



City of Tacoma  
Planning and Development Services

## Home In Tacoma - Planning Commission Public Hearing February 5 to March 8, 2024

The City of Tacoma maintained an online interactive map during the Public Hearing comment period and received a total of 426 comments.

This report includes the full text of all the comments received. Each comment has an index number which is also displayed on the map. To view comments on the interactive map, visit the [Home In Tacoma Interactive Zoning Map](#) online.

Comments are geographically sorted according to the Neighborhood Council where the comment pin was added to the map, as follows:

- Central Tacoma: 1-20
- Eastside: 21-33
- New Tacoma 34-36
- Northeast Tacoma: 37-102
- North End: 103-329
- South End: 330-345
- South Tacoma: 346-359
- West End: 360-426

Within each Neighborhood Council District, comments are further sorted into the following four categories, as selected by the commenters:

- Zoning
- Standards
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- Other

# CENTRAL NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

## Draft EIS

1. Crossing Sprague can be quite dangerous. By putting more housing on the corridor, there should be some special consideration to redevelop the street to make it more conducive to pedestrian and bike crossings. We have to protect vulnerable street users like kids and seniors.

## Other

2. Do these zoning changes take into consideration the increased need for dirty businesses like laundromats? Can they be built? They are features in older neighborhoods of this density, landlords don't like to build laundry all the time, the closest laundromat to 25/MLK is on south 9th.
3. As the church grows this intersection is becoming busier and more challenging for motorized and pedestrian traffic. The impacts are particularly notable when there are also events at Peck Field Park. These factors should be considered when setting standards near this location and other high traffic areas. I also believe residential zoning along Sprague should be consistent from S 19th to 6th, and should be UR3.

## Zoning

4. This is a weird island of UR-1 even though there are parcels on the same block face in two different areas that are UR-2 and the adjoining blocks are UR-2. There's a 4-plex on the corner of 8th and Sheridan already and it's pretty close to People's Park. For consistency's sake it should be UR-2 across this block.
5. MLK is extremely narrow here, has thought been put into the width of the street here and access for emergency vehicles with increased zoning. 2 vehicles cannot currently pass at this intersection without stopping and waiting.
6. This is a school zone with speed issues, can this street be modified to increase pedestrian access and safety. People will be parking more cars here making it less safe for the children walking to school.
7. Can zoning along Wilkeson be increased? There is existing businesses and churches, this area can accommodate more people.
8. The neighborhood covenant in this area will prevent anything from being built. Can the city correct the racist and classist practice of neighborhood covenants?
9. This small bubble of UR1 from 17th to 14th might as well be UR2 for consistency through this neighborhood.
10. This small section of UR1 should be zoned as UR2 for consistency in the neighborhood.
11. This small section of UR1 should be zoned UR2 for consistency in the neighborhood.
12. Everything in this small section of S Ferry St should just be UR3 for consistency. At the least, the UR1 should be UR2.
13. I worry about the loss of trees here if there is new development. This should be zoned as parks and open space.
14. This should be zoned UR-1 to reflect its use as low intensity sports fields
15. This area is more than two blocks away from transit. Why is it UR-2 and not UR-1?
16. The city stated that the parking overlay in this area was associated with the 6th Ave bus line and that the State had mandated the no parking required zone. This bus line does not meet the min. service standards noted in the State HB. Contrary to the city's statements the 6th Ave bus line is not a major bus route; the new zone that eliminates parking in this part of the city is a city of Tacoma's planning decision not a state mandate as stated in public meetings.

17. The city stated that the parking overlay in this area was associated with the 6th Ave bus line and that the State had mandated the no parking required zone. This bus line does not meet the min. service standards noted in the State HB. Contrary to the city's statements the 6th Ave bus line is not a major bus route; the new zone that eliminates parking in this part of the city is a city of Tacoma's planning decision not a state mandate as stated in public meetings.
18. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
19. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
20. Are we not trying to keep continuity and likeness in neighborhoods? Why go from UR3 on one property and UR1 on a neighboring lot. Why not step down to UR2, or continue UR3 one more lot to the street so the entire block is the same? Also, 1701 S Mason is closer to transit/corridors than 1702, by walking or by vehicle, why is that lot UR3 and not 1701?

# EASTSIDE

21. Needs increased tree density
22. needs BRT and bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements to offset density increase impacts. corridor is too dependent on cars with little alternatives
23. It is concerning to me that there are few comments from the Eastside and South End, particularly that I am seeing no comments from the Salishan neighborhood. Homeowners in the North End are making their voices heard and I want the city to put time, effort, and money into soliciting input from Eastside, South End neighborhoods. Maybe in person events, events at the library to help people comment on this map, making this map available in multiple languages.
24. Multiple empty lots here go unused, the zoning requirements should include vacant lot taxes.
25. Why not UR-2 to the east of A St from 48th to 52nd?
26. None of these proposals will work unless the city or tpu authorizes an alleyway or private drive behind the lots on this section of a street. Especially with parking requirements
27. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
28. UR-3 opportunity (surrounded by UR-2?) since Gault is now gone and District has no plans for another school there?
29. Why is the Cushman Cemetery zoned UR-3, while the Old Tacoma Cemetery is zoned UR-2? Seems discriminatory against Native Americans. In fact, neither of them should be zoned for ANY kind of residential.
30. Why is this area exempted from any kind of upzoning like other neighborhoods?
31. Why is this area been made exempt from upzoning?
32. This entire is exempt from upzoning. Why?
33. This area is exempt from upzoning? Why?

# NEW TACOMA

34. Need more high rise apartment complexes (2024 price of 1300 ideally)
35. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.
36. The Urban Residential (UR) Zoning Quick Guide table provided in the Interactive Map is significantly misleading. It doesn't reflect the more intensive density and exemptions that developers can obtain through bonuses that have been granted by the Planning Commission. This seems purposeful; it is dishonest and demonstrates a lack of transparency.

# NORTHEAST

<b>Draft EIS</b>
37. How is an area with restrictions for building like a sensitive areas shown as part of the plan, how does it impact HOA community's?
<b>Other</b>
38. Your map is incorrect...it has two Meeker Middle School points on the Browns Point Elementary site. I DO NOT live across from Meeker and I am NOT please that I will Urban 2 designation.
<b>Standards</b>
39. Are there any road widening / improvement plans for Northshore Parkway and for these intersections due to the additional density planned here? These are all one-lane roads each way and may not support the type of traffic that you're trying to bring here.
40. Will additional safety standards or police allocation to the dark yellow and orange areas be required? This area is already feeling unsafe, becoming high in crime and in vehicle VS pedestrian incidents. Additional density will only bring more of that.
<b>Zoning</b>
41. Why isn't there more dark yellow in northeast Tacoma? Maybe there aren't enough services here. Start with improving services. Why is this HIT plan exceeding state requirements for density?
42. i do not agree with the new zoning in existing single family neighborhoods. homes were bought in these neighborhoods for a reason. i disagree if my neighbor could divide his lot to create 4 homes on what currently has one.
43. I am concerned about preserving the characteristics of our neighborhood. These zoning changes may be beneficial in places closer to the downtown and more urban centers, they are only detrimental to us here. We bought our homes here to live quietly and peacefully, not crowded in like sardines. NE Tacoma is geographically separated from the rest of Tacoma and doesn't share the same problems that the city does, and I'm feeling like we aren't being represented at all by the City of Tacoma who continues to focus on urban initiatives that are definitely NOT one-size-fits-all for every area.
44. Why is there so little UR3 and UR2 in NE Tacoma? This is NOT equitable. Why are HOAs and VSDs allowed to block additional density?
45. This a pittance of UR3 in NE Tacoma. This should be a prime area for tall apartment buildings that developers want to build.

46. Why isn't the entire boundary of the golf course UR3? This would be an excellent location for 4-5 story buildings
47. Why isn't there more UR3 around Norpoint Park. It's a great location for 4-5 story apartment buildings.
48. Why isn't all the area around this 'complete neighborhood' amenity zoned UR2 like elsewhere in the city?
49. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.
50. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
51. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
52. Increasing density in NE does not align with the Vision for Home in Tacoma largely due to its geographic location and lack of City services. Increasing density here influences Federal Way more than it does Tacoma.
53. Are these properties in Tacoma or is there an overlay or special district here? If not, UR-2/3 would work.
54. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat.
(Comments 55-59 are identical.)
55. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning
56. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
57. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning
58. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

<p>59. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning</p>
<p>(Comments 60-64 are identical.)</p>
<p>60. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."</p>
<p>61. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."</p>
<p>62. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."</p>
<p>63. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.</p>
<p>64. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.</p>
<p>(Comments 65-66 are identical.)</p>
<p>65. Please consider UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."</p>
<p>66. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."</p>
<p>67. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.</p>
<p>68. Consider UR-2 for this side of the block.</p>
<p>(Comments 69-72 are identical.)</p>

69. "Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

70. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

71. "Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

72. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

73. Consider UR-2 on this row abutting the school.

(Comments 74-77 are identical.)

74. "Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

75. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

76. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

77. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

78. This is a stormwater facility. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.



(Comments 79-93 are identical.)

79. "Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

80. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

81. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

82. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

83. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."

84. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

85. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

86. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

87. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.

88. Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine.

	Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
89.	Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
90.	Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning."
91.	Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
92.	Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
93.	Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
94.	Consider UR-2 for this row
95.	Consider UR-2. Redevelopment potential here, adjacent to green space and near services.
96.	Consider UR-2. Redevelopment potential and close to services. Adjacent to green space.
97.	Consider UR-2. Redevelopment potential is high and is a prime 3-sided corner lot to plan for traffic increase. Maybe even provide an alley connection.
98.	Please consider a row of UR-1 directly adjacent to the green space to reduce development intensity immediately adjacent to critical wildlife habitat. Other side of street zoned for UR-2 would be fine. Increases in overall noise and lighting near habitat areas are not advised under the critical areas code. Please consider looking at the required or recommended critical area mitigation measures for development adjacent to potential or known critical areas to consider them when re-zoning.
(Comments 99-102 are identical.)	
99.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
100.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
101.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
102.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.

# NORTH END

Draft EIS	
103.	Won't this plan impact the character of this national historic district? What about the residents who invested in this area based on the place?
104.	Not sure where this should go. What will the process be to ensure infrastructure; like updated sewer systems, acknowledging & providing for increased runoff, aging roads, parking availability, maintaining & improving our tree canopy. There are many beautiful and historic homes in Tacoma which is part of its appeal. How will these be protected from demolition.
Other	
105.	Having the entire I Street / N 21st Street corridor higher density will require additional traffic calming or other measures to limit speeding. it's already a problem in this corridor, including along Lowell Elementary. Adding cars will make it more busy and dangerous and mitigation should be required.
106.	This road does not exist
Standards	
107.	The proposed changes are long overdue, great work city of Tacoma. It has been difficult to find housing for relatives on fixed income in this neighborhood, and the proposed changes reflect our need to increase the supply of housing and therefore bring down rent and home prices. I especially like the upzoning around Jane Clark park as it will allow more people to live next to such a great park. In addition, the proposed changes will allow for greater density which is critical for public transit and cycling, not to mention the increased tax dollars/housing unit needed to keep Tacoma a great city to live in. My only complaint is the required parking minimums should be entirely done away with as the street widths in this neighborhood already allow for a high level of street parking and it will only prevent more housing being built by increasing costs. Overall, this policy will help make Tacoma a more dynamic and enjoyable city to live in.
108.	Hard to you're planning to make parking availability even worse in our neighborhood. In the evenings, if you were to drive down them, you would find very few if any parking spots available in the streets so narrow and only one car can pass. Please don't do this to our neighborhoods.
109.	Unexpected that you are eliminating minimum parking requirements through almost the entire North Slope District - an area that already has lots of parking issues and resident only parking areas. All because we are within a half mile of Pierce Transit Route 1 that runs every 30mins?
110.	Denser housing and no parking minimum make a lot of sense here with the new lightrail station. We need to shift how we think about transportation to center and prioritize public transit especially as we navigate climate change and the need to rely less on cars.
Zoning	
111.	Building sizes and per lot and parking . Parking is already at a premium . This will impact noise pollution and congestion adding to safety issues for the school age children walking to school. Will also drop home values since this was originally designated as single family lots. minimum minimum
112.	This method of ringing parks with higher density darker yellow will destroy existing quiet neighborhoods for years to come. And why only some parks? It doesn't make sense because some areas like this one, and actually most of Tacoma, are unwalkable for services like groceries. Even if you could walk, the crime is so bad no one wants to. People will need their cars to haul groceries, and there won't

<p>be enough parking for them. No more talking over the back fence to your neighbor. Who wants a 35 foot multiplex shading their home, eliminating the use of their property for gardening and lowering their property value? And where are the jobs and willing labor force to pay the rents for all these apartment-like dwellings? There is already plenty of empty housing in Tacoma. Where will the additional schools be added for the increased density?</p>
<p>113. Since the housing zoning in Tacoma is a free for all now with people living wherever they want and defecating in the streets, this HIT is all a joke and a waste of taxpayer dollars. Enforce the laws we already have! Solve the city's BIG problems first like crime, drugs and mental illness. Why is the new mental hospital empty? Housing doesn't solve these problems.</p>
<p>114. "Not all ""parks"" are created equal. This is a small open lot, hardly a ""park"" by most people's standards. It does not make sense to create a large multi-acre buffer of higher density zoning around this small lot which does not even provide any park amenities. There should be a min standard for a park to meet to demand the buffer. The same buffer for a large park, like Kandle, should not be the same buffer for this ""park"" which is maybe 1% of the size of Kandle.</p>
<p>115. seems silly to have remnant lots like this that do not share the same zoning as the rest of the block. the zoning should go by block or at least half-block.</p>
<p>116. makes no sense to have this skinny corridor along 6th as different zoning district that the rest of the entire neighborhood.</p>
<p>117. The North Slope district is currently designated a historic district, with restrictions on building that are more restrictive than general residential codes. What will happen with North Slope and other such historic districts?</p>
<p>118. For consistency, the area surrounding Buckley Gulch should be UR1 instead of UR2. Buckley Gulch is a natural area , not a recreational area/park. In addition, there is no access to it. There is public access only to Ursich (greenspace) off N 29th St. No walking access possible off the hill above. Thank you for making this correction which should apply to all the parcels near Buckley Gulch.</p>
<p>119. Love this little neighbor hood. Would like to see this small UR-3 ringed with UR-2 to provide a step up and down around this Brewers Row</p>
<p>120. Being close to Ruston, surprised this area is not also UR-2</p>
<p>121. Being close to Ruston, surprised this area is not also UR-2</p>
<p>122. Glad to see UR-2 in proximity to gulch. The gulch provide a great neighborhood resource (from walking around the top, or hiking up from 29th). Hope overtime more people can live in proximity to such a neighborhood asset.</p>
<p>123. Kids and I love to play here. It's the closest park to our house so we walk here when we have a little free time. The kids enjoy climbing on the play structures. Already surrounded by multifamily housing. I'm happy to see the zoning changed to reflect the existing character of this inclusive family neighborhood.</p>
<p>124. Huge lack of UR3 here. Why is the rest of the city getting a large amount of upzoning, but this wealthy, white, neighborhood isn't?</p>
<p>125. There should be increased zoning here. This wealthy, white, neighborhood shouldn't be able to avoid increased density. There is a HUGE block of UR1 in the north end that isn't broken up by UR2 or UR3.</p>
<p>126. This UR3 zoning in the North Slope Historic District would have a negative impact on historic resources. Yet VSDs and NE Tacoma are exempt.</p>
<p>127. UR-2 opportunity near Old Town. Curious why the entire perimeters along Ruston Way are not UR-2? Seems like a slam dunk for better access to green space, amenities, businesses, and transportation. Lets celebrate our waterfront instead of shield it</p>
<p>128. Why no UR-3 or UR-2? As others have mentioned there is a lack of equitability here</p>
<p>129. Needs UR-2, density in the north end</p>
<p>130. "Why is there more UR3 in this area? This is a great spot for 4-5 story apartment buildings.</p>

131.	Both sides of Route !! should be UR3 just like other bus routes.
132.	We moved back to Tacoma from Seattle to start a Family and have a home that felt like it was still a neighborhood. Don't make Tacoma neighborhoods into what they have in Seattle. That's why we and so many of our our friends moved out of Seattle and back home to Tacoma. Keep our neighborhoods a neighborhood and not a development.
133.	Is this an alley? zone R3?
134.	I think this should be zoned UR-2, as UR-3 is too abrupt from the area around it.
135.	I think this should be zoned UR-2, as UR-3 is too abrupt a change from the area around it.
136.	Multifamily zoning should just be focused on high-traffic arterials. It should focus on increasing the number of people who on high-demand resources, such as parks, schools, grocery stores and community centers. Multifamily housing allows a broader range of families with all income levels to enjoy the terrific amenities that Tacoma has.
137.	While it makes sense for UR-2 zoning for blocks immediately next to schools and bus stops, it is probably unnecessary to extend beyond that. Please reduce the UR-2 areas to 1 full block around schools and bus stops, and no more. The city (and state) is making pretty substantial changes to the zoning as it is. These UR-2 areas should be pared down by up to 1 block in any direction.
138.	In response to people concerned about equity: There are no bus routes along N. 21st, nor are these blocks located close to parks and schools. Therefore, they fall in the UR-1 category. UR-1 areas are already set for significant upzoning. UR-2 areas should be pared down to 1 full block in any direction. Tree canopy, parking requirements, and impacts on infrastructure also need to be considered.
139.	The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.
(Comments 140-141 are identical.)	
140.	Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
141.	Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.
142.	The city stated that the parking overlay in this area was associated with the 6th Ave bus line and that the State had mandated the no parking required zone. This bus line does not meet the min. service standards noted in the State HB. Contrary to the city's statements the 6th Ave bus line is not a major bus route; the new zone that eliminates parking in this part of the city is a city of Tacoma's planning decision not a state mandate as stated in public meetings.
(Comments 143-145 are identical.)	

143. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.
144. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.
145. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.
146. Much of the area around Proctor is not suitable for UR-3. It is composed of one story houses. And in many places transitional buildings already exist between the MUC and adjacent neighborhoods: the library, schools, fire station, supermarkets. Allowing 3 and 4 (even 5) story buildings will actually create the need for a transitional zone from these new tall structures to the single story homes across the street. This rezoning seems to have been conducted from a great height, with no regard to the actual conditions of the neighborhoods involved.
147. There should not be UR-2 in areas next to Puget Park. We need to protect the wildlife and the tree canopy. The use of UR-2 here is not consistent with the HIT 1 approved by the City Council and public comment during that process. This is true for all the areas that border the gulch. It will be hard enough to protect the wildlife and old trees with the required increased density set by the state. The areas within a couple blocks of the gulch should be kept at UR-1. Anyone familiar with the area knows about the wildlife that wander around. The area is also some of the most walkable areas around, because of the old trees. Don't risk the trees more than you have to.
148. The several blocks along N. 31s where the more dense area is being added is lined by many over 100 year old trees. I don't see how these old trees, with their deep roots that already extend deep into the lots (most are also fairly narrow lots), can handle the increased density of the UR 2 designation. We need more trees in the area, not less. Also why is there so much more higher density areas (UR 2) in this new plan? This seems the opposite of what the City Council decide after months of public comment.
149. Why is this area not the same color as farther east? The College Park Historic District should have the most protective zoning and not fill our wonderful residential neighborhood into crowded urban 4plex and 6plex apartments.
150. Pierce Transit Route 16 operates along 26th. Why is it the case that vicinity neighborhoods are not supported by UR-3 zoning, whereas most/all other transit-adjacent communities are upzoned?
151. Pierce Transit Route 11 operates along 45th, Cheyenne, etc. Why is it the case that vicinity neighborhoods are not supported by UR-3 zoning, whereas most/all other transit-adjacent communities are fully upzoned?
152. Having a hard time understanding the desire to put 8 to 16 units on a single lot when all there is here is a tavern and a barbershop. The idea that there are a bunch of community serving assets here for people to walk to doesn't match reality. Also bus service is once an hour - not a viable option for most people.
153. This parcel at the NW corenr of 26th and MAdison should be rezoned from T to UR3
154. Without planning for realistic parking needs this entire zoning proposal seems overdrawn and will create chaos on streets and in alleys. Nice as it is to try to reduce cars by forcing people into public transit, until the transit is there, all this will do is make streets more congested and dangerous. If you place four units on a single lot instead of the current one, you will double or even quadruple the number of cars along the streets and in the alley. Look at what has happened in Ballard - density increased and now parking is a nightmare for everyone. This entire zoning effort should be reduced by at least half unless and until the city established proper public transit to handle the growth.

155.	I like the idea of zoning for multifamily home potential along 21st. There are already many large homes converted to apartment buildings as well as 2, 4, and 6 unit apartment buildings in this neighborhood. As a resident in this neighborhood, I love the mix of renters and home owners, people who are new to the neighborhood, and people who have lived here for decades. I hope this rezoning will allow the North Slope Historic District to continue to grow as a diverse, beautiful neighborhood that is home to people from many walks of life.
156.	I would include this parcel or block based on current use and density this is an approx. 8-unit apartment building.
(Comments 157-158 are identical.)	
157.	Should be UR-2 or UR-3. These are fraternities/sororities with rear parking lots and would match or even exceed UR-3 densities.
158.	Should be UR-2 or UR-3 (the whole block). These are fraternities/sororities with rear parking lots and would match or even exceed UR-3 densities.
159.	Should be UR-2 surrounding the community garden where access to food and increased participation in the garden could occur. There is also a two-way transit stop at 21st and Proctor St. Potential development surrounding this food resource should have design consideration for sun to continue to serve the garden and not be blocked. However, please consider making the garden itself UR-1 or have some type of protective covenant or restriction to prevent development from replacing this vital resource."
160.	I would suggest not split zoning this block and make it entirely UR-3.
(Comments 162-167 are identical.)	
161.	Change to UR-2 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
162.	Change to UR-2 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
163.	Change to UR-2 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
164.	Change to UR-2 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
165.	Change to UR-2 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
166.	Change to UR-2 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
167.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine. Also, looks like this has some sort of historic designation ("McNeely James House")."
(Comments 168-173 are identical.)	
168.	Meant to say change to UR-1, not UR-2.
169.	Meant to say change to UR-1, not UR-2.h
170.	Meant to say change to UR-1, not UR-2.
171.	Meant to say change to UR-1, not UR-2.
172.	Meant to say change to UR-1, not UR-2.
173.	Meant to say change to UR-1, not UR-2.
(Comments 174-183 are identical.)	
174.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
175.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.

176.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
177.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block would be fine.
178.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
179.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
180.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
181.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
182.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
183.	Change to UR-1 to reduce development intensity for this block of green space. Other side of the block for UR-2 would be fine.
184.	N Union has oldest intact tree lined street in Tacoma whose intertwined roots under the avenue and streets manage storm water drainage - UR2 will damage this highly affective and low cost natural system. Revert back to UR1
185.	The park like setting is a wild life corridor from Puget Gulch reserve by many critters. A right of spring is slowing down for fawns being guided to the nearest rose gardens.
186.	UR 2 does not support the ""main street corridor"" designation in Urban Form of Comprehensive Plan. to extend ""multi-family"" and commercial uses on this section of N Union between N 21st and N 26th. For transparency, all designated ""corridors"" for Tacoma should be reflected on this interactive map.
187.	Remove UR2 and replace with UR1. Tacoma neighborhoods deserve to retain a quiet and peaceful setting for children and working parents.
188.	People, children and dogs use this beautiful street to walk safely to Proctor amenities. Too much density brings more vehicles; air pollution and noise. Honor promise of Low Scale only from City Council decision Dec 2021.
189.	This looks like spot zoning to me.
190.	The 90+ year old former RR tracks were transformed to what should have become similar green spaces throughout Tacoma. Look at Tacoma's tree canopy, this is a one of a kind open space whose trees have created a healthier outcome for residents. It take 20 t 30 years for trees to grow and become efficient to remove CO2 from our air. Why would the City jeopardize destruction of any trees in neighborhoods that provide storm water control and clean air.
191.	This looks like spot zoning to me. This should be UR-2.
192.	This entire block is the Tacoma Historic Cushman Building and property, protected from demolition, along with 1/4 block of Adams Substation.
193.	A university campus is no more a "Complete Neighborhood" than a sidewalk makes it a "Complete Street." It's like saying that every neighborhood should have a university campus.
194.	Do not support UR3 becoming up to 45 ft tall (4 or 5 stories) and offering a CUP to allow commercial mix with residential in same building. This is a a sly way to push the MUC zoning logic into surrounding neighborhoods.
195.	Revert back to only one type of low scale per City Council map from 2021. Only allow UR1 classification that follows State HB1110 allowing 4 -6 units (bonus for affordable) on 6,000 sq ft lot. Only



Tacoma Planning Commission supporting UR2 (dark yellow), in last 2 months, to increase bonus to 8 or 12 units (double the State mandate).
196. Object to new bonus for UR3 (Mid-scale) to dwarf 1 to 2 story homes - allowing not just 35 ft high. but 45 ft. Look at home next to Proctor Flats by post office, is that "transition" to this home acceptable for any in Tacoma?
197. Return N 26th to what was promised under HIT Phase I, to one classification of low scale. In fact, that should be for the entire City.
198. Encourage, incentivize density in empty downtown Tacoma first where water/sewer; streets; sidewalks and public transportation investments already exist.
199. This would be a good spot for more UR-3 zoning.
200. This would be a good spot for more UR-3 zoning.
201. Jefferson Park is already and literally a part of the "Complete Neighborhood Service" area along the 6th Avenue transit corridor. It doesn't need to create and extend this area even further by having its own buffer.
202. The fraternities here should not be a pretext for extending the UR-2 zone even further into neighborhood west of N Adams Street.
203. The fraternity houses here should not be a pretext for extending the UR-2 zone even further into neighborhood west of N Adams Street. These blocks provide no "complete neighborhood service" value to the area west of them. In fact, those who live in the area would argue they are already a detriment to the neighborhood.
204. This area is incredibly close to the light rail station and the whole historic neighborhood situation is going to make even more difficult to build anyway. Everything east of Steele St should be at least UR-2.
205. This area s/be UR1 from Alder to Union. No logical reason to up-zone to UR2. No public amenities, nominal transit, predominant low density. UR2 is unnecessary intrusion.
206. Should be UR1 from Alder to Union, just as 26th is UR1 in that same stretch. 26th is arguably more conducive to UR2 since already has business element.
207. This area from Alder to Union should be UR1. No logical reason to up zone to UR2. Nominal transit, no public amenities, low density residential predominance. Unnecessary intrusion into this neighborhood.
208. I am slightly horrified. Tacoma's 1, that's "one" tree lined street/blvd. is subject to the UR-3 zoning!?! Seattle has 1 tree lined blvd - Mt Baker St - I grew up there and that special street is still there only the trees are bigger and take over the median strip!!!
209. Love making this area UR3 so more people can enjoy this wonderful area. Only a 4-block walk to Proctor and more people can enjoy these amazing local restaurants, shops, and grocery stores. Another great thing about density is that it's super easy to justify and add more frequent bus service when needed.
210. Making this UR3 makes total sense given its proximity to Proctor. Please add UR2 ring around it.
211. This is such a great area. Adding density will help more people enjoy this space. This area should have a zone of UR2 around it.
212. Making both sides of Union UR2 makes sense.
213. This should be zoned with a UR-2 ring.
214. This should be zoned with a UR-2 ring.
215. Given this streets proximity to Proctor, zoning it U2 makes total sense. It is a beautiful area and adding density will allow other people to enjoying living in this area.
216. This whole half of this block should be UR2.
217. In order for any new development to occur in this area, they will have to meet the tree canopy requirement. This should be UR2.

(Comments 218-233, 237 are identical.)
218. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
219. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
220. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
221. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
222. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
223. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
224. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
225. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
226. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
227. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
228. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
229. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
230. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
231. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
232. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
233. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
234. The blocks from N Puget Sound Ave to N Junnett St should all be UR2
235. This needs a UR2 ring
236. A UR2 ring would be great here, providing a nice transition and infill housing.
237. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
(Comments 238-268 are identical.)
238. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
239. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
240. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
241. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

242.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
243.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
244.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
245.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
246.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
247.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
248.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
249.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
250.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
251.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
252.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
253.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
254.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
255.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
256.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
257.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
258.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
259.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
260.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
261.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
262.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
263.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
264.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

265.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
266.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
267.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
268.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
(Comments 269-277 are identical.)	
269.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
270.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
271.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
272.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
273.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
274.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
275.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
276.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
277.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
278.	This entire block should be UR2
279.	This entire block should be UR2
280.	This block seems like it should be UR2 also
281.	This parcel should not be exempt from UR2 zoning
282.	Needs UR2 ring
283.	Needs UR2 ring
284.	A UR2 ring is needed here
285.	We desperately need infill housing in the North End for equity. Please upzone along transit routes.
(Comments 286-297 are identical.)	
286.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
287.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
288.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
289.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
290.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.

291.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
292.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
293.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
294.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
295.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
296.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
297.	The area flanking the Mason St. Greenway (from Stevens to Tyler) should also be UR2. People can easily walk along the Greenway to Jefferson Park and Proctor.
298.	Need more traffic calming here and in walkable areas in order to keep the areas safe and walkable. City does nothing to slow traffic down. To reach goals of pedestrian friendly areas, add things like roundabouts, stop signs.
299.	UR 2 here is opposite of what city council decided in 2021. This area was changed from mid-scale to low scale in response to public comment.
300.	Route 13 being eliminated as of April 1. Not enough transit to support the density yet. Slow process down to see how state required requirements work. This is more consistent with public comment from HIT 1.
301.	In HIT 1, city council changed N 26th from mid-scale to low scale. Don't ignore the public. The addition of UR 2 is overreach by the Planning Commission, and not consistent with what the public wanted in HIT 1. The state requirements are going to provide an extensive amount of additional density. Don't go beyond that yet. Wait to see how the initial impacts of the state changes play out. Don't go beyond the state density requirements yet, especially since transit is way behind in supporting increased density.
302.	Add traffic calming in several blocks surrounding urban centers like Proctor (any like this around the city). Traffic calming (roundabouts, crosswalks, stop signs, etc.). That will keep areas more pedestrian and cycling friendly. Traffic getting more aggressive in the area which is counter to a human focused area.
(Comments 303-309 are identical.)	
303.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.
304.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.
305.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.
306.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.

307.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.
308.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.
309.	I don't understand how people can complain about homelessness and then turnaround and say we don't have a housing problem. Please proceed with HIT but add more UR2 and UR3 in the North End, especially on bus routes so our neighborhoods can be more accessible for people with lower incomes and for younger individuals and families.
(Comments 310-315 are identical.)	
310.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
311.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
312.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
313.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
314.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
315.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
316.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. The current code is 200 per unit and it should not increase. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
317.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. The current code is 200 per unit and it should not increase. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
318.	Amenity space should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
(Comments 319-329 are identical.)	

319.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. The current code is 200 per unit and it should not increase. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
320.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. The current code is 200 per unit and it should not increase. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
321.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. The current code is 200 per unit and it should not increase. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
322.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. The current code is 200 per unit and it should not increase. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
323.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
324.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
325.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
326.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
327.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
328.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
329.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.

# SOUTH END

## Other

330. There's a HUGE imbalance of comments from the North End, Ruston, Proctor, and other neighborhoods that have higher home values and a different socioeconomic makeup than South Tacoma, Lincoln, and the South End. Additionally, it feels like the resources you've provided aren't in plain language so it is hard to articulate concerns or have a vocabulary for explaining concerns with the new housing proposal.
331. Putting ur3 zones at the end of the block just means those people are going to park their cars in front of ur2/ur1 houses. People who come home from work late at night will not be able to park in front of their house. People moved to Tacoma because it was the closest they could afford with a reasonable commute time, mass transit does not get most people to work and back. Parking is still essential.
332. Stepping down the zoning should be consistent across the city. This should be UR-2 just like it is across South M Street. This block has the same connectivity as the block next to it.
333. Within two blocks of Pacific Avenue we should be looking at at-least UR-2 zoning to support BRT
334. It is unfortunate that this plan is being proposed by individuals with so little knowledge of urban planning. This is not a video fame but the lives of real people
335. Why is this area proposed as UR-3? The only feature in this area to possibly explain it is the tiny tot lot park, which is super small, so it seems like a poor reason to have it UR-3, especially since the areas around a school is only UR-2.
336. It is concerning to proposed the highest density near a freeway, potentially placing more people next to poorer air quality. Has public health been taken into consideration when proposing the new zones? I think this also has equity implications, since lots can be denser if they provide more affordable units. Therefore, if these dense zones are adjacent to the freeway, that essentially encourages affordable housing in areas of greater air pollution.
337. I question whether this should be UR-3, since it's so far removed from the closest bus stop. There is no direct access to 38th St from these parcel
338. It is a shame to build high density buildings around one of the only green spaces with trees in the South End. Consider building more green spaces and parks in this side of town if you are going to increase housing density and crowding at our parks.
339. U3 make sense along this corridor (Thomspen) because both the 45 and 48 bus routes run along here.
- (Comments 340-343 are identical.)
340. Looks like another case of spot zoning.
341. Looks like another case of spot zoning.
342. Looks like another case of spot zoning.
343. Looks like another case of spot zoning.
344. Why are these areas depicted as exempt from HIT-2? Parcels elsewhere (e.g., areas west and east of Lincoln HS) are zoned various UR zones. This is a major inconsistency.
345. Why are these areas depicted as exempt from HIT-2? Parcels elsewhere (e.g., areas west and east of Lincoln HS) are zoned various UR zones. This is a major inconsistency.



# SOUTH TACOMA

## Standards

346. Hi, UR-3 is proposed at 750 sqft. It's very tight to build 2 bedroom units for a family. Could an extra 50 sqft be added for 800 sqft total? Even just that 50 sqft would be a big help. Also, could the baseline height be raised from 35ft to 40ft? 9 foot ceilings are becoming more common in small units as they give the space a much larger feel. But that means each level, in a mulit-plex, is about 11 feet high. 3 levels is 33 feet before adding the roof. With 5 more feet that would give 7 feet up to the midway point of the roof (14 foot high roof) and would be much more feasible. My location, for example, sits next to a gas station and the backside of the property is a hillside. Both are much higher in elevation and I don't think an extra 5 feet in height would make a huge difference aesthetically. Thank you for your consideration.

347. Would love to see stronger standards around walkable/bike-able communities. Great neighborhood but tough to transit on bike. (love the water flume trail)

## Zoning

348. Why isn't this park ringed in dark yellow like so many others?

349. Sharing a comment agreeing with another nearby. It looks like Wapato Hills Park was missed when determining what the nearby zoning should be.

350. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

351. Echoing previous comments about this park - Also would love to consider how we might improve access to and maintenance of green spaces in South Tacoma as a part of this plan

352. This is absurd. Cemeteries shouldn't be zoned for any kind of residential development.

353. Why are these areas depicted as exempt from HIT-2? Parcels elsewhere (e.g., areas west and east of Lincoln HS) are zoned various UR zones. This is a major inconsistency.

354. Why are these areas depicted as exempt from HIT-2? Parcels elsewhere (e.g., areas west and east of Lincoln HS) are zoned various UR zones. This is a major inconsistency.

355. Why are these areas depicted as exempt from HIT-2? Parcels elsewhere (e.g., areas west and east of Lincoln HS) are zoned various UR zones. This is a major inconsistency.

356. Why are these areas depicted as exempt from HIT-2? Parcels elsewhere (e.g., areas west and east of Lincoln HS) are zoned various UR zones. This is a major inconsistency.

357. What is the new zoning here?

358. Cemeteries should not be zoned any kind of residential.

359. Cemeteries should not be zoned any kind of residential.

# WEST END

Draft EIS	
360.	This area is currently part of an HOA, that has restrictions on development, will the plan remove these restrictions
361.	Why is the point shown as housing are you planning on developing the park for housing?
362.	The trees on this property are the site of two bald eagles who feed, shelter, and mate here every year.
Other	
363.	It seems like a big waste of potential to not consider this commercial area as a potential residential target area. Adding residential to this strip would add buildings that abut the street and help to create a sense of place, while making it a compact, mixed-use area close to goods and services.
364.	The pedestrian bridge to the Narrows Park and Ride is a great transit feature of this neighborhood. Could help people shift from cars to transit
365.	I would really like to see C-2 added to the residential target areas at least along major streets like 6th. There's just so much potential for infill and mixed use.
366.	Since the City of Tacoma is dumping on the West End, we need a Community Center for all of the kids in the new apartments on Pearl, 12th, 19th, and Mildred Streets. The West End does not have a community center. Start planning one now.
367.	When I asked a city administrator in December how the city was going to implement the noise and litter ordinances in our neighborhoods with increased urban density, she told me that I NEEDED TO ROLE MODEL what I wanted other to do. That was a terrible answer. Here is a solution- Increase Tacoma 311 funding so there are more inspectors to make sure that our neighborhoods do not have an increase in nuisance issues.....noise, litter, parking issues, etc.
368.	Oops! My comment dot was in the wrong place. So here I go again. Increase the budget of Tacoma 311 to deal with the increased city nuisances that will occur with urban density.
369.	There is no fairness in HIT. You have left out all of the upper income neighborhoods from increased urban density. There is very little fairness in Tacoma.....city officials who live in the North End have caved in and eliminated urban density in upper income neighborhoods who got a lawyer or organized and got their way.
370.	This "Bridgeview Estate" plat contains 50 lots in total, not 47.
Standards	
371.	To achieve the intended form and scale of buildings, the form-based code/zoning must REGULATE THE HEIGHT, WIDTH AND DEPTH OF THE BUILDING, NOT THE REAR SETBACK. If an adjacent lot is wider or if the developer aggregates lots, regulating the rear setback would make the delivery of the desirable scale unpredictable and incompatible with neighboring lots. Please ensure that the building width and depth, besides height, are well regulated under 13.06.100 Building Design Standards. This neighborhood is neither served by transit nor within reasonable walking distance to essential complete neighborhood amenities, including schools, shops, and transit facilities. Reduced parking in this particular location would make the implementation of proposed zoning, and thus HIT, very challenging.
372.	"The West Slope building height is currently 20'. How can this responsibly be increased to 35' without the vote by the residents here? This is a HUGE increase and will most definitely be a negative impact on the value of the homes here if the city is allowed to permit developers to block views! This is shocking and

irresponsible of the city planners to even consider this in a view area. Many owners here have invested in their homes for decades. Homes they very likely are depending on as retirement income. I attended the meeting this past Sat on the east-side as I wasn't able to attend the prior meeting at UPS. I inquired about this height differential and all I got was 'oh I think that's protected.' Really? Okay lets see that in writing. Not one question I had could be answered by the gentleman who was in the UR2 Zoning district. I really hoped the city reps would have been more informed. "

373. The UR-2 requirements include minimum distance to bus stops, schools, and parks and SHOPPING? The Winco is .9 miles away. Doesn't Zone UR-2 need to check all the boxes? I think West of Jackson, from 16 to South 19th the should be zoned UR-1 completely. I don't believe the proposed zoning of UR-2 in the upper slope from Terrace to South 10th, and from Jackson to Fernside is justified. Further, not to expect developers to provide parking in and around multi family structures is insane in the neighborhoods. No one wants a giant parking structure but if they cannot figure out how to provide parking for each unit, 1-2 cars per, they shouldn't be allowed to build. Our neighborhood streets will be full of cars. Its not safe.

## Zoning

374. With the light-rail being proposed to come down S 19th to TCC, shouldn't more of this southern portion of the neighborhood be UR-3 in anticipation of a robust transit option coming on-line?

375. This UR-2 is not all that appropriate because the buffer from the "major transit station" is being applied "as the crow flies" rather than as a pedestrian's travel pattern along streets. This area should probably be UR-1 and that is justifiable to the State.

376. Awesome little neighborhood. Glad to see UR-3 zoned, would like to see ringed by UR-2 so more folks can enjoy the Unicorn and VFW

377. The rezoning proposed for Vista Drive is untenable. Were a representative from the city to visit our street, he/she would see that it is comprised of single family homes, on a quiet, residential street. We have no sidewalks and are not set up for apartments. The planners behind this initiative would do well to take a look down 6th avenue, heading east, and see what they can do to entice developers to make offers on some of that land, currently occupied by used tire dealerships, smoke shops, etc.

378. UR-2 closer to Ruston to make the transition more cohesive

379. There are apartments located here currently and should probably be zoned accordingly.

380. This is all one parcel. It makes sense to keep the entire school in one zone (UR-2). More housing near any school will improve its potential to serve more students within walking distance.

381. Titlow is one of the premier parks in the city. This is a huge missed opportunity to provide many more families access to the park without getting in a car. I would recommend UR-3 with a UR-2 buffer within a quarter mile in all directions of the park.

(Comments 382, 387, 392, 393, and 395 are identical. Comments 383-384, 386, 394, and 396 are identical.)

382. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

383. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

384. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

385. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

386. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

387. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

388. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

389. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

390. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

391. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

392. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

393. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT

plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

394. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

395. Much of the area in this part of the city was developed with Private building restrictions that are still in effect. Known collectively as Covenants or Home Owner Agreements, some of these plats date back to the 1940's with restrictions on race, although unenforceable. The city approved these Plats and restrictions at the time, and they were signed off by the Mayor, Council, Planning Director and Planning Commission. These Private agreements supersede new land use plans, these areas are effectively except from HiT. It is disingenuous for the city to state it does not track these plats and has not shown their impacts on the HiT plan. An Estimated 25% of the city is in one of these land development areas, principally in the West end and NE Tacoma, but can be found in the new parts of town.

396. The View Sensitive Overlay (VSD) in this part of town, with its restrictions on heights and use will impact the proposed increase shown in these areas. The city should show the VSD for full transparency of the plan's effects.

397. The addition of the west slope under UR-2 is an unacceptable and drastic change from phase 1. The availability of amenities (1/8-mile of complete neighborhood features and 1/4-mile from MAJOR transit) is a complete fabrication in order to fall under UR-2. Having a park nearby is insufficient to justify UR-2. Additionally, the area surrounding Optimist Park is outside of 1/4-mile from major transit except as the crow flies. Reducing parking requirements in the area will add to neighborhood congestion and endanger children. The west slope north of SR-16 must fall under UR-1.

398. Why does the entire waterfront get to keep the lowest density zoning, but huge swaths of the South End, Lincoln District, South Tacoma have much higher density housing?

399. This looks like spot zoning to me. This should be UR-2.

400. This neighborhood is carefully segregated from Pearl Street. Development cannot occur facing Pearl. Should not be corridor from 37th to 42nd on west side of Pearl; homes face Visscher, not Pearl.

(Comments 401-404 are identical.)

401. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

402. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

403. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

404. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

405. Need more density here given it's proximity to the park and nice lifestyle of the area.

(Comments 407-412 are identical.)

406. The entire route of the 16 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

407. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

408. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

409. The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.

410.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
411.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
412.	The entire route of the 11 should be zoned to UR3 to allow more infill housing along transit routes in the N. End.
(Comments 413-415 are identical.)	
413.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
414.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
415.	I agree that the North End needs more infill housing and that the areas along the bus route should be up-zoned, to at least UR2 at minimum.
416.	We need more density in the North End along transit routes
417.	Extend this UZ3 to Villard (just two more blocks) to allow for MFTE. My family had been waiting since 2017 and would like to build affordable housing in two lots that have been in our family since the 1890s. We currently rent out property with THA and would like to build here for additional affordable housing. The MFTE would be a significant incentive.
418.	This location in the middle of this neighborhood may not be 1/4 to transit/corridors, but it is a 1/3 mile to 4 different arterial roads which all have transit, a church, and 4 schools(elem, middle, college, & St Charles). This neighborhood should all be zoned the same. They were all built at the same time and should all remain alike. Having <10% of this square mile zoned differently doesn't make sense
(Comments 419-420 are identical.)	
419.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
420.	The north end needs density around the bus routes to ensure people who live there can rely on transit to travel through Tacoma and commute. Please add UR2 and UR3 density to bus routes in the North End. Our planet and community deserve more equitable transit. This will allow people to opt out of car ownership and more families with lower incomes to live here.
(Comments 421-426 are identical.)	
421.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
422.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
423.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
424.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
425.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.
426.	The required green-space/amenity space being 300 per unit is too high and will prevent housing development. It should be 150 in UR1, 100 in UR2, and 50 in UR3.

END