AGENDA

MEETING: Regular Meeting

TIME: Wednesday, November 4, 2015, 4:00 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 of October 21, 2015

D. Public Comments – Comments must be pertaining to items on the agenda and limited to up to
three minutes per speaker.

E. Discussion Items

1. Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan Update
Receive an update on project status, including an overview of key issues and initial design concepts, and provide high level input guiding the upcoming development of the policy framework. (See “Agenda Item E-1”; Elliott Barnett, 591-5389, Elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org)

2. Planning Commission Work Program for 2016-2017
Develop a work program for 2016-2017 based on the Commission’s Annual Report for 2014-2015. (See “Agenda Item E-2”; Lihuang Wung, 591-5682, lwung@cityoftacoma.org)

F. Communication Items & Other Business

(1) Unified Development Code – Supplemental information provided in response to the Planning Commission’s inquiries from the October 21, 2015 meeting (See “Agenda Item F-1”)

(2) Vacancy – The Planning Commission has a vacant position representing the “Development Community” with an unexpired term through June 30, 2017. Applications are due to the City Clerk’s Office by November 16, 2015. Citizens interested in applying would please visit http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/.

(3) Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability Committee special meeting, November 18, 2015, 4:30 p.m., Council Chambers; agenda includes: Sustainable Materials Management Plan; and 2015 Annual Amendment.

(4) The Planning Commission’s meeting on November 18, 2015 has been canceled.

(5) Planning Commission meeting, December 2, 2015, 4:00 p.m., Room 16; agenda includes: Capital Facilities Program Process Update; Marijuana Regulations; and 2016 Annual Amendment.

G. Adjournment
To: Planning Commission  
From: Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division  
Subject: Tacoma Mall Regional Center Subarea Plan and EIS  
Meeting Date: November 4, 2015  
Memo Date: October 29, 2015

At the November 4th meeting, staff will present updates on the Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan and EIS. This presentation follows significant public outreach and input through the four-day design workshop held at the end of September. The presentation will include a process update, policy background and key issues, outreach and public input, and high level discussion of draft goals, concepts and opportunities that will direct the planning effort moving forward. The presentation will also cover the illustrative vision plan created during the design workshop. This design seeks to create four distinct quadrants linked together to create one functional neighborhood by using a place-making approach. Staff welcomes discussion and guidance on all these topics.

Building on the success of the three downtown Subarea Plans/EIS’s, the City has now initiated a similar planning and environmental review effort for the 485-acre Tacoma Mall Regional Growth Center. This project will bring much-needed attention and resources to this important area, focused around a community-driven process to develop a vision, goals and actions to achieve the area’s potential as a thriving, multi-modal growth center. The effort will result in programmatic environmental approval that will help catalyze development in the area, and will fulfill Tacoma’s obligation under Vision 2040 to plan for designated Regional Centers. This work is being funded by a $250,000 National Estuaries Program Watershed Protection Grant, administered jointly by the State Departments of Ecology and Commerce.

The Subarea Plan and EIS is a community forum to collaboratively develop a vision, goals and strategies to guide growth and development, identify environmental impacts up-front on an area-wide basis, and target mitigation measures and other implementation steps.

Attached is a draft of the presentation that will be reviewed at the November 4th meeting. If you have any questions, please contact me at 591-5389 or elliott.barnett@cityoftacoma.org or Molly Harris at 591-5383 or mharris@cityoftacoma.org.

Attachments (1)

c: Peter Huffman, Director
Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan
Planning Commission
Project Update

November 4, 2015

City of Tacoma
3 Square Blocks

Project Area
Policy background

- GMA and Vision 2040
- Regional Growth Center
  - Density, transit, jobs & housing, livability
- Growth Targets:
  - Additional 7,555 jobs & 8,079 people
- Tacoma Comp Plan – Urban Mixed-Use Center
- Community concerns, negative perceptions
- Watershed Protection grant

Project Approach

- Placemaking for identity & neighborhood structure
- Smart growth approach to improve:
  - Quality of life, safety, livability, health
  - Water quality, green infrastructure
  - Air quality (decrease greenhouse gas)
  - Investment climate
  - Development quality
- Circulation, mobility & plan for transit-oriented development
- Programmatic environmental review and mitigation
- Prioritize actions – capital facilities, projects, partnerships
Process Update

• Initial public outreach complete
• Developing high level policy framework
• Next steps:
  – Vet draft policy framework with key stakeholders
  – Define EIS Alternatives
  – Develop Draft Goals, Policies, Subarea Plan

Outreach to Date

• Stakeholder interviews
• Health department focus groups
• Public meetings
• EIS Scoping meetings
• Design workshop
• Web site input
• Mailings and signage
Key Issues from public input

- Lacks identity/no sense of place
- Not walkable or bikeable
- Public health and safety/crime
- Lacks open space, play space and schools
- Lacks local-serving businesses & healthy/affordable food access
- Growth occurring haphazardly
- Lacks green features
- Equity and empowerment

Neighborhood Structure

4 quadrants with distinct characteristics

¼ mile radius
5 minute walk
4 QUADRANTS
Existing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Character</th>
<th>Streets</th>
<th>Block Size</th>
<th>Urban pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mall Area</td>
<td>Regional mall, big box retail, hill in center, dispersed residential</td>
<td>Discontinuous public streets, no streets in mall area</td>
<td>Up to 50 acres</td>
<td>Large commercial buildings &amp; parking lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Mall</td>
<td>Single family, multifamily</td>
<td>Mostly neighborhood scale grid pattern with alleys</td>
<td>4 -12 acres</td>
<td>Single family, townhouse, 3 story apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Quadrant</td>
<td>WW2 era 1-3 unit residential and big box development</td>
<td>Discontinuous and curvilinear</td>
<td>2.5 – 15 acres</td>
<td>Small residential &amp; large commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Quadrant</td>
<td>Heavy commercial/ light industrial, public facilities</td>
<td>Large block grid</td>
<td>Up to 15 acres</td>
<td>Dispersed development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Goals for Neighborhood Structure

Develop coherent, cohesive neighborhood structure

Common to all quadrants:
- Coherent, cohesive urban form
- Walkable everywhere
- Parks, public places, transit access
- Linked with bike/ped loop
- Safe & livable
- Improved image, access & investment climate
- Strategic investment to capture multiple benefits

Distinct to each quadrant:
- Character & identity
- Internal connectivity
- Gradations in height, scale & form
- Focal points
Illustrative Vision Plan

Legend:
- Existing Buildings
- Development
- Parking/future infill
- Public facilities
- Infill in existing grid
- Parks, Open Space, Schools

Parks, Open Space & Circulation Concepts

- Park and public gathering place in each quadrant accessed from internal bike/ped connector loop street
- Primary throughput on 38th and Pine
  - Internal bike/ped connector loop street connects 4 quadrants
  - Reconnect grid with complete streets; LRT on Pine
Stormwater Opportunities

Green Street Concept
**Neighborhood Structure**

### Scale Transition Concept

**Existing Zoning Potential in Project Area**
- Current Zoning allows infill development of up to ten stories and a variety of uses in most areas of the neighborhood.
- Less responsive to scales and character.
- Disperses development activity and economic potential.

**Potential Scale & Form Transition Concept for West of Mall Quadrant**
- Potential Neighborhood Transition concept allows higher-density mixed-use infill transitions to minimize impacts to existing residential areas.
- Concentrates development activity to create more cohesive place.

### Neighborhood form – key actions

- Create attractive and livable mixed-use neighborhoods
  - Recent growth not perceived as adding value
  - Over-zoned relative to anticipated growth
- Retain and build on neighborhood structure where present; establish structure where absent
- Differentiate form and scale between quadrants
- Strengthen human scale to build sense of place
- Establish hierarchy of streets & bike/ped thoroughfares
- Public gathering space for events & celebration
- Achieve multiple goals (open space, stormwater, connectivity, urban form)
Transportation - key actions

- Reconnect the grid
- Complete streets retrofits & improved right-of-way design
- Incorporate linear park and green features into street system
- Improve access for regional and local traffic
- Create an internal bike/ped circulator loop
- Direct I-5 access to Tacoma Mall Boulevard
- Plan for consolidated Sound Transit LRT/Pierce Transit station
- Explore potential for Sounder Station on South Tacoma Way
- Mixed use walking streets – 38th, Steele, Pine
- Connect to other neighborhoods/bridge barriers
- Coordinate with transit service providers
- Develop design elements for 3 major corridors

Natural & Built Environment - key actions

- Green infrastructure system for water quality & amenity – treatment & infiltration
  - Potential regional stormwater approaches
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions with compact, mixed use walkable neighborhood
- Increase access to parks, play spaces & nature
- Increase area-wide tree cover and landscaping
- Infill on existing paved areas & reconnect street grid
Economic Development – key actions

• Leverage prime location while improving development outcomes & capturing the benefits of development
• Improve investment climate and development quality
• Make phased, strategic investments in streets, infrastructure, the public realm & sites
• Better calibrate zoning to respond to contemporary markets, lifestyle preferences & housing needs
• Leverage transit station(s)/parks as hubs
• Recruit businesses & facilities in desired locations (including local-serving retail and services)
• Respond to changing retail dynamics – integrate with neighborhood, broadened range of activities and uses
• Upfront SEPA review and project lists

Mall Quadrant

• Public gathering places, outdoor dining & entertainment
• Public & private street network
• Infill with mixed-use, residential & structured parking
• Education, health care & employment potential
• LRT station on Pine west of Mall
• Public park on top of hill
• I-5 direct access to Tacoma Mall Boulevard
• Large scale development appropriate in this context
• Post Office may be catalyst site for redevelopment
West of Mall Neighborhood

- Transition scale from about 8 stories on 38th to lower scale to south (3-4 stories)
- Retain existing neighborhood block structure
- Revise development standards for private open space, parking and building street frontage
- Allow local serving retail & service
- Re-integrate Madison School into neighborhood
- Complete streets, green streets & neighborhood park

NW Quadrant New Gateway/ Potential TOD Development

- Redeveloped area with new street pattern
- Oriented to concept of new Sounder Station on South Tacoma Way
- Large scale development pattern
- Take advantage of hillside for structured parking
- Use stormwater facilities as major new street/park character elements to establish highly urban district
NE Quadrant

- Transition wartime housing to low to medium density residential development; can occur over time while retaining key characteristics
- Potential to use curvilinear street pattern
- Oriented to topography
- Neighborhood parks create neighborhood places and separate area from more intense development to north & south
- Mixed-use industrial area north of S. 35th Street

Key Actions – Summary

- Create neighborhood organizational structure for desired results (street networks, block size, parks & public spaces, scale)
- Carefully leverage all public investment & actions for multiple strategic benefits
- Plan for Light Rail & Sounder stations
- Regional stormwater facilities & green streets
- Complete streets/transportation projects – major change to arterials, local circulator street, new street alignments
- Coordinated actions by Metro Parks and Tacoma School District & the business community
- More directive zoning for desired results
Key actions – land use & zoning

- Fix the random, disjointed development pattern
- Consider regulating plan code vehicle to identify specific locations of street networks, parks & public places
- Require new streets with redevelopment
- Ensure that design standards promote goals
- Create more nuanced building scales and heights in different districts
  - Retain existing residential characteristics of West of Mall and NE Quadrant
  - Concentrate large scale mixed use development on 38th, in Mall & NW Quadrants
Next Steps

- Consultation with stakeholders
- Define EIS alternatives
- Refine and build on concepts as draft policy framework
A. CALL TO ORDER AND QUORUM CALL
Vice-Chair Wamback called the meeting to order at 4:09 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 October 7, 2015 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Unified Development Code (UDC)

Peter Huffman, Planning and Development Services Director, provided a briefing on the development of the Unified Development Code (UDC) which would make the development codes more accessible, effective, and predictable for customers, staff, and the community. He commented that the predictability piece was critical as many of the code sections that affect development are spread throughout the Municipal Code creating a web of code authorities and requirements that often conflict. Mr. Huffman noted that the goals of the UDC were to create a single source reference for all development related regulations/codes; organize development codes to align with the typical design/development process; resolve inconsistencies and conflicts; clarify authorities and streamline processes; and develop a user-friendly, web-based interface. He commented that the goals were in line with the strategic objectives of the department with regards to people, process, and policy.

The code sections that were being considered for consolidation included Title 2 - Building Code, Title 3 - Fire, Title 9 - Public Ways, Title 10 - Public Works, Title 12 - Utilities, and Title 13 - Land Use Regulatory Code. The proposal was to consolidate the titles into the new Title 19. He commented that bringing the codes together would also help them to develop comprehensive code and avoid conflict in the development of the code. Sue Coffman, Planning and Development Services Assistant Division Manager, commented that the process that they went through with Live-Work/Work-Live codes was an example of how to get the codes to work together within one code package and the UDC would encourage that type of code development.

The schedule was discussed. Mr. Huffman reviewed that in Phase 1 they had hired consultants and scoped the project out with a large amount research including analysis of the UDC of San Antonio. In Phase 2 they were getting into the details of the code construct and identifying the easy to resolve issues, recognizing that Phase 3 would be more complex. As they moved into 2016 there would be discussions with the Planning Commission as they amend Title 13 to reconcile with the new Title 19. Other project
goals would include clear delegation of authority for decision making; clear reference and standard guidelines; consolidation of code sections by related type of development versus by code authority; simplification of fees; and availability in an online format designed to improve accessibility.

Commissioners provided the following comments and questions:

- Commissioner Winship asked if there would be an index of acronyms. Ms. Coffman responded that how the glossary would be handled was still being considered, but they would ensure that definitions and acronyms are merged from the different code sections to eliminate conflicts.
- Commissioner Waller asked why Title 11 - Traffic and Title 14 - Urban Renewal were not being consolidated. It was noted that Public Ways would likely handle Traffic and that Urban Renewal was included in the tracking list.
- Commissioner Neal asked what the process would be for dealing with inconsistencies within the code and if there would be public involvement. Mr. Huffman responded that administrative inconsistencies would be dealt with internally. Structured code conflicts that are above administrative decisions would go through a public process of discussion.
- Commissioner Erickson asked if they could cite which municipalities adopted a UDC and if any of them were local. It was noted that Snohomish County had adopted a UDC. Mr. Huffman reported that San Antonio had been highlighted during Phase 1 for having some of the best practices.

2. Billboard Regulations

John Harrington, Planning and Development Services Division, facilitated a discussion to review public comments (testimony received at the public hearing on October 7, 2015 and written comments received through October 9, 2015), consider modifications to the proposed code amendments, and make a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Harrington highlighted six representative public comments. Representatives of Clear Channel Outdoor (CCO) and business owners had commented that billboard advertising supports small business and non-profits. Three billboard owners had asserted that existing billboards were legal and in compliance with codes when built. Four commenters had expressed support for amortization and some concern for potential issues related to MAP 21. Twenty five commenters had expressed support for removal of billboards from the City. One landowner commented that CCO leases are difficult to get out of. There were also comments that regulations should protect development potential.

Jeff Capell, Deputy City Attorney, addressed legal questions from Commissioners concerning billboard regulations. He reported that amortization is legally viable process and that the State Supreme Court decision in the 1998 Rhod-A-Zalea & 35th v. Snohomish County case had established that amortization is a viable path for getting rid of nonconforming uses.

Commissioners provided the following comments and questions:

- Commissioner Winship asked if there were any legal requirements with regard to the duration of an amortization period. Mr. Capell commented that a reasonable amount of time is required, but there weren’t any specific time requirements.
- Vice-Chair Wamback asked if creating a new amortization period would make it more likely they would have to comply with the MAP 21 compensation clause. Brian Boudet, Planning Services Division Manager, recommended that the Commission include a finding noting the concerns about the legal issues surrounding amortization. Mr. Harrington commented that a representative of the Washington State DOT had reported that the local jurisdictions would have to develop their own regulations for the new routes similar to what the State had done. He added that the State regulations were requiring fair compensation on State routes.
- Commissioner Erickson asked if the new amortization would be considered a reset or an extension. Mr. Boudet responded that they could specify that the intent was to extend and not reset the amortization period in their recommendations.
- Commissioner Erickson noted concerns from the public testimony about the exchange program benefitting CCO almost exclusively and asked if they were creating a monopoly. Mr. Capell responded that the current ownership is an existing present situation.
In response to a question about whether billboards were real or personal property, Mr. Capell explained that when a billboard is being moved to a location it is personal property, but when it is fixed to the ground it becomes a fixture and part of the real property.

Commissioner Santhuff asked if they could pursue the option of having fixed term permits for future billboards. Mr. Capell responded that it could be done, but unless the applicant and regulatory authority were in agreement it could become an appeal issue.

Commissioner Erickson asked about the distinction between legal nonconforming and illegal nonconforming. Mr. Capell responded that the Rhod-A-Zalea & 35th v. Snohomish County case had defined a nonconforming use as one that lawfully existed prior to the existing code. He added that the State Supreme court had also said that for things like life, health, and safety interests you can regulate existing nonconforming uses out of existence so long as you don’t violate constitutional provisions, primarily from the Takings Clause.

Vice-Chair Wamback recessed the meeting at 5:50 p.m. The meeting resumed at 5:58 p.m.

The maps of buffer options for Downtown were reviewed. Mr. Harrington discussed new options including removal of the Conservation District buffer; removing the school buffer; reducing the historic building buffer; removing the buffer for Downtown Residential (DR); allowing wall signs in the DR area; and removing the dispersion requirement from existing pole signs. Discussion ensued. Commissioners concurred on removing the Conservation District buffer; removing the school buffer; reducing the buffer from historic buildings to 100 feet; removing the Downtown Residential buffer; and a dispersion requirement of 200 feet from any billboards in the same view corridor.

The proposed Billboard Code Amendments were discussed. Mr. Harrington reviewed the recommendations including pole mounted billboards limited to old billboard zones; wall signs permitted in all billboard zones; exchange ratios; physical characteristics for size, height, design, illumination, landscaping, and maintenance; buffers and dispersal; and 3 and 5 year amortization periods.

Commissioners provided the following comments and recommendations:

- Vice-Chair Wamback asked if the paragraph discussing dispersal of freestanding signs larger than 300 square feet was still necessary as they were no longer permitted on the Billboard Use Matrix. Mr. Boudet suggested modifying the second paragraph to specify the dispersal requirements from larger and smaller signs. Commissioners concurred.

- Commissioner Erickson suggested removing the 3 and 5 year amortization periods from the recommendations out of concern that it could be interpreted as resetting the amortization period. Vice-Chair Wamback noted that he had suggested a statement in the cover letter that billboard owners had continued to extract value from assets that had been fully amortized.

- Commissioner Winship suggested removing the word ‘legal’ from ‘legal nonconforming’ in their recommendations to avoid confusion. Commissioners concurred and requested that their concerns be noted in the Findings of Fact and Recommendations Report.

- Commissioner Santhuff suggested having fixed term permits for future signage. It was noted that amortization had already been vetted by the courts as a mechanism for placing a limitation on the duration of the sign and a fixed term on permits would possibly be subject to additional litigation.

- Vice-Chair Wamback asked if the existing 311 faces and 93,684 square feet was the appropriate ceiling for what would be allowed. Commissioner Erickson commented that they could potentially end up with more square footage, but fewer signs. Commissioners concurred with removing the cap on total square footage to prioritize removal of pole signs.

- Vice-Chair Wamback asked if there should be a lower threshold for the requirement that billboards be removed or made conforming for any alteration within a two-year period where the cumulative value exceeds 200% of the value of the existing development or structure. Mr. Boudet noted that the 200% threshold is a reference to conformance requirements in other sections of the Land Use code. Commissioners concurred to changing the threshold to 100%.

- Commissioner Santhuff recommended labeling the offset sign in the design standards illustration.

The draft Findings of Fact and Recommendations Report was discussed. Mr. Harrington reviewed that the key findings including that conditions and community feelings had not changed since 2011; pole signs are considered not compatible with the city; wall signs are now the preferred way of having billboards in
the City; amortization is an effective tool for removing nonconforming billboards that are not moved or made conforming; an exchange program should encourage wall signs. Vice-Chair Wamback noted that some findings would likely need to be changed to reflect the changes made to the proposed code. Mr. Boudet reviewed that they would summarize the changes to the proposed code in Finding 42.

Commissioners provided the following comments and recommendations:

- Commissioner Erickson asked if they had specified in the definition of wall signs to exclude frames or other structures. Mr. Boudet responded that there currently was not anything in the code excluding frames for wall signs.
- Vice-Chair Wamback noted that Finding 39 would require buildings be at least two stories for wall signs and would eliminate single story buildings. Commissioner Erickson expressed support for maintaining two-story minimum to reduce issues related to vandalism.
- Commissioner Santhuff asked if Finding 32, which stated that the proposed amendments were inconsistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, was supposed to say “consistent”. Commissioners concurred with revising it to say “consistent”.
- Mr. Boudet suggested adding a Finding 43 that would discuss the legal issues and outstanding questions around the extended amortization period and MAP 21. Vice-Chair Wamback suggested adding the language between Findings 40 and 41.
- Commissioner Santhuff suggested that references to billboards as “legally nonconforming” should be changed to reflect changes to the language in the proposed code. Commissioners concurred to revising the language to “the other 308 billboard faces are nonconforming to the current code”.
- Commissioner Santhuff recommended including a finding addressing what the City needs to do with illegal nonconforming signs to identify and remove them. Vice-Chair Wamback suggested adding a statement between Findings 13 and 14 that the Commission’s intent is not to legitimize a sign that may have been installed incorrectly or inconsistent with its original intent.

The draft Letter of Recommendation was discussed. Vice-Chair Wamback noted that he had requested the addition of language reflecting the discussion including that they supported the general process; a reminder that the Commission has been involved with the issue for a long time; that nothing has changed that would cause them to take a more relaxed position than the 2011 Planning Commission; concerns related to amortization; that the Commission opposes digital billboards and pole signs over 300 square feet; and that they believed the proposal would result in fewer billboards and some of the existing billboards becoming conforming.

Commissioner Erickson motioned to transmit the Cover Letter, Finding of Fact and Recommendations, and Proposed Land Use Regulatory Code Amendments to the City Council with all of the discussed modifications. Commissioner Winship seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. COMMUNICATION ITEMS & OTHER BUSINESS

Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division, requested the cancellation of the November 18th Planning Commission meeting to accommodate a special meeting of the Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability Committee. Commissioner Winship motioned to cancel the November 18 meeting. Commissioner Santhuff seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Boudet reported that the November 4th meeting agenda included the Planning Work Program for 2016-2017.

F. ADJOURNMENT

At 7:33 p.m., the meeting of the Planning Commission was concluded.
To: Planning Commission  
From: Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division  
Subject: Planning Commission Work Program for 2016-2017  
Date of Meeting: November 4, 2015  
Date of Memo: October 29, 2015  

At the next meeting on November 4, 2015, staff will facilitate the Planning Commission’s development of a planning work program for 2016-2017. The work program will be part of the Commission’s annual reporting to the City Council’s Infrastructure, Sustainability and Planning Committee, tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2015.

Attached is a draft list of projects derived from the “Draft Planning Work Program for 2015-2017” as contained in the Commission’s Annual Report for 2014-2015, dated July 1, 2015. Staff will discuss the scope and status of each project and solicit the Commission’s comments and suggestions, which may include addition, removal, deferring or prioritization of projects.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 591-5682 or lwung@cityoftacoma.org.

Attachment

c: Peter Huffman, Director
# Draft Planning Commission Work Program for 2016-2017

For Planning Commission’s Review and Discussion on November 4, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan</td>
<td>Required (PSRC), Consultant Contract; PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Marijuana Permanent Regulations</td>
<td>Required (State Law), Council Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Unified Development Code</td>
<td>Department Priority, Consultant Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Infill Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Required (City Code), Council Request, PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Comp Plan Implementation – Zoning Districts</td>
<td>Council Request, PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Land Use Designations (Phase 3)</td>
<td>Private Applications, PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>JBLM Joint Land Use Study Implementation</td>
<td>Required (State Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Short Term Rentals and B&amp;Bs</td>
<td>Council Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sign Code Update (in response to recent Supreme Court decision)</td>
<td>Required (Legal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wireless Facility Code Update (in response to recent federal legislation)</td>
<td>Required (Legal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Capital Facilities Program 2017-2022</td>
<td>Required (State Law), PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>6-Year Comprehensive Transportation Program 2016-2021</td>
<td>Required (State Law), PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Other Transportation Issues (Amtrak, LINK, TMP implementation)</td>
<td>Department Priority, PC Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Historic Preservation (demolition review)</td>
<td>Department Priority, Council Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Vision 2040 Update</td>
<td>Required (PSRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>“Growing Transit Communities Compact” Status Report</td>
<td>Required (PSRC), Council Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a. Project numbers are for identification purposes, not an indication of priority order.
b. PSRC = Puget Sound Regional Council
c. PC = Planning Commission
d. Department = Planning and Development Services Department
To: Planning Commission  
From: Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division  
Subject: Unified Development Code – Supplemental Information  
Date of Meeting: November 4, 2015  
Date of Memo: October 29, 2015

At the last meeting on October 21, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed the status of the Unified Development Code (UDC) project and asked for supplemental information concerning the incorporation of Titles 11 and 14 of the Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC) and benchmarking research for the project.

Staff provides that Title 11 is included in the scope of work for the UDC, but only one section in this code title is related to development, which is TMC 11.05 – Model Traffic Ordinance. Title 14 is likely obsolete and will be addressed as part of the larger TMC update where all TMC codes are being reviewed and any obsolete code titles will be repealed.

Concerning benchmarking, Planning and Development Services had conducted a Phase I study to provide benchmarking and research about developing a unified development code. Included in the benchmarking study were the following jurisdictions: Las Vegas, NV; Payson, AZ; San Antonio, TX; Surprise, AZ; and Tucson, AZ. Based on a review of the benchmarking information and other stakeholder outreach, the report provided findings on the successful practices of other cities and recommendations for development of the Tacoma UDC and future web access needs for the code. More information about the UDC can be found at www.cityoftacoma.org/TacomaUDC. The Phase I study will also be posted on this website soon.

If you have any further questions, please contact Sue Coffman, Project Manager, at 594-7905 or sue.coffman@cityoftacoma.org.

c: Peter Huffman, Director