



## AGENDA

**MEETING:** Regular Meeting (with a Joint Session with the Transportation Commission)

**TIME:** Wednesday, September 16, 2015

- Meeting begins at 4:00 p.m.
- Joint Session with the Transportation Commission begins at approximately 5:00 p.m.

**LOCATION:** Room 16, Tacoma Municipal Building North  
733 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

### **A. Call to Order and Quorum Call**

### **B. Approval of Agenda**

### **C. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting and Commission Tour on September 2, 2015**

### **D. Discussion Items**

#### **1. Billboard Task Force Recommendation**

Review the Task Force's recommendation, authorize the release of it for public review, and set October 7, 2015 as the date for a public hearing.

(See "Agenda Item D-1"; Shirley Schultz, 591-5121, [shirley.schultz@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:shirley.schultz@cityoftacoma.org))

#### **2. 2015 Annual Amendment to Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code**

Review public comments received at the public hearing on August 19, 2015 and through the comment period ending on September 11, 2015, and review staff's responses and suggestions.

(See "Agenda Item D-2"; Lihuang Wung, 591-5682, [lwung@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:lwung@cityoftacoma.org))

#### **3. (5:00 p.m.) Joint Session with the Transportation Commission**

Review public comments concerning the draft Transportation Master Plan and staff's responses and suggestions.

(See "Agenda Item D-2"; Stephen Atkinson, 591-5531, [satkinson@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:satkinson@cityoftacoma.org))

### **E. Communication Items & Other Business**

- (1) **Unified Development Code** – Background information about streamlining and consolidating development codes, permits and processes into a single, more user-friendly document.  
(See "Agenda Item E-1")
- (2) **Vacancy** – The Planning Commission has a vacant position representing the "Development Community" with an unexpired term through June 30, 2017. The process and timeline for filling the position is expected to be determined soon.
- (3) Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability Committee meeting, September 23, 2015, 4:30 p.m., Room 16; agenda includes: Community Solar; Intergovernmental Agreement for Puyallup Avenue Bridge Repair; and Pedestrian Crossing Improvements Summary.
- (4) Planning Commission meeting, October 7, 2015, 4:00 p.m., Council Chambers; agenda includes: Public Hearing – Billboards Regulations; and 2015 Annual Amendment.

### **F. Adjournment**



The City of Tacoma does not discriminate on the basis of disability in any of its programs, activities, or services. To request this information in an alternative format or to request a reasonable accommodation, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at (253) 591-5056 (voice) or (253) 591-5820 (TTY).





## **MINUTES** (Draft)

**TIME:** Wednesday, September 2, 2015, 4:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Asia Pacific Cultural Center – Auditorium  
4851 South Tacoma Way, Tacoma, WA 98409  
**PRESENT:** Chris Beale (Chair), Donald Erickson, Anna Petersen, Brett Santhuff, Dorian Waller, Scott Winship  
**ABSENT (Excused):** Stephen Wamback (Vice-Chair), Meredith Neal

### **A. CALL TO ORDER AND QUORUM CALL**

Chair Beale called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. A quorum was declared.

### **B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved.

### **C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting and public hearing on August 19, 2015 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

### **D. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **1. 2015 Annual Amendment to Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code**

Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division, reported that 53 people had testified at the public hearing on August 19, 2015 and over 170 written comments had been received to date. He noted that staff will compile all the comments and prepare responses to comments for the Commission to review, beginning at the next meeting on September 16<sup>th</sup>, while at the current meeting, Commissioners would review major issues and concerns reflected in the public comment.

Brian Boudet, Planning Services Division Manager, reviewed comments related to the Comprehensive Plan and Mixed-Use Centers (MUCs). He reported that there had been significant testimony expressing concern on the 65-foot height allowance in the Proctor Mixed-Use Center and requests for a moratorium on development over 45 feet. What action the Commission could take on the issue was discussed. Commissioners suggested that additional information and opportunities for testimony would be needed before any recommendations could be considered. The Commission concurred that a letter should be sent to the City Council to inform them of the concerns expressed on the Proctor height allowance.

Continuing through a review of comments related to the Comprehensive Plan and MUCs, Mr. Boudet noted general support for the MUC concept; continuing focus on downtown; and requests from the Commission for addition information about impact fees and the system completeness concept in the Transportation Master Plan.

Comments relating to regulations for infill development and housing affordability were discussed. Mr. Boudet noted a good deal of concern expressed on infill proposals; mixed responses for Detached Accessory Dwelling Units; some support for smaller lots; and support for design standards. For infill within Historic Districts, Mr. Boudet reported that concerns had included what impact infill could have on character; concerns about conversion of existing homes; concerns about lot sizes and yards; and concerns that the proposals would be working against past historic preservation successes.

Affordable housing incentives and upzones were discussed. Mr. Boudet noted that not many comments had been received, thought they were anticipating comments from the Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group. Comments received from the Commission included questions on the fee in lieu program for the affordable housing component and design guidelines for the pilot infill program.

Mr. Wung discussed the proposed Narrowmoor Conservation district. He noted that the majority of comments received were in support of the proposal for reasons such as preserving neighborhood character and reinforcing the covenants. He noted the comments against the proposal included concerns that requirements for property owners were excessive and comments that the covenants were adequate.

The cleanup of Land Use regulatory code was discussed. Mr. Wung noted that suggestions had included tying the code provisions on dead end and cul-de-sac regulations to the six year Transportation Improvement Plan; a suggestion for a fee in lieu program; and a suggestion that the sunset clause for Conditional Use Permits be evaluated on a case by case basis.

## **2. Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan – Tour**

Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division, provided a briefing prior to the tour. He reviewed the tour schedule and commented that the purpose was to familiarize the Commission with the Tacoma Mall neighborhood. He reviewed the input received from public outreach including comments that the neighborhood has a good location and lots of services, though some services, such as parks and grocery stores, are lacking. He noted concerns including crime and safety, lack of open space, lack of schools, and how change would affect the current residents. Mr. Barnett suggested that while on the tour, participants should consider some of the key issues discussed at the Community Meeting – what are the assets and issues of the neighborhood as it is today, what does the area need to accommodate growth successfully, and where is the neighborhood's center or centers?

The Commission recessed the meeting at 5:01 p.m., and reconvened at 5:15 p.m. for the tour. Tour participants included 6 Commissioners, 4 staff, and 5 interested citizens.

The tour began at the Asia Pacific Cultural Center, included bus and walking segments, covered the routes and stops as identified in the tour plan that had been included in the agenda packet, and concluded back to the Asia Pacific Cultural Center at approximately 6:40 p.m.

## **E. Communication Items & Other Business**

Mr. Wung updated the Commission on the following items:

- (1) The Planning Commission's Billboards Task Force would be meeting on September 8 and 10.
- (2) The recruitment process for the vacant "Development Community" position would be starting soon.

## **F. ADJOURNMENT:**

At 6:40 p.m., the meeting of the Planning Commission was concluded.



City of Tacoma  
Planning and Development Services

**Agenda Item  
D-1**

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Shirley Schultz, Development Services Division  
**Subject:** **Billboard Task Force Recommendation**  
**Meeting Date:** **September 16, 2015**  
**Memo Date:** September 11, 2015

At the September 16, 2015 meeting, the Planning Commission will review and discuss the recommendation of the Commission's Billboard Task Force, as outlined in Attachment A. The associated draft code revisions will be provided to the Commission at the meeting. The Commission will consider authorizing the release of the information for public review and setting October 7, 2105 as the date for a public hearing.

The City is exploring amendments to the special billboards regulations in the Tacoma Municipal Code, Section 13.06.521.M. The main objectives are to continue to reduce the number of billboards in the City and facilitate the move of billboards which adversely impact neighborhoods, protected districts and land uses to more acceptable areas. This process is part of an effort to successfully end a legal "standstill" agreement between the City of Tacoma and Clear Channel Outdoor (CCO) regarding the City's efforts to enforce its billboard regulations.

Additional information relevant to billboards, including the Community Working Group's (CWG) full report is available on the Planning Services Division's website at [www.cityoftacoma.org/planning](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/planning) (and click on "Billboard Community Working Group").

If you have any questions, please contact me at 591-5121 or [shirley.schultz@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:shirley.schultz@cityoftacoma.org).

Attachment

c: Peter Huffman, Director





City of Tacoma  
Planning Commission

MEMORANDUM

September 11, 2015

TO: Planning Commission  
Chris Beale, Chair  
FR: Steve Wamback, Chair  
Billboard Task Force, Planning Commission  
RE: Summary of Task Force recommendations for Billboard Regulations

---

This memorandum is to transmit to you a summary of the Billboard Task Force recommendations for regulatory changes, in preparation for discussion at the September 16 Planning Commission meeting.

The Task Force consists of four members and one alternate from the full Commission: myself, Don Erickson, Meredith Neal, and Anna Petersen. Brett Santhuff served as alternate. The group met five times, starting on August 17 and concluding on September 10, 2015.

The purpose of this Task Force was to review the Community Working Group reports as well as staff review of work so far. The Task Force was formed to pick up where the CWG left off while also considering prior years' work, to incorporate the Commission's role in recommending code, and to form a recommendation for the Planning Commission in developing draft code and preparing for public review.

We discussed all major topics relating to existing and relocated billboards: design, maintenance, landscaping, height, lighting, buffering, dispersal, and allowed zones. We also discussed an exchange mechanism whereby billboards may be removed and some of all of the square footage be relocated to a new (conforming) location.

The summary of recommendations is attached. The recommendation reflects consensus among the group; we believe that the package will be at an appropriate level of detail to be released for public review.

A draft of code revisions will be provided to the Commission at the September 16 meeting.

## Summary of Task Force Recommendations – Billboards

### **Exchange:**

The Task Force recommends adoption of an exchange system to allow the removal of billboard faces and to relocate the square footage, in all or in part, in another location. This includes allowance of wall-mounted billboards in additional zoning districts.

In the existing “allowed” districts (M1, M2, PMI, and C2), new pole-mounted billboards would be allowed in exchange for removal of an equivalent nonconforming billboard. In the “newly allowed” districts, only wall-mounted billboards would be allowed.

An exchange “value” is assigned for each square foot of an existing nonconforming billboard per square foot of newly located billboard. The ratios are as follows:

- Relocating from a pole sign in any zone to a wall sign downtown (DCC, DMU, WR) or UCX has a greater ratio than 1:1 – the biggest incentive of the exchange.
- Pole sign to wall sign in same district or “newly allowed” zone is greater than 1:1.
- All other sign relocation would be less than a 1:1 ratio (more than one square foot of billboard would have to be removed per new square foot of billboard).
- NCX would become a receiving zone for relocated billboards (wall only) once tier 1 zones are rid of billboards (R, RCX, CONS, SHR, and C1 – approximately 17 billboards). This is subject to confirmation that there are no HIST or NRX, VSD, or similar zones billboards. If there are, they are included in this list.

Finally, the Task Force recommends keeping an amortization clause in the regulations, to be modified to align with the new exchange program and with a revised “sunset” date. Billboards would still be considered nonconforming if they are not compliant as of the date of the regulations and amortization should be pursued.

### **Maintenance:**

The CWG, staff, and the Planning Commission Task Force have concurred that the recommendation is to retain existing code related to maintenance.

The Task Force also recommends including language specific to immediate graffiti removal from a billboard. TMC 8.120 states that a site with graffiti is considered a nuisance. When a correction letter is sent the property owner has 18 days to abate the condition. The Task Force recommends stricter language for billboards, requiring abatement within 48 hours of notification. This would be enforceable under TMC 13.05.100, but would be supplemental to that language (which also allows 18 days for compliance).

### **Design:**

The Task Force concurs with the CWG and recommends removing the requirement that billboard faces be within five degrees of perpendicular of the roadway, as well as the deleting the 10-foot maximum setback requirement. Wall mounted signs must meet the requirements for all wall signs\*\*, and may not be located on the primary façade of a structure. Pole-mounted billboards would be subject to the applicable sections of the freestanding sign regulations. ++

Further, the Task Force agrees with the deletion of the clause about cantilevered design; however, offset faces would not be allowed. Pole signs would be required to be a single pole only. The rationale behind this is to reduce the amount of visible structure.

For sites with an existing freestanding sign, a billboard may be allowed only if it is building-mounted. No freestanding billboard would be allowed.

### **Landscaping:**

The Task Force concurs with CWG and staff to delete the section about the required landscaping buffer. The remaining language should be retained.

### **Dispersal:**

The Task Force forwards the following recommendation for changes to the dispersal language in the current TMC (which has a 500-foot dispersal restriction on all billboards).

- Billboard faces over 300 sf in size, not located on the same structure, shall be a minimum of 500 feet apart, including billboards which may be located outside the City limits.
- Billboard faces of 300 sf or less in size, not located on the same structure, shall be a minimum of 300 feet apart, including billboards which may be located outside the City limits.
- Wall mounted billboards shall not be located within 200 feet of another billboard within the same view corridor (i.e., billboards on opposite or perpendicular faces of a building/s may be closer).

Rationale: in order to achieve a reduction in the number of faces in undesirable areas, and in order to remove nonconforming billboards, additional areas need to be provided for an exchange.

### **Size/Dimensions:**

The Task Force forwards the following recommendations for allowed billboard sizes:

- Maximum size of 300 square feet in all non-industrial zones permitting billboards
- Maximum size of 672 square feet in M-1, M-2, and PMI for freestanding signs
- Wall mount maximum of 672 square feet in all districts allowing billboards

The Task Force concurs with staff to retain existing vertical and horizontal face dimensions for pole mounted signs; for building mounted signs vertical and horizontal dimensions are flexible.

### **Lighting:**

The Task Force recommends that any billboard lighting be LED or equivalently efficient lighting. All billboard lights must be turned off from midnight until 5 a.m. In addition, the code should clarify that timers or other device are used to make sure lights are off during daylight. Otherwise, retain current language.

### **Buffering:**

The Task Force recommends a buffer of 250 feet from all “non-billboard zones”, overlays, and protected uses. In short, retain the existing buffering language but change “500 feet” to “250 feet”. Religious institutions are removed from the list of buffered uses (unless deemed historically significant by historic preservation officer).

**Height:**

The Task Force recommendation is that for any freestanding billboard within 500 feet of residential, shoreline, view-sensitive, historic, and conservation districts the maximum height should be 30 feet; building mounted signs may be higher based on staff review.

If a billboard is located more than 500 feet from residential, shoreline, view-sensitive, historic, and conservation districts the maximum height would be 35 feet.

Wall mounted signs must be at least 10 feet from the ground to discourage vandalism.

**Location:**

Add UCX, CCX, CIX, DCC, DMU, WR, PDB, and NCX to zoning districts allowing billboards (see matrix below). The reasoning behind this is that these zones have development characteristics that are very similar to the current “allowed” zones. In addition, the allowed zones already have a concentration of billboards. By adding these zones some additional acceptable areas are opened up for relocating and consolidating billboard faces. The Task Force has included limitations on billboards in these new areas (e.g., no new pole-mounted billboards) and has maintained buffers, height, and lighting limitations.

In addition, the Task Force recommends a future consideration of off-premises signs that are smaller (maximum of 32 square feet) and incorporated into an overall streetscape design. These signs would be allowed in all “billboard” zoning districts as well as C-1 and all downtown districts. The Task Force concurs with the staff recommendation that code be developed for these kinds of signs:

- must be located on a building face which is perpendicular to the sidewalk if the near edge of the sign is within 10 feet of the sidewalk;
- signs are also allowed on permitted information kiosks ;
- signs must be located a maximum of 7 feet above the adjacent sidewalk;
- require a minimum 200 foot dispersal between each pedestrian scale outdoor advertising sign; and
- signs will require a sign permit (and a street occupancy permit if applicable) and square footage utilized will be deducted from banked billboard square footage.

**Zones**

|             |                      | Existing allowed |        |        |    | "New Zones" |     |            |     |     |     |    |     |  |
|-------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|--------|----|-------------|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|--|
|             | Zone                 | PMI              | M2     | M1     | C2 | CIX         | UCX | NCX        | CCX | DCC | DMU | WR | PDB |  |
| <b>Sign</b> |                      |                  |        |        |    |             |     |            |     |     |     |    |     |  |
| 72 sf       | Jr Poster/Wall Mount |                  |        |        |    |             |     | only later |     |     |     |    |     |  |
| 72 sf       | Jr Poster/Pole Mount | relocated only   |        |        |    | Not allowed |     |            |     |     |     |    |     |  |
| < 300 sf    | Poster/Wall Mount    |                  |        |        |    |             |     | only later |     |     |     |    |     |  |
| < 300 sf    | Poster/Pole Mount    | relocated only   |        |        |    | Not allowed |     |            |     |     |     |    |     |  |
| > 300 sf    | Bulletin/Wall Mount  |                  |        |        |    |             |     | only later |     |     |     |    |     |  |
| > 300 sf    | Bulletin/Pole Mount  | no new           | no new | no new |    | Not allowed |     |            |     |     |     |    |     |  |

**Additional items:**

The Task Force recommends that a definition of “pedestrian-scale outdoor advertising sign” be developed to accommodate this additional type of signage.

Further information is needed about the effects of “MAP 21” applicability to arterial streets and the off-premises signs located along those streets.

Prior to any relocation of signs, all illegal signs must be removed.

The Task Force made a recommendation to keep the “cap” on billboard faces and square footage.

\*\* The wall-mounted sign definition includes any sign mounted or painted on the wall of a building. There are specific regulations for wall-mounted signs in TMC13.06.521. These would apply to a wall-mounted billboard, as well.

E. Wall Signs. Special regulations governing wall signs are as follows:

1. A wall-mounted sign shall not extend above the wall to which attached or above the roofline.
2. A wall sign shall not extend more than 18 inches from the wall to which it is attached.
3. No wall sign shall cover wholly or partially any wall opening nor project beyond the corner of the wall to which it is attached.
4. Where a wall sign extends over a public or private walkway, a vertical clearance of eight feet shall be maintained above such walkway.
5. For the purposes of this subsection, any building with an actual or false mansard roof may use such walls or roof for wall sign installation.
6. An architectural blade designed primarily for the placement of signs may be erected on top of a wall, parapet, roof, or building face and shall comply with all applicable height limitations. All supporting structure for such signs shall be completely enclosed.
7. Painted signs, on the building, shall be calculated with the allowed sign area for a business.

++ The Freestanding sign definition is “A permanently installed, self-supporting sign resting on or supported by means of poles, standards, or any other type of base on the ground” and would include pole-mounted billboards. The standards for freestanding signs are below, and could apply to billboards in addition to any other specific regulations. As with wall-mounted, this section could be referenced in the billboard section as well.

G. Freestanding signs. Special regulations governing freestanding signs are as follows:

1. No freestanding sign shall be located within 15 feet of a residentially-zoned district, and where the side of a commercially zoned property abuts the side of a residentially-zoned property the first 100 feet of the commercial frontage shall have a sign setback requirement of 15 feet.
2. Minimum clearance. All freestanding signs shall have a minimum clearance to the ground as follows:
  - a. Over parking lots and other similar areas where vehicles are moved or stored, 14-1/2 feet;
  - b. Over footpaths, sidewalks, and other spaces accessible to pedestrians, eight feet.
3. Signs shall be located upon the frontage for which the sign area is calculated.
4. No freestanding sign shall project over a public right-of-way, unless an adjacent structure or sign is built out to or over the property line that blocks visibility to a freestanding sign on the adjoining property; then, such freestanding sign may be located so that the sign structure is on private property and the sign cabinet may project over the right-of-way, subject to all the provisions regulating projecting signs which project over rights-of-way.
5. Signs placed on public property and/or right-of-way, abutting the business for which they identify, will require a Street Occupancy Permit. Sign regulations shall be determined by the zoning district of the abutting property.





City of Tacoma  
Planning and Development Services

**Agenda Item  
D-2**

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division  
**Subject:** **2015 Annual Amendment**  
**Date of Hearing:** September 16, 2015  
**Date of Memo:** September 11, 2015

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on August 19, 2015 to receive testimony on the Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code for 2015 ("2015 Annual Amendment"), and kept the record open through September 11, 2015 to accept written comments.

At the last meeting on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Commission was provided a brief summary of comments received through August 31, 2015 and major issues and concerns reflected therein.

At the next meeting on September 16, 2015, the Commission will begin to review staff's responses to comments and suggestions for potential modifications to the proposed amendment package. Attached to facilitate the Commission's review and discussion is a Draft Public Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions Report.

Please be advised that:

1. The review on September 16<sup>th</sup> will focus on subjects relating to Narrowmoor Conservation District, Code Cleanups, Mixed-Use Centers, and Affordable Housing. The review will continue at the subsequent meeting on October 7<sup>th</sup> with a focus on the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The meeting on September 16<sup>th</sup> includes a joint session with the Transportation Commission beginning at approximately 5:00 p.m. This is a previously assumed session and the focus of the discussion will be the public comments concerning the Draft Transportation Master Plan and staff's responses and suggestions.
3. Staff had provided the Commissioners with the public comments received through August 31, 2015 via e-mail. Additional comments received between September 1<sup>st</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> will be provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting on September 16<sup>th</sup>. All comments will be compiled into a single document and posted online at [www.cityoftacoma.org/planning](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/planning) (and click on "2015 Annual Amendment" or "Tacoma 2040: Growing Tomorrow's City").

If you have any questions, please contact me at 591-5682 or [lwung@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:lwung@cityoftacoma.org).

Attachment

c: Peter Huffman, Director





**2015 ANNUAL AMENDMENT  
TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND LAND USE REGULATORY CODE**

**Public Comments and Staff Responses and Suggestions Report**

September 11, 2015

*NOTE: Additional comments may be received after this summary was completed.*

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on August 19, 2015, concerning the Proposed 2015 Annual Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code and kept the record open through September 11 to accept written comments.

A *Public Review Document* was compiled and made available for public review prior to the public hearing. The document includes the complete text and staff analyses of the nine applications (or proposed amendments), the Preliminary Determination of Environmental Nonsignificance and the environmental checklist associated with the applications, as well as relevant background information.

This report was prepared for the Planning Commission's review and discussion on September 16, 2015. The report summarizes public comments received during the public hearing process, identifies major issues and concerns reflected therein, provides staff's responses to the issues and concerns, and suggests modifications, where appropriate, to the proposed amendments as contained in the *Public Review Document*. In addition to public comments, there are internal-review comments provided by various City departments. Those comments and the corresponding staff responses and suggestions are also compiled in the report.

| Comments  | Commenters  | Staff Responses and Suggestions |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| <b>Narrowmoor Addition Conservation District</b> (Application #2015-05) |   |                                 |
| Supports the proposal.  | Brown, Cohn, Messman (2), Mylet, Quilici (2), Skog, Younger, Messman (1), Quilici (1), Talcott, Lewington, Bolland, Fleming, Noel and Laurie Shillito, Cline, Kingsbury | Support noted.                  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Topography, architecture, low density development, open space and existing streetscape are important character elements within the Narrowmoor Neighborhood and should be preserved.             | Brown,<br>Kirbaway,<br>Messman,<br>Skog, Wilson,<br>Quilici (Judi),<br>Lewington,<br>Cline,<br>Kingsbury | Comment noted. The Landmarks Preservation Commission's recommendation to the Planning Commission includes a recommendation that the City explore street standards that are consistent with the neighborhood development character.   |
| Neighborhood needs protection against inappropriate development/remodeling.   | Cohn   | Comment noted.   |
| Opposes conservation district.  | Davidson,<br>LaFranca (3),<br>Parsons,<br>LaFranca (1)   | Comment noted.   |
| Conservation district will create undue burdens on property owners and increased costs.   | Davidson,<br>LaFranca (3)  | Staff concurs that the conservation district will increase the requirements for property owners within the affected areas, when owners intend to add to or demolish an existing house, for those who plan to build a new house, and for property owners that plan to subdivide their lots. However, there are no additional requirements proposed for the remodeling or updating of homes that do not involve the aforementioned types of projects.  |
| Covenants are already adequate protection.  | Davidson,<br>LaFranca (3)  | Comment noted.   |
| The proposed conservation district should not be called a conservation district, because it is not protecting land. It should be called "Narrowmoor Addition Historical Preservation District." | Hansen   | "Conservation district" in the City of Tacoma is a category of special review overlay district that is intended to protect and preserve historic character, as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Regulatory Code. Conservation districts differ both in policy objective and technical requirements from historic districts. The use of the term "Conservation District" for the Narrowmoor Addition proposal is appropriate in this instance.   |
| Supports protection of views.   | Kirbaway   | Comment noted.   |
| The Narrowmoor proposal is primarily about protecting views, but the conservation district creates excessive requirements that go much further than view protection.                            | LaFranca (3),<br>LaFranca (1)  | The Narrowmoor Addition was platted and designed to take advantage of topography and views of the Narrows, and thus the view is a significant character defining element of the district. However, the conservation district is intended to protect more than views, including architectural massing, design and site planning, which are also important elements and which the neighborhood has indicated are elements that should be addressed. During the consideration of the proposal, amending the View Sensitive Overlay was discussed, but considered to be inadequate to achieve the protection of character sought by the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition. |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>The costs to the City associated with creating and administering the Narrowmoor Addition is not justified by the public benefit.</p>                                     | <p>LaFranca (3)</p>   | <p>Comment noted. The question of whether creation and administering historic landmarks and districts is legitimate public business was settled by the Supreme Court in the <i>Penn Central Transp. Co. v New York City case</i> (1978). The preservation of areas that have distinctive character is a public benefit. The Narrowmoor Addition, as a postwar midcentury residential development, is a resource type that is currently poorly represented in the City's historic register. The City's historic preservation authority, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, found, based on criteria contained in the Tacoma Landmarks and Historic Special Review Districts code (TMC 13.07), that the Narrowmoor Addition is eligible as a conservation district and is worthy of protection.</p> |
| <p>The Landmarks Commission design review process should be removed if the conservation district is created.</p>  | <p>LaFranca (3),<br/>LaFranca (1)</p>                             | <p>The Landmarks Commission design review process is a basic code requirement for a conservation district.</p>  |
| <p>The design guidelines are overly detailed and complex, and if adopted, should be simplified to only pertain to basic elements such as massing and height.</p>            | <p>LaFranca (3)</p>   | <p>The scope and minimum contents of design guidelines are identified in TMC 13.07.120. Extensive discussion on the content and language of the design guidelines occurred over the course of several Landmarks Commission meetings. The recommended design guidelines reflect the Commission's balance between character preservation, property rights and policy intent.</p>  |
| <p>The minimum 60' lot width effectively prohibits subdivisions, because most lots are 100' wide.</p>   | <p>LaFranca (3),<br/>Parsons</p>                                  | <p>Staff concurs with this point. The basis of the 60' minimum width recommendation was to achieve consistency with Narrowmoor covenants, while allowing for reasonable infill development. However, the 60' provision may be problematic. If the 60' minimum width was removed, the R-1 minimum is 50'. However, the zoning would be in conflict with the minimum lot width as written in the Narrowmoor First Addition covenant.</p>  |
| <p>Conservation district is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, including the Generalized Land Use Plan, Historic Preservation Plan, and the West End Plan.</p>    | <p>Quilici (2)</p>  | <p>Comment noted.</p>   |
| <p>Variance and Conditional Use Permit criteria at TMC 13.06.640-645 (and 13.05.020) should be amended to include historic and conservation district design guidelines.</p> | <p>Quilici (2),<br/>Quilici (1),<br/>Fleming,<br/>Quilici (3)</p> | <p>Staff generally concurs with this recommendation, which was also made by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. TMC 13.05.020 concerns general public notice process and requirements. Whether this language requires reference to historic and conservation districts may need additional exploration.</p>  |
| <p>Conservation district will reinforce existing covenants/existing covenants are inadequate.</p>   | <p>Brown, Mylet,<br/>Younger,<br/>Wilson,<br/>Lewington</p>       | <p>Comment noted.</p>   |

|  |                |   |
|--|----------------|---|
| <p>Narrowmoor 4 is unlike the other plats (Narrowmoor 1-3) and should be excluded from the district.</p> | <p>Cofchin</p> | <p>This question was directly addressed in the original proposal from the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition. The application states that the majority of homes in Narrowmoor 4 were constructed prior to 1968 and that, according to an architectural survey done by Baseline Engineering, a majority of the residences in the plat were consistent with the development in the other Narrowmoor plats.</p> |
|--|----------------|---|

| Comments   | Commenters  | Staff Responses and Suggestions  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Code Cleanup</b> (Application #2015-10)   |   |  |
| <p>13.04.190, Dead-end/cul-de-sac public or private streets or ways, or permanent easements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tie Land Use Regulatory Code requirements to the 6-year Transportation Improvement Plan to ensure that required transportation improvements are consistent with the City's planning process and 6-year Transportation Improvement Plan.</li> </ul> | <p>Jeremiah LaFranca, Master Builders Association (MBA)</p> | <p>The 6-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a list of the City's arterial projects and relevant transportation programs (LID, sidewalks, safety, etc.) that are funded or partially funded. The legislative intent is for cities to account for how, when and where they are spending their transportation funds. The 6-Year TIP does not contemplate residential streets, dead ends, private roads, easements or the need to preserve public ROW's for future transportation improvements. Therefore it does not appear that the suggested text addition has merit.</p> |
| <p>Consider a fee in lieu program to ensure monies that would be used for streets not tying into a network could be used for developing planned multi-modal transportation systems.</p>  | <p>Jeremiah LaFranca, Master Builders Association (MBA)</p> | <p>Staff does not believe the fee-in-lieu question has been considered with regard to transportation improvements (such as frontage improvements). The City does routinely consider alternative solutions for mitigating offsite impacts from proposed developments, but such a change in standard amenities would require further information and study. This matter would require additional discussion of the potential merits of the idea with both the Planning and Transportation Commissions.</p>   |
| <p>Supports removing barriers for Low Impact Development scenarios in building and other projects to help decrease storm water effects. Also suggests that financial incentives get incorporated so as to have active participation in use of Low Impact Development scenarios.</p>  | <p>Scott Hansen, Puget Creek Restoration Society</p>        | <p>Support noted. Financial incentives would require further information and study of the idea with the Planning Commission and other City organizations that are involved in sustainability.</p>  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The sunset clause for conditional use permits should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as some permits for parks and natural area projects might not have the same deleterious effects as permits for development projects and therefore, not need to be sunsetted.</p> | <p>Scott Hansen,<br/>Puget Creek<br/>Restoration<br/>Society</p> | <p>The proposed code changes are to not allow conditional uses that have been discontinued for three or more years to be reestablished without obtaining a new permit. The proposal does allow a one-year extension, subject to review by the Director and in accordance with some conditions. It is not reasonable to allow longer extensions for parks and natural areas, especially since those projects are particularly sensitive to environmental changes, may require additional permits (e.g. wetland, shoreline, etc.), and may be subject to new environmental science and regulations.</p>   |
| <p>Update Landscaping Code as Type D Landscaping is no longer defined in the Land Use Regulatory Code.</p>   | <p>City Staff</p>  | <p>Proposed change to Update 13.06.513 , Drive-throughs C.1 – b:<br/><br/>Exterior stacking lanes and service areas shall provide a minimum 3 foot landscaped buffer along sides which do not abut the building. The buffer must be landscaped with <del>at least Type D Landscaping.</del> <u>decorative landscaping to include flowering or colored-foliage shrubs which will cover at least 50% of the landscaped area within three years; the remainder shall be fully landscaped with additional trees, shrubs, and/or groundcover.</u> Alternatively, on sides that do not front on streets, the buffer width may be reduced to 1 foot and improved with a vegetated wall at least 6 feet in height <u>to reach maturity and full screening within three years.</u> The required buffer may be interrupted by structures or for vehicle or pedestrian access crossings.</p> |
| <p>Correct a number of incorrect and De minimis RCW and WAC references</p>   | <p>City Staff</p>  | <p>Recommend De minimis changes. Example: TMC 13.10.1.1. Chapter 1 - Introduction. The reference should be RCW 90.58, not RCW 90.48.</p>  |
| <p>Correct missing header at top of table on p. 13 – 211, TMC Section 13.06.522.K</p>  | <p>City Staff</p>  | <p>Recommend De minimis change</p>  |
| <p>Clarify Variance Criteria for Sign Regulations in Mixed Use Centers</p>   | <p>City Staff</p>  | <p>Add the underlined words to TMC 13.06.645.B.5.B(5), Variance to Sign Regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In a shopping center or mixed-use center, the variance is warranted because of the physical characteristics of the center <u>or site</u> such as size, shape, or topography, or because of the location of signs in existence on the date of passage of this section.</li> </ul>  |

Use a graphic illustration to better address the required minimum usable yard area and allowable configurations on residential lots.

City Staff

13.06.100 Residential Districts. Minimum Usable Yard Space. Recommend three graphics to illustrate the requirement that residential lots provide a contiguous rear or side usable yard space equivalent to at least 10% of the lot size.



## **Mixed-Use Centers Review**

### **Summary of Comments Received and Staff Responses**

In addition to the 4Proctor petition, that had approximately 1,500 signatures, as well as the public testimony provided at the August 19<sup>th</sup> public hearing, staff has received over 70 letters on the Mixed-Use Centers Review. Almost unanimously, the comments provided have been about the recent development in the Proctor Neighborhood Center and concerns over the scale of development allowed under the current zoning for that district. The specific requests made by the 4Proctor organization, and reiterated in both written and oral testimony, is to adopt a moratorium on development over 45' in height and amend the land use regulatory code to reduce the maximum allowable heights in the Proctor Neighborhood Center from 65' to 45', and to repeal the height bonus option. In support of this position, commenters have cited concerns related to:

- 65' being out of scale and incompatible with the neighborhood and its character;
- One size does not fit all;
- Impacts from growth on traffic, walkability, schools, and public safety;
- That the Proctor Mixed-Use Center is already meeting the City's goals;
- 45' is a feasible development height.

Other commenters have written in support of the current zoning and development standards and have cited support for having new customers and new rental opportunities in the district.

In general, the opposition to the current height limits has far surpassed the support for the current development allowances. This is unsurprising, as the 2015 Annual Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code has not been framed as a recommendation on the zoning and height allowances in the centers. The public hearing notice would not have made the broader community aware of this issue because the specific height allowances have not been part of the scope of work for this year's amendments.

The authority to enact emergency moratoria resides with the City Council. While the request for moratoria is a procedural request, the substantive request is to reduce height allowances in the Proctor Mixed-Use Center from the current maximum height of 65' (via a height bonus) to a 45' limit. As specific amendments to the mixed-use center zoning and development standards were not included in this scope of work, and can be reviewed and evaluated separately from the 2015 Annual Amendment, the Commission has forwarded the request and petition to the City Council for review and consideration.

While the Commission has forwarded on the petition to the City Council, when considered more generally, the concerns raised by the community do relate to broader policies in the Comprehensive Plan, including the Transportation Master Plan. The following is a summary of concerns and staff responses.

**Comment:** *One size does not fit all.*

Staff Response:

Staff recognizes and agrees that each center is unique, with its own development patterns, mix of uses, opportunities, constraints, and development feasibility. As such, the path forward for each center is also unique. The mixed-use centers profiles included in the report are a first step towards more officially recognizing these differences even as the Comprehensive Plan policies recognize and respond to the commonalities amongst them. More broadly, the Urban Form Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan distinguishes between different types of centers that vary in size, scale, service area, role and density of residents and businesses, as well as residential pattern areas that have distinct characteristics that contribute to the sense of place. An overarching goal of the Design and Development Chapter is to “Design new development to respond to and enhance the distinctive physical, historic, aesthetic, and cultural qualities of its location, while accommodating growth and change (page 3-2).”

Many of the policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the recommendations in the Mixed-Use Centers study build off of past discussions pertaining to design review and master planning (circa 2007-2009 Planning Commission review) and would help to address concerns raised from the 4Proctor organization and other public commenters about how the general policies of the Comprehensive Plan are applied to a specific neighborhood to ensure that development contributes to and does not detract from the quality of life. While there is a long list of recommendations in the report, staff would highlight the following as key implementation measures:

- Establish a design review process in Mixed-use Centers;
- Orient local improvement district funds to Mixed-use Centers and develop an impact fee to fund transportation improvements;
- Consider tailoring the height bonus palette, parking management, tax exemption, and core commercial areas to the individual center.

More broadly, the Mixed-Use Centers report recommends focusing on one or two centers to maximize the effects of public planning and investment. The study states: “this strategy will produce the most visible and measurable benefits in the shortest period (page 84).” Area-wide planning can be an effective means of translating general city policies to a specific neighborhood in a way that respects the City’s overall policies as well as the specific context of the neighborhood and the community.

Staff recommends including Mixed-Use Center profiles in the Urban Form Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan that highlight the characteristics of the individual centers.

**Comment:** How does the plan address the impacts of growth, especially on auto and truck traffic? When a new development is built, how will the City of Tacoma make sure nearby intersections still function?

Staff Response:

Historically, the City has measured performance of the roadway network with respect to cars and trucks, but did not measure how well the network serves other modes of transportation. The system completeness measure provides a way to address system performance for all modes, including cars and trucks. The Transportation Master Plan requires that the network be improved at a pace which is equal to the pace of development. The plan also requires regular monitoring of the performance of each mode, and prioritizes construction of projects which improve the performance criteria. While the performance criteria do stipulate that vehicle delay should be limited, especially on key travel routes, they also recognize that more population and more employment will bring more traffic. For this reason, and because it is not feasible or desirable to eliminate all delay by adding more traffic lanes, another performance measure focuses on making more efficient use of existing infrastructure. This measure addresses how well the transportation network moves people and goods, not just vehicles. With this increased efficiency, and the projects on the TMP's project list, the long-range travel forecasts prepared for the Transportation Master Plan show that the City's network has the capacity to accommodate all of the expected growth. As projects on the project list are built, new projects can be added to the list based on emerging needs. More immediate needs related to localized impacts related to new development will still be addressed by the City during the project level environmental review process.

Staff does not recommend any changes at this time.

**Comment:** I am concerned that additional growth and density will make it less safe to walk.

Staff Response:

Walking is a fundamental form of mobility, and ensuring walking is a viable mode choice is an important goal of the Comprehensive Plan. While additional density will make more amenities available within walking distances, the density also creates more opportunities for roadway users to interact, which in turn increases risk of collisions. Since we desire the flexibility to choose from among many different modes, we are increasingly designing the road network to be accommodating for all users. The urban environment, in this regard, is more advanced than less developed suburban areas, which may lack facilities such as sidewalks, bike lanes, and crosswalks. The urban environment, too, generally has much lower speeds than rural environments. Since speeds are one of the most important determinants for crash outcomes (see figure below), the urban environment is generally safer. Over the past several decades, even as the percentage of the country living in cities has increased, the number of fatalities in cities has steadily decreased (see figure below). These trends hold true in Washington, where even though only one third of the total miles driven are outside cities, half of the fatal pedestrian crashes are outside cities (<http://wtsc.wa.gov/wp->

[content/uploads/dlm\\_uploads/2014/11/Factors-in-Pedestrian-Fatals-Crashes-2008-12.pdf](http://content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2014/11/Factors-in-Pedestrian-Fatals-Crashes-2008-12.pdf)). <http://sdotblog.seattle.gov/2015/09/08/does-speed-matter/>.

Staff does not recommend any changes at this time.

**Comment:** *How does the plan address the impacts of new growth on the capacity of our public schools and other infrastructure?*

Staff response:

High-quality and dependable basic public services, like clean water and reliable sewer and stormwater management services, are essential to Tacoma's future success. The City's public facility systems provide water, sewer, transportation, parks and civic services. Public facilities include the varied and extensive networks of streets and pipes, as well as parks and natural areas that not only manage stormwater and flooding, but also help provide places for recreation. Public services include things like public transportation and police, fire, and emergency response. In addition, services such as access to broadband technology, electricity and natural gas, and comprehensive waste, recycling, and composting services are essential for households and businesses. It takes the collective and coordinated effort of multiple agencies and regulated utilities to maintain and operate the complex systems used to manage and provide these necessities to Tacomans.

The goals and policies of the Public Facilities and Services chapter convey the City's intent to:

- Set clear goals for service delivery and system expansion for public rights-of-way, sanitary and stormwater systems, water, parks and recreation, public safety and emergency response, solid waste management, school facilities, technology access, and energy infrastructure.
- Ensure that public facilities and services support the local and regional growth planning objectives.
- Emphasize the development of facilities that serve multiple goals.
- Advance an adaptive management approach to improve reliability and resilience.
- Provide more equitable service delivery.
- Reduce risks to human and environmental health and safety.

The background information of this chapter is based in large part on the City's Capital Facilities Program, which is a separate document and is adopted by reference. The background information fulfills the requirements of the Growth Management Act to:

- Provide an inventory of existing public facilities.

- Identify deficiencies in capital facilities and the actions necessary to meet such deficiencies.
- Forecast future needs for facilities.
- Propose capital improvements and their costs.
- Plan for financing proposed capital improvements.
- Inform the capital budget process.

The City's Capital Facilities Program will be updated in 2016 on the same schedule as other public agencies, including Metro Parks Tacoma and the Tacoma School District. The goals and policies adopted in the Comprehensive Plan as part of the proposed update would then guide the development and implementation of these programs.

Staff does not recommend any changes at this time.

***Comment:*** *The Proctor Mixed-Use Center is already achieving the City's goals – having 3,000 households in and around the Center.*

Staff Response:

The description of the Neighborhood Center in the Comprehensive Plan suggests that there should be sufficient zoning capacity for 3,000 households within the center and within ½ mile of the center. This is not intended as a goal for how many households are desirable but rather, a minimum development capacity that should be required to be eligible to be a Neighborhood Mixed-Use Center. This is a threshold that differentiates a Neighborhood Center from a smaller business district, like Fern Hill.

Staff recommends amending the language to ensure it is clear that this is not a goal but rather a minimum requirement for a Neighborhood Center.

***Comment:*** *45' is a feasible height.*

Staff response:

While this comment is directly related to the Proctor Station project and the height allowances in the Proctor Neighborhood Center, staff asked Greg Easton, of Property Counselors, to review the feasibility analysis provided by 4Proctor in order to identify whether any changes to the findings and recommendations in the Mixed-Use Center Report are necessary to reflect this information. The Mixed Use Center report did not include a development scenario in Proctor, but rather used a representative 5 over 1 project in the 6<sup>th</sup> Ave Neighborhood Center.

His response:

The proforma provided by 4Proctor uses the same format and many of the same assumptions used in the 2015 MUC feasibility analysis, but the revised assumptions provide an unrealistic overall performance picture. With adjustments to the construction cost and operating expense, the underground parking unit cost assumption, higher retail vacancy, and per square foot land cost, the projected return is just below the minimum threshold of 10% and well below the target rate of 15%. With the 8 year property tax exemption the project could be considered marginally feasible. Effective rents at levels below those of Proctor Station would challenge that conclusion. The desire for greater heights is generally an attempt to spread the cost of land acquisition over a greater amount of rentable area. Where land prices are relatively low, lower heights can still allow for feasible projects. Where prices are high, the extra height is important. With land prices increasing faster than the cost of living, the desire for greater heights will be stronger over time.

Staff recommendation:

While the rent and lease rates in Proctor may exceed initial staff expectation, this does not alter the findings and recommendations in the report. However, staff does recommend that the Mixed-Use Centers Report be amended to include a feasibility analysis for both a 45' and 65' development scenario in the Proctor Neighborhood Center.

| Comments   | Commenters   | Staff Responses and Suggestions   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>1. Affordable Housing Regulations (Application #2015-08)</b>  |  |   |
| <p>PROPOSAL:<br/>Amending the Tacoma Municipal Code to implement a package of residential infill/affordable building proposals and affordable housing incentive, bonus, and inclusionary strategies which are part of a package of initiatives recommended by the City Council's Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group.</p> |  |   |
| <p>The proposal has generated substantial attention, press coverage, and comments both in support and opposition. The majority of the concerns pertain to infill within designated Historic Districts.</p>   | <p><i>Over 75 individual comments have been received, as well as a survey with 630 signatures.</i></p> | <p>Staff recognize that this proposal touches upon issues and concerns shared by many Tacoma residents. Staff recommend modifying the proposal to reflect the concerns expressed pertaining to specific aspects of the proposal.</p> <p>Specific staff recommendations are included by topic below.</p>   |
| <p>General Support for proposals</p>   | <p><i>AHPAG, Bond, Gibson, Guinup, Kaster, LaFranca, Shelton, Washburn, Waters, Williams, Woo</i></p>  | <p>Support noted.</p>   |
| <p>General opposition to proposals</p>   | <p><i>Bjornson, Nelson, Smith</i></p>  | <p>Opposition noted.</p>  |
| <p>Tacoma has adequate affordable housing</p>  | <p><i>Bjornson, Miller, Nelson, Root</i></p>   | <p>The City Council has adopted strong policy objectives to work toward greater housing affordability and choice throughout the neighborhoods of the City. While housing is relatively affordable in Tacoma on a regional basis, incomes are also lower here making affording housing a challenge for some households. This challenge is anticipated to worsen as population continues to grow in the region.</p> |
| <p>Affordability is a growing concern in Tacoma</p>  | <p><i>AHPAG</i></p>  | <p>Staff concur.</p>  |
| <p>How many open lots/properties in Tacoma could be used for residential use and how many could be build under the current code provisions?</p>  | <p><i>Ryan Jeff</i></p>  | <p>It is difficult to provide an accurate answer. The majority of parcels within the City are already developed to some degree. Those which are left often have limitations to development capacity such as steep slopes or wetlands. Much of the development that takes place in Tacoma includes redevelopment.</p>  |

|   |                  |  |
|---|------------------|--|
| What is the current percentage of rental properties in the City and by each district?   | <i>Ryan Jeff</i> | The homeownership rate (as of 2014) was 52.8%. Housing mix was 65% single family, 35% multifamily.   |
| Have any projects in the last 15 years increased density, added affordable housing units? What percentage?                                      | <i>Ryan Jeff</i> | Most higher density development over the past years has taken place within downtown and designated Mixed-Use Centers, with some also taking place in multifamily residential districts. Staff have not studied the total increase or the average cost per housing unit. Anecdotally, much of the development within the City has been affordable to households earning the Area Median Income or even below, though housing costs vary greatly by neighborhood.  |
| Provide case studies where these concepts have worked in other cities of our size   | <i>Ryan Jeff</i> | <p>The proposals are based on the recommendations of the City Council-appointed Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group (AHPAG). The Council referred the AHPAG's planning-related recommendations to the Planning Commission, which has analyzed them and developed the package of proposals which are now being considered. The report is available on the project webpage at <a href="http://www.cityoftacoma.org/planning">www.cityoftacoma.org/planning</a>, select Affordable Housing.</p> <p>These planning proposals are part of a broad range of strategies to address affordability. Other approaches include funding for affordable housing development or subsidies. These proposals are also informed by precedents from other cities and a range of policy analysis, including Puget Sound Regional Council's Housing Innovations Program. Staff also reviewed approaches from other jurisdictions including Portland, Oregon, Seattle, University Place, Everett and Pierce County for some of the specific components. Here are links to some relevant resources: <a href="https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/49254">https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/49254</a>, <a href="https://everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/798">https://everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/798</a>, <a href="http://www.psrc.org/growth/housing/hip/">http://www.psrc.org/growth/housing/hip/</a></p> |
| Streamline approach to create new historic districts.   | <i>Ryan Jeff</i> | Comment noted. This is outside the scope of the current proposal.  |
| New residential projects outside of the downtown core should provide at least 1.5 stalls per unit on site and 1 per unit without extra charges. | <i>Ryan Jeff</i> | Comment noted. This is outside the scope of the current proposal.  |
| Support downzoning current R2-SRD districts with intact single-family residential uses.   | <i>Ryan Jeff</i> | Comment noted. This is outside the scope of the current proposal.  |

| <b>INFILL PROPOSALS GENERALLY</b>   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Infill proposals will not necessarily support the goal of promoting housing affordability.</p> <p>Proposals will benefit developers only.</p> <p>Land use tools are at best a minor tool to generate affordable housing.</p> | <p><i>Colburn, Corso</i></p>                                 | <p>While there is no direct correlation between infill and affordability, allowing a broader range of housing types and sizes create opportunities for development of affordable housing options. They can do so by reducing the costs of development per housing unit, and by increasing supply of housing. Allowing property owners and the market flexibility is not guaranteed to produce more affordable housing in each instance, but it does allow for that possibility.</p> <p>In addition, allowing for flexibility and alternative housing types creates the opportunity for a broader range of housing choices within neighborhoods and options for multigenerational or caretaker housing.</p> |
| <p>Should call this either Infill Housing or Residential Densification.</p>   | <p><i>Colburn (2)</i></p>                                    | <p>Comments noted. The Planning Commission and staff have recognized that this proposal is very broad and touches on affordability and choice, urban design, infill, and many other related policy issues.</p>   |
| <p>Population projections often overstated. Growth targets unrealistic.</p>   | <p><i>Colburn (2)</i></p>                                    | <p>Vision 2040 requires Tacoma to plan to accommodate 127,000 new residents and 90,000 new jobs by the year 2040. The Planning Commission and staff have discussed that while these targets are stretch goals, the pace of growth in Tacoma is likely to increase over the coming years along with growth in the region.</p> <p>Staff anticipate that the proposed infill strategies will only accommodate relatively small proportion of that targeted growth. Rather, one significant objective of these proposals is to increase the range of housing affordability and choices throughout the City's neighborhoods.</p>  |
| <p>Concerns about density impacts (such as parking), Streets, transit service and infrastructure are not adequate to support additional density.</p>  | <p><i>Buffington (2), Cuellar</i></p>                        | <p>Comments noted.</p>   |
| <p>Infill/development should occur downtown and within centers.</p>   | <p><i>Bjornson, St. Hilaire (3), Nelson, Colburn (2)</i></p> | <p>This perspective is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan which calls for the majority of growth to occur Downtown and within Mixed-Use Centers. Tacoma is planning to accommodate 80 percent of growth within those areas. The additional 20 percent would be distributed across the rest of the City, including residential areas. However, the overall amount of growth that can take place in single-families is low, and would remain a small percentage even if these proposals were adopted.</p>  |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Infill/development should occur in less developed/more affordable areas of the City</p>  | <p><i>Divers, Haight, St. Hilaire (3)</i></p>                      | <p>The City Council has adopted policies calling for a range of housing affordability and choices throughout the City's neighborhoods.</p>  |
| <p>New infill potential could accelerate demolition of older, affordable houses.</p> <p>Develop Demolition review process</p>   | <p><i>Corso, McClintock, Landmarks Preservation Commission</i></p> | <p>Staff concur. Demolitions are currently allowed outright outside of designated historic districts and inventories. New development options could potentially motivate property owners to demolish existing structures in some cases.</p> <p>The City's Historic Preservation Officer and the Landmarks Preservation Commission have been discussing a proposal that the City adopt additional demolition review procedures. Currently, such review is robust but limited to historic and conservation districts. The proposal is to require demolition review citywide to protect structures that are historically significant but not designated historic properties. The Planning and Development Services Department is currently working to develop demolition review regulations and policies, although the threshold for such review has yet to be determined.</p> <p><b>Staff recommend continuing these discussions along with ongoing assessment of implementation of infill options that may be adopted through this proposal. In addition, staff recommend linking demolition review to the CUP review for two-family and three-family development in the R-2 District, if adopted.</b></p> |
| <p>City design review capacity needs to be increased to ensure that infill occurs in a sensitive manner.</p> <p>The permitting process can/should be structured to decline projects which would be negative, while offering others these opportunities.</p> | <p><i>Guinup, Shelton</i></p>                                      | <p>Staff concur. These proposals seek to provide additional flexibilities along with the additional City design and process controls necessary to be confident that the resulting development will be sensitive to existing neighborhood patterns and avoid or reduce impacts on neighbors. This is the explicit intent of the Residential Infill Pilot Program in particular. It is also the approach taken with the existing Small Lots Design Standards already in place.</p>  |
| <p>Proposal reduces power of neighbors to influence the look and feel of their neighborhood, gives power to investors, builders and landlords outside the neighborhood.</p> <p>Require good neighbor/conflict resolution clause.</p>                        | <p><i>Corso</i></p>  | <p>Comments noted.</p>  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Public notification and environmental review was not adequate for the scope of proposals.</p>   | <p><i>Nelson, Ryan Jeff, Ryan Susan</i></p> | <p>Comments noted. Staff have consulted with the City Attorney's office and been assured that public notification requirements were met. Staff provided information on these proposals through the Planning Commission and Neighborhood Council processes. In addition the issue attracted extensive media coverage which helped to disseminate information.</p> <p>In regards to the SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance, this proposal is a non-project action which is not anticipated to result in significant environmental impacts. If adopted, these development options would be implemented over time through the voluntary decisions of property owners distributed throughout the City. Larger development projects would still be required to provide environmental review (such as subdivisions and multifamily housing) per the City's SEPA requirements. Finally, the Residential Infill Pilot Program, which is only one aspect of the proposals, limits the number of projects that may be permitted without additional City review.</p> |
| <p>Conditional Use Permits for DADUs, two and three-family development should be required to assess surrounding density. Avoid over-densification within certain specific locations.</p> | <p><i>McClintock</i></p>                    | <p>Staff concur. Conditional Use Permits are assessed for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. As part of that review, the City would also consider policies regarding land use densities. Though the City does not interpret the Plan's densities as imposing a strict maximum, this could be considered in specific situations where there was a perceived over-densification.</p>  |
| <p>Too much focus on already dense areas like North Slope - other areas present great opportunities for infill.</p>  | <p><i>Shelton</i></p>                       | <p>Staff concur. The North Slope and other historic districts are in many ways models of neighborhoods with a range of housing choices and affordability as envisioned under these proposals. That said, the North Slope neighborhood is close to entirely built out and the total increase in development potential under these proposals would be limited, while other neighborhoods have significantly more infill potential.</p>  |

**INFILL WITHIN HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

Opposition to changes that would affect the North Slope Historic district. Several express similar opposition to infill within the Wedge Historic District, and other older neighborhoods. Key comments expressed include:

- Strong opposition to Historic Mixed-Residential Special Review District (HMR-SRD) changes
- Some support for infill options within historic districts
- Single-family house conversions to 2-family or 3-family will harm historic character (exterior and interior)
- Reduced lot sizes could disrupt the historic patterns of development
- DADU's not consistent with historic patterns and will impact backyards/privacy
- North Slope Historic District already has a mix of housing types, affordability, high density
- Infill proposals would undermine the intent to protect historic character
- Infill proposals constitute a rezone, upzone, or re-do of the HMR-SRD zoning district
- New construction cannot replicate the look and feel of historic houses
- The HMR-SRD Zoning District should be renamed to further emphasize historic preservation
- Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) should have review and approval authority
- If some infill proposals are enacted within

*Baarsma, Boone, Bolland, Buffington (1), Buffington (2), Burns, Cade (1 and 2), Colburn (1 and 2), Couperus, Delmage, Elert, Faker, Fanni, Frank (1) (2), Gray, Haight, Haines, Hankwitz, Jackson, Johnson and Boyles, Johnston, Kamieniecki, Kelanic, Larson, Martin, May, McClintock (1, 2 and 3), McDonald, Miller, Moore, Morado, Oberfield, Oswald, Provazek and Napolitano, Pruitt, Ramsey, Rasmussen (1 and 2), Root, Seward, Shepherd, Sotak, St. Hilaire (1, 2 and 3), Sullivan, Templin, Thoms, Tomberg, Troger, Turner Jay (1, 2, 3, and 4), Turner Julie (1, 2, 3, and 4), Waters, Webb, Willis, Woodhams*

*SURVEY WITH 630 SIGNATURES ALSO SUBMITTED.*

Opposition noted. This is by far the most frequent theme of comments received. It clearly reflects a deeply held attachment to Tacoma's historic neighborhoods and their character.

The proposal includes several components intended to enhance the City's capacity to protect historic character. The proposal seeks a balance – allow for smaller lots and potential 2- or 3-family infill, consistent with historic neighborhood development patterns. At the same time, strengthen design requirements to ensure infill is compatible with the Historic District; and, improve coordination between Land Use permitting review and LPC design review. The current draft proposal includes the following requirements:

- Demolitions of historically contributing structures are prohibited in all cases.
- Include LPC representation on Pilot Program advisory design review committee
- Designs must adhere to Historic District Guidelines;
- Require a massing study and site plan demonstrating consistency with Historic District requirements (for small lot proposals)
- Require a Floor Area Ratio of 0.5 for “small lot, small house”
- New design requirements for roofs and architectural finishes on small lot houses;
- In Historic Districts: front porches required; rear yard garages must be detached; Historic District Guidelines trump in the case of conflict and give LPC authority to provide direction
- Conditional Use Permit criteria for consideration of two or three-family development: Require protection of the exterior appearance of the house

**Staff recommend that the above proposals be retained, and recommends the following additional steps:**

- **Remove proposed minimum lot size reduction to 3,500 sf; extend the proposal to count half of alley area toward minimum lot sizes to the R2-SRD and HMR-SRD Districts (see Additional Lot Size Flexibilities discussion)**
- **Revise proposal for 2-family and 3-family development through a CUP to only be available to non-contributing structures.**

|  |                                      |   |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>the NSHD, several steps should be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Demolition review process (within and outside the Historic Districts)</li> <li>○ Small lots, small houses – reduce proposed FAR to 0.43</li> <li>○ Small lots should be limited to non-contributing properties; LPC review</li> <li>○ Cottage housing not appropriate in North Slope</li> <li>○ CUP criteria for 2-family and 3-family conversions should be strengthened</li> <li>○ HMR-SRD definition changes proposed should be removed</li> <li>○ DADU's should be further reviewed for backyard shading and historic compatibility</li> </ul>  |                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Remove cottage housing proposal from Historic Districts</b></li> <li>● <b>Strengthen CUP criteria for 2-family and 3-family conversions in all districts to better ensure neighborhood fit</b></li> <li>● <b>Remove proposed HMR-SRD definition changes</b></li> <li>● <b>Retain proposal to allow DADU's in Historic Districts, with strengthened language to prevent shading of neighboring yards – limit to one DADU in an Historic District</b></li> <li>● <b>The LPC to have consultative role in most land use decisions as well as in zoning and policy changes pertaining to Historic Districts</b></li> <li>● <b>Continue study of demolition review process</b></li> <li>● <b>Initiate review of Historic District Design Guidelines</b></li> </ul> <p><b>If these modifications are made, the proposal would result in the following changes within Historic Districts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>2-family and 3-family development CUP criteria changes, limited to non-contributing large lots</b></li> <li>● <b>One potential DADU through Infill Pilot Program</b></li> <li>● <b>Potential reduction of lot sizes to a minimum of 4,000 sf where alleys are present</b></li> </ul> |
| <p>Support Comprehensive Plan change of HMR-SRD to single-family intensity.</p>  | <p><i>McClintock (1)</i></p>         | <p>Support noted.</p>   |
| <p>Support for infill within Historic Districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Protecting historic character can be accomplished in conjunction with some infill development.</li> <li>● Allowing options can make cost of ownership less, allow better care of my property, and provide affordable housing options.</li> <li>● Millennials don't have the same housing preferences as older generations.</li> <li>● Increasing density will help local businesses, provide the city with revenue</li> <li>● Support minimum lot size reductions so long as historic structures are not removed</li> <li>● Some homes in the North Slope that have been altered or neglected should be</li> </ul> | <p><i>Bond, Kaster, Washburn</i></p> | <p>Comments noted.</p>  |

|   |            |  |
|---|------------|--|
| <p>replaced with new high quality modern homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support allowing conversions of existing homes to duplexes or triplexes – this may help preserve the architecture and historic character of the neighborhood while providing affordable housing. Should include a robust maintenance code/covenant to ensure conversions preserve and maintain the structure.</li> </ul>  |            |  |
| <p>Tacoma has historically significant building some that are protected and others that are not. Critical that City consider potential adverse impacts.</p> <p>Improve coordination between the Historic Preservation Officer and Land Use staff, including for Conditional Use Permits.</p> <p>If duplex and triplex included, in R Districts LPC adequate design standards are needed.</p> <p>Update NSHD and Wedge Guidelines, particularly if DADUs are authorized.</p> <p>Citywide demolition permit review process to protect historically significant buildings not on on designated lists/districts.</p>  | <p>LPC</p> | <p>Staff concur.</p> <p><b>Staff propose the following change consistent with the LPC recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The LPC to have consultative role in most land use decisions as well as in zoning and policy changes pertaining to Historic Districts</b></li> <li>• <b>Continue study of demolition review process</b></li> <li>• <b>Initiate review of Historic District Design Guidelines</b></li> </ul> |
| <p>INITIAL PROPOSAL:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Additional lot size flexibility</b> options for context-responsive infill (all Residential Districts). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Allow smaller lot sizes to a minimum of 3,000 square feet in some circumstances, through a short/full subdivision lot size averaging approach.</li> <li>b. Update the existing Critical Areas density bonus option to provide lot size and setback flexibility.</li> <li>c. Update Small Lot design standards to better provide for context-responsive residential infill.</li> <li>d. In R-1 and R-2 Districts, allow for half of the width of abutting alleys to be counted toward the required minimum lot area, up to 10 percent of the minimum lot area requirement.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |            |  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Support for allowing smaller lots as a neighborhood infill approach  | <i>AHPAG, Turpin</i>  | Support noted.<br><b>Staff recommend the following changes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The LPC to have consultative role in small lot application review</b></li> <li>• <b>Extend the alley area credit proposed for R-1 and R-2 Districts to the R2-SRD and HMR-SRD Districts (instead of the proposal to reduce lot sizes to 3,500 square feet).</b></li> </ul>  |
| The proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.5 should be reduced to 0.43 in historic districts.<br>Front and backyard patterns should be 20 feet setbacks.   | <i>McClintock (2)</i>   | Comment noted.  |
| Lot size averaging and critical areas.   | <i>Staff</i>  | Staff identified a potential concern related to the lot size averaging proposal. As written, the proposal would count lot area encumbered with critical areas and buffers toward the total lot size leading to an unintended density bonus.<br><br><b>Staff recommend the proposal be modified to indicate that critical areas and buffers may not be counted toward lot averaging.</b> |
| <p>INITIAL PROPOSAL:</p> <p><b>2. Special Review Districts refinements (R2-SRD and HMR-SRD):</b> Proposed changes are intended to promote a predominately single-family detached development pattern, with additional provisions for smaller lot sizes and some mix of housing types.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce minimum detached Single-family Lot size from 4,500 square feet to 3,500 square feet, with enhanced Small Lot Design Standards.</li> <li>Update Conditional criteria for 2 and 3-family development to introduce more flexibility to allow this type of development, when consistent with neighborhood and historic district character.</li> <li>Update NRX District lot standards for consistency with the proposed changes to the SRD Districts.</li> </ol> |   |   |
| Support for Special Review Districts – minimum lot size reduction to 3,500 square feet.  | <i>AHPAG, Bond, Turpin</i>  | Support noted.  |
| Opposed to Special Review Districts – minimum lot size reduction to 3,500 square feet.   | <i>See Historic District Infill comments, Ryan Jeff, Ryan Susan</i> | Opposition noted. Smaller lot size generated significant concerns, within Historic Districts in particular.<br><br><b>Staff recommend the following:</b>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Remove the proposed reduction to 3,500 sf</b></li> <li>• <b>Extend the alley area credit proposed for R-1 and R-2 Districts to the R2-SRD and HMR-SRD Districts</b></li> </ul>   |
| Support Special Review Districts - 2-family and 3-family development Conditional Use Permit criteria changes.  | <i>AHPAG, Bond, Farer, Kaster</i>   | Support noted.   |
| Opposed to Special Review Districts - 2-family and 3-family development Conditional Use Permit criteria.   | <p><i>See Historic District Infill comments,</i></p> <p><i>Bjornson, Buffington (2), Karl, Kingsbury, Ryan Jeff, Ryan Susan, Turpin</i></p> | <p>Opposition noted. Two-family and three-family development, particularly conversions of existing historic homes, generated possibly the most concerns overall.</p> <p><b>Staff recommend the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Within Historic Districts, revise proposal for 2-family and 3-family development through a CUP to only be available to non-contributing structures</b></li> <li>• <b>Strengthen CUP criteria for 2-family and 3-family conversions in all SRD districts to better ensure neighborhood fit</b></li> </ul> |
| Retain HMR-SRD definition. In order to protect remaining single-family homes, encourage renovation and restoration, and to accommodate existing mix of housing types.  | <i>McClintock (2)</i>   | <p>Staff concur.</p> <p><b>Staff recommend the proposed HMR-SRD definition changes be removed from the proposal.</b></p>   |
| <p><b>INITIAL PROPOSAL:</b></p> <p><b>3. Create a <b>Pilot Residential Infill Program</b> approach to allow innovative housing types with heightened review, and subsequent code refinement. The proposal would allow the following infill housing types, with enhanced discretionary City review:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADU's) in R-1, R-2, R2-SRD and HMR-SRD Districts.</li> <li>Two-family development as a Conditional Use on corner lots in R-2 Districts.</li> <li>Multi-family development as a Conditional Use in R-3 Districts.</li> <li>Cottage housing developments as a Conditional Use in all residential districts.</li> </ol> |   |  |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Support for allowing DADU's through Residential Infill Pilot Program</p>   | <p><i>AHPAG, Bond, Farer, Guinup, Karl, Shelton, Ryan Jeff, Johnson, Kaster, Morado</i></p>         | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>As proposed, the Residential Infill Pilot Program will be reassessed as directed by the City Council or by the Director, after projects have been completed in three or more of the permitted categories, or after three or more of any single category has been completed—whichever comes first. The pilot projects would serve as test cases from which additional code refinements would likely result. In addition, the Pilot Program provides a venue for neighbors to get notification and provide input on the project's consistency with the design criteria.</p>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within Historic Districts, modern, green architecture should be allowed in units not visible from the street</li> <li>• ADU's should not require additional parking.</li> <li>• ADU's should not have to be registered</li> <li>• One of the two units should be owner-occupied, or both rented on one lease.</li> </ul>   | <p><i>Bond</i></p>  | <p>Comments noted. New construction within Historic Districts is required to meet the District's design guidelines. The City requires that ADUs obtain a permit with the City, and that one of the units must be owner-occupied.</p>  |
| <p>Concerns/opposition to DADUs through Residential Infill Pilot Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further refinements needed on height limits, size limits, lot widths, protecting backyards, preventing shading, parking.</li> <li>• Can DADUs be rented nightly?</li> <li>• Require a Conflict Resolution clause.</li> <li>• Within Historic Districts, there should be specific design guidance on DADUs. Minimize visibility from primary rights of way. Clearly subordinate to principle buildings, architecture compatible with the principle building, no exterior staircases should be allowed.</li> </ul> | <p><i>See Historic District Infill comments, Bjornson, Buffington (2), Corso, McClintock(2)</i></p> | <p>Concerns noted. The Residential Pilot Program requires discretion and calls for consideration of these issues. Staff note that there is currently no code preventing short-term residential rentals, including of ADUs. Staff note that the Pilot Program provides broad discretion to ensure that the project fits with neighborhood patterns.</p> <p><b>Staff recommend the following steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Modify the Pilot Program term so only one DADU will be permitted within any Historic District until after the program has been reassessed</b></li> <li>• <b>Strengthen review criteria to prevent shading of neighboring yards</b></li> <li>• <b>Lots must be a minimum of 50 feet in width for DADUs</b></li> <li>• <b>Continue to review the City's approach to short-term rentals</b></li> </ul> |
| <p>Support for allowing cottage housing as a Conditional Use through the Residential Infill Pilot Program - if thoughtfully designed.</p>   | <p><i>AHPAG, Shelton</i></p>  | <p>Support noted.</p>   |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Concern regarding cottage housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This housing type is not appropriate or feasible within the North Slope Historic District</li> </ul>   | <p><i>McClintock (2)</i></p>   | <p>Staff concur. There is no precedent for cottage housing within the North Slope and Wedge Historic Districts.</p> <p><b>Staff recommend that the Cottage Housing proposal be removed from the two Historic Districts.</b></p>   |
| <p>Support for two-family development as Conditional Use on corners in the R-2 District through the Residential Infill Pilot Program</p>  | <p><i>AHPAG, Farer, Kaster</i></p>   | <p>Support noted.</p>   |
| <p>Oppose two-family development as Conditional Use on corners in the R-2 District through the Residential Infill Pilot Program.</p>  | <p><i>Bjornson, Karl, Turpin, Ryan Jeff, Ryan Susan, Kingsbury, Oswald</i></p> | <p>Opposition noted. From the comments, it was clear that people are envisioning large numbers of two-family buildings in their neighborhoods. The total number would be limited to three citywide under the Pilot Program.</p> <p><b>Staff are seeking guidance from the Commission. We see two options:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Remove this option from the Pilot Program, or</b></li> <li><b>Modify the criteria in the following ways:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Increase minimum lot size to 6,000 sf</b></li> <li><b>Site must abut or be across the street from a more intensive zoning district</b></li> <li><b>One per Council District, until after the Pilot Program has been reassessed.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ol> |
| <p>INITIAL PROPOSAL:</p> <p><b>4. Planned Residential Districts</b> (PRDs) code updates to make PRDs a more effective tool for innovative site development, with optional density bonuses for affordability and sustainability features. Key changes include additional emphasis on urban design, complete streets, sustainability and housing affordability. The minimum site size and required common open space requirements would be reduced (for new PRDs) to provide more opportunities for utilization of this approach.</p> |  |   |
| <p>Support - if thoughtfully designed.</p>  | <p><i>AHPAG, Shelton</i></p>   | <p>Staff concur.</p>  |

|                           |              |  |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|
| Staff generated revisions | <i>Staff</i> | <p><b>Staff have conducted additional analysis and recommend two changes to the proposal:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reduce maximum density bonus to 1.75 times underlying zoning district (the current proposal would allow up to 2 times)</b></li> <li>• <b>Clarify the required sustainability features</b></li> </ul> |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|

INITIAL PROPOSAL:

**5. Affordable Housing Incentives & Upzone Requirements:** Offer density bonuses and permit fee reductions in exchange for voluntary inclusion of affordable housing, or for approval of a request for a residential upzone.

- a. Create an Affordable Housing Incentives Code to support implementation of proposed affordable housing incentives and bonus options pursuant to the requirements of state law.
- b. Offer a Downtown Tacoma Floor Area Ratio bonus for the voluntary inclusion of affordable housing.
- c. Offer a Planned Residential Districts density bonus for the voluntary inclusion of affordable housing.
- d. Require the inclusion of affordable housing in association with privately initiated residential upzone requests, and commit the City to analyze housing affordability in association with City-initiated residential upzones.

|  |                                   |   |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>The AHPAG supports the proposals with the following comments/caveats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals are positive steps forward</li> <li>More focus is needed on voluntary incentive and mandatory inclusionary strategies for multifamily housing</li> <li>Expand density bonus to include anywhere in the City that allows multi-family development.</li> <li>Make affordable housing a higher priority relative to other bonus options.</li> <li>AHPAG does not support mandatory inclusion proposals in present form. Mandatory upzones as proposed lack density bonuses. The following changes are needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional density bonus or other incentives.</li> <li>2. Include both private and city initiated upzones.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Downtown FAR: should be a separate and meaningful density bonus allotted to affordable housing downtown.</li> <li>Typographic correct: affordability targets are 50% rental and 80% ownership</li> <li>Continue to pursue the AHPAG's non-planning recommendations</li> </ul> | <p>AHPAG</p>                      | <p>Staff concur that there are additional opportunities to promote affordable housing through incentives and bonuses. However, to do so beyond the current proposal would require additional analysis and community engagement. To further incentivize affordable housing, the City would either have to offer significant additional bonuses (density/height being the most likely), or prioritize affordability above other public benefits (such as sustainability, design, public art, historic preservation). In staff's view the current proposal places affordability on an even keel with other public benefits. To further prioritize affordability would mean to de-emphasizing those other public benefits.</p> <p>The AHPAG's comments regarding mandatory up zones are in this same vein. Meeting their recommendation would require that the City identify additional bonus features (height/density) to offer in association with upzone requests. Significant increases in height and density merit additional community discussion.</p> <p>Either offering additional density/height, or changing the priorities of public benefits incentivized through Tacoma's bonus systems would require a broader dialogue. This activity could take place in the future.</p> <p><b>Staff recommend the following steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Given the AHPAG's concerns, remove the Mandatory Inclusion of Affordable Housing in exchange for upzones from the current proposal.</b></li> <li><b>Correct typographical error</b></li> <li><b>Present the AHPAG's non-planning recommendations to the City Council Neighborhoods and Housing Committee</b></li> <li><b>Consider a finding calling for ongoing refinement of the City's Affordable Housing Voluntary and Mandatory approaches</b></li> </ul> |
| <p>Clarifications and refinements to the proposed Affordable Housing Incentives Code as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct market study to determine the appropriate Affordable Housing - Fee In Lieu amount.</li> <li>Refinements and definitions</li> </ul>   | <p>Planning Commission, Staff</p> | <p>At previous meetings the Commission requested further explanation of the proposed \$10,000 Fee In Lieu amount. Staff have hired a professional appraiser who is recommending a two tiered fee in lieu system. The values downtown and outside of downtown are significantly different. The appraiser will provide recommended fee in lieu amounts prior to the next meeting.</p> <p>PDS and Housing Division staff have identified minor clarifications and</p>  |

|  |                            |  |
|--|----------------------------|--|
|  |                            | additional definitions within the draft Code. These do not change the intent.  |
| <p>INITIAL PROPOSAL:</p> <p><b>6. City process enhancements:</b> Pursue changes to the City’s housing development review process intended to reduce delay and cost, and to promote housing that meets city policy objectives.</p> <p>a. Authorize fee reductions and permit process enhancements for affordable housing proposals (pending resource availability).</p> <p>b. Develop a library of residential infill housing examples to illustrate the proposed Residential Infill Pilot Program.</p> |                            |  |
| The Affordable Housing Incentives Code should specify when financial incentives would apply or what they would be.   | <i>AHPAG</i>               | Comments noted. Given budget uncertainty, staff are unable to specify at this time what financial incentives, in the form of permit fees, would be on offer specifically. However, the proposal does authorize fee reductions, and the Planning and Development Services Department may have budget at any given time to support affordable housing projects through permit fee reductions or waivers. |
| Develop a library of residential infill housing examples to illustrate the proposed Residential Infill Pilot Program.  | <i>Planning Commission</i> | Should these proposals be enacted, staff will develop design guidelines in graphic format to assist developers, property owners and the public to understand the City’s design intent and requirements.  |



City of Tacoma  
Planning and Development Services

**Agenda Item  
E-1**

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division  
**Subject:** **Unified Development Code**  
**Date of Meeting:** September 16, 2015  
**Date of Memo:** September 11, 2015

The Planning and Development Services Department is initiating the creation of a Unified Development Code, which will streamline and consolidate development codes, permits and processes into a single document that is easy to use, amend, and interpret, and which clarifies approvals, appeals, and authorities.

Staff will provide a briefing of the project to the Planning Commission at a meeting to be scheduled. Attached for your timely review are a handout and a set of PowerPoint slides that provide the background information about the project. If you have any questions, please contact Sue Coffman at 594-7905 or [sue.coffman@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:sue.coffman@cityoftacoma.org).

#### Attachments

c: Peter Huffman, Director



**UNIFIED**  
DEVELOPMENT  
**CODE**

LAND USE  
SITE  
BUILDINGS

Planning Commission Handout

## Table of Contents

- Summary
  - Unified Development Code
  - About the Unified Development Code
  - Project Goals / Schedule
  - Background Information
- Tracking List
- Title 19
  - Summary
  - 19.01 Administration
  - 19.02 Zoning and Subdivisions
  - 19.03 Environmental Protection
  - 19.04 Site Development
  - 19.05 Building

## **Summary**

### **Unified Development Code**

Currently, the City of Tacoma is addressing the ease, simplicity and predictability of its permitting process. To that end, the City's Planning and Development Services Department (PDS) is initiating the creation of a Unified Development Code (UDC). The UDC is a way to provide a predictable, customer service-oriented process that allows for increased economic development and investment, while protecting the natural, built, social and cultural assets that define a unique sense of community.

### **About the Unified Development Code**

The City's UDC project will streamline and consolidate development codes, permits and processes into a single, more user-friendly document. This document will include all development-related regulations, including zoning, subdivisions, shoreline and critical areas, building codes, site development and administrative provisions such as fees, code authority, etc. Within a single code title, the codes will be organized in a way that reflects the order of design, development and permitting processes. As part of this effort, the City is also addressing out of date or conflicting information currently in the codes.

### **Project Goals / Schedule**

Specific goals associated with the UDC project include the following:

- Clear delegation of authority for decision making
- Clear reference to standards and guidelines
- Consolidation of code sections related type of development (i.e. building, site development) versus code authority
- Simplification of fees
- Available in an online format designed to improve accessibility, searchability, and consistency
- Council adoption of UDC is intended for spring, 2016

## **Background Information**

### What are Development Codes?

Development codes regulate where and what type of development may occur, including land use, density, setbacks, and transportation requirements. When done well, codes make it easier for a community to implement its vision. However, when they are out of date, or doesn't line up with the community's vision, or are in conflict, codes can actually inhibit desired development.

Code sections or portions of code sections currently being considered for consolidation into the UDC are as follows:

- Title 2 – Buildings
- Title 3 – Fire
- Title 9 – Public Ways
- Title 10 – Public Works
- Title 12 – Utilities
- Title 13 – Land Use Regulatory Code

## Tracking List

Below is a complete list of the current codes with the corresponding new code in Title 19:

| Current Code | New Code      | Code Title   |
|--------------|---------------|--|
| 2.01         |               | Minimum Building and Structures Code                                     |
| 2.02         | 19.05.200     | Building Code  |
| 2.03         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 2.04         | Ref 19.05.300 | Electrical Code  |
| 2.05         |               | Sign Code  |
| 2.06         | 19.05.500     | Plumbing Code  |
| 2.07         | 19.05.400     | Mechanical Code  |
| 2.08         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 2.09         | 19.01.100     | Fee Code   |
| 2.10         | 19.05.700     | Energy Code  |
| 2.11         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 2.12         | 19.03.400     | Flood Hazard and Coastal High Hazard Areas                               |
| 2.13         | 19.05.200     | Waterfront Structures and Marina Code                                    |
| 2.14         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 2.15         |               | Weights and Measures Code  |
| 2.16         | 19.05.200     | Mobile Homes and House Trailers  |
| 2.17         | 19.01.400     | Board of Building Appeals  |
| 2.18         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
|              | 19.04.100     |  |
| 2.19         | 19.04.200     | Site Development and Off-Site Improvements                               |
| 3.02         | Ref 19.05.600 | Fire Prevention Code   |
| 3.03         |               | Piers and Wharves  |
| 3.04         |               | Fire Department  |
| 3.05         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 3.06         |               | Alarm System   |
| 3.07         |               | First-Aid and Life-Saving Requirements at Retirement Apartment Complexes |
| 3.08         |               | Assessment of Fees on Hazardous Chemicals Reported Under EPCRA           |
| 3.09         | 19.01.100     | Fire Code Permits and Fees   |
| 3.10         |               | Mobile Fueling Operating and Permitting Requirements                     |
| 3.12         |               | Fireworks  |
| 9.02         |               | Banners over Streets   |
| 9.04         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 9.06         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 9.08         |               | Street Occupancies   |
| 9.10         | 19.05.100     | Moving Buildings   |
| 9.12         | 19.05.100     | Numbering Buildings  |
| 9.14         |               | Railroad Trains  |
| 9.16         | 19.04.400     | Streets and Sidewalks – Keeping Clean                                    |
| 9.17         | 19.04.400     | Private Use of Street Right-of-Way                                       |
| 9.18         | 19.04.400     | Trees and Shrubs – Trimming and Removal                                  |
| 9.19         | 19.04.400     | Trees and Shrubs – Planting  |
| 9.20         | 19.04.400     | Trees and Shrubs – View Blockage   |
| 9.22         | 19.04.400     | Vacation of Streets  |
| 9.24         | 19.05.100     | Minimum Vertical Clearance   |
| 9.26         | 19.04.400     | Special Lighting Permits   |
| 9.28         | 19.04.400     | Pedestrian Mall  |
| 9.30         |               | Fourth of July Concessions   |
| 9.35         |               | Hydroplane Races   |
| 9.40         | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |
| 10.02        |               | General Provisions   |
| 10.04        |               | Local Improvements – Initiation and Assessments                          |
| 10.06        |               | Local Improvements – Bond  |
| 10.08        |               | Local Improvements – Guaranty Fund                                       |
| 10.09        |               | Inactive Local Improvement Districts                                     |
| 10.10        |               | Payment of Contractor – Retained Percentage                              |
| 10.12        |               | Condemnation   |
| 10.14        | 19.04.400     | Driveways  |
| 10.16        |               | Labor on Public Works  |
| 10.18        | 19.04.400     | Sidewalks – Construction, Reconstruction and Repair                      |
| 10.20        |               | Sidewalks – Repairs Pursuant to Agreement                                |
| 10.22        | 19.04.400     | Rights-of-Way  |
| 10.24        | Ref 19.04.500 | Streets – Installation of Utilities                                      |
| 10.26        | <i>n/a</i>    | <i>Repealed</i>  |

|        |               |   |
|--------|---------------|---|
| 10.27  |               | Small Public Works Contracts  |
| 10.28  |               | Transportation Benefit District                                     |
| 10.30  | n/a           | Expired   |
| 11.02  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.04  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.05  | 19.04.600     | Model Traffic Ordinance   |
| 11.06  |               | Motorized Scooters and Electric Personal Assistive Mobility Devices |
| 11.08  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.09  |               | Transportation of Hazardous Materials                               |
| 11.10  |               | Production of Motion Pictures                                       |
| 11.12  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.14  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.15  |               | Special Events Permitting Code                                      |
| 11.16  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.18  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.19  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.20  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.24  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.25  |               | Cruising  |
| 11.26  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.27  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.28  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.29  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.30  |               | Bicycle, Skateboard, Roller Skates, and Scooter Helmets             |
| 11.32  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.34  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.35  |               | Notice, Failure to Sign, Nonappearance – Failure to Satisfy Penalty |
| 11.36  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.38  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.40  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.42  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.44  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.45  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 11.50  |               | Parking Facilities – City   |
| 11.55  |               | Heavy Haul Industrial Corridor                                      |
| 11.60  |               | Automated Traffic Camera Systems                                    |
| 12.01  |               | Utility Charges   |
| 12.02  |               | Franchises  |
| 12.04  |               | Collection of Charges by Agents                                     |
| 12.05  | Ref 19.04.500 | Electric Energy - Other Utilities                                   |
| 12.06  | Ref 19.04.500 | Electric Energy - Regulations and Rates                             |
| 12.07  |               | Electric Energy - Interchange of Surplus Power                      |
| 12.08  | Ref 19.04.500 | Wastewater and Surface Water Management - Regulation and Rates      |
| 12.09  | Ref 19.04.500 | Solid Waste, Recycling, and Hazardous Waste                         |
| 12.10  | Ref 19.04.500 | Water - Regulations and Rates                                       |
| 12.11  |               | Emergency Curtailment of Electric Energy                            |
| 12.12  |               | Transit System - Rates, Fares and Charges                           |
| 12.13  |               | CLICK! Network Cable TV Products                                    |
| 13.02  | 19.01.300     | Planning Commission   |
| 13.03  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 13.04  | 19.02.200     | Platting and Subdivisions   |
| 13.05  | 19.01.200     | Land Use Permit Procedures  |
| 13.06  | 19.02.100     | Zoning  |
| 13.06A | 19.02.100     | Downtown Tacoma   |
| 13.07  | 19.02.100     | Landmarks and Historic Special Review Districts                     |
| 13.08  | 19.02.100     | Current Use Assessment  |
| 13.09  | 19.02.100     | South Tacoma Groundwater Protection District                        |
| 13.10  | 19.03.200     | Shoreline Management  |
| 13.11  | 19.03.300     | Critical Areas Preservation   |
| 13.12  | 19.03.100     | Environmental Code  |
| 13.13  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 13.14  | n/a           | Repealed  |
| 13.15  | 19.04.600     | Commute Trip Reduction  |
| 13.16  | 19.01.300     | Concurrency Management System                                       |
| 13.17  | 19.02.100     | Mixed-Use Center Development  |

## **Title 19**

### **Summary**

Chapter 19 of the Tacoma Municipal Code serves as the Unified Development Code, and is intended to simplify and streamline the land use approval and permitting process in order to maximize efficiencies within and between City departments, and to provide a better customer experience for those seeking permits and approvals.

The purpose of the Unified Development Code is to maintain a single source of development regulations that are easy to use, amend, and interpret, and which clarifies approvals, appeals, and authorities. Title 19 has been created in order to improve predictability, consistency, efficiency, and communication during the permitting process. In doing so, City departments will run more efficiently, with better integration, and the external client will experience a higher level of certainty regarding project approvals and construction.

### **19.01 Administration**

This chapter is comprised of the several sections regarding the administration of the current codes. Included in this chapter are four major sections:

- 19.01.100 Fees
- 19.01.200 Permit Process
- 19.01.300 Authority
- 19.01.400 Appeals

### **19.02 Zoning and Subdivisions**

### **19.03 Environmental Protection**

### **19.04 Site Development**

### **19.05 Building**



# UDC PROJECT BRIEFING

September, 2015

By Peter Huffman, Director

Planning and Development Services

City of Tacoma

UNIFIED  
DEVELOPMENT  
CODE

BUILDINGS  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
SITE  
ZONING/PLATTING

Tacoma

2016  
2015

*“Make the development codes more accessible, effective and predictable – for customers, staff, and the community”.*

PURPOSE OF THE UDC



- ▶ *Create a single-source reference for all development-related regulations/codes*
- ▶ *Organize development codes to align with typical design/development process*
- ▶ *Resolve inconsistencies and conflicts*
- ▶ *Clarify authorities and streamline processes*
- ▶ *Develop a user-friendly, web-based interface*

## GOALS OF THE UDC PROJECT



3



## ALIGNMENT WITH DEVELOPMENT



4

Code sections or portions of code sections currently being considered for consolidation into the UDC to assist the city's goal of promoting more efficient and sustainable development (land use, site and building):

- ▶ Title 2 – Buildings
- ▶ Title 3 – Fire (by reference)
- ▶ Title 9 -- Public Ways
- ▶ Title 10 – Public Works
- ▶ Title 12 – Utilities (by reference)
- ▶ Title 13 – Land Use Regulatory Code

THE NEW TITLE 19...



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ 19.00 Preamble</li><li>▶ 19.01 Administration<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ 19.01.100 Fees</li><li>▶ 19.01.200 Permit process</li><li>▶ 19.01.300 Authority</li><li>▶ 19.01.400 Appeals</li></ul></li><li>▶ 19.02 Zoning and Subdivisions<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ 19.02.100 Zoning</li><li>▶ 19.02.200 Platting</li></ul></li><li>▶ 19.03 Environmental Protection<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ 19.03.100 Site Development</li><li>▶ 19.03.200 Off Site Development</li><li>▶ 19.03.300 Critical Areas</li><li>▶ 19.03.400 Set backs</li><li>▶ 19.03.500 Public Ways</li><li>▶ 19.03.600 Utilities (by reference)</li><li>▶ 19.03.600 Traffic</li></ul></li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ 19.04 Building<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▶ 19.04.100 Design standards</li><li>▶ 19.04.200 Building code</li><li>▶ 19.04.300 Electrical</li><li>▶ 19.04.400 Mechanical</li><li>▶ 19.04.500 Plumbing</li><li>▶ 19.04.600 Fire</li><li>▶ 19.04.700 Energy</li></ul></li></ul> |
|---|---|

TABLE OF CONTENTS



- ▶ Clear delegation of authority for decision making
- ▶ Clear reference to standards and guidelines
- ▶ Consolidation of code sections by related type of development (i.e. land use, site development, and building) versus by code authority
- ▶ Simplification of fees
- ▶ Available in an online format designed to improve accessibility, searchability, and consistency

## OTHER PROJECT GOALS



7

2015 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr

- Organization structure for Development Title 19 **complete**
- Conduct stakeholder outreach and education **in Sept/Oct**
- Identify authorities and conflicts and resolve by **November**

2015 – 4<sup>th</sup> Qtr

- Design new Administrative chapter – definitions, standards, fee schedule, authorities, etc. **complete by Dec**
- Formal Code adoption process **starts in late 2015**

## SCHEDULE FOR THE WORK - 2015



8



- Formal Code adoption process continues and completes **1<sup>st</sup> Qtr**
- UDC is uploaded to Web server and is online **1<sup>st</sup> Qtr**
- Incorporate regular building code updates **2<sup>nd</sup> Qtr**
- Incorporate 2016 Annual Land Use Amendments **3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr**
- Gather stakeholder feedback about new UDC **late 2016**

SCHEDULE FOR THE WORK - 2016



9

- ▶ Staff Contacts - Sue Coffman, Building Official
- ▶ (253) 594-7905 - sue.coffman@cityoftacoma.org
  
- ▶ Information, Questions and Comments
  - ▶ Send an Email to TacomaUDC@cityoftacoma.org
  
- ▶ URL:  
[http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/city\\_departments/planning\\_and\\_development\\_services/planning\\_services/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/city_departments/planning_and_development_services/planning_services/)
  
- ▶ <http://www.cityoftacoma.org/cms/one.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=25995>

CONTACTS FOR INFORMATION



10