



## **MINUTES**

(Approved on 02-05-2020)

**TIME:** Wednesday, January 15, 2020, 5:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** Council Chambers, 1<sup>st</sup> 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**

Chair Petersen called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. A quorum was declared.

### **B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

The agenda for the meeting was modified to correct a typo of Discussion Item D3 – Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0, instead of D2 as listed. The agenda was approved.

The minutes for the December 18, 2019 meeting was approved as submitted.

### **C. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **D. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Stephen Atkinson, Planning Services Division, acknowledged that it was going to be a housing-oriented meeting and briefly reviewed all Discussion Items within the context of the Comprehensive Plan, which was to be implemented by all departments of the City. Mr. Atkinson used the amendment of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) code to allow detached ADUs last year as an example of the Comprehensive Plan implementation. He also explained that an implementation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan had been created to articulate the relationship among the different plans and implementation strategies. He invited feedback from the Commission and wanted to ensure appropriate involvement from the Commissioners. He, then, proceeded to welcome Daniel Murillo and Darian Lightfoot from Community and Economic Development Department (CEDD).

The meeting recessed at 5:11 p.m. for the Commission's group photo and resumed at 5:14 p.m.

#### **1. Consolidated Plan 2020-2024**

Daniel Murillo, CEDD/Housing Division Manager, provided an overview of the Consolidated Plan, a 5-year plan required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that laid out the City's strategies and priorities in housing and community development in order to receive federal grants. The funds were intended to benefit lower income individuals and neighborhoods.

Darian Lightfoot, CEDD/Housing Division, reviewed the scope and timeline of the Consolidated Plan and its connection to the Affordable Housing Action Strategy (AHAS). Ms. Lightfoot explained that while the AHAS was a City's initiative and independent of federal fund, the Consolidated Plan was one of the tools to implement the AHAS. It also served a similar purpose to help build and implement the Comprehensive Plan. She concluded the presentation by informing the Commission of the next steps and inviting their feedback.

Commissioner Edmonds pointed out that the cover memo read "The Tacoma-Lakewood Regional Consolidated Plan," causing her confusion. Mr. Murillo explained because Lakewood was not sufficient in size to qualify for grants, Tacoma and Lakewood formed a consortium to receive funds. Though, each city had its own specific plan and Lakewood would receive their portion of the HOME funding only. Commissioner Edmonds advised making the distinction clear when moving forward to the public engagement phase.

Commissioner Karnes requested the report to include where the money was spent and how it was allocated.

Commissioner Givens asked whether the City was applying for grants or submitting proof to receive funds already supposed to be given. Per Mr. Murillo, it was a grant application but the City was an entitlement city, meaning the City was entitled to receive an allocation of fund upon meeting the requirements.

Commissioner Strobel had questions about processes and specific projects associated with the plan. The specific projects were covered in the annual plan; the 5-year Consolidated Plan laid out high-level plans without necessarily establishing funding plan for each year.

Commissioner Edmonds commented that there were many small cities in Pierce County and asked if they were part of another consortium. Mr. Murillo was unclear of how the County allocated their funds but no other cities were part of the Tacoma-Lakewood consortium.

Commissioner Santhuff requested more context information, namely projects or programs funded in the Consolidated Plan 2015-2019 (the last cycle) and their outcome, along with the one-year annual action plan for the following year if available.

## **2. @Home In Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021**

Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division, recalled that the project started with 2019 Annual Amendments, stating it had been a long process. For the public launch, it was branded "@Home in Tacoma" to help people remember the project. Mr. Barnett explained that he was seeking direction on the scope of work and setting the public hearing date. After the public hearing, there would be one more meeting for the Commission to discuss and formulate final direction.

Mr. Barnett also noted that the project might be controversial and take time for the community to understand. Unlike other projects, this one would result in a study and a high-level recommendation from the Commission to the City Council about Tacoma's housing growth strategy. After recapping issues discussed in previous meetings, Mr. Barnett indicated the AHAS had identified that increasing housing supplies, particularly affordable housing supplies, would help address housing challenges. He quickly re-explained the definition of Inclusionary Zoning and Diverse Housing Types, as well as how they worked. Then, he moved on to present the approach in engagement and technical analysis, explaining each of them in details. Also presented was the scope of work, which included broad equitable communication strategy, understanding current circumstances, developing proposals to meet City goals, and implementation strategies and priorities.

Chair Petersen clarified the action requested for this meeting, which was to determine whether the scope of work as presented was ready to be published rather than to finalize it.

Commissioner Edmonds commented that one of the goals to “tailor proposals to market conditions” was still vague and needed more defining. She also wanted criteria on which the effectiveness of the program would be evaluated, and perhaps with examples of the criteria.

Commissioner Karnes was excited about the Inclusionary Zoning component. Referencing the policy framework behind the project, he stated the intent was to encourage additional density around transit and suggested including the level of service (e.g. 15-minute service over 12 hours per day) in the technical analysis. Furthermore, Commissioner Karnes remarked that the City was facing a challenge of having to grow while reducing greenhouse gas emission from transportation. He would like to see an analysis of the greenhouse gas emission impact for each option presented. Lastly, he asked how the corridors were determined, as some presented did not have any transit service.

Mr. Barnett informed the Commission that the bill mentioned by Commissioner Karnes was ES2HB 1923, which encouraged local governments to accept more growth and do more infill. As part of the requirements for the funds, the definitions and parameters specified in the bill would be incorporated in the project at later stages.

Vice-Chair McInnis expressed approval to release the materials, but noted that one of the maps was hard to read and suggested changing the color. He also wanted to emphasize to the community that this was an optional program.

Commissioner Santhuff shared Vice-Chair McInnis’ concern about the visibility of the maps and suggested upsizing them and adding captions. Additionally, selective pages or the entire PowerPoint from this presentation should be released with other materials to help the public understand them better.

Commissioner Strobel inquired about why the Inclusionary Zoning and Diverse Housing Types actions of the AHAS were selected for further analysis but the Multifamily Tax Exemption was not, stating he was concerned about excluding it while engaging the public about market-based strategies. Mr. Barnett explained that the City Council was working on the Multifamily Tax Exemption action, which was closely linked to the Inclusionary Zoning action. Commissioner Strobel also commented on the 10-year target of 6000 new units and wanted to track data on how many units of each type were built to meet residents’ income. In response to Commissioner Strobel’s question, Mr. Atkinson added that there was a study about levels of income and affordability.

Chair Petersen wanted to know if the comments from the Commission was intended to be changes in the materials going out to the public or just directions for staff to keep in mind.

Mr. Barnett stated he was comfortable with incorporating the comments before releasing the document.

Commissioner Givens loved the branding. However, it was hard to understand the objective from the introduction. He suggested adding what types of open space structures were to be built. Regarding missing middle housing, he would like to explore alternative means for land use categories.

Commissioner Horne commented in favor of the document, but wanted something with less text and more graphic to make it more easily understandable.

Commissioner Torrez echoed Commission Horne. She also wanted to specify communities targeted for feedback and possibly translate the materials into other languages.

Chair Petersen suggested sending postcards or one-page letters to provide a summary of the project to the public with a link for additional information. Overall, the report appeared ready for public input.

Vice-Chair McInnis moved to authorize staff to incorporate comments from the Commission and produce a document for the Public Scoping Hearing on February 19, 2020.

Commissioner Santhuff seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

### **3. Residential Infill Pilot Program**

Mesa Sherriff, Planning Services Division, provided an overview of the program. He went over four project types included in the Pilot Program 2.0, the number of projects by categories, and the application process. He pointed out that the administration process had reduced from two decisions to one and combined the process to take place simultaneously and shorten the time.

Mr. Sherriff went on to present the discussion from the Infrastructure, Planning, and Sustainability (IPS) Committee. There was an interest in expanding two-unit dwellings to consider mid-block option. They wanted to look at ways for two-unit buildings to be more broadly accepted. Also discussed was the growth strategy around corridors with transit.

Chair Petersen asked for clarification on whether the mid-block option was to be considered for only corridors or throughout the City. Mr. Sherriff responded that it would be for the entire City. Chair Petersen commented that the inclusion of the corridors seemed redundant at this point of the program.

Commissioner Givens expressed support for allowing mid-block duplexes. He was concerned about how density was calculated and wanted to check it with the codes before releasing.

Commissioner Santhuff commented on the terminology of "unit," and advised further distinguishing them ("housing unit" vs. "unit factor").

Mr. Sherriff asked whether the Commission would like to include the two items (mid-block option for two-unit dwellings and transit corridors) from the IPS discussion. Chair Petersen had no object to the mid-block option, which was agreed by other Commissioners. The corridor item could be included in a future project, perhaps a code change.

### **E. TOPICS OF THE UPCOMING MEETING**

- 1) Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0
- 2) 2020 Amendment – Minor Plan and Code Amendments

### **F. COMMUNICATION ITEMS**

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division, indicated that a new communication item would be added to the agenda for Commissioners serving on other groups/committees to provide updates to the Commission.

Regarding lunches with Commissioners, three lunches would have taken place by the end of the week. Mr. Wung would continue scheduling with other Commissioners in weeks to come.

### **G. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:57 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/](http://www.cityoftacoma.org/government/committees_boards_commissions/planning_commission/agendas_and_minutes/)