



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

The City of Tacoma maintained an online interactive comment portal (Social Pinpoint) during the Public Hearing comment period. The City received comments on each of the following topics.

- General comments: 184 comments
- Zoning: 203 comments
- Parking: 137 comments
- Housing types: 68 comments
- Amenity Space and Trees: 89 comments
- Affordability and building retention bonuses: 53 comments
- Unit Lot Subdivisions: 30 comments
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): 29 comments

General Comments (184)

1.	Thank you for providing the final straw. After living here for 30+ years, the degree to which the Planning Dept, the Planning Commission (in particular) and the City Council ignore and disrespect the views and interests of residents has provided the motivation I needed to leave. Home in Tacoma? No thanks.
2.	The city has ignored the will of the people since this "Home in Tacoma" was first rolled out. Taking a look at all public comments (Phase 1) it was 80-20 ANTI. Yet, here we are. If the city council moves forward with these "multiplexes" and subdivided neighborhood lots, the tax payers will have lost (again).
3.	I fully support this idea and think it is important to go forward with this in order to address our housing crisis.
4.	– No. Please do not increase density and leave residents with the added costs and overcrowding.
5.	It cracks me up you offer an “open forum” to discuss the “HIT” projects when 95% of the people are against it and want to keep their traditional neighborhoods. Just be honest, you’re doing this for developers money!
6.	This is a great change for Tacoma. Walkable and affordable neighborhoods will set Tacoma apart from other cities in the US. We can only expand our cities outward for so long, and it's great to see Tacoma taking the step to start building inwards. I think denser housing, walkability, and an emphasis on more shared spaces will help strengthen Tacoma's community.

7.	It is great to encourage developers to build housing that reflects what the people want. Younger generations want more affordable and denser, walkable neighborhoods. Build for the future!
8.	I love the inclusion of covered bike parking for each new unit! Hopefully an increase in protected bike lanes will follow and we can turn Tacoma into a biking haven! I know so many people who would bike for all of their errands, just look at the Netherlands! People never drive there, and it's because the government put a focus on people rather than cars.
9.	This plan encourages the ongoing financialization of housing as a process where housing is treated as a commodity, or a means of investment and wealth, rather than a social good. This process involves financial actors, such as private equity firms or Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs), using housing as a financial instrument for profit. The very useful supply-side progressives on the Planning Commission have done their job.
10.	Walkable cities are the norm in so many places around the world, the U.S. is seriously lacking behind in that area. I'm glad that this issue is being addressed, great steps towards a less polluted, more affordable city.
11.	Mixed-used developments ftw!!
12.	Pop on down to the "mixed use" buildings near UWT. They're empty.
13.	WORRIED about population density. Don't want to Burden resources of power, water, sewer, traffic, parking, schools, emergency response. DON'T want to look like Seattle. Residents Will Leave if quality of life diminishes.
14.	Home In Tacoma could be a major tool to address socio-economic disparities but this is only if the focus shifts from enticing big developers to assisting existing home-owners, the ones paying taxes to support the new infrastructure to make this all feasible. Some, if not most, of the fee in lieu should be for educating and financing or subsidizing homeowners to develop their properties as affordable housing. A community lender program should be developed. Strate titling should also be explored.
15.	I do wish that a community land trust could be a part of this project. Can the City dedicate some of the funding in the housing trust fund to a community land trust? That will help to ensure that affordable housing in parts of the city lasts forever and not just however long the tax exemption lasts.
16.	The socialists and activists are simply jealous of what others have. They believe that everyone is a victim and that those of us who pay taxes and mortgages ought to have our neighborhoods destroyed so that more Seattle transplants can move here. It's time to shut this thing down via citizen's initiative.
17.	"Home In Tacoma" sounds pleasant but living in these areas that are zones for "multi families" is going to be a nightmare because of the "Tenant's Bill of Rights" ordinance that was just passed. Good luck but we are selling and running for the hills. Imagine having all these units filled with people that don't have to pay rent. Who pays? Mom and Pop landlords can't afford it and investors either sell or let it go into foreclosure. Clowns running our city.
18.	I like how they need to add covered space for bikes! lol People can't safely leave their bikes outside in Tacoma! We have thief's running rampant. I walk outside and find drug paraphernalia among other bio hazards. We should be focusing on these issues. Maybe also focus on picking up trash over tree planting!

19.	<p>Proposal still leaves ADU size requirements based on square footage of orig home not the square footage of property. Please change to square footage of property. A 1000 sq foot home on a 75x100 square foot lot only allows 850 ADU and limits on a garage.</p> <p>Current requirements require home with detached garage to become attached (enclosed and heated) in order to have an ADU with detached garage placed on property. Doesn't make sense.</p> <p>Stop making the regs so rigid and inflexible.</p>
20.	<p>The City planners, we can thank them. Our city is not laid out or built as a European "walking" city. Neighborhoods are already touchy about finding a parking spot (which according to the plan could be a 0.5 space allowed...half a space!). I hesitate to mention, but I will, a large percentage of our population is older (some elderly), they are going to hop on a bicycle, dodge the speeding traffic...nothing to it! I blame the City planners who are arrogant.</p>
21.	<p>What safeguards are in place to prevent over saturation of low quality inventory homes from flooding the market?</p>
22.	<p>We already have an excess of housing available in Tacoma at most income levels. Who exactly are we trying to house?</p>
23.	<p>As mentioned previously and still not addressed, the HIT program will increase global warming. This is a known effect of urban areas that due to dense housing and increased pavement a warming bubble is created. How do you plan to address global warming with this plan? Will you retain and increase forestry, greenspace? This plan is flawed and supported only by a council of developers. When will you bring in residents who have no financial benefit from this plan?</p>
24.	<p>When I lived on North K Street. My neighbor, Paul was walking his English Bull dog, (2 years old). It was during the summer. The dog collapsed and died from heat exhaustion. Last year, I picked up my two dogs from the vet after getting their teeth cleaned. I had to wait 45 min. for pick up since a dog was brought in with heat stroke. Its internal body temperature, 107 degrees. The dog died. Tacoma has the lowest tree canopy in the Puget Sound Basin. We need more trees and a funded forestry dept.</p>
25.	<p>Affordable housing is only 10% lower than the market? Affordable housing properties also need tree equity, but developers don't need to plant as many trees with these properties. Instead of addressing social justice/ tree inequity in Tacoma, HIT makes tree equity worse. The poor and low income will have fewer trees, less shade and more heat. View properties are also exempt from high density building like other areas. HIT increases social injustice. Climate Change is part of our future. Step Up</p>
26.	<p>HIT is perpetuating classism in Tacoma by reducing the number of trees that need to be planted if the property has low-income units. As former Tacoma mayor Baarsma said, "Tacoma just can't seem to get it right". Last I heard he's living in Gig Harbor which is a good 10 degrees cooler than Tacoma during the summer. We need to increase our tree canopy for all Tacoma residents, not just the white folk in the Historic districts. Tree justice for all.</p>

27.	Pierce County has the highest average property tax rate in Washington State. We pay higher taxes than more populous and affluent King County or any of the other 37 counties in the state. We're also the only city that doesn't charge builders impact fees for ensuring a robust infrastructure. Why isn't our city government taking care of the citizens instead of the builders? HIT is just another example of builders getting financial breaks that we'll end up covering in our property taxes.
28.	The draft Code provides protection for trees as part of HiT which is a positive development and helps to reach the goals of reaching a 30% canopy as well as providing more housing. The Code needs to strengthen or eliminate the ability to obtain a variance from the tree protection requirements and increase the in lieu of fees paid. Tree credit bonuses for more increased lot density must be eliminated as they provide too large a loophole to avoid the tree retention requirements. In all I support
29.	What a bait and switch. This plan doesn't provide for any of the things we were promised. Where are the design standards? Anything goes! A metal box without windows towering over the other houses at 35' practically on top of the sidewalk with setbacks so small that rooflines will overlap. It's time to go back to the drawing board and create a real plan.
30.	I just saw on tv last night that the Tacoma School District is down about 2,000 students. Not a surprise to anyone who has been following the decades-long trend of low natural birth rates (below replacement level). And now there is growing bipartisan support to limit immigration. Cities that have upzoned, like Portland and Minneapolis, are losing people because people who have the money expect a certain quality of life that the reimagined city can't provide.
31.	I say a giant NO to this plan. Actually, I'm being generous in calling it a plan. It's just a bunch of pie-in-the sky goals for ideologues.
32.	So let me get this straight. We want to kick out the homeowner working and retired families who pay all of their taxes and utility bills, year after year, and replace them with renters who do not need to be held accountable for paying their bills, thanks to so-called tenants' bills. And, while we're at it, let's tell developers that they don't need to pay property taxes for 8, 12, and even 24 years and they don't need to pay impact fees. Sounds like Tacoma is on its way to bankruptcy.
33.	No matter how much you build, nothing will be affordable unless people earn a living. The key to any successful city is a strong and resilient workforce. If the city leaders had cared more about education and jobs, we wouldn't be in this mess right now.
34.	Not sure why we would waste valuable space in front of homes and apartment buildings with bike racks and canopies. Why would anyone leave an expensive bike rack outside. You might as well add a sign that says "Steal me" or "Free bike" on the bike stand. Most/all people will carry their bike up the stairs into their apartments.
35.	I have seen very little said about the connection between new housing with more dense zoning and home ownership. Turning our single family neighborhoods into R2-4 without also providing incentives for owner occupancy will result in a major deterioration of community. Renters aren't usually as committed to neighborhoods as owners are - why should they be if they are going to move (most renters aren't long term). With the cost of buying a house today, the city should have a way to help.

36.	This proposal doesn't acknowledge all of the compromises that got us here. The planners have no answers to all of the challenges/obstacles ahead of us. Where are the design standards preventing eyesores from appearing in our beautiful neighborhoods? Where is space for the inevitable cars that are going to exist unless you outright ban them? (Let's not give our planners any ideas.) Where are the affordable units?
37.	As economists say, "there is no free lunch." This proposal offers no affordable units. Buildings will cost what they cost because construction costs are high (due to labor and materials). Incentivizing developers to build with our hard-earned dollars in the forms of exemptions and getting out of paying infrastructure costs is NOT a deal for the average homeowner.
38.	I say reject this plan because it does not meet the goals of the original resolution. The density levels have dramatically increased through UR-2 (which is really mid-density sold as low-density). Where are the promised design standards? Where are the promised setbacks?
39.	Time to go back to the drawing board. This plan is an overreaching proposal that doesn't consider the bundle of compromises that led to the passing of the original proposal. Promises for smart implementation have not been met, as the city has decided to disregard the original proposal's request for design standards, enabling any new construction to fit within the existing neighborhoods.
40.	Remember the metal box that someone put up in the North End off of Sixth Avenue with a roof that overlapped the neighboring houses. We were told that this monstrosity was a cherry-picked example and that Home in Tacoma would create standards (in terms of design and scale) that would prevent this from happening throughout our city. Surprise. There is nothing, absolutely nothing in this proposal that would prevent ugly buildings from appearing in any neighborhood. Reject this plan.
41.	We can do better than this plan. If I were a city planner, I'd be embarrassed to present this plan to the Planning Commissioner. Time for the Planning Commission to say "No Way." It's time for an adult to enter the room and say, "this plan is not good enough" and needs revision.
42.	Interesting how Tacoma leaders are so behind the times. The Tacoma School District has lost over 2,000 students (demonstrating the long demographic downward trend) and bipartisan support is growing to block the immigrant flow into the US, yet the city is going full steam ahead in planning for a future of huge numbers of people. Where are they coming from?
43.	The city planners are like the captain of The Titanic who, despite being warned of giant icebergs ahead, listened to the arrogant owner of the ship and picked up speed in the middle of the night. Just as hubris led to the sinking of The Titanic, hubris will lead to the destruction of a beautiful city if we ignore the obstacles and travel full steam ahead.
44.	Social engineering never works. Why do we think it's going to work here and now? Plan for the worst and expect the best. We are not planning for the worst. Let's do better than this.
45.	Why are we trying to be the densest of the dense cities in the US? Doesn't sound like a winning formula to me.
46.	The higher the density, the higher the crime. Who is going to pay for all of the extra policing that will be needed?

47.	Public health will be worsened in higher density areas, particularly vermin. Pandemics spread through cities faster than in rural areas. This is all makes it hard to understand why our city leaders are so hell-bent to densify, no matter the cost.
48.	Reject and return this draft proposal. It is extremist, overreaching, and polarizing.
49.	This proposal is deeply flawed and needs to consider the wants and needs of its citizens before it is sent off to the City Council. If the proposal were so great, then the city would be open to having a longer review proposal.
50.	As they say, the "devil is in the details." And where are the details? What safeguards are there preventing developers from taking advantage of us? Where are design standards? Why is it so easy to get out of the tree canopy requirements? How does giving handouts to developers for affordable housing make it affordable for present residents to live here? Where are the real-life pictures showing us what 12 units of "low-density" looks like in our neighborhoods?
51.	Where are the impact fees? Who is paying for all of this change?
52.	We waited two years for a set of generalizations! Remember how the city showed us pretty craftsman duplexes surrounded by single-family homes. Where are the pictures that will show us what our single-family will look like if/when 12 housing units of "low-density" will look like on each side, in front or, and behind our single-family houses?
53.	The populations of Portland and Minneapolis are dropping, yet our city is determined to lead us into this density full speed ahead, no matter the cost to our standard of living.
54.	Interesting way to bring about affordability. Make everything as small as possible and eliminate amenities. Push out the people who can afford to live here for greener pastures and then divide their former modest homes with even smaller housing units.
55.	Any advice on when to jump out of this sinking ship? Do we leave before or after the density comes?
56.	I give the plan a grade of D-. They need to go back and do their research on real cities before imposing this social experiment on us.
57.	Defund the social planners. This draft is a criminal assault on the residents.
58.	I say NO to this plan.
59.	I don't see anything positive in these changes. More crime, more noise, more congestion, more pollution. Just more and more of all the bad stuff and less and less of all the good stuff.
60.	Time to wake up and smell the coffee. The only ones who will benefit from all of this construction are the developers who you can bet will not live in Tacoma. Why would they when they have the money to live somewhere that will be nice?
61.	There should be a public vote on this. A council vote will be seen as tainted. The losing side will claim that the vote didn't represent their view.
62.	I'm unclear as to why this draft is being pushed through so closely. If you really believed in this draft, then it seems to me that you would be willing to have it scrutinized.

63.	I agree with the last speaker who questions why this thing is being rushed through so fast. Let's slow down the time schedule so that people really have time to sit down and reflect on it and do the research that the planners didn't do.
64.	Good day, I am a resident of Tacoma. I have the following statement, followed by questions. To wit: It appears your plan is to get buy-in to your predetermined agenda of social engineering. By squeezing more people into less space without adequate parking, it causes an artificial need for public transit and adds to the city tax base by building multi-units on formerly single lots. The goal of "affordable housing" is often quoted, never realized.
65.	Building these houses is certainly lucrative to the builders with waived development fees and reduced costs, but it doesn't transfer directly to the homeowner. Instead it is run through the city's "affordable housing industrial complex" with its layers of bureaucracy of career bureaucrats that only siphons money to them, not reduced housing costs.
66.	Questions: 1. Do the city leaders have a master plan which includes this simple question: What is the ideal number of residents Tacoma can accommodate, in regards to livability, adequate police, fire and city utility services? There has to be a finite number, given available resources. Just increasing housing by decreasing lot sizes and piling people on top of each other is NOT a solution.
67.	Affordable housing means affordable for all. If you begin putting 2-4+ houses where 1 once stood, what will the reduction in overall property taxes be? Certainly this needs to be discussed as the overlap in services will have the effect of cost-savings in regards to staffing and equipment and materials, i.e., existing roads and sewers.
68.	If this is such a great plan, put it to a vote of the people of Tacoma. Thank you.
69.	I read the whole plan. It appears that we sold our city to outside interests. It seems like we are allowing developers to build anywhere they want without any real accountability. We relax the rules for them at the expense of our own citizens, allowing them to evade impact fees, property taxes, and design rules. They take all that from our citizens without providing any guarantees of real affordability.
70.	Let's pass on this plan. It only sounds like a deal for developers who profit from us.
71.	A coup for builders and a raw deal for homeowners and tenants. I've looked at the buyers for some of our properties that are becoming multi-plexes and most don't even live in Tacoma. I've seen buyers come from as far away as Rhode Island. If they live nearby, they seem to go home to their homes with lots of acreage across the bridge.
72.	Not clear how this plan benefits me. I don't see any pluses beyond the tree canopy recommendations. I'm pretty sure that we could implement the tree canopy goals without Home in Tacoma.
73.	Wondering how many housing units we would have if every property were developed. It seems like overkill.
74.	hard-pressed to see how any of this will lead to affordability and an improved quality of life.

75.	The people of Tacoma need much more information. Then we must have a VOTE regarding changes of this magnitude. Otherwise, many people, especially tax payers, will leave for more better environments. Who will be left to pay the taxes?
76.	The Tacoma public schools have lost over 2,000 students in a year. Doesn't that tell us a lot about the future in terms of population growth? Just let around. You see more dogs being walked around than children. People aren't getting married and they're not having kids. So why exactly do our planners think that growth is going to happen here?
77.	I don't like the changes and I don't think that they will improve Tacoma. Because I am a taxpayer and voter, I really shouldn't have to explain to anyone why I don't want it. Just give me a ballot and I will show you that I don't want the plan by casting a no vote.
78.	The voters should be able to vote directly on something that impacts their life so dramatically. When it comes to our lives, we are the real experts and should be able to decide. I only know one person who supports Home in Tacoma (and he's too young and naive to know any better).
79.	Nearly 40% of the United States is public land, supported by taxpayers and managed by federal, state, or local governments. In Washington alone, the federal government owns 12.2 million acres and the state government represents roughly 6.5 million acres. In Pierce County, the number is even higher. Here 42.7% of the land is owned by the government. Even if the government released a fraction of this land, we would have space for all of the people who needed land for housing.
80.	Eye-opening to learn that the government in Pierce County owns more than 40% of the land. If we opened up even some of that land for housing, it would take the pressure off of Tacoma. Plus the land would be free.
81.	This is definitely NOT the plan that the City Council passed two years ago. This is the 60% mid-level, 40% low-level density plan! The UR2 is really mid-level density. This is wrong on so many levels. We need to let the officials know that we know.
82.	Wow! What can I say? This plan bears no resemblance to the original. We are back to mid-level density in most of the city, despite the fact that it was soundly defeated.
83.	The party that claims it saves democracy has just given us turned many, if not most, neighborhoods into mid-density (12 apartments on our lots). This is not okay with someone who still wants to believe that government should represent the majority. I want to VOTE.
84.	Who is John Galt?
85.	One the goals of this HiT is to "retain existing neighborhood character " which I support. I can even support some additional density. However the increased heights, reduced front, back, and side setbacks, no parking, under the Bonus structure would cause a dramatic change in our neighborhood character and the livability standards we currently enjoy. At minimum I see a fire safety hazard. No impact fees, tax credits, granting maximum density, such a gift for developers!
86.	Disappointing draft that doesn't seem worth the paper it's printed on. Throw it out and start again.
87.	If passed, the city will go on a downward trajectory. Reject so that we can get something that will work.

88.	An insult to the generations of people who worked hard to create a beautiful, thriving city.
89.	A socialist mess. Say no to this.
90.	This plan opens up the city to too much growth. Better to encourage growth in underinvested areas of the city than promote parts of the city that are already developed and work fine.
91.	The number of units proposed and the size of these multi-family entities are unrealistically high.
92.	The scale of the new buildings is too high to fit into any of our neighborhoods (except for downtown Tacoma).
93.	This plan only creates "affordable housing" through government subsidies. How can we afford to pay for our own expensive housing and provide expensive housing for anyone else?
94.	Wish we had stayed closer to the intent of the original resolution that the Council voted for. Remember that three Council people heard our voices and voted against this plan. This version is even more extreme than the original plan. What happened?
95.	I am a Washington resident who believes that legalizing more homes in more places creates affordability. I support passing Home in Tacoma unchanged, as the density increases would bring prices down for everyone, as was shown in countless US cities like Austin, as well as making Tacoma a more attractive place to live. Please don't water down this plan.
96.	This whole thing is overwhelming. Why does Tacoma have to bear the brunt of people who can't afford to live here, no matter how low we could make the rents go?
97.	Why is the United Nations telling an American city what to do? I'd like to see an American plan that rewards hard work with a nice place to live.
98.	Frankly, sprawl looks preferable to an overly crowded poor city.
99.	I don't see how it's possible for Tacoma to reach its goal of 30% tree canopy without cutting back on development. A good start would be to keep the present setbacks (front, back, and side) intact. This plan allows for too many buildings and too little green space.
100.	Maximum density standards are too high. Pull them back to the minimum required, which I believe is 4 in a residential zone.
101.	The high density standards/goals in this plan don't seem to reflect the shift towards remote work that has altered the demand for properties in urban areas.
102.	It is difficult to rewrite the rules so late in the game. If we knew what we know now about zoning, we might have purchased a different home in a different neighborhood. The homes on the biggest lots that once provided privacy and security could now be the most crowded lots. If large lots have the same setbacks as small lots, then developers will flock to our lots. Doesn't seem fair. Larger setbacks should still exist for larger lots.
103.	What's going to keep people here who can afford to live here?
104.	I don't genuflect at the woke altar.
105.	Thank you for making a plan that increases housing. Tacoma residents need housing options. We are in favor of creative housing that allows for density in repurposed buildings with historic significance in residential neighborhoods. Historic gathering places are often

	set up very well for group housing. We support creative, sustainable uses that don't demolish these buildings, but instead use their structures to increase housing options. Well done leading this change.
106.	This is wonderful progress and I fully support it! This will do wonders to improve livability and affordability in Tacoma. The only thing I would change is to go further! More UR-3 zones, loosen the "bonus" requirements, and lower (or eliminate!) the parking requirements. Let's make Tacoma a welcoming place for all!
107.	Back in the 60's we had these same wonderful ideas called "high density housing." Today, we call them "the projects." How did that work out for you? Think about that.
108.	A too aggressive plan that will hurt livability/quality of life of many of our residents. A city government is supposed to protect the standard of living for its citizens. This plan fails to do so.
109.	The plan has a high level of government control. More respect for private property rights in needed.
110.	What really bothers me about this whole plan are the mistruths about "affordability." You can't build your way to affordability. As the supply increases, profits will start dropping off and builders will just move to a "hotter" market.
111.	It is clear that we will get more housing from this plan, but most of us will see a declining standard of living. Will we able to say that we will be better off in the future than we are now in terms of our housing? I don't see improvement for my neighborhood.
112.	This plan is being rushed through without adequate study. The details for ensuring that new buildings will fit into our city is sorely lacking.
113.	Who is John Galt?
114.	It seems like the sole argument to support this plan is based on affordability. But if affordability didn't come, would you still support the plan? What if the only way affordability will come if the city isn't a desirable place to live anymore? Without evidence to prove that supply-side answers will work, I can't support this plan. The only certainty will be more crime and more noise and all of the other problems associated with big city life.
115.	It appears that this whole thing is a charade anyway since the building keeps happening through the use of variances. The city will do what they want, no matter what we say.
116.	The planners admit that a few years ago that the city acknowledged that there was plenty of land to meet housing demand for decades. That's a fact. This plan is unnecessary.
117.	The city's projections seem all wrong. Tacoma School District enrollment continues to decline year after to decline. (Even without the rise in private school enrollment and home schooling, there would be a drop in our public schools.) It's called demographics. The city was counting on more children. So right there the projections are wrong. Nevertheless, the city won't back down. Instead, it has raised the density designations since Phase 1 passed through a bundle of compromises.
118.	Who exactly are we trying to make Tacoma "affordable" for? We just seeming to be attracting people from the north who do find our prices affordable, while pushing our own residents further south towards Olympia?

119.	The city doesn't seem to have a workable plan. Point Ruston and Salishan were planned communities. You can't create that level of cohesion by adding a housing unit wherever a developer chooses to. Wouldn't it be better to focus on tracts of available land rather than trying to tear an entire city apart?
120.	Under the guise of housing "shortage" and climate change and equity, the city is trying to dictate to how we should live our lives. These terms have been misused in order to take our choices away from us. I hope that people figure this out before it is too late.
121.	I don't want to live in the kind of city that is being planned for us.
122.	This whole process seems rushed. We have only one month (and that's the shortest month) of all to review and comment on this document. Lots of people complained that Home In Tacoma was pushed through during COVID. Once again, the postcard sent was too rosy (it never said that single-family zoning was being eliminated) and the comment period is even shorter. Sounds like they are trying to push this thing through, no matter the consequences.
123.	This draft package bears no real resemblance to the original proposal passed. They are thinking/hoping that we won't remember what was passed on the first go-around.
124.	Disappointed. Angry. Frustrated. Feelin' unheard. Worried about the future of our city.
125.	The package is flawed. It deviates too far from the original proposal.
126.	Everything for a developer to "build, baby, drill. Nothing to protect the residents who want a nice home and a yard with some space between a neighbor.
127.	Insufficient protections. The state has created laws that will allow, at a minimum, duplexes everywhere and everywhere in the state. So why in the world are we pumping up the density level to unprecedented heights?
128.	You don't solve an economic problem (lack of affordable housing) with a slew of counterproductive political policies. I don't see how this plan will lead to affordability. Things will cost what they cost because building housing is expensive in Washington state and you just upped the price of the land by upzoning.
129.	This plan exceeds the original Council resolution.
130.	Why does a roomful of appointed, unpaid people have such say over our future?
131.	I spent countless hours researching and sending in comments to the Planning Commission and City Council in Phase 1. I can't find anywhere in the plan where those ideas were implemented.
132.	It is clear that our voices were not heard in the Phase 1 comments. Only the loudest minority voices were listened to.
133.	Thank you for taking up this important part of Tacoma's affairs. I hope you will allow much more housing than you anticipate will be necessary. It may be that Tacoma will grow faster than we think. If demand turns out to be much less than we anticipate, then sale and rental prices probably won't be high enough to motivate constructing as much as is allowed, anyway. I think it would be great to build many more homes near common destinations like grocers and schools.

134.	Where are the referees? The coaches? The parents? Where is the person in the room making sure that the growth doesn't get out of hand? This plan is too aggressive. Let's tone it down.
135.	Sounds like shrinkflation. Sure you might be able to pay less for housing, but it will just be smaller and smaller and the price won't go down.
136.	Still trying to figure out how this works. Tear down a house that you paid \$500,000 or more for. Now you have a very expensive vacant lot when you could have had a whole house.
137.	Just drove through downtown this weekend. Lots of apartments have been built since I was there. Many are being built as we speak. Plus, there are still lots of big vacant lots. The old K-Mart apartments aren't even open yet. South and East Tacoma seem to be on a big building binge as well. Will there be enough people to rent these apartments?
138.	It's a sad chapter in American history when the government decides to purposefully lower our standard of living. Socialism is here and the government is selling the noose to the highest bidder. Sad.
139.	I think HIT is horrible. HB110 is more than adequate and should be fine. We do not deserve Half way Frat houses mixed in with our beautiful homes like you have approved...like Amici House on Warner and N. 24th. No green spaces, Terrible parking. Even if you only approved it for 20 people it would still be terrible. You are making it to where I am going to move out of Tacoma. I am going to sell my rental houses as well!!!
140.	Keep urban housing zoning near shopping, not in the middle of residential areas (regardless of whether there is a bus line through the residential area)
141.	The state's new rules are more than sufficient to create growth. I reject this plan until the numbers are brought lower and requirements for style and proportion are imposed.
142.	It's clear that the city is overstepping once again. There is no need to cram units into a former single family lot in the middle of a neighborhood. The city seems to be ignoring the voices of many Tacomans who has issues with this plan. Why continue to raise property taxes on homeowners while giving new builders excessive tax breaks? A builder pays no taxes into the community for 12+ years, all while the building is full of residents using public infrastructure, safety, schools, etc.
143.	The maximum units needs to be lowered, setbacks increased, more parking required, just to name a few. Listen to the citizens of Tacoma. We definitely feel unheard and misrepresented.
144.	There has not been enough time to consider all the changes. I would like more interactive opportunities for questions. I think a year or so ago, there were opportunities where the public could talk to staff about different topics (there were easels with different topics/issues, and you could go from station to station asking questions). This would be more helpful than the most recent, very limited meetings (with a lot of questions that went unanswered). We really had less than a month.
145.	I like that the plan is aiming to increase the tree canopy. However, parts of the plan seem really inconsistent with that goal, especially where it adds more density right up against urban forests/nature areas. What is the thinking behind that?

<p>146.</p>	<p>Tacoma City Council.</p> <p>You are about to succumb to the siren song of the developer and real estate agent. Your proposal will bring unwelcome changes to successful thriving neighborhoods and leave those most in need of adequate housing with no improvements.</p> <p>The changes as written will only enrich developers and real estate agents. It is wrong to overlay very different neighborhoods with the same building codes.</p> <p>30 year resident of Tacoma Jim Bickford</p>
<p>147.</p>	<p>Every time our home goes up for sale in our nice neighborhood, we will all be on edge. Will it be sold to a nice family or will it be torn down and replaced with 8, 12, or even 16 units?</p>
<p>148.</p>	<p>This whole plan is based on a wrong assumption--that there is one small pie and that we all need to get a smaller and smaller slice of pie. Just make a bigger pie by opening up more land for sale. Hell, just give some of the excess land away.</p>
<p>149.</p>	<p>I think this is enough we look like a city of trash, and apartments, now were looseing buisness and we have crappy roads .Time to sit back and listen to the tax payers of Tacoma.I would not elect one of you again.Lets put a duplex next to your house or maybe the mayor now. Enough get to cleaning this dump of a city back to where it use to and listen to the voters for once.This should of been a voted measure not your small group agenda. Thanks Tax payers of Tacoma...</p>
<p>150.</p>	<p>Many of us have gotten used to a suburban lifestyle (albeit with small lots and neighbors nearby). When we leave to go to a real suburb, the residents there will be upset that we are turning their suburban lives into cities. When the suburbanites move to the country, the rural residents will claim that the suburbs are coming to them. Just create a new place on the edges.</p>
<p>151.</p>	<p>It would be so much easier to create a planned community SOMEWHERE ELSE where you can build whatever you want. For all I care, you can create millions of small units and ban all cars THERE. This plan is asking (actually demanding) that we live in a city we did not choose. We lived here for a reason and now you are trying to take away every positive reason for living here.</p>
<p>152.</p>	<p>Questionable rationales. Reject.</p>
<p>153.</p>	<p>Neighborhood-specific standards are needed so that we just don't become a homogeneous mess.</p>
<p>154.</p>	<p>The problem is the prevalence of "group think" in planning. Everyone has received the same education and no one ever questions what they learn. Dissenting voices keep getting silenced. Remember how three original members on the Planning Commission told us that affordability wouldn't come with this plan. They got silenced and pushed aside.</p>
<p>155.</p>	<p>The left sure knows how to kill the American dream. Will our children be able to find a place to live that is similar to the way they grew up. Very sad future for everyone.</p>
<p>156.</p>	<p>There is absolutely no evidence that middle housing will enhance the quality, character, and function of residential neighborhoods. Implementing middle housing will reduce current housing values, reduce tree canopy and landscaping, result in parking congestion,</p>

	and irreparably alter the historic character of Tacoma neighborhoods. There is plenty of undeveloped and underutilized property in the downtown corridor for increased density.
157.	Put it to a public common vote!
158.	One of Tacoma's greatest assets are its neighborhoods. The density being proposed in HIT2 has the potential to destroy that asset. These changes go well beyond what is required to meet State Law HB 1110. That law should have been used as a ceiling (not a floor) for the city's zoning changes. I am aware that the majority of comments from the public oppose the level of density you have proposed. HIT 2 must be revised to bring the density levels back to those set out in HB1110.
159.	Be as flexible as possible with Missing Middle development options to permit robust infill development in the city. Don't lose sight of the objective: build as many housing units as possible to shelter all Tacomans and to arrest the rise of housing prices.
160.	Design standards need to be imposed to ensure that our city stays attractive. Almost all New England towns have strict rules for homes on their main street. That's why homes are usually white with black shutters. The beauty lies in the cohesive, complementary look of a city. What happened to the promised standards?
161.	The objective is to build more housing within the context of existing neighborhoods. Don't throw the baby out with the water.
162.	This plan reminds me of the frog who was put in water. The temperature level rose so slowly that the frog died. Our concerns are put off with the answer that change won't happen suddenly. That's not the point. The point is that, whether incremental or sudden, we see what is coming.
163.	We chose to live in Tacoma due to the character of the neighborhood we bought in. It is easy to get around and the city has most of what's needed close at hand. Please don't turn Tacoma into another Seattle, where we have a 15 minute commute to go to the closest grocery store. People need affordable homes, not to enrich developers while building in one of the hottest markets in the US. More reasonably sized homes in the same space and affordable. No monster LEGO blocks!
164.	I purchased a home approximately 18 months ago. It came with a nice, large, concrete patio in the back. We would like to cover it, but the rear setback is 25 feet, which honestly, is within 10 feet of the house. I saw a draft that changed it to 15 feet, but I did not see that in the summaries, only "Front setbacks reduced from 20 feet to 15 feet in UR-1 & 2". Please consider including the change to the rear setback as part of this plan. Oh, to make it more weird, I could build a deck.
165.	I want fairness in home in Tacoma. If reduced housing is good for one area, it's good for all. There should not be higher, so the economic districts that have less of an impact of home and Tacoma. I find there's great inequity in Tacoma for the lower, so economic and middle class areas all across the city. The City Council dumps on the residential areas that don't speak up. I'm tired of how politics are played out in Tacoma.

166.	The City Council is beholden to developers...just look at their tops donors at pdc.wa.gov. It's no wonder we're getting force fed this "HIT" disaster.
167.	The plan is written by "supply side progressives" who've been unwittingly co-opted by anti-regulation free-market libertarian think tanks like the American Enterprise Institute. Tacoma will become the worse for it.
168.	Build build build! Relax any restriction that makes new construction more expensive. Parking requirements, historic districts, any and all community veto points that make new construction slower and more expensive all have to go. Please don't listen to the NIMBY busybody public meeting attendees who want to freeze Tacoma in the 1940s. If we want to unlock the city's potential, we need to make it affordable to live here, and that means BUILDING.
169.	Make Tacoma a great city that anyone can afford to live in. I fully support this plan and the city planning departments intentions. Encourage growth wherever possible all across the city. That is the only way this city can become affordable especially given Seattle's lack of commitment to building more housing. Tacoma may have to pick up some of the slack for so we make sure we are zoned for much more than we expect.
170.	I would like the Planning Commission and the City Council to do the following: (1). Please do not expand the Home in Tacoma housing plan beyond what the State of Wash. has required in HB 1110. (2). Eliminate U-R 3 (3.) develop HiT slowly by creating pilot developments. Then monitor them to see what is working and what is not. (4). Implement strict design standards so that new multi-family housing is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. (5) Protect all mature trees on building sites.
171.	It's Groundhog Day. Every morning, I wake up thinking today will be better. Then I realize I'm still zoned to live next door to an apartment building (which you are trying to tell me is low density).
172.	Our "experts" are looking at the whole forest of residents from the very distant view of a plane from above. They forget that each individual tree needs nourishing soil, space to send out roots, water, and sunlight. Plant the trees too closely and we won't thrive, particularly the smaller trees who will find water and sun blocked off. Being too close together makes us more vulnerable to the spread of diseases and fire and other hazards. Please allow us to thrive!
173.	It didn't seem that anyone on the Planning Commission cared about we had to say. The only show of emotion was from the chair who nodded his head when the employees of special interest groups indicated support for this plan. I didn't hear any applause from the audience when they spoke.
174.	I do not support the proposal based on (1) its nonobservance of the HB 1110 housing density regulation baselines, as well (2) the 4-5 story height bonus to support of further apartment unit development in UR3 zones. I believe the state is wisely taking intentional steps to support and regulate housing growth, to which we should respect and trust. Apartments are not the only way to increase housing, or gain community support for HIT while maintaining the City's overall sustainable growth.

175.	Stick to the absolute minimum requirements needed to comply with the law. Use their zoning density numbers (that's bad enough), keep setbacks, and get your environmental impact plan together.
176.	I recall the original debate when the city tried to push the 60% mid-level density on us. It got voted down. The city just sat on it for a couple years. Now they are back to creating at least 60% mid-level density. UR-2 is mid-level density! You know it and I know it. The city is trying to claim that most residential neighborhoods are zoned for UR-1. UR-2 is way more prominent in my part of the city. This is just plain wrong. Honor your promises to keep the level of density down.
177.	For thousands of years, we've learned what beauty looks like in terms of scale, proportion, color, empty space, and coherence. Now we just want to pretend that we have no idea what makes a neighborhood beautiful. Anything and everything goes! Beauty be damned.
178.	Even before the demographic cliff hits colleges next year, the number of college-age students has been declining for years. Even international students cannot fill all of the empty spaces. If you followed the city's logic, then the price of college should be plummeting because of all of this extra supply. Yet colleges keep closing and merging. Many colleges are underenrolled (including UW Tacoma, Evergreen, UPS, TCC). The colleges keep charging more and more. Apply this to housing.
179.	"Government has nothing to give anyone that wasn't first taken from someone else."
180.	Beware of the gift of a hollow wooden horse like the one that led to the toppling of Troy. I hope that our leaders take this lesson to heart.
181.	Please don't approve a rezone west of Jackson. The homeowners west of Jackson do not want it. It fails to take into consideration the topography west of Jackson. A private covenant already restricts the area west of Jackson to one single family home per lot so a rezone will create conflict between owners. There are no sidewalks west of Jackson so the new people would have no safe way to access transit.
182.	It's of utmost importance for there to be a Tacoma Urban Forestry Commission as called for in the 2019 Urban Forest Management Plan for the City of Tacoma. This commission is essential because it will provide the necessary oversight and accountability mechanisms to monitor compliance with the Landscaping Code. Also, this group will help to ensure that the L. Code process will have the necessary transparency.
183.	This plan is too extreme and will create a mess that cannot be undone. Stick to the state law, see if the city can handle that additional housing first. Years of work has been put into Home in Tacoma and Seattle's mayor came up with a better plan that is more thought out. See if it will work in targeted areas first, then expand if successful. I say this all and I am a RE investor in Tacoma. I like the potential to add to my portfolio, but more importantly, I love this city the way it is.
184.	Please take the time to listen to the people affected as it seems this plan has been made without any consideration for the impacts on residents. This plan will ruin the charm and character that drew many to make Tacoma their home and have a negative impact on residents and the quality of life. Stop approving huge structures that stress infrastructure, sit with empty units and ruin the aesthetic of its surroundings. Is the city going to compensate the loss in value and loss of quality of life

185. This whole process has been too much too soon!! Slow it down and make good, solid decisions that involve the people who live here. Our voices should be heard ABOVE the developers who are creating a sense of panic about a housing shortage. Follow the HB1110 guidelines- do not go beyond those requirements. Listen to what we citizens have to say.

Zoning Comments (203)

1.	It seems to me that the city needs to determine what is affordable housing. I know In minimum wage finding a place is next to impossible. I believe that the city wants all the density in order to increase property tax revenue to benefit the city and not the residents.
2.	The needs to be more requirements that new construction fit in with the neighborhood characteristics. It should not be radically architecturally different from the surrounding properties.
3.	Stop pretending that UR-2 is the same as "Low-Scale." That's not true and you know it. Your own documents from just a few months ago show that what you defined as Mid-Scale is now what you call UR-2.
4.	Don't bother with additional restrictions requiring that new construction "fit in" with the neighborhood. Property owners are currently able to build huge, unsightly boxes as single family homes without any sort of aesthetic restriction, so there's no need to change that just because the boxes house more than one family.
5.	Tacoma does not need additional cheap housing. According to Apartments.com, there are more than 3000 rental units available in the city right now. Once these "multiplexes" are thrown up, and the owner realizes there's no demand, the rents will plummet and the neighborhood will become depressed. The city should look at Federal Way in the 1990s for proof....
6.	There is plenty of "affordable" housing in Tacoma...but you need to have a job and be willing to live outside of Proctor. This whole upzone is a giveaway to developers, ironically promoted by socialists.
7.	No 35ft (or 45ft!!!) apartments in our neighborhoods. That this is even being considered is scandalous.
8.	why doesn't the map show View Sensitive areas?
9.	IT IS THE BEST ZONING MAP I HAVE EVER SEEN IN MY LIFE. KUDOS TO THE CARTOGRAPHER.
10.	I would really like to see any development of a lot (i.e. the construction of additional units) to require completion of the sidewalk (if there is not one) and/or a fee to pay for sidewalks (with the City's discretion of where best to fill-in missing sidewalks). So much of Tacoma has missing sidewalks and adding density and decreasing parking requirements will only encourage more people to walk (which is great!), but we need the infrastructure for people to walk safely.
11.	I would love that developers would need to put some extra effort into design and aesthetics rather than the big box buildings. Maybe look into Tax Incremented Financing for mixed use areas to fund that?
12.	It has been way to long that American zoning practices have made our neighborhoods unwalkable and unaffordable. Bringing back denser housing and more mixed use zoning (hopefully even more than is currently proposed) would make tacoma a much more friendly place to live.
13.	Multi-use areas shouldn't be limited to blocked areas, expand them along corridors of commerce/transit, such as 6th ave, 12th ave, etc

14.	We want more mixed-use zoning!
15.	Please produce a legible map and resubmit.
16.	There is plenty of affordable housing in Tacoma, just not in Proctor. This whole effort to destroy our neighborhoods in the name of "equity" is ridiculous. Does the city plan to reimburse current homeowner's for the dimunition in value to their properties? When did it become every person's god given right to live in the nicest neighborhood in every city? What ever happened to aspirational?
17.	If this proposal becomes law there should be an initiative on the ballot to overturn it before our neighborhoods are destroyed.
18.	Adding middle size housing to the north end of Tacoma will destroy these amazing neighborhoods. These are historic areas whose homes should be revered and respected, not perverted in the name of 'equity' and development. Adding condos, townhouses, and apartments will do nothing to improve these areas. People desire these communities because of the beautiful homes, family-friendly neighborhoods, and quiet, safe streets. We do not want our beautiful community destroyed!
19.	Question: In a UR2 zone is a Pierce County bus stop considered within the "major transit" category? Or are you referring to a Transit Center?
20.	I'm excited about the changes of this will bring to Tacoma. I live in old town Tacoma, partially because of the amazing mix of apartments and houses that were built prior to our current zoning regime. I would love to see even more opportunities to add units to strengthen our urban neighborhoods.
21.	I really like the concept being proposed for light commercial in residential areas. It'll do a lot for walkability when people can go down the street to get a small bag of groceries or a cup of coffee without getting in their car. Please do not require off-street parking for this small scale sidewalk-style retail. More surface parking lots will destroy the green character of our neighborhoods.
22.	Love the focus on denser housing; just make sure it's balanced with trees and equitably spread out around the city.
23.	<p>As a home owner in a residential neighborhood, I very much oppose this plan for many reasons: Larger buildings will shade out yards and homes and eliminate privacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhoods will become noisier and more congested. • Apartment buildings will gradually replace the existing homes. • Existing residents could be displaced. • Well-built, older homes could be demolished - some Neighborhoods could change rapidly if they're opened up to profitable new development opportunities.
24.	I am concerned about proposed URS at bowns pt blvd and norpoint area. As a resident of this area with nondriving residents in the home I can attest that there is no public transportation here at all so I dont see how increasing density for a multistory residence would not make sense in this location. it is already townhouses here in this spot.

25.	50 years to get any housing bonuses are so long that few can comprehend the impact and few will apply for them. As a result, only the baseline will primarily be built. Consider changing this to something more reasonable like 12 years that the MFTE is.
26.	Once the density is increased to more than 4 units per parcel, per FEDERAL RULES/LAWS, the parcel is no longer eligible for financing use VA, FHA, USDA and Conventional funding. Are you going set up bank to replace the federal fund tools that are currently available?
27.	\$1,291,198,804 was the total worth of the 2,404 homes (i.e. 1-4 units) that sold in 2023 within the City Limits of Tacoma. These sales brought an estimated \$91 million to support the local economy thru salaries to those individuals and business involved in the selling and buying of homes. Once these new densities are placed in TMC, the lending tools available to help the typical buyer is going away - it already happen in Spokane.
28.	No Lender will fund a home with 2 ADUs - per Federal Rules
29.	Just wait until the military members are not able to access their VA benefit to purchase a home - they will go shopping someplace else.
30.	Increased housing creates a known effect of a heat bubble. This creates temperature inversions and the airflow goes over the city instead of through. Net result is increased global warming. How do you plan to mitigate this?
31.	Yes for density! Particularly along major transportation corridors like Pac Ave, higher density will encourage trasnit use, community based businesses, walkability that is currently hard to come by, and provide affordable housing options.
32.	The city has pulled a fast one on us. The original plan had one level of low-density at four units per lot. Now the new and even worse plan has a second level of "low-density" that allows 6-12 units on a lot. That amount is what was considered mid-level density in the original plan. If you recall, thousands of people spoke against have mid-level density in their neighborhood in the first round, leading to many compromises. Unacceptable that zoning went from 4 to 12 on my lot.
33.	Bait and switch for low-density standards. Twelve housing units on a city lot is not low-density by anyone's standards. City planners have purposefully disregarded the will of the people.
34.	We are not stupid. Twelve units per lot with 5' front and back setbacks and 2.5 side setbacks is not low-density. Reject this and come up with a real plan.
35.	Eliminate the 2 level. There is nothing low-density about 6-12 units on a city lot. This category is a wolf in sheep's clothing since nothing about the 2 level is low-density. Stop punishing people just because they happen to live too close to a park or school or a shop that they may or may not access.
36.	Where did the UR-2 category of "low-density" (NOT low-density) come from? The will of the people was pretty clear in phase 1. Virtually no one in a residential neighborhood wanted to live near a mid-level density apartment building. Instead of listening to the residents, you tried to sneak in mid-level apartment buildings by calling them low-density. How stupid do you think we are?

37.	Do not go beyond the state-mandated minimum of 4 units in a low-density zone. Eliminate this second category of low-density that is actually the mid-level density that our city residents soundly rejected via petition, letters, and comments.
38.	Stop acting as if UR-2 is low-scale when it doesn't take a genius to figure out that the old mid-scale is now UR-2. I think the city planners and Planning Commission are trying to rush this proposal through before the residents of lovely neighborhoods figure out that they have been duped. This change in designation should not be allowed to happen because it deviates so far from the original proposal and far exceeds the state mandates. Fight this!!
39.	This proposal is going to fail with the citizens of Tacoma impacted by a lack of knowledgeable planners and politicians. This has already been tested and failed in Minneapolis, Minnesota. What was the brick wall that caused the failure? It's the same one the city of Tacoma is going to hit. Federally Regulated Lending Rules. They are completely based on Single Family Residential Homes with 1-4 units (SFR, 1-4). Once the City of Tacoma implements the proposed new zoning, many properties will be
40.	Once the City of Tacoma implements the proposed new zoning, many properties will be excluded from accessing Federally regulated funding (i.e. Conventional, FHA, USDA and VA). The impact will be immediate. To access the Federally Regulated funding for the typical buyer, a Lender engages the services of an Appraiser. Per Federal and State Laws, the 3 categories of Appraisers are Licensed, Certified Residential and General Certified Appraiser (GCA).
41.	Both the Licensed and Certified Residential Appraiser have legislative regulated restrictions, mainly focused on the Single Family Residential, 1-4 unit market. Where the GCA is allowed to appraise any property that they determine is within their Competency level. Most GCA are focused on large Multifamily and Commercial properties. With most GCAs working for large firms and not typically found doing SFR, 1-4 as the money they make completing appraisals for shopping centers, land acquisition
42.	land acquisition for Sound Transit projects, large apartment complexes, etc. pay more. Typically, a GCA might spend a full month or more completing just one report. Why does this matter? The appraisal process is completely built on what is referred to as the "Highest and Best Use" (HBU) analysis which is required in ALL APPRAISALS. It is a simple question with a required Yes or No answer. "Is the subject property at its Highest and Best Use".
43.	"Highest and Best Use" analysis includes consideration of both the land as though vacant and the property as improved. The conclusion is specific in terms of use, timing, and market participants. The testing criteria for Highest and Best Use includes: Physically possible, Legally permissible, Financially feasible and Maximally productive.
44.	In the case of the proposed UR-1 density allows (utilizing all potential bonus increases) would allow up to 8 units per parcel, with UR-2 allowing up to 12 units per parcel and UR-3 allowing up to 16 units per parcel. First, the fact that more than 4 units can be built on a parcel, nearly excludes the Licensed and Certified Residential Appraiser from completing the report. Which means, the lender must find a General Certified Appraiser (GCA) to complete the assignment.

45.	Even if a GCA is hired to complete the report, the potential of construction of 8, 12 or 16 units on the parcel far exceeds the one SFR that currently exists on the lot for “Maximally productive”. The answer to the HBU is NO, which means no lending. This means for a seller, it’s a cash only transaction or what is referred to as a “hard money” lender. No more 30 year fixed mortgages, no more refi’s or HELCOs in Tacoma.
46.	The approval of this proposal will nearly destroy the \$1.3 Trillion dollar per year real estate market in Tacoma. You will be forced to fix it. You just need to understand, you fix it now before you harm the citizens of the city or after the harm has begun, the phones and emails start coming in to the Mayor's office or the planning dept.
47.	More UR-2 along the waterfront/Riston Way, this is a great green space and potential transportation corrdior with few existing housing opportunities.
48.	It's immoral and illegal to try to sell mid-density UR-2 as low-density. Keep one low-density category with the limitations of UR-1. I believe that what you are calling UR-2 was soundly rejected.
49.	Wow! UR-2 zoning in our simple neighborhoods would be a disaster. Drop all UR-2 zoning down to one simple category of UR-1, with four housing units.
50.	It seems like the planners are counting on residents to think that their neighborhoods will be restricted to four units of housing, as the original proposal said. Many of us are now finding that those four units have tripled to 12. People, don't get complacent. The old map has been replaced with much higher density levels than the original map held.
51.	Because of state law's requirement for assessing properties at "highest and best use," many homeowners living in single-family houses could find their taxes assessed as if they were apartments. I hope that everyone understands the tax implications of this if these high levels of density are allowed to stand.
52.	Now that the state legislature has upzoned the entire state, the pressure should be off the city to increase density to the greatest height possible. Stick to the state-mandate of 4 units per lot in our single-family neighborhoods.
53.	Upzoning so high is unfair to the residents who invested in homes in beautiful neighborhoods. We didn't just buy a dwelling. We also bought the land that came with the house and that includes the setbacks and yard.
54.	It is not fair that residents who purchased large lots (and, yes, they paid more for that space) could now find themselves the target of future development because of the potential of that space to developers.
55.	Don't reduce the setbacks. Anything new built with these new setbacks will stick out like a sore thumb.
56.	There were safety concerns for the setbacks, particularly fire concerns. When you put people that close together, fire is more apt to happen. These reduced setbacks will make it harder for firefighters to do their job. The most dangerous fires happen in city, precisely because of density.
57.	Creating small homes with lowered standards is just looking for danger. We are in an earthquake zone, and with high density something falling will hit another.
58.	These designations are a blueprint for how to destroy a neighborhood. Stay with the minimum levels allowable for established neighborhoods. There should be no more than 4 units allowed in our developed neighborhoods under low density.

59.	This is density on steroids. So unnecessary.
60.	This is why socialism never works.
61.	This is density on steroids.
62.	If it's cold outside and you give your hat to one person, your shirt to another person, and your shoes to another person, everybody freezes. So why do we think dividing up our three bedroom homes into three teeny, tiny homes benefits anyone?
63.	I vote to go with the absolute minimum of density that the state makes us provide. Why should our city have to bear the brunt of degradation?
64.	Last year, when I asked at an informational meeting what the setbacks would be, I was told that they would be the same. But they are not the same. And somehow the setbacks are the same for any size lot. Suddenly our asset (space) has turned into a liability, making us targets for developers. Why was no one watching out for us?
65.	We were given guarantees that reasonable setbacks would be provided in this plan. Now all of the setbacks have been reduced to practically nothing. No matter the lot size you started with, you now must have the same undersized setbacks as the smallest lots. I protest this.
66.	The original map approved by the city has now been reworked, causing many (even most) people to have increased density imposed on them. This doesn't seem legal to me. It's certainly not moral. Time to start from scratch.
67.	Crazy high numbers for density. If all we need to allow is four housing units on anyone's low-density lot, why the heck are we jacking up these numbers?
68.	If you want to live in a high-density area like Ballard, please move there and let us keep our lovely homes intact. Why don't we learn anything from our neighbor to the north?
69.	The high levels of density are not enticing. I would prefer urban sprawl to this plan.
70.	I'm befuddled how cities have suddenly become models to stop climate change. They trap heat.
71.	The extremely low setbacks being proposed will not allow for the inclusion of heat pumps, which the city keeps pushing. This high level of density is incompatible with heat pumps.
72.	If the City is serious about increasing its tree canopy levels, then it needs to decrease the density levels to no more than four units per lot. We need to provide ample space for trees on lots, and that means limiting the density on each lot.
73.	shocked to see the plan for density. too aggressive targets. please make density numbers lower.
74.	When you convert a home into multi units, you are not just bringing in more people, you are also bringing in more animals and guests. More tvs blasting, more phones ringing, more babies crying, more doors slamming, more people screaming. Are we really supposed to tell you that we want more of this?
75.	The Growth Management Act requires periodic examination. The crazy high levels of density in this draft tell me that the GMA needs to be reexamined so that the city of Tacoma does not take on the burden of growth for the entire county. I don't understand why our city

	officials are punishing their own residents. The burden needs to be spread out to other parts of the county.
76.	How and why did the density map change so much from two years ago? The original numbers for housing units were high and now they have doubled and, in some cases, have tripled. Please return to lower numbers. No one wants such high density in our quiet neighborhoods.
77.	Thanks to all of the people who have been sounding the alarm bells about the high numbers. I've been telling my neighbors about the new map and they didn't even know that single-family zoning has ended and their lot could now be zoned for 12 mini-units. It makes me wonder how many people just don't know. I guess they'll figure it out when a developer tears down the house beside them and builds a 12-unit apartment building. Who will be fielding all of these emails and calls?
78.	In the West End you have placed my very strong middle class neighborhood in the R2 Zone. As I look at the map, I see many upper economic neighborhoods, like the entire West Slope neighborhoods in R1 Zone. This is BLANTANT discrimination against the middle class homeowners. Why are you discriminating against the middle class homeowners and bending over to please the West Slope homes? Tacoma government practices discrimination against the middle class. You cater to the upper and lower classes.
79.	I realize this is going on in many places in the country, and it is wrong everywhere it's being tried. It's indecent to foist this on people. No single-family zoning? This will destroy neighborhoods and the character of our city. Is it worth the money, political agenda, or whatever is driving this, to ruin Tacoma?
80.	The maps have changed. Suddenly, the density being considered has shot up. I don't like being manipulated like this. Bring back the first set of maps that had one category of low density. Those first set of maps weren't good for us, but these are even worse.
81.	Our planners seem to be trying to make Tacoma into New York City. If I wanted to live in a big city, I would just move north to Seattle.
82.	If implemented, Tacoma would start looking an awful lot like Ballard. Big apartment buildings there have increased crime and broken down community bonds. I say no thank you to such high density.
83.	Sad to see that our children will never be able to raise their children in the nice, quiet neighborhoods they grew up in. It breaks my heart that with so much available vacant land throughout the city that we are resorting to high density zoning on the smallest of single-family lots.
84.	All three suggested zones are too high in terms of density. Come on man. Give us something reasonable.
85.	An attack on the middle class. Twelve apartments on .2 acres. You got to be kidding me. How is that even possible?
86.	I think that the entire planning department and planning commission need to come our neighborhoods and show us what 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and even 12 apartments would look like on our small lots. I don't even know if it's possible.

87.	To piggyback on the prior comment, the writers of the so-called draft and the decision-makers need to drive around the city and actually see for themselves what these lots would look like if filled to capacity. None of this makes any sense.
88.	It's fine to add an ADU or to build a duplex or even a four-plex, but anything beyond that is too much when there are other options available throughout the city.
89.	It's easy to draw colors on a map for density. Our leaders need to come to our streets block by block and show us what these numbers could mean for us.
90.	It is unconscionable to rezone a single family dwelling, Old Tacoma street into one where 35-45 foot high units can be built, essentially destroying property values for current residents who have worked hard and taken pride in the neighborhood. As it is there is not enough parking and U3 zoning would make parking even worse. This poorly conceived idea would benefit only the developers. Terrible idea unless you want Tacoma to become Ballard 2. I strongly oppose this plan.
91.	The alleged UR2 is really mid-level density. 12 apartments is not low-density by anyone's measurements. The city has gone back to the 60% mid-density, 40% low-density that it wanted all along. I guess our voices don't really matter, after all.
92.	Deja vu! The city planners' original plan for 60% mid density is back. I guess they thought that we'd forget what we wanted. No wonder the city is trying to rush this plan through, hell or high water. They're afraid that if we actually read it we'll see that the whole debate was one big lie and that we will give us the HIGH density they wanted, instead of the lower density we insisted on.
93.	This map has changed dramatically, rising to higher and higher levels. This is not acceptable. The city has tried to pull a fast one on us.
94.	Who is John Galt?
95.	I am concerned that the building footprint won't leave enough space for newly planted trees to grow to maturity.
96.	Too crowded. A planner told me that the setbacks would stay the same. That is a lie. These setbacks are so small that you could walk down the street and someone could sit at the window and pull you into their house. Some people might have to walk sideways to get through the side setbacks.
97.	Twelve apartment units masquerading as low-density in single-family neighborhoods. Not for me or my neighbors.
98.	With all of the available space in the city, it makes no sense that they are trying to cram as many people into as small a space as possible.
99.	Why does everybody have to have such high density? It would be better to retain some single-family neighborhoods so that we can work hard for aspirational housing.
100.	Socialist philosophy will lead to Soviet-style housing that is crammed and ugly and shoddily built. Can't say that nobody warned you about what will happen if you accept this plan.
101.	We should keep the high urban density for the downtown core and around the Tacoma Mall commercial zones only. Keep low density (nothing higher than UR1) for our neighborhoods.

	The people who want the big urban experience can have what they want, while the rest of us can have the quieter more residential experience we want. Repeal the UR2 and move back it to UR1. More people will get what they want. Problem solved.
102.	Why are we trying to make the density so high from the get-go, given the demographic shifts of the old dying with reduced life expectancies and few children being born? Why don't we start with low densities? In a couple of decades if your numbers hold true (I think you're planning for too many people), you can always upzone more. Start low!
103.	My research shows that 425 housing units per square mile is considered urban. If you take the automatically allowed density of 4 units for UR1 on a large lot city of .2 acres, that could lead to a density of 12,800 units per square mile. Bonuses could raise that number to 25,600. Smaller lots would boost this number. This is only for UR1. More of the city will be zoned for even higher levels if we allow this plan to pass.
104.	Density levels need to be reconsidered. The state has spoken and we should stick with those density numbers. They provide for ample growth.
105.	In Minneapolis, only triplexes are allowed. The caveat is that the interior square footage of a building can be up to half the square footage of its lot. That's a number I could live with it. I can't live with the numbers in this draft that use virtually all of the space of a lot, bar a tree or two.
106.	In Portland, duplexes can be up to 3/5 the square footage of their lot, and triplexes and fourplexes up to 7/10 of the square footage of their lot. I could live with those numbers. In comparison, our numbers are too high.
107.	In comparison to us, Portland and Minneapolis rezoning allows for only modest increases in building size. Their changes enable new construction to actually fit into the neighborhood feel. I think we should look more closely at what we do so that growth happens more naturally.
108.	Use Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to look at the relationship between buildings when multiple housing units exist on the same site. Right now the building's total floor space is too high against the size of the land it occupies. You must increase the setbacks to their original size to get back a balance.
109.	Scale back density so that we should follow the state law. That's 4 regular and 2 extra.
110.	Prioritize space and comfort. These seem sadly missing in this packet.
111.	Why are you forcing high-density into areas that are not designed or capable for handling the influx. The proposal is short-sided to change beautiful neighborhoods into high-density centers. There are multiple areas of Tacoma that are more suitable for higher density. Cities should allow their residents to have a choice for housing and celebrate the downtown, urban centers but also green neighborhoods. Poor city planning with downtown, 6th ave, Tacoma Mall, rail line, etc. Another example here.
112.	I don't genuflect at the woke altar.
113.	I disagree with the proposed zoning change to UR1 in my neighborhood. My home is in the Narrowmoor Third Addition. My statutory warranty deed states the property is subject to CC&R's recording no. 1450063 dated May 1947 and modified by recording 1725015. These CC&R's are in direct conflict with the the UR1 zoning of housing types, dwelling

	units per sq. ft, and height limits, etc. Request that Narrowmoor additions are NOT zoned UR-1 and that the zoning map instead reflect the in place CC&R's
114.	Consider pocket neighborhoods for areas of ultra high density and allow 10+ story apartment buildings. These types of neighborhoods shouldn't have through traffic, minimizing overall added congestion. At the same time, the added MDH in the current version of the plan is not enough to meet future housing needs. Thus, we need areas of ultra high density alongside MDH to allow for multiple options for current and future residents.
115.	Will the historic designation of the North Slope neighborhood be deleted?
116.	I fundamentally disagree that Tacoma zoning needs to be more lenient than the state requires. I think we should leave all current single-family zoning as you are one and eliminate you are two and you are three. Identify specific areas to be zoned more densely, but move away from this blanket approach to the entire city.
117.	Thank you for making a plan that increases housing. Tacoma residents need housing options. We are in favor of creative housing that allows for density in repurposed buildings with historic significance in residential neighborhoods. Historic gathering places are often set up very well for group housing. We support creative, sustainable uses that don't demolish these buildings, but instead use their structures to increase housing options. Well done leading this change.
118.	Expanding multifamily housing is the best way to give many people and families access to accessible housing. Single family residential requirements is so obsolete. Having these housing laws overturned will allow more people to call Tacoma home.
119.	Having more walkable and urban communities will connect many people to each other as they see their neighbors walking rather than in cars behind tinted glass.
120.	Many lots in the UR3 zone share sewer pipes with their neighbors. This means that neither property can realistically become a high-density/high-use building without either incorporating the neighboring property and/or completely demolishing/revamping the sewer system for the property at hand. Will there be incentives for folks to address this before it becomes an emergency?
121.	I think UR3 could be upzoned even more (higher units, or expanding out one full block from the main corridor), perhaps at the expense of downscaling UR1 to the minimum required by the state. I don't honestly expect there to be a marked change in housing affordability with this plan over the long term, especially with the light rail coming. Single family homes will remain in demand and those values will keep rising, and the new buildings will all be called "luxury". We need the space nevertheless
122.	Who is John Galt?
123.	Need to clarify whether the affordability and zoning specifications encourage (or ideally mandate) units with more than one bd. Disappointed that new construction in proctor (right by the school!!!) is only 1bd max, which excludes families. Can we ensure affordability extends to multiple bedroom units, and ensure that those units get built?

124.	I think it is short sighted that UR1 covers the largest portion of available space. 1/8th of a mile is a very short distance. 1/4 mile is very walkable and then more of the city could have denser housing with UR-2. We need to prepare for the next 100 years of growth, not just the next 30.
125.	Fully support the state regulations but have yet to hear why City of Tacoma believes they need to go further? Stick to UR1.
126.	The projected population increases are way off. "Projected to begin in 2025 (and likely continuing for decades), a 'demographic cliff' for higher education is coming to the United States in the form of a dramatic drop in the traditional, college-aged population. This cliff is a result of a dramatic decline in the U.S. birthrate that began during the Great Recession in 2007." We already see the decline of 2,000 students in Tacoma School District alone, which is on top of other declines.
127.	Tacoma is under the illusion that it is going to escape the demographic cliff that is coming. Enrollment at TSD: down. Enrollment at UWT, UPS, & TCC: down. That tells you a lot about the future. And people die in the city every day.
128.	Overkill in density numbers. You'd think that a meteor struck the state and we had to take in the population of the whole state into our city.
129.	I went shopping today at Home Goods. They haven't sold children's items in two years. The aisles that sold children's bedding and toys is now devoted to dog beds and animal toys. That tells you a lot about the future of our country. Let's be realistic about dropping birth rates (and now lowered life expectancy rates). I have no idea where our leaders are getting their statistics from, but they do not appear to be correct.
130.	The demographic cliff is coming. Why doesn't anyone in our city consider that fact?
131.	I find it interesting that when I purchased my home a few years ago that the realtor had to use comps from a part of the city that was miles away because there weren't really any recent sales in my neighborhood. In the last few years, though, "for sale" signs keep popping up on my block and nearby blocks with similar houses. The most prominent reason: many homes are estate sales. That's the circle of life. So, from my perspective, there is no shortage of houses for sale.
132.	Drop the density levels down to the state minimum. Going from one to four units would be a fourfold increase. Why isn't that enough. I worry that one ignorant person will build to the maximum of density and then when the population drops we'll be stuck with one large monstrosity within a sea of modest single-story homes.
133.	I am totally opposed to the new Urban Residential (UR-3) zoning for Old Town Tacoma (N 29th St). We should preserve the historic homes in this area, not tear them down for modern structures. Public transportation will no longer be provided soon, thus the UR-3 is inappropriate. Parking is already a problem. Preserve the character of Old Town!

134.	The plan doesn't treat anyone fairly. (Equally is not the same as fairly.) Pumping up the density levels for people who just happen to live near something isn't fair. If a neighborhood of retired people lives near an elementary school, do they really care about access to that school? If you live across the street from a park, but you have to walk a long way to a pedestrian crosswalk and cross over 5 lanes of traffic, is that really "access."
135.	It is misguided to look at how the crow flies when determining access. It is misguided to conclude that people will want access to that park, school, or store. The fair thing to do is to create only one category of low density residential--and that is the state minimum of 4.
136.	Density expectations are too high. Get rid of UR2. Make all low density residential be 4 plus 2 more bonus. This will already be a big change and won't create an eyesore.
137.	Keep the density levels as low as possible. When the population drops in a few years (and people get tired of living in units that are the size of prison cells), it will be easier to combine units together.
138.	When the first proposal passed, I was zoned for 4 units. Not ideal, but I could live next door to four neighbors with some ifs (like there was enough space between the neighbors and me and the homes were 20 feet or more from the sidewalk. Suddenly, we are not talking about houses. We are talking about a major apartment building . . . in a quiet neighborhood where a car barely drives through in the front. Apartments are NOT low density. Return to the duplexes and ADUs that were talked about.
139.	Density numbers are just not realistic. We don't have enough police officers as it is. Increased density brings more crime and an increased awareness of those crimes because of that proximity.
140.	Bait and switch. The city talked about a small backyard ADU and duplexes. Now we are talking about looming apartments in residential areas. How did this happen?
141.	The governments in Washington own almost fully half of the land, so they can release some of it to people. Now free land would really bring down the cost of housing and get the government off our backs.
142.	My whole life I've believed that if a governmental action improves the lives of working, middle-class Americans then it must be good for our country. I don't see how this plan helps the majority of the middle class.
143.	I firmly believe that rezoning every neighborhood is excessive and unnecessary. Last year's HB110 by the state legislature seemed like an appropriate step. I worry that rezoning every neighborhood would put us on the path to becoming Seattle light. As an owner in both spots, believe me -- you don't want that.
144.	The only thing scarier than a NIMBY is a YIMBY. This "plan" is a developer's boondoggle. HB1110 is plenty. The north end doesn't have the infrastructure for all multi-unit buildings. Who will be TAXED for all the sewer, street, sidewalk, and lighting upgrades? And when I look at how the permit office is allowing structures to FILL the lots, where will all these beautiful trees be planted? Tacoma contains so much rich history in its architecture. We don't want to be West Seattle.

145.	NO TO HIT!! It's city planning on steroids. HB1110 has our housing issues covered at a slower pace to allow for more considerate construction and infrastructure improvements.
146.	Leave our residential neighborhoods alone!
147.	The city shouldn't expand density beyond what the state law changes require. If there is a certain minimum distance the state requires for certain density, DO NOT EXPAND the density beyond that. I am already upset that the state did what it did, especially after all the work Tacoma did to work towards an increased density plan that would work four our city. It was like the state ignored what the community wanted, and steamrolled over the public.
148.	The proposed density is neither needed nor wanted by most of the community. The proposal will cause more problems than it seeks to solve. The density will create more stress on residents, particularly with the proposed parking reductions. Regardless of the proliferation of bike lanes and sidewalks, it is pure fantasy to think that residents will give up their cars. If Tacoma wants to be New York City, the city better bring some large employers to town. Without jobs, we don't need this density.
149.	I support greater density in all Tacoma neighborhoods. I lived in Stadium for years and did not think the apartments and mixed use residences took away from the character at all - indeed the mixed economic backgrounds of residents and resulting walkability made the neighborhood my favorite in the city.
150.	I could not agree less with allowing multifamily structures being built in old and established single family home residential areas! My wife and her family have lived in North Tacoma their entire lives. I have lived in North Tacoma for over 20 years and I did not buy a home to have a multi-story complex just across the street. If I wanted to live in South Hill Puyallup I would have bought a home there.
151.	Please stick with HB1110. We don't need further measures that take away from the historic nature of some of our neighborhoods.
152.	Please rewrite this draft to limit the levels of density to no more than the state demands of us. Tacoma did enough by pressuring the state to upzone everywhere. Isn't that enough?
153.	I do not support greater housing types and more units per lot. I'm not sold that more congestion is a good thing for Tacoma. I moved here because this is not Bellevue, nor would I want it to be.
154.	While I agree with the increase in density across the board, I am worried that the lack of expansion of, or creation of new mixed-use centers would mean there would be no benefits to walkability for current residents, only those occupying newly developed residences surrounding those mixed use centers. If the city wishes to truly cut down on car-dependency, increase livability and walkability, and reach its goal of making Tacoma a 20-minute city, mixed-use development should be more widespread.
155.	Why not include the possibility for commercial space in UR3 multiplexes?
156.	Commercial space should be allowed in UR3 in certain scenarios, such as for a corner store or small grocery stores. No reason not to allow buildings that would already be large to include a small shop
157.	Walkability would drastically increase if UR3 zoning allowed for commercial space as well, or was just turned into mixed-use zoning in some areas. Otherwise this plan does nothing to

	improve walkability for existing residents as those amenities/shops are just as far away in the mixed-use centers.
158.	Increasing density will reduce current housing values, reduce tree canopy and landscaping, result in parking congestion, and irreparably alter the historic character of Tacoma neighborhoods. Look at the new apartment construction near Pierce County Annex and the old K-Mart site as examples. Is this the future of Tacoma? Multi-family housing should be encouraged along transit corridors, and in undeveloped and underutilized property in the downtown corridor.
159.	I wholeheartedly support this innovative approach to our housing crisis. Transforming buildings of historic value within residential areas is one of the great ways suggested in Home in Tacoma. Such historic sites are typically well-suited for group housing. I support imaginative ways to preserve these beautiful buildings, while increasing housing availability.
160.	I have lived in Tacoma all of my life except for my four years away at college in southern California. While I understand the housing crisis I do not believe that disrupting single family neighborhoods by cramming in more structures is the appropriate way to address the issue. Please think carefully before you ruin the character of this city.
161.	I do not agree with this plan to densify all areas of Tacoma.
162.	Please do not change the Narrowmoor view community west of Jackson from 6th Ave S. to 19th Avenue S. to either UR1 or UR2. Changing the height of residences to 35 ft. will totally destroy one of the few view neighborhoods in Tacoma. This area is not adjacent to public transport, has sidewalks, traffic control or ability for adding multi-family housing safely.
163.	Ensure that all transit lines are supported by more relaxed zoning regulations to the maximum extent feasible. Maximize HIT zoning codes to deliver as many housing units as possible within the constraints of Missing Middle urban forms.
164.	Density should not be pursued at all costs. Regulations need to be imposed to ensure that the positive features of our city remain intact.
165.	I oppose your changes from HIT1 to HIT2. "Affordable" housing units that would require an \$80,000 income are not affordable. This seems like the main beneficiaries are developers and still doesn't do anything to help my friends that are working 2 and 3 jobs and still can't find housing they can afford. Please go back to the drawing board with the people's interests in mind instead of developers.
166.	How will this proposed change impact the North Slope Historical District? How will the newly allowed larger buildings be limited in scope to align with the existing structures? Residents of the NSHD are not currently allowed to build or modify homes if construction alters the existing roof line or is significantly different than the existing structures. How will this new zoning restrict builders from building giant multifamily homes that dwarf the surrounding structures and strain utilities?
167.	Your plan is overly ambitious and the plan the state has come up with is much less onerous. People who bought in single family zoning do not want condos, townhomes, etc, going up alongside our homes, robbing us of our sunlight and openness. And the result will be too much density, and too much density invites its own set of problems. I do realize the need

	for more housing, but many of the ideas you have come up with would be more suitable in new areas that are being developed.
168.	More density is better. More everywhere. Let's do it!
169.	I have reviewed this website and also a letter from the north slope historic district (NSHD) opposing the Home in Tacoma plan as set forth. I am in agreement with the points made in the NSHD. I own a home in the Proctor neighborhood and have lived here for 40 years. I feel the city is going for a "one size fits all" solution in trying to be "equitable", but forcing across the board regulations defeats the purpose. It seems this HIT plan is a win for developers and a loss for affordable housing.
170.	While I strongly support addressing housing shortages and affordability, I don't believe this is the way to do it. Having a 35-foot tall set of row houses (or similar) towering over a single family home? Blocking light, staring into the windows? A hulking "modern" building in a sea of historic homes? Severely reducing the value and quality of life for current neighborhoods is not the way to move a city forward. Why do we need to be packed in like sardines?
171.	As I read the comments, I can see that I am not alone in recognizing that the changes proposed are too much and too unrealistic. I don't see how upzoning will be able to provide the inexpensive housing that people need, particularly if we don't bring in the necessary well-paying jobs to support them.
172.	HIT is just latest ploy by socialists to destroy what others have earned.
173.	Despite the snake oil claims, it does nothing for DEEPLY affordable housing, which even the Planning Commission's discussions acknowledged. It's more about creating more landlords and renters, not homeowners. Gentrification, displacement and further growth in racial disparities of homeownership will certainly result, not to mention an increased financial burden on current residents to pay for needed additional infrastructure capacity to accommodate the growth.
174.	Several "Buildable Land Inventories" and studies produced in the past and recently by Pierce County found that NO regulatory changes were needed by Tacoma to accommodate housing and employment growth targets set by the Growth Management Act - no changes necessary. So why is the entire city being upzoned? The answer of course -- \$\$\$ -- for the real estate industry and developers to squeeze more money and more profits out of a limited supply of land. It's called "regulatory capture."
175.	Several nomenclature changes have happened in this process since Dec 2021. After starting with two zones (i.e., Low-Scale & Mid-scale, these became 4 zones: low-low, low-high, low-mid & high-mid. Now it's UR-1, UR-2 & UR-3. In order to sell this plan & make it sound more palatable, the claim is that UR-2 is low-scale. This is, at best, misleading. Commission docs & PowerPoints from last fall show that UR-2 is in fact Mid-scale. This vast upzoning of the entire city is both radical and extreme.
176.	When this whole process started, the city planners acknowledged that the city had enough land to accommodate growth for decades to come. (And though the city won't admit it, the population projections are way off. The demographic cliff is coming.) So why exactly are we upzoning an entire city? It's not for economic reasons.

177.	At the meeting last night in City Chambers, I learned that the Planning Commission has not consulted necessary experts. They didn't seem to ask for or receive input from economists, appraisers, demographers, and engineers.
178.	This plan is quackery/snake oil/misinformation. It takes advantage of people who really need a safe and affordable place to live by giving them false hope. You can't build your way to affordability. Part of the reason why everything is so high is because of inflationary pressure from handing out money. More subsidies will just lead to higher prices.
179.	It's crazy that we have to be fighting so hard to hold on to already small spaces between a neighbor. I own .2 acres. I grew up on 12 acres. I own literally 1/60th of what my parents owned. yet you think that I don't need that extra space or want a buffer/barrier between neighbors. We already live on lots that are sized appropriately for mid-level cities. Why do you think we want to be Seattle, Tokyo, or New York? News flash: those highly dense cities are more expensive than Tacoma is.
180.	It's crazy that we have to be fighting so hard to hold on to already small spaces between a neighbor. I own .2 acres. I grew up on 12 acres. I own literally 1/60th of what my parents owned. yet you think that I don't need that extra space or want a buffer/barrier between neighbors. We already live on lots that are sized appropriately for mid-level cities. Why do you think we want to be Seattle, Tokyo, or New York? News flash: those highly dense cities are more expensive than Tacoma is.
181.	The maps that have been provided to us always lack the names of the streets. This makes it almost impossible to understanding where U-R 1, 2 and 3 are located. In the future, please provide maps with street names. Also, I totally object to the extent of the UR-3 zones throughout Tacoma. State Bill 1110 should be followed and not expanded upon. HiT is too drastic a plan to force upon its citizens.
182.	Affordability will continue to DECREASE under this proposal. How will this happen if we change the supply side of the equation you ask? This plan will dramatically INCREASE the land value of a given lot as each lot can now carry many more dwellings. This STRUCTURALLY CHANGES the economics for investment. There will be a flood of investors and the new economics will make higher sale prices worth it as more density unlocks value for the investor.
183.	I'd like to remind the planners that they are fighting macro economic themes. 15 years of near 0 interest rates, near parabolic equity valuations, local tech salaries and remote work have driven housing prices up; not a lack of available volume. The exodus from Seattle and its density nightmare makes Tacoma a desirable option, people see the value that living in Tacoma offers.
184.	The current sewer and wastewater treatment capacity is past useful life and beyond capacity. There appear to be no plans nor funding associated with investing in additional capacity. Renewal/replacement of our sewer systems is necessary to support the proposed growth. The City needs to make DRAMATIC financial investment in these critical infrastructure. Who will pay for this? Taxpayers will in subsequent funding requests.
185.	Who lives in urban environments? Young people, single people, couples. Typically people couple up, marry and soon kids arrive. They mature and often aspire to home ownership, establishing 'roots' and building their legacy. At this point, people LEAVE the bustle of the density for a quieter, safer place to raise their children. People realize that a dense area is

	no place to raise a family. A place where there's grass, parks, community; all the things we have here in Tacoma is what people
186.	What does density bring? More noise, more traffic, more garbage and litter, more broken glass, less open space, more crime. These are all the opposite of what the people of the city desire.
187.	Don't Ballard my Tacoma
188.	The proposed zoning changes go significantly further than the statewide guidance outlined in HB1110 (inspired by Tacoma's Home in Tacoma project). The Commission is reckless in its desire to change so much so fast without first trialing or learning from the success of other cities. Dial this back -significantly-.
189.	There is no requirement for the employment of only local contractors. By and large, especially for the high rise structures, out of county firms will develop the properties and siphon the profits out of the local economy. Failure to have such a requirement is a major, major oversight that could provide significant economic benefit to the area, making it more of a win/win.
190.	The reality is that single family has been targeted deliberately, and underutilized areas of the city were explicitly 'out of scope.' The downtown core and upslope area are awash with vacant lots perfect for exactly the types of dwellings proposed. Why then must we do away with single family for the rest of the City? The downtown core and upslope area have much more available infrastructure and transportation to support an Urban Village
191.	Similarly, there is significant space available in the Nally Valley that could be leveraged. An entirely new district could be created with repurposed buildings to lofts, new construction and would create a bridge community between Hilltop, Central, and South Tacoma. Yet this wasn't taken into consideration despite being a perfect proof of concept opportunity.
192.	Home in Tacoma describes creating 'new' housing types, implying that HIT is a silver bullet. The fact of the matter is that each of the housing types in the proposal already exist. These housing types are currently being built all over the City. High rise, multi plex, quad plex, triplex, duplex, ADUs. They are happening all over. So why then is it that we need wholesale rezoning?
193.	I'm concerned about the UR3 area in Old Town. How are you going to allow 35 ft tall structures that will block the view of other homes? The traffic is already terrible. We don't have enough parking now without the new buildings. The charm & historic area will be ruined.
194.	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 is dishonest and demonstrates a lack of transparency.

195.	Scale is all way down by limiting the number of units and increasing distances between neighbors. That is, use big and wide setbacks.
196.	Worried about how crime will skyrocket with increased density when our police are already short-staffed. Defund the planning department.
197.	This plan should take into account the current neighborhood and how it will affect those living there. Past building standards were for the current neighborhoods and adding density will not stress and maybe cause the current infrastructure to fail but lead to noise pollution above what was expected for the homes. Constant noise is not good for mental health. The density and standard change will also lower values and therefore take money from homeowners. Ask people what they want for their homes
198.	<p>Senior Planers &a Residents</p> <p>The habitable space (G) on page 13 of the Urban Residential Districts Development and Design Standards states that Street Facing Facades will have to have habitable space for 75% of the front of the building and will have to be at least 10 ft deep.</p> <p>This virtually eliminates two car garages on building lots with no alley access. This makes no sense.</p> <p>On a 40 ft wide house plan leaves only has 10 ft for a garage on new construction houses. This needs to be changed!</p>
199.	<p>The new Proposed Habitable Space code needs to be addressed.</p> <p>75% of the front facing facades needs to be living space on property without an alley?</p> <p>A house would have to be 80ft wide to accommodate a 20ft garage.</p> <p>A 40ft wide house can only accommodate a 10ft garage?</p> <p>A 39ft wide house or less leaves does not leave enough room for a garage?</p> <p>This code virtually kills the possibility to build a two car garage on a front load SFR lot.</p> <p>New home buyers want 2 car garages! WHY?</p> <p>PLEASE ADDRESS THIS</p>
200.	<p>The proposed zoning framework that creates a baseline of 4 units per lot for R1 and 6 units per lot for R2 zones is acceptable, but I have concerns about the bonus units that could double the density in these zones and create an overcrowded urban space that will negatively impact established neighborhoods and will not comply with a vision to create a healthy urban canopy. I urge you to either eliminate or lower the number of bonus units in these zones: R1-2 bonus units, R2 2-4 bonus units.</p>
201.	<p>HIT 1 included extensive public comment. resulting in scaled back plan. Originally, the Planning Commission had a lot more mid-scale housing. The City Council reduced mid-scaled significantly, while still increasing density throughout the city. Tacoma residents insisted that the city scale back the very aggressive initial plan by the Planning Commission. Now, the Commission is again trying to force a very aggressive zoning plan. Stop ignoring residents. Slow down, and scale back the plan.</p>
202.	<p>Slow the process down so that we can understand the plan. Greatly reduce/eliminate UR 2, and don't require more density than required by the state. More density can always be added later after the impact of the state law is seen. No bonuses. Actually look at the topography before finalizing zoning. More parking should be required for home businesses.</p>

203.	For such an ambitious drastic change to the landscape & population of the city, residents should be given more time to review, learn and voice their opinions. Increased density is already felt with changes made so far, yet infrastructure has not been kept up. More density accomplished with hasty plans will not lead to “affordable housing” the residents will be satisfied with. I’ve come from a city that was over built in haste and 20 yrs later turned into a city not many choose to live.
204.	Where will all of the multi-family housing structures be built? What is the plan? Will we be subjected to watching the horrible site of countless homes within our established neighborhoods be demolished? ? Why are none of our City planners talking about this??!!

Parking Comments (137)

1.	how do i find what you are planning for parking ?
2.	In the Lincoln District, the parking is becoming more scarce in the business district and is currently difficult with the new LIHI construction. I propose that the city partner w/Lincoln HS to build a parking structure on the current school parking parcel, which is on 37th, across from the school. This was done at Stadium and provides more parking for the school, the community, the park-goers and the business district. It's a great solution for a space that currently has only surface parking.
3.	The city can't, in good conscience, pretend that people don't drive. All of these "multi family" buildings must have one spot (off street) per resident. Where will all of the Seattle transplants park their Subarus??
4.	S J street on street parking is negatively impacted M-F by hospital employees who have access to hospital employee parking; residents have limited options. Limits on parking hours during business hours or only resident parking would help.
5.	I'm all for reduced parking requirements! I also want the city to charge developers a fee that supports active transportation and invest that revenue in the communities in which growth is happening. Tacoma is really not safe to bike in, so while I love the minimum bike parking requirements here, the city needs to invest more in protected bike lanes and separated paths, particularly as we look to increase density and reduce reliance on personal vehicles.
6.	Decreasing parking requirements is great! This will fit perfectly with the city's climate planning bike and transit improvements!
7.	I currently live car-free, and it is at times a struggle, but I love it way more than the stress of driving. People drive so fast and erratically that it is incredibly stressful. Seriously time to shift away from cars. Not even to mention the cost of car ownership being an average of \$12,000 a year for the average American. This is not only a sustainable change, but also a benefit to mental health and to working families' pocketbooks.
8.	Car ownership is so expensive! Making it possible to live car free would save lots of money for working-class people
9.	Reduced parking is great, however the City has a long way to go if wanting to focus on active transportation. I live near 6th and Mildred, and it is not safe to bike in the areas with bike lanes, and crossing streets like 6th, 12th, and 19th via bike are extremely difficult at peak hours if you take less busy neighborhood roads to avoid cars. Walking in the neighborhood is also not pleasant, as the sidewalks are very skinny and not well kept up.
10.	The reduced parking requirements certainly are a step in the right direction but it would be more transparent to understand the data behind the proposed parking ratios as the summary sheet does not state the methodology for arriving at these figures. If Tacoma is truly aiming to increase the supply of housing, it seems counterproductive to require building space for cars instead of homes, in effect promoting car ownership but also aiming to achieve the city's vision zero and environmental goals
11.	Clearly all the bicycling enthusiasts amongst the 20- and 30-something "we know what's good for you" millennials on the Planning Commission pushed for the anti-parking and pro-bicycle regulations to force everyone else to adopt their own lifestyle choices.

12.	Have you bothered to survey people who live in Tacoma about their automobile ownership? No, you have not. If you had you would know that just because an area is "walkable" or "bike friendly" doesn't mean that the owner/renter does not own a CAR. Who are these planners who sit around and fantasize about about people living on top of one another and walking in the rain. Spoiler alert: Tacoma is not Tokyo. This proposal is asinine.
13.	For all of you people who think everyone is going to walk and bike everywhere and won't need a car in Tacoma, please take a field trip to Costco and look around. Now, close your eyes and imagine all of those bodies walking and biking everywhere. Enough said. We need parking because people are not going to give up their cars. You can't plan a city around virtue signaling.
14.	Remember when the city council let the Lime scooters run amok because "we have to transition away from driving?" I do. It was a disaster....and no one ditched his car. These parking proposals are nothing more than feeble attempts at social engineering.
15.	Parking is already tight. In Stadium district many old houses are converted into apartment buildings. This puts MANY cars street parking. It is difficult to then find parking. There is an apartment across the street from my house, but because parking is limited their vehicles are parked right out side my front door. One house converted means six different vehicles on our neighborhood street. Build parking garages and put a public garden on top to meet the green goal.
16.	I'm excited for the cupboard bike parking being added. As Tacoma strengthens its bike network and e-bikes, become more common I see this being a small but transformative part of this process.
17.	Once again, I see the North End Will have more parking spaces than the West End off of 12th and 19th. The north end Always comes out unscathed because they are much better at voicing their concerns and getting their way. Meanwhile, the City Of Tacoma dumps on the West End And other neighborhood areas. Make this fair and equitable. Require more parking spaces on the West End and other areas just like the north end has, or reduce all of our parking spots.
18.	<p>Who needs parking spaces per unit anymore in 2024? Online sales delivered to your home have eclipsed in-store retail. Doves of people work from home or take online classes. Banking is online. This public forum is online.</p> <p>Millennials and Gen-Z are seeing that cars are about as exciting as vacuum cleaners; they perform a function, but no one needs the government telling them they need an entire room for one of them in their house.</p>
19.	Lets look at how reduced parking worked at the new apartment building in the 6800 6th Ave. The nearby streets are full of cars and the streets are quite narrow. You cannot force the residents out of their cars. Most public transportation is blocks away from where one works. I gave someone a ride home for Tacoma Mall nightly and as a result he got home 90 minutes earlier. Note; He even lived a block for TCC transit center.
20.	We don't need more parking! Love that this is going away, but we also need to bolster the transportation systems to make them more efficient and making biking paths safer. Take away the parking and put in trees!

21.	Reducing parking for neighborhoods that already have limited parking make sense if you're trying to eliminate cars altogether. In reality this does not work for families that work far from home or don't live within walking distance to goods and services. Encouraging bike usage is admirable but again, not realistic. Have you tried to ride a bike in Tacoma with the hills and in our perpetually crummy weather?
22.	I am for increased housing density and getting rid of single family zoning. But we cannot wait to invest in infrastructure and walkability. If we decrease parking in our current system the quality of life will decrease. Let's invest in walkability and local amenities.
23.	Apartment buildings are now being built without parking and small apartments without parking are creating clutter with street parking of which there is not enough space for the cars.
24.	You addressed the tree issue by noting the aesthetic value of trees. In relation to this with all the cars that will be parking on the street, I find that objectionable in that Looking at many many cars is not a pleasant view to look at. Could you make requirments to have parking under the new homes? Part of the beauty of our single family neighborhoods lies iin the peacefulness of not so many cars.
25.	Please take a look at 47th and S Fife apartments. No parking and the streets are jam packed with cars. This is not esthetically pleasing.
26.	I am so excited to see that you are expanding the reduced parking area. I selected my home for all the amenities in walking distance and the link line that finally opened, and I know that more density in my neighborhood will mean less reckless speeding, more clients for more cafes, and more likeminded recreational walkers to provide eyes on the street. thank you so much for letting my 1900's neighborhood function car free and people friendly, the way it was designed!
27.	Freeing up from required car parking to space availble for more housing is very welcome as we face a shortage of affordable housing and rising demand in Tacoma. As many have mentioned, car dependency is hard to escape in Tacoma, and the solution is less parking infrastructure, not more. I particulary enjoy the connection to transit in requirments, and would go further to encourage less parking requirements near major intersections with walkalbe commuity businesses nearby.
28.	Less parking, what are the alternatives when we have incomplete and dangerous bike lanes? There's no rapid transit and the light rail isn't substantial enough to support the population.
29.	Social engineering never works. No city can just "will" cars away. The city should plan for cars. Otherwise, you will see cars on curbs, front yards, alleys and in front of fire hydrants and at the edge of blocks. I recently visited someone in a row house in another city and saw someone trying to park in a space half on the sidewalk and half on the street that was so tight that she hit the front and the back of the parked cars; this will be the new normal.
30.	Is the city really expecting elderly people to give up their cars that are parked in attached garages for bicycles? Are parents really going to take their kids to ballet classes and soccer practices on bicycles? It is not realistic. Our planners live in a world of dreams (actually a world of nightmares). Let's get real and plan for more cars and fewer bikes.

31.	An American city without cars. Imagine that? When are we going to get real planners who plan for real people who live, work, drive children to school and activities, and enjoy life. They want us all to be dependent on government. What they don't want you to know is that a car is freedom.
32.	Why was Pierce Transit Route 2 chosen as an metric for the Reduced Parking Area Expansion. It currently has 30-minute headways, which is NOT frequent. Additionally, Pierce Transit has been having, like other transit agencies, an issue with staffing operators. This has resulted in a lot of trips being cancelled. So if a trip on Route 2 is cancelled, someone has to wait an hour between buses.
33.	Since the idea behind lower or eliminating parking requirements near transit is that more people will not be driving, I think that there should be additional requirements on developers to contribute to the multimodal network (e.g., provide ORCA cards, pay a transit impact fee, pay a multimodal impact fee, etc).
34.	The planners are anxious to get rid of your cars. First, they said that you are selfish to want a spacious home with some space between you and your neighbor. Next, they said that you are selfish to want to own a car. They will soon be asking you to turn your garage into housing. I heard one of the City Planners say all this, so I am not making this up.
35.	Happy and excited to see some recognition that parking lots don't make happy cities
36.	Parking requirements are inadequate. If you want to buy a bike and ride through the city, go for it. However, even if you gave every city resident a "free" bike, you wouldn't be able to get rid of bikes. Maybe it would be better if the city planners tried to live in a real world, rather than in an imaginary world.
37.	Meant to say even if you gave everyone a bike, you wouldn't be able to get rid of cars.
38.	It's hard for a business to stay in business when people can't drive there. Point Ruston wouldn't exist without cars. Neither would Proctor. Proctor was a thriving business district long before the mega-apartments came.
39.	The reality is that automobiles are part of modern American life. They are not going away anytime soon. Trying to bring back 1950s small towns in a city is a failed idea. For example, the small town doctor doesn't exist anymore. Health care comes through large medical complexes that you usually need to drive to, unless you want to take a day off from work to spend hours on mass transit.
40.	Suppose you believe that mass transit is the panacea for all of our woes, the cost is extremely expensive. You have to factor that extra cost of mass transit when you consider the affordability of a housing unit. Someone pays one way or another.
41.	Accommodate more cars or you will be sorry. Create underground garages with a park on top, if you need to. And please don't raise our level of density because we happen to live near a park. If it is as hard as you keep saying it is to find a place to live, then we might not have the ability to live far enough away from congestion and noise as we would like.
42.	As someone wrote, the lime green ebikes were a big failure. The lesson we should have learned is sit back and evaluate how other big cities handle things instead of trying to be the first when we know nothing about how things will work.

43.	Lucky that I have an unused garage stall and a driveway to house my two cars. I feel sorry for people who are not so fortunate. Everyone thinks they will be young and vital forever. As people age, even the most athletic of us, might eventually need help. The elimination of single-family ranch homes with attached garages will eventually force seniors into retirement homes. This plan to eliminate spaces for cars is age discriminatory.
44.	As we get older, we especially need social contact. We won't be able to meet with friends at houses if there is no place for anyone to park their car. Very isolating future for our seniors.
45.	Yes get rid of all the empty parking lots that are heating up the City. Plant trees instead and make mini forests. We need to cool the city as it heats up with climate change. Asphalt is 40-60 degrees hotter than the ambient temperature during the summer months. Asphalt is stressing out the roots of our trees as well as the tree canopy. Take care of our trees and then all else will fall into place.
46.	Lots of people can say they don't want parking spaces to happen right now. Once they realize what it's like to live in a city without sufficient parkin, they'll change their tune fast.
47.	Limiting public is not realistic. It's just another aspirational goal bound for failure.
48.	Meant to write, limiting PARKING is not realistic.
49.	Some Americans like to romanticize Europeans for their smaller cars and their pedestrian-friendly ways. In fact, many Europeans long to be like Americans when it comes to cars and trucks, but many simply can't afford vehicles, especially big vehicles. "Many European countries tax vehicles on size, weight, engine size and fuel consumption at a far higher rate than our own states." Source: NYTimes.
50.	The parking space dilemma raises the key question of which types of citizens are we going to serve. A biking lifestyle is great for young twenty- and thirty-something single professionals who can work remotely or have great flexibility in the hours they work. This lifestyle is less suited for partners with children who have the responsibility to take children to and from school and to all the assorted activities that bring joy and success to the whole family. Seniors can't bike everywhere.
51.	Many European cities are very expensive to live in, so owning a car is not even possible for most people. Therefore, the comparisons between Tacoma and European cities don't really work.
52.	It is necessary to allocate spaces for cars throughout the city. People riding around the block multiple times just to find a spot to park will increase congestion exponentially. Better to plan spaces for cars to park so that we don't have people driving in circles and blocking traffic waiting for someone to drive out of a spot.
53.	Failing to create enough parking spaces will only lead to greater levels of traffic congestion, so please plan on expanding both private and public parking.
54.	Searching for a parking spot or being forced to use public transportation will use up a lot of our time. Time is the only resource we can never get back.
55.	We will need street parking. In the West End the homeless are using our bus shelters as housing. The busriders have to stand out in the elements otherwise they will be in a

	homeless person's shelter. The homeless using our bus shelters will discourage bus ridership.
56.	If you want to get rid of your car with or without Home in Tacoma, no one is stopping you. It's not fair to force other people out of their cars who want them and can afford them?
57.	Supporters of Home in Tacoma tend to be lax about enforcing rules and holding criminals accountable for their actions. With our lax drug rules, I don't think I'll be riding the bus anytime soon. I don't want to sit on a drug needle or breathe the fumes from fentanyl or be confronted by a mentally disturbed person. A certain level of public safety is needed to encourage people to leave their cars and hop on a bus or the link. Will the city step forward on this?
58.	The transportation infrastructure (both existing and planned) doesn't seem to be up to the challenge of providing timely public transportation to any place besides Seattle. Therefore, you need to provide for adequate parking.
59.	I don't see how businesses can rely on enough foot traffic to keep their doors open, no matter the level of density we achieve.
60.	Experience tells us that if you make it difficult for people to own and/or use cars that they will just have their food and anything they need or want delivered. Do we really think that your restaurant driver will walk your hot food to your door, instead of using your car? Do you really think that the Amazon driver will walk your items from the distribution center to your home? Someone will be driving a car or truck to meet people's needs and wants.
61.	If you add bike paths, please don't make them as dangerous as the ones on 6th and Mildred. Who wants to ride their bikes in the middle of multiple lanes of traffic?
62.	Please get past the idea that we do not need cars. I am a senior citizen with health problems. I need my car. I can't walk very far at all, even to get to bus stops. Many, many of our citizens are in this situation.
63.	If you try to ban cars and limit parking spaces, then delivery drivers will just stop in the middle of the street to deliver their items. Oh, wait, I've already seen that happen.
64.	We should be planning for housing growth by figuring out how to accommodate more cars by including enough spaces in front of homes and businesses and by building parking lots, particularly near transit centers.
65.	Highly impractical ideas, pushed by radicals, whose ideas never pan out. Unfair and unsafe to senior citizens and anyone who is not in tiptop shape.
66.	I live in a neighborhood with mostly retired widows and widowers who spent a lifetime contributing to the success of this city. It shows disrespect to tell these self-supporting seniors who pay all of their taxes (without any reductions) that you don't care if they can't find a parking space near their house when they come back from buying groceries. Some concessions should be made in these neighborhoods.
67.	It seems like the makers of these density zone paper maps have forgotten that real people live within these boundary lines who didn't ask for any of this density. We just wanted to raise our family and retire here live peacefully in what seemed like a nice suburban life. Now you want us to live in New York or Las Vegas.

68.	Even the young eventually get old. I've known people who used to bike over 30 miles each way to work every day in their 30s who only 20 years later have back problems and can't even get on a bike. If the planners are really serious about helping seniors age in place in their neighborhoods, then it is essential that you guarantee readily accessible parking for them. Thank you for listening to my thoughts.
69.	I believe that businesses will suffer when there is a lack of parking, placing the burden of paying for all of the services back on the ordinary taxpayer who will find the taxes onerous.
70.	It appears that the city just wants a lot of young and fit people in our city.
71.	Create car space to help working families. Not everyone has the time it takes to go places via bike or public transportation. Limiting cars won't help get people out of poverty because it will be hard to find opportunities for jobs and activities.
72.	Pie in the sky pipe dreams. Somebody watched Don Quixote too many times.
73.	Who is John Galt?
74.	No parking requirement puts all the vehicles (because everyone will have one and in fact needs one) on the street. This adds to the congested feeling of a place - yes, looking at you Seattle - and reduces the livability and neighborhood feel. Also, let's call this for what it is- maximum developer profit.
75.	Hard to live without a car in America today unless you live in New York City.
76.	Making car ownership a thing of the past is an important goal, but we need our infrastructure to make getting to work on the light rail or bus a real possibility. Tacoma isn't there yet. What is being done about this?
77.	I would be build the infrastructure first before trying to limit cars.
78.	The planners admitted that many people were concerned about car congestion in the city, but they don't appear to have done anything to address those concerns.
79.	If you don't provide enough parking for visitors, then how will our museums and restaurants and stores thrive? Tacomans will just drive to Gig Harbor, UP, or Lakewood where it will be far easier to park and shop and eat. Way to drive business out. And, once again, the taxpayers will be left to pay for it all.
80.	Too few spaces will be there for too many cars.
81.	If you limit the use of cars, then the poverty rates will go up and we will be left with slums. People with low incomes need a car even more than people with high incomes because they usually have jobs that are highly dependent on being at a job at a specific time or else they get fired. Trying to ban cars in low income areas will only exacerbate the equity issues you keep claiming you are trying to address.
82.	Parking chokes cities, clogs streets that should be walkable with dangerous car traffic and congestion, and gobbles up land that should be used for homes. Don't listen to the awful NIMBIES on here whining about their inability to take their 3000 pound machine and store it on land for free anywhere in the city. It is time to make room for more walkable ways of life, and create streets and neighborhoods that allow people to avoid the scourge of the automobile.

83.	A case study for getting rid of cars in an upzoned city is Minneapolis. "Uptown was still struggling despite the addition of thousands of units of housing over the last two decades." In 2019, the city eliminated auto parking in one area to provide greater spaces for bikes.. The result: "Loss of street parking decimated foot traffic."
84.	From today's Seattle Times: "A 26-year-old man was shot and killed late Sunday on a light rail train in downtown Seattle, marking the latest in a spike of transit-related violence."
85.	Seattle Times newspaper "Riders on Sound Transit's light rail endured more hassles than usual, as four different kinds of incidents disrupted service between Friday night and Monday morning. Wind-related power outages, a minor train crash with a motor vehicle, other track blockages and a homicide all either forced station closures or delayed train arrivals. They all happened a few hours apart."
86.	Show me the parking spaces. I want more parking spaces.
87.	In order to move the city forward, we need to be less reliant on cars and invest in public transit. One way to do this is to lower parking requirements so that there are no more than 1 parking space per living unit. While this will be painful at first as people struggle to find places to park, in a few years the community will acclimate
88.	I love the growth of retail villages near attractive residential areas that allow residents to live and work within walking distance. More and more people work from home and the need for commuting has reduced. The younger generation is waiting longer to drive. Creating infrastructure that allows a lifestyle that does not depend on car is healthy for Tacoma residents. Change is hard. Well done Tacoma.
89.	Cutting parking requirements will help our fellow citizens afford to remain and live in this wonderful city. Housing shouldn't be based on housing private automobiles. The number of parking spaces in Tacoma out numbers the quantity of cars. Investing in transit will benefit all. Better transit will, hopefully, encourage people to get out of their giant pedestrian killing vehicles.
90.	Reducing parking requirements doesn't mean that builders won't build parking. It means that people who need housing with less parking will be able to find a place to live. Let the market set how much parking we need. Thank you
91.	Lack of parking spaces doesn't lead to affordability. If it did, then Manhattan would be an inexpensive place to live. I haven't seen any data to prove this.
92.	Follow-up: I haven't seen any data that proves that banning cars leads to affordable housing.
93.	Who is John Galt?
94.	how would the city ensure that citizens and senior citizens have access to public transportation, especially to medical appointments, grocery stores and parks.

95.	For all of those anti-car people: If we all believed that no one needs or wants a car, then we wouldn't be talking about the government forcing people to give up their cars. If a life without a car was so great, we wouldn't need you to tell us to live without a car.
96.	This is currently an issue on our street as it's a dead end and most of the houses use the street for parking. With the large town homes being added to our street, i forsee our street being taken over by vehicles. This will leave no room for children to play and it's already an issue for cars to turn around at the end of our street. We now will have more cars destroying the property in front of our house when they try to turn around. This is extremely poor planning and I'm extremely angry.
97.	Have we learned nothing from Seattle neighborhoods? Parking is essential. The idea that there are 1000s of people who can afford an apartment but don't have a car is insane! We simply cannot eliminate all parking requirements for these units!
98.	Eliminating the parking requirement or even reducing it significantly doesn't prioritize walkability. Walkability is a quality of a neighborhood. If anything, increasing the density with NO additional parking REDUCES the walkability due to increased traffic. Claiming having no parking prioritizes walkability is disingenuous. Its also absurd to think that local transit will meet the needs of the new residents. It won't, we all know it it won't and that people will still have cars.
99.	If you do everything in your power to get rid of cars, then the inequalities between the rich and poor will just grow deeper. Some of us will never get rid of our cars (no matter the price), while the less fortunate won't have the means to buy and park a car. Good job in increasing inequities (saying sarcastically).
100.	Not sure how getting rid of parking spaces will help a city to grow. If you need something, you just drive to stores with big parking lots (like Tacoma Central) or, even worse, for the city, you just drive to Gig Harbor, University Place, or Lakewood. Getting rid of parking spaces doesn't seem to be the best plan for finding and keeping reliable workers and for businesses finding customers. Any plan that considers parking spaces as nuisances, rather than assets, will fail.
101.	Where's your model for getting rid of parking spaces? What city has done this successfully?
102.	The elite will have all the space they need for cars, the middle class will move out, and the poor will be left behind. Is this the city you want?
103.	My observation after looking over the Home In Tacoma plan is that the city is attempting to dictate use of cars by allowing development without requiring adequate parking space. In addition, allowing development of multi-family dwellings in established neighborhoods where street parking is already scarce. More people will always mean more cars and parking space must be provided. The thought that people will use only public transportation is ludicrous.
104.	There are a lot of areas that are not walkable and the public transit is terrible. The bus stops have no rain protection. They do not run oftern enough and there are areas of Tacoma that are not accessible by bus. Removing Parking Requirements will only make life more difficult.

105.	New housing needs to have more parking required as we already have parking issues.
106.	Please prevent parking for 1-2 spaces around intersections to maintain visibility and pedestrian safety crossing intersections.
107.	For now, sufficient parking still needs to be available because transit is so far behind (and transit keeps being cut). Also, if the city wants to increase walkability, it would be great if the city could increase traffic calming and/or enforcement. Just reducing the speed limit, without more, is unfortunately not enough.
108.	The proposal to mandate bike use is flawed for several reasons. Tacoma is not bike friendly. It does not have a well-developed system of bike lanes. Current bike lanes (i) end abruptly, (ii) are not continuous, and (iii) are not maintained exposing the City to future liability. The cost to build bike lanes is prohibitively expensive. Seattle recently incurred average construction costs of \$1 million to \$2 million per mile to install bike lanes. Is that part of Tacoma's budget?
109.	Ive experienced a large apartment complex added to the neighborhood and 5 Townhomes, deemphasizing parking has been problematic. There are 13 vehicles, 5 townhomes. There is only room to park 5 small vehicles in garages that aren't being used as storage units. This overflows to street causing st. parking to be an issue. This causes bad parking behavior, ie. Parking on sidewalk, lawns, close to driveways, in front of mailboxes, on private property, etc. Folx work multi jobs need cars 2b on

	about transportation, parking will be a constant headache and cause of chronic criticism for City of Tacoma Planning.
116.	<p>It's Interesting to me that the city is proposing to further reduce planning for parking demand when at the same time the County is reducing transit service, per the flyer I recently received in the mail about the elimination of several bus lines.</p> <p>This type of policy harms and punishes the less fortunate, for not owning their own private parking facilities. It externalizes the cost of providing parking for new residents to the existing residents, instead of the developers profiting from it.</p>
117.	Please do not change the zoning of the Narrowmoor community west of Jackson from 6th Ave. to 12th Avenue and down to Lindan to either UR 1 or UR 2. There is no capacity for parking additional vehicles necessary for multi-family housing. The north south roads are too narrow for additional parking and there are no sidewalks.
118.	Parking rules must reflect the reality that most Tacoman's require a car to commute to work, grocery shop and perform other errands. Neither public transit nor a bike are realistic replacement of a car particularly for the elderly or individuals with poor health. At least 1 parking spot per unit of housing must be required. Also, remove the mandate for "covered parking for bikes"; that's an unnecessary expense that takes away from the goal of affordable housing.
119.	Ensure that the Reduced Parking Area includes all of Pacific Avenue, 6th Avenue and 19th Street, at a minimum. Core Lincoln and Proctor District streets would be sensibly included as well to affirm our commitment to infill development and transit viability. It is important to note that the TCC T Line extension could be constructed over 19th St, 12th St or 6th Ave, and the DEIS should reflect these possibilities. 19th St is only a representative alignment.
120.	I am not anxious to live in an overcrowded city. I'll need my car to find fresh air and the calmness offered by the country.
121.	The number of parking allotment is not enough in spite of encouragement of public transportation. I am afraid the streets will be busy with parked cars and illegal parking will occur.
122.	If you get rid of parking spaces, I will just find a family member or neighbor to drop me off at my destination. Then I'll call that person to return to pick me up when I'm done. So now there will be two round trips instead of one. Just an example of how people will find a way to get around a difficult situation that the city will have created.
123.	Better to plan for many cars (prepare for the worst) and hope for the best (few cars). If you don't create those spaces, you will see cars parked on lawns and curbs. They'll block fire hydrants, trash cans, and ramps. Let's be practical in allotting spaces for cars.
124.	I would like to see incentives for developers of multiplexes to place parking under the buildings. Developments of more than one building should not have parking lots between them and instead have green space or courtyards for the use of the residents.
125.	City Council should commit to using public transit for all their transportation needs for a minimum of 30 days before changing our parking regulations. Public transit is severely lacking and it's backwards to reduce parking before improving options

126.	I think transit should be highly supported and paid for by the City to have enough service to support people living without cars. It's fine to hope transit service will materialize, but it's not a given since the City's not in control of the transit agencies. And without transit, where will we be left?
127.	To reduce parking without providing for something to replace it is ignoring the sickly state of public transit in Tacoma. There need to be buses that run more than once per hour and past 6pm on a Sunday. There need to be more routes and hubs added. Yet just a few days ago I received a flyer that 3+ transit routes were being discontinued. If people have nowhere to park and can't get to work in a reasonable time (or at all) by transit, how are they supposed to afford this new housing?
128.	Wondering how many commission or planning staff members used public transit to go to and from the Planning Commission meeting last night. If they didn't, it would be hypocritical to ask us to give up our cars.
129.	Limited Parking Proposal- The West Slope is primarily full of view lots. Common sense tell us these lots, if sold and developed will likely be more expensive dwellings which then equals potential for more cars per unit, for sure, and that will equal unsafe streets, crowded streets. Those that can afford to live on the slope, because the rents or costs will be high, will most definitely own 2 cars. Each neighborhood should be treated individually in regards to parking.
130.	Thank you for eliminating/reducing parking mandates. It only serves to subsidize and mandate car ownership. Let the market decide how many parking spots we really need.
131.	To me, the rationale of allowing builders to supply fewer parking spaces because that will encourage people to drive less is foolish. Ideally, it would be better for the health of our our environment if we all were to walk, ride a bike or use public transit. But most of the time, these methods of transportation are not adequate to get us to our destinations. Our dark and rainy months of Oct.- March are not great for walking or riding a bike to go shopping. Bus schedules ar seldom convenient.
132.	One of the most short sighted aspects of this plan is the exclusion of parking. Given the lack of available transit in the city, it's not effective to rely on Pierce Transit nor Sound Transit. This plan does not address further funding or even acknowledge the transit gap. Regardless, people will still own vehicles. Those vehicles will need to rest somewhere. The addition of more people, and more cars places a significant increase in the risk to residents. Before long, taxes will be raised
133.	Parking needs to be required and considered. We do not have a public transportation system that allows people working in other cities or who travel for work to be able to commute without owning a car. There is already not enough parking as my guests are often not able to park near my house. Not only do most households have a car but many have more than one and the exclusion of parking puts extra strain on the limited spaces available. Lack of parking is also a strong barrier to shoppers/visitors
134.	How will the city help individuals whose disabilities require parking close to their unit help insure the reduced parking does not affect accessibility? Will the remaining parking be ADA/reserved for individuals with disabilities and/or small children? How quickly do we think public transportation could accommodate the increased need for those who cannot walk to the local store/doctor/school/etc?

135.	If you try to limit cars, you will be hurting families, seniors, and businesses the most.
136.	So many of these new developments are allowed without any parking. That is a problem which continues to increase. Require the developer to provide 1 shared vehicle/ car share per 10 units as part of the rent calculation. This can be done for all building units. When a multi-unit development is more than 2,500 feet from public transportation it must have a minimum of 10 parking stalls for 10 units or more units. Then each 10 be provided with 1.5 stalls at a rate of with 2 - 3 bedroom units.
137.	<p>The habitable space (G) on page 13 of the Urban Residential Districts Development and Design Standards states that Street Facing Facades will have to have habitable space for 75% of the front of the building. This virtually eliminates two car garages on building lots with no alley access. This makes no sense.</p> <p>This will virtually kill the ability to get adequate garages on newly constructed homes with no alley? Terrible for parking? A new house 40 ft wide will not have enough space for a garage</p>
138.	The habitable space (G) on page 13 of the Urban Residential Districts Development and Design Standards requires 75% of the front facades of building to be habitable space. This makes no sense. On a 40 ft wide house plan leaves only has 10 ft for a garage on new construction houses. This virtually eliminates two car garages on building lots with no alley access. Any new house under 40 feet wide would not have enough frontage to even accommodate a garage at all. New home owners want 2 car garages!

Housing Types Comments (68)

1.	The new construction should reasonably match architecturally the existing structures in the neighborhood. This is important to get buy-in for this proposal.
2.	There are currently no restrictions on architectural style, so there should be no additional ones just because new buildings will be multifamily. Tacoma should not become a giant HOA policing how property owners' homes look.
3.	Given that "Home in Tacoma" is little more than a giveaway to developers, they should at least be required to make their cheap apartments look like the surrounding neighborhood.
4.	Despite earlier promises to the contrary, here is what the City's FAQ says about design review: "There will be no formal design review for the middle housing included in the HIT package." As suspected, a giveaway to developers. SCRAP THIS PROJECT.
5.	Matching local architecture is great. It may take a little more effort at the start, but nobody likes the look of large cube buildings that are so popular.
6.	I love the increased density. Hopefully more of this will include mixed use properties as well! That will increase tax revenue which is a benefit for project affordability
7.	Confused at why people call this a giveaway to developers. Developers have built all of our housing developments (yes, even your single family homes), might as well encourage denser, walkable developments if they are going to develop anyways.
8.	This proposal is an abomination. It will not "enhance the quality, character, and function of neighborhoods." To the contrary, it will destroy our beautiful neighborhoods in favor of cheaply constructed housing with little or no greenspace or parking. This is the worst proposal I have seen yet and just keeps getting worse. To think that UR-2 will now allow up to 8 units (with 2 being 'bonus') on what was previously a single family residence. You must be taking cues from communist housing.
9.	Developers didn't build our houses 100 years ago. Give me a break....
10.	HIT has created an unholy alliance between the developers and the socialists. I am not against development. I just want it to be architecturally pleasing, have greenspace and adequate parking. Whoops, I guess nice is more expensive. Ugly is cheap and clearly, that is what city leadership wants. Google the country's most affordable cities. If cost is all that matters, move to Gary, Indiana or Akron, Ohio but please don't ruin the city I've called home for 30 years.
11.	These are awful plans for our communities. The buildings will be cheap, large, and modern (aka ugly). We do not need to overdevelop our city. There is plenty of housing availability in Tacoma. Stop destroying our neighborhoods with large, ugly buildings!
12.	Tacoma is beautiful because of the historic homes and buildings throughout the city. Developers should be required to build structures that reflect the time period of the neighborhood. Annie Wright Seminary and Stadium districts will lose their charm if we begin putting very different architecture in the neighborhood. In addition, taller buildings

	than those around will restrict light needed for the tree canopy. Building heights should be limited.
13.	I wish we could have the option for taller, skinnier buildings. Then we would have more room for trees and amenity space, as well as housing - maybe even some parking. Tacoma really is a beautiful city if you get up on your roof and see it. Drone photography posted online proves it. I wish more people could see their city from higher up.
14.	Have you given serious consideration and investigation what the difficulties are to placing a manufactured home on Tacoma property. They are well built but according to the manufacturer distributors Tacoma is not friendly to manufactured home placement. Please consider checking this out.
15.	The size of an ADU is based on main home sq footage and not the square footage of the property. I live on an 8600+ lot and have a 1912 2 story home of 1200 square feet with a detached 2 car garage. I would like to build a 1200 sq foot ramble with a detached garage in my backyard which would accommodate them. I am told I would have to attach my current detached garage to my home in order to build a 500 sq ft garage and 1000 sqft ramble. My question is why? The rules have to be flexible.
16.	Why is isnt the size of an adu be based on the sq footage of the property and not the size of the primary home?? Really limits what can be built and still look estheticdally pleasing.
17.	Increased housing means less trees and more CO2. How do you plan to address this impact on the environment. Electric cars increase the heat generated at the charging station, further impacting global warming from cities. Why do you refuse to accept the science?
18.	The reality is Tacoma is going to need more housing, of all types and sizes, if we are going to properly respond to growth demands and pressure. This is not a gated community or HOA, this is a city for working people by working people that needs to be able to house everyone unless you'd all really enjoy seeing more unhoused individuals.
19.	Due to climate change, Tacoma is hotter than ever during the summer months. Why isn't there any green architecture/planning going on with this HIT effort? Now, is the time to showcase new materials and ways of building to keep the city cooler. Why are we doing "business as usual"? It seems that Tacoma is heavily influenced by developers and not looking out for their citizens and a warming climate. Western Europe, even Charleston, South Carolina are using innovation to minimize climate change
20.	Where are the promised design standards to prevent a giant Soviet-style building from overtaking a neighborhood with single-story homes and large setbacks?
21.	I agree with the person who wrote "scrap this proposal." Design standards (even if only for scale) need to be imposed. The Planning Commission will be negligent if they do not require some aesthetic standards. Please do not allow the Planning Commission and the City Council to destroy our beautiful city. If affordability is the only criteria, then there are lots of places in the US that people could move it. Please preserve our city.

22.	Nothing will be compatible with anything unless you decide to establish strict zoning standards. Where are the expected design standards to ensure that our neighborhoods are not destroyed one lot at a time? In Phase 1, the city tried to assuage our "fears" by telling us that they would put into place standards that would prevent incompatible additions to our neighborhoods. It appears that these were empty promises. The proposal needs to be rejected until these standards are in place.
23.	Interesting how the housing type that most people say they want (the single-family home) will become rarer and, using your logic, because of its limited supply will become even more expensive.
24.	Where are the pics of real places? It's easy to move on a Monopoly board your houses and replace them with a hotel and then sell the hotel at a loss to raise cash. It's not so easy to move real houses around on a lot, as needed.
25.	When you start a city from scratch, there are lots more options than trying to change a city into something that didn't start at and people resist.
26.	HiT, business as usual and then there's Copenhagen. It's going to be carbon neutral by 2025. They've addressed energy concerns by turning towards solar, wind power, and smart street lighting to greatly reduce its energy consumption and limit carbon emissions. Oh, and did I mention they have more bikes than cars. What value is HiT adding to our lives, certainly not with innovation. Who's more prepared for climate change? At least plant trees.
27.	In today's society, we find ourselves faced with the daunting task of finding balance between meeting human needs and reversing years of environmental strain. HiT could have introduced tree equity, a commitment to clean air, safe biking lanes, and energy efficient buildings. Unfortunately HiT isn't about building a sustainable, carbon neutral city, it's about the builders doing what they do best, buy, build and move on. Quality of life isn't part of HiT.
28.	No more need to fit into existing architecture, right? Gone by the wayside. I've seen the hideous boxes being "thrown up" and then painted garish colors. Who is profiting from this? Who wants this? Not the citizens of Tacoma. People unfortunately are uninformed and not paying attention. What a shame to trash our pretty little city!
29.	More housing choices work better when you have a vacant area of land to work with (that is, a new city). These little developments don't work so well when the city is already developed (that is, Tacoma).
30.	I support different housing types . . . only if there are defined design standards. Unfortunately, this plan offers NO design standards. A metal box without windows and any other amenities could be placed on practically the entire lot. This is not right.
31.	The only reason the Home in Tacoma plan passed without protest initially was because of the promise that design standards would be established. And now there are none. It could be ugly and it could take over an entire lot and no one seems to care.
32.	There is nothing in this plan to prevent Soviet bloc-style housing from taking over the city. I don't think even the socialists want to live in these places.

33.	Tragic to find out that there are no aesthetic standards at all in this hastily created plan. Even supporters of Home in Tacoma should fight more and expect some kind of standards.
34.	Who is John Galt?
35.	If only we could create little cottages in the middle of city neighborhoods. Need to look at reality, not a little dream.
36.	Ironic and sad that we would think about making less available the very thing (homes with yards) that most people want scarcer and scarcer. We should be finding a way to make single-family neighborhoods happen.
37.	Please consider allowing regulated tiny houses as options for ADUs or cottage style housing. These homes have allowed many, who may not otherwise be able to afford it, to become homeowners and support both their newly adult and aging family members.
38.	An argument to be made is wasted space. Look at a map of Res lots, how much space does the building occupy? How much space is tree, garden, play space, etc? How much is just grass or bare dirt? How many junker cars are on the lot? How often are residents actually using these spaces? Much of the time, too much of the lot is dedicated to spaces people maybe spend one or two afternoons of the week. Much of this space would be better served as housing rather than needless open space.
39.	Having multiple housing options to select from will help people find the right place for them. not everyone can afford or wants a single family residence. Having multiple family buildings face sidewalks along a commercial corridor will help create community pride and engagement.
40.	Missing from this plan are defined, detailed design standards with a design review process that considers input from each of the neighborhood residents.
41.	The draft doesn't explain how neighborhood patterns will be defined and who will define them. You need a requirement for input from neighborhood members who best understand what they want and don't want their neighborhood to look like. We don't want cookie-cutter and one-size-fits-all answers, to design.
42.	Individually, the pictures shown look fine, but they don't look good beside each other. Without standards, we will have a hodge-podge. Please allow for a design review so that we can ensure that the growth works for all involved.
43.	What support do you offer to homeowners who are interested in creating UR1/2/3 vs. commercial developers? it would be great if the city offer classes or process for small business/property owners to explore this options so that they can contributing economic vitalization in their communities?
44.	Can we have the law that the city or the developer must work the neighbors to offer model designs that we would like to see existing in each of our communities?
45.	I definitely agree that we need the oversight of a design board so that new buildings will look good in the neighborhood. After seeing all of the Soviet-block style buildings with no green space that have erupted around the city, I know that we can and should do better in terms of appearance.

46.	The city loves to use Salishan as a model. Not sure how you can replicate a "village" in the city unless you take out entire blocks, but if you take out entire blocks then developers will want full-block apartments like those in Proctor. Cottage housing seems to be a pipe dream.
47.	The planners have imposed their standards on us. I would prefer my own private space (even if it is small) instead of a larger public space that I would have to share with neighbors who I might not trust or want to spend time with. We already have public spaces--they're called parks and schools.
48.	We don't want to live in a socialist collective. As Americans, we want our own space.
49.	Please clarify how these design types will ensure availability of units with 3+ bedrooms. Otherwise demand for single family homes will continue to proliferate. Need design specs that mandate developers to have a certain number of units beyond the one bedroom box.
50.	Please consider preserving our historic neighborhoods, and increasing density in areas where there is still a lot of area to expand. Many areas downtown, on 6th Ave, and parts of Pearl street have open spaces and/or rundown buildings where you could incentivize building and growth. Take a walk through Ballard, in Seattle, where they have stripped historic architecture. This isn't what we want in any of our old neighborhoods... smaller affordable homes being torn down & replaced w/ expensive townhs
51.	Our lovely city has grown up over time. There are many distinctive areas that reflect the time period. There should be more effort to respect and reflect these special areas. I am so angry to see that no one is willing to provide any design standards.
52.	Keep new housing types limited in height so that our tree canopy has enough light
53.	If this were well thought out, there would be design standards. Instead we have this rushed proposal, which was promised to have some 'architecture' rules, etc. Many of us in Tacoma love the history and historic buildings. These designs give our neighborhoods character and charm. We are proud of our neighborhoods. This is going to allow it all to be destroyed, just for developers to make a dollar. Cheap, ugly, boring box 'homes'. Think Salishan or the new buildings at 37th and McKinley. Awful.
54.	I am opposed to building apartment complexes with fancy names like and courtyard housing right next door to 100 year old homes where people have specifically moved...and paid a premium for in order to experience livability and safety. The Cushman station should remain a historic building used to enhance existing character of proctor. Adding a few hundred high cost rental units will not help with Tacomas affordable housing issues.
55.	No to smaller lots
56.	Please do not change the Narrowmoor community west of Jackson from 6th ave. S to 19th ave S. to UR 1 or UR 2 allowing multi-family housing. The roads are too narrow to park additional vehicles, there are no community sidewalks and this would destroy the small remaining view property left in Tacoma

57.	Emphasize the development of townhomes with individual narrow lots (think Chicago or Baltimore); emphasize the construction of 3 or 4 story apartments where one unit occupies a floor (think Montreal). Ensure that FAR is as flexible as possible to allow for the construction of family-size residences—and additional units more generally.
58.	Actual design standards will be needed. I couldn't find any in the plan.
59.	Compatibility doesn't "just happen." Design standards need to be imposed in terms of setbacks, height restrictions, and general neighborhood patterns to ensure compatibility. Someone didn't do his or her homework. Maybe the dog ate the homework?
60.	We are planning for a garage/ADU on our property and permitting should be made more streamlined and speedy. We understand that controls are required and necessary, but an ordinary citizen should not have to jump through multiple hoops, spend thousands of dollars and wait for months to get a building permit. It is not only big-money developers that hold a key to expanding housing choices, but individual citizens should be part of the plan.
61.	How many "choices" will be left when the choice that people want most (SF homes) starts to disappear? If I really want to wear a pink dress, but you offer me a purple or orange crop top (without the pants), I'm not going to be happy.
62.	I don't see any lovely cottage housing coming into Tacoma. We haven't seen it in Seattle, so why should we see it here?
63.	I don't see how this legalizes true rowhouses. I feel the charm of row houses is that over time different styles of homes built at different times can all come together to form a cohesive street. However with the current side setbacks this could never happen. We could only get rowhouse shaped multiplexes that are completely separate buildings.
64.	Home in Tacoma describes creating 'new' housing types, implying that HIT is a silver bullet. The fact of the matter is that each of the housing types in the proposal already exist. These housing types are currently being built all over the City. High rise, multi plex, quad plex, triplex, duplex, ADUs. They are happening all over. So why then is it that we need wholesale rezoning?
65.	Housing types need to fit the neighborhood's character and be of good quality. Don't build housing that will revert into future slums in less than 10 years. Ensure that quality housing can be good looking and affordable. Also, have trees and adequate yard space for people to enjoy.
66.	This entire proposal needs to be paused to give more time for staff and community review. The community can now review it. Staff needs to look carefully at the 600 comments to ensure we don't have too many unintended consequences. Specific consideration needs to be given to single family homes in commercial zones; also staff needs to show what a 35 foot and a 45 foot structure looks like and where it would be allowed. MONSTER HOUSING next to a Craftsman is not a good transition.
67.	Housing should fit into the character of the neighborhood and the aesthetical there. There needs to be a design standard, adequate parking, and a height requirement so as not to impede on views. I do not want major apartment complexes, hotels and other disrupting structures built next door especially when they will ruin the charm and character that is what drew many of us to make a home in Tacoma. Large complexes and luxury apartments are not the answer

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 68. | Don't forsake quality for "affordability". What we don't want to see are multi-family housing that is cheaply thrown together and then, within just a few short years, becomes an eyesore in the neighborhood. Insist upon a design review panel that includes the neighbors who live there- neighbors who have invested their time and money and are deserving in how their neighborhood should look and function. |
|------------|---|

Amenity Space and Tree Requirements Comments (89)

1.	More trees, please!
2.	I'm very excited to see the proposed tree requirements for new development and the first ever protections for trees on private property. And that the development and landscaping code are being addressed at the same time. I have concerns around the variance process and that so much weight appears to be on the Planning Director to approve or deny variances. We need MORE TREES in Tacoma. Our canopy is embarrassingly low. Please do not allow for variances!
3.	I believe more trees are always a good thing. However, I also think it is important to consider the urban farming movement or just everyday gardeners. A property filled with tree shade could make it difficult to grow produce. I am wondering if it is possible to make an exception or allowance for land that is set aside for this purpose.
4.	Is amenity space required to be outside? Do balconies count as meeting the requirement if the balcony is less than 100sf?
5.	I appreciate the balance of density and useable open space (amenity space). I believe this is critical to a liveable community. There could be a provision to allow a city owned or metro parked own park within a certain distance to count. Do not allow development to use schools.
6.	There need to be more trees in areas where we are planning more density. If they can't be planted on parcels where we are putting housing, then the City needs to convert some general purpose traffic lanes or turning lanes in some spots to boulevard medians with trees. That is what University Place did to Bridgeport and twenty years later it is beautiful and thriving.
7.	Trees are very important for property value, aesthetic, and environmental reasons, but should take a back seat to housing. Density in Tacoma prevents urban sprawl in Pierce County. It would be great to add a tiered approach to tree requirements where housing is the first priority and trees have a higher priority than parking spaces.
8.	The EIS indicates the tree canopy will decrease or, with additional legislation, perhaps be maintained. It says it is okay to not meet this goal because other communities will make up the difference. I would like to "yes and" this issue and ensure we increase the tree canopy and improve the walkability as we increase housing density.
9.	Adding trees is wonderful but the city doesn't cut public space next to the roads and sidewalks now. Look around in the summer time its a mess. Who takes care of these spaces? Green? I don't see much green care in Tacoma because it's hard to see beyond all the trash and homelessness.
10.	If trees over 24" are required to be preserved, wouldn't everyone cut down any tree that reaches 23" in order to preserve their ability to build on the land later? This seems to encourage the opposite of the goal to have more tree canopy. Also, the majority of infill lots are either empty (with a lot of trees), or are a single-family home's current side yard or back yard which also often have large trees. It seems that this mandate will dramatically reduce the buildable lots for infill.

11.	ROW trees seem easy to do and a good option, but requiring tree canopy in a city seems odd when you can drive 10 minutes south, east, or west and be in a literal forest. The larger area is not lacking for tree space, why are we trying to increase canopy in what is turning into a modern city?
12.	I am very concerned about the variance process; right now, if I'm reading correctly, it is up to the planning department to decide whether or not a variance will be allowed. This should be left up to the urban forestry department, NOT the planning department. The planning department does not accurately understand the importance of our current tree canopy.
13.	Have you increased the tree care/maintenance budget along roadways? The deciduous trees are messy and in the fall the drains get plugged and the leaves make the roads slick. Also have noticed the types of trees have roots that spread out and break up the sidewalks making them dangerous. Also some of them grow so tall that they impede electrical wires.
14.	I am VERY excited about the tree preservation requirements and tree planting requirements. Trees are so important! I am concerned that bonuses can be combined to reduce the tree requirement all the way down to 15%. Why are we continuing to perpetuate inequitable tree canopy placement. If affordable housing can have less tree canopy, then poorer neighborhoods will continue to have less tree canopy than the rest of the city. We are essentially codifying racist practices.
15.	Can evergreen shrubs substitute for trees on a property? If a variance is requested in removing a tree, we will have to pay the city to be able to remove the tree, then pay to have the tree cut down in order to build your structure. Doesn't make sense to pay the city to remove a large tree when smaller trees would be required anyway to replace the larger tree. Too stringent with not a lot of flexibility. Unintended consequences with inflexibility.
16.	I've read thru the proposed code and think that differentiating between street and site trees is an unnecessary distinction. I have a lot with 8 trees, 7 are street trees, and many are mature. there is not room (or light!) for more trees, nor would you want me to cut down mature healthy street trees to make room to plant site trees. any healthy large tree should count towards the credits ;)
17.	Happy about all of the proposed amenity and tree space requirements in the proposed code change. Tacoma has one of the smallest urban canopies and we need to be doing more to protect existing street trees and encourage developers to value site trees. With that thinking in mind, it would be nice to raise the Fee-in-Lieu to force developers to invest in Tacoma's tree canopy instead of allow them to pay to increase urban heat island effect.
18.	Portland intentionally reduced City parking in the 70's to make the city walkable and less congested. Portland has a light rail. Tacoma's HIT is removing parking and adding bike parking without bike lanes or rapid transit. We have a light rail that only goes in a semi-circle for a few miles and leaves much of Tacoma without options except for a car. How can you reduce parking without transit options? Our bike lanes are incomplete and poorly marked. It's dangerous to bike in Tacoma.

19.	Lidar shows Tacoma's tree canopy at 15.3 %. (This is excluding the non-buildable Point Defiance and the gulches.) With global warming/ climate change, residents need access to cooling trees. Our great city has the lowest tree canopy in the Puget Sound Basin, yet we want to incentive builders to provide affordable housing by reducing the number of trees they need to plant. This is a social justice issue. People need access to trees regardless of income.
20.	My partner and I bought a home here in 2016. We love our 100 year old Craftsman bungalow but the one thing that disturbed me to my core was the lack of tree lined streets and the brutal practice of topping trees. I live in the Historic District and even though houses are protected from major changes without a permit, the mature trees that were taken down for no apparent reason have not been protected. Now HiT aims to build structures and most likely, removed mature trees. We need trees!
21.	When the City of Tacoma has an urban forestry department of 1 how does it expect to accomplish a 30% tree canopy. The forestry department needs to be funded. Enforcement also needs to be funded. It doesn't matter what the city passes if it doesn't fund it, it's not going to happen. We need more trees to reduce heat and process rain run off. We need to plan for climate change. Plant more trees.
22.	Urban forest investment and stewardship increases the value of your home and of commercial properties: Price Increase Condition 1. 3-5% trees in front yard 2. 7% rental rates for commercial offices having quality landscape 3. 6-9% good tree cover in neighborhood 4. 9-12% reported increase in consumer spending in forested business districts 5. 10-15% mature trees in high-income neighborhoods Get inspired Tacoma. Instead of being at the bottom for every metric regarding tree canopy, lead the way.
23.	“A number of studies have found that exposure to urban forests generally reduces mental and physical stress, anxiety, and depression, and that they improve moods.” Yale Climate Connections https://yaleclimateconnections.org/ HIT should be green scaping, showcasing new building materials. Building location and shape can create shade. Yes, we need more tree canopy, and we also need less asphalt and other impervious surfaces.
24.	“A number of studies have found that exposure to urban forests generally reduces mental and physical stress, anxiety, and depression, and that they improve moods.” Yale Climate Connections https://yaleclimateconnections.org/
25.	How do you have any space for amenities when you have reduced the setbacks to practically nothing? Look at the plan and you will find that the anything that prevents you from living beside metal boxes are a few tree requirements that most developers will just opt out of by paying a small in lieu fee. We have no protections.
26.	Since the City will be requiring more trees, they should not make the property owner responsible for damage that required trees do to sidewalks. Especially if part of the aim of

	HiT is to encourage more people to own homes, there are some equity implications of holding homeowners responsible for the damage required trees do to infrastructure.
27.	Too many loopholes for developers. Limit the levels of density to make way for trees.
28.	Where are amenities like rain gardens and benches and landscaping besides trees? I just see a lot of impervious pavement.
29.	Put some teeth into the tree canopy "requirement" or it will fail.
30.	Now we're getting somewhere. The tree canopy proposal is the only thing in this proposal that will actually improve our city, but even that has loopholes which developers will just work around.
31.	I love the idea of tree canopies, but it is another pie-in-the sky idea that is incompatible with growth.
32.	Hey wait, if trees are so important (something we actually all can agree on), then maybe (just maybe) we should reduce the density standards so that trees will be compatible with people. Just sayin'.
33.	The only thing worth keeping in this flawed draft is the tree canopy requirement. Go trees.
34.	Didn't see much in the way of amenities in this proposal. Just a lot of bike racks on streets. Hoping that we could do better in terms of quality of life.
35.	If we get amenity space (like a park), won't that just push our neighborhood into a higher category of density? Good luck, Metro Parks and city of Tacoma, in convincing us to vote for a park or a school when it will increase the density allowances in our neighborhood. Sorry that I purchased a home too close to an "amenity." Dreaming of a Green Acres life. The country is the place for me.
36.	More trees please.
37.	Pull back on unrealistic zoning goals to ensure that the tree canopy happens. The worst of worlds would be that we cut down the trees in anticipation of building that never happens.
38.	Tree canopy cools the air temperature, cleans the air, reduces particulate matter, and reduces storm water. Studies show people are less stressed around trees. Why isn't the Forestry dept and the City of Tacoma accountable for not increasing our canopy in the last 15 years? HiT continues tree inequity. The builders are in the drivers sit with Hit and we'll end up with a bunch of uninspired rectangular housing like the California junction in West Seattle. Showcase innovation, not status quo.
39.	As far as I'm considered, we can't have enough trees in our city. Instead of expanding the multi-tax exemption, let's expand the tree requirements.
40.	If we don't expand the tree requirements, we will become one giant apartment complex without any relief from noise.
41.	The tree canopy requirement is necessary and should not be negotiable. I beg you to expand the requirements. I want to make sure that trees are not only planted, but are maintained.
42.	If the City is really serious about increasing its tree canopy levels, then it needs to decrease the density levels to a low of four per lot.

43.	There need to be many more amenities. People are having more pets and fewer kids. Where are the doggie parks so that dogs can run free sometime? We already have enough people who don't pick up after their dogs. What are we going to do with more dogs without separate spaces for animals?
44.	Beyond trees, I don't see anything else regarding amenities to make our city look better. I'd like to see rain gardens, resting spots, special landscaping, and more. There needs to be something to look at besides metal walls.
45.	You need to make the developers utilize the whole space with amenities that are as beautiful as they are functional. They need to be added into the plan.
46.	Throw us dogs some bones. Inadequate to make us swallow HIT.
47.	Who is John Galt?
48.	Not enough amenities to make Home in Tacoma palatable. I'm still a big NO.
49.	I recently learned that Tacoma replaces City trees approximately every 10 years. Is that the plan for the HiT trees as well
50.	Planting as many Native trees and native for other landscaping is something that should be considered. Is it in the Landscaping Code?
51.	Where is the space for parks and shops and gathering spaces? Just seems like the city is willing to give up every inch to buildings. Must keep larger distances between curbs and homes and between homes. Trees are a start, but we need bushes and winding trails and gazebos and benches and trellises too.
52.	Make way for lovely things to look at, like fountains and sculptures.
53.	like the plan for more trees but it seems like builders can get out of planting trees easily
54.	You should provide for more negative space. Too much stimulation with too much stuff going on. Too busy.
55.	Trees will lead to more calming space for people. If you just lower the zoning densities, it would be a lot easier to keep and spread the trees.
56.	UR3 builders should be required to create things that the whole walking community can benefit from. That could include and is not limited to fountains, places to sit, bushes, trees, murals, weathervanes, sculptures. Require something to make the area inviting.
57.	More plantings needed.
58.	Thoughtful development lifts up the people and the planet. HiT is not thoughtful development. It's being pushed on us by the Master Builders who are involved for short term profits. Has the Puyallup tribe been included in the development of HiT? Let's be thoughtful about growth and include experts such as, Kate Wolf UW, (psychological impacts of forests on humans). People who live around trees, happier and healthier than those living without trees. Dr. Kathleen L. Wolf (washington.edu).
59.	Fee in Lieu should not be allowed and the variance process (if there needs to be one) should be overseen by the Urban Forestry Department, not by the Planning Department. And where is the Urban Forest Commission called for in the 2019 Urban Forestry Plan? Who is ensuring that there's enough transparency in this process?

60.	Why are bonuses allowed to reduce the tree canopy requirement to 15%. This is codifying tree inequity! 30% should be the minimum required, not 15%!
61.	More native trees!
62.	There should be provisions where for every tree removed due to development, 2 or more should be planted to replace them/donations made to Tacoma Tree Foundation to support greening efforts. Further, fruit producing trees should be allowed throughout the city, perhaps in public parks like the Blueberry park
63.	This is excellent!! Heritage trees need to remain on sites, as they are valued. One can't just replace a 60 year old tree with a 10 year old tree. We can design our structures around these magnificent trees. There is no reason to cut them down. Tacoma's tree canopy is very small. Trees will help shade pavement and homes to cut utility costs. Not to mention, trees, especially old trees, have been shown to lower our stress.
64.	Can we have a say where the three should go? 20 years ago, my street got expanded and trees were added but never considered of the driveway block or the power lines interfere.
65.	I already have trees on my property and they are big and unsafe to build any structure around, I would like to keep them and build around it, will there be any incentive or service to look at the health and safety of those three?
66.	hard to grow big trees when there's not much space to work with. Great idea to increase tree canopy. The best way to do that is to keep big setbacks so that the space exists for trees to thrive.
67.	Tree canopy requirements need to be combined with incentives for property owners to plant and maintain trees. City urban forestry staff must be increased so we have crews working with those property owners to ensure tree survival. City urban forestry staff must also be increased to plant and maintain young trees in our rights-of-way, parks, schools, etc. Our increasingly hot summers make tree care and watering even more important. Variances approved to cut down trees must be strictly limited!
68.	If you were really committed to increasing the tree canopy, you would ensure that there is some space left on lots so that trees can be planted and grow to their natural size.
69.	Without big setbacks, any reference to tree canopy is just lip service. Go back to the original setbacks so that we can plant trees.
70.	You need to make a commitment to planting trees by providing necessary space (i.e. normal setbacks). Otherwise, it's all just virtue-signaling.
71.	We need more trees in Tacoma and to get rid of shady tree trimmers who top and destroy existing mature trees. We also need to eliminate laws that discourage tree planting on the curb strips. We need to "Tree Tacoma!!"
72.	Please require tree protections and multi-year accountability for tree health standards in new developments. Some trees can take a century to replace and its benefits to the community will be lost for many generations.
73.	There's so much factual evidence about the value of having trees in cities. City officials have made many comments about the need for trees, especially as an equity issue. If tree protections and requirements aren't a part of this policy, what's the point of having facts and official comments?

74.	Yes, this should be encouraged but this proposal is inconsistent with your proposed increased density in the Tacoma neighborhoods. Look at the apartment complex in the old K-Mart site. No buffering or landscaping.
75.	City can plant trees as a utility service to “parking strips” in front of residential housing. Other cities do this.
76.	It seems too easy to get around tree requirements with fees and this will impact neighborhoods that need the canopy the most like South Tacoma, the South End, Hilltop, etc.
77.	Tacoma seems poised to make a much-needed increase in tree coverage. The plan must go beyond wishes to funded action, not dependent on citizen volunteering to plant and manage trees.
78.	In view of our progressive attitude toward electric vehicles, the City needs to take action to install electric charging stations, especially in areas without garages (like mine) and only street parking. If auto charging can generate funds for the City, so much the better. Or the City might make it more attractive to businesses to install charging stations.
79.	The plan needs to assure that it is not the cause of decreased tree coverage as development increases. Ordinances need to require the retention of existing trees as much as possible. In this way, one part of the Plan does not negate another provision of the Plan.
80.	I support increasing Tacoma's tree canopy with programs that do not solely depend on the onus of the homeowner/landlord/renter to initiate the process of procuring trees to plant.
81.	Many of these items should be provided in the public ROW, as opposed to on-site. Strike a balance between achieving infill development goals without creating unnecessary hurdles for infill development by over-regulating parcels.
82.	i'm going to echo what was said elsewhere: Please require tree protections and multi-year accountability for tree health standards in new developments. Some trees can take a century to replace and its benefits to the community will be lost for many generations.
83.	Holistic approaches should be taken on amenity space and trees. I like the intent here but it should be about the neighborhood as well, not just the individual unit. Buildings should have space between them, setbacks should never be reduced, and their should be green space between them. Road side sidewalks should be wide with trees or greenery as much as possible. Making a building affordable by cutting back on setbacks and reducing the walking/biking area is not equity. Go up not out.
84.	Strong and legally binding protection for existing healthy trees should be part of the plan. Planting new trees is a wonderful step, but there needs to be a feasible plan to protect our existing trees. If a home or property owner were required to keep and maintain trees on their property the City should offer help and guidance to that effect, so that there would be alternatives to just taking trees down.
85.	The footprint of the buildings and the shade canopies of the trees leave little or no space for gardens. Gardens need SUN for at least 6-8 hours a day. this means fewer flowers to attract pollinators, fewer spaces for people to grow fruits and vegetables, or just beautiful landscape plants. Please rethink keeping parts of lots accessible to 6-8 hours of sun a day. The current footprint is not sun-friendly for gardens.

86.	Trees make for great neighborhoods regardless of building size. Prioritizing our tree lined streets now will only make our neighborhoods even better when those trees reach maturity.
87.	Trees AND housing. We CAN and MUST have both!! In 2019, our City declared a Climate Emergency. As in any emergency, we are expected to not drag our feet and come up with excuses. Instead, we must act quickly! Therefore, we need to accept the fact that TREES are one of the best ways to mitigate for Climate Change. Preserve the mature trees we have and plant thousands more to achieve our 30% tree canopy goal by 2030. Let's get busy! The longer we wait, the worse our environment will become!
88.	The Code must require for ALL housing units 1 Large Tree per bedroom and allow for a fee (\$750) in lieu of in cases where their is inadequate space for the quantity of Trees. This is regardless of other Code requirements or allowances. This fee would be put into the Urban Forestry Fund to strengthen Tacomas commitment to Climate Protection and reducing the Heat Island effects throughout the City. The Basis is simply bedrooms, 1 Large Tree per Bedroom. You don't need algebra to calculate.
89.	There needs to be a CLEAR accountability plan regarding the Variance process so that it doesn't become a LOOPHOLE that will threaten the loss of existing trees on building sites. It takes the average tree 20 to 30 years to begin to provide it's environmental benefits. Protecting and preserving our mature trees will go a long ways to mitigate for the Climate Emergency as declared by the City of Tacoma in 2019.
90.	The more density we have, the more our citizens need open green spaces that provide us with numerous health benefits. Adequate housing is more than just a roof over our heads, it's also the area around the housing. We cannot pack every square inch of a lot with housing without adding a green space for children to run and play in the fresh air and for adults to garden, sit and read under the shade of a tree or walk amongst the flower beds. Exposure to nature provides us with a sense of well being
91.	Included in Home in Tacoma should be the specific financial benefits for the average tree- in terms of cleaning our polluted air, providing oxygen, cleaning stormwater runoff, providing air conditioning to our buildings, etc. If we take a close look at the HUGE financial benefits that each tree gives us, there will be a greater incentive to save the trees we have and to plant thousands more. As the saying goes "Money (does) grow on trees! YES, we CAN and we MUST have housing AND trees.

Affordability and Retention Bonuses Comments (53)

1.	"Affordable" is a meaningless term. What's affordable to one, may not work for another. That's how markets work. There should be NO incentive to put up low income housing in our neighborhoods, especially since there is so much open space in south Pierce County. Who moves to an area that he can't afford and then demands that the government subsidize his lifestyle? Insane.
2.	Pierce County is extremely expensive! Thank god we're finally changing this
3.	Denser neighborhoods are so much more affordable, not just in housing costs, but others too! If you can walk or bike to get groceries, go to work, etc. thats a lot of gas money saved!
4.	Affordability will help a lot with the current homelessness problems in Tacoma
5.	HIT and MFTE policies seem counterproductive. Imagine if Tacoma had 25 homeowners and 15 homes. The homes would be expensive as the wealthier people would bid up the prices. If there were 100 homes in the city for the 25 people, the cost of housing would be much cheaper as there would be plenty for all. Why can't we just make housing more legal by right, rather than providing tax handouts or more hoops for builders to jump through? It seems a faster way to provide housing for everyone.
6.	This plan does little-to-nothing for what the City calls "deeply affordable housing." The plan is actually more about incentivizing "moderately affordable housing" and leaves unsolved the need for the former. It's not about creating more homeowners; it's about creating more landlords. It will result in driving more people into rental housing that benefits the investor class and real estate development interests, non-local LLCs and the greater financialization of housing as a commodity.
7.	End the MFTE (Multi-Family Tax Exemption) Program and other developer bonuses. It's merely a windfall for developers (and their investors) that shifts their property tax burden to existing homeowners, amounting to a significant increase in our own property taxes. We should stop subsidizing their development costs and the private profits of developers and condo owners at places like Point Ruston or anywhere else. Some of those projects owe millions in back taxes and creditors as it is.
8.	Tacoma should not throw up subsidized housing. Socialists always want to tear down what others have. It's a disorder grounded in jealousy.
9.	Creating 'affordable' housing in every neighborhood in Tacoma is a great way to destroy all the desirable neighborhoods in Tacoma. There is a reason people desire to live in the north end of Tacoma: the historic and beautiful single-family homes, established neighborhoods, and quiet, safe streets. Adding low-income housing as well as mid-size housing will do nothing but quickly deteriorate these communities. Do not pervert our neighborhoods!
10.	Lawns of grass are overrated. It would be really cool if we could have more courtyard housing like they have in Europe, where there are buildings built up to the sidewalk and on the inside of the block there is a nice garden or community space. It's better to preserve a large back yard than to require large setbacks in the front.

11.	We need housing AND trees; don't allow for developers to buy down their tree canopy requirements. This would exacerbate the tree inequity that already exists. We need more trees in the city! Don't allow for developers to buy down their tree canopy requirements.
12.	50 years to get any housing bonuses are so long that few can comprehend the impact and few will apply for them. As a result, only the baseline will primarily be built. Consider changing this to something more reasonable like 12 years that the MFTE is.
13.	Is global warming worth the cost of cheap housing that is poorly insulated? What standards do you propose to offset the increased global warming from denser housing? Or from the poorly built housing? This plan is extremely flawed.
14.	Appreciative of the bonuses proposed. More housing options is always needed.
15.	End the multi-family tax exemption. Nothing that is created is affordable. The costs outweigh the benefits. The existing homeowners are tired of giving a free ride to the developers who keep destroying our neighborhoods with their Soviet-style block housing.
16.	Fifty year bonuses. If an individual started a business at age 22, he'd be 72 in fifty years. I guess you are talking about giving big development/financial companies a break. This seems proof that the city is catering to developers.
17.	I don't buy the argument that anyone can just move anywhere they want to and expect that someone else will foot the bill. There is only so much we can do as taxpayers to subsidize people who will never afford to live in Tacoma.
18.	Money, money, money. Is that what this is all about?
19.	I attended a Tacoma City Council meeting a few years ago. The representative from Olympia admitted that there was no evidence that multi-family tax exemptions worked. Yet here we are trying to expand them. If there is no evidence that they encourage development and affordability, then why are we passing on the burden to our taxpayers?
20.	If multi-family tax exemptions were working as well as you think they are, then why haven't they led to greater affordability? Insanity seems to be doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result.
21.	Same old tools. MFTE seems to be a losing proposition for the city's budget. We'll never get that missed tax revenue back. Not sure why we keep encouraging developers to build when no one really benefits except for the developer.
22.	Why do we keep providing incentives for developers to build here? If they want to build somewhere else because someone else gives them a better deal, let them build there. We won't be so crowded.
23.	If a business keeps selling products at a price below their costs it will go out of business. The city should stop this crazy practice of enticing developers by allowing them to build something at a price below the city's costs. The taxpayers get stuck with the bill by forced to pay more for police, fire, schools, libraries and all of the services. Everyone should pay their fair share.
24.	Don't let the developers off the hook when it comes to the tree canopy. We can't afford those trees.
25.	Who is John Galt?

26.	No where in your material have I seen a definition of "affordable housing." I lived in Seattle during the building craze and heard and witnessed how people were told that they would be able to afford to live in the new development after being forced to leave their apartments. It didn't happen. They were unable to afford to return to their communities.
27.	Creative, affordable, housing options are crucial to the growth of our city. Tacoma residents need housing options. I am in favor of creative housing that allows for density in repurposed buildings with historic significance in residential neighborhoods. Historic gathering places are often set up very well for group housing. Please allow creative, sustainable uses that don't demolish beautiful buildings, but instead use their structures to increase housing options. Well done leading this change.
28.	It is not clear to me if/how the MFTE and other financial benefits do or could work for existing homeowners, particularly those who have multi-generational households. For example, I would benefit from financial incentives for folks to build DADUs or mother-in-law units to explicitly house my non-dependent family members (i.e. parents), who otherwise qualify for section 8/medicaid (therefore are low-income). Please include families, not just developers, in these plans.
29.	It would be wonderful if the city could create a set of 3-7 pre approved DADU designs/blueprints for some of the smaller detached housing types. The current process requires tens of thousands of dollars in up-front costs for permitting and design work before construction even begins, which is cost-prohibitive especially if folks are interested in offering housing at a lower price. If there was a pre-approved design that would be instantly granted permission it would open many doors.
30.	If I am the property owner and want to take advantage of this incentive, why would i need to go through another hoop to get this grant when I should automatically received them.
31.	We should not replace existing affordable units with more expensive ones that will price people out of their neighborhoods. Many of the new "missing middle" options should be in the form of condos, townhomes, etc. in which aspiring homeowners can begin building home equity. Rental units must be available as a stepping stone. With the tenant rights initiative that was recently passed, some property owners may stop renting out their spaces to avoid expenses and difficulties with future tenants.
32.	Thank you for including affordability and anti displacement strategies and priorities in the Home in Tacoma plan. I just want to leave this comment in support of affordability and anti displacement as secure, safe, and stable housing for all in Tacoma is of utmost importance.
33.	thanks for extending the mfte to ur3 zones. I own a ur3 lot. i want to provide housing that is affordable for 50 years, and I want to have a tax break for 12 years to help me to do it. I am pleased to see that a occupant/owner now has access to the same benefit as large corporate developers.
34.	Developers should be encouraged to build but not at the expense of residents. There is no reason why the developers of apartment complexes should not be required to re-pave St Helens. Developers too often get a free ride.
35.	I understand that developers sometimes need (or expect) tax abatements in order to make a project feasible. However, the existing tax base (you and me) will be required to pay for the City's support of new development (utilities, services, etc.) Therefore, I ask that the plan provide the minimum tax abatement amount that will allow new construction.

36.	The amount of "affordable" housing specified in the plans seems minimal, in view of the existing market for housing in, say, the Hilltop area currently. Of course, the amount set in the plan needs to accommodate realistic development costs so that affordable housing is provided but does not become a disincentive to development.
37.	Please do not change the Narrowmoor community west of Jackson and between 6th and 19th Ave S. to UR 1 or UR 2. Doing this would destroy a small community and not add affordable housing. Don't be fooled by developers. They would merely add more residences onto existing lots and sell all of them for high prices.
38.	Please see Habitat for Humanity comments sent to: homeintacoma@cityoftacoma.org
39.	There is no reason for developers to get a tax break on non-affordable housing. Homeowners shouldn't be expected to pick up the tab for wealthy developers if it doesn't help the less fortunate. I'm all for giving tax breaks if it helps low-income people into housing, but not the least bit interested in paying more tax because the rich don't want to. The \$24 dollar per month reduction on a \$2600/month apartment for the tax break the developers got is ridiculous and should never happen.
40.	Go up, not out. Reducing setbacks is not equity. Room for trees, greenery is necessary.
41.	What about affordability to homeowners who want to build something? Where are the programs to support them dividing their lot, financing the building, using local companies? Why is all this money geared toward developers? And the definition of affordable is disgustingly high. There needs to be a higher percentage of units dedicated to actually affordable rent. Developers shouldn't get a "bonus" for retaining an existing building, they should pay a fee if they don't.
42.	It is more expensive to build up than out, so why do we think increased density will drive down prices? How do you explain that the most densely populated cities are some of the most expensive places to live? Manhattan, Honolulu, and Tokyo are all very expensive. Think about it.
43.	So long as construction costs are high (due to high minimum wages, limited pool of artisans, high cost of materials), any new housing units will be expensive. Don't forget about inflation, which has made everything more expensive, including housing. You just can't get around that. Economists agree that passing out "free money" has led, in part, to inflation. So why do we think passing out more free money will bring down costs?
44.	There are only so many people we can subsidize before we don't have the money to pay for our own housing. No easy answers. We just need to be realistic with people about the cost of things. I suspect that people who have been renters their whole lives have no idea the thousands and thousands of dollars a new roof, new furnace, new sewer line, new water pump costs installed. Building more housing units won't bring down any of those costs of building and maintaining homes.
45.	If retention bonuses actually brought down the cost of housing to manageable levels, then I might support them. Right now the very small reductions in rent prices have been insignificant. And you wonder why the ordinary taxpayer wonders how this plan can make any difference in his life.

46.	People should live where they can afford. It's not the government's job to subsidize housing so that anyone can live in any neighborhood. The very idea is absurd.
47.	Well-informed and rational decisions are made by considering all viewpoints and implications on those impacted by these decisions. The decision-making process needs to involve transparency and honesty BEFORE decisions put in motion. Clearly giving bonuses to builders is how these obtrusive structures are going up so quickly. This is a backhanded and deceptive way of pushing your agenda. You are destroying Tacoma neighborhoods and wasting tax dollars! Most of these buildings remain empty!
48.	Beautiful historic buildings and houses, both big and small, are architectural treasures being sacrificed in the guise of "affordable housing." Construction companies backed out of downtown Tacoma contracts because the multi-family housing market in Tacoma is saturated. New, large, empty apartment buildings are being built all over Tacoma, and remain empty. Whoever is making these decisions is abetting the destruction of a colorful and important Historical legacy, without doing their research!
49.	Bonuses! For what? Empty, ugly structures! These houses are not affordable, and if they were, most people don't want this life style. Jamming public transportation down everyone's throat adds insult to injury. This is a disaster plan that is sure to fail and destroy Tacoma's beauty and history.
50.	People matter, buildings don't (for the most part). Homelessness is because people can't afford a home its as simple as that. Affordability should be a top priority but I'm also glad that it is not a requirement that could make certain developments unfeasible. 4 expensive houses is better than 0 housing. If developers don't end up taking advantage these bonus I urge you not to ever require them simply make the bonuses better until it is used.
51.	Bonuses should not be made at the expense of having trees. I do not agree with the HiT plan for bonuses: Relaxed setbacks (front and rear) and reduced amenity space and tree canopy. Less yard space and fewer trees will reduce the quality of life for those who live in that housing unit. Trees and yard space all add to the health and quality of life for adults and children. Trees and housing CAN and MUST co-exist.
52.	Building and providing a percentage of affordable housing should be MANDATORY, not a bonus. Developers consider profit, not the needs of Tacomans. Trees in Tacoma have more thought put to them and new regulations than the people and their housing needs.
53.	No bonuses yet. Wait to see how the state zoning requirements impact the city. Add more components (like the bonuses) later if needed/appropriate. Don't add more density than required by state plan yet. See if the impact hoped for (like affordability) actually happens. This also allows more time to add back more transit to support the density.
54.	Providing bonuses is just another way for developers to build taller structures that don't fit into our existing single family neighborhoods. Their boxy multi-family housing structures each stick out like a sore thumb among our older well made homes dating from 1890's to 1950's. Don't break up our established neighborhoods! Don't demolish our older homes! Build on vacant property or reuse and repurpose the buildings that already exist throughout our City.

Unit Lot Subdivision Comments (30)

1.	Would think it self-evident, but I guess it has to be said: cramming people into existing neighborhoods destroys the quality of life for all involved. Now, that may be a feature, not a bug for some folks, but it's wrong nonetheless.
2.	Remember, no one wants to stare at another wall in their view!
3.	Love this
4.	Who here has ever visited an old European city and hated how dense it was? Not me. That's part of the appeal
5.	This will absolutely destroy our neighborhoods. We do not want dense housing in our communities!
6.	How is letting someone buy a home connected to another person's home going to destroy our neighborhoods? We are building ADUs already, why not let people buy them at fair market value and build equity? I am for expanding private property rights. thank you.
7.	I appreciate the focus on increased density; that's the way to fight climate change; more dense urban centers, but please ensure there is a balance of development and tree canopy. Protect heritage trees on private property and don't allow for variances. Development can be done in a creative way around existing trees.
8.	"Home in Tacoma:" uniting real estate developers and socialists!!!!
9.	How does this destroy our neighborhoods? If anything it will breathe new life into them, allowing for more homeowners at more affordable prices. Tacoma isn't some UNESCO World Heritage Site that must be left alone at all costs. We should allow the city to grow and encourage home ownership at all levels and backgrounds.
10.	Whatever! Not really sure if owning only a little piece of not much will provide much, if any, equity, especially given the fact that housing prices are dropping throughout our whole area. I'm fearful that those with the least amount of money could take the biggest loss, when property values drop. Despite whatever you say, our city will no longer be as desirable a place to live once these changes are put into place. Other parts of the state and of the country will start looking better every day.
11.	Not sure how much value a small house on a small lot will be, especially after all of the closing costs are involved. Many of the costs of selling and buying are the same, no matter the cost of the home.
12.	If the plan is intended to bring down housing costs, then what's the point of owning something at today's costs that will soon drop in value.
13.	I've been reading all of the new code that is available to the public and see a potential issue in the following: F. Urban Residential Districts (UR-1, 2 and 3) Development Standards. Before this section of code goes into effect, I want to make sure that the new internal lot line setbacks are excluded on unit lot subdivision applied to courtyard housing, which I believe is a City intent. In this case, the internal lot line setbacks need to be excluded while keeping the exterior zoning setbacks

14.	This is my favorite part of the new Home In Tacoma Code. This allows for ownership of front to back or side to side attached or detached homes or cottages. This will allow for more ownership opportunities rather than simply allowing for greater density in apartments. This attached homes, townhomes and cottages will be more affordable than existing stand alone, larger lot homes. As such, this will add entry level inventory to Tacoma which is greatly needed. Thank you Tacoma for this addition.
15.	City council, city planners, city staff, do you really want Tacoma to be ruined on your watch? Is it worth it, whatever it is you're getting out of it? You know if this were adequately publicized, people would reject it. Stop now, and save our city for the future. This isn't about affordable housing. Anyone who is reasonably informed about this matter, knows that.
16.	Nonsense. Leave our single-family home neighborhoods alone. People aren't asking for this. Developers like it, but our own people do not, at least the ones who know about it. The others have a nasty surprise ahead if those in leadership don't wake up and stop pushing the political Left's destructive ideas on us.
17.	Who is John Galt?
18.	Subdivision of lots will provide many more opportunities for ownership and increased stability. Proponents of SFH need to understand their homes are investments. Investments go up and down, and historically SFH have mainly gone up. Time for them to go down so the rest of us have a chance to get some stable footing. If SFH owners complain about their home values, sucks to suck. Try renting for a few years!
19.	I agree in ownership opportunities. Yet we must realize that upzoning is a one big social experiment and we have no way of knowing what will happen to values. Historically, condo prices don't seem to have gone up as rapidly as home prices. Might that mean that a small housing unit with no real land won't grow as much as a house with a yard? Wish we could put this plan on hold so that we could gather more information from other cities.
20.	Current ADU regulations are still relatively new. Let them be, monitor the impact overtime, then discuss making changes. This is all too much too soon.
21.	More research needs to be done on this. I do believe that everyone should have the opportunity to build equity, but if we embark on a building craze when the demographic cliff is coming, I am worried that people could lose money when the buyers evaporate. The population is aging fast. The baby boomers are already selling homes at a good pace and more and more of these houses will be opening up.
22.	Lower property taxes for ALL city residents
23.	Please do not change the Narrowmoor Community to UR 1 or UR 2 zoning for smaller lot sizes. This would not add more affordable housing to the city of Tacoma. Developers would simply build more housing in this small view area and sell it all at a high cost. Do not be fooled by developers.
24.	Allow for the subdivision of parcels in a streamlined manner, especially to allow for construction of individual lot townhomes (with party walls). Consider the lovely North Chicago urban form and the means and instruments needed to generate it, to include small lot subdivision. Carefully identify lot size minimums, if at all, so as not to preclude desirable infill development that is very small scale.

25.	Subdivision in general should be made easier to accomplish, or at least, to understand. Right now it's a bureaucratic jungle impossible for an ordinary citizen to navigate.
26.	The City is literally engaged in an effort to LOWER our property values. This is madness. Can't afford to live in a particular neighborhood? Move to one you can. This is not a "crisis" in any sense of the word.
27.	I find the limit on characters off putting. It should be open to however long it takes one to describe what they want to say. Your map with "pillows" of designated zoning makes it seem helter skelter. There appear to be pockets of UR surrounded by UR 1. That means you must go through high density to get to a property that is a single family home. High density is generally for non home owners. Many want more stability where they raise their children. Renters add little in stable environment.
28.	Research should be done involving the people this actually affects for each neighborhood. This has an impact on our property values but no consideration is being given to our opinions and how these decisions will impact us. Has information been gathered from other cities who have implemented this?
29.	WHERE will all of the new multi-family housing that you have designed actually be built?? Are there huge tracts of vacant land within our City? Then build THERE. Don't start demolishing houses within our single family neighborhoods. Don't tear apart our neighborhoods and replace our houses with those terrible looking boxy structures that totally lack any kind of architectural quality. There must be design standards and design review fo any new housing that will bebuilt.
30.	There needs to an adequate setback for each multi-family housing structure. The structure should not be just a couple feet from the sidewalk. There needs to be a buffer of trees and plants between the building and the sidewalk and then a buffer of trees and plants along the right of way. Residents of housing deserve to look out their windows and see greenery, rather than car rushing by. Trees and other plants create beauty in a neighborhood and sense of well being that we all so deserve.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments (29)

1.	The EIS acknowledges the tree canopy will not increase, sidewalks will not increase, and we there is no plan to be less dependent on our cars since public transportation only covers a few main roads. It acknowledges in several places that the built infrastructure will be burdened. I know we need more housing, but we desperately need infrastructure that complements that housing and we have to stop kicking that can down the road. We need walkability and complete neighborhoods.
2.	As the DEIS makes clear, there will be growth impacts to infrastructure and the need to expand and improve utility systems. It also suggests that developer charges and impact fees should pay for much of these impacts. The consultants forget that this is Tacoma, which shields developers from bearing those costs. No, the residents can expect to pick up the costs through higher budgets, bond measures & higher utility rates, which translates to higher taxes & rents. More affordable housing? Hah! JK.
3.	Where are the impact fees? There's a lot of talk in the EIS about trying to meet demands on infrastructure, but the city has been dragging its feet, waiting until every other city in the State adopts them because they'll be "bad for business." I'll tell you what's bad for business, putting ridiculous requirements like building out hundreds of feet of sidewalks, which are a betterment. Charge all development equally otherwise areas without sidewalks in East Tacoma won't get them built.
4.	Impact Fees should be part of this plan!
5.	This impact statement has not had independent review. If you believed in the plan you would invite a devils advocate to drill holes into the plan so that you could make it better. This is a disgrace to the citizens of Tacoma to present this plan that fails to adequately address the impact of global warming due to the denser housing and reduced distributed green space. Shame on you.
6.	The impacts described in 4.3 Transportation, specifically the trip generation of the zoning alternatives and impacts, all point to a large amount of pressure on the pacific avenue/SR-7 corridor as a result of higher density zoning. 4.3.3 Potential Mitigation Measures describes in detail the steps needed to improve this corridor before the pressure begins. Tacoma desperately needs better public mass transit infrastructure here, like un-pausing the paused BRT, to make this zoning change work.
7.	Why aren't builders in Tacoma required to pay Impact fees? Impact fees should be required to cover infrastructure improvements. Homeowners are tired of having their property taxes go up to cover the tax breaks and other incentives our city council have approved for builders. We, the residents are the ones investing in our city, not the builders. Come on folks.
8.	The developers should pay all of the costs for development on the lots they are building. They should pay for all of the city's costs as well for improving infrastructure. They should pay neighbors for all of the damages that will happen from their construction. Don't pass the costs onto the existing homeowners.
9.	Make the developers pay the full price of impact fees, like most other places do. If there is really such a "housing shortage" as claimed, then it would seem that the builders should be

	able to sell anything they want without needing government handouts. Developers shouldn't be given a free ride.
10.	If developers aren't paying the full cost of impact fees, aren't paying property taxes on the properties they own for years, and are restricted on how much they can raise taxes in a given year, what will happen when their taxes come due just at the same time that maintenance is needed on these aging apartments (and remember they can't raise rents very much)? It sounds like all of the ingredients are in place for slums in our city.
11.	Place the burden of improvements onto the developers/builders, not onto the existing taxpayers. Everyone needs to pay his or fair share.
12.	Not clear enough. Need to drive home the point that developers need to pay for the added pressures on infrastructure. They need to pay for all the updates/improvements or else they shouldn't be allowed to build. End of story.
13.	Too high a cost for development. If the developers are not forced to pay the real cost of new development, then the burden gets passed onto us all as taxpayers, making it harder for all of us to afford to live in Tacoma. Someone has to pay when sinks start backing up and water pressure gets too low to take a shower. So who pays up?
14.	How is HIT going to improve living conditions in Tacoma? Density is not healthy, leads to more crime, and destroys quality of life for all of us.
15.	This statement seems insufficient to cover the financial and environmental costs of housing growth.
16.	Don't see many protections in here for Tacomans if development plans go awry.
17.	Who is John Galt?
18.	I don't feel confident that there are enough safeguards in place to limit environmental damage to the city. The developers who come and go will leave us in the lurch getting stuck with the bills.
19.	Any projects should be fully paid for by those building them. A builder shouldn't build anymore than he can afford to pay for.
20.	There should be no cost to the current homeowners for new development.
21.	Increased housing will increase revenue for Tacoma. This is an investment worth while for the city as a whole. Building costs are incredibly high and interest rates have sky rocked. To implement this change, the city should invest in the infrastructure as a long-term investment into a healthy tax base. Community wide change should not just be on the shoulders of those trying to help increase housing.
22.	We already know that parts of Tacoma's sewer and stormwater system is on the verge of being overwhelmed. Increased development in the city will further strain these systems. Impact fees and other revenue must be generated to improve and expand these systems if Tacoma is serious about increasing density AND maintaining quality of life for its residents.

23.	Planting and maintaining trees, both on private land and public parks, schools, and rights-of-way, needs to be a higher priority. We know there are inequities in temperatures for areas of the city that have fewer trees. As density increases, tree requirements are good, but we also need to increase urban forestry staff to plant and maintain trees, particularly during our warming summers. More staff should be hired to work with property owners to ensure success of newly-planted trees as well.
24.	I am worried that that developers and new builders will not pay their fair share. Our infrastructure is aging. Can it bear the extra demand of new construction?
25.	The TCC railway extension of the T Line may not use 19th Street, whereas the DEIS repeatedly states that it will. For a variety of reasons, this should be revised to clarify the representative and conceptual nature of the project as it currently exists.
26.	Building denser in the city will stop/slow the expanding suburban sprawl that is encroaching on our national forests and parks. Suburban sprawl is constantly leading to deforestation in this state. Research also consistently shows that dense cities are the lowest carbon emissions producers on a per capita basis and to me that is really all that matters. Denser cities protect the natural landscape that make this state great so we should be doing everything in our power to promote that density.
27.	There needs to be more information and clarification made. Homeowners should not have the burden of carrying costs caused by developers. Developers should be paying for the impact they are having on our systems and any new infrastructure needed as a result of their projects cause
28.	Developers need to pay their fair share to help to improve the infrastructure that will be needed as more and more housing is being built. They also need to pay IMPACT FEES. Other cities require impact fees, why not Tacoma? Without impact fees, much of the financial burden falls upon us, Tacoma's citizens.
29.	The EIS should include mention that Tacoma has the lowest tree canopy of any city in the Puget Sound region. And there needs to be a specific plan as to how many trees we will need to plant each year between now and 2030 to achieve 30% canopy.

END