

From: Vicki Mckinney <vickimckinney@tds.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 9:19 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: ADU regulations
Attachments: ADU regs.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please find (attached) my letter to the Tacoma City Council Members regarding the new ADU Regulations.

Thank You

Victoria McKinney

--

The true measure of a person is how they treat someone that can do them absolutely no good!

March 5, 2019

Re: ADU Regulations

Dear City of Tacoma Council Members,

I lived in the unincorporated area of Tacoma for over 50 years. Raised my children there and worked there as a non-profit advocate for over 30 years. Non-profit work rarely has funds left for retirement plans or health care but it was my calling and back then we all thought our contribution to Social Security would be enough to live on. However, times have changed and as a Senior citizen in retirement I find myself in a situation of not being able to truly retire. I'm very fortunate to be able to work part time job to try and make ends meet. To help with this situation my son has offered to build an apartment above his garage in Tacoma. This is my reason for writing in favor of the changes to your ADU regulations. Not only will it help seniors, such as myself, but it will also help many people unable to find affordable housing. I implore you to pass these new regulations.

Respectfully,

Victoria McKinney

102 Ripple Way

Cinebar, WA 98533

From: Foster, Katie
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 8:44 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: DADU Amendment Comment
Attachments: DADU Amendment Comment.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Katie Foster
City of Tacoma | City Clerk's Office
Phone: 253-591-5153 | Fax: 253-591-5300

DONALD K ERICKSON, AICP

218 Tacoma Avenue N; Unit 402

Tacoma, WA 98403

February 28, 2019

Honorable Robert Thoms
Tacoma City Council Member
747 Market Street
Tacoma, WA 98402

Subject: Proposed DADU Amendments

Dear Council Member Robert Thoms;

I attended last week's Council Public Hearing on the latest proposed amendments regarding the ADU Regulations by the IPS Committee and applaud your and Council Member Hunter's efforts, among others, to refine and improve the draft ADU regulations. I was gratified to see design standards reinstated that should increase neighborhood acceptability while improving privacy between abutting properties. I also support among other things reducing off-street parking requirements, especially for units with a ¼ mile walking distance of designated transit routes.

At the public hearing a number of people testified in support of the proposed amendments in the hopes that the new provisions would result in more affordable housing for under-served segments of the housing market. Unfortunately, without City/County assistance these new units are unlikely to be any more affordable than similarly sized smaller studio unit in a new multi-family residential building. Unless the City waives or significantly reduces development fees, and/or its share of City property taxes (much as it now does for new residential developments in our MUCs and downtown) these new ADUs/DADUs will not be affordable, as even pre-fabricated units now cost in the vicinity of \$300 per square foot! As a result, we are looking at a building or development cost of around \$240,000 for a small 800 square-foot unit and around \$300,000 for a 1,000 square-foot DADU. A 30-year mortgage for a 1,000 sq. ft. unit at interest rates of 4.4% - 5.1% would require mortgage payments of \$1,200 to \$2,000 per month, plus lender fees, utilities, etc. With a 15-year mortgage and interest rates between 3.5% and 4.5% one's mortgage payments would increase to between \$1,700 and \$1,800 per month, exclusive of lender fees, taxes, and utilities. Passing these costs on to one's tenants in the form of rent hardly results in what most people would consider "affordable" rental units.

This is why I would encourage you and the City (as an option for developers) to explore ways of subsidizing or reducing these costs for new ADUs/DADUs, in exchange for the property owner agreeing to rent such a "reduced price rental", for say a minimum of ten or more years, at rents not exceeding 70% of the median rent for similar sized market-rate units in the same area, per month.

The other concern I have and hope you and the council share, is that the proposed ADU/DADU legislation in our State legislature would usurp most of Tacoma's latest proposed recommendations for ADUs/DADUs. Both the House and Senate bills as currently proposed would go beyond Tacoma's current provisions and permit two ADUs per lot wherever there is a "single, detached home or duplex, triplex, or townhome" in cities of 2,500 people or more, and within an urban growth boundary. In addition, both of the proposals before the legislature this year stipulate that by July 1, 2020 all cities of more than 2,500 shall develop ordinances that, among other things, do not:

- Impose a minimum lot size requirement for siting ADUs;
- Require the installation of new or separate utilities;

- Count ADU residents towards the number of unrelated residents on a single-family lot;
- Establish development standards that include certain roof and wall height limitations on detached ADUs;
- Regulate the location of ADU entry doors;
- Limit the maximum gross floor area of an ADU to less than 1,000 square feet; and
- Require the exterior design or appearance of an ADU [to] be similar to the appearance of the principal housing unit [on the lot].

I would encourage the City of Tacoma to join with the Association of Washington Cities in the likely event that they come out in opposition to both HB 1797 and its companion bill, SB 5812. Were either of these to be adopted in some form there should be, as a minimum, a provision that cities which have adopted ordinances allowing one or more ADUs per single-family lot within their jurisdiction prior to July 1, 2020, to be exempted from these new requirements.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours truly,



Donald K. Erickson, AICP

Attachments: SB Report, SB 5812

Cc: Deputy Mayor McCarthy
Council Member Lillian Hunter
Council Member Chris Beale

Attachment: Senate Bill Report – SB 5812

SENATE BILL REPORT

SB 5812

As of February 21, 2019

Title: An act relating to local governments planning and zoning for accessory dwelling units.

Brief Description: Concerning local governments planning and zoning for accessory dwelling units.

Sponsors: Senators Palumbo, Liias and Nguyen.

Brief History:

Committee Activity: Housing Stability & Affordability: 2/13/19.

Brief Summary of Bill

- Requires cities and counties to adopt ordinances and development and zoning regulations that authorize creating accessory dwelling units within designated urban growth areas.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON HOUSING STABILITY & AFFORDABILITY

Staff: Brandon Popovac (786-7465)

Background: Local Planning for Accessory Apartments. Local governments must have accessory apartment—commonly referred to as an accessory dwelling unit (ADU)—provisions incorporated in their development regulations, zoning regulations, or official controls. These provisions must be consistent with a 1993 report by the Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development's (CTED) providing recommendations to the Legislature designed to encourage developing and placing accessory apartments in areas zoned for single-family residential use. The CTED recommendations include standards and criteria regarding size, parking, design, and quantity of accessory apartments. "Local government" means a county that is planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA), a city with a population of over 20,000, and a county with a population of over 125,000.

Urban Growth Areas. Counties that fully plan under the GMA must designate Urban Growth Areas (UGAs). UGAs are areas within which urban growth must be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature. Planning jurisdictions must include, within their UGAs, sufficient areas and densities to accommodate projected urban

This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not a part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.

growth for the succeeding 20-year period. In addition, cities must include sufficient areas to accommodate the broad range of needs and uses that will accompany the projected urban growth, including, as appropriate, medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail, and other nonresidential uses.

Summary of Bill: By July 1, 2020, any city with a population of 2500 or more and any county with a population of 15,000 or more must adopt by ordinance and incorporate into its development and zoning regulations an authorization for creating ADUs within designated UGAs.

Such ordinances and regulations must allow:

- either one attached ADU and one detached ADU or two attached ADUs on all lots zoned for single-family homes and all lots that contain a single-family housing unit;
- one attached ADU on any lot zoned for single-family homes; and
- detached ADUs to be sited at the lot line of the rear yard if adjacent to an alley within five feet of the rear yard lot line if approved in writing by the adjacent property owner.

Such ordinances and regulations may not:

- impose minimum lot size requirements for siting ADUs;
- require installation of new or separate utilities between an attached ADU and a utility;
- consider attached ADUs to be new residential uses for calculating utility connection or capacity fees, but may require a utility connection between a detached ADU and a utility with the appropriate and proportionate connection or capacity fee;
- prohibit the sale of a condominium unit on sole grounds it was originally an ADU;
- count ADU residents towards the number of unrelated residents on a single-family lot;
- establish requirements for ADU off-street parking;
- require the lot owner to reside or occupy the ADU or other housing unit on the same lot;
- count the gross floor area of an ADU against any single-family home floor area ratio limitations;
- establish development standards that include certain roof and wall height limitations on detached ADUs;
- regulate the location of ADU entry doors;
- establish maximum rear yard coverages for detached ADUs less than 60 percent of the rear yard;
- establish tree retention requirements for ADUs in addition to those that exist for single-family homes;
- require the exterior design or appearance of an ADU be similar to the appearance of the principal housing unit;
- limit the roof height of detached ADUs to less than 24 feet or limit their wall height to less than 17 feet; and
- limit the maximum gross floor area of an ADU to less than 1,000 square feet or its minimum gross floor area to more than 140 square feet.

By April 1, 2020, the Building Code Council must adopt rules pertaining to ADUs consistent with the act's definitions and development standards.

An impact fee for ADUs established by local ordinance may not be more than 50 percent of the impact fee set for single-family residences.

"Dwelling unit" is defined as a residential that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons and includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation. "Accessory dwelling unit" is defined as a dwelling unit located in the same lot as a single-family housing unit, duplex, triplex, townhome, or other housing unit.

Appropriation: None.

Fiscal Note: Available.

Creates Committee/Commission/Task Force that includes Legislative members: No.

Effective Date: Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

Staff Summary of Public Testimony: PRO: This represents one more approach to the affordable housing crisis that legislators are trying to fix. More people are moving to Washington State and home construction is not keeping up. ADUs represent a happy medium since it can increase housing density within the framework of the existing neighborhood. The bill represents the lowest hanging fruit to help ease the housing shortage. ADUs do not require a lot of infrastructure either. Any additional housing that local officials can bring into their respective jurisdictions benefits the broader region.

With extremely high Puget Sound real estate prices, the state's younger generation is unlikely to be able to afford a house or save up enough money for a down payment. With more of the younger generation being pushed to the suburbs, more carbon intensive commutes occur. ADUs provide supplemental income to homeowners and the potential for more affordable rents. ADUs can be helpful for senior citizens who are facing a limited income after retirement by generating more income or perhaps feel safer by having somebody live close by. If their home no longer meets their needs, senior citizens can move into an ADU that is universal design and is more accessible for them and then rent out the main property.

Requiring all local governments to authorize ADU development is necessary since it is difficult for an individual local government to develop more housing if surrounding jurisdictions are not going to step up and do the same.

ADUs provide green housing options since they are compact and energy efficient. ADUs can help avoid a climate crisis and bring down overall emissions by not pushing people out of the city. People who are forced to move out of the city either double or quadruple their carbon footprint. ADUs are environmentally responsible building options and only require a few resources to construct while consuming far less energy than larger size homes. ADUs allow more people to live near the places they work and shop, walk to transit, or bike instead of driving a car. ADUs make it easier for multiple generations of the family to occupy the same lot and for young home buyers to offset their high mortgage costs with rental income.

CON: The bill should be an option for cities and counties and not a requirement. Removing the detached ADU portion of the bill and just including the attached ADU would not impact underlying density issues. Requiring ADU regulations might impact the installation of septic systems and other infrastructure requirements. Urban growth areas are very difficult area to map out and determine which areas the counties can expand to. The growth management hearings board has ruled in a number of occasions that attached ADUs must be considered in overall density considerations for counties. Any changes must be considered when complying with the growth management act, which puts counties in the crosshairs for appeals. Population capacity and population trends must be considered when counties implement their housing element. The bill might lead to the doubling of density in many zones relating to detached ADUs and possibly decrease the amount of available land for development, leading to an unintended price increase on development overall. The bill removes all of the optional tools cities have to implement ADU use. The bill would allow a twenty-four foot high ADU roof line in a single story rambler neighborhood. It would allow people to build a two-story ADU close to property lines.

OTHER: The population threshold for the bill's application is problematic. The bill would apply to smaller cities that do not have reliable transit options, and there is a great need to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

Persons Testifying: PRO: Senator Guy Palumbo, Prime Sponsor; Alex Hur, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties; Joanna Grist, AARP Washington; Margaret Morales, Sightline Institute; Emily Johnston, 350 Seattle; Brittany Bollay, Sierra Club; Shannon Loew, Impact Development; Kate Burke, City of Spokane Council Member; Austin Bell, Deputy Mayor, Burien; Denise Rodriguez, Washington Homeownership Resource Center.

CON: Carl Schroeder, Association of Washington Cities; Paul Jewell, Washington State Association of Counties; Wes McCart, Stevens County.

OTHER: Bryce Yadon, Futurewise.

Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying: No one.

From: Susan Walker <smaurawalker@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 7:02 PM

To: City Clerk's Office

Subject: Feb 19th Meeting Concerning DADU's

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Greetings, I was very pleased to read the Tribune article outlining the findings of the Feb. 19th hearing. I own a duplex on a large property and hope to convert the garage at the back of the property into a DADU. It has alley access and off street parking and would be ideal for a single occupant dwelling.

I was also encouraged to see that the requirement for the owner to be resident on the property will be eliminated. I will eventually live on the property after retirement but will probably not be able to afford the build if I can't rent it for a few years first. I live nearby now and have long-term tenants who will tolerate no drama on the property.

I completely concur that the units should be used to help eliminate the shortage of affordable housing. My duplex is rented to THA clients and I plan to do the same with the DADU if given the chance. I think it would be a good idea to require ADUs and DADUs to be listed as accepting Section 8 and HOP renters and that they be listed on the THA webpage of available rentals if not being rented to family members.

Thank you so much for the effort you are all putting in to assure this rezoning is done to maximize the benefits to the communities.

Susan M. Walker

From: Barnett, Elliott
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 12:39 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Fwd: Public Hearing Notice on Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Regulations - 2/19/19
Attachments: image001.jpg; ATT00001.htm; ADU Garage Plan.pdf; ATT00002.htm

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Another comment

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alex Trettin <Alex@travelcenter4u.com>
Date: February 27, 2019 at 12:29:39 PM PST
To: "Foster, Katie" <KFoster2@ci.tacoma.wa.us>
Cc: "Barnett, Elliott" <elliott.barnett@ci.tacoma.wa.us>
Subject: RE: Public Hearing Notice on Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Regulations - 2/19/19

Attached please find the image I share during my testimony. Please share with the city council.

Alex Trettin

President
Travel Leaders - Travel Center Inc.
1142 Broadway Suite 100
Tacoma WA 98402
(P) 253-383-8000 (F) 253-564-5020
alex@travelcenter4u.com
www.travelcenter4u.com



Travel is a Journey, Discover All That's Ahead

Our brand embodies our commitment to our customers and our progressive approach toward travel. Welcome to Travel Leaders.



A full-sized garage with a complete 2-bedroom apartment above can be an investment that easily pays for itself.

As you can see, the structure of the building is clean and simple, with trussed roof, TJI® second floor and slab first floor.



Second Floor Plan



First Floor Plan



LIVING AREA: 720 SF	WIDTH: 24'-0" (27'-6")
WDW./FLR. %: 15.5%	DEPTH: 30'-0"
BEDROOMS: 2	RIDGE HEIGHT: 22'-8"
BATHROOMS: 1	GARAGE: 720 SF

PLAN No.

1440-1

From: Michael <mmalaier@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 11:48 AM
To: City Clerk's Office; Hunter, Lillian; Mello, Ryan; Blocker, Keith; Ibsen, Anders; Thoms, Robert; Ushka, Catherine; Beale, Chris
Subject: ADU Regulations

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a homeowner at 3410 N. 19th Street. I write to voice my strong disagreement with the proposed ADU rules. It should be obvious that providing an incentive to pack people into our (largely) serene neighborhoods isn't fair, much less right. Why is Tacoma constantly trying to mimic Seattle's mistakes? Does anyone over the age of 30 actually think that Seattle, Fremont, Ballard, etc are **better** now, than they were 10 years ago? Do they really feel that the character of those communities has been preserved? Of course not.

Practically speaking, parking is already at a premium in most North End neighborhoods. Potentially doubling the number of cars on the street will be disastrous. My wife and I saved for years to put in a down payment on our house, and we chose it because of the neighborhood feel. These proposed ordinances will, inevitably, undermine the quality of life here. Why should the city encourage backyard rentals in established neighborhoods, when much of the city is wide open? Every time I drive down South Tacoma Way, I see buildings in need of rehab, which would (with the right investment) make attractive and quality rentals/condos. The same can be said for much of downtown, south of 25th. Shouldn't we focus on developing open space, than 100 year old, occupied residential neighborhoods?

The proposals should be rejected *in toto*.

Thank you for the consideration,

Michael Malaier

From: susan manning <smanning209@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 8:51 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Barnett, Elliott
Subject: Request Regarding Detached ADUs
Attachments: ADU - Request for Code Adjustment Regarding Height Allowed.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

February 25, 2019

Dear Tacoma City Mayor, City Council Members and Planning Commission Staff,

Thank-you for encouraging public comment regarding the ADU code changes.

I am writing to request a change to the height limit in section 13.06.150D.3.b. Would you consider removing the requirement that a detached ADU be no taller than the main house?

Here is the current draft code:

13.06.150D.3.b. Detached ADUs shall be not taller than the main house. In addition, height shall be limited to the most restrictive of the following:

(1) The maximum height for detached ADUs shall be 18 feet, measured per the Building Code, or up to 20 feet with incorporation of either parking on the main level of the structure, or of green features.

This is the adjustment I am requesting:

13.06.150D.3.b. The height of Detached ADUs shall be limited to the most restrictive of the following:

(1) The maximum height for detached ADUs shall be 18 feet, measured per the Building Code, or up to 20 feet with incorporation of either parking on the main level of the structure, or of green features.

My house is one-and-a-half stories and is approx. 16 feet high, measured per the Building Code. If I can afford to do so I would like to build a detached ADU with parking for one small car on the north side of the main level, laundry facilities, bicycle storage, and a passive solar arrangement on the south side of the main level, and a small but comfortable and energy efficient apartment above the main level. I am trying to keep the ADU as small as possible, both in height and in footprint, because I want it to fit in well in my backyard and in my neighborhood. I am also trying to build a simple gabled roofline, as it fits in with the surrounding 1940's-built neighborhood. I love my home and my neighborhood and so need any changes to be as comfortable as possible for myself and for my neighbors, as well as for any future renter. I might even live in this ADU if I can persuade elderly relatives to live in my house; meanwhile I would rent it out and it will also be handy when I'm elderly and need someone living with me to help out.

A friend with experience in designing and building houses has been helping me plan this hoped-for ADU and we have tried very hard to limit the height to the height of my house but it is very difficult, perhaps impossible, to do so with parking on the main level. You have mentioned your desire to alleviate, whenever reasonable, barriers to the infill housing project and I think that tying the height limit to the height of the house is a barrier for people who have smaller homes. I think it could be possible to build the ADU I've described with a height of 18 feet, certainly at a 20 foot height would be possible. Allowing for parking underneath makes it possible for environmentally concerned homeowners to keep as much

green space as possible in their yards and in our city and our world. This would also help avoid contributing to parking problems in our neighborhood; although it's commendable that you've removed a requirement for on-site parking in order to withdraw this barrier to building ADUs it would still be preferable to have on-site parking whenever possible. An ADU of no more than 20 feet, or even 18 feet, would remove barriers unfairly placed on owners of small houses while keeping the height from overwhelming the lot or the neighboring lots.

Thank-you so much for your efforts and attention.

From: Steve & Jane VerValin <sjvervalin@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 9:11 PM
To: City Clerk's Office; Ibsen, Anders; Hunter, Lillian; McCarthy, Conor; Mello, Ryan
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Units Proposed Changes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

I am writing to request that the proposed changes to zoning laws regarding Accessory Dwelling Units be modified to require owner occupation of the primary residence.

I am certain updating of the regulations is needed, as is code enforcement, so I support review and enhancement of this regulation. However, neighborhoods are zoned "single family" for a reason. Those living in these areas expect a lower density of residents. Accessory Dwelling Units, in essence, turn these properties into multi-family units without agreement of the other property owners.

Further, there is no evidence to suggest ADUs rent at below market-rate, so, the suggestion that they will somehow support the homeless crisis is unfounded.

I have no issue with home owners expanding into their garage or property to provide housing for family members or friends. There seems to be great interest in this and I think it should be allowed. However, the proposal should be modified to REQUIRE the property owner to live in the primary residence. Too many rental homes in Tacoma are already owned by out-of-state financial corporations, and changes to the zoning law will encourage more without helping those families that the modification backers are claiming to support.

Sincerely,
Jane M VerValin

From: Sue Comis <comiss@nventure.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 7:18 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: FW: Accessory Dwelling Units

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Nventure [mailto:comiss@nventure.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 6:51 PM
To: city-clerk@cityoftacoma.org
Cc: robert.thoms@cityoftacoma.org; ryan.mello@cityoftacoma.org; conor.mccarthy@cityoftacoma.org; lillian.hunter@cityoftacoma.org
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Units

Dear City Councilmembers,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed ordinance to allow accessory dwelling units in single family zoned areas. This will provide an important addition to the housing supply and should help with the housing affordability crisis.

Units should be allowed on all lots regardless of size or width. It would be counterproductive to overly restrict them.

Most importantly, off-street parking should NOT be required or even incentivized. This would make the units far less affordable and fewer would be built. Many who would live in them may not have cars. We don't need additional City acreage devoted to parking. Instead, use of transit should be encouraged.

And of course, there should not be any provisions that would require neighbors' approval. That would likely prevent any additional units from being developed.

If there are innovative ways to encourage rentals below market rate to those of lower incomes, I would ask you to include those.

Sue Comis
43 West Rd N
Tacoma 98406

From: shawn <shawnmpolhamus@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 4:02 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Detached ADU Proposed Rules Changes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

My name is Shawn Polhamus and my wife and 2 children live in North Tacoma. We Own 2 houses in North Tacoma and have owned property in the area for almost a decade. We live in one house and rent the other out.

I would like to briefly write you to tell you how and why I hope you approve these rules changes. My wife's parents are getting older and now have some major health issues. We would love to convert a garage on one of our properties into an apartment for them to age in while we take care of them.

Most of our income comes from our rental and both houses are on the small side. Due to this, we would have to sell our houses and lose our income and ability to stay in Tacoma when we decide to take care of her parents full time. It is an impossible sad outcome that I hope we won't have to see...

Tacoma is an amazing city. It is unique in many ways, but perhaps most unique in its sense of community and the way to try to take care of all our citizens and neighbors. With housing costs so high, allowing detached ADU's will allow many of my friends and neighbors to keep their houses by combating the affordable housing crisis in a meaningful way. Keeping more of our neighbors is good for everyone, and it allows Tacoma to keep its truly unique soul.

I hope that you will consider allowing detached ADU's in Tacoma.

Thank you,

Shawn Polhamus

709 North Cedar Street

4307 North 24th Street

jthorpe@nventure.com

From: jthorpe@nventure.com
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:48 AM
To: a_ibsen@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: Affordable Housing

RECEIVED
FEB 27 2019
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Anders,

Are the citizens of Tacoma truly aware of this legislation? Has it been reported in the news?

I have looked at the Accessory Dwelling Unit Regs.

Page 8 of 13:

There is no maximum number of occupants in an ADU.

(Is it not obvious that this will invite huge problems, with no solution. People sleeping on top of people.)

Parking regulations for additional cars is very weak.

(Where I live cars can only park in driveways or on street. No alleys exist.)

The Senate and House bills in the Legislature speaking to this issue are terrible. Dictatorship by the State, cannot be acceptable to cities and counties.

Jerry

I am concerned about these small homes (former garages) being located on property that the owner does not also live on. The impact of more people and more cars (will there be requirements for parking space for the extra cars?) could well overtax the capacity of the neighborhood.

I rented apartments when a college student at UPS. But when I rented an apartment in a private home the owner was always close by. From what I understand there will be no requirement for a close oversight by the owner. If so, I believe it is a mistake.