

Atkinson, Stephen

From: Julie TURNER <juliejayturner@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 16, 2017 4:14 PM
To: Atkinson, Stephen
Subject: Commenting on new map program

Mr. Atkinson, I am a Board member of the NSHD, Inc. and Marshall McClintock urged me to try the map program for commenting. I am fairly computer literate, but I do have trouble manipulating maps that grow and shrink - inextricably, it seems. I wrote one sentence, and hit a return for another line and that was all I got! I couldn't even figure out how to get back to where I'd been. So, I gave up on it and am going to write to you instead! I guess you can tell that I didn't like the new tool!

My objection to "adjacency" as a model of where to put large multi-units is that it is very easy to overwhelm a block, as well as the surrounding neighborhood blocks. We have at N. 3rd and J St. a 35-unit building, and the builder was given a "parking discount" because the lot is near public transit. There are 20 inside parking spaces, but there is an extra charge to park there, so where do people put their cars? On the neighboring blocks, along with the Group Health and MultiCare workers who park on the same blocks. Of course, there isn't room.

This is a lot of words to say that just because there is one 35-unit building in the 200 block of N. J. should not be a reason to put one or two more large apartments. "Adjacency" would then create a problem with absorbing of the extra people, all living too close together.

Adjacent to this block is a large, older residential neighborhood, with narrow streets and small lots; the Historic District here is the densest neighborhood in the city, as we pointed out during the

Residential Infill Project objections we had to increasing density inside our NSHD. Adjacency on all our sides could affect the quality of life and property value of our homes.

Please be careful how you use it - and other planning tools whose design appears to be meant to squeeze in apartments until no one wants to live in the area, which is the opposite of the desired effect.

Thank you for serving Tacoma's citizens.

Julie Turner
817 N. J. St.
Tacoma, 98403

**To the City of Tacoma
Tacoma City Council
Tacoma Department of Planning and Development Services**

We are fifty-two property owners and residents of the Stadium and nearby districts, and have examined the proposed rezone of the area.

Concerned property owners believe this proposal is inappropriate to the area.

- This is an attempt to transform the Stadium District into a Seattle bedroom Community.
- The proposal overlooks how this neighborhood has been doing an excellent job of densification. We are not against densification.
- The infrastructure of the neighborhood will not support this very large increase in residents.

We ask you to consult with us and reconsider this proposal. We as a neighborhood look forward to working with the city on a vision that would enhance the neighbor without degrading its character.

NAMES	EMAIL CONTACT	ADDRESS
Deborah and Devitt Barnett	dbarnett36@comcast.net	501 North Tacoma Ave.
Paula and Todd Bond	paulacrewsbond@gmail.com bndmgc@gmail.com	407 North E St.
Callista Brown	callista.brown@plu.edu	513 N. E St.
Kathy Caraher	kac819@hotmail.com	Stadium District
Ronald and Linda Coleman	rcoleman@wamail.net	602 N. Stadium Way
Jodi Cook	Jodi.cook0983@gmail.com.	Northend Neighborhood Council
Doug and Sue Ethridge	douglasethridge@icloud.com, sueethridge@me.com	424 North D St.
Jon Fayth	<jfayth@comcast.net>	717 North I st.
Tyler, Kelly and Reilly Firkins		415 North 10th St.
Jeanie Garrity		1 Broadway #513
Steve Hale		2615 starr tacoma 98403
Lois Hansen	Lois618hansen@gmail.com	618 N 6th St
Linda M. Heaton		905 N Stadium Way
Beverly Howe	mojarush@verizon.net	302 N. Tacoma Ave.

Jennifer irigoyen	jenniferirigoyen@me.com	620 north c st
Christine and Peter Krumins	krumaster@nventure.com	603 North D St.
Peter and Johnette Maehren	pjmae@comcast.com	502 North E St.
Linda Marvik	lindaalmare1@gmail.com	814 N. 10th St
Martha Mendenhall	hijumpcoach@gmail.com	215 N Tacoma Ave #A106
Julie Miller	juliemiller737@gmail.com	724 N. Yakima Ave.
Cara and Reed Moore	reedmoore@hotmail.com	620 North E St.
Michael Moore		1221 N. Tacoma Ave.
Julie Murray	pepperstarsky@gmail.com	912 N. Ainsworth
Pam Nyman	pamnyman@gmail.com	417 N E st
Sid Olufs	olufs@plu.edu	513 N. E St.
Phil Ray	philray48@hotmail.com	
Deborah Richards	debjrichards@gmail.com	1110 N. Yakima
John A. Richards		1110 N Yakima Ave
John 'Andy' Rush	mojarush@verizon.net	302 N. Tacoma ave
Tom Ryan	tom.patrick.ryan@gmail.com	Stadium District
Marilynn Sabo	gowanraig@yahoo.com	
Jeff Skov	jskov@harbornet.com	511 N. E St
Traci Skov	tskov@hewittcabinets.com	1201 N. Anderson St.
Mary and Steve Smith	marycsmith@att.net	Stadium District
Drew and Lisa Thatcher	thatcher.drew@comcast.net	522 N. E St
Diane Tilstra	mdtilstra@aol.com	719 North 3rd St. #302
Bruce Titus	Lmt@brucetitus.com	Stadium District, C Street
Diego and Kim Wendt	Kim@4us.org	401 N E St
Marilyn and Michael Zimmerman	mz.525.mz@gmail.com	516 N. G st

From: [Louise E. Allshouse](#)
To: [Atkinson, Stephen](#)
Subject: A Show of Public Concern
Date: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:19:21 PM

Hello Steve,

One true Gem of Tacoma is the historic charm of the "Northend".

Please don't diminish this by rezoning "single family parcels" to "multi-family".

Doing so will cause the loss of quaint appeal, and quality of our neighborhood.

Specifically I am speaking about the property located at 3115 N. 25th Street, but also the general area 3 blocks around N. 26th and Alder Streets.

The proposal of multi-family density will be a huge impact on this neighborhood. We already have parking issues, and crime on the rise.

Please take time to reconsider this proposal.

How is it best for me to show my concern for this issue? I have attended 2 of the community meetings, but I am not sure my concerns are noted.

Respectfully,

Louise Allshouse
3114 N. 25th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98406
253 752 6422

From: [Marilyn Zimmerman](#)
To: [Atkinson, Stephen](#)
Subject: proposed re-zoning in the Stadium District
Date: Monday, March 13, 2017 8:43:36 AM

Dear Mr. Atkinson:

I have been advised that there is a proposal to re-zone the Stadium District to allow 60-65 foot tall buildings in this historical neighborhood.

Why weren't ALL residents of the Stadium District notified of this proposal?

Residents of the Stadium District MUST be informed of any proposed re-zoning. I request any and all documentation, notes, memoranda, plans, minutes of City meetings, etc. with regard to this proposed re-zoning be provided to ALL residents of the Stadium District. Neighbors are very angry they have not been informed. I have lived in this District for over 20 years, and I have never received one scrap of information or piece of mail with regard to this proposal.

Residents of Stadium District are under the impression that the reason for this proposal is related to the Central Lutheran Church on Tacoma Ave apparently not being able to pay their property taxes and/or afford to maintain their property. That should not mean the City gets to ruin the quality of life and property values for the people that live near it within the Stadium District.

I look forward to your response.

M

City planning & zoning is at odds with many of OUR neighborhood standards:

1. Ask any planner and they will say they favor mass transit. They do NOT require enough parking space, do NOT favor wider traffic lanes, do NOT encourage development to have enough parking for each commercial or residential space, making traffic bad, double parking for delivery trucks making deliveries, also creating noise and gridlock, by having larger waste receptacles. Planners do this they say, "so people will get out of their cars and onto buses." But in the meantime, OUR quality of life diminishes. CASE: City approved new brewery and new Starbucks without ANY parking! **Existing grocery has to HIRE GUARDS to patrol their parking lots in the evening to protect their customer's having a parking place.**
2. Also the SCALE of the high multistory walls is just insensitive to the historic qualities here. The craftsman detailing, porches, offsets, height and different fenestration patterns are PART OF THIS DISTRICT – make the new buildings vary and not act as one large monolithic wall taking up the whole block; REQUIRE more trees and MORE MATURE TREES! Another quality that makes our neighborhoods nice is the play of the light and shadows in our neighborhoods. **They should require STEPPED BACK facades, not allowing the 4 or 5 or more story canyon effect.**
3. But our city likes more tax income and more units per acre is their goal. They do not want to encourage more single family dwellings, but that is our neighborhood! How about the center of the block be huge, be dense but taper down towards the edges, towards our homes and be SIMILAR in massing? How hard is to respond in context to our neighborhood context? Don't ignore what makes us great.
4. Ask for local businesses to have preference, give tax abatement first few years for LOCAL INDEPENDENT businesses to go into multi-family developments! But our local gov't LIKES chain stores OVER local independents because chains bring in more tax revenue but they support local businesses LESS - advertising dollars go back to corporate, purchasing dollars go to central buying group, we just get 1 or 2 family wage jobs. the rest are low paying clerk or barista jobs. But these developments and gov't like McDonalds and such, over something local.
5. There are planning and zoning requirements for many things. But loading zones, number of bathrooms per square foot of building, number of parking spaces, and many more, often get waved by planners without the neighborhoods getting to weigh in on any. Then we have to put up with the consequences each day forever, trying to cross busy street or find parking or whatever. **The entire plan and EVERY waiver ought to be spoken loud and clear for each of us to think about,** not just a pretty rendering of the main façade. CASE in point: Proctor has no loading zone, the new proposed city block sized building has none; they have no large tree or lawn space, no place for mature vegetation to grow, they have not enough parking for renters/owners AND their guests or delivery people, no specific local public amenities, like a bathroom, a bench or place to converse out of the flow of sidewalk traffic.
6. Rear facades facing the neighbors ought to have sufficient detail to not look like a big grey box 5 stories high! There ought to be green roofs, with trees on them and set backs and balconies on rear and side facades as well. CASE in Point: Proctor development looks like a giant big box, like a Costco or something from the rear side. The money was spent on the street side making a good 1st impression, but THE ARCHITECTURE TURNS ITS BACK ON NEIGHBORHOOD and places garbage cans and electric power panels and transformers for us to see and walk past. Don't allow two-faced design, or one phony facade one side but unadorned or listless architecture on all the other sides!
7. Why do all our mixed use project have to look like Seattle, or Bellevue or Portland or everywhere else – brick base, aluminum storefront and over-sized metal trim and eyebrows, same-o same-o from here to the East Coast?