AGENDA

MEETING: Regular Meeting and Public Hearing

TIME: Wednesday, March 4, 2020, 5:00 p.m. (Public Hearing starting at 5:00 p.m.)

LOCATION: Council Chambers, 1st Floor, Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

A. Call to Order and Quorum Call

B. Approval of Agenda and Minutes (February 19, 2020)

C. Public Comments
   - Comments are accepted on Discussion Items (except Item 1, public hearing) and are limited to 3 minutes per person (subject to change).

D. Discussion Items

1. Public Hearing – Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0
   - Description: Conduct a public hearing concerning the proposed modifications to the Residential Infill Pilot Program code.
   - Action: Receive testimony and accept written comments through March 6, 2020
   - Staff Contact: Mesa Sherriff, 253-591-5480, msherriff@cityoftacoma.org

2. Pierce Transit Destination 2040 Long Range Plan Update
   - Description: Review status of project.
   - Action: Feedback and consider preparing a letter of comments
   - Staff Contact: Lihuang Wung, 253-591-5682, lwung@cityoftacoma.org

3. Pierce Transit Bus Rapid Transit
   - Description: Review status of project.
   - Action: Feedback
   - Staff Contact: Lihuang Wung, 253-591-5682, lwung@cityoftacoma.org

4. Urban Design Studio
   - Description: Review accomplishments from Phase I of the project and outlook for Phase II.
   - Action: Comment and Guidance
   - Staff Contact: Mesa Sherriff, 253-591-5480, msherriff@cityoftacoma.org

5. Tideflats Subarea Plan – Community Engagement
   - Description: Review the draft Community Engagement Plan for the Tideflats Subarea Plan.
   - Action: Comment and Guidance
   - Staff Contact: Stephen Atkinson, 253-591-5531, satkinson@cityoftacoma.org

(Continued on the back)
E. Topics of the Upcoming Meeting (March 18, 2020):
(1) Consolidated Plan 2020-2024
(2) @ Home in Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021 (debriefing of 2/19/20 hearing)
(3) 2020 Amendment Package (release for public review):
    • Heidelberg-Davis Land Use Designation Change
    • West Slope Neighborhood View Sensitive Overlay District
    • Transportation Master Plan Amendments
    • Minor Plan and Code Amendments
(4) Pierce Transit Long Range Plan Update (letter of comments)

F. Communication Items
(1) Status Reports by Commissioners – TOD Advisory Group, Housing Equity Task Force
(2) “Infill Pilot Program 2.0 Code Amendments” Public Information Session, Wednesday, March 4, 2020, 4:00-5:00 p.m., Room 243, Tacoma Municipal Building
(3) “State of the City – Our Future in Focus” address by Mayor Victoria Woodards, Wednesday, March 4, 2020, 6:30 p.m., Mt. Tahoma High School.
(4) 2020 South Sound Sustainability Expo – Saturday, March 14, 2020, 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Greater Tacoma Convention Center, www.SouthSoundSustainabilityExpo.org
(5) The Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability Committee is meeting on Wednesday, March 4, 2020, at 4:30 p.m., in Room 248. Agenda (subject to change) includes: Limiting New Storage Unit Developments.

G. Adjournment
MINUTES (DRAFT)

TIME: Wednesday, February 19, 2020, 5:00 p.m.

PLACE: Council Chambers, 1st Floor, Tacoma Municipal Building
747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402

PRESENT: Anna Petersen (Chair), Jeff McInnis (Vice-Chair), Carolyn Edmonds, Ryan Givens, David Horne, Christopher Karnes, Brett Santhuff, Andrew Strobel, Alyssa Torrez

ABSENT: N/A

A. CALL TO ORDER AND QUORUM CALL

Vice-Chair McInnis called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. A quorum was declared.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

The agenda for the meeting was approved with correction of the meeting date printed on hard copies previously provided to the Commissioners.

The minutes for the February 5, 2020, meeting was approved as submitted.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. 2020 Annual Amendment – Heidelberg-Davis Land Use Designation

Larry Harala, Planning Services Division, provided an overview of the project proposal, which was a private application as part of the 2020 Annual Amendment. The proposal was to change the Land Use designation from Parks and Open Space to Major Institutional Campus for the Heidelberg-Davis area. The applicant, also being the owner, was Metro Parks Tacoma. Mr. Harala presented a map of the subject area as well as described the Land Use designation of the surrounding areas. Also presented was a conceptual elevation of the stadium, which was resulted from the feasibility report from the application’s submission. Mr. Harala noted that this was merely conceptual, there was no proposal before the City at this time. He went on to introduce a potential fully developed concept of the area, which would include office, retail, educational, and even residential space.

As part of the outreach effort, a townhall meeting was held at the Metro Parks Headquarters on November 4, 2019, with approximately 40 attendants. The main concern was what would happen if the proposal was approved but the stadium was not built. Preliminary technical evaluation had been done on traffic, sound, light, and field impacts. The studies suggested that the impacts could be overcome with mitigation measures. Metro Parks had also committed to replacing any loss of open space and programmable field that might come from this proposal.

Moving forward, the City and Metro Parks would have another meeting in July. In the meantime, each organization would consider issuing a formal letter of intent and continue the negotiation. The immediate
next steps were to release materials for public reviews, set the public hearing for April 15, 2020, and continue public outreach until April.

Commissioner Givens asked whether the application had changed since its submittal, especially regarding text amendment, for the proposed uses did not align with the description of Major Institutional Campus. He also wanted to know whether it would change the zoning of the area. Mr. Harala clarified that the application would not change the zoning R2 of the area, only the Land Use designation; however, if further development required rezoning, that would trigger a separate process.

Commissioner Karnes encouraged any future traffic studies to reflect the mode splits and transit-supportive policies as currently described in the Comprehensive Plan.

At 5:23 p.m., too early to commence the public scoping hearing on @Home in Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021, the Commission moved to discuss topics for the upcoming meeting and communication items. See the corresponding sections below for details.

The meeting was recessed at 5:27 p.m. and resumed at 5:30 p.m.

2. Public Scoping Hearing: @Home In Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021

Chair Petersen called the public scoping hearing to order at 5:30 p.m. The subject of the hearing was the proposed scope of work for the project “@Home in Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021.”

Chair Petersen went over the procedures of the hearing and asked Commissioners to introduce themselves.

Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division, opened by welcoming members of the public that had come to attend the hearing. Then, he provided the meeting objectives and went over the timeline of next steps. He also referred the public to the project webpage for more details. Mr. Barnett proceeded to explain Action 1.2 Inclusionary Zoning and Action 1.8 Diverse Housing Types from the Affordable Housing Action Strategy packet, elaborating on what they meant and how they would work. He also provided a broad recap of the comments he had received so far.

Before calling for testimony, Chair Petersen emphasized that there was no code change proposal at this point, and this scoping hearing was for the scope of work of the project.

The following citizens testified:

1. Jessie Gamble – Ms. Gamble represented the Master Builders Association of Pierce County. Through her work, she had learned that the City of Tacoma was 20,000 housing units short of where they thought they would be. She supported the zoning changes and believed that affordable housing had a connection with zoning. She urged the City to pursue housing options with full force rather than through isolated pilot programs. In term of inclusionary zoning, she understood it was a common tool to address housing issues but stated it did not yield desirable results, urging the City to stay away from inclusionary zoning.

2. Cady Chintis – Ms. Chintis stated she is an architect and a missing middle developer. She supported the @Home in Tacoma project and increasing housing choices in the City. She stated that allowing more small and medium multi-family projects would help meet the City’s affordability and environmental goals. By allowing more Missing Middle and infill development, growth would be incremental, and change would be more gradual. In addition, fewer existing homes would be demolished while more services and amenities would become walkable for more people. The walkability of a neighborhood impacted affordability because families dependent on cars spent 25%
of their income on transportation, compared to 9% for those living in walkable urban places. Increased walkability would also reduce the City’s carbon footprint and increase citizens’ health and affordability. Ms. Chintis also discussed affordability related to lower utility costs in Missing Middle housing types.

3. John Wolters – Mr. Wolters stated he is an architect and a builder of Missing Middle housing. He stated that the City of Tacoma was projected to see 100,000 new residents over the next 20 years. Gentle density and mixed-use communities would bring many benefits such as boosts in both current and new business, local jobs, weekend activities and entertainments, etc. He called for providing choice to accommodate growth through thoughtful density. And contrary to popular belief, home values would often increase.

4. Sean Horner – Mr. Horner stated he is a resident of the City of Lakewood but a member of the Democratic Socialists of America’s (DSA) Housing Justice Working Group in Tacoma. While fully in support of the resolve to achieve affordable housing, he stated that the strategy and the means to get there was crucial, leading to his objection to inclusionary zoning. Mr. Horner referred to an interview given by Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, Assistant Professor at Pacific University and author of Race For Profit, to explain that Inclusionary Zoning is a flawed tool because the private sector is not good for meeting affordable housing needs. He also stated housing needs to be carbon neutral.

5. Ben Ferguson – Mr. Ferguson stated he is the owner of Ferguson Architecture in Tacoma. He commented that the housing crisis was caused by the Great Recession, when housing stopped being built but the population kept growing. The City of Tacoma had only seen significant housing built in the past 4-5 years. Also, people with good incomes were secure but other people were being displaced. He applauded the effort that the City was making. He compared prices for specific housing types ($400,000 for a new house, $250,000 for a large building, and $180,000 for a Missing Middle unit) to show that money was being invested in the most expensive housing types. He stated we should be building Missing Middle housing as the most cost-effective housing type.

6. Bea Christophersen – Ms. Christophersen stated she is a member of the North End Neighborhood Council, but testifying on her own behalf. She stated we need all these housing types to meet different needs (e.g., children, single people, people with disabilities). Her concern was with the quality of life, adding that high-density mixed-use centers and high-rise apartments should not be located next to R1 and R2 single-family homes. Higher density structures should be in areas with transit and infrastructures to support it, such as downtown. She argued there is a need for parking, transit and four-lane roads to support dense housing, and argued the Proctor lacks some of these and so is an example of an area that is not right for high density housing. Lastly, Ms. Christophersen commented that a new apartment building on Adams Street, where the zoning line separating commercial and residential was in the middle of the block instead of in between blocks, is not good for the neighborhood.

7. Chuck Sundsomo – Mr. Sundsomo spoke of when his son and daughter-in-law moved to Tacoma in 2016 and looked for a house, and had a difficult time finding one. They ended up renting a house on Hilltop that had been turned into a duplex. Mr. Sundsomo went on to say that the Missing Middle houses worked great if the design was done right. He argued that the City has a supply problem, as demonstrated by his son who had an annual income of $75,000 unable to afford a house in Tacoma, that could be solved through smart designs and infill. Mr. Sundsomo asked the City to hurry, adding the longer they waited, the more people would be priced out.

8. Megan Capes – Ms. Capes stated she is the co-chair of the DSA’s Housing Justice Working Group in Tacoma, and an educator with Tacoma Public Schools. She bought a house in Parkland in 2015 because she could not afford one in Tacoma. Previously, she was a volunteer coordinator at Food Connection and heard from many people about housing displacement. She raised the issue of equity, saying that they City could do more to reach out to communities across the city. She stated one way to stop homelessness is to keep people in their homes and argued for building more affordable housing now, especially for people with eviction records, formerly incarcerated, etc. Ms.
Capes also suggested capping rental costs. She supports upzoning like was done in Minneapolis, as well as community land trusts. She urged action quickly on these issues.

9. Esther Day – Ms. Day stated that she is a former Planning Commissioner and had worked with the Infill Pilot Program. She stated we need to grow, but while there was a lot to do in Tacoma, it is important to remember Tacoma is not Seattle. The discussion of affordable housing needed to consider the distinction of to whom it was affordable and target low income households. Also mentioned was the importance of creating green space for families and children. Ms. Day went on to suggest looking into insurance for townhouses with a concrete wall between units; owners of such townhouses might be eligible for homeowner insurance instead of townhouse insurance, which had a higher rate (referencing a Houston example). She urged the City to be cautious about where to build more density and consider parking while doing so.

10. David Fuller – Mr. Fuller stated he is a 5th generation Tacoman, a builder, and a real estate agent. After living elsewhere he returned and couldn’t believe the changes. He stated he is the builder of a new building being built on 37th Street and McKinley Avenue, where parking and setbacks are going to be an issue. Mr. Fuller also discussed the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) code and mentioned illegal ADUs.

11. Mandy McGill – Ms. McGill commented in support of developers and of development, explaining that development would mean more jobs. She believed that the City needs to move quickly on housing issues as people all around the country were moving to Seattle for Amazon.

12. Christi Kniffin – Ms. Kniffin stated she is a Section 8 tenant and had been in the rental unit for 10 years. She has a good relationship with her landlord and neighbors as she takes good care of her house and yard. She stated that, however, one of her neighbors’ boyfriend is harassing her purportedly because she is disabled and low income. She stated she has called the police but no action could be taken without hard evidence. She stated she is scared, but unable to get out of the situation because she cannot afford to move.

13. April Thompson – Ms. Thompson stated she is a Section 8 tenant, who moved to Tacoma in 2003 and raised her five children here. She commented that information on access to housing is scarce. One of her friends was approved to rent a home but unable to afford the deposit. Ms. Thompson liked Ms. Capes’ suggestion of putting a cap on rental cost. She also discussed lights from new buildings beaming into her windows and disturbing her children’s sleeping. She would like new buildings to look more aesthetically pleasing. She also mentioned that there are people camping out in front of Tacoma Housing Authority at People’s Park.

14. Michael Fast – Mr. Fast stated he is a member of the Master Builders Association. He stated that Inclusionary Zoning does not work, referenced Portland Oregon’s IZ program, and called instead for changes to allow more housing types citywide. He stated there is a huge demand for Missing Middle housing, but not much space to build it in. He stated that people like duplexes and triplexes; that Cottage housing sounded great but was not feasible under Tacoma’s current standards; that there is a need for greater diversity in housing stock. Furthermore, affordable housing should mean attainable housing, and attainable at all income levels.

15. David Foster – Mr. Foster stated he is an architect and a developer, and offered two suggestions. First, consider whether single-family zoning is still appropriate, imagine the single change of allowing duplexes. Second, consider code changes that would assist infill development, especially single or double lots located mid-block or without an alley. Additionally, infrastructure, parking and utilities requirements often hinder development potential of smaller projects and drives down the achievable density. Mr. Foster asked the Commission to study design challenges with those lots so more housing supplies could be generated.

16. Kimber Starr – Ms. Starr stated she is a realtor, is on the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority Board, and is a South End Tacoma resident. She asked the Commission to use all
available tools to create more housing at all price points, especially townhouses, duplexes, and triplexes blended in single-family neighborhoods. She stated that buyers are being outbid by other buyers for 20-40% over asking price. On a different note, Ms. Starr had recently moved and found it very difficult to find a rental unit for her family due to low housing stock.

17. K.C. Dickerson – Ms. Dickerson stated that she works in construction and project management, and had some felonies from her early 20s but had not had legal problems since. Her felonies still made everything subsequent much harder. She stated that in 2017 she was able to buy a house, but probably would not be able to afford it at the current prices even with her increased income. She stated that prices are high even in areas she would consider to be “the ghetto” (e.g., 96th and Hosmer area). She had friends and family members struggling to afford high rental prices for “ghetto” neighborhoods and having to pay late fees as a result. Ms. Dickerson added that what was available was no longer affordable; it was important not only to build more housing but prevent high prices for substandard housing.

18. Miriam McBride – Ms. McBride stated she is a displaced resident from Hilltop but still worked in the area as a community organizer for a community-owned housing project. She introduced the concept of community stewardship, where communities controlled land with the goal of keeping it out of speculative market for uses such as housing, businesses, and services. This would lead to community-owned entities. Ms. McBride proceeded to describe ways in which the City could support community stewardship models (e.g., land trusts). She called for funding for grassroots housing organizers so that the community can lead change in their neighborhoods. She said she designed a flyer to publicize this meeting. She stated she does not think inclusionary zoning is a good idea, that zoning changes should serve the needs of the community, and called for more outreach to the community.

19. Theresa Power-Drutis – Ms. Power-Drutis stated she was not thrilled with new high-rise buildings and parking shortage, but she understood the need for density to house people. She would like to see housing affordable to low income people who are in the most need. She brought forward two suggestions – single resident occupancy dwellings (SROs) and urban campgrounds. Ms. Power-Drutis also provided a written letter with more information on those suggestions for staff.

20. Justin Goro – Mr. Goro stated he lives in Gig Harbor and works at an architecture-engineering firm in Tacoma. He presented a fact that the number of newly built single-family houses dropped in half in the last decade, compared to that of the past 4-5 decades. He believed the solution was upzoning and allowing Missing Middle housing types in single-family zones.

21. John DeLoma – Mr. DeLoma stated he is the owner of MD Designs in Tacoma. He stated he has 1,800 units on his desk today, none of which was affordable due to construction costs. This is the case for other recent projects in Proctor and Pt Ruston. He would like to see more incentives and requirements for affordable units, such as a 10% requirement. He referenced the Multifamily tax Exemption Program 12-year option and stated changes should be made/advocated at the state level to make it better. He stated Tacoma should lobby the legislature to require affordable units in every building (even one out of four units affordable would still be better than none).

Chair Petersen reiterated that written comments would be accepted until February 29, 2020. She closed the public scoping hearing at 6:52 p.m.

The meeting was recessed at 6:52 p.m. and resume at 6:55 p.m.

Chair Petersen encouraged Commissioners to provide suggestions to staff as to what needs to be reviewed when staff comes back for a debriefing at a future meeting.

Vice-Chair McInnis, in reference to the comments on Inclusionary Zoning, asked staff to look at neighboring communities to see how it has worked. He also wanted to explore the possibility of
considering any development under the AHAS as single-family home for the purpose of requirements and fees to keep costs low.

Chair Petersen would like more attention and study on Inclusionary Zoning, and to review barriers to development. She also would like to incorporate the community stewardship concept in the scope of work. For those issues that were outside of the scope of work but might be appropriate for the Housing Equity Taskforce, particularly Section 8 housing and barriers to renting, Chair Petersen asked staff to forward those to the Taskforce.

Commissioner Givens wanted to look at incentives for utilities and possibly how to expand them, as well as how to reduce costs such as connection fee, second meter, etc.

Commissioner Santhuff provided guidance on what he would look for in staff’s review and summary of comments. One suggestion is to see how issues align with the AHAS, and if it is not in the AHAS to find out why not. He requested staff create a list of the topics that we want to study (e.g., empirical results of IZ).

Commissioner Strobel was interested in best practices for Missing Middle housing, parking, and proximity to transit, especially for more intense development. For example, what are Missing Middle housing types, and how does parking factor into costs for each? He additionally wanted to look at empirical evidence of IZ in other cities, as well as compare to cities that do and do not have IZ in terms of how much affordable housing is produced. This gets to a question of whether allowing the market to act by itself or whether the City should intervene in the market. He requested benchmarking, including of cities on the west coast, which might serve as good examples.

Chair Petersen wanted to ensure the scope of work would study costs to build different housing types. She is also interested in non-planning issues that could affect costs, such the reference to designing townhouses with a cement wall between them to keep down insurance rates.

Commissioner Karnes commented on the need to have infrastructure and services to support growth before the growth occurs. He noted that one key topic that needs attention is transportation—there is a tradeoff between having public transit available, versus having ample parking available. He requested additional information on cost/unit for each housing type to inform what strategy is most cost-effective in producing housing.

Commissioner Torrez asked if it would be possible to eliminate IZ from the project if it was found undesirable after further analysis. In regards to community outreach, she would like to involve more grass roots communities in the process.

Vice-Chair McInnis added that sometimes contractors are not the biggest contributor to cost, but rather offsite improvements required by the City are more expensive. It is important to consider municipal requirements and fees in the development process. Moreover, he stated that it was a supply-and-demand market; once there was more supply, the cost would likely go down across the board.

Commissioner Strobel noted that there were external regional forces beyond the City’s control, particularly the City’s location, which mean that the City should evaluate steps to intervene in the market. While it was important to support development, it was also necessary to acknowledge that people might get priced out of Tacoma.

Mr. Barnett summarized the key issues and stated he would address them on March 18th and indicate how they would be integrated in the scope of work. He stated that we will evaluate IZ on its merits of cost for producing affordable housing. He described there is a range of options included from voluntary/bonuses to mandatory requirements, and Tacoma already has some IZ tools on the books. The City Council has referred this issue to the Planning Commission for evaluation. The scope will do that through a market analysis, including comparing the cost of an affordable unit built through IZ to
that of creating a unit in a public housing project. Mr. Barnett also stated that equity and engagement will be discussed Housing Equity Taskforce. Finally, the project will also evaluate barriers to development including city requirements and fees.

E. TOPICS OF THE UPCOMING MEETING

1) Public Hearing – Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0 Code Amendments
2) Pierce Transit Long Range Plan Update
3) Pierce Transit Bus Rapid Transit Project Update
4) 2020 Amendment – West Slope Neighborhood View Sensitive Overlay District
5) Urban Design Studio
6) @Home in Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021
7) Tideflats Subarea Plan Update

F. COMMUNICATION ITEMS

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

Lihuang Wung, Planning Division Services, informed the Commission of the following:

- An open house regarding the proposed View Sensitive Overlay District for West Slope neighborhood, which was another application of the 2020 Annual Amendment, would start at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 20, 2020, at Geiger Montessori Elementary School.

- The “2020 Urban Studies Forum: Attainable Housing and the Future of Prosperity and Inclusion in Pierce County” would take place on March 4, 2020, at the William Phillip Hall at the University of Washington-Tacoma. The Commissioners were encouraged to register and attend.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

*These minutes are not a direct transcription of the meeting, but rather a brief capture. For full-length audio recording of the meeting, please visit:
http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/
To: Planning Commission  
From: Mesa Sherriff, Senior Planner, Planning Services Division  
Subject: Public Hearing – Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0  
Meeting Date: March 04, 2020  
Memo Date: February 26, 2020

Action Requested:
Receive oral testimony and continue to accept written comments through March 6th, 2020.

Discussion:
The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on March 4th, 2020 at 5:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers concerning the proposed changes to the Residential Infill Pilot Program.

Staff will conduct a Public Information Session an hour prior to the public hearing (from 4:00 to 5:00 pm.), in Room 243 of the Tacoma Municipal Building, for interested parties to learn more about the subject and/or be better prepared to testify at the hearing.

Notification:
A State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Notification (including the attached Notice) was circulated to the Planning Commission contacts list, the City Council, Puyallup Tribe of Indians, JBLM, and individuals who have indicated an interest in the Program and related topics.

Notification for the public hearing has been sent out on February 12, 2020 to reach a broad-based audience, through the following efforts:

1. Public Notices – The notices for both Public Hearing were emailed to the Planning Commission’s interested parties list that includes the City Council, Neighborhood Councils, area business district associations, the Puyallup Tribal Nation, adjacent jurisdictions, City and State departments, and others.

2. Library – A request was made to the Tacoma Public Library to make the public hearing notices available for patrons’ review at all branches.

3. News Media – A legal notice concerning the SEPA Checklist and the public hearings was posted on the Tacoma Daily Index.

4. 60-Day Notices – A “Notice of Intent to Adopt Amendment 60 Days Prior to Adoption” was sent to the State Department of Commerce (per RCW 36.70A.106). A similar notice was sent to the Joint Base Lewis-McChord (per RCW 36.70A.530(4)) and the Puyallup Tribe of Indians, asking for comments within 60 days of receipt of the notice.

Project Summary:
The purpose of the Residential Infill Pilot Program is to promote innovative residential infill development types and housing choice, while ensuring that such development demonstrates high quality building and site design that is responsive to and harmonious with neighborhood patterns and character. In addition, the Pilot Program is intended to develop a body of successful, well-regarded examples of innovative residential infill in order to inform a future Council decision on development regulations and design standards for some or all of these infill-housing types. The most recent changes are summarized as follows:
- Multi-family projects have been limited to the R3 district. Exception: Applications to the Infill Pilot Program for renovations of existing structures, that do not increase building footprint, will be allowed in the R2 and R3 districts.
- Parking requirements have been removed for all project types in the Infill Pilot Program
- Access requirements have been changed to reflect building code
- Two-family housing in the R-2 district will no longer be required to be on a corner lot

Prior Actions:
- 02/05/2020 – Release of packet for public review and setting public hearing date
- 01/15/2020 – Review of options for program relaunch
- 12/04/2019 – Review of options for program relaunch
- 09/18/2019 – Provided guidance on Phase 2.0 of Pilot Program
- 04/03/2019 – Review to remove DADU’s from Pilot Program
- 03/01/2017 – Round one Application Review, Lessons Learned

Staff Contact:
- Mesa Sherriff, Senior Planner, msherriff@cityoftacoma.org, (253) 591-5480

Attachment:
1. Notice of Public Hearing

cc. Peter Huffman, Director
Residential Infill Pilot Program Regulations

REGULATORY CODE CHANGES UNDER REVIEW BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION

- Public Information Session: March 4, 2020 from 4-5 PM at the Tacoma Municipal Building (747 Market St.) Room 243
- Planning Commission Public Hearing: March 4, 2020 at 5 PM at the Tacoma Municipal Building (747 Market St.) in the Council Chambers (first floor)

In response to the acute housing need and concerns of displacement in the City, as well as the level of community interest, Council adopted Ordinance 28336, which created the Residential Infill Pilot Program (TMC 13.05.115). The program has been in operation since the end of 2016 and the program has reached capacity. The proposed modifications to the Residential Infill Pilot Program code are summarized below.

For more information and the draft program documents, visit www.cityoftacoma.org/infill.

Expand Infill Housing Types:

- Add Density-based Housing category
- Increase the number of each housing type allowed through the program

Modify design requirements and other standards:

- Allow Cottage Housing in rear yards when an alley is present
- Increase flexibility for the Two-family Housing type by removing the requirement to be on a corner lot, and to present the general appearance of a detached single-family dwelling
- Increase emphasis on qualitative design review of all categories
- Other changes for improved design outcomes, program clarity and consistency with Building Code
- Remove Parking requirement for projects reviewed by the Infill Pilot Program

Streamline the permit process

- Integrate the Infill Pilot Program review process into the Conditional Use Permit process (rather than requiring both separately)
- Update handbook to reflect changes and promote quality and performance through improved guidance.

For more information, visit www.cityoftacoma.org/infill or contact Mesa Sherriff, Senior Planner at (253) 591-5480, msherriff@cityoftacoma.org.
To: Planning Commission  
From: Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division  
Subject: Pierce Transit Destination 2040 Long Range Plan Update  
Meeting Date: March 4, 2020  
Memo Date: February 26, 2020

Action Requested:  
Feedback and consider preparing a letter of comments.

Discussion:  
At the meeting on March 4, 2020, the Planning Commission will receive a briefing on Pierce Transit's *Destination 2040* Long Range Plan Update project. Pierce Transit has released the draft Long Range Plan Update document (posted at [www.piercetransit.org/destination-2040](http://www.piercetransit.org/destination-2040)) for public review through April 10, 2020. All Commissioners are encouraged to review the document and Appendices online and be prepared to provide feedback to Pierce Transit staff.

The Commission will also consider providing a letter of comments to Pierce Transit before April 10th. The Commission may entrust Commissioner Karnes (representing Public Transportation) to prepare such a letter for the Commission's review and approval at the subsequent meeting on March 18th.

Project Summary:  
In April 2016, Pierce Transit adopted its first Long Range Plan, *Destination 2040*, to create a comprehensive guiding document of the Agency's vision for providing dependable, safe, efficient, and fully integrated public transportation services throughout the South Sound Region of today, tomorrow, and beyond.

Pierce Transit is conducting a minor update to *Destination 2040* to refocus its goals and objectives, identify access and coverage gaps within the current system, assess nonmotorized and active transportation access to existing routes and facilities, envision what services and coverage would offer a full 0.9% sales tax scenario, increase annual service hours from 500,130 to 735,000, and incorporate a Bus Rapid Transit system at full build-out or new multiple routes.

For more information, please visit [www.piercetransit.org/destination-2040](http://www.piercetransit.org/destination-2040) or contact Darin Stavish, Principal Planner - Pierce Transit at (253) 983-3329 or dstavish@piercetransit.org.

Prior Action:  
- November 20, 2019 – Commission reviewed the scope of work

Staff Contact:  
- Lihuang Wung, lwung@cityoftacoma.org, (253) 591-5682

Peter Huffman, Director
To: Planning Commission
From: Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division
Subject: Pierce Transit Bus Rapid Transit Update
Meeting Date: March 4, 2020
Memo Date: February 26, 2020

Action Requested: Feedback.

Discussion:
At the meeting on March 4, 2020, the Planning Commission will receive an update on Pierce Transit’s Bus Rapid Transit project.

Project Summary:
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is an innovative, high capacity, efficient public transit solution that moves people like light rail, but on wheels. Pierce Transit is in the final stages of planning an improved service of BRT along a 14.4-mile corridor on Pacific Avenue/State Route 7 between downtown Tacoma and Spanaway.

The corridor is currently served by Route 1, which continuously has the highest ridership of any Pierce Transit fixed route. Currently, riders board the BRT portion of the Route 1 alone an average of 1.1 million times per year, which accounts for 12 percent of Pierce Transit’s total ridership system-wide. By 2040, 2.2 million annual boardings are projected along the BRT corridor. In early April, the BRT project will be about 30 percent designed.

For more information, please visit www.piercetransit.org/BRT, e-mail BRT@PierceTransit.org, or call BRT phone line at (253) 983-3407.

Staff Contact:
- Lihuang Wung, lwung@cityoftacoma.org, (253) 591-5682

Attachments:
1. BRT Open Houses Postcard
2. PowerPoint Presentation for March 4, 2020

Peter Huffman, Director
Pierce Transit invites you to learn more about Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and the project plans for this new transit service along Pacific Avenue/SR-7 between Tacoma and Spanaway. In early April, the BRT project will be about 30 percent designed.

WE WANT YOUR INPUT ON:
- Updated project designs, including lane configurations and station locations
- Potential roundabouts
- Left turn management
- Project timeline

SPECIAL PROJECT UPDATE:

In March, a Pierce Transit contractor will be conducting required soil sampling along the future Bus Rapid Transit route. This will require about three weeks of temporary lane closures along Pacific Avenue/SR-7, working in sections from Military Road to downtown Tacoma. The contractor will not be working in the road during peak traffic times.

If you have questions or concerns, please call 253.983.3407.
What is Bus Rapid Transit?

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is an innovative, high capacity, efficient public transit solution that moves people like light rail, but on wheels.

- Frequent
  Bus runs every 10-15 minutes

- Fast
  Traffic signals prioritize transit

- Safe and reliable
  Real-time arrival information and station lighting

- Accessible
  Larger buses, room for on-board bicycles, easier wheelchair and stroller access

- Connected
  Connecting downtown Tacoma and Spanaway with stops at key destinations

- Easy to board
  Off-board fare readers, raised platforms, multiple doors

---

We want your input – attend an open house!

Join us to discuss updated project designs, potential roundabout locations, left turn management and the project timeline. This is also a great time to get your questions answered about the project.

**TUESDAY APR 14**

4:30 - 7 PM

University of Washington Tacoma
1918 Pacific Ave., Tacoma
William W. Phillip Hall,
Jane Thompson Russell Commons
Room WPH 101A
Served by Routes 1, 2, 13, 14, 41, 42, 400, 500, 501 and
Sound Transit’s Routes 590, 594 and Link light rail

**WEDNESDAY APR 15**

4:30 - 7 PM

Moore Library
215 S. 56th St., Tacoma
Served by Routes 1, 41, 42, 45

**THURSDAY APR 16**

4:30 - 7 PM

Parkland/Spanaway Library
13718 Pacific Ave. S., Tacoma
Served by Route 1

**SATURDAY APR 18**

10 AM - Noon

Fern Hill Library
765 S. 84th St, Tacoma
Served by Routes 1, 45, 48

**TUESDAY APR 21**

4:30 - 6:30 PM

Sprinker Recreation Center
Alder Room
14824 C St., Tacoma
Served by Route 1

---

- Translation service is available in more than 200 languages by calling 253.581.8000.
- Registered SHUTTLE customers may obtain specialized transportation to and from the open houses by calling SHUTTLE at 253.581.8000, option 1, then 2, one to five days in advance.
AGENDA

- Project Update
- 26th Turnaround
- Traffic Analysis
- Bus Selection
- Stations and Branding
- Open Discussion
LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE REFINEMENT

- Median and curbside operation
- 3.6 miles median lanes
- 1.0 miles business access transit (BAT) lanes
- 9.8 miles mixed traffic operation (right or left lane)
- 26th turnaround to serve the Tacoma Dome Station

26th TURNAROUND CHALLENGES

- 26th Bridge is load rated for 48,000 pounds
- 60’ bus can weigh up to 70,000 pounds
- Bridge retrofits as well as moving 26th turnaround to Puyallup Ave are being studied.
Traffic Analysis

- SR7 from 121st to 38th complete
- Concern about migration off corridor requires additional study
- Additional traffic analysis includes:
  - S Yakima Ave
  - E McKinley Ave

BUS SELECTION

- Battery Electric Buses (BEB) selected as preferred option for BRT 1 and following BRT 2-5
- Three Door, 60-foot articulated buses
- Top Off Chargers installed at Commerce Street
- Catenary or Inductive Wireless Charging
- Chargers installed by 2022
BRANDING AND STATIONS

- Naming work underway

- Station Design:
  - Suspension
  - Mountain
  - Ripples

STATIONS – SUSPENSION
Upcoming Outreach

- February/March - 15 Presentations, including:
  - Infrastructure, Planning and Sustainability
  - Tacoma Transportation Commission
  - Tacoma Planning Commission
  - Tacoma City Council Study Session
  - Corridor Neighborhood Councils
  - Corridor Business Districts
  - BRT Community Committee
  - Mailer to 20,000+ residents along the corridor notifying of upcoming soil testing and upcoming Open Houses

- April
  - 5 Open Houses to get feedback on 30% Design + Virtual Open House
  - Repeat of February circuit, topics to include Roundabout analysis

RideBRT.com
To: Planning Commission
From: Mesa Sherriff, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Services
Subject: Urban Design Studio
Meeting Date: March 4, 2020
Memo Date: February 26, 2020

Action Requested
Comment and Guidance.

Discussion:
At the previous meeting on September 18, 2019, the Planning Commission received a briefing on the findings from the code audit and an update on the project deliverables, program, and guidelines. After the September meeting, the project team incorporated the input from the Project Advisory Group, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the guidance from the Planning Commission into the Interim Summary Report. This document (Attachment 1) is as the accumulative report of the work conducted during the first phase of the project and serves as the primer for the second phase that is now underway.

Phase I was focused on developing a clear direction on where in the city design review would operate and it was determined that Neighborhood Mixed-use Centers, the Downtown, and along Pedestrian Corridors should be the initial focus areas. In addition, Phase I set out to determine what existing regulations impact design, what capacity there is for existing staff to administer this program, and how this program would operate. These points and many more are covered in the attached Interim Summary Report.

Building off the work from Phase I, Phase II will be focused on what is most important to review under the program. The starting place for this discussion is the Universal Design Principles laid out in the Draft Guidelines section of the Interim Report. Planning Commission will be asked to provide feedback and guidance on the following key points;

- Exemptions, are any project types that meet the thresholds of design review exempt?
  - Residential Single-Family Uses
  - Residential Duplex / Corner Units
  - Townhomes (4 - 6 units – or anything below 8-10 units)
  - Religious Institutions
  - Higher Education (UW)
  - Schools
  - Hospitals
  - Commercial Retail / Warehouse Outlets
  - Affordable Housing
- The following are currently being considered part of the code and not the design guidelines
  - Land Use (uses, setbacks)
  - Building Heights
  - FAR
  - Street Guidelines
  - Parking Standards
**Project Summary:**
The City of Tacoma has studied the idea of developing a comprehensive design review program to enhance the quality of the built environment throughout the City. The City currently operates two narrowly focused design review systems, one for historic districts and buildings, and the other for the Foss Waterway redevelopment area.

The focus of The Urban Design Studio is to work with the community, development partners, and other departments and agencies to advance the design quality of places citywide. The program’s mission is to build upon Tacoma’s unique setting and history, our special character and our changing population, to elevate the quality of public and private spaces and create a more vibrant, livable, walkable, and sustainable city. The program will oversee a design review process and will work to translate visions and ideas into policy and objectives that result in guidelines and projects, with the intention of forwarding community-supported design.

For more information, the website [www.cityoftacoma.org/urbandesign](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/urbandesign) will be regularly updated with information and documents related to the project.

**Prior Actions:**
- September 18, 2019 – Reviewed findings of code audit and project deliverables.
- June 19, 2019 – reviewed outreach efforts and focus area criteria
- April 3, 2019 – Reviewed scope of work

**Staff Contact:**
- Mesa Sherriff, Senior Planner, msherriff@cityoftacoma.org, (253) 591-5480

**Attachment:**
1. Interim Summary report

cc. Peter Huffman, Director
Introduction

The City of Tacoma is considering the idea of developing a comprehensive design review program to enhance the quality of the built environment throughout the City. The City currently operates two narrowly focused design review systems; one for historic districts and the other for the City’s Foss Waterway redevelopment area. Over the last few years, the concept of a broader Urban Design Studio, intended to create a citywide design review program and help visually communicate design issues to staff and residents has evolved.

The Project

The focus of the Urban Design Studio (UDS) is to work with the community, design and development stakeholders, and other departments and agencies to advance the design quality of places citywide. The program’s mission is to build upon Tacoma’s unique setting and history, its special character, its changing population, and to elevate the quality of public and private spaces and create a more vibrant, livable, walkable, and sustainable city. The UDS program will oversee a design review process and work to translate design policy objectives into guidelines and standards that forward community-supported design.

This Interim Summary Report provides the framework for future decisions regarding the purpose and format of the UDS program and includes the following:

- City of Tacoma Land Use Regulations Code Audit Findings / Recommendations
- Design Review Program / Operations Manual Recommendations
- Preliminary-Draft Urban Design Guidelines and Standards

Additional refinement of each element will be addressed based on the input and direction provided by the City. The next Phase II will include completion of the Design Review Program / Operation Manual and the Draft Urban Design Guidelines and Standards.
TACOMA LURC
CODE AUDIT

Planning and Development Services
City Of Tacoma, Washington
January, 2020
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Introduction

**Design Review History**

Over the last decade, the City of Tacoma has studied the idea of developing a comprehensive design review program to enhance the quality of the built environment throughout the City. The City currently operates two narrowly focused design review systems, one for historic districts and buildings, and the other for the City’s Foss Waterway redevelopment area. Over the last few years, the concept of a broader Urban Design Studio that would build and administer a citywide design review program, as well as visually communicate zoning and development to City staff and residents has evolved. Positions were created over the last two budget cycles and the Urban Design Studio (UDS) was established in 2018.

**The Project**

The City of Tacoma is developing a program design for an internal UDS and design review program. The focus of the UDS is to work with the community, development partners, and other departments and agencies to advance the design quality of places citywide. The program’s mission is to build upon Tacoma’s unique setting and history, its special character and its changing population, to elevate the quality of public and private spaces and create a more vibrant, livable, walkable, and sustainable city. The program will oversee a design review process and will work to translate policy and objectives into guidelines and projects that forward community-supported design. The program design for the UDS and the Design Review Program will create frameworks and parameters for both the studio and design review.

It is important to note that a design review system that is fair and equitable for all parties relies on sound underlying zoning. Where standards for typical best practices have to be incorporated into the design guidelines, instead of the underlying code, then design review is a greater challenge. In general, when design review does not impact the zoning entitlement (especially the buildable floor area) allocated in the Land Use Regulatory Code (LURC), it is better received, since the focus can turn to the design of the project, and not the rights associated with the property.
Purpose of This Document

The purpose of this document is to audit the existing land use regulations and select recent development projects, comparing them to the City’s planning objectives, to determine whether the City’s objectives are being achieved by the existing provisions of the LURC. The audit recommends concepts for improving the existing regulations, and also begins the conversation about implementation of the new design guidelines.

Basis of Analysis

Any views or opinions presented in this report are solely those of the consultant and do not necessarily represent those of the City.

In preparing this report, a variety of regulatory and planning policy documents and regulations were reviewed. While these documents provide a foundation for understanding Tacoma’s planning and regulatory framework, it was the time spent touring Tacoma and meeting with staff and the Project Advisory Committee (PAG) that provided the details of the challenges and opportunities facing the City.

An organized tour of the City was conducted that included members of City staff. The tour covered Mixed Use Centers and Corridors across the City. The tour allowed the consultants to match the details of the existing zoning with real life examples and obtain a running commentary from City staff as they discussed recent planning initiatives and proposed or recently built projects.

The input received from City staff and the PAG offers an invaluable local perspective on challenges with the current LURC. Both staff and PAG have their own insight into what is working and what is not working. By establishing an open dialogue, a more complete picture of what is happening and what Tacoma wants to see happen has been pieced together.

This evaluation provides recommendations to address inadequacies with the current LURC that would support the adoption of a new design review system. These recommendations represent potential solutions that may or may not be appropriate for Tacoma, but can serve as the starting point for discussion, prior to future code drafting.
This analysis requires the consultant team to read the existing provisions very literally. In other words, the review focuses on what the LURC actually says. While this approach can result in occasional misinterpretations of intent or established local conventions, these provide valuable insight into provisions in need of clarification.

Finally, it is important to note that peculiar inconsistencies or weaknesses in the current LURC are in no way intended to reflect poorly on the drafters or administrators. The existing LURC has been incrementally updated for a long time, and in fact, many issues raised by stakeholders have already led to patches in the existing Code. Also, the City’s recent approach has been to use overlays as a chance to test new regulations. It is to be expected that amendments prepared by various authors have resulted in some inconsistencies.

**A View to the Future**

The analysis included in this document looks to the future. However, that future design review system is likely to be phased in over time. Initially, the LURC and the Design Guidelines must work together without major revisions to the existing code. This document recommends some initial patches to the Code in order to achieve improved outcomes even when the design guidelines do not apply. Finally, at some point, the City can conduct a wholesale revision of the existing LURC, at which time reorganization of the material, improved page layout, enhanced graphics and other more significant changes could occur.
Introduction

This review of the design standards in the LURC has been broken down into standards impacting sites, and those that impact buildings.

Site Plan vs. Subdivision

Today’s regulations treat a site that will be subdivided differently from one that is subject to site plan review. Most modern codes attempt to place these approaches on parity so that the outcome looks the same whether the land is divided or not.

In order for this to work without the duplication of standards in Chapter 13.04, Platting and Subdivision, in Chapter 13.06, Zoning, it is typical to place all jointly applicable standards in a single chapter. This would be especially important with regard to site access, which is currently reviewed only as it affects the impacted lot (even within a consolidated shopping center). This has led to some awkward designs that would easily be improved if the entire center were part of the discussion. A definition for site that discusses the group of lots that share access, parking or ownership would allow for this.

There are also differing rules for townhouses if they are on a single property versus individual parcels. Consistency is important here, to avoid the developer skirting a requirement by changing the proposed form of eventual ownership.

The standards discussed in this section assume that projects will be treated in like fashion whether they are subdivided or not.
Phasing

Transitioning an auto-oriented center to something with more street orientation is difficult. No longer can the City expect that a developer will raze everything on the site and build anew all at once. It is much more common to see phasing that retains some tenants in place, while creating new space for additional tenants.

Dealing with the first new liner buildings (located at the street edge instead of in the center of a parking lot) can be challenging. “Don’t paint yourself into a corner” is a key principle in phased redevelopment. Requiring the developer demonstrate that early phase improvements won’t preclude more robust compliance with urban design guidelines in the future is critical. One option is to require a “future opportunity plan” (not a binding site plan) that demonstrates how future connections may be provided and appropriate building sites established. Provided there are ways in which a compliant later phase could be built, the developer should be allowed to move forward with the current phase.
1.1 Sites

**Blocks**

Breaking up large blocks is hampered today in Tacoma by restricting the application of the Code to the new building area only. Both subdivisions and sites should be subjected to a maximum block standard (the preferred method is to set a maximum block perimeter and block face). This standard will ensure that internal streets are created on large sites, breaking them down into functional blocks. New connections are not typically required to be public streets. The City’s recent work at the mall subarea reflects this type of approach.
Internal Streets

The internal streets of large development are critical to the creation of the blocks described above. **The City must have a street design standard for these blocks.** Graphics can assist with clarity. In order to slow internal traffic on these streets, it is important to include parallel parking in these cross-sections. Street trees help to shade the sidewalk, parking and street.

There is no need for these streets to be public, but if they are private they must be built and maintained to public standards. This includes those elements of the public realm such as sidewalks and street trees. The City may determine that private streets are appropriate settings to experiment with roadway widths, paving materials and other streetscape options. New standards for these internal streets, allowing for on-street parking, should be adopted.
Open Space

Title 13 does include open space requirements for some development (15% in PRD and 10% usable yard space in residential districts). Open space can be a critical organizing element for site development. A minimum requirement should exist in all districts subject to Design Review.

The developer should have choices - public space is often seen as more valuable than private space, and a bonus may be appropriate for dedicating land to the public or providing privately-owned public space.

Figure 6: Open Space as an Organizing Element for a Site
Building Placement

The City’s Mixed-Use Districts require buildings to be pulled up to the street. Designated Pedestrian Streets have the same requirements. However, not all locations that will be subject to Design Review will have this requirement. Consideration should be given to adding this requirements for all properties subject to Design Review.

Figure 7: Building Placement Away from Street
Building Orientation

Once the buildings are required to be pulled up to the street, it is equally important to ensure the right building orientation. Both the Mixed-Use and Commercial Districts do not allow rear orientation to the street; however, side orientation may still create blank walls facing the street.

Orientation to internal parking lots, without appropriate orientation to the street as well, should not be allowed. Management of service areas and loading along the sides of buildings along the street may also be necessary.
Drive-Through/Stacking

Screening is required, and drive-through lanes are required to be internal, but sometimes this doesn’t work because of site constraints. How can there be better standards or guidelines to address this issue? Or should the districts in which they are allowed be re-evaluated?
Parking as a Principal Use

There are instances of full-block surface parking in the City. Locking up development capacity for this use should only be considered as a temporary measure. There are no standards for accessory parking when it is the principal use of a full block. Consideration should be given to banning this use in the future, or at least requiring a conditional use permit so that the timing of temporary nature of the use can be made explicit. District parking (with shared spaces) is more efficient than parking each site separately. Consideration should be given to techniques that introduce shared parking and development screening the parking.

Figure 10: Parking Lot Example in Central Tacoma
Signs

For corridors that are planned to transform to pedestrian and transit-oriented places, eliminating pole signs and installing monument and building signs would both improve wayfinding and enhance aesthetics. In addition, a mechanism to retain unique older signs throughout the community would help retain local character.

Figure 11: Character Sign Example
Service Areas

Addressing the design of “back-of-house” for buildings is always an issue. Ensuring that service areas are located in less prominent, less travelled and less visible (from the street) areas helps. Service areas are more frequently an issue for “liner buildings” (those buildings that are pulled up to the street, with parking to the rear). Where necessary due to a site facing two street frontages, service areas can be embedded into the building itself, using screening to reduce their impact. The City bans service areas adjacent to the street in most cases; however, it should be clarified in the code for all areas subject to Design Review.

Figure 12: Service Areas Located on Alley
Tree Canopy Cover

Tacoma regulates tree canopy coverage in some of its districts (including multi-family residential and commercial districts). This concept should apply in all districts subject to Design Review. At the same time, consideration must be given to ensuring developers can achieve the full capacity of their site (density and FAR), in order not to underbuild portions of the City. This may mean providing flexibility for tree replacement off-site, subject to a hierarchy of preferred locations.
Residential Transitions

The City currently has residential transition requirements when new commercial or mixed-use buildings abut the property line. However, these transition concepts do not apply across streets. In certain cases, large blank walls associated with foundations or parking garages can create an unfortunate impact on neighbors across the street. Limits on the extent of blank walls facing a street, along with foundation or buffer planting requirements should be added to the code for these instances.

Figure 16: Transition of Residential to Commercial
1.2 Buildings

There are a variety of existing building design standards applied in Title 13 to Mixed-Use Districts. These standards are all very good, and should be considered for application more broadly for all properties subject to Design Review.

An example of the results in a district not subject to the Mixed-Use District requirements is shown below. This particular instance could be cured by applying the existing multifamily standards to development in all districts.

Figure 17: Side Elevations on Street
In particular, the standards for the following should be applied:

- Windows and doors
- Roofs
- Weather protection
- Facade design
- Mass variation

In regulations across the country, these building design standards are the most common prescriptive standards requiring relief. See the discussion of **Alternative Compliance** later in this report as an option for effective relief.

Figure 18: Facade Design Example With Variation of Massing
1.3 Setting the Tone

“First, Best Plan” Model

Ideally, the application process and design review system encourages a developer to submit their best plan first. They will do so if there is a likelihood (or even better, an assurance) that the plan will be approved. This reduces the climate in which a developer first puts forward a plan that is not serious and uses it as a start for negotiating a final plan.

Most developers just want to know what the requirements are. They are not trying to ask for alternatives, or to push the envelope. The system needs to have basic standards (and very specific design guidelines) for these cases.

Pre-Application Conference

When a design review system is in place, a mandatory pre-application conference becomes more important. For newcomers, this is a chance to understand the review process, and the conference may be long. For seasoned veterans, the meeting can be brief, focusing on key issues.

The regulations need to make it clear that comments provided at the pre-application conference require revisions. The permitting process flowchart must include a step for revisions.

Code vs. Guidelines

For purposes of this strategy report, design “standards” are prescriptive requirements, which must be met in order to obtain a permit for improving a property. They usually are measurable, such as the dimension of a minimum setback, or the maximum height of a building. Some simply require, or prohibit, the presence of a particular feature of site or building design.

The appeal of using prescriptive standards in the development code is that they can be administered by staff “at the counter,” and they are predictable in their application. Owners can understand all of the requirements when planning a project, and neighbors also know what can happen around them.
Title 13 should include all of the basic requirements necessary for good design. Not all design review will occur through a Board (smaller projects will likely receive only staff review). The outcome of the code alone must deliver an acceptable building and site.

A “guideline” means a more discretionary criterion for determining the appropriateness of a proposed improvement. These are more qualitative, and offer flexibility in the way in which they may be applied to individual projects. When guidelines are used in a review process, it usually is not necessary to comply with all of the guidelines that are published for a particular district, but instead to adequately meet a sufficient number of them in order to have the proposal be determined appropriate.

The guidelines allow for additional conversation about the quality of the design, and should be considered an extension of the code. The guidelines can also serve as a support mechanism for the relief process when a code provision is too restrictive in a specific instance.
**Variance vs Alternative Compliance**

The variance process is always available to applicants. However, the outcome of a variance application is either denial or the relief from a specific standard as requested. There is not typically any room for “give and take” in the outcome - either relief is justified or it is not. Tacoma’s variance expressly allows relief for an environmentally-sensitive site and structure design, which may help improve design. However, any variance process does not always yield the best design outcome.

The Director does have administrative authority to process up to a 10% variation from quantified standards, providing some relief and streamlining the approval process.

Communities adopt an Alternative Compliance process as an adjunct to their codes in order to provide more flexibility to accommodate projects that may meet the intent of the prescriptive standards, but in different ways. In this case, an applicant may opt to enter into the design review process in order to gain additional flexibility in meeting certain standards that exist in the code. This permits the City to adopt relatively prescriptive base standards, which could apply to most situations, but still provide the option for allowing new design approaches.

Alternative compliance review should occur at the Board level, and not through staff review. Use of the Alternative Compliance process to provide relief from prescriptive standards in the regulations should be made possible by allowing projects not typically subject to Board review the opportunity to request relief at the Board level.
1.4 Changing Role of Guidelines

Without Code Revisions

Initial projects are likely to be reviewed without any major code revisions, therefore the Design Guidelines document should include the changes discussed above as “standards” that can be eliminated later once revisions to the City’s zoning and subdivision regulations has occurred.

Code Amendments

The majority of the ideas included in the Summary Matrix on page __ can be added to the existing regulations as amendments. These regulations will assist the review process by improving the quality of development before the guidelines are considered.

Two key ideas apply here - one is that many of the necessary regulations have already been applied in some portion of Tacoma through an overlay or special district. These regulations should simply apply more broadly in areas that are subject to Design Review.

The second key idea is that the Design Review areas have already been highlighted in prior planning exercises as places of heightened design interest (Neighborhood Mixed Use Centers, Pedestrian Streets, etc.). The supporting code amendments can be seen as Plan implementation, in support of the Design Review process.

Code Rethink

Many of the important improvements to usability of the existing regulations require a complete rethink and reformat of the existing zoning. This will allow improved page layout with better handling of graphic elements, and an opportunity to rethink the multiple layers applied today through overlays.
Improved page layout is possible once the City moves from simple word processing (for example, Microsoft Word) to page layout software (such as Adobe InDesign) for their regulations. Once this move is made, many opportunities become available, including improved page layout, the use of color, and the more frequent inclusion of graphics, tables and flowcharts.

---

Sec. 13.3.4. Zone Change

1. **Initiation**
   - COUNCIL, CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, PLANNING DIRECTOR or PROPERTY OWNER

2. **Submittal**
   - COMPLETENESS REVIEW
   - HEARING OFFICER HEARING
   - PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
   - CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING
   - CITY PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

3. **Decision**
   - CITY COUNCIL MEETING
# Summary Matrix

The following matrix summarizing the urban design issues in the current regulations are the consultant’s response only. Specifically, the priorities are a combination of consultant best practices and staff discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE REFERENCE</th>
<th>CONTENT SUMMARY</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.660 Site Approval</td>
<td>Development site defined as land sharing common access, circulation, and improvements.</td>
<td>Good definition. Should apply to all “site” level standards in order to generate same outcomes for both site plans and plats. Add to 13.06.700 Definitions and Illustrations.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan vs. Subdivision</td>
<td>13.04.040 Definitions Terms such as replat or redivision and vacation apply to site plans and plats.</td>
<td>Support for concept above. --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require “Future Opportunity Plan” with submittals that do not cover the entire site.</td>
<td>Allows confirmation that future development can meet the code standards. This Plan should not be binding site plan.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.04.220 Blocks</td>
<td>Contains maximum block length for platting purposes of 600 feet. Width is set to allow, “two tiers of normal lots.”</td>
<td>Appropriate block length, but does not apply to site plans (only platting). Apply to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>13.06.660 Site Approval Blocks are defined as “assemblages of land circumnavigated by the shortest possible complete loop via the public street network.” [Size = 8 acres for Site Approval]</td>
<td>The concept of circumnavigation via public streets should be part of the definition of block in 10. Could also include private streets built to public dimensional standards.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.512 Pedestrian and Bicycle Support Standards</td>
<td>Requires through-block connection if 60,000 SF or more. Through-block connection width is 10 feet</td>
<td>Consider wider through-block connections when they run between buildings using 3 feet of landscaping.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Streets</td>
<td>There are no design standards for internal streets that extend from a public street to reach a parking area.</td>
<td>In order to meet block standards discussed above, internal streets should be required to meet public street standards (even if the ownership remains private). Need a new street type for this purpose.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE REFERENCE</td>
<td>CONTENT SUMMARY</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.140 PRD Planned Residential Development District, F. Area Regulations</td>
<td>Common open space -15% required in PRD District.</td>
<td>Good standard. Consider applying to all residential and mixed-use projects subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usable yard space - 10% required in residential districts.</td>
<td>Good standard. Consider applying to all mixed-use projects subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.200 Commercial Districts, D. Building Envelope Standards</td>
<td>Maximum front and side setback of 10 feet for Pedestrian Streets.</td>
<td>Good standard. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify this standard.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.300 Mixed-Use Center Districts, F. Maximum Setback Standards</td>
<td>Maximum front and side setback of 10 feet.</td>
<td>Good standard. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify this standard.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, B. Commercial District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Restricts rear orientation facing streets.</td>
<td>Remove exemption for more than 2 qualifying elevations on all properties subject to Design Review. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Restricts rear orientation facing streets.</td>
<td>Remove exemption for more than 2 qualifying elevations on all properties subject to Design Review. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.513 Drive-Throughs</td>
<td>Does not allow direct connection on Pedestrian Streets.</td>
<td>Consider expanding to all street types and all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking as a Principal Use</td>
<td>Parking as a Principal Use not regulated where it is accessory to a nearby use.</td>
<td>Ban accessory parking as a principal use in all sites subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>See discussion under Building Orientation above</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.100 Residential Districts, D. Lot Size and Building Envelope Standards</td>
<td>Required percentage of lot area must include canopy cover (R-3, R-4-L, R-4, R-5)</td>
<td>Good standard. Also included in T, C-1, C-2 and PDB Districts. Consider including on all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>Requires daylight plane abutting a single-family zone. No vehicle ingress or egress, loading bay doors facing residential. No light trespass over 3 lux. Standards end at street.</td>
<td>Good standard. Misses the need for screening to hide tall blank walls facing residential across a street.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE REFERENCE</td>
<td>CONTENT SUMMARY</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, B. Commercial District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes facade transparency and blank wall standards.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards. Apply these standards to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, B. Commercial District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Requires customer entrance for non-residential or mixed-use buildings on designated streets.</td>
<td>Applies only to Pedestrian Streets. Apply to all properties subject to Design Review. Also consider applying to residential buildings.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes facade transparency and blank wall standards.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards. Apply these standards to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes window trim and detailing standards.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards. Apply these standards to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, F. Townhouse Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Ensures that “slot homes” have their end unit with a street facing door.</td>
<td>Applies only to townhomes. Apply to all multifamily properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, F. Townhouse Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Ensures that alley-facing units have doors, an alley must extend through the block, and include sidewalk on one side.</td>
<td>Applies only to townhomes. Apply to all multifamily properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, B. Commercial District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes roof pitch standards, modulation and roof cornices.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes detailed roofline and cornice standards.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards. Apply these standards to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE REFERENCE</td>
<td>CONTENT SUMMARY</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, B. Commercial District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes facade variety standards</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes facade articulation requirements.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards. Apply these standards to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes maximum facade width of 120 feet.</td>
<td>Strict dimensional standards may conflict with future design guidelines. Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards. Apply these standards to all properties subject to Design Review.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, C. Mixed-Use District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Includes additional requirements for Core Pedestrian Streets.</td>
<td>Allow Alternative Compliance to modify these standards.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06.501 Building Design Standards, B. Commercial District Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Requires 25% of facade length along public street frontage</td>
<td>Consider expanding to all properties subject to Design Review. Consider applying higher standards from Mixed-Use Districts.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE REFERENCE</td>
<td>CONTENT SUMMARY</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Compliance 13.06.502.E.6. Street Trees</td>
<td>Street trees shall, when possible, be planted within the right-of-way adjacent to the curb and between the pedestrian lane/sidewalk and curb. When this is not possible or a different location would better achieve the intent, street trees may be located elsewhere within the right-of-way, including behind the sidewalk, in street medians, parking strips or bulbouts. If neither of these preferred locations is possible, such as when existing infrastructure prevents trees from being planted within the right-of-way, trees located within 10 feet of the right-of-way may be counted as street trees.</td>
<td>Example of use of Alternative Compliance process in today’s code.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Role of Guidelines (w/o Code, Patch, Rethink) -- --</td>
<td>Initial projects are likely to be reviewed without any code revisions, therefore the Design Guidelines should include the changes discussed above as “standards” that can be eliminated later once revision of the City’s zoning and subdivision regulations has occurred.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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OVERVIEW

VISION AND GOALS

THE SCOPE OF DESIGN REVIEW

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION
Introduction

This manual is the strategic operating plan for the Urban Design Studio in the department of Planning and Development Services. It includes:

- Vision and goals
- Timeline for growth, implementation, and rollout of key projects and functions
- Recommendations for necessary resources including software, consultants, and staff
- Recommended organizational relationships and roles

General Structure of the City’s Design Management Tools

The design review system is envisioned to operate in designated areas of the city, which are described later in this manual. It also works within limits established as thresholds for design review.

Design review is an added process that is coordinated with other permitting processes, including code compliance. Within the designated areas, the character of development is addressed in three basic categories:

1. **Basic code compliance only**
   These are projects that are subject to standards within the Municipal Code only and approved administratively. No additional design review is applied to these projects.

2. **Code compliance AND design review by staff**
   These projects are checked by staff for compliance with the code and are also reviewed administratively for compliance with adopted design guidelines. Of those projects subject to design review, the majority are to be in this category.

3. **Code compliance AND design review by a board**
   These projects are checked by staff for compliance with the applicable standards in the code and are reviewed by the (proposed) Design Review Board. This review category is limited to projects which are of highest visibility, are large in scale, are public projects, or are in sensitive locations.
Relationship to the City’s Development Code

Some basic design requirements exist in the city’s Municipal Code, particularly in Title 13. The design review system and the related design guidelines are to be coordinated with the code. The guidelines will provide more detail related to design than exist in the code and also will include some new topics that are not in the code. In time, more design standards may be added to the code, some of which may be drawn from the design guidelines. This may require adjustments to the design guidelines over time.

Relationship to Other Character-Management Tools

The design review system operates in concert with the city’s established historic preservation program. The historic preservation program (with its historic and conservation districts and special review overlays) will continue to operate as a separate unit but closely allied with the Urban Design Review Program.

Relationship to SEPA

The SEPA commenting process provides some opportunity for design review. Where a SEPA review is triggered, it will follow after review by the Urban Design Studio.
This section presents the vision and goals for the Urban Design Program. It is an amalgam of goals and objectives set forth in the city’s Comprehensive Plan and related policy statements.

Goals for the UDRP:

- To improve the quality of design in Tacoma
- To raise the awareness of and appreciation for high quality design in the city
- To implement policies and goals set forth in the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan related to design and quality of the built environment

Vision: The Urban Design Review Program Should be:

- Highly effective and operate efficiently
- Scaled to fit the city’s administrative resources
- Flexible, yet predictable in its process and outcomes
- Applied equitably throughout the city
- Related to special community concerns, including:
  - Affordable housing
  - Sustainability
Objectives of the Program:

• Improve upon the city’s existing development review process
• Support high quality, sustainable, and compatible development
• Support equitable growth and development
• Provide community education and be a resource to the community
• Administer the program effectively and within the department’s administrative capacity
• Provide a user-friendly and understandable interface
• Be flexible and promote innovation
• Encourage public involvement at appropriate levels
• Integrate the program with other city permitting processes

Planning for Success

It is important that the program demonstrates success from the outset. Because it is beginning with a modest budget and staffing, phasing in some program components, in balance with resources, is essential. First priority is to establish the building blocks of a good urban design program review process before getting into more detailed guidance for individual neighborhoods or sub-areas. Some key aspects of phasing are:

1. Sufficient tools (codes, guidelines and procedural materials) must be in place before an official launch
2. Sufficient human resources must be in place for effective administration (staff, board, etc.)
3. The design guidelines are appropriately tailored to each phase of implementation. Initially, they will operate at a “high level” and be tailored to the most critical geographic areas and building types. If it is needed, more detailed guidelines for specific planning areas may be added later.
3.0 The Scope of Design Review

Positioning the Program

The program respects Tacoma’s character and culture. It does not impose models from other cities; instead, it builds on Tacoma’s sense of identity and its values. In doing so it will:

- Anchor the guidelines in the city’s design traditions
- Express community values
- Focus on enhancing the community that exists, not creating a new city

Geographic Application

The review system will be implemented in phases, in concert with administrative capabilities. This will include:

1. CENTERS
   Centers are defined and mapped in the Comprehensive Plan. There are three types:
   - Regional (including downtown)
   - Crossroads
   - Neighborhood

2. COMMERCIAL & MIXED-USE ZONES ALONG CORRIDORS
   Those portions of corridors indicated and mapped as commercial and mixed use in the Comprehensive Plan, which are:
   - Avenues
   - Mainstreets

3. MULTIFAMILY DISTRICTS ALONG CORRIDORS
   Those portions of corridors indicated and mapped as multifamily in the Comprehensive Plan.
Using Thresholds

In addition to its geographic application, the system will use thresholds as a means of limiting the number of projects reviewed to a volume that can be administered effectively. Using thresholds will:

1. Tailor the work load to fit the administrative capability at various stages of program implementation
2. Focus review on projects most likely to accomplish the city’s goals for design quality that are adopted in the Comprehensive Plan

Based on a sampling of building sizes along selected corridors, it appears that a threshold of 5,000 square feet would include most projects that have the potential to impact the character of the street.

Recommended Thresholds For Design Review:

The recommended thresholds for projects subject to design review are that the project is in one of the designated design review overlay areas (Centers and Corridors), and:

• The project involves construction of a new building of 5,000 square feet or more, or:

• The project involves construction of an addition to an existing building that itself is at least 5,000 square feet, the addition would be visible from the public way, and which increases the footprint by 500 square feet or more, or:

• The project is on the corner of a key intersection, as defined in the comprehensive plan, or:

• The project directly abuts a property with single family (R-1 and R-2) zoning.
Addressing Single Family Neighborhoods

Detached single family residential projects are not to be a part of the design review system at this stage. Instead, other tools that may focus on single family projects are:

- Improve underlying zoning with form-based standards
- Establish a conservation district
- Establish a historic district
- Develop educational materials that highlight compatible design

Project Tracking

The city will use its web-based permitting platform (Accela) to track Design Review approvals. In this system, an applicant can apply for permits, make payments and track their project’s status online. These are some factors in project tracking:

Design Review Process

Applicants must go through the design review process prior to the start of work or issuance of permits. Most simple projects take two to four weeks to review from the point of application. More complex projects can require several meetings, including informational briefings during design development.

Submitting Plans for Preliminary Review

By submitting plans through the Accela permitting system, the project will be reviewed for applicable codes.

Scheduling Review

Upon receiving an application, staff will review it for completeness. If the project qualifies for Administrative Approval, staff will then initiate review. If the project meets the requirements for review by the Design Review Board, it will be placed on the next available agenda. Applications must be completed two weeks in advance of the desired meeting date. When it is determined that the application is complete, the applicant will be notified when their project has been scheduled for review.
Apply for Other Permits

Once design review approval is granted, an applicant may obtain the required permits. In some cases, land use review or plans review may occur concurrently with the design review process in the interest of streamlining.

Studio Structure

The Urban Design Studio consists of a team of professionals with expertise in urban design along with administrative support personnel.

The Urban Design Studio is responsible for:

1. **Managing the design review program**
   - This includes reviewing projects, making determinations of appropriateness and working with the Design Review Board

2. **Technical assistance w/Planning and department staff**
   - This includes matters related to urban design, and special initiatives, such as compatible infill pilot programs

3. **Engaging in public outreach**
   - This includes community engagement to build awareness of design
   - Building a constituency of advocates for high quality design
   - Communicating through a wide range of media, including social media

4. **Resource to the community in matters related to urban design**
   - This includes assisting designers and property owners in dealing with design issues
Roles in the Design Review System

Staff

Staff of the Urban Design Studio are professionals in architecture, landscape architecture and urban design as well as administrative support staff. Their responsibilities include:

1. Outreach
   A. Public presentations
      • To build general awareness of and appreciation for urban design
      • To engage the community in developing design guidelines and other policies related to urban design
   B. Web site materials
      • Providing content that promotes urban design
      • Providing on-line interface for project applicants (through Acella)

2. Developing program-related tools, including:
   A. Design guidelines
   B. Educational materials about urban design
   C. Administrative (on-line) forms

3. Facilitation, including:
   A. Providing technical assistance
      • Assisting property owners and their architects in interpreting the guidelines
   B. Coordinating with other permitting processes
      • Meeting with other department representatives to collaborate on permit application review

4. Decision-making (Design Review)
   A. The Director (through the Urban Design Studio staff) should be the decision-maker for as many projects as is feasible. A threshold for administrative approvals would apply.
   B. In other cases, staff will provide recommendations to the Design Review Board (who are recommended to be decision-makers for large projects).
   C. Approval would be indicated in a written statement, including findings.
5. **General administration of the Urban Design Studio, including:**
   
   A. General administration (e.g. maintaining files, scheduling, etc)
   
   B. Providing an annual report (a summary of activities, including design review actions), to be presented to the Planning Commission.

**The Design Review Board**

A Design Review Board (DRB) composed of qualified professionals is recommended to review and recommend approval on major projects and those of special sensitivity. In considering the role of a board, these alternatives were considered:

**Option A: No review board**

Some communities operate design review at the administrative level only. Staff make all decisions. This can be efficient, in terms of the amount of time to review, but places substantial burden on staff and can place them under intense political pressure. It also provides limited relief from staff decisions that would include the insights of a board with professional qualifications.

**Option B: Advisory board only**

Other communities use a board for advice, which is provided to staff who make the final decisions. This approach does provide the insights of design professionals to staff and may expedite the time to review to some extent.
Option C: Formal design review board with decision-making authority

Many communities use a board that has authority to approve certain types of projects. In smaller communities, the board may review all projects, but in larger communities their role is usually focused on more complex and sensitive projects. This approach is recommended. This helps to relieve staff of some of the burden of decision-making and provides an avenue to appeal a staff level decision.

The Design Review Board should be a key part of the system. The objective is to use the board strategically, to:

- Keep the process as efficient as possible, by focusing on more visible projects
- Serve as a support to staff on difficult projects for which they are responsible
- Provide a mechanism for public participation without overburdening the process
- Bring in additional expertise in design-related fields

The purpose of the DRB is to promote high quality building design and site planning that enhances the character of the city. The Board reviews proposed projects for consistency with adopted design guidelines. The Board should meet at a frequency that keeps their review skills honed, but not to the extent that they are bogged down with extensive agendas.

Roles of the design review board are:

1. To approve projects brought before them:
   - In sensitive locations
   - Projects above a defined threshold
   - Civic projects
2. To advise the Director on making decisions for other projects subject to review:
   - For all projects of a defined type or threshold
   - For others that staff feels the need for advice

3. As an appeals body for staff decisions
   - An applicant has the right to appeal a staff decision to the board.

Membership in the DRB

Members of the DRB would serve at large and will be appointed by City Council and should consist of seven (7) active members who represent the following categories:

1. At least two members should be from design and planning professions:
   - Licensed architect
   - Licensed landscape architect
   - Urban planner
   - Urban designer

2. At least one member should be from the construction and building fields:
   - Licensed civil engineer
   - Licensed contractor
   - Builder/Developer

3. At least one member should represent the professions of graphic design, signage and wayfinding.

4. At least one member should represent the community at large and not be from the above listed professions.
Qualifications

All individuals who seek appointment to the DRB should have a demonstrated interest in the design of the community and be motivated by a desire to serve fellow members of the community. Members of the board should be persons who, as a result of their training and experience, are qualified to analyze and interpret architectural and landscape drawings and site plans.

They should have experience as project designers (not simply administrators) and have designed projects that are considerate of their context. Experience with design review systems also is desired.

To the extent feasible, members should represent diversity and bring knowledge of different parts of the city to the board. The majority should be residents of the city but others from the region who have professional experience working in Tacoma also may serve. Elected officials may not serve on the board.

Terms of service

Board member would be appointed for a three-year term, and could serve a maximum of three terms consecutively.

Role of the public in design review

A key is that the public should have sufficient opportunity to participate in the design review program and its approval process while also doing so in an efficient manner that does not unduly delay the process. Ideally, the public participates in developing design guidelines and in monitoring the system, and only comments on individual projects when necessary. Seeking diversity in all levels of public participation is a goal. The public should participate in these ways:

1. Establishing the design review tools

   This is one of the most effective means of participating in the system. The public should participate in developing:
   - Ordinance revisions that enable the design review process
   - Design guidelines
   - Operations tools and procedures
This is a key engagement method, when the guidelines are being developed. The expectation is that, when clear guidelines are in place and professionals are administering the system, there is less need for public comment on individual projects.

2. **Reviewing the system**

A periodic review and assessment of the system (annually at first and later at every 5 years) should include a public outreach component. Topics to address should include:

- How well have the guidelines addressed the issues?
- How effective is the review process is achieving its goals?

The concept is that the public monitors the overall system, and discussion occurs in special meetings, not during regular board meetings or individual staff reviews.

3. **Reviewing the reviewer**

The public should participate in a periodic (bi-annual) review of how staff and the board are performing. Topics to address should include:

- Debrief a selection of projects received in the past year
  - How effective was the process?
  - Do the results help to accomplish the goals for design?
- Discuss ways to improve interpretation of the guidelines

4. **Participating in informational meetings for projects that are referred to a neighborhood**

The Director may determine that some projects merit a presentation to the community in an informational meeting. This is not a formal decision-making hearing, but one at which a project may be presented and comments can be received in an informal format. Highlights of the comments should be reported in a staff memo, which may then be considered in a staff decision or in a report to the Design Review Board.

5. **Testifying on individual projects**

For those projects scheduled for a public hearing, members of the public may testify during the formal public comment period for an agenda item.
6. The role of neighborhood councils

Neighborhood Councils may be invited to participate in the periodic system reviews.

Appeals

The city uses a Hearings Examiner for appeals of decisions. This should also be used for the DRB decisions. The DRB would hear appeals for staff decisions. Appeals of Board decisions would go to City Council.

Inspections

While planning staff can assist in monitoring projects in the field for compliance, establishing a position for a formal Compliance Officer is recommended. (This position could be in coordination with the preservation review system as well.)

Training

Staff and the DRB should participate in an annual training session on design review. The agenda should include a refresher on the content of the design guidelines, as well as meeting procedures and techniques for effective decision-making. This may be an in-house event or it may be a program presented at a conference or other meeting of similar boards and professionals.

Staff in other departments should also participate in a training session. This will help them understand how their programs interface with the design review system, both in terms of subjects addressed and also in terms of coordinating permitting processes.
design review operations

THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

PHASING IN THE PROGRAM

SYSTEM MECHANICS
The Planning Commission has prioritized design review to occur in the Downtown, designated centers and key corridors. Given that, there are these factors to consider:

**Incentives For Design Excellence:**
Public investment follows (or better yet precedes) private improvements, thus serving as a stimulus. There is more likelihood of the development community accepting the design review program if the areas where it is to be implemented are also seeing public investment now or in the future. For example, the city’s plans for transit enhancement and streetscape improvements along certain corridors should be considered when setting geographic boundaries for initial phases of design review.

**Considering Context**
In the early stages of a design review project, context will be considered at a high level. The design guidelines will not be tailored to specific settings. Nonetheless, it will be helpful to require documentation of the context in a project’s submittal package, in part in anticipation of later phases in which guidelines for more specific contexts may be developed.

The downtown plan identifies different sub-areas that can be used as high level contexts for design review. Along the corridors, those places that immediately abut established lower-density residential neighborhoods are candidates for considering context as well, especially in terms of providing gentle transitions.

**Sub-Areas Along Corridors**
The corridors are defined in the Comprehensive Plan. These include sections that have commercial and higher density residential uses as well as mixed-use properties. These are the areas where design review for corridors should be targeted. There are other portions of these corridors that are lower density residential. These should not
be included in the design review program, at least in these initial implementation stages, in order to keep the number of projects reviewed manageable.

Adaptive Reuse

Supporting adaptive reuse of existing buildings is a goal, particularly for older commercial strip centers that may transition to more urban environments. To what extent are the conflicts with zoning requirements (which might be addressed in this project), versus other codes? An example is that adding canopies to a building can trigger requirements for structural upgrades. Some codes make it clear that certain changes to the property (and even changes in use) do not trigger full compliance with other codes. What are the triggers for meeting new code requirements in adaptive reuse? For site work? For parking compliance? While an adaptive reuse program should be a separate initiative, the design guidelines should address this topic.

Projected Work Load

A series of charts (excel spreadsheets) is attached in the Appendix. The charts estimate the potential number of projects that will be reviewed annually and the amount of staff and board time that will be required. This assumes that thresholds will be set for projects sizes. Small projects will not be subject to design review. For those that are subject to review, the priority is to have staff make decisions to the extent feasible. Board review would be targeted at larger and more complex projects. As the design review program becomes well-established and as more staff can be added, the thresholds for review may be adjusted to include more projects.
While priorities for phasing have been identified by the Planning Commission, there may be fine-grained adjustments, based on these criteria:

**Follow Transit Improvements**

Higher density development is encouraged to cluster around transit service. Some of these areas are targeted for enhancement. This public investment can serve as a magnet for new development, which should comply with best practices in urban design.

This also will help developers comply with guidelines that seek to bring buildings closer to the street edge and at grade level. Otherwise, asking private property development to comply when the public realm is in transition, or is planned to change is a challenge. That is, requiring a new commercial building to be located at the sidewalk edge with an entrance onto the street may be difficult to accomplish when a change in the street design is anticipated for the future.

**Benchmarking For Phased Implementation of the Program**

Indicators should be established that identify when it is appropriate to move to a subsequent phase of implementation. Benchmarking should include:

- Reaching a threshold in the number of projects seeking permits in a defined category
- Evaluation of the preceding stage to document its success
- Implementation of Comprehensive Plan policies related to design
Early Phasing Possibilities For Using Design Guidelines

1. Use the design guidelines in existing permitting processes when the director exercises authority to vary some standards in the code (10%).
2. Use the design guidelines when compliance with the Comprehensive Plan is considered in project review.
3. As a required “informational” review
4. Conduct site design only for some locations and phase Building Design review in later
5. Limit review to “high level” site design topics
   a. Internal streets / street-like lanes
   b. Cut and fill / terracing
   c. Internal pedestrian circulation
   d. Connectivity at site edges
6. The Commercial zones (because the code is being updated now and audit recommendations could be implemented soon)
7. Civic buildings: At a minimum design review could be established for civic buildings and other public projects.
8. By threshold:
   a. Only buildings greater than an established square footage (See the Appendix for suggested thresholds.)
   b. Only sites greater than an established square footage
9. Only sites with slopes greater than an established percentage
10. Areas designated for public realm investment in the near-term
11. Areas designated as “pedestrian streets”
12. Areas programmed for transit in upcoming years
Procedures For Design Review

The approval process has these steps:

1. Preliminary consultation (This is required; it should occur concurrently with other department consultations, which are voluntary.)
   a. The applicant should schedule an initial visit with staff to discuss their project and outline the steps involved.
   b. This is required, as a means of having a conversation early on.
   c. Determine that the project is subject to design review.
   d. Determine if approval will be Administrative (by staff) or by the DRB.
   e. Applicants also should be encouraged to informally check in at various stages of design development, between formal submissions.

2. Concept Review (This step is to be required.)
   a. Applicant prepares a Concept Review application. (This is the equivalent of an architectural “schematic design” level of information.) This will include:
      i. Application form
      ii. Design documents as required
   b. Concept review will address siting, massing, etc.
   c. This is equivalent to the Concept Design phase in architectural services.
   d. Staff conducts the Concept Review. Review at the Concept stage will be conducted by staff for all projects.
   e. Staff will issue a report, approving the concept design and stating the requirements for changes and additional information based on this preliminary application step.
3. Final review (This step is required.)
   a. Applicant prepares the Final Review application (equivalent to Design Development level documentation).
      i. The On-line form is submitted
         1. A checklist is used for the applicant to identify how they have met the guidelines.
         2. The application also identifies which changes were made from Concept Review in response to staff comments.
      ii. Design documents are submitted as required.
   b. Staff checks the application for completeness.
   c. Staff reviews the project and:
      i. Issues approval, or
      ii. Prepares a staff report for DRB consideration
   d. If required, DRB conducts a hearing and issues a decision.
      i. If approved as submitted, applicant proceeds with other permitting. This will include:
         1. An analysis of how the applicant has satisfied the guidelines.
      ii. If approved with conditions, applicant executes changes and submits to staff to confirm compliance with conditions.
         1. If in compliance, the applicant proceeds with other permitting.
      iii. If not approved,
         1. The applicant may revise and re-submit.
   e. This review step is required. It focuses on the remaining aspects of design and any revisions to variables addressed in concept review.
   f. This is the equivalent to the Design Development stage in architecture.
   a. Following final design approval, the applicant may prepare
      construction documents and submit them to the Building
      Department for permitting.
   b. Urban design staff will review construction documents for
      consistency with the approved Final Review documents, along
      with any conditions that were applied at that stage.

5. Follow-up for compliance
   a. This includes site inspections by urban design staff as well as by
      the (proposed) code compliance officers.

The design review process should be synchronized with other
permitting processes, including entitlements and building permits.
(See the flow chart diagrams that are attached.) It also may include
provision for an expedited review for projects of special interest to the
city. For example, expedited review may be available to affordable
housing projects. In an expedited review, the Director could waive
the requirement for a preliminary consultation or concept review in
the interest of fast-tracking a project. Or, they may determine that
the project can be approved administratively when otherwise a DRB
review would be required. Specific criteria for expedited review would
need to be developed.

**Fees For Design Review**

Fees will be charged for design review services. There are three
alternative approaches for a fee structure:

**Fee option 1: Recover all costs of review**

This establishes the program as a self-sustaining cost center. This
approach can support increasing the number of staff as the program
expands. In this approach, fees may be charged on an hourly basis, or
they may be fixed at a rate calculated to meet average administration
times.
Fee option 2: Recover a reasonable amount of costs, but not all
This approach requires some general departmental funding and may affect the number of staff that can be brought in as the program expands. This option is recommended.

Fee option 3: Charge only a minimal fee.
This approach requires full staffing be funded from general operating budget for the department. Increasing staff as the program expands will be affected.

Fees should be charged for:
1. Pre-application conference
2. Preliminary (concept) review
3. Final review

Charging a fee for the pre-application conference will elevate its importance. Actual fee calculations should be established following the city’s procedures for setting various fee rates.
Enforcement

A key component for success is to be certain that compliance can be enforced. An example is with a potential transparency requirement for storefronts. Even when the requirement is met at the time a Certificate of Occupancy is issued, windows may be blocked up later. Is this monitored and enforced?

Enforcement should be the responsibility of a (proposed) zoning enforcement officer. Members of the Urban Design Studio should provide support, in terms of helping to confirm potential violations by conducting some site visits. Initial enforcement actions should occur in conjunction with inspection by the Building Department and their issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, when that is required. In general, enforcement of violations will occur in response to citizen complaints.

Application forms

Application forms should be produced in the implementation stage of establishing the program. The application forms should be:

1. Dynamic – structured such that an applicant must fill in answers to questions related to compliance with the design guidelines. By asking the applicant to indicate how the guidelines are met by their application, it signals that the guidelines are important and causes the applicant to read them.

2. Submitted online

3. Graphically coordinated, such that the program has a distinct identity

4. These forms should be accompanied by helpful instruction sheets. These appendices provide additional information related to the analysis of information that supports the recommendations in the body of the operations manual:
City of Tacoma Coordinated Review Process
appendix C
Appendix A: Spreadsheets projecting the work load for the Tacoma design review system

This document is in Excel, to facilitate changing variables that may affect the projected work load.

Appendix B: Survey of the design review workloads in other communities

This is a sampling of communities in which Winter & Company has assisted in establishing design review systems. The information includes the number of projects reviewed annually and the personnel hours required to conduct the reviews. This information is used in estimating the workloads in Appendix 1.

Appendix C: Summary of online research on design review systems of peer communities

This reports the findings from a sampling of Western cities that have urban design review systems. The information varies, based on what is available on line. This research informs the strategies in this operations manual.
8.0 Work Load Projections

Appendix A:
Explanation of Spread sheets for Tacoma Design Review System work load projections
Updated: September 6, 2019

This document describes information on the accompanying spread sheets that projects the potential work load for Urban Design Studio staff and a proposed Design Review Board. This information is revised to reflect a more accurate count provided by the city of permits issued over a three year period in the areas targeted for design review.

While the data for building permits is as accurate as is reasonably possible, there are some other assumptions that we’ve made:

• The percentage of alterations projects that have exterior work – The estimate is based on reviewing the work described on a sampling of building permits from the target areas.

• The percentage of projects that will be reviewed by the Design Review Board – This is based on anecdotal reporting of some peer communities.

Two work load scenarios based on building size thresholds
We have calculated the projected work loads for two different scenarios: one (1) for projects greater than 5,000 sf and one (1) for projects greater than 10,000 sf. Separate Excel files are attached for the two scenarios.

Each Excel file has 5 tabs. These are organized sequentially, in terms of the information that they provide for determining the work load of the Urban Design Review program.

Tab 1: Past permit activity
This data is provided by the City. This serves as the starting point for estimating the number of projects that may be subject to review. Data was provided for about a three-year period. This information is then divided by 3, to provide an average annual count of building permits.

Tab 2: Design review thresholds
This table sets up a method of estimating the number of projects that might be reviewed by staff and the number that might be reviewed by a DRB. This is calculated as a percentage of all permit activity, as reported on Tab 1.

Tab 3: Projecting staffing requirements (design review tasks only)
This table estimates the hours staff will spend in reviewing projects. It uses the number of projects subject to review that is generated in Tab 2. It further divides these into two categories: (1) Projects in which staff makes the decision, and (2) Projects in which staff assists the DRB in decision-making. (The split is a working estimate.) The number of hours estimated to review a project is based on our research of comparable communities. The total hours required to conduct design review is then compared with the total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) working hours that one staff member would have.

Tab 4: Projected staffing requirements (all tasks)
This table estimates the number of professional hours required for all aspects of the Urban Design Review program. It brings forward the design review hours from Tab 3, and then adds hours for other tasks, including Outreach, Developing program tools (e.g. guidelines),
### Tacoma Building Permit Projection Work Sheet

#### 1. Past permit activity

**Update: Sept 6, 2019**

**5,000 SF THRESHOLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridors (120’ offset)</th>
<th>Neighborhood MUC + DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New commercial</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors (120’ offset)</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood MUC + DT</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New commercial</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial alterations</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors (120’ offset)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood MUC + DT</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New commercial</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial alterations</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Design Review Thresholds

**PHASE ONE**

**Tacoma Urban Design Review System**

**Draft: Sept 6, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED USE CENTERS + Downtown</th>
<th>Total permits annually (1)</th>
<th>Threshold for review (2)</th>
<th>% projects estimated above threshold (3)</th>
<th># of Projects above threshold (4)</th>
<th>% of projects that are Staff Decision (5)</th>
<th># of Staff decision projects (6)</th>
<th># of DRB Decision projects (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>25.67 &gt; 5,000 sf total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>50.00 &gt; 500 sf increase in footprint or exterior alteration</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDORS OUTSIDE OF CENTERS</th>
<th>Total permits annually (1)</th>
<th>Threshold for review (2)</th>
<th>% projects estimated above threshold (3)</th>
<th># of Projects above threshold (4)</th>
<th>% of projects that are Staff Decision (5)</th>
<th># of Staff decision projects (6)</th>
<th># of DRB Decision projects (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>6.33 &gt; 5,000 sf total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>8.00 &gt; 500 sf increase in footprint</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS | 90.00 | 55.20 | 40.96 | 14.24 |

**Notes:**

1. Data from City; Linked to Tab 1
2. These are preliminary ideas for thresholds.
3. This is an estimate of percentage of projects at the threshold in Column E; Need a more refined data query.
4. Number of projects based on assumed threshold and percentage for staff review.
5. Assumed percentage of projects in Column G that would have staff review.
6. Number of projects for staff review based on assumed percentage.
7. Number of board reviewed projects is the balance, subtracting Column I from Column G

Cells in grey are values derived from a link to Tab 1
### 3. Projecting Staffing Requirements

Tacoma Urban Design Review System

Draft: Sept 6, 2019

**Annual projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 1 PROJECTIONS</th>
<th>Total Projects Reviewed (1)</th>
<th># Projects for Admin review (2)</th>
<th>Hours per project for Admin reviews (3)</th>
<th>Total hours for Admin review (4)</th>
<th># Projects for DRB approval (5)</th>
<th>Hour per DRB project for staff (6)</th>
<th>Total hours for DRB admin (7)</th>
<th>Total hours combined (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIXED USE CENTERS + DOWNTOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>359.33</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>154.00</td>
<td>513.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MUC + Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>849.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORRIDORS OUTSIDE OF CENTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88.67</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>126.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>53.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.96</td>
<td>744.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE hrs/Yr</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. Assumed percentage from Tab 2
2. Assumed percentage from Tab 2
3. Based on research of peer communities
4. Multiple of column E times column F
5. from Tab 2
6. Based on research of peer communities
7. Multiple of column H time column I
8. Sum of column G and J
## 4. Staffing Projections

Tacoma Urban Design Review System

Draft: Sept 6, 2019

### PROJECTION OF PROFESSIONAL HOURS FOR THE URBAN DESIGN STUDIO PHASE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK CATEGORY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY/YEAR</th>
<th>HOURS/UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL HRS.</th>
<th>% / CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public presentations (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site materials (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences &amp; training (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPING TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design guidelines (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational materials (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative forms (6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance (7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other permitting (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING (DESIGN REVIEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational meetings with potential applicants (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing MUC+DT Projects (10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>849.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing Corridors (10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to general inquiries (12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections to confirm compliance (13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration (14)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report (15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOURS, ALL PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2905.76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 FTE ANNUAL HOURS: 1920

TOTAL FTE PROFESSIONALS REQUIRED: 1.51
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>1. Preparing for and attending presentations to civic groups, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Preparing informational materials for department web manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Attending conferences related to urban design and design review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Coordinating with consultants and developing supplementary guidance materials as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Developing brochures, etc. for the general public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Preparing and updating application forms, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Providing advice on site prior to formal application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Assisting with other reviews, adaptive reuse, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Advising at preapplication meetings about potential projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Conducting formal review of applications, ruling and writing findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Conducting formal review of applications, writing recommendations, and attending DRB meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Meetings and calls not formally associated with an application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. On-site inspection visits (a supplement to code enforcement officials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Internal reporting, staff meetings, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Preparing formal annual report on studio performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tacoma UDS Operations Manual

**Winter Company**

**5. Design Review Board Work Load Projections**

**Tacoma Urban Design Review Program**

**Draft: Sept 6, 2019**

### PROJECTION OF BOARD MEMBER HOURS

#### YEAR 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK CATEGORY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th># / YEAR</th>
<th>HOURS / UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL HRS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTREACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences &amp; training (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPING TOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design guidelines updates (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACILITATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECISION-MAKING (DESIGN REVIEW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing appeals of staff decisions (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing major projects (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising applicants</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOURS, FOR ONE BOARD MEMBER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hearing hours (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total meetings per year (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours per meeting (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES

1. All members participating in local/regional conference or in-house training
2. Reviewing drafts and providing comments
3. Hearing appeals and staff requests for advice on administrative reviews (10% of staff reviews)
4. Includes concept and final review meetings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5. Review and comment on annual report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6. Board meeting hours on agenda items only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>7. DRB meets twice monthly, except once monthly in Nov and Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8. Average length of DRB meeting with projected agenda load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tacoma Building Permit Projection Work Sheet

#### 1. Past permit activity

**Update:** Sept 6, 2019

- **10,000 SF THRESHOLD**

#### Permit activity from 3/2016 through 6/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 year total</th>
<th>annual average</th>
<th>3 year total</th>
<th>annual average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridors (120’ offset)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neighborhood MUC + DT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neighborhood MUC + DT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neighborhood MUC + DT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial alterations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Design Review Thresholds

#### PHASE ONE

**Tacoma Urban Design Review System**

**Draft:** Sept 6, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total permits annually (1)</th>
<th>Threshold for review (2)</th>
<th>% projects estimated above threshold (3)</th>
<th># of Projects above threshold (4)</th>
<th>% of projects that are Staff Decision (5)</th>
<th># of Staff decision projects (6)</th>
<th># of DRB Decision projects(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIXED USE CENTERS + Downtown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>&gt; 5,000 sf total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>&gt; 500 sf increase in footprint or exterior alteration</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORRIDORS OUTSIDE OF CENTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>&gt; 5,000 sf total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>&gt; 500 sf increase in footprint</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Data from City; Linked to Tab 1
2. These are preliminary ideas for thresholds.
3. This is an estimate of percentage of projects at the threshold in Column E; Need a more refined data query.
4. Number of projects based on assumed threshold and percentage for staff review.
5. Assumed percentage of projects in Column G that would have staff review.
6. Number of projects for staff review based on assumed percentage.
7. Number of board reviewed projects is the balance, subtracting Column I from Column G.

*Cells in grey are values derived from a link to Tab 1*
### 3. Projecting Staffing Requirements

**Tacoma Urban Design Review System**

**Draft: Sept 6, 2019**

Annual projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 1 PROJECTIONS</th>
<th>Total Projects Reviewed (1)</th>
<th># Projects for Admin review (2)</th>
<th>Hours per project for Admin review (3)</th>
<th>Total hours for Admin review (4)</th>
<th># Projects for DRB approval (5)</th>
<th>Hour per DRB project for staff (6)</th>
<th>Total hours for DRB admin (7)</th>
<th>Total hours combined (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIXED USE CENTERS + DOWNTOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270.67</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>116.00</td>
<td>386.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160.43</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>210.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total MUC + Downtown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>597.23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORRIDORS OUTSIDE OF CENTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New Commercial &amp; Multifamily</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.33</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Commercial &amp; Multifamily Alterations</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>44.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Corridors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>118.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>38.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>192.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE hrs/Yr</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. Assumed percentage from Tab 2
2. Assumed percentage from Tab 2
3. Based on research of peer communities
4. Multiple of column E times column F
5. from Tab 2
6. Based on research of peer communities
7. Multiple of column H time column I
8. Sum of column G and J
## 4. Staffing Projections

Tacoma Urban Design Review System

**PROJECTION OF PROFESSIONAL HOURS FOR THE URBAN DESIGN STUDIO**

**PHASE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK CATEGORY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY/YEAR</th>
<th>HOURS/UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL HRS.</th>
<th>Hours/Category</th>
<th>% / Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public presentations (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site materials (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences &amp; training (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>256.00</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPING TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design guidelines (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational materials (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative forms (6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance (7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other permitting (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING (DESIGN REVIEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational meetings with potential applicants (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing MUC+DT Projects (10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing Corridors (10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to general inquiries (12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections to confirm compliance (13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>1075.36</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration (14)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report (15)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>480.00</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOURS, ALL PROFESSIONALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2591.36</td>
<td>2591.36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FTE ANNUAL HOURS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FTE PROFESSIONALS REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES

1. Preparing for and attending presentations to civic groups, etc.
2. Preparing informational materials for department web manager
3. Attending conferences related to urban design and design review
4. Coordinating with consultants and developing supplementary guidance materials as needed
5. Developing brochures, etc. for the general public
6. Preparing and updating application forms, etc.
7. Providing advice on site prior to formal application
8. Assisting with other reviews, adaptive reuse, etc.
9. Advising at preapplication meetings about potential projects
10. Conducting formal review of applications, ruling and writing findings
11. Conducting formal review of applications, writing recommendations, and attending DRB meetings
12. Meetings and calls not formally associated with an application
13. On-site inspection visits (a supplement to code enforcement officials)
14. Internal reporting, staff meetings, etc.
15. Preparing formal annual report on studio performance
### S. Design Review Board Work Load Projections

**Tacoma Urban Design Review Program**

**Draft: Sept 6, 2019**

#### PROJECTION OF BOARD MEMBER HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK CATEGORY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th># / YEAR</th>
<th>HOURS / UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL HRS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences &amp; training (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPING TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design guidelines updates (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other permitting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING (DESIGN REVIEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing appeals of staff decisions (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing major projects (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising applicants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. All members participating in local/regional conference or in-house training
2. Reviewing drafts and providing comments
3. Hearing appeals and staff requests for advice on administrative reviews (10% of staff reviews)
4. Includes concept and final review meetings
5. Review and comment on annual report
6. Board meeting hours on agenda items only
7. DRB meets twice monthly, except once monthly in Nov and Dec
8. Average length of DRB meeting with projected agenda load
Appendix B:
Explanation of responses from emailed communities
Draft: July 16, 2019

The accompanying spread sheet contains information collected from some of our former clients in an informal survey about their experience with operational aspects of design review.

Questions asked appear at the top of the chart, followed by responses from the different communities. The questions apply to all projects subject to design review, city-wide, or to all special review districts, but excluding the historic preservation program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Projects Reviewed</th>
<th>Project Distribution</th>
<th>Approval Rate</th>
<th>Process Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arvada, CO</td>
<td>133 projects</td>
<td>Agriculture - 1%; Civic - 2%; Commercial - 50%; Mixed-use - 5%; Multi-family - 12%; Office - 3%; Single Family - 18%</td>
<td>46% approved</td>
<td>In straight zoning districts, one step. In PUDs, two steps. All require an informal pre-application meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill, NC</td>
<td>2 large redevelopment projects; 5 façade renovations/modifications (Blue Hill District projects only - special review district)</td>
<td>Redevelopment projects - 1 residential, 1 mixed use; Façade projects - 4 commercial, 1 residential</td>
<td>All projects received approval or approval with conditions.</td>
<td>Design review largely happens at Community Design Commission hearings. There may be some informal consultation with staff for larger projects. Between 1 and 4 CDC meetings are typically needed for review, depending on the scale of improvements. For new buildings/building additions, staff also reviews projects for Building Form and Mass requirements. This happens concurrent with or subsequent to CDC review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farragut, TN</td>
<td>8 projects reviewed for compliance with the Architectural Design Standards during the past 12 months. We generally have between 5-15 projects per year that would warrant an ADS review.</td>
<td>During this review cycle there were 7 commercial projects and 1 office project.</td>
<td>Each project received approval, though each project made adjustments to comply with the ADS which ended up improving the appearance of both the building and the site.</td>
<td>Pre-submittal meeting with staff, review of initial plans by staff, review of staff comments with applicant, revisions to initial plans, review of revised plans, recommendations to the Planning Commission, and action taken by the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missoula, MT</td>
<td>4 projects that have at least started going through Design Excellence Review (DER), 1 of which was approved and is waiting on building permit review. There have also been 4 projects that were in our Design Excellence overlay but only required meeting zoning standards, not guidelines.</td>
<td>Of the 4 projects under DER, 3 were commercial (2 hotels, 1 retail) and one was multi-family (micro-apartments). The 4 that did not go through design excellence review were all commercial buildings.</td>
<td>Out of 4 projects under DER, 1 project has received approval (a new hotel). At this point, it seems likely that the other three will be fine, although one of them, a renovation in the downtown (of the Days Inn hotel), may end up being referred to the Design Review Board for approval.</td>
<td>So far, all of our DER’s have started with pre-application/informal consultation. Our submittals have been fairly loose as far as what constitutes a preliminary vs. formal submittal. We also are struggling with how to address guidelines that apply to elements of a design that will come up later during the building permit process (i.e. bike parking or street furniture). Our approach has been to re-open the initial DER during time of building permit to evaluate those guidelines that weren’t applicable in the preliminary application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey, CA</td>
<td>102 - yes a typical volume</td>
<td>Commercial: 46; Residential: 56</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>One if administrative, two if it goes to the Architectural Review Committee, but more often than not, both preliminary and final review occur in one meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswell, GA</td>
<td>34 projects reviewed by Design Review Board. (Note: Projects go before the Board sometimes twice between initial and final approval. Therefore, there is some overlapping and duplication. About 75% of DBR items are heard twice. Board informally weighs in on rezoning/conditional use permit applications and code text amendments.) There is also, a minor approval process, where staff approve projects administratively. There were 31 projects in 2018.</td>
<td>Commercial - 18%; Mixed Use - 5%; Multi-family - 1%; Townhouse - 6%; Others -4%</td>
<td>Approximately 95 to 98% approval. There are not a lot of speculative projects</td>
<td>Assuming there is not a rezoning or use permit involved, the typical review process is as follows: (1) Pre-application meeting; (2) Application submittal, at which time review for completion - incomplete applications not accepted; (3) Staff Report for Initial Review; (4) Initial review at DRB meeting; (5) Staff Report Completed for Final Review; and (6) Final Review – DBR meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How much staff time is involved at each of those steps for a typical project review? (Include time consulting with the applicant, writing reports and attending meetings, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Time Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative cases, generally 12-16 weeks; Public Hearing cases, generally 24 weeks</td>
<td>Administrative cases, generally 12-16 weeks; Public Hearing cases, generally 24 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment projects - 3-6 month CDC review, 4-6 months staff review - may be concurrent or sequential; Façade projects - 1-2 months CDC review only</td>
<td>Redevelopment projects - 3-6 month CDC review, 4-6 months staff review - may be concurrent or sequential; Façade projects - 1-2 months CDC review only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodically and final site and building inspections by codes, planning and engineering staff</td>
<td>Periodically and final site and building inspections by codes, planning and engineering staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a planning perspective, less than 2-3 hours. This is a very rough estimate however and varies depending on the project and contractor.</td>
<td>From a planning perspective, less than 2-3 hours. This is a very rough estimate however and varies depending on the project and contractor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is the average length of time that a project takes, from the first formal application for review to its gaining an approval?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Time Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three months, if the applicant resubmits any missing information from the initial application in a timely manner</td>
<td>Three months, if the applicant resubmits any missing information from the initial application in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through building plan check, then final inspection by the planner</td>
<td>Through building plan check, then final inspection by the planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere from 2 to 40 hours depending on the complexity of the project. Best estimate is as follows: Planners visit site at least 2-3 times Planners (engineering and building) visit at least 3 to 4 times. Very difficult to quantify.</td>
<td>Anywhere from 2 to 40 hours depending on the complexity of the project. Best estimate is as follows: Planners visit site at least 2-3 times Planners (engineering and building) visit at least 3 to 4 times. Very difficult to quantify.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How is compliance monitored? (e.g., by a zoning inspector, building inspector)

- Certificate of Occupancy inspections - completed by building inspectors, planners, engineers
- Planning staff do a zoning inspection for design-related items, prior to CO
- It's hard to say for us at this point since we are so early in implementing this.

### Approximately how much time goes into monitoring compliance for an individual project?

- Staff spends a few hours on a site visit towards the end of construction, with possibly a second site visit if there are items to correct. We are considering whether it would be effective to do some interim compliance checks during construction, so we're not waiting till the CO stage to identify issues.
Tacoma Operations Manual Appendix C: Design Review Systems in Other Communities

Design review systems – their processes, review projects, review procedures and fees – vary throughout the country. This report summarizes a range of options for a design review program, based on information collected from the websites of a variety of communities. Note that each community had varying degrees of information online; therefore, while 13 communities were initially the subject of this research, ultimately, this report summarizes the ten communities with the most information to help create a complete picture of design review. The communities surveyed range in population from 142,647 to 647,805 people and are between 22.98 and 183.94 square miles. The communities included in the analysis below are:

- Boise, ID
- Fort Collins, CO
- Glendale, AZ
- Pasadena, CA
- Portland, OR
- Sacramento, CA
- Salt Lake City, UT
- Scottsdale, AZ
- Spokane, WA
- Tempe, AZ

Scope of Review

While each of the reviewed communities includes some type of design review, the number and reviewed project types differ. The majority of the communities require design review for commercial, multifamily, office, industrial and public projects. Other project types - such as residential, site design, change of use, parking, and public art placement - require design review only in some communities.

Thresholds

In some cases, size thresholds are used to determine which projects require design review. For instance, in Glendale, AZ, remodels that alter 20% of an existing site or building, or remodels valued at 50% or more of the existing improvement on the site require design review. In Pasadena, CA, thresholds include multifamily development of three or more units, and any new building over 5,000 square feet in size. In yet another approach, Spokane, WA requires design review for projects within certain zones such as downtown zones and Centers & Corridor zones, and within each zone a threshold is set using square footage, or the percentage of visible building façade that is changed.

Staffing

The design review process in every community includes numerous steps, but most often begins with the assignment of a staff person to review the application. In some communities, the staff person receives the project and takes it all the way through design review, while in others, the staff person acts as a contact and passes the project to the appropriate review body. For instance, in Boise, ID, staff can review new residential buildings of 6 or less units, small office, commercial or industrial buildings and minor alterations to existing buildings, among other
projects. The number of planning staff differs for each community, but in general ranges from 3 - 27 people total, with 3 and 4 people designated to design review, for the communities that provided this information online.

**Design Review Process**
For larger, more complicated projects that are required to be reviewed by a design review board or committee, a “pre-application” meeting is typically provided as a free city service, and is usually optional, albeit recommended. Where a pre-application meeting is charged, it typically is treated as a “deposit” that then applies to the subsequent design review fee, or is forfeited if the project does not move forward. For example, Portland, OR provides the opportunity for a Design Advice Request (DAR) meeting with the Design Commission prior to submitting a full application for the types of projects that will be reviewed by the group.

**Design Review Board**
Each of the researched communities has one design review board, rather than separate boards for specific locations or types of projects. For those communities that provided information about the required composition of the board members, a range of professionals were represented including architects, engineers, developers, arts commissioners, realtors, urban designers and land use lawyers. Required review by a specific design review-focused board is often completed during a public hearing. Other unique meetings may be required, such as a neighborhood meeting in the City of Fort Collins, CO to explain the proposed project and answer any questions the community may have.

**Design Guidelines**
In addition to adopting specific design review processes for submitted proposals, each of the researched communities also adopted at least one set of design review criteria, most often a set of design guidelines or standards. The majority of the communities adopted guidelines or principles that apply citywide, and may address a specific topic such as single-family residential design principles. The majority of the communities also had at least one document that was specific to a certain geographical area, including downtown, specific corridors or defined neighborhoods. In addition to adopting separate documents to aid in design review, a few of the communities also included standards in their development code or ordinances.

**Design Review Fees**
Each of the communities included in this research charged a fee for design review. Specific fees for a separate list of communities (with some overlap in the previously researched communities) ranged based on project type and size. Often a base fee was charged for design review and the amount increased based on staff or administrative review, as well as the size or type of project. For instance, Boise charges a $530 base fee and the price increases by $15/residential unit or $15/1,000 square feet of gross floor area. Pasadena also charges based on the number of residential units and staff or commission review, but also charges for each meeting and phase,
such as concept review vs. final design review. The fee schedule in Pasadena is also dependent on the project type, resulting in a design review fee that ranges from $400 for minor projects such as signs, awnings and paint colors to $20,000+ for large projects. To aid applicants, some communities, such as Fort Collins, provide downloadable Excel sheets that an applicant can use to estimate the associated project and design review fees.
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1.6 Universal Design Principles

The following **Universal Design Principles** apply throughout the downtown, mixed-use centers and pedestrian corridors and form the basis for the urban design standards and guidelines that follow in this document.

**Connectivity**

A highly functional and legible mobility network provides a seamless interconnected, safe, and enjoyable experience, connecting people of all ages and abilities to access services and improve the quality of life for community members living and working in Tacoma. Built forms are an integral part of the community. A logical pattern of blocks, streets, internal lanes, alleyways and urban pathways provide direct access to public transit, bicycle and pedestrian systems, linking neighborhoods to community services and places of employment.

**Engaging Design**

Each geographic area defined as part of these Guidelines is recognized for its unique context and cultural value. The mix of uses and active streets embrace creative, flexible spaces. Pedestrian-level storefronts, engaging plazas, courtyards, stoops and porches, all support residential and live-work uses. Individual structures, blocks and streets vary in scale, massing and character. A variety of amenities, finish materials and colors express individuality and a richness that is distinctive of each character area.

**Healthy Community**

The urban form and public spaces embrace a healthy lifestyle. Land uses, built structures and open spaces embrace a human scale and walkable community design ethic. Tree-lined corridors, waterfronts, parks and open spaces provide safe places for people of all ages and backgrounds to sit, enjoy and engage with others. Built structures are designed around health and wellness and are built to last, with future generations in mind.
Universal Design Principles, Cont.

**Sustainable Design**

Designers, builders and developers consistently demonstrate integrated design solutions aimed at long-term, sustainable best practices. Designs take into account ecological and environmental stewardship, social equity, indoor health, and economic development. High-quality, well-performing buildings and site designs occur throughout the community.

**Cultural Heritage**

The City of Tacoma is defined by its rich history and culture. Important community resources that define the past, present and future are representative of the values and placemaking attributes of the community. Protection and conservation of key resources is fundamental to the community’s desire to look to the future.

**Adaptability**

The Tacoma downtown, mixed-use centers and pedestrian corridors will evolve over time. Development initiatives and design outcomes should respond accordingly to assure that places remain viable and respond to changing trends and community needs. Flexibility in uses, materials and construction practices contribute to this objective.

**Sense of Place**

New development reflects progressive values and distinctive characteristics and styles of its time, while contributing to Tacoma’s unique identity. This helps set the community apart from other locations in the region, while maintaining its unique attributes on which to build for the future generations.
**Creativity**

The community supports its cultural and arts foundations. Residents of all ages and interests engage in innovative ideas and problem solving, embracing a diverse and creative population. The design of the city emulates a diversity of uses enriched with expressions of art incorporated into public and private spaces, reinforcing and anchoring the community, its neighborhoods and the unique geography and context of Tacoma.

**Variety**

A mix of workplace, housing, retail, cultural and institutional uses and building typologies permeate each character district. Design guidelines encourage a variety of architectural expressions to accommodate; a mix of market, attainable and affordable housing, a diversity of creative workspaces and retail options, and local services and institutions.

**Accessibility**

Tacoma is welcoming and family-friendly. Built urban forms and public spaces (streets, parks, natural open spaces and waterfronts) provide universal accessibility for people of all ages, abilities, and interests, particularly for those with restricted mobility or abilities, youth and the elderly.
Next Steps

Phase II of the Urban Design Studio program development will include the following tasks and deliverables:

**Interim Summary Report**
Input provided by staff has been incorporated in the updated Interim Summary Report. This update was provided to the City of Tacoma on February 13, 2020 for distribution.

**Design Review Program / Operations Manual**

**Draft Urban Design Guidelines and Standards**
Anticipated Deliverable Date: April 3, 2020

**Planning Commission Review / Recommendation**
Anticipated: April - June 2020

**City Council Adoption**
Anticipated: Late Summer 2020
To: Planning Commission
From: Stephen Atkinson, Principal Planner, Planning and Development Services
Subject: Tideflats Subarea Plan – Community Engagement
Meeting Date: March 4, 2020
Memo Date: February 26, 2020

Action Requested:
Comment and Guidance.

Discussion:
On March 4, staff will be presenting an outline of the draft Community Engagement Plan for the Tideflats Subarea Plan. The Community Engagement Plan is the next key milestone in the planning process and will be presented to the Steering Committee on April 9th, 2020 for review and consideration. Attached is an outline of the Community Engagement Plan for the Commission’s review.

A focus of the discussion on March 4th will be on the following questions:
1. What will a successful community process look like?
2. Whom should we directly engage with to ensure equitable representation through this process?
3. What methods of notification or engagement have been successful for you in the past?
4. Are there other resources or tools that we should be aware of that would help expand the breadth of engagement?

Project Summary:
The Tacoma Tideflats is one of ten designated Manufacturing and Industrial Centers in the Puget Sound Regional Council’s regional development plan VISION 2040. The State Growth Management Act requires that local comprehensive plans comply with VISION 2040 and directs local jurisdictions having one or more regionally designated centers to prepare a subarea plan for each such center.

The Tideflats Subarea Plan will address requirements under Washington State law to include State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) environmental review, Growth Management Act (GMA), Shoreline Management Act (SMA), the Puyallup Land Claims Settlement, the Container Port Element and elements for certification of a Manufacturing and Industrial Center (MIC) by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PRSC). The Subarea Plan is being conducted through an inter-governmental partnership between the City of Tacoma, Port of Tacoma, Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Pierce County and the City of Fife.

Prior Actions:
• February 5, 2020 – Reviewed the status of the project
• November 20, 2019 – Reviewed the status of the Tideflats Interim Regulations
• October 2, 2019 – Reviewed the Tideflats Subarea Planning Work Plan

Staff Contact:
• Stephen Atkinson, Senior Planner, satkinson@cityoftacoma.org, (253) 591-5531

Attachment:
1. Tideflats Community Engagement Plan Outline

cc. Peter Huffman, Director
WHAT COULD COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT LOOK LIKE?

TACOMA TIDEFLATS SUBAREA PLAN PRELIMINARY PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN OUTLINE

1. Introduction
   - Purpose of public engagement
   - Work Plan process for developing Public Engagement Plan
   - Summary description of the engagement plan

2. Planning Framework
   - Description of state, regional, and local planning context
   - Work Plan Summary

3. Tideflats Subarea Plan
   - Project overview
   - Other related projects
   - Generalized timeframe

4. Community Engagement
   - Communications materials for each project phase
   - 3-4 public meetings
   - Social media and an interactive project website
   - Meetings-in-a-Box
   - Small group visioning meetings

5. Decision-making Process
   - Work Plan governance process
   - City of Tacoma legislative process and Work Plan provisions

6. Evaluation and Accountability
   - Feedback loop for public comment and decisions
   - Effectiveness of public involvement tools

7. Equity and Empowerment Framework
   - City of Tacoma Equity and Empowerment Framework

8. Coordinated Schedule and Engagement
   - Schedule for involvement