



Parking Technical Advisory Group

728 St. Helens; Room 16

Meeting #90 – January 8, 2014, Notes

4:10 Meeting called to order by Co-Chairs

Steph Farber, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order. The December 4th notes were approved as presented.

[SF] began introductions around the room as well as invited interested people to consider joining the PTAG in the future.

4:25 Public Comment Period [focusing on Residential Program]

Due to the number of people in the room, the PTAG decided to go straight into public comment to ensure everyone ample time to comment. David Schroedel, a consultant to the City, gave an overview of public comment and the goal of listening rather than debating.

The public comment received included the following:

Received prior to the meeting by Eric Huseby, Parking Services Manager:

1. \$60 per vehicle is too much, but \$60 per household might be okay (repeated again)
2. Each resident should control spaces in front of their home
3. \$250 permit application fee is too much for a small parking zone (repeated again)
4. Appreciate the ability to expand/contract zones
5. Large vehicles (like trailers) take up the parking
6. Existing permit zones don't allow space for visitors – it's needed
7. Residents will park in front of neighbor's homes
8. Apartment residents take up the parking
9. Group Health employees take up the parking
10. Getting 60% approval of owners would be challenging
11. Contacting & getting 60% approval of residents in apartments would be difficult (repeated two additional times)
12. With the number of residents, apartment buildings could skew approval numbers needed (repeated again)
13. Like all changes proposed to permit zones
14. Zones need better enforcement
15. No spaces are available near Tacoma General for residents
16. Some existing residential permit zones may not qualify under 10 block face minimum – proposed 5 block face minimum (repeated two additional times)
17. Guest pass provisions proposed are too generous
18. Allowing non-permit holders to park in residential zone is too generous
19. Appreciate ability of non-permit holders to park for 2hrs

Speaker regarding area near North Tacoma:

- 20. Block face definition is too complex
- 21. Pointers on how to address neighbors would be helpful

Speaker regarding area near N. 21st & Oakes:

- 22. Existing zones are working well
- 23. Enforcement is not needed
- 24. Grandfather existing zones in with a zone application

Speaker regarding area near St. Pat's School:

- 25. 10 block faces doesn't work since they are talking about 8 homes
- 26. Allow permits for repeated workers/contractors to residences
- 27. Allow family member passes

Speaker regarding area near North Slope:

- 28. Concerned about parking from Group Health
- 29. \$60 could be a hardship for some
- 30. Apartments with parking could choose not to participate (lowering community support potentially below 60% threshold)
- 31. Public transportation is insufficient to support less cars

Speaker regarding area near North Slope:

- 32. Will residential mental health facility at 402 N. J St. be counted in the number of eligible parkers for the purposes of community support? [unknown]
- 33. There is no incentive for anyone with off-street parking to participate

Speaker regarding area near N. 3rd & Tacoma:

- 34. Existing zone works well with limited enforcement
- 35. Existing zone would not qualify for current program – suggest reducing the minimum zone size

Speaker regarding area near the Wedge:

- 36. Current zone on South M Street has worked well over the last 12 years
- 37. Signs are a sufficient deterrent with occasional enforcement calls
- 38. Small zones less than 10 block faces work
- 39. Shouldn't have to pay for the zone/signs again – already paid \$79 for the signs

Speaker regarding area near S. 5th & M and S. 5th & G:

- 40. Current zones work well
- 41. If small zones become one larger zone, higher intensity uses can have parkers encroach on smaller single family uses
- 42. Guest passes could overburden the zone when multifamily is present – though it could work in single family areas
- 43. Current guests in zone park without regard to rules, requiring a call to enforcement
- 44. 2hr limit option in lieu of permit could overburden zone – currently contractors are just handed an extra residential parking permit while they are working on the building
- 45. Multicare employees and construction workers are a significant issue
- 46. The hardest time to find parking in the area is in the evening

Speaker regarding area near Annie Wright:

- 47. If the residential area around Annie Wright School became all permit parking, employees would have nowhere to park

Speaker regarding area near 6th Avenue Business District and 6th & Oakes:

- 48. Concerned about residential parking permits impact 6th Ave Business District which employs about 300 people
- 49. Residential program doesn't address ease of parking for business customers – currently #1 customer issue
- 50. 2hr or by permit may help some, but still have to address employee parking. Transportation options are limited for employees in the winter (dark & wet)

Speaker regarding area near Proctor District:

- 51. Area has existing parking challenges
- 52. Unclear how the parking zones would be determined & by whom [suggested by residents]
- 53. Density needs additional public transportation
- 54. Concerns about added density

Speaker regarding area near Wright Park & 6th Ave:

- 55. Multicare parking is an issue in the morning and during the day
- 56. 20 units are in the building, but building may not qualify based on zoning designation
- 57. Need resolution of the parking problems
- 58. Meters might work better in area rather than resident or 2hrs
- 59. City has done a good job with the meter system downtown

Speaker regarding area near south side of Wright Park:

- 60. Zone has worked well for 10yrs, since paid \$75 per sign
- 61. Extra residential placards are used for guests
- 62. Prefers a system where permits are assigned to residence rather than license
- 63. Police have had a good response time when called
- 64. Concerned about renters using permits
- 65. Currently residents police their own zones

Speaker regarding area near N. 4th & D:

- 66. The existing system works well
- 67. Stadium High School football games are biggest parking challenge
- 68. Prefers hang tags to license plate system
- 69. 2hr or by permit makes more sense near businesses

General final comments regarding system as a whole:

- 70. 10 block face minimum doesn't work
- 71. Consider multiple types of residential parking zones
- 72. Concerned about paying for system
- 73. Existing system works well (repeated again)
- 74. Remember that available parking impacts occupancy in apartment buildings
- 75. If a 2hr limit is used in conjunction with permit, it needs regular enforcement
- 76. Prefer permit tied to address rather than vehicle (repeated again)
- 77. City needs to coordinate between departments on parking & land use issues
- 78. Appreciate the annual fee implementation (repeated again)

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10PM with the next meeting on 2/