PRESENTATIONS and HANDOUTS

Meeting on June 19, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Urban Design Studio/Design Review Program (PowerPoint Slides, for Discussion Item D-1)</td>
<td>3 – 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2020 Amendment – Public Scoping Hearing (PowerPoint Slides, for Discussion Item D-2)</td>
<td>17 – 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2019 Amendment – Recommendations (PowerPoint Slides, for Discussion Item D-3)</td>
<td>47 – 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2019 Amendment – Future Land Use map Implementation (Handout, for Discussion Item D-3)</td>
<td>67 – 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Design Studio Initiative This 2018-2019 initiative establishes an Urban Design Studio, through a substantial public process, with the requisite code amendments, design manuals, administrative and public process, fees, etc. This studio enhances the City’s capacity to ensure higher quality urban design in new public and private development and is critical for encouraging long-term growth, community vitality, and trust in City government.

- 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN
Presentation

1. Update on progress and Project Advisory Group

2. Focus area for Design Review
   - Action on focus area
Policy DD-1.4 Consider development of a design review program to promote high quality design that supports community identity, a distinctive built environment, human-scale elements and amenities, resilient and durable materials, landscape enhancements, and other similar features.
Goals for Design Review - 2016

- Improve upon the City’s existing design review process
- Support quality, sustainable, compatible development
- Support equitable growth and development
- Provide education and a resource to the community
- Are administratively practical
- Are user-friendly and understandable
- Are flexible and promote innovation
- Are predictable
- Encourage public involvement
- Are integrated with other City processes
Project Team + Scope

- Urban Design Studio and operations manual
- Design review program manual
- Draft code recommendations and modifications
- Draft design guidelines

VIA Architecture

Keith Walzak will serve as the Project Manager and be the first point of contact for the VIA team. Keith brings a deep resume of urban planning policy and design projects, including strategic plan and district-level planning efforts in similarly sized communities as Tacoma. Keith is available to work on all prescribed project work throughout the entirety of its duration.

Justin Panganiban is an urban designer supporting multiple VIA planning, transit infrastructure, and sustainability projects. He has experience across different scales of urban design; including long-range planning, neighborhood design, and streetscape design and activation. Justin will provide design graphics, mapping, and public outreach support to the project team, and is available to work on all required aspects of the project.

Michael Cannon is a versatile and experienced designer that is comfortable working at various scales with multi-disciplinary teams on complex and demanding projects. He has years of experience working in and preparing planning documents for mixed use projects including high-tech academic environments in the US, Canada, and Australia, bringing a diverse background and unique perspective to the project.

Code Studio

Lee Einsweiler of Code Studio has been involved in planning, zoning and plan implementation in a variety of settings over the past 30 years. His emphasis has been on redevelopment activity in urban areas, beginning in south Florida in the 80’s and 90’s, and continuing with his recent work in Los Angeles, Amherst NY and the Concord NH. Lee sharpened his skills in the preparation of zoning and subdivision regulations across the country, and has been personally responsible for over 50 code projects, including the complete revision and adoption of over 30 codes and the preparation of almost 20 form-based codes. His combination of conventional zoning know-how and new code approaches are rare in the profession, and his ability to facilitate the consideration and adoption of new zoning serves his clients well.

Colin Scarff of Code Studio brings a design perspective to conventional coding and planning practices, developing plans and codes that place a greater emphasis on urban form. Colin crafts plans and codes that are easy to use, easy to understand and easy to administer. His recent efforts focus on applying form-based, mixed-use approaches to plan and code the character of a wide variety of communities across the nation. Whether it’s a neighborhood, downtown, commercial corridor or entire community, Colin believes in developing planning documents that encourage traditional, compact neighborhoods that are sensitive to the environment and context around them.

Winter & Co.

Noré Winter is an urban designer and planner specializing in serving communities with special amenities, distinctive natural settings and historic places. He is inspired by communities whose residents value their past and look to a future with neighborhoods that enrich their lives. He helps citizens develop visions for their cities and towns and then crafts tools that will accomplish their goals for livability. He is recognized nationally for preparing context-sensitive guidelines and standards, and tailoring urban design plans to inspire action.

Julie Husband offers twenty-five years of experience in architecture, urban design and related fields. She has worked for Winter & Company for the past twenty years on master plans, design guidelines/standards, urban design and historic preservation projects.

Harry Brennan has worked with Winter & Company for three years. Before joining the firm, he gained planning experience working in both the public and non-profit sectors. He has been involved in historic research and design character analysis for preservation projects and neighborhood compatibility studies. Harry has also helped write design guidelines, design standards and historic preservation ordinances for local government clients.

Lead Consultant
Project Management
Design Guidelines - Lead
Community Engagement Plan Graphics

Design Review Program Manual
Internal Operations Manual
Design Guidelines - Support Graphics

Code Audit
Design Guidelines - Support Graphics
Project Guidelines

• This Project is About Site and Building Design

• Not Changing the Allocation of Development Rights (Height, Use, etc.)

• Codes Must Be Measurable Standards - Meet Them or Get Denied (or Request Relief)

• Guidelines Imply Use of Discretion, Balancing of Intent
Project Advisory Group (PAG)

- Initiated by Planning Commission (04/03/19)
- Represented Stakeholder groups
  - Community Members
  - Planning Commission (chair)
  - Design Community
  - Development Community
  - Landmarks
  - Environment
  - Affordable Housing
- Provide Input to Planning Commission/Council to inform decision making

Members

Alex Clark
Brett Santhuff (Chair)
Ben Ferguson
Charles Mann
Christine Phillips
Felicia Medlen
Gary Knudson
Jeff McInnis
Jennifer Mortensen
Mat Shaw
Patrick Fisher
Rachel Lehr
John Wolters
Project Discussion

Focus area for Design Review

1. Public Projects
2. Projects in Neighborhood Mixed-Use Centers
3. Projects on Pedestrian Corridors
4. Projects in zone transitions (MUC to Residential, etc)
5. Projects in Mixed Use Centers

• Is there a vision in place?

• Are there areas where current code is preventing good design?

• How many projects need review vs. need guidelines?
Summary of Planning Commission (04/03/2019)

Focus area

• Options provided sufficient to identify significant projects
• Mixed-Use Centers + pedestrian corridors?
• Public projects + Ped streets included in others
Goals for the Urban Design Studio/Design Review in Tacoma

• Integrate with existing legislation (Urban Forestry, transportation, affordable housing)
• Provide a tool for the community to be heard
• Don’t cause unnecessary delay to development

Focus area

• Mixed-use centers + zone transitions
• Where it has the most real world application
• Where the action is
Focus area

- Mixed-use centers + zone transitions
- Pedestrian Corridors + Transitions in Mixed Use Centers
- Adjacency Review for historic structures
- Infill Projects in Established Areas
- Block standards for Crossroads Centers
Summary of PAG Meeting (05/08/2019)

Focus area

- Neighborhood mixed-use centers w/transitions (e.g. Proctor, Stadium, Lincoln)
- Mixed-use Center (e.g. Downtown, Tacoma Mall, McKinley Neighborhood)
- Where people regularly interact spaces
- Need early testing with neighborhoods
- Focus on areas that are going through change (e.g. Stadium)
- Get out ahead of development vs. reacting to where it is now (e.g. light rail corridor)
- Identify areas w/less friction / opposition (Nimby-ism)
Neighborhood Mixed Use Ctr. + Downtown + Corridors

• There is a vision from the Comp Plan
• Potential for rapid growth
• New development adjacent neighborhood residential
2020 Amendment
To the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code
OVERVIEW

Purpose of the Public Scoping Hearing:
Receive comments on the scope of work for the 2020 Amendment

1. Process Overview
2. Staff Introduction
3. Applicant
4. Conduct hearing
AMENDMENT PROCESS

SCOPING
- Community Input
- Council / Commission Requests
- Public / Private Applications
- Staff Initiation

PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW & ANALYSIS

COMMUNITY & STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

CITY COUNCIL REVIEW & PUBLIC HEARING

CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION

IMPLEMENTATION

We are here
SCOPING AND ASSESSMENT

Planning Commission Decision: Accept, Deny, or Modify the Application and Finalize the Docket

1. Determine if the request is legislative and subject to Commission Review.
2. Determine if there have been recent studies of the same issue, or other active or planned projects that the request could be consolidated into.
3. Determine if the amount of analysis is reasonably manageable, if large scale study is required, or if the amendment may be scaled down, phased, or included in a future amendment.
PUBLIC SCOPING HEARING

Feedback from the Community:
• Are there other options to address issue?
• Types of impacts to be considered?
• Who may be impacted?
• Suggested outreach and engagement?
• Should we accept the application?
# APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Amendment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heidelberg/Davis Park – Land Use Designation Change</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. View Sensitive District Height Amendment</td>
<td>Code/Areawide Rezone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minor Amendments</td>
<td>Plan and Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Next Steps**

- **July 17, 2019:** Complete the review of the 2020 Applications and recommend a proposed work program
- **August:** Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability Committee reviews proposed work program
- **September/October:** Begin technical review and community outreach.
HEIDELBERG LAND USE DESIGNATION AMENDMENT

Planning Commission 6.19.2019

2020 Amendment Public Scoping Hearing
APPLICATION

Application for a Land Use Designation Change request

• From: Parks and Open Space

• To: Major Institutional Campus
## LAND USE DESIGNATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks and Open Space</th>
<th>Major Institutional Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation intended to conserve and enhance open/green space and/or to provide active spaces such as ball fields.</td>
<td>Designation is intended for large institutional campuses (High schools, higher education, hospitals) 10+ acres in size.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heidelberg-Davis Land Use Designation Application
TACOMA METRO PARKS

Next Steps

• July 9th Joint City Council – Metro Park Board Meeting
PUBLIC HEARING
HEIDELBERG-DAVIS PRIVATE APPLICATION

• Land Use Designation Change from Parks and Open Space to Major Institutional Campus
Narrowmoor View Sensitive District Application
NARROWMOOR VSD APPLICATION

• Application to amend city of Tacoma Land Use Code (Tacoma Municipal Code Title 13)
  • To create a second View Sensitive Overlay District Building Height Restriction of 20 feet where presently the restriction is 25 feet

• Area Wide Rezoning to designate the area VSD 20
VSD HEIGHT MEASUREMENT

- City wide View Sensitive Overlay Districts all presently with a uniform 25-foot building height limit
- Uniform measurement standards which are unique to the VSD properties.
Sightlines
Narrowmoor Additions are one of the most studied area in the City with respect to design issues-

- 1988 View Sensitive Area Study conducted by the Tacoma Planning Commission. Building height survey measured for 47 houses. Average height of housing determined to be 18.1 feet using standard methods.
- 2010 Painter Study prepared by Diana J Painter PhD, focused on historical preservation qualities of the Narrowmoor Additions.

Areawide support of the application-

- 2019 Community wide survey with 50% response with near 90% positive response supporting the proposed 20 feet height change.
  2019 Volunteers measured 349 houses in Narrowmoor Addition. 12 parcels undeveloped. Average height of houses, using modern laser equipment, is 16.05 feet.
Unique *characteristics* of Narrowmoor Addition justifying rezone application:

- Physical characteristics—Unique subdivision and site design within individual lots to respond to views
- Sloping lots often terraced to create building sites that optimize views
- Street to street configuration
- Low profile homes and landscaping
- Narrowmoor Addition covenants (1-4) 1944-1955 designed to preserve the layout of each lot to maximize the view for the entire community
Restrictive covenant modification process -

- Discriminatory language embedded in covenants from the '40s & '50s typical of the developments of this era

- HB 2514 went into effect on January of 2019, allowing homeowners to remove restrictive language in legal documents without a court order

- Volunteers worked with Pierce County Auditor’s staff and held 2 workshops to help homeowners through multi-step process to remove discriminatory language from their title

- 93 modifications have been filed with the Pierce County Auditor
TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (TMP)

• TMP Adopted in 2015:
  ▪ Vision, Goals, and Policies
  ▪ Modal Networks
  ▪ Implementation

• TMP Amended in 2017:
  ▪ Performance Measures
  ▪ Priority Project Lists
  ▪ Implementation and Action Strategies – Bicycle & Pedestrian

• TMP Amendments in 2020 – Needs/Objectives:
  ▪ Maintain consistency with Comprehensive Plan
  ▪ Respond to changing circumstances and community’s needs and desires
  ▪ Enhance neighborhood livability
TMP AMENDMENTS IN 2020

• Scope of Work:
  - Update Priority Networks and Project Lists (including incorporation of priority projects from the Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan)
  - Update Performance Measures
  - Incorporate City Initiatives – Pedestrian Implementation & Action Strategies, Impact Fees, Vision Zero
  - Strengthen pedestrian priorities in the Downtown Regional Growth Center (DDBA request)
  - Modify policies and clean up text

• Applicants:
  - Transportation Commission
  - Bicycle & Pedestrian Technical Advisory Group
  - Public Works – Traffic Engineering
  - Dome District Business Association (DDBA)
MINOR PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS

• **Scope of Work:**
  - Minor revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Regulatory Code
  - Technical, non-policy, clean-up types of amendments

• **Objectives:**
  - Keep information current
  - Address inconsistencies
  - Correct errors
  - Clarify intents
  - Enhance language
  - Increase administrative efficiency
  - Improve customer service
# Minor Plan and Code Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Issues / Topics</th>
<th>Code / Plan Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flexibility for nonconforming commercial buildings in residential districts</td>
<td>13.06.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Light Trespass into Any Residential Use</td>
<td>13.06.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rezone Modification</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emergency and Transitional Housing</td>
<td>13.06.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Street Trees Applicability Section not consistent with Street Trees in Development Standards section</td>
<td>13.06.502.B.2 &amp; E.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TMC 13.06.645 Variances</td>
<td>13.06.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Preamble</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bicycle Parking for Schools</td>
<td>TMC 13.06.512.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Commercial Districts adjacent to Residential Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Egress Windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Option E Tap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Elevator Lobbies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Highland Hills Golf Course Zoning</td>
<td>TMC 13.06.650.C.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Accessible Parking Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Code Section Reorganization</td>
<td>13.05, 13.06, 13.06A, 13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Compliance with RCW 58.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 Amendment

To the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code

Planning Commission
6.19.2019
OVERVIEW

Purpose of the Meeting:
Finalize a Recommendation to the City Council on the 2019 Amendment Package

1. Application Review and Status
2. Outstanding Issues and Finalize Exhibits
3. Findings and Recommendations/Letter of Recommendation
4. Consider a Vote on Full Amendment Package
## Application Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Future Land Use Map</td>
<td>Plan and Code</td>
<td>• Retention of Existing Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shoreline Master Program</td>
<td>Plan and Code</td>
<td>• Salmon Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affordable Housing Action Strategy</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>• AHAS Action 1.8/1.2 Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Historic Preservation Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manitou Potential Annexation Area</td>
<td>Plan and Code (will not take effect unless and until annexation occurs)</td>
<td>• Final Zoning/LUD Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minor Amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORIC PRESERVATION CODE AMENDMENTS

Request: Recommend as Proposed

Proposal:

• Historic Demolition Review
• Nomination Process
• Conditional Use Permits
# Minor Amendments

**Request: Recommend as Proposed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cleanups to TDR Admin Code</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Landscaping along walkways</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Street tree removal/pruning clarification</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Landscaping Buffer Screening for Craft Production</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Landscape Type B</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Substantial Connection and Accessory Building</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ADUs in association with single-family development</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Single-family dwelling accessory buildings in Commercial and Mixed-Use Center districts</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yard space standards for single-family dwelling in mixed-use districts</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Onsite Open Space for Multi-family</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FAR for small lots/Variations and Functional Yard Space</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Garage Doors on Corner Lots</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Front porches into front yards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMP Periodic Review

Final Changes:
1. Salmon Beach
2. Geologic Hazard Code
3. Consistency and cleanups
4. Archeological review*
5. Sea level rise*

Salmon Beach recommendation:
Modify proposal: Conditional Use Permit rather than prescriptive process for 2\textsuperscript{nd} story additions
- Requires improvement, rather than full compliance in every case
- Site-specific review and conditions
- Notice to DOE, FEMA and others

* Future review/policy initiatives
Final Changes:
1. Infill Pilot Program
2. Recognize historic inequities
3. Reference Equity Index
4. Housing and health
5. Implementation recommendations*

* To be included with package

Implementation recommendations:

* Action 1.2 Inclusionary zoning
* Action 1.8 Diverse housing types
  - Start immediately
  - Multi-phased policy effort
  - Broad, inclusive, data-driven outreach
  - Evaluate potential impacts
  - Coordinate with related policy efforts
MANITOU POTENTIAL ANNEXATION AREA

Request: Recommend Zoning and Land Use Designations

Outstanding Issues:
• Two primary zoning/LUD Options under consideration
• C-1 Impacts to Auto Related Businesses
• Effect of R-2 versus R-3
MANITOU AREA ZONING OPTIONS

Option 1

Option 2

Option 3
MANITOU: C-1 EFFECT TO AUTO-RELATED BUSINESSES

Car Repairs / Used Car Sales
- Repairs allowed in C-1; nonconforming to development standards
- Sales not allowed in C-1; nonconforming to use

Gas Station and Mini Mart
- Allowed in C-1

Used Tire Shop
- Allowed in C-1
- Nonconforming to development standards

Used Car Sales
- Not allowed in C-1
- Nonconforming to use
MANITOU: R-2 VERSUS R-3

Cursory Review of Single-Family Areas

- Total lots: 36
- Total dwelling units: 34
- Lot sizes: 2,900 – 43,560 sf
- Large lots (10,000+ sf): 20

Based on educated estimate:
- Lots more promising for development: 14
- If zoned R-2:
  - 40 units on 14 lots (increased by 26)
  - Total units: 34 + 26 = 60
- If zoned R-3:
  - 80 units on 14 lots (increased by 66)
  - Total units: 34 + 66 = 100
MANITOU: PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

- **Single-Family Residential**
  - Corresponding Zoning: R-1, **R-2**, R-2SRD, HMR-SRD

- **Multi-Family (Low Density)**
  - Corresponding Zoning: **R-3**, R-4L

- **Neighborhood Commercial**
  - Corresponding Zoning: **C-1**, T
FUTURE LAND USE MAP IMPLEMENTATION

Request: Recommend as Modified by the Commission

Proposal: Future Land Use Map Amendments and Area-wide Rezones

Outstanding Issue: Incentivizing Retention of Existing Structures
FUTURE LAND USE MAP IMPLEMENTATION

Confirmation:

• Portland Ave: Exclude C-2 and M-1; Expand zoning to include the contiguous property at the Reservoir
• 26th and Alder: Keep R-2, except for two multifamily properties
• N 12th and Yakima: Keep properties R-2, with exception for existing multifamily and those at N Yakima and N 21st
• McKinley Hill: Question regarding topography and compatibility of R-4
FLUM: McKinley Hill Topography
1. **R-3: Minimum Lot Size Reduction + ADU with Duplex Triplex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (sq ft)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Triplex</td>
<td>Base Density</td>
<td>W/ ADU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Existing</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Modified</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: 7100 sq ft lot</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FLUM: INCENTIVIZING RETENTION

### 2. R-4L: ADU + Density Bonus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (sq ft)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>Triplex</td>
<td>Base Density W/ ADU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4L</td>
<td>4250</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>23-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multifamily Density Bonus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>Density Maximum</td>
<td>Lot Size Modified</td>
<td>Density Maximum Modified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4L</td>
<td>1500 per unit</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>1000 per unit, no more than 6 units</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Portland Ave Corridor Plan
2. View Sensitive District – Comprehensive Review
3. Housing Work Program
4. Sea Level Rise and Managed Retreat
2019 Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulatory Code

Request: Recommend as modified by the Commission in response to public comment and testimony.
**Housing Element: Affordable Housing Action Strategy**

- **REVISED DRAFT** -

**Planning Commission AHAS Implementation Recommendations**

The Planning Commission is tasked with providing recommendations on planning and land use matters to the City Council. The following two AHAS actions relate most directly to the work of this Commission:

**Action 1.2:** Modify inclusionary housing provisions to target unmet need and align with market realities.

**Action 1.8:** Encourage more diverse types of housing development through relaxed land use standards, technical assistance, and financial incentives.

In light of the potential of these actions to support achievement of AHAS goals, the Commission recommends that the City Council initiate broad, data-supported policy analysis and community engagement efforts for **AHAS Actions 1.2 and 1.8**.

Consideration of significant zoning changes generates major interest and the potential for controversy. The increasing housing challenges in our City and region touch everyone, yet more understanding is needed of the causes, the links with related community values, and how these together inform the range of options. Furthermore, these policy tools are complex and technical, which can make them difficult for people to understand.

A broad, intentionally inclusive and strongly data-supported public engagement and policy development approach is needed. Such an approach can build shared understanding of the issues, help to identify common ground between diverse stakeholders, maximize achievement of the community’s goals, avoid unintended consequences, and build trust in the process. All stakeholders should have the opportunity to participate meaningfully, including low-income households most in need of housing options, yet who may not feel empowered to participate. The City should also explore the potential to collaborate at the regional level as Puget Sound communities grapple with the same housing challenges.

The Commission recommends the following multi-phased implementation approach:

**PHASE 1: Scoping, public engagement and data gathering**

- Initiate a broad, diverse and data-informed public engagement process with an emphasis on engaging under-represented communities to identify options for analysis
- Integrate an active role for internal stakeholders, partner entities and City Commissions, in coordination with broader AHAS implementation steps
- Benchmark to learn from other communities
- Identify lessons learned from ongoing AHAS implementation efforts (including the Residential Infill Pilot Program and existing Inclusionary Zoning standards), and implement near-term enhancements
- Identify and coordinate with related City, state and regional housing policy and implementation strategies
PHASE 2: Policy and regulatory changes

- Build on and continue to deepen and broaden community engagement
- Identify and study potential alternative strategies and consider phasing options
- Coordinate with regional and state policy efforts including PSRC’s Vision 2050 and the required GMA Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review
- Evaluate the impacts of any potentially significant changes to Tacoma’s growth strategy and identify appropriate mitigation actions
- Council action to update the Comprehensive Plan, zoning and development standards to implement the preferred approaches, along with any identified mitigation steps

PHASE 3: Implementation and ongoing evaluation

- Implement the Council’s action, supported with robust education and technical support to promote housing development
- Conduct ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the outcomes and consider revisions as appropriate
- Foster ongoing community empowerment in implementing and improving Tacoma’s housing strategies

The Planning Commission stands ready to fulfill its role in these major and important policy initiatives.