

From: Heidi S. <heidigs@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 4:52 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Comments for Ordinance 28986

Public Comments for Ordinance 28986
Home in Tacoma Phase II

The final draft and all amendments should be rejected.

HIT II still meets none of these most important objectives:

- Affordability
- Livability
- Preserving tree canopy

It goes completely, unnecessarily too far beyond state requirements and continues to leave many unanswered questions regarding:

- Individuals being outbid by developers
- Lack of proper infrastructure and traffic measures
- Lack of impact fees raising property owners' costs resulting in
- High displacement and
- Fewer opportunities for individual home ownership (further exacerbating the inequity already felt in Tacoma's southern and eastern neighborhoods.

The need for this much rezoning has been an exaggeration from the start; but even more disappointing is that years of community input has been essentially ignored with priority instead put on developers' desires.

What Tacoma needs is affordable housing but HIT does nothing for affordability (especially for low-income families who cannot fit nor afford the tiny studio no-greenspace housing being built).

We have asked repeatedly for data/stats to support this claim of "affordability", but have never been provided any. However, we have submitted many examples of how this unprecedented plan will result in higher costs, more displacement and loss of valuable livability (as experienced in other cities not even going as far, as fast).

The truth is (which PDS has admitted but not broadly enough): during the first phase of HIT I, Tacoma was assessed as having enough buildable land without any rezoning, and the current designated growth centers would be more than adequate to allow for needed increased housing/density. During this phase, PDS also admitted that "affordability" is not part of this rezoning plan, yet continued to falsely advertise it as such.

Even if the above weren't true (although it is) the state mandate of HB1110, is more than appropriate as first steps (allowing for more reasonably-paced increased units per property) but not at the unnecessary and disastrous extreme which HIT II goes to of single family to sixteen units in areas that the state is only requiring four, not to mention the coming apartment buildings in neighborhoods which never had them before, the lack of oversight and proper design/accommodations we're being left with.

The question has still never been fully answered regarding residential property now qualifying as commercial when sold and complications of title/assessments and potentially denial of loans.

Lack of infrastructure, green space, parking before adequate mass transit (not to mention never including statistics of the pending mega-warehouse traffic) has not been appropriately addressed, much less the ever avoidance and omission of required critical area aquifer recharge and limitations of impervious surfaces.

Have any of this City Council actually fully read this HIT II proposal and completely understand it -or- are you just going off the high-level summaries provided by PDS? The City Council Action Memorandum, alone, has numerous holes and broad liberty with facts such as:

"These new zoning and development standards are also designed to respond to recent mandates from the State of Washington regarding local residential zoning, particularly 2023's House Bill 1110 (the Middle Housing Bill)."

No, HIT was in the works long before the state bill which took HIT and lessened it. There is no need to push beyond the state density requirements so why is Tacoma, of all locations in the state, so willing to be the sacrifice city when we're clearly not operating appropriately with the current population and thousands of vacant overpriced units.

"The City completed multiple studies and technical analyses to support the Home in Tacoma project..."

... yet even though the HIT EIS and HIA did include significant cautions, those were glossed-over and not adequately included in the PDS version coming out of the Planning Commission.

“COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/ CUSTOMER RESEARCH: The Home in Tacoma Phase 2 planning process began in 2022.”

... and yet we never see a true reflection of the communities' comments and concerns reflected in the summaries much less any practical changes.

“This legislation will reduce racial and other inequities, disparities, or discrimination in underrepresented communities.”

Nothing about HIT II guarantees housing, much less affordable housing, so this statement is an empty tool, when the opposite will occur.

“The Home in Tacoma package will require regular tracking and adjustment.”

This wouldn't have to be if only the HB1110 were implemented in reasonable, appropriate steps.

The verbiage of these “alternatives” to reject a terrible proposal (just because it's been a long time in the making, which doesn't make it right) are often comical but also insulting since, yes, the correct thing to do is to fully reject HIT II.

ALTERNATIVES:

The City Council could reject the Home in Tacoma ordinance or modify the ordinance before adoption.

Alternative(s) Reject Ordinance

Negative Impact(s)

Without a local Ordinance implementing recent State legislation (including HB1110), the State will preempt the City's local land use control on these issues, and many of the same changes will be mandated without the additional local controls and incentives in this package.

No, HIT II and HB1110 are not the “same changes” but adopting HB1110 will be a much better place to start building the “local controls and incentives” which, frankly, HIT II has very few of, instead deferring to nearly every developer request and continually allowing for tax exemptions at the expense of the city/taxpayers with very little if any return in affordable housing benefiting anyone.

Please reject HIT II; start with the HB1110. If not, you will unknowingly be the leaders forever remembered for this disaster of a plan which you will not want as your legacy.

Heidi Stephens

From: Courtney Davis <c.davis622@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 3:00 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Walker, Kristina; Bushnell, Joe; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Diaz, Olgy; Sadalge, Sandesh; Daniels, Kiara; Scott, Jamika; Woodards, Victoria; Hines, John
Subject: Comment on Landscaping Code Amendments:

Hello Councilmembers and Mayor Woodards,

To reiterate the letting that is being sent by the TUFF (Tacoma Urban Forest Friends) group, I wanted to express my individual concerns on the proposed amendments to the landscaping code with HiT. You have all expressed the importance and need for more trees in our city and many of these proposed amendments would completely undermine the work of the Planning Commission and the goals you all have set forth in the Climate Action Plan for the city of Tacoma. In order to ensure we are equitably setting every neighborhood up for success as climate change continues, we must aggressively take action to increase our tree canopy. Many of these amendments are unresearched, do not model surrounding cities, and will not allow us to go as far as we need to go to increase the tree canopy within our city.

Amendment # 8 Homeownership Incentives

While we fully support using incentives to increase homeownership, we think that the incentives that involve reducing on-site Tree Credit requirements and waiving any Canopy Loss Fee for removed trees would undermine tree protections. Also, we don't see how this would be enforceable. Rather than tying incentives to trees, we hope you will consider other ways to provide incentives for homeownership.

Amendment # 9 Tree Preservation for non- development sites

At first glance, this proposal sounds like a reasonable plan that would involve a broader conversation about Tacoma's urban forest. Yet, we would appreciate some clarification. Does this proposal mean that the Landscaping Code would only apply to newly developed residential sites and not for currently developed private property (as it was originally intended?) It was mentioned by CM Hines that this process should begin immediately (first of the year). And the City Manager added that it will have fiscal and administrative impacts. One of our concerns is that during the many months that it will take to have a broad community outreach and the development of a new code, how many more trees will be removed on private property?

Amendment # 10 Increase flexibility for City use of mitigation fees

Again, at first glance, this seems like a reasonable proposal. Yet, once we take a look at the map of the watersheds across our City, we can see that each one extends for several miles. So according to this proposal, rather than planting a tree on the site of the housing, the developer would be allowed to plant elsewhere in the watershed - then who would be responsible for that tree's maintenance? Including watering the tree for up to 5 years? We already see newly planted trees that have died due to lack of proper watering. (*We support the current proposal to plant within 1/8 mile of the building site*). Also, Mike Carey has stated that we are maxed out in regards to available planting on city owned property, so these plantings will most likely not be possible.

Amendment # 11 Reduce on-site tree credit requirement "floor" to 10% in all UR zones. *We strongly recommend the current proposal of 20% in UR-1 and UR-2, and 15% in UR-3.*

Amendment # 12 Remove discretionary Variance requirement

We tend not to be in favor of this proposal but would like to have more information about it.

Amendment # 13 "Tree Banks

We are mostly in favor of this. Yet, if trees were to be planted in a location other than a new building site, who would be required to care for them? Watering for 3 to 5 years?

Amendment # 14 Modified standards for large tree removals

The intent of this proposal is good- yet, it needs to be looked into further to see if it's a workable solution.

Amendment # 15 Reduce on-site tree credit requirements by 5% in each UR zone

We are most definitely not in favor of this amendment. It just ends up giving us fewer trees - knowing that Tacoma has an

extremely low tree canopy, we should *increase* the tree credit requirements, *not reduce them!* There is no need to reduce the on-site tree requirements by 5%, because in the current code, developers have options to reduce the trees they need to plant by 5% if they take advantage of affordability bonuses. That means we make the trade off of fewer trees for more affordable units.

Thank you for your time,
Courtney Davis

From: Georgette Reuter <gee.reuter@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 2:04 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Comment for the Landscaping Code Amendments for the Oct. 29, 2024 City Council Meeting

Mayor Woodards and Tacoma City Council,

Our Tacoma Urban Forest Friends group has been following along with the development of the Home in Tacoma's Landscaping Code for the past many months. We would like to extend our appreciation to both the Planning Commission and the City Council for their recognition that the quality of life for our residents requires affordable housing *and* a healthy urban forest. It's clearly not realistic to choose one over the other - we deserve to have both.

As you know, our group has communicated with all of you through emails and many meetings to advocate for the preservation and expansion of Tacoma's extremely low tree canopy. With our canopy as low as 10% in some parts of our City, even to lose one mature tree is a substantial loss. Tim Olsen wisely pointed out: "**The standing big trees are the canopy we have for the next couple of decades, and no amount of planting can fill that short term need. *Planting is for the future: our standing trees are for NOW and the future. We can't afford to lose them.***"

Although our group fully supports the inclusion of the Landscaping Code within the Home in Tacoma Phase 2 package, we have some questions and comments to make about the Amendments that were proposed during the City Council's Study Session on October 22.

Amendment # 8 Homeownership Incentives

While we fully support using incentives to increase homeownership, we think that the incentives that involve reducing on-site Tree Credit requirements and waiving any Canopy Loss Fee for removed trees would undermine tree protections. Also, we don't see how this would be enforceable. Rather than tying incentives to tree requirements, we hope you will consider other ways to provide incentives for homeownership.

Amendment # 9 Tree Preservation for non- development sites

At first glance, this proposal sounds like a reasonable plan that would involve a broader conversation about Tacoma's urban forest. Yet, we would appreciate some clarification. Does this proposal mean that the Landscaping Code would only apply to newly developed residential sites and not for currently developed private property (as it was originally intended?) It was mentioned by CM Hines that this process should begin immediately (first of the year). And the City Manager added that it will have fiscal and administrative impacts. One of our major concerns is that during the many months that it will take to have a broad community outreach and followed by the development of a new code, how many more trees will be removed on private property in the meantime?

Amendment # 10 Increase flexibility for City use of mitigation fees

Again, at first glance, this seems like a reasonable proposal. Yet, once we take a look at the map of the watersheds across our City, we can see that each one extends for several miles. So according to this proposal, rather than planting a tree on the site of the housing, the developer would be allowed to plant elsewhere in the watershed - then who would be responsible for that tree's maintenance? Including watering the tree for up to 5 years? We already see newly planted trees that have died due to lack of proper watering. (*We support the current proposal to plant within 1/8 mile of the building site*).

Amendment # 11 Reduce on-site tree credit requirement "floor" to 10% in all UR zones. *We prefer the current proposal of 20% in UR-1 and UR-2, and 15% in UR-3.*

Amendment # 12 Remove discretionary Variance requirement

We tend not to be in favor of this proposal but would like to have more information about it.

Amendment # 13 "Tree Banks

We are mostly in favor of this. Yet, if trees were to be planted in a location other than a new building site, who would be required to care for them? Who will be responsible for watering them for 3 to 5 years?

Amendment # 14 Modified standards for large tree removals

The intent of this proposal is good- yet, it needs to be looked into further to see if it's a workable solution.

Amendment # 15 Reduce on-site tree credit requirements by 5% in each UR zone

We are most definitely not in favor of this amendment. It just ends up giving us fewer trees - knowing that Tacoma has an extremely low tree canopy, we should *increase* the tree credit requirements, *not reduce them!* There is no need to reduce the on-site tree requirements by 5%, because in the current code, developers have options to reduce the trees they need to plant by 5% if they take advantage of affordability bonuses. That means we make the trade off of fewer trees for more affordable units.

We hope that you will consider our suggestions as you continue your work on these Home in Tacoma Landscaping Code amendments.

Thank you for all of your time and energy in creating a Home in Tacoma package that balances our housing needs with our City's 30% tree canopy goal.

Sincerely,
Georgette Reuter
Tacoma Urban Forest Friends
October 28, 2024

From: Felicity Devlin <felicitydevlin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 9:39 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments on Home in Tacoma: Do not pass. Manage HB 1110

Since the Council is still taking comments, I will again ask that Council not pass Home in Tacoma. The most significant zoning changes in decades have recently been made by the Washington State Legislature's HB 1110. The City should assess and manage the consequences of these changes before further opening up neighborhoods to unpredictable and transformative free market forces. There are likely to be negative and irreparable unintended consequences from such a massive and complicated citywide zoning change as HiT.

Felicity Devlin

From: Torrez, Alyssa
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2024 10:30 AM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: FW: Home in Tacoma 2 - Reduced Parking Area Amendments
Attachments: Letter In Support of RPA2 HIT2.pdf; Letter in Support of Reduce Parking Areas HIT.pdf

We got this letter for Home In Tacoma so I wanted to share.

Alyssa

From: Matt Stevens <matt99stevens@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 10:13 PM
To: Walker, Kristina <KWalker@cityoftacoma.org>; Hines, John <JHines1@cityoftacoma.org>; Boudet, Brian <BBoudet@cityoftacoma.org>; Wilhelme, Carrie <cwilhelme@cityoftacoma.org>; homeintacoma@cityoftacoma.com; jbushnell@cityoftacoma.org; Torrez, Alyssa <ATorrez@cityoftacoma.org>; Diaz, Olgy <ODiaz@cityoftacoma.org>
Subject: Home in Tacoma 2 - Reduced Parking Area Amendments

Hello,

Please see my attached letter in support of keeping the Reduce Parking Area in the Home in Tacoma 2 Plan. Also attached is my original letter to the Planning Commission from October 2023. I would love the opportunity to discuss this in depth with you.

Matt Stevens
Co-Chair Transportation Commission

Matt Stevens

Co-Chair - City of Tacoma Transportation Commissioner
matt99stevens@gmail.com

October 29, 2024

Infrastructure, PLanning and Sustainability Commission,

I'm writing in support, again, of the Reduced Parking Areas (RPA) that were originally proposed as part of the Home in Tacoma 2 that were originally proposed in October 2023 and were approved by the Planning Commission.

I watched the City Council Study session from October 22nd and I was extremely concerned by the discussion around removing the RPA on 6th Ave and S19th St. These two streets are the future of our high capacity transit network in Tacoma. One or both will have streetcars on them providing access to residents and visitors to a wide variety of amenities throughout Tacoma. One or both of these arterials will have Bus Rapid Transit in the future that will provide the opportunity for far flung residents to make it to 6th Ave in a more fuel efficient and society friendly way.

I worry about re-installing parking requirements on 6th Ave and S19th. I worry it will slow down the development of those neighborhoods. We know that each additional parking spot costs between \$25k to \$50k in construction costs. Those costs are passed down to the renter or buyer of the new home. I worry developers will delay building and we will not escape the affordability crisis that we find ourselves in. Government leaders choosing to make homes more expensive is not a good solution.

At the October 22nd meeting, there was an incredible amount of time spent talking about saving trees and expanding our canopy in the city. It is important for a wide variety of reasons to provide more trees and shade and better air to our residents. But every parking space we require, we make it more difficult to meet those tree goals. All those vehicles parked in off street parking places take valuable land away from green space and soaring Douglas Firs and Red Cedars.

We are trying to build a city that by 2050, 51 % of our trips will be in forms other than personal vehicles. Walking, bicycling, and transit has to be the future so that we can reduce the risk of damage from global warming and also to ensure we have enough homes in the city and don't price out so many people that want to live here. Each time we require a parking space, we prevent another bedroom from being built, or we price that bedroom an additional \$500/month.

We also know that in parts of the city that have already eliminated parking minimums, we do not see an instant turnover to large developments on every street corner with no parking. Development takes many years. We also know that this will be a slow transition to denser homes and more residents in these neighborhoods.

Lastly, for our vision of a denser city, with less personal vehicles, we need to put pressure on Pierce Transit to help us meet those goals. We can do that with impact fees and ensuring that we can use those dollars to our top priority areas and can build out the infrastructure in our high priority transit areas so that pedestrians and cyclists feel safe and welcome in that community. The city needs to prioritize impact fees so that our streetscape and infrastructure grows with the density that Home in Tacoma will bring.

I think an excellent choice would be to do a parking study in several years to identify what and if any negative impacts that the reduced parking area has had on the neighborhoods. I think that parking study should be coupled with a sub area plan or corridor study for 6th Ave so that we can evaluate what the future of that critical and incredibly successful promenade should be like in the future.

Thank you for your time,

Matt Stevens

Sent to:

CM Walker
CM Diaz
CM Bushnell
Deputy Mayor Hines
Brian Boudet
Alyssa Torrez
Carrie Wilhelme

Matt Stevens

Co-Chair - City of Tacoma Transportation Commissioner
matt99stevens@gmail.com

October 17, 2023

City of Tacoma Planning Commission

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I'm writing in support of expanding the Reduced Parking Areas as detailed on the map on page 309 of the Planning Commission Agenda Packet for the meeting dated October 18, 2023. The corridors indicated on the map are the highest ridership of our existing Pierce Transit Bus System and also they are planned for future expansion between T-Link and for phase two of Pierce Transit's BRT Expansion.

We already know that reduced parking minimums create a better city and street life. Parking minimums also increase home prices and reduce the amount of space we dedicate to humans and increases the amount of space we dedicate to large metal boxes.

The arterials indicated on the map on page 309 are going to be centers of change and development as Home in Tacoma is implemented. Significant portions of these areas are single family homes with large setbacks. On Pacific Avenue, we have large parking lots surrounding small businesses that are never full. By requiring parking on streets that have access to excellent bus service already, we are going to hamper future business owners, home owners and renters with parking spaces they may not want or need. Those imposed parking spaces could be better used by those residents for additional bedrooms, additional living space, or perhaps reducing the costs of the homes and thus the mortgages and rents that will be paid. We could increase the number of businesses present and create a better urban landscape.

Moreover, we should not be requiring excessive parking in corridors in which we expect to have High Capacity Transit in the future. In June of 2022, Pierce Transit had several open houses where they indicated the next BRT project would likely follow the path of Route 2 - which runs down S19th. The spirit of HB1110 would indicate that we should eliminate the parking requirements so that the future BRT on this line could be successful.

Route 1 and thus Pacific Avenue South and 6th Ave is our busiest route in the city. The bus service on 6th Ave and Pacific Avenue is some of the best in the city. The future of 6th Ave is likely to include a pedestrianized street, light rail, or BRT as it is the ideal place to dramatically change how our city's transportation system works so that it serves people and not cars. Pacific Avenue is already targeted for BRT-Light (Enhanced bus service) and the future of the Pacific Avenue corridor will likely include High

Capacity Transit. Locking our city into excess parking requirements will only create further space between our most activated neighborhoods.

We have been tasked by the legislature to create a city where our mode share for vehicles is 51% or less. If we continue to require excess parking throughout the city, we'll never create a dense urban environment where cyclists, pedestrians and transit users can make their way around the city. In order to create that future, we need now to stop requiring parking for users that may or may not want it. Allow developers and homeowners to identify what the market requires for parking. We have an excess of empty parking spaces in this city because we keep requiring parking.

Because of all of the above, I fully support the Reduce Parking Area for the areas as indicated on the map so that we can make Home in Tacoma as successful as we all hope it will be.

Thank you,

Matt Stevens

Co-Chair - City of Tacoma Transportation Commission

From: Heidi S. <heidigs@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 4:59 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Comments to two Public Hearing(s) 10/29/24

Comments for both Public Hearings being conducted on 10/29/24

Re: 2025-2026 Biennial Operating Budget -and- 2025-2026 Capital Budget and 2025-2030 Capital Facilities Program

Neither of these budgets (nor any city plans) have adequately included appropriate assessments / considerations / mitigation regarding the impact of the Bridge Industrial mega-warehouse to infrastructure, traffic safety the environment, public health and inequity costs.

The city approved this mega-construction with full knowledge yet little requirements of costs to the builders, but cannot continue omitting the looming implications of what's to come in any projections.

The community didn't want this but will be left with the consequences. The city approved it anyway so we need to see some valid, realistic approaches for how to address the massive impacts to come.

Heidi Stephens