



Parking Technical Advisory Group

728 St. Helens; Room 16

Meeting #115 – June 1, 2017, Notes

4:10 Meeting called to order by Co-Chairs

Steph Farber, one of the co-chairs, called the meeting to order.

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

- The Stadium Business District occupancy study is wrapping up. A presentation is coming later this summer to the PTAG.
- License plate recognition technology [LPR] is expected to go live this month with testing.

4:30 RPZ Signage Discussion

[RL] brought forward examples of sign options around the RPZ. The sign examples were both 2-hour except by permit. The most significant differences between the signs were related to "PARKING" or "P"; size of time/date applicability; and a question of whether the Zone should be moved to the top.

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.

Based on a few months' discussions, the group had effectively come up with four options for areas in question within the MUCs:

- 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
- 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

Since the last meeting, staff took the feedback from the PTAG on how to apply these rules and applied it to the 6th Avenue MUC and the Hilltop MUC. The rules used were:

- A) If a full block face of residential uses within the MUC is adjacent to an RPZ, the RPZ can be extended to include the full block face. [option 3 above]
- B) If a partial block face of residential uses (and partial non-residential) within the MUC is adjacent to an RPZ, the residents adjacent may buy RPZ passes to park in the adjacent RPZ, but cannot extend the RPZ to their property. [option 2 above]
- C) If a residential use is not adjacent to an RPZ, they are not allowed to participate in any RPZ. [option 1 above]

Based on these rules, the PTAG reviewed the application to the 6th Ave MUC. The one outlier was the multifamily building at 6th & Trafton. While the PTAG didn't feel like a RPZ should be allowed on 6th, the above rules didn't preclude it. The sense was that 6th Avenue was the main commercial corridor through the MUC. In order to recognize this significance and that 6th Avenue parking is really a shared resource with no priority user, the group looked at using the Primary Pedestrian Street designation already in the zoning code and being applied to 6th Avenue in the MUC. The added this rule:

- D) No RPZs are allowed on Primary Pedestrian Streets [as defined by TMC 13.06]

The PTAG then turned its attention to the Hilltop MUC along Martin Luther King Jr Way. This MUC has a different layout than the linear 6th Ave MUC. Rather than being aligned entirely along a central corridor, the Hilltop MUC has a several block depth in every direction. Also rather than leading with entertainment uses, Hilltop has more service & medical uses integrated into it. It also directly abuts much of downtown leading to greater density of uses.

The first area examined within the Hilltop MUC was the area around S. 8th & I Streets where an existing RPZ is and a new application has already been received. Much of this neighborhood is outside of the MUC, being zoned residential. However, these residential patterns extend into the MUC and the application of rules A-D could be tested on this area.

Because of the complex nature of development patterns here, the group explored several edge cases:

- 1) Diagonal connectivity: The group decided that an RPZ be extended across an intersection diagonally or across the street.

- 2) Can an RPZ be expanded more than one block face into an RPZ despite the potential to lose part of the original RPZ leaving a smaller remnant RPZ inside a MUC with no parent adjacent? The group decided it was very unlikely, but yes it should be allowed.
- 3) Does a small single parcel non-residential use preclude the extension of an RPZ in an otherwise residential character neighborhood? No. RPZs may be continued provided the block face is not interrupted by more than 100' of non-residential uses.

Following these additional points of reference, City staff was going to take another look at the details and prepare for more discussion next month.

The PTAG briefly discussed the need for a more robust set of discussion points for those areas that would be losing their RPZ and would not be eligible for the new RPZs. The point was that simply telling a resident that they are not the priority parker, is not a sufficient answer. There needs to be a more complete explanation regarding the shared use of a public resource and making the neighborhood stronger and vibrant.

[There was nobody attending to provide public comment.]

The meeting was adjourned at 6PM with the next meeting on 6/1.