seems unrealistic that six months would be sufficient time.

Under the proposed schedule, a draft of new language would be submitted to you by November 2, 2011. Given the breadth of changes that we believe are necessary in the Zoning Code, it seems entirely unrealistic that staff could provide you with draft code language by that date. Certainly, if all that is contemplated is imposing a size limit on large retail in the mixed-use zones, code language to that effect can be drafted in short order. But we do not believe the issue is that simple, for two reasons.

First, even if code language creating a size limit can be drafted quickly, it will take longer than that to develop an understanding of the issues that inform the decision as to where draw that size limit line. Staff has provided you with a few articles of considerable length that address a number of matters related to this issue. For the Planning Commission to make a fully informed decision as to an appropriate size limit, we believe a considerable amount of time should be devoted by staff and the Planning Commission to review that literature and other studies and develop an informed judgment as to an appropriate size limit.

Second, the problems with the existing code run deeper than the absence of a size limit on retail. As noted above, the Comprehensive Plan calls for a mix of uses in this zone and a focus on pedestrian-oriented activities and streetscapes. We believe a number of code revisions will be necessary to accomplish this Comprehensive Plan vision. Simply imposing a size limit on retail will not be enough. Development of these other code provisions will undoubtedly take much longer than a month or two. There is no way preliminary draft language could be ready by November 2, 2011. It seems unlikely that it could even be ready by the end of the year.

For these reasons, we suggest that you ask staff to revisit the schedule and develop one that is more realistic given the concerns listed above. We suspect a full year will be required.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters. I wish you good luck with your work on this very important issue.

Very truly yours,

BRICKLIN & NEWMAN, LLP

David A. Bricklin

DAB:psc
Planning Commission
October 5, 2011
Page 4

cc: Client
Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing in support of the Large Scale Retail Moratorium. I was disappointed to hear of the plans to build a large retail complex at the site of the Elks Lodge. Traffic is already a nightmare in that area due to all the cars going to the Target complex or trying to get to the highway interchange at Union. I also don't believe that giant retail stores are good for Tacoma's future. Tacoma already has a myriad of large retail stores to serve its residents. Further addition of large retail stores will just take business away from existing stores, causing a blight of empty big boxes. We have seen this blight especially in the Tacoma Mall area when national retail chains have gone bankrupt. I am also concerned that further addition of large retail chains will also pull business away from locally owned small businesses. Large retail stores also provide only low-wage work that often don't provide benefits. Large retail chains also usually only carry cheaply made imported products that further erode our nation's economy.

I would support long-term development of mixed-use medical, educational, hospitality, business professional, or small business retail facilities in that location.

I would also support extending the Large Scale Retail Moratorium for 4 years in order to support Tacoma's current businesses and encourage sustainable planning and growth.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Michele Drochak
NorthEnd Neighborhood Resident
Name: Sarah Merken
Affiliation: United for Peace & Justice
Address: 809 N Proctor St, Tacoma 98406
E-mail/Phone: DTRLSJM@gmail.com
Date: 10/5/11
Subject: Moratorium

Comments: Make it permanent please.
No more poverty wage jobs, where the employees have to get DSHS health care & food stamps to survive.
I live outside of the City of Tacoma (in Parkland). I do not want a Walmart in Tacoma or anywhere. They get tax breaks and other goodies which don't benefit locals and which small businesses do not get. Walmart is predatory and destroys local businesses. Their profits go to Arkansas. Please make the moratorium permanent! Thank you.

Lin Swanson

(Over)
From: Susan Cruise [mailto:susanmcruse@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 11:57 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Tricia DeOme
Subject: Ordinance 28014 Moratorium Retail Establishments in Excess of 65,000 Square Feet

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

I understand that an application was filed seeking permission for Walmart to build a 150,000 sq. foot super store in the vicinity of S. 23rd St. and S. Union Ave. on the property occupied by the Elks Club. I will explain my support for Ordinance No. 28014 in relation to the application to build a Walmart super store at this location in Tacoma. I support Ordinance No. 28014 adopting an immediate six month moratorium relating to land use and zoning and establishing a moratorium on the acceptance of applications for new building and related permits for the establishment, location and permitting of retail establishments that exceed 65,000 sq. feet for the following reasons:

1. A 150,000 square foot superstore such as Walmart will have damaging economic, environmental and social impacts on Tacoma.

2. It is inappropriate to have such a large store across the street from residential apartments such as the Villas at Union Park on S. Union Ave. due to the traffic congestion it will bring diminishing the quality of life of those apartment residents.

3. Because the neighborhoods to the immediate west of the proposed store, as well as to the north and east are primarily residential, the proposed location will clog the main arterials of these neighborhoods such as S 19th St. S. 12th St. 6th Ave., S. Union St. and Proctor St. increasing traffic congestion and the potential for accidents. It has been come increasingly hard for me to make a left turn from 6th Ave. at Proctor on to N. Proctor because of the increased traffic on 6th Ave. and this would worsen with the traffic driven to 6th Ave. by congestion on S. Union.

4. I do not think that the citizens and residents of Tacoma should have their quality of life damaged, and compromised and subjected to daily traffic delays and increased congestion due to a store that is known for not being a good corporate steward.

5. Because Walmart's business plan includes a very low wage low benefit model of employment, Walmart burdens tax payer funded services such as medicaid. I understand that in Georgia a 2002 survey found that Walmart was the largest private employer of parents whose children were enrolled in the state subsidized medical program.

6. Therefore, although people pay lower prices for products at Walmart there are hidden costs that people pay, such as in funding medicaid.

7. In addition, during a recession when people are spending less money generally the City of Tacoma should not welcome a store that has been sued on several occasions for predatory pricing, meaning pricing that is so low that it intends to or has the consequence of putting competitors out of business. The City of Tacoma should show more support for its local businesses who can be harmed by predatory pricing practices. Since profit margins are probably much smaller for local businesses due to the recession a store like Walmart with its aggressive business plan can put local businesses that have contributed and enhanced Tacoma out of business.

8. Since there are already a number of large stores in the same area - such as Target, Top Food and Office Depot - and in view of the numbers of residential homes in the immediate vicinity west of the proposed location and starting a few blocks north and east the time has come for the City of Tacoma to reevaluate its zoning code, study these problems and change the code to not permit such a large retail establishment at S 23rd and S Union.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Susan Cruise
615 S. Madison St.
Tacoma, WA 98405
Dear Sirs,

I unreservedly support and urge this Planning Commission and City Council to support the moratorium on the building of large "big box" stores in Tacoma until such time as appropriate regulations for their establishment can be created. These are large stores and their massive above ground parking lots must be appropriately zoned and regulated.

Marshall McClintock
701 North J Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
As a resident of the city of Tacoma, I ask that the council carefully weigh the pros and cons of a "big box moratorium."

My overall concern is that we are in economic times where the city needs all the potential revenue through sales tax it can get. As just one example that is of concern to many residents, we have something like 100 years of deferred maintenance on our roads. The sales tax revenue derived from new large businesses could go a long way towards paying for long-needed public works improvements.

My other concern is we can't really guess what a "good" or "bad" future big box store might look like--but to put a ban in place might discourage a national retailer from even considering Tacoma. A few possibilities:

- Apple comes up with a new business model and starts stores similar to Best Buy versus their current smaller mall locations. Would we be left out?
- Large local employers like Fred Meyer or Best Buy want to add an additional Tacoma location.
- A well thought of brand like Amazon or Microsoft goes into the large retail space--would they not even consider Tacoma?
- A local merchant find enormous success in Tacoma and wants to build a large box-type space. How sad if they started that business in Tacoma but would not be able to carry there business vision through in the town they started in.

I know city residents have concerns about wages paid by these large retailers along with traffic patterns, congestion, etc. These same local residents also expect basic city services that are paid through sales tax. Let's make sure our citizens understand that for every business we turn away--it could potentially lead to a reduction in city services.

-Mitch Robinson
Tacoma, WA
To: City of Tacoma - Planning Commission  
From: Central Neighborhood Council  
Date: October 7, 2011  
Subject: Planning Commission Public Comment – Ordinance No 28014

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Ordinance No. 28014 was adopted on August 30, 2011 which put in place an emergency moratorium on the permitting of large scale retail establishments with a floor area greater than 65,000 square feet. The moratorium applies City-wide and was enacted for a duration of six months (until February 28, 2012). As stated in the ordinance, the purpose of the moratorium is to allow the City time to evaluate the impacts of these kinds of land uses and to consider potential changes to applicable regulations and requirements.

The Central Neighborhood Council (CNC) agrees the emergency moratorium is necessary and the moratorium should be in place at least six months or until the City evaluates the impacts of big box stores and revises the maximum floor size and parking requirements in Commercial Community Mixed-Use District (CCX) zoned areas. Our reasoning is discussed below.

**Why is the moratorium necessary?**

“Big Box” stores with floor area greater than 65,000 square feet are currently allowed in C2-General Community Commercial, CCX – Community Commercial Mixed Use, UCX – Urban Center Mixed Use, CIX – Commercial-Industrial Mixed Use, M1 – Light Industrial, and M2 - Heavy Industrial Districts. It is our understanding the areas were zoned CCX during the formation of Mixed-Use District and specific building design and parking requirements were not thoroughly evaluated. There are seven CCX areas distributed throughout the city. The moratorium is necessary to allow time to evaluate building requirements in CCX areas before parcels within the CCX areas are developed or redeveloped with suburban style big box stores.

**Why should CCX allowed uses be reevaluated?**

The Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC 13.06.300) states one of the purposes of the Mixed-Use Districts is to “increase the variety of development opportunities in Tacoma by encouraging greater integration of land uses within specific districts in a manner consistent with the Growth Management Act, the Regional Plan: Vision 2020, the County-Wide Planning Policies for Pierce County, and the City’s Comprehensive Plan.” CCX areas are to “provide for commercial and retail businesses intended to serve many nearby neighborhoods and draw people from throughout the City. These areas are envisioned as evolving from traditional suburban development to higher density urban districts. Walking and transit use are facilitated through designs which decrease walking distances and increase pedestrian safety. Uses include shopping centers with a wide variety of commercial establishments; commercial recreation; gas stations; and business, personal, and financial services. Residential uses are encouraged in CCX Districts as integrated development components.”
There currently is no designated maximum floor area per story for a single business or a minimum floor-area ratio (total building area divided by site size) within CCX areas based on the City of Tacoma code. Therefore, a 150,000 square foot building serving one use with an expansive surface parking lot and little to no interface with transit options is allowed by the City code. This is the exact opposite of what the City of Tacoma’s Comprehensive Plan describes as an urban style, pedestrian and transit friendly development that provides an environment for building synergies between local businesses, entrepreneurial opportunities, workforce housing, and living wage employment in designated Mixed-Use District.

The CNC recommends the Planning Commission retain the moratorium to allow for a thoughtful evaluation of impacts of large scale retail operations on:

- existing land use plans;
  - implementation of zoning and design regulations appropriate to recently-adopted updates of Mixed-Use Districts;
- traffic congestion and patterns;
- pedestrian and bicycle travel; and
- investment in and support for locally-sustainable economic development.

Further, the CNC recommends the Planning Commission consider appropriate regulations for large scale retail land uses, to include prohibition in Mixed-Use Districts, or at least restriction of the suburban characteristics. Additional regulations may include:

- limitation on floor area per story per single use;
- limitation on vehicular access and parking (including deliveries);
- pedestrian and bicycle access and amenities;
- outdoor storage;
- landscaping; and
- location and size of signage.

The Comprehensive Plan sets policy to build up not out, especially in Mixed-Use Districts. However the City of Tacoma code is not strict enough to implement that policy. The purpose of the moratorium is to provide time to evaluate the code so development is in line with policy before it is too late.

Tricia S. DeOme  Justin D. Leighton
Chair  Corresponding Secretary
Central Neighborhood Council  Central Neighborhood Council

www.cnc-tacoma.com
October 7, 2011

Jeremy C. Doty
City of Tacoma Planning Commissioner
District 5
747 Market St
Tacoma, WA 98402

Chairman Doty:

The Chamber of Commerce is writing to you in opposition to the large scale retail moratorium currently being evaluated by the Planning Commission. While the Planning Commission heard testimony at the public hearing addressing one potential site with one potential project, it is important to remember that the question posed to you by the Council (and state and local law) is not about a project. Rather you have been asked:

1) Does the municipal code and review process fail to address issues associated with large scale retail uses over 65,000 square feet in size, and,
2) If it does fail to, how much time is needed to make corrections to address these gaps?

The Chamber believes the municipal code, the State Environmental Policy Act and the associated processes with these regulations allow the City and the public ample opportunity to address potential impacts associated with large scale retail uses. Therefore, the moratorium is not warranted and should be ended immediately. Furthermore, if additional municipal code changes are warranted there is a clear process in place to make these changes absent a moratorium.

Existing Regulations
The municipal code has extensive regulations governing the types, sizes, locations, and build out of an array of uses. Currently the regulations governing land use regulations are over 400 pages long – not including regulations associated with administration, buildings, streets, traffic or other public works rules.

In addition to the City’s regulations, Washington State has its own sets of regulations governing the development of properties. While these are wide in scope, the most significant of these is tied to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). As the Planning Commission is undoubtedly aware, SEPA is designed to identify potential adverse impacts and provide mitigation of these impacts.

Finally, SEPA allows that if the City “determines that a proposal may have a probable significant adverse environment impact” (WAC 197-11-360) it may require the more substantial environmental review associated with an Environmental Impact Statement – which includes an analysis of alternative development scenarios. This is true regardless of whether the impacts are associated with wetlands, public safety or other quality of life issues.
Testimony to date in support of the moratorium has focused on the potential impacts associated with traffic. SEPA is specifically designed to address these potential impacts with seven questions about transportation, including “[W]hat are the] proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts?” (WAC 197-11-960) Through the SEPA process, the City may propose mitigating measures to address these impacts.

Furthermore, the Planning Commission and City Council are constantly reviewing and updating the code through existing processes. Some examples:

- The municipal code was just amended on June 14, 2011 with the completion of the annual amendments to the comprehensive plan.
- A couple of years earlier the Planning Commission recommended a significant package of amendments to Council addressing development in our most significant retail centers, our mixed use centers. These amendments were adopted by Council July 28, 2009 – a process that began in 2006.
- The Planning Commission has just begun its review of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan amendments. These will likely amend the municipal code around the middle of 2012.
- Additionally, studies are underway around the City looking at regulations and development in areas like the South Downtown, the Dome District, the Foss Waterway, and the MLK Corridor.

These layers upon layers of regulations have existed for years with constant updating. The City has seen successful developments and businesses operating that now contribute to the local economy. The idea that yet another “emergency” moratorium is necessary to address an existing legal land use is unimaginative at best.

**Adverse Impacts**

The purported purpose of the moratorium is to allow the City time to address potential adverse impacts associated with development. While regulations are in place to address these impacts at both the local and state level, there has been little discussion of the impacts associated with another emergency moratorium.

As the first person testifying at the October 5th public hearing stated, “The only time I’ve gotten in trouble is when I’ve gone into something too fast without thinking it through.” Unfortunately, her warning was after the Council had already adopted this moratorium. Now is the opportunity to think the moratorium through and consider the impacts of halting businesses that conform to all laws including the Growth Management Act, the Comprehensive Plan and the Municipal Code.

A moratorium reduces the predictability of development which strongly impacts the economic growth of the City. This reduced predictability:

- Reduces the ability for property owners to solicit Tacoma properties to interested developers, retailers, and businesses meaning more empty lots and empty buildings.
- Halts development plans of both new and existing developments.
- Limits the potential of the City to act as the economic engine for the South Puget Sound meaning less revenue for needed public services and less revenue for filling the projected budget shortfalls of the next decade.
- Keeps people out of work in the construction sector, a sector seeing unemployment rates that are still over 14%.
- Prohibits tenant improvements on large retail buildings throughout the City, potentially keeping smaller retail and non-retail tenants from coming to the City.
The City has failed to address these potential impacts. Unfortunately, there was no public discussion before the implementation of this moratorium and there is no SEPA process available to ensure appropriate mitigation. At this point in the economy’s recovery, the City of Tacoma cannot afford to keep businesses away while the surrounding cities and counties are finding ways to attract them.

The Chamber encourages you to recognize the validity of existing regulations that past and current Commissioners and Councilmember’s have worked hard to implement. The state mandated comprehensive planning process is designed to allow for reasoned discernment of land use issues revolving around the community’s vision and its implementation. The Planning Commission should support this process and recommend that the Council reverse its shortsighted adoption of the large scale retail moratorium.

Best wishes,

Tom Pierson
President & CEO

cc: Mayor Marilyn Strickland
City Council
City Staff
Chamber Board
October 7, 2011

Planning Commission
City of Tacoma
747 Market Street
Tacoma, WA  98402

Re: Large-Scale Retail Moratorium – Ordinance 28014

Dear Planning Commission:

As noted in my letter of October 5, 2011, on behalf of UCFW 367, I submit these written comments in regards to Ordinance No. 28014. As you know, this recently enacted Ordinance puts in place a six-month moratorium on the filing, acceptance, and processing of applications associated with large-scale retail establishments; meaning those establishments with a floor area greater than 65,000 square feet. The City Council, as provided in TCC 13.02.055, has referred the moratorium to you for the development of findings of fact and a recommendation addressing both the need for and the duration of the moratorium.

The Need for Moratorium

The moratorium itself is a City Council initiated action. Currently, according to City Planning Staff, within Tacoma there are approximately 17 large-scale retail establishments, including the retail anchors at the Tacoma Mall. Proposals to expand or modify these existing proposals are subject to current regulations which, as discussed below, do not effectively accomplish many of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Moreover, proposals for new large retail establishments continue to arise, even in these difficult economic times. Two additional large-scale projects were proposed in August 2011 and September 2011 alone. One of these additional proposals would be located within the Tacoma Central Mixed Use Center and the other within a C-2 General Community Commercial zoning district. These new proposals are seeking between 135,000 and 152,000 square feet of space. These new proposals further demonstrate the need for the moratorium. Unless the existing regulations are reviewed and necessary improvements made, these new proposals and others following them will be judged by the lax regulations in effect today.
We refer to the current regulations as lax and ineffective because they allow large scale retail developments which are inconsistent with the goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan. As discussed in detail below, the city's policies eschew suburban style, auto-dominated malls and large retail establishments surrounded by a sea of parked cars. Instead, the Comprehensive Plan calls for pedestrian-oriented developments, often in a mixed-use setting, that makes Tacoma a "distinctive place" and which is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and Tacoma's vision for growth and development.

- Tacoma's Vision for Growth and Development

Tacoma's Comprehensive Plan provides the primary framework for addressing land use issues in the City. Thus, in considering the issues posed by large-scale retail establishments and the moratorium, primary reference should be made to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan seeks to address managed, desirable growth and development so as to both shape and reshape the City's urban form. The Comprehensive Plan specially states that the policies in the Plan serve as:

[A] means of managing growth in a way that is physically, socially and environmentally acceptable, while at the same time providing for the preservation, redevelopment, and improvement of the City's establish residential neighborhoods.

The General Growth and Development goal is:

To achieve orderly, timely, and desirable planned growth and development that enhances the quality of life for the citizens of Tacoma.

These visionary statements are supported by Policy LU-GGD-3 which states:

Growth and development throughout the urban area should be regulated, stimulated, and otherwise guided toward the development of compact concentrated areas to discourage sprawl, facilitate economical and efficient provision of utilities, public facilities and services, and expand transportation options to the public. (Emphasis added.)

The Intent section of the Comprehensives Plan's Urban Aesthetics and Design section builds on these statements by expressly setting forth Tacoma's visionary aspirations:

---

1 Comprehensive Plan, Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element at GD-2, § I (emphasis added).
2 Comprehensive Plan, Generalized Land Use Element, at LU-6, § Section 1.
3 Comprehensive Plan, Generalized Land Use Element, at LU-12.
Positive urban design and architecture can enhance Tacoma’s livability, the health of its residents, the natural and built environment, and encourage a sustainable and economically vibrant city … Tacoma aspires to be:

- Pedestrian-oriented …
- A desirable and inviting place to live, work and play …
- A safe place to live, work and play …
- A distinctive place …

These aspirations are reiterated in Policy LU-UAD-3, which seeks to enhance the distinct character and identity of Tacoma by:

- Emphasizing pedestrian-oriented design …
- Recognizing and retaining existing scale, proportion and rhythm …
- Embracing the natural setting and encouraging regional character …
- Balancing the historic, work-class character and its physical development with the community’s desire to be progressive, innovative …

As noted in my comment letter of October 5, 2011, several other policies within the Urban Aesthetics and Design section of the Land Use Element speak to these same features: LU-UAD-10 (streetscapes designed to promote pedestrian-activity and enhance the character of neighborhoods) and LU-UAD-11 (mixed-used commercial areas in a pedestrian-oriented manner).

As noted in the Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element, future growth in Tacoma is to be directed towards compact mixed-use centers.⁴ One of the recently announced large-scale retail proposals is in an area designated as “Mixed-Use Centers” in the Comprehensive Plan. The vision for Mixed-Use Centers is a dense, well-integrated variety of development types that is pedestrian-oriented and supports transit.⁵ Mixed-Use Centers have several objectives or key principles, including:

- Create walkable and transit-supportive neighborhoods;
- Build on and enhance existing assets and neighborhood character and identity;
- Reduce dependence on cars and enhance transportation connectively;
- Support neighborhood business development;
- Provide community gathering space and public spaces;
- Increase mix of uses (residences, shopping, jobs, and services).

---

⁴ Comprehensive Plan, Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element, at GD-2, § II.
⁵ Comprehensive Plan, Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element, at GD-5, § III and at 6-9, § VI.
⁶ Comprehensive Plan, Growth Strategy and Development Concept Element, at GD-9 to GD-10; Generalized Land Use Element, at LU-20 to LU-21, § II.
The Comprehensive Plan sets forth a variety of policies to facilitate these goals. Policies address pedestrian orientation, integration of a variety of uses, compact development, reduction in vehicle dependency, and impediments created by large parking areas. More specifically, policies address ensuring compatibility of design for mixed-use centers and the need to establish design guidelines. With all of the policies related to mixed-use centers, the desire for a pedestrian-friendly design is replete and detailed.

In regards to commercial development, the Comprehensive Plan recognizes the pressure for retail and service uses to support a growing population. But, the Comprehensive Plan anticipates demand can be accommodated through redevelopment and intensification within established commercial areas, many of which have been designated as mixed-use centers. And, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's overarching policies, commercial development is to be designed in a pedestrian-friendly manner and compatible with the character of the area.

Thus, it is abundantly clear the vision for future growth and development the City of Tacoma has adopted for itself – compact urban development with an emphasis on a pedestrian-oriented/friendly design compatible with the surrounding area. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes that its aspirational vision and policies are not self-implementing. Instead, regulations must be adopted to turn this vision into a reality. Thus, LU-UAD-5 seeks the creation of:

...[C]lear and detailed standards that are crafted to encourage desired types of developments.

This is the very thing that is missing when it comes to Large-Scale Retail Establishments. The very reason a moratorium is necessary is to allow for the development of these regulatory standards so as to ensure the proper design and placement of these large-impact uses.

It must be noted that the term "large-scale retail establishment" is not defined in Tacoma's Land Use Regulatory Code, Title 13. While retail use is a permitted use within a multitude of zoning

---

7 See Comprehensive Plan, Generalized Land Use Element at LU-21 to LU-24.

8 See Comprehensive Plan, Generalized Land Use Element at LU-26 to LU-33.

9 Comprehensive Plan, General Land Use Element, Policy LU-MUI (Pedestrian and Bicycle support); LU-MCD-6 (Compactness, support more walking, bicycling, and transit use); LU-MUCD-7 (Circulation, convenient and attractive pedestrian and bicycle linkages); LU-MUCD-13 (Restrict Auto-Oriented Uses, negatively impacts walkability and pedestrian orientation); LU-MUP-4 (encourage pedestrian connections through parking lot in Community Center and Regional Growth Center); LU-MUD-3 and LU-MUD-4 (Pedestrian streets and uses); LU-MUD-6 (Design guidelines including those addressing pedestrian-friendly areas); LU-MUD-11 (Pedestrian-Friendly Design).


11 See also LU-MUD-6 and LU-CDD-1 (design and/or development standards/guidelines); LU-MUCC-3 (site plan review).
districts, the regulations prescribe a square footage limitation in only a few of those districts. Despite the Comprehensive Plan’s intent to focus growth into Mixed-Use Centers, with few exceptions, the zoning districts intended to implement the City’s Mixed-Use Centers permit retail use with no size limitation. For instance, the C-2 General Community Commercial Zone permits retail uses outright and sets no maximum floor area. Similarly the M-1 Light Industrial and M-2 Heavy Industrial Zones permit retail uses outright, but provide no restrictions as to maximum floor area.

The square footage of the establishments relates directly to its impact on Tacoma’s urban community. The design of large-scale retail establishments, through both the structure and the associated parking, are allowed to sprawl over the landscape. This sprawling, auto-dominated (and often linear) development pattern makes inefficient use of land and does not adequately support alternatives to automobile transportation; rather it creates a single-use, auto-centric development. This style of development is in juxtaposition to the City’s Comprehensive Plan which seeks an evolution from expansive suburban large-scale retail to a compact, more pedestrian friendly, mixed-use urban center concept.

The code’s effort to require a pedestrian-oriented streetscape is also deficient. The code starts out on the right track, requiring that retail buildings larger than 30,000 square feet have no more than a five foot setback from the public right-of-way along 75% of their front and side facades. TCC 13.06.300.F. But, inexplicably, this requirement only applies to buildings “located in close proximity to the street.” The intent of this regulation (and the Comprehensive Plan) is easily avoided by simply locating the building far from the street with, for instance, a large parking lot between the street and the store. That is, the code does not preclude the very kind of auto-dominated, suburban mall design that the Comprehensive Plan seeks to avoid. This is the kind of deficiency in the existing code that needs to be addressed immediately if the goals of the Comprehensive Plan are to be realized.

In addition to design elements for these large-scale retail establishments, the economic impact cannot be ignored. The Economic Development Plan of the City’s Comprehensive Plan seeks to not just recruit new business, but also foster the growth of existing businesses. The Economic Development Plan recognizes that how a city regulates land is critical to economic development.

---

12 TCC 13.06.300(D)(2) Use Table. Only the URX and NRX Mix-Use districts prohibit retail.

13 TCC 13.06.200(C)(4) Use Table; TCC 13.06.200(D) Building Envelope Restrictions.

14 TCC 13.06.400(C)(4) Use Table (Except within the ST-M/IC area – 10,000 to 15,000 square feet); TCC 13.06.400(D) Building Envelope Restrictions (no reference at all to floor area).

15 One of the few zoning districts with a size limit is the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zone which permits retail uses outright, but sets a maximum floor area of 30,000 square feet. Similarly, the Hospital Mix-Use Zone also permits retail uses, establishing a 7,000 square foot maximum, but this is “per business” not per structure. These two zones are the exception to the rule. Most of the zones allowing retail include no limit on size.

16 Comprehensive Plan, Economic Development Plan at 41.
and Action L-2 specifically seeks the efficient use of land through denser development.\textsuperscript{17} As noted above, larger retailers have shifted their focus from suburban markets to urban markets not only because of market coverage, but also a realignment of population. Given the impact of these uses on existing urban retail businesses and local employment, determining the proper sizing and location is vital to ensuring business sustainability within the City of Tacoma.

**Duration of Moratorium**

Ordinance 28014 was adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.390 which allows for a moratorium to be effective for not longer than six months. This same provision also allows for the renewal of a moratorium, in six month increments, subject to certain procedural requirements. There is, however, an exception to this time limitation - a moratorium may be effective for up to one year if a work plan is developed for related studies to support the longer period.\textsuperscript{18}

City Planning Staff has crafted a very aggressive schedule for the review and adoption of necessary amendments to the Tacoma City Code, encompassing both Planning Commission and City Council review along with study sessions and public hearings. While every interested party appreciates the City’s efforts to avoid a moratorium any longer than necessary, the proposed schedule is devoid of any discussion related to studies we believe are necessary to fully inform the decision-making process. It also seems to ignore that the changes to the code may need to sweep more broadly than simply imposing a maximum size on large retail establishments in certain zones.

As the background information provided to the Planning Commission in its meeting packet indicated, the past few years have seen a shift in the design and layout for large-scale retail establishments, most notably by creating a new market area for such establishments – the urban area. However, use of this information is questionable given the dates of preparation (1995-2008) and its relevance to Tacoma’s unique community character. This background information also provided commentary on the economic impacts. However, given the economic transformation Washington State has experienced in the past years, this information may also not accurately reflect the economic impact of large-scale retail establishments within the urban area.

Thus, we believe region-specific studies or more current analysis as to land use and economic impacts of large-scale retail uses is vital to ensuring the development of regulations that not only reflect Tacoma’s land use vision, but also continue its "business friendly" atmosphere that has drawn a variety of business to the area in the past few years.\textsuperscript{19} After the background studies are obtained, City Planning Staff needs adequate time to determine the full extent of amendments

\textsuperscript{17} Comprehensive Plan, Economic Development Plan at 44; Economic Development Plan, § II Land Use.

\textsuperscript{18} This same language is contained in TCC 13.02.055(D).

\textsuperscript{19} Councilmember comments at the August 30 council meeting spoke to Tacoma’s being seen as a “business friendly” community but that this also meant the success of businesses, with the future for retail being “hot” in Tacoma: Councilmember Mello (Business Friendly); Councilmember Woodards (Ensure the success of businesses); Councilmember Campbell (Retail hot for Tacoma).
that will be required for the development regulations so as to address the impact of these types of facilities on the urban form of the Tacoma community. The time to obtain and analyze such studies and then draft appropriate regulatory language would undoubtedly take more than six months. A one-year moratorium seems appropriate.

In addition to the need for studies and analysis, a realistic schedule would take into account the time of year activity is slated to occur. Under the schedule proposed by staff, much of the Planning Commission’s work is scheduled to occur during the busy holiday season, creating potential time-conflict issues not only for the Commission and City Staff, but also for members of the public wishing to attend public hearings or comment on proposed amendments. When adopting this moratorium at its August 30 Council Meeting, one of the reasons councilmembers stated for enacting the moratorium was the need to ensure a “community conversation” regarding large-scale retail establishments. The need for a community conversation denotes a respect for the vision and character the citizens of Tacoma are expecting based on the Comprehensive Plan. The process necessarily entails affording a variety of opportunities for citizen involvement. Tacoma’s distinct character – based on its unique physical setting, its history, and its people – is a strategic asset that can be leveraged through compatible, high quality, new urban development. The public will provide valuable input, if provided a fair chance.

In conclusion, the future of large-scale retail establishments within Tacoma needs to be thoughtfully analyzed. The City has recognized that current regulations addressing these establishments are not adequate. New regulations should be development which not only respect Tacoma’s economic desires, but also respect the community’s character. To develop high quality regulations that achieve this, adequate time must be provided. Thus, on behalf of UCFW 367, we ask the Planning Commission to recommend that the moratorium be left in place and extended to an entire year so as to ensure that Tacoma’s vision for its growth and development is accurately reflected within its development regulations.

Thank you for the consideration of UCFW 367’s comments in regards to this moratorium.

Very truly yours,

BRICKLIN & NEWMAN, LLP

David A. Bricklin

Councilmember Mello stated the moratorium allows for the community to have a conversation about community character. Councilmember Boe noted the process for adoption of the Mixed Use Centers and the community vision behind those centers; the very area such large-scale establishment would be located. Councilmember Woodards believed the moratorium demonstrates a “thoughtfulness” for the community and the council needed to ensure the success of the community. Mayor Strickland concluded the moratorium allowed the City to “take a deep breath” and address such things as the surrounding neighborhood.

Comprehensive Plan, Generalized Land Use Element at LU-12.
Planning Commission
October 7, 2011
Page 8

DAB:psc

cc: Client
October 19, 2011

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council:

On August 30, 2011, the Council adopted Ordinance No. 28014, enacting an emergency, city-wide, six-month moratorium on the acceptance or processing of applications for development permits for large scale retail establishments. The purpose of the moratorium is to prevent vesting of permits under the current regulations while they are reviewed and updated to better implement the policies and goals of the Comprehensive Plan and sufficiently address the potential economic, social and environmental impacts associated with these types of uses.

As required by the Tacoma Municipal Code, the Commission conducted a public hearing on October 5, 2011 concerning the moratorium. Thirty people testified at the hearing. They all expressed their strong support for the moratorium and most called for extending it. The Commission also received 15 written comments which, while including some opposition to and concern about the impact of the moratorium, still largely favored continuing the moratorium. The overwhelming message from the public testimony was that the community has significant and wide-ranging concerns about large retail uses, particularly within the City’s Mixed-Use Centers, and feels that a temporary hold on the permitting of such uses is warranted while the City reviews and considers whether changes to the existing regulations and associated requirements are needed.

The Commission’s preliminary review of the Comprehensive Plan and associated regulations found that there are numerous areas where the existing land use regulations do not sufficiently implement the Plan’s policies and goals. These discrepancies are particularly problematic within the City’s Urban and Community Mixed-Use Centers because center development is a key part of the City’s vision for accommodating future population and employment growth. The center vision expresses how we, as a community, will shift from the auto-centric pattern that has dominated development over the past few decades to a more compact, mixed, sustainable, vibrant and dense urban pattern that promotes pedestrian activity and multi-modal transportation options. Ensuring that these areas develop in a manner that is consistent with the community’s vision is critical to achieving our long-term land use and economic goals.

The existing language of the moratorium is very broad, applying to all types of permits associated with large retail establishments in all portions of the city. While the concerns expressed have also been broad, a common message has been that development of new large retail establishments is of particular concern within in the Mixed-Use Centers. The Commission shares this sentiment and has found that the differences between the regulations and Plan policies are also most significant in the Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers. Therefore, the Planning Commission supports the continuation of the moratorium but is recommending that its geographic scope be reduced to focus on the Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers, where it is most clearly needed and appropriate. As noted in our findings and recommendation report, it may also be appropriate to clarify how the moratorium is intended to affect remodels and additions to existing large retailers, which could include minor and/or necessary maintenance and repair or the reuse of existing, potentially vacant buildings.
Although imposition of moratoria should be used infrequently and with caution, in this instance, the moratorium provides an opportunity to conduct needed analysis of the impacts of these kinds of uses and an evaluation of where and how they can be accommodated in a manner that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Continuing to permit development that is inconsistent with the community’s vision will only hamper our ability to achieve it.

While the Commission supports having a moratorium within the Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers, we are also concerned that the six-month duration originally adopted would require that draft code be ready for public review in less than a month from now. Considering the scope outlined in the moratorium ordinance, the findings of our initial analysis and the numerous and wide-ranging concerns expressed by the public it is apparent that this effort will require significant resources and attention and should include multiple opportunities for general public and stakeholder input and coordination between the Council, Commission and staff.

The Commission is also very concerned about the impact that this project will have on other planning work items. In addition to the two other existing moratoria, the Commission is working on numerous other planning program items, many of which are in response to City Council requests and/or grant funding, such as the proposed amendments to downtown parking requirements, the critical areas regulatory update project, and the two sub-area plans being developed. These projects are in addition to our regular work on the 2012 Annual Amendment, which includes review of seven proposed amendments. The Commission and staff’s ability to manage existing responsibilities in addition to this new task will be severely constrained within a six-month schedule. In order to minimize such impacts and ensure that this project receives the level of review, outreach and coordination it deserves, a one-year timeline is needed. I am providing a one-year work plan for the development of regulations that provides a reasonable schedule for the necessary review by the Commission, Council, staff and community.

Therefore, on behalf of the Planning Commission, I am forwarding our findings and recommendations in response to the emergency moratorium. Enclosed you will find a copy of our Findings of Fact and Recommendations report that summarizes the public review process and the Commission’s actions. We believe the enclosed document addresses the review requested by the Council and required by City Code. We look forward to our continued work in addressing large scale retail uses within the City.

Sincerely,

DONALD K. ERICKSON
Vice-Chair, Planning Commission

Enclosure
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

TACOMA PLANNING COMMISSION
October 19, 2011

A. SUBJECT:
Emergency moratorium on the permitting of large scale retail establishments within the City of Tacoma.

B. BACKGROUND:
On August 30, 2011, the City Council enacted an emergency moratorium on large scale retail establishments. The moratorium specifically prohibits the filing, acceptance and processing of applications for land use, building or other development permits associated with the establishment, location, or permitting of retail sales establishments with a floor area greater than 65,000 square feet in size. The moratorium applies Citywide and was enacted for a duration of six months (until February 28, 2012). As stated in the ordinance, the purpose of the moratorium is to allow the City time to evaluate the impacts of these kinds of uses and consider potential changes to its regulations and requirements.

C. FINDINGS OF FACT:
1) On August 30, 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 28014, enacting an emergency moratorium on all permitting for large scale retail uses (those with a floor area greater than 65,000 square feet) and referred the moratorium to the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing and develop findings of fact and a recommendation addressing, at a minimum, the need for and appropriate duration of the moratorium, by October 19, 2011.

2) As noted in the moratorium ordinance, the purpose of the moratorium is to allow time for the Planning Commission and City Council to assess the impacts associated with large retail establishments, including economic, environmental, health, traffic and public safety, and to review and consider changes to the City’s regulations and standards for these types of uses.

3) The moratorium applies City-wide and is in effect for six months (until February 28, 2012).

4) RCW 35A.63.220 and Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) 13.02.055 permit the establishment of moratoria when it found to be necessary as a protective measure to prevent vesting under current regulations or to maintain the status quo.

5) With regards to the duration of moratoria, the Code provides:
   “Moratoria or interim zoning may be effective for a period of not longer than six months, but may be effective for up to one year if a work plan is developed for related studies requiring such longer period.” [Excerpt from TMC 13.02.055.D.]

6) With the adoption of Ordinance No. 28014, the City Council declared that an emergency existed and that immediate adoption of a moratorium was necessary to prevent the continued permitting
of large scale retail establishments that might be inconsistent with the general public welfare and undermine the policies and intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

7) TMC Chapter 13.02 sets forth the procedures and criteria for amending the City’s development regulations, including temporary moratoria.

8) TMC 13.02.055 provides that following adoption of an emergency moratorium, the Planning Commission is required to conduct a public hearing and provide findings and recommendations to the City Council before the Council, after further review, takes final action to retain, rescind or modify the emergency moratorium. The Commission’s findings and recommendations are required to address, at a minimum, the need for and appropriate duration of the moratorium.

9) The emergency moratorium was presented to and discussed by the Planning Commission at its September 21, 2011 meeting and the Commission authorized the distribution of the moratorium ordinance for public review and set October 5, 2011 as the date for the Commission’s public hearing on the matter.

10) Written and/or electronic notice of the Planning Commission’s public hearing was provided to all recipients of the Planning Commission agenda, the Planning Commission’s electronic mailing list, City Council members, Neighborhood Councils, business district associations, adjacent jurisdictions, state and other governmental agencies, the Puyallup Tribal Nation, City staff, City Commissions, environment, development, civic and social organizations, major institutions and employers, and other interested individuals and groups. In addition, notice was sent to community members who testified on the emergency moratorium to the City Council at its August 30, 2011 meeting, all known owners/operators of existing large retail establishments in the city, those who own property on which such large retail establishments are located, and taxpayers of record for all known properties with 400 feet of these properties. In total, the notice was sent out to over 3,000 addresses. Additionally, the public notice was posted on the bulletin boards on the first and second floors of the Tacoma Municipal Building, at all branches of the Tacoma Public Library, and on the City’s internet website.

11) The notice included general information regarding the time and place of the public hearing, a description of the purpose of the public hearing, where additional information could be obtained and how to submit public comment.

12) A copy of the moratorium ordinance was available for review at the offices of the Community and Economic Development Department and was also posted for public review on the City’s website.

13) The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the moratorium on Wednesday, October 5, 2011. Thirty people provided testimony at the hearing and all were strongly in favor of the moratorium, with many requesting to extend the duration beyond 6-months and some requesting a permanent ban on large retail establishments within the City.

14) In addition to the oral testimony received at the October 5, 2011 public hearing, 15 written comments were submitted in response to the public notice prior to the October 7 comment deadline.

15) The Planning Commission reviewed all testimony offered at the October 5, 2011 public hearing and all written testimony submitted to the Commission prior to the comment deadline.

16) The testimony at the public hearing and the information contained in the public record indicate that the public overwhelmingly supports continuation of the moratorium to prevent the establishment of new large retail uses while the City reviews and considers revisions to the regulations for such establishments.
17) Public testimony in support of the moratorium raised a wide range of land use concerns about these types of uses, such as the appropriateness of current zoning, their consistency with the plan policies and vision for various areas of the city, the current permitting process for these types of uses, the inadequacy of the existing design and development standards, and environmental review processes and mitigation standards.

18) Four of the written comments received by the Commission opposed the continuation of the moratorium. The associated concerns included its potential impact on economic development and job recovery within the city and that the City already has regulatory tools in place to address potential design and environmental impacts that may be created by large retail establishments.

19) It is important to note that the moratorium ordinance and the community have expressed concerns about large retail establishments that extend well beyond land use issues and the Planning Commission’s purview (e.g., living wages and employment conditions, unionized labor, crime, corporate conduct, international trade and labor practices, and other significant but very far-reaching socio-economic concerns associated with large retail establishments).

20) The existing moratorium prevents the “filing, acceptance, and processing of applications for land use, building permits or other development permits associated with the establishment, location, or permitting” of large retail establishments. As drafted, this language is very broad and could be interpreted to encompass any and all permitting associated with large retail establishments, including minor remodels or additions to existing large retail establishments (possibly including necessary or needed maintenance and repair), or establishing a new large retail use within an existing, potentially vacant building. It is likely that even if the Commission and Council review and modify the design and development standards for large retail uses, many of these minor types of projects would not be affected by the revised regulations. Also, based on the input received by the Commission it would appear that the primary community concern is associated with the construction of new large retail uses and potentially significant expansions or remodels. If the Council did not intend for the moratorium to affect all types of permitting, including these types of minor actions, it would be appropriate to modify the language of the moratorium to clarify how it impacts remodels, additions and new businesses going into existing buildings.

21) Based on staff research, the City receives requests for approximately one new large retail establishment or a significant remodel of an existing establishment each year. Just over the past couple of months the City has received one building permit application for a new large retailer and an inquiry about construction of another one. It is likely that if the moratorium is not retained one or more new or significantly remodeled large retailers will be permitted under the current regulations and before any amendments could be considered through the standard code update process.

22) Staff has also indicated that there are approximately 17 existing large scale retail uses (as defined by the moratorium ordinance) located within the City, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Approximate Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macy’s (Tacoma Mall)</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>255,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC Penney’s (Tacoma Mall)</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>233,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears (Tacoma Mall)</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>180,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costco (37th &amp; Steele)</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>152,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordstrom (Tacoma Mall)</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>144,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Approximate Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Meyer (19th &amp; Stevens)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>143,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Meyer (72nd &amp; Pacific)</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>142,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe’s (80th &amp; Hosmer)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>138,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe’s (25th &amp; Orchard)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>131,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target (Allenmore)</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>124,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot (Center &amp; Mullen)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>117,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot (74th &amp; Sprague)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>110,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forever 21 (Tacoma Mall)</td>
<td>UCX</td>
<td>106,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Mart (72nd &amp; Portland)</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>106,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Mart (6th &amp; Orchard)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>106,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winco (72nd &amp; Hosmer)</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>103,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Meyer (19th &amp; Mildred)</td>
<td>CCX</td>
<td>68,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23) Large retail uses are currently allowed in many areas of the city. The zoning districts that allow large retail uses include the C-2 General Community Commercial District, CCX Community Commercial Mixed-Use District, UCX Urban Center Mixed-Use District, UCX-TD Urban Center Mixed-Use Tacoma Dome District, CIX Commercial Industrial Mixed-Use District, M-1 Light Industrial District, M-2 Heavy Industrial District, and all of the Downtown zoning districts. It is worth noting that all of the existing large scale retail uses are located within the districts which allow such uses.

24) The intent statements for most of these districts recognize that they are areas appropriate for large scale uses that will attract people from throughout the city and beyond. However, many of these districts, particularly the Mixed-Use Center Districts, are also intended to incorporate a dense and compact mix of uses and a development pattern and form that encourages and supports pedestrian activity and multi-modal transportation choices.

25) The existing large retail establishments in the city generally represent significant portions of the districts in which they are located, often occupying large properties at major intersections or other key locations in the center of their districts. The manner in which these types of projects are developed has a substantial impact on whether these areas can and will meet the applicable Plan policies and goals of the community.

26) The Mixed-Use Centers are a key part of the City’s growth strategy and how it intends to accommodate new population and employment growth as required by state law and regional and local growth management policies. The centers are supposed to incorporate a dense and varied mix of uses that provide opportunities to live, work, play, learn and recreate and are to be designed to support pedestrian activity and multi-modal transportation options. The Plan specifically provides the following objectives for the centers (pages GD-9 – GD-10):

- Strengthen and direct growth with a concentrated mix of diverse uses (work, housing, and amenities) and development toward centers;
- Create a range of safe, convenient, and affordable housing opportunities and choices;
- Create walkable and transit-supportive neighborhoods;
• Build on and enhance existing assets and neighborhood character and identity;
• Foster efficient provision of services and utility;
• Reduce dependence on cars and enhance transportation connectivity;
• Support neighborhood business development; and
• Encourage sustainable development, including green building techniques, green/plant coverage, and low impact development.

27) The Planning Commission and City Council recently conducted a substantial update to the Comprehensive Plan policies, zoning and development regulations for the Mixed-Use Centers. That effort resulted in expanded policy guidance and the creation of three new centers in 2007 and the adoption of revised zoning and design and development regulations in 2009. However, while that project resulted in significant improvements it was largely focused on the Neighborhood Mixed-Use Centers and the Urban and Community Centers did not receive sufficient attention. The eight Community and Urban Centers are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED-USE CENTER</th>
<th>CENTER TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Mall Area</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 72nd and Portland Avenue</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Center/TCC</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Portland Avenue</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South 34th and Pacific Avenue</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South 72nd and Pacific Avenue</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Central Plaza/Allenmore</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28) Of particular note, the Comprehensive Plan policies adopted in 2007 specifically call for the creation of a special permit process for large developments within the Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers. Implementing regulations for these policies have not yet been developed.

29) Based on the Commission’s preliminary review of the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations, there are discrepancies between the current Plan policies relative to Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers and the associated code requirements, particularly as they relate to large retail establishments. While the current regulations applicable to large retail developments in Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers include provisions to promote plan goals they still allow for a largely suburban style of development with large single-use buildings, surrounded by expansive parking. That style of development could thwart the ability for the community to achieve its long-range vision for these areas as described in the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.

30) Based on the moratorium ordinance adopted by the City Council, the public testimony provided, and a preliminary review of the associated Comprehensive Plan policies and associated development regulations, the Commission has identified the following items that are in need of review:

   a) Consider creation of a discretionary permit process for large developments within Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers that would allow for community input as well as a more comprehensive review of large projects to ensure they are consistent with the intent and goals of the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations.

   b) Modify the design and development standards applicable to large scale retail uses within Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers. This could include exploration of new or
modified standards addressing business size limitations, building mass and design details, maximum setbacks and site layout, required mix of uses, parking requirements, and pedestrian orientation and amenities.

c) Review and assess the existing environmental review processes and standards to ensure that they provide the appropriate guidance and authority to address environmental impacts associated with large scale retail uses, with a particular focus on traffic impacts.

31) Under the proposed 6-month moratorium staff would be required to provide draft code changes for Commission review by November 2 and the Commission would have to authorize a full proposal for public review by November 16. If the proposed changes only involved creating a permit review requirement for large projects in certain districts these deadlines could be met. However, based on the Council and community input, all of the identified issues cannot be sufficiently addressed through this one measure. A more detailed review and sophisticated regulatory response are needed and to accomplish this with appropriate community input and in coordination with the Council, this process will require additional time.

32) In order to properly address the identified land use issues and prepare code amendments that sufficiently balance the community’s concerns, this evaluation should include a significant public outreach component. Collaboration with key stakeholders, such as the Neighborhood Councils, Business Districts, other commercial, real estate and business organizations, and the Public Works Department, will require more than the six months provided in the original moratorium ordinance.

D. CONCLUSIONS:

On August 30, 2011, the City Council declared an emergency and adopted an immediate, six-month, city-wide moratorium on the acceptance or processing of development permit applications for large scale retail establishments.

Based on a preliminary review of the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations, the Commission concludes that there are areas where the current land use regulations do not sufficiently implement the Plan policies and goals, particularly as they relate to Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers and the potential development of large retail establishments in these important districts. It is also clear that, absent this moratorium, continued permitting of large scale retail establishments within these districts is likely and if allowed, that continued development under the current regulations will impact the community’s ability to achieve the goals, policies and vision laid out in the Comprehensive Plan.

State law and City Code allow a moratorium to be in effect for up to one year if a work plan to address the permanent regulatory requirements is developed that requires a longer period. After a review of the findings in the moratorium and the extensive public comments provided at the Planning Commission public hearing, it is apparent to the Commission that the range of land use issues raised cannot be addressed with one simple regulatory change. If this project were focused only on creating a discretionary permit review process for large projects in these areas that could likely be accomplished in 6-months. However, considering the much wider scope outlined by the Council and the wide range of community concerns expressed during our public hearing it is apparent that this project involves multiple highly contentious and, in some cases very technical issues and will require significant research, study and public outreach than cannot be accomplished within the original 6-month timeline. The wide-range of issues raised deserve a thorough and considered review and will likely necessitate a comprehensive update to the regulations associated with these uses, potentially including changes to permitting procedures, zoning, design and development standards and environmental review processes and standards. The new land use regulations could impact a wide
range of residents and businesses in our community and, based on the substantial interest shown so far, should be developed in a manner that includes community and stakeholder input and close coordination between the City Council, the Commission and City staff.

The two other moratoria currently in effect, as well as the numerous other work program items, many of which are in response to City Council requests and/or grant funding, do not allow for the Commission or staff to dedicate all of their energy to this particular project. The Commission is also concerned about the potential for this new task to impact these and other important planning work currently underway or planned to occur this fall, such as the proposed amendments to downtown parking requirements and our regular work on the 2012 Annual Amendment. The Commission and staff’s ability to manage existing responsibilities in addition to this new task will be severely constrained within a six-month schedule. In order to minimize such impacts and ensure that this project receives the level of review, outreach and coordination it deserves, a one-year timeline is needed.

E. RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission finds that there is a need for an emergency moratorium to preserve the status quo and prevent vesting of development permits under the current regulations while the City reviews and considers development of improved regulations pertaining to large scale retail establishments.

However, the Planning Commission also recommends that the City Council reduce the geographic scope of the moratorium so that it applies only to Community and Urban Mixed-Use Centers and, if appropriate, clarify how the moratorium is intended to apply to remodels and additions to existing large retail uses and the potential reuse of existing, potentially vacant buildings.

Lastly, the Commission further recommends that the City Council extend the timeline associated with the emergency moratorium on large scale retail establishments to one year (until August 30, 2012) in order to allow the Commission, Council, staff and community sufficient time to develop a comprehensive and balanced regulatory approach that will address the myriad of land use issues that have been raised during this process, as outlined in the attached work plan.

F. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed 12-Month Work Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>August 30, 2011</strong></td>
<td>City Council adopts emergency moratorium; Ordinance No. 28014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2011</td>
<td>Effective date of emergency moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21</td>
<td>Planning Commission discussion of Ordinance No. 28010, State law, Council direction and proposed code amendment schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Provide notice for Commission public hearing on emergency moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 5</strong></td>
<td>Planning Commission public hearing on emergency moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>Commission review of preliminary draft code options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 19</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation to City Council on emergency moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>Provide notice of Commission’s recommendation on moratorium in advance of Council public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 25, 2011</strong></td>
<td>City Council conducts public hearing on emergency moratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2011</td>
<td>City Council clarifies and extends the moratorium to one-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>Commission discussion of identified issues, timeline, public outreach, project scope, and benchmarking from other jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5</td>
<td>Commission discussion of Community and Urban Centers policies, vision, geographies, existing circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Community/stakeholder outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Council Committee discussion of identified issues, Mixed-Use Centers policies and vision, community and stakeholder input, and project scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18</td>
<td>Commission discussion of large retail and shopping center design and development standards (parking, setbacks, landscaping, mass reduction, pedestrian-orientation, and other site and building design requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February</td>
<td>Community/stakeholder outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Commission discussion of environmental review processes and mitigation standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February/March</td>
<td>Council Committee discussion of design and development standards and environmental review processes and mitigation standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>Commission authorizes draft amendments for public review and sets the public hearing date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>Distribution of public notice for Planning Commission public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2012</td>
<td>Public informational meeting on draft amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2012</td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission public hearing on draft amendments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27</td>
<td>Last day to submit written comments on draft amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Council Committee discussion of public review draft and public comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>Planning Commission discussion of hearing testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30, 2012</td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission makes recommendation to City Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>City Council sets hearing date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>City Clerk distributes public notice for City Council public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>City Council study session on proposed amendments, as recommended by the Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 26, 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>City Council conducts public hearing on proposed amendments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Council Committee discussion of hearing testimony and potential changes to the draft ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>City Council – first reading of ordinance(s) to adopt amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>City Council – second reading and adoption of amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17</td>
<td>Submit final amendments to State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>Effective date of amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30, 2012</td>
<td>Moratorium expires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING COMMISSION 2011-2012 PLANNING ACTIVITIES
### OCTOBER 1, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoreline Master Program Update</strong></td>
<td>Shoreline Mgt Act</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City is required to update the SMP by Dec 1, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012 Annual Amendment</strong></td>
<td>Municipal Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Container Port Element</td>
<td>Growth Mgt Act/Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Housing Element Update - Affordable Housing Policy Principles</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Transportation Element Update</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sign Code Revisions - Digital on-premises signs</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Plating and Subdivision Code Revisions</td>
<td>Growth Management Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Urban Forestry Code Revisions – Landscaping and Vegetation</td>
<td>PW/Env. Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Minor Plan and Regulatory Code Refinements</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Billboard Regulations</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise regulations per Council’s direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Cannabis Moratorium and Regulation Development</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop regulations for medical cannabis uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large scale Retail Moratorium and Regulation Development</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise regulations for large scale retail uses in mixed use districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)</strong></td>
<td>EPA Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop TDR program in coordination with county and region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Downtown/Brewery District Sub-area Plan</strong></td>
<td>PSRC Regional Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct subarea planning and SEPA upfront review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MLK District Sub-area Plan &amp; SEPA Planned Action</strong></td>
<td>State Commerce Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct subarea planning for the MLK corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Areas Preservation Ordinance (CAPO)</strong></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code revisions to support voluntary restoration &amp; simplify permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code revisions to further implement Historic Preservation Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Requirements - Downtown</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise requirements in DCC zone and historic districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoreline Public Access and Restoration Planning</strong></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Master Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Requirements – Commercial Districts Citywide</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add incentives and revise code to reduce parking requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Annual Amendment</td>
<td>Municipal Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private Applications</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council/Commission/Staff applications</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan and Regulatory Code Refinements</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Potential Projects Being Discussed

| Affordable Housing Strategies                                         | City Council                  |       |       |
| Plan and code revisions to increase availability of affordable housing |                               |       |       |

Implement Sustainable Tacoma Commission Priorities

Establish policies for green house gas emissions review under SEPA

| Capital Facilities Planning and Programming                          | Finance & Public Works Depts  |       |       |
| Revise procedures for meeting GMA requirements for capital facilities |                               |       |       |

KEY:
- **Green**: Mandated projects
- **Blue**: Grant obligations
- **Tan**: Projects committed and underway
- **Yellow**: Planned for initiation
- **Pink**: Projects under consideration