



## **Parking Technical Advisory Group**

**728 St. Helens; Room 16**

**Meeting #112 – March 2, 2017, Notes**

### **4:10 Meeting called to order by Co-Chairs**

Judi Hyman, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order.

Eric Huseby from the City of Tacoma gave a brief update on some of the parking related items the City has been working on:

- The parking services group has moved into their new offices in the 900 block of Pacific Avenue. This is activating a long vacant space on the first floor of the Park Plaza North parking garage at 923 Commerce. They are sharing the space with Republic Parking, the company managing several parts of the City's parking program.
- The Residential Parking Program went live 2 weeks ago which means the City has been fielding lots of questions about the program. The first round deadline of April 3<sup>rd</sup> is coming up soon for those applicants that hope to have new signs up by this summer. The City also had a good presentation to the North Slope Neighbors, one of the neighborhoods most impacted by significant non-residential parking generators.

[JH] gave an update on the City's Transportation Commission. The Transportation Commission is currently reviewing the 6-year transportation improvement program, the work being done under the Tacoma Streets Initiative, and revised complete streets language. She did not feel that any of these would impact parking at this stage.

#### **4:30                      Mixed Use Center Parking Discussion**

David Schroedel, a consultant, began by reminding the group of the ongoing discussion on restricted parking for residents within mixed use centers. Currently, based on PTAG recommendations in the past, residential parking preferences may be put in place in any residentially zoned area, but anywhere that is mixed use of residential and commercial is not currently eligible. This was intended to give the PTAG more time to evaluate who the priority users are in these areas.

Up until now, most of the conversations in the PTAG have looked at the Stadium District as a case study for application of rules. Today, the discussion decided to focus more on the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue District running from roughly Sprague to Alder. After a walkthrough of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue itself using Google Streetview, the conclusions about the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue environment included almost all commercial buildings along 6<sup>th</sup> itself with a handful of multifamily units above commercial & one stand alone multifamily building. Shortly off of 6<sup>th</sup>, the landscape changes to single family and low density multifamily (2-3 stories) quickly. A block off 6<sup>th</sup>, most buildings are single family.

Based on this review, the PTAG could not see a scenario where an residential parking zone would be appropriate on 6<sup>th</sup> between Sprague and Alder. With nearly all of the block faces being nearly all commercial, the priority user is clearly the customer, client and visitor.

Starting from Alder, the PTAG then began reviewing streets block-by-block with the following conclusions:

**Alder:** No RPZ on a multilane arterial with only commercial uses within the mixed use center (MUC) zone.

**Cedar:** On Cedar, there were still entirely commercial uses inside the MUC, though a couple of the buildings were houses that had been converted. After some discussion the PTAG felt that if these were exclusively residential uses zone MUC that abutting the residential zoning, residents should be allowed to “buy-in” to an adjacent RPZ should one be established. If one was not established, there was not enough demand for parking by non-residents to create a significant enough problem.

**Junett:** One side of Junett was consistent with past blocks in that it was 100% commercial. However, on the north side of Junett, the zoning extended more than the 1/2 block seen so far. With the MUC zone extending a full block north of 6<sup>th</sup>, it included a 3-story multifamily property.

The group was divided on who the priority user of the curb face was. Some additional characteristics of the situation included limited off-street parking at the building, detached singly-family homes across the street to the north, a restaurant across the street to the east, the lower density nature of the development, the age of the development, and a “local residential road feel” along North 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

After much discussion the group was undecided on whether residents along the block:

- 1) Would not be allowed to participate in any RPZ
- 2) Would be allowed to buy-in to an adjacent RPZ should it be created (like the Cedar conversation)
- 3) Would be allowed to expand an adjacent RPZ to include their side of the street if an RPZ were created
- 4) Would be allowed to be part of the creation of an RPZ from the outset

This question was left open to be returned to next month. Additionally, the group would be taking on more split block questions as the block/alley orientation changes.

**The meeting was adjourned at 6PM with the next meeting on 4/6.**