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Work Program Update 2022-2024

Planning Commission
January 18, 2023

Brian Boudet, Planning Manager
Planning and Development Services Department
AGENDA

• Work Program (2022-2024): Mid-Cycle Status Update
• Planning Commission Bylaws: Potential Modifications
• Recent Commission Feedback
REPORTING REQUIREMENT

Duties and responsibilities (TMC 13.02.040)

The Planning Commission is hereby vested with the following duties and responsibilities:

............

L. To develop the work program for the coming year in consultation with the City Council and provide an annual report to the City Council regarding accomplishments and the status of planning efforts undertaken in the previous year.
## Reporting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 3, 2022</td>
<td>Report Completed – Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10, 2022</td>
<td>Report Concurred – IPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2023</td>
<td>Mid-Year Check-in – Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2023</td>
<td>Mid-Year Check-in – IPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August/Sept. 2023</td>
<td>Annual Report and Work Program (2023-2025)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK PROGRAM STATUS UPDATE
2023-2024
SOURCES

• Previous Work Program
• Previously postponed projects

• Mandates (state, regional, and local)

• City Council initiatives and actions
• Planning Commission feedback and suggestions

• One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan High Priority Implementation Measures
• Feedback, requests, or applications from citizens and stakeholders
**ANNUAL VS OFF-CYCLE AMENDMENTS**

**Annual Amendment Docket:**
- Changes to the Comprehensive Plan
- Changes to zoning districts/standards that need an associated change to the Plan

**Off-Cycle Amendments:**
- Exceptions to annual limitation on Comprehensive Plan amendments (Subarea Plans, Capital Facilities Program)
- Code amendments or area-wide rezones that require no concurrent Comprehensive Plan amendments

**Factors Considered in Administrative Decisions:**
- Staff resources
- Planning Commission work program considerations
- IPS and City Council prioritization
- Timing and duration
- “Batching” amendments with other code amendments
- Administrative efficiency (i.e., one process, one public hearing, one adoption effort)
- Concurrent review and assessment
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Planning
Establishing Community Vision and Priorities

Code Development
Establishing community standards

Permit Review
Ensuring a proposal’s consistency with community standards

Construction
Inspecting to ensure a project’s consistency with approved permits
Key Projects in 2023

Annual Amendments Package

Applications:

• Mor Furniture Land Use Designation
• Commercial Zoning Update
• Shipping Containers for Storage
• Electric Fences
• Delivery-Only Businesses
• Plan and Code Minor Amendments

Expected Completion – Summer 2023
## Key Projects in 2023

"Off-Cycle" Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Neighborhood Plan</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Program</td>
<td>Summer 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home in Tacoma Phase 2</td>
<td>Fall 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor Neighborhood Plan</td>
<td>Winter 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tacoma Groundwater Protection Update</td>
<td>Fall 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan – “Picture Pac Ave”</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tideflats Subarea Plan &amp; EIS</td>
<td>Summer 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA 2024 Comp Plan Periodic Update</td>
<td>Fall 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Projects in 2024 *(Preliminary)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMA 2024 Comp Plan Periodic Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tideflats Subarea Plan &amp; EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan – “Picture Pac Ave”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Plan Implementation &amp; Additional Neigh. Plans (approx. 1/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice and Engagement – Comprehensive Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2030 Capital Facilities Program (CFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home in Tacoma Project – Implementation and Refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Program – Implementation and Refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tacoma Economic Green Zone – Subarea Plan (pending budget)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECENT COMMISSION FEEDBACK
COMMISSION FEEDBACK

• Coordination with other groups
• Commission meetings
• Meeting preparation
• Staff presentations
• Outreach/Engagement
• Other issues
Electronic participation in meetings – Section IV.E.

Electronic Participation in Meetings – Members of the Commission may participate in a meeting through electronic communications, teleconferencing, videoconferencing, or other appropriate technology available at the meeting location that enables all persons participating in the meeting to communicate with each other simultaneously and instantaneously. Members who wish to participate in such a meeting must notify Staff before the scheduled start time for the meeting, allowing adequate time for Staff to make necessary preparations. Participation in such a meeting shall constitute presence in person at such meeting, and that presence shall count toward a quorum of the Commission for all purposes. Electronic participation in meetings shall not be used on a regular basis; it should be used to accommodate special needs of the Commission as may be determined by the Chair or to accommodate members whose physical presence at the meeting is prevented due to prior obligations, personal illness or disability, a family or other emergency, or unforeseen circumstances.
Planning Commission Bylaws

Accepting oral comments at meetings
  • Chair authority - Section H.2(d)

Task forces, subcommittee or working groups
  • Advisory Committees – Section II.A.
  • Task Forces – Section II.B.

Disclosures
  • Purpose – Section VII.B.
POTENTIAL ACTIONS

Electronic participation in meetings – Bylaws Section IV.E.

Task forces, subcommittee, working groups – Bylaws Sections II.A./II.B.

Disclosures – Section VII.B.

Accepting oral comments at meetings – Bylaws Section H.2(d)
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Brian Boudet, Planning Manager
Planning and Development Services Department
We All Make
One Tacoma

2024 Update to the Comprehensive Plan
Planning Commission Meeting
January 18, 2023

Stephen Atkinson
Principal Planner
Long Range Planning
AGENDA

Purpose: Initial Introduction of scope and schedule for the 2024 update of the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

Presentation Outline:
• Planning Requirements
• Related Efforts
• Overarching Themes
• Milestones
REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

STATE OF WASHINGTON
Growth Management Act
Shoreline Management Act

PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL
Vision 2050

PUYALLUP TRIBE
Treaty of Medicine Creek
Land Claims Settlement Agreement

PIERCE COUNTY
Countywide Planning Policies

SPECIAL PURPOSE DISTRICTS

One Tacoma
Comprehensive Plan

2024 Comp Plan Update
GOALS OF THE GMA

1. Urban Growth
2. Reduce Sprawl
3. Multimodal Transportation
4. Housing for all
5. Economic Development
6. Protect Private Property Rights
7. Fair and timely permitting
8. Natural resource industries
9. Open space and recreation
10. Environment
11. Citizen participation and coordination
12. Public facilities and services
13. Historic preservation
WHAT’S NEW IN GMA?

• **Tribal Planning and Coordination**
  - Comprehensive Plan update
  - Container Port Elements

• **Housing**
  - Anti-displacement policies
  - Provisions for all economic segments of the community
  - Address racially disparate impacts
VISON 2050

Figure 2 – Historic and Forecast Growth

Figure 7 – Employment Growth by Regional Geography and County, 2017-5
WHAT’S NEW IN VISION?

• **Regional Collaboration**: New policies on coordination with tribes and military installations
• **Environment**: New emphasis on Puget Sound recovery and open space
• **Climate**: Seeks to advance GHG emissions reductions
• **Development Patterns**: New emphasis on displacement, opportunity mapping, health disparities
• **Housing**: New policies to promote housing affordability in new development, anti-displacement
• **Public Services**: New policy on school siting, water supply management, resilience
• **Transportation**: New policies on stormwater, electrification, emissions reductions
• **Economy**: Emphasis on jobs in proximity to housing, commercial displacement
INTERJURISDICTIONAL COORDINATION

• Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Update
  • Evaluation of the Urban Growth Area Boundary
  • Incorporation Study
  • Critical Areas Protection – Aquifer Recharge Areas

• Metro Parks Tacoma
  • Strategic Plan Update

• Puyallup Tribe of Indians
  • Comprehensive Plan
WHAT’S NEW LOCALLY?

Long Range Planning Efforts:
- Home in Tacoma
- Subarea Planning
- STGPD – Code Update

New Programs:
- Urban Design Program
- Neighborhood Planning Program

Other City Initiatives:
- Tacoma 2025
- Climate Action Plan
- Impact Fees
- Watershed Planning
- Green Economy Strategy
- Vision Zero
OVERARCHING THEMES

- **Equity** – Engagement, investments, outcomes
- **Climate** – Greenhouse gas reduction, resilience, and emergency response
- **Health** – Community and environment
- **Implementation** – Making the Plan actionable and meaningful at neighborhood scale
- **Accountability** – Performance measures to gauge success
**Update Milestones**

- **Scoping and Public Engagement Plan:** January – June 2023
- **Community Visioning:** June – December 2023
- **Draft Plan and Code Development:** January – June 2024
- **PC and CC Review:** June – December 2024
INITIAL COMMISSION THOUGHTS

- Partnership/coordination opportunities?
- Key issues or conflicts to address?
- Community engagement methods and communications?
Urban Design Review Program
Planning Commission

January 18, 2023

Urban Design Studio
City of Tacoma | Long Range Planning
Meeting Agenda

1. Program Design Elements – *Planning Commission Direction*
   - Framework Assumptions
   - Feedback Compiled from Planning Commissioners
   - Staff recommendations for Public Review Draft

2. Preview of TMC Design Standard Amendments

3. Next Steps
Framework Assumptions

*These program assumptions are based on previous Commission discussions and reflected in the questions posed by staff and staff’s recommendations*

**Process Structure**

- Exempt: Subject to Design Standards but not discretionary Review
- Tier I: Subject to Administrative-level Urban Design Review
- Tier II: Subject to Board-level Urban Design Review

**Neighborhood Centers**

Feedback from PC appears to support having lower thresholds for Neighborhood Centers
Feedback Compiled from Planning Commissioners

✓ Nine Questions distributed via online survey
✓ Solicited input over a two-week period

Urban Design Review Thresholds

• 2 Sets of Building Area Thresholds: Neighborhood Centers & Other MUCs
  o Tier I: Baseline/Administrative-review
  o Tier II: Design Review Board (DRB)-review

• Other Possible Threshold Metrics

Design Review Board

• Role & Timing of Engagement
• Composition
Feedback Compiled from Planning Commissioners

Received 4 responses via survey & email

Comments provided at 12/07 meeting

**WHAT WE HEARD:**

• Support for different project size thresholds for Neighborhood Centers and Other MUCs: Downtown, Tacoma Mall Area, and Crossroads Centers

• Some support for greater threshold sensitivity for projects located on Pedestrian Streets but that this could be further considered at a later date

• Design Review Board should include advisory and decision-making roles

• Design Review Board should be involved at early conceptual guidance and at the conclusion of the design review process

• Design Review Board should represent a mix of expertise
Thresholds: Neighborhood Centers

Tier I: Baseline/Administrative-Review

What should be the project size threshold to determine if a project is exempt from Urban Design Review (UDR) or requires UDR within Neighborhood Centers?

Planning Commission Responses

- 20,000 sq. ft. 2
- 10,000 sq. ft. 2
- 5,000 sq. ft. 0
- [Other] 0

Staff Notes

- 5,000 sq. ft. threshold presented likely program capacity concerns
- 10,000 sq. ft. threshold limited to Neighborhood Centers addresses these concerns

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: 10,000 sq. ft. threshold
Thresholds: Neighborhood Centers

Tier II: Board-Review

What should be the project size threshold to determine if a project warrants Board involvement within Neighborhood Centers?

Planning Commission Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 [Other]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Notes

- 20,000 sq. ft. threshold limited to NCs should be manageable but might strain some program capacity
- 20,000 sq. ft. might overlap with Home In Tacoma-scale projects and could convey mixed messaging

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: 40,000 sq. ft. threshold
Thresholds: Other Mixed Use Centers

Tier I: Baseline/Administrative-Review

What should be the project size threshold to determine if a project is exempt from UDR or requires UDR within other Mixed Use Centers?

Planning Commission Responses

- 40,000 sq. ft. 1
- 20,000 sq. ft. 4
- 15,000 sq. ft. 0
- [Other] 0

Staff Notes
- 20,000 sq. ft. threshold addresses capacity concerns

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: 20,000 sq. ft. threshold
Thresholds: Other Mixed Use Centers

Tier II: Board-Review

What should be the project size threshold to determine if a project warrants Board involvement -- in other Mixed Use Centers

Planning Commission Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 sq. ft. [Other]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Notes

- Wide range of Commissioner recommendations
- Previous analysis evaluated 80,000 sq. ft. threshold
- Thresholds lower than previous analysis for NC and other MUC might present capacity challenges
- Higher threshold here balances a lower NC threshold

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: 100,000 sq. ft. threshold
### Potential non-Building Area Threshold Metrics

Should Urban Design Review be required by metric(s) other than building size?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Commission Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Staff Notes
- No consensus Commission position but support for exploring possibility
Thresholds: Additional Metrics

Potential non-Building Area Threshold Metrics

Planning Commission Responses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUC Boundary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown X-District</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height; Larger than surrounding development [Other]</td>
<td>1, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Notes
• MUC Boundary metric captures transition sensitivity
• Mix of possible other metrics cited
• Pedestrian Street frontage cited twice
• These site conditions will be addressed with UDR

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: No additional threshold metric at launch but to be considered in future
### Staff recommendation for Public Review Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Type of Mixed Use Center</th>
<th>Exempt from UDR: Design Standards-only</th>
<th>Tier I: Administrative-Review</th>
<th>Tier II: Board-Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>0 – 10,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>10,000 – 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>40,000 + sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other MUCs</td>
<td>0 – 20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>20,000 – 100,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>100,000 + sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tacoma Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crossroads Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional Thresholds: No additional threshold metrics at launch but to be considered in future*
Urban Design Review Board

Board Role

Should the Board’s role be advisory or decision-making?

Planning Commission Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix [Other]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Notes
- No consensus Commission position
- Suggestion for a mix with decision for larger projects – no threshold recommendation

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: Decision-making but with limits established to mitigate potential negative outcomes
Time of Board Engagement

Staff Notes
- Strong support for Early Guidance from Board
- Support for both Early and Final Review engagement

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: Early Concept Review and Final Review Board engagement along with establishing mitigating limits
MUC Thresholds for Board Role & Engagement

**Neighborhood MUC**
- **Tier I: 10k+ sq ft but <40k sq ft**
  - Preliminary Consultation
  - Concept Review – Administrative, public notice
  - Final Review Decision – Administrative, public notice

- **Tier II: 40k+ sq ft**
  - Preliminary Consultation
  - Concept Review
  - Final Review

- **Downtown, Tacoma Mall & Crossroads MUCs**
  - **Tier I: 20k+ sq ft but <100k sq ft**
    - Preliminary Consultation
    - Concept Review – Administrative, public notice
    - Final Review Decision – Administrative, public notice

  - **Tier II: 100k+ sq ft**
    - Preliminary Consultation
    - Concept Review
    - Final Review

- **Administrative-level Action**
- **Board-level Action**
- **Required Pre-Application**
# Board Composition

Which Board composition do you think would best align with the values and objectives of the Tacoma Urban Design Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A. Profession– oriented (2021 consultant draft)</th>
<th>Option B. Project Advisory Group feedback (summer 2022)</th>
<th>Option C. Reflect urban design priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2- Architect/Landscape Architect/Urban Planner-Designer/other design professional | 2-Architects  
2- Landscape Architects  
1- Urban Design/Planner  
1-2 Development/Engineer/Construction/Green Building | Design & Development Professionals (4 members)  
• 2 maximum from any one discipline |
| At least one: Graphic design/wayfinding  
At least one: Construction/building  
At least one: Community at large | Other Expertise (3 members)  
• Active Transport  
• Sustainable Development/Green Building  
• Culture/Heritage/History (could come from Design Professional disciplines) |
Board Composition

Which Board composition do you think would best align with the values and objectives of the Tacoma Urban Design Program?

Planning Commission Responses

- Option A – Design Professionals 0
- Option B – Design & Development Professionals 1
- Option C – Design/Development Professionals & Urban Design Priorities 3

Staff Notes
- Strong support for a Board that reflects a variety of experience including non-Design Professionals and community members

Staff Preferred Public Review Option: Option C

Interested in ways to increase diversity of community representation, considering geography & equity
Board Composition: Equitable Representation

Possible “Equitable Representation” requirement:
Min. 2 members
REPRESENTATIVES FROM WITHIN Central, Eastside, New Tacoma, South End, or South Tacoma Neighborhood Council boundaries (NOT Council representatives)

Equity Index: Opportunity
- Very High
- High
- Moderate
- Low
- Very Low

Neighborhood Councils
- Central
- Eastside (ENACT)
- New Tacoma
- South Tacoma
- Northeast
- North End
- South End
- West End
## Staff Preferred Public Review Program Package

### Board Composition

7 Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Development Professionals</td>
<td>4 Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscape Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban Designer/Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction</td>
<td>* Max. 2 from any one profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Urban Design Priorities                             | 3 Members         |
| • Active Transportation                             |                   |
| • Sustainable Development/Green Building           | * Min. 1 from each priority area |
| • Culture/Heritage/History                         |                   |

* Equitable representation: Min. 2 members from identified Neighborhood Council district boundaries (*NOTE: Not NC representatives*)
Preview of potential TMC Design Standard amendments

UDS staff have outlined a number of amendments described as follows:

1. **Cross-District Migration**: Address inconsistencies in standards between certain zoning districts’ provisions

2. **Local Concerns**: Address Urban Design-related concerns raised by community and staff

3. **Best Practices**: Revise provisions per project consultant input

4. **Minor Amendments**: Revisions to provide greater clarity and/or inconsistencies

**Future Work Items**
- Downtown: Parking, FAR Bonuses
- Mixed Use Standards: Height Bonuses
- Block Sizes: Block perimeter, Block length
Next Steps--Schedule + Approach for Public Review Draft

Jan.—March: Code work with Project Advisory Group

March 15: Present draft TMC Design Standard amendments

Spring: Release proposal package for Public Review; Public Hearing

Summer: Debrief and PC recommendation to Council