



MINUTES

(Approved on 05-05-2021)

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, April 7, 2021, 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT (virtually): 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 5:00 p.m. A quorum was declared.

Chair Petersen read the Land Acknowledgement.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda for the meeting was approved as amended.

The minutes for the March 17, 2021 meeting were approved as submitted.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public comments were not accepted for Discussion Item #1, which was the subject of a recent public hearing.

Written comments received on the subject of Discussion Item #2 – Home In Tacoma Project would be reviewed in the public hearing portion of the meeting. Oral testimonies regarding the public hearing item will be accepted during the appropriate portion.

D. CONTACT DISCLOSURE

- Commissioner Givens's firm, Stantec, worked on a request proposal for the Port of Tacoma, which was for environmental assessment. He believed it did not conflict with the Tideflats and Industrial Land Use Regulations.
- Commissioner Karnes had several conversations relating to the Home In Tacoma Project, including a presentation before the Tacoma Rotary Club, conversations with Tacoma Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) and LegallyBLACK Tacoma, and an interview with Crossing Division.
- Commissioner Santhuff had a phone conversation regarding the Home In Tacoma Project with Ben Ferguson, who was a former coworker and a fellow architect expressing his concerns and insights. Commissioner Santhuff encouraged Mr. Ferguson to submit written testimony.
- Commissioner Strobel had a coworker that approached him about the Home In Tacoma Project. He encouraged the coworker to attend this meeting.

E. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Tideflats and Industrial Land Use Regulations

Chair Petersen stated that this portion of the meeting was a continuation of the debrief of the public hearing on March 3, 2021, on the Tideflats and Industrial Land Use Regulations, after which the Commission would recess and transition into the public hearing for the Home In Tacoma Project.

Stephen Atkinson, Planning Services Division, began with the objective, which was for the Commission to consider final modifications to the Public Review Draft (released for the public hearing) and forward the Findings of Fact and Recommendations Report to the City Council. The content of the materials provided to the Commission in the meeting agenda packet was outlined. Mr. Atkinson also briefly discussed the meeting with the Port of Tacoma staff, its reasoning and outcome.

Additional information regarding topics previously debriefed and modifications to the Draft Exhibits based on the Commission's direction from the March 17 meeting were presented. Then, Mr. Atkinson went over the proposed modifications in detail. The Draft Findings of Fact and Recommendations were also reviewed. If the Commission made their recommendation at this meeting to allow for the City Council's public hearing to be scheduled on April 27, First Reading of Ordinance on May 11, and Final Reading of Ordinance on May 18, the Tideflats and Industrial Land Use Regulations may be in effect prior to the expiration of the Interim Regulations on June 2.

Vice-Chair McInnis expressed his dismay towards the process and wished the Commission had had more time to review the project. That said, he was comfortable with what the Commission had accomplished given the situation. He made a motion to forward the Draft Findings of Fact and Recommendations to the City Council with the modifications brought forth by Mr. Atkinson. Commissioner Horne seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Chair Petersen recognized the extensive effort invested in the project by the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public. She also acknowledged the aggressive timeline, which resulted in certain limitations and dissatisfaction. Additionally, for any comments that were not incorporated in the recommendations, commenters were encouraged to stay engaged and provide their feedback for the Tideflats Subarea Plan.

The meeting was recessed at 5:30 p.m. and resumed at 5:35 p.m.

2. Public Hearing – Home In Tacoma Project

Chair Petersen called the public hearing to order at 5:36 p.m., and went over the procedures of the hearing.

Lihuang Wung, Planning Services Division, reported to the Commission that 222 pieces of written comments had been submitted via email. He thanked those that provided comments for their feedback.

Elliott Barnett, Planning Services Division, provided an overview of the project. He covered the overall goals, components of the two phases, community engagement efforts and input, low-scale residential, medium-scale residential, proposed design principles, and housing growth scenarios (Evolve Housing Choice and Transform Housing Choices). Additionally, the content of the project package and public comment timeline were presented.

Chair Petersen called for testimony. Seventy-two people testified in the order listed below:

- 1) **1253****991** – I sent a letter in to 747 Market Street, Room 345. I'm opposed to the zone change. If you want to see what that looks like you can drive down Pine Street by the Evergreen Station Post Office and you can see exactly what it is. So the proposed zone change will negatively affect our property values and the zoning change will also, if it is successful as you desire, create a nightmare for traffic and for the infrastructure. Everything would have to be rebuilt. Everything would

have to be increased in size, resulting in tremendous tax increases for taxpayers particularly harmful to senior citizens.

- 2) **Kim Vascik** – I live in the West End. I would like to bring up about three points of interest for me and our fellow neighbors. We would like to see a full environmental impact statement completed not as simple SEPA statement. We feel that this needs to be more involved and that this needs to be addressed and not just simple recommendations, which is what's currently going on now. Also, I would like to mention that we're talking about infill – quite a number of people entered Tacoma. Has Tacoma provided jobs? Good jobs, higher wages, recruitment of companies? Shamefully, we lost Russell, a \$151 billion worth of assets. We lost State Farm, 800 employees. So I think that also needs to be something that they think about as well, and then I think every one of us would like to know how this will affect our taxes, if our zone is single-family and then we go to a triplex or other zoning. And when will this affect our taxes? Can this be something that can be written to us prior to us deciding how we feel about Phase 1 or Phase 2?
- 3) **Sue Comis** – I fully endorse the goal of expanded housing choices in Tacoma's single family and multi-family areas and enabling the missing middle housing. My preference is for Scenario 1 – Evolve, but only if you make the following changes, which would make it more restrictive. Expand the single-family zones to allow the following housing types only – single family, ADU, duplex/triplex, cottage, and the tiny mobile homes. So just those five types. And then, the other housing types that should be included into the midscale would be the four-plex, the small lot, the townhouse, and the small multifamily. And the midscale residential, I would recommend only for the following areas. So what I'm getting at here is to focus, focus your development and step it forward a little bit slower and more gradually than this radical changes that you're proposing, but I still think it's frankly very radical. So the midscale would be along the high-capacity transit corridor, not all the transit corridors. That way, people really have good transit to take. Make it walkable and transit friendly, so that would be along the existing plan to Tacoma Link including out to TCC and then the Pierce Transit routes 1, 2, and 3. I also think that the midscale should definitely be around the mixed-use centers including the Downtown. So that's kind of the specifics of changes, but I'm really concerned by such quick radical change.
- 4) **Holly Kelly** – I wanted to say that I am in support of the second plan, where the middle development happens more intensely throughout the entire City. I think we have different centers, but I think those centers can also be distributed more throughout the City and the housing can be throughout the City. I currently live in a single-family zoned space but we absolutely need more housing. And for those that keep saying that they're concerned about the integrity or concerned about the neighborhoods, I'm not happy knowing that many of my neighbors are unhoused or living on the street. I would like to have the opportunity for them to be housed and I would like to have them be more permanent neighbors and not just living in tent structures. I would like the opportunity for more parts of Tacoma to actually be walkable, that some of these zoning areas that we consider central are more throughout the City because what is environmentally friendly is having condensed housing.
- 5) **Kristen Hulscher** – I would like to address that I am not for this project. I have seen what has happened in Proctor, which has absolutely destroyed Proctor. The apartments that were put there are very expensive apartments that people cannot afford. They could have taken those and designated that those needed to be low income and they did not do that because the City wanted the taxes off of it. In downtown Tacoma, there were multiple locations where low income housing could have been put, and yet again very expensive townhomes and single-family homes and high-rises were put in those areas, instead of affordable low income housing which the City had the opportunity to do. Now the City wants to come into single-family neighborhoods and destroy those areas where once you start putting multi-level in and with the density, it becomes more dangerous for children. You have more transient community with around schooling, and in general, it always impacts down. If you want to see this, go to the areas like Ballard and other areas in Portland where they have had these things happen. In fact, in Portland, they started getting themselves designated as historical areas because the impact was so great. What we need is to look at those areas where

it wouldn't have a high impact and how can we put affordable housing there, which the City has not done and they've had decades to do it. There's no guarantee that you're going to follow through now because you did not follow through then. Destroying family homes is not the way to go.

- 6) **Devin Kelly** – I'm speaking on behalf of the second scenario which includes more mid-level residential infill. Like the last speaker who claims to be deeply concerned about affordable housing, I think it's essential that we provide meaningful affordable housing for people throughout the City. I, like the last speaker, think that we are years behind as a City on providing meaningful housing policy and that rezoning is significantly overdue. I was a big part of the fight in Seattle around the upzone but I was part of a crew of people that represented environmental movements, immigrant rights movements, unions, and many others saying that an upzone is good, but it must include mandatory affordability. And this is the thing we need. So saying you support affordable housing, but then turning it into a weird neighborhood character thing and talking about transients is a strawman. We need infill. We need different levels of development. We need different building heights. We need density around transit corridors. We need density and different neighborhoods and affordable housing needs to be distributed. But this can't be done with a market solution and it can't be done by building luxury units. So I really do agree with the last speaker on that. So this recommendation for this committee, I understand, has limitations, but I'm really hopeful that folks on the call tonight and folks with the Council will push really hard for whatever comes out of this to include mandatory affordability requirements for any units to go beyond a certain size or scale, which is what's happened in many different cities. And it's going to be the way we solve our housing crisis. Housing Justice now.

- 7) **Joseph Tieger** – I'd first like to begin with one of the observations that is in your plan that says poorly designed or out of scale infill could build opposition to further infill. Clearly, that's what's happened with the apartments. So far, we've gotten very little moderate income housing. In the plan, it says that the City will work with builders and offer enhancements to build middle-income housing. Well, enhancements are what allow buildings to become larger than the zoning provides. I think the height and mass limits need to be absolute. Adding units for temporary housing, essentially temporary housing, does not help the community. We're adding more impervious surface but plans said nothing about how you're going to deal with the increased volume of stormwater. Are you going to deal with it on site? Adding impervious surface does not help the environment. Also about avoiding displacement, are you going to base that solely on income? I've yet to see something that addresses the fact that some people who may have an appearance of a large income but also have large expenses – insurance, raising grandchildren, etc. How are you going to keep them from being displaced as property taxes inevitably rise? Are you going to offer to freeze their R-1 taxes? Also infrastructure, the City has done an absolutely abysmal job of adding infrastructure, even where they're adding development. You can't keep lagging behind. We're short on parks. We're short on support for police, fire. The library is underfunded. School capacity is limited. And you're not saying anything about how you're going to deal with that. You're just going to build it and let the taxpayer pick up the difference because Tacoma does not have any impact fees. Impact fees should be part of this proposal or this proposal should not move forward. Last, this should be a density equalizer, not keeping all the density in the same part of the City.

- 8) **Laura Nixon** – Thank you for all the work you've done and all the thought you've put into the project so far. I appreciate your time and I know it's a big job to volunteer on behalf of the community. So thank you for that. I agree, I want people to have affordable housing. That's what makes our community work. I specifically have concerns about my neighborhood. It's a wonderful neighborhood. It's a working neighborhood where neighbors are connected to each other because of the scale of the housing, because we are working out in our front yards, because it's walkable and we support each other. I think that's what you want everybody to have. I'm concerned because Union Avenue is on the map as a possible area for midscale housing and I don't believe in my experience that four-story apartment buildings have that same sort of connectedness to the community. I would be heartbroken to see something that works so well, that has played such an important role in my life since I've lived in Tacoma for the last 27 years, destroyed. That's all I'd like to say.

- 9) **Jane Evancho** – I'd like to provide comments this evening on behalf of the West Slope Neighborhood Coalition. We emailed a complete document to the Planning Commission this afternoon. We carefully reviewed the preliminary mitigated determination of environmental non-significance and we don't believe it is an adequate evaluation of the degree of environmental impacts. The overall impacts of the proposal cannot be understood and evaluated concerning Tacoma's future without a substantial amount of additional information and public interaction. The proposal allows and will encourage countless project actions that will determine the future of Tacoma's land use, economy, property values, community character, and infrastructure. These decisions necessitate an environmental review beyond that which is provided in the City's mitigated determination of non-significance. Public involvement in this process appears to be minimal. The typical departmental and agency review is noted but there is no indication that community, professionals, and neighborhood organizations were contacted or consulted. Given this is where the impacts will be felt, these groups should be a larger part of the process than has been provided. This proposal represents the potential change to Tacoma's image and character. It is a shift to higher densities impacting long-established single-family neighborhoods. There's the potential for degradation of the urban environment with a costly burden on existing infrastructure such as streets, water, sewer, and power. For these reasons, we respectfully disagree with the City's determination of non-significance and request significant additional information to be developed, discussed, and accepted prior to further consideration or action. Thank you very much for your work and for the opportunity to comment on this.
- 10) **Anthony Steele** - I live on the West Slope. I wanted to, first of all, say that my wife and I, as African-Americans, came to the West Slope; we work very hard all our life, save our money to buy our own home on the West Slope. We also saved our money so that we could move away from certain places where we grew up and we absolutely know that there's no infrastructure, where you have a lot of density. There are always issues that the City cannot keep up with. Now we hear that you're trying to now move all the stuff that we left basically to the West Slope. It does not do us any good just to do this as a one-size-fits-all just so that developers don't have to pay so much to build larger taller units. And so now our property value is now going to begin to go down. Let me give you some real world inside information. There are currently two illegal, if you will, duplexes on both sides of our house. Right now, there are people in the back, there are people coming out of the front, there are more than 10 people living in one house in an area that's already zoned for single-family. Also, the police have had to be called. We want you to realize that this is not just about destroying the word "racial" in there so that we can not have some racial bias. We need to look at all sides of it. We need to actually look at it for what it is. Right now, the City is not even keeping up with the infrastructure that's already there. Thank you for your time.
- 11) **Riley Bushnell** – I would just like to say that single-family zoning has a racist history, which is being perpetrated by people blanket to disliking these policy changes. That being said, I don't really understand why we're considering the people who oppose the proposed housing changes that are to be in place. These changes won't negatively affect the community in terms of property value or environmental sustainability or in terms of character or displacement. That logic goes completely against urban planning knowledge. That's just basic level. It sounds like a lot of nimbyism honestly. I know the City of Tacoma likes to value equity, and for that, I think it would be wise to go with the transform housing choice in order to right the wrongs that have come with single-family zoning. I also think that when the City inevitably grows denser, we need to prioritize low-income people.
- 12) **Jean Elliott** – Tacoma's known as the City of Destiny. Currently, the Planning Commission is giving us two choices for which direction that destiny might take. In my opinion, scenario one labeled "Evolve" is a chance for that destiny to change and grow, and scenario two "Transform" is destruction of that destiny. We can all accept that progress and change are vital of the survival of life and the City's life. More variety of supply of housing is a definite need within the City right now. "Evolve" lets that growth occur at a much more reasonable pace, resulting in 75% of the City being low scale residential and 25% big midscale development. On the other hand, "Transform" eradicates any sense of the beautiful turn-of-the-century housing community that Tacoma is renowned for, leaving it with only 40% low scale residential and a whopping 60% City-wide

midscale development. What kind of destiny is that for such a thriving residential community? Under "Transform," North Union Avenue, one of Tacoma's most iconic tree line two-lane residential streets, would become nothing more than an extension of Proctor, the Target/Walmart shopping area and 6th Avenue. Also, North 30th, another gateway street into Tacoma, with its large residences would become nothing more than an extension of Old Town's commercial district plundering its way up North Proctor leaving nothing, but the sixth story I saw, a Proctor condos, in its way. Again, it seems to me that these structures plus the one that's coming in by the Post Office have created zero affordable missing middle housing that the City claims it wants. There is nothing affordable about anything in any of these units. They are rich Seattleites new homes, nothing more, nothing affordable for the missing middle homebuyers. A residential City destiny full of friendly neighbors would be gone leaving in its wake a City of high rises, businesses, parking nightmares, economic and environmental decay, and very wealthy developers.

- 13) **Christine Winskill** – I love the City of Tacoma. Of course, we know that change and growth need to happen. But this proposal is such a sweeping change that would change the very fabric and personality of the City, which is what people love. Everyone I know who is from here or wants to move here, fabric of the City today is what they like about it. Make no mistake, if these changes are approved, the changes will happen very swiftly. In Seattle and Ballard, once there was upzoning allowed, all the smaller homes that were actually "affordable" were torn down, and mid-range apartments were built to the point where some of the areas are completely unrecognizable. With that has come crime and even unfortunately more homeless problems, even though the attempt was to have affordable housing. Anyway, I just think that we need to be very careful not to destroy that which we love.
- 14) **Louis Alonzo** – I'm in favor of the transforming housing choices scenario. I want to thank the Commission and the staff of the City of Tacoma for the level of engagement in this project. This is the first time I've seen major planning project fully translated into other languages including live interpretation in Spanish at several meetings. I encourage you to continue doing more of that. Regarding the proposal, I'm excited at the fact that you have looked at aligning the housing growth with active transit options and less parking constraints. I'm hopeful that this will lead to larger transit investments in the future and more walkable neighborhoods, and even more growth in the future. One thing that I would like to see with this project is to focus on implementation and impact fees for larger developments to help make infrastructure improvements and support the growth that is happening. Additionally in the future, I'd like to see the Commission focus on how accessory commercial units fit into this growing plan. I'm a proud central neighborhood resident and am very happy to know that 79% of people in my neighborhood, according to the Home In Tacoma Project survey, share my vision for a more inclusive central neighborhood. I hope this Commission's recommendations keep this process equitable and that all neighborhoods throughout Tacoma are expected to play their part, and that this process isn't just used as an excuse to keep the North End, North East, and West End Neighborhoods exclusive. We cannot convert the vision into a modern-day redlining process. Housing should be accessible to everyone and is an important step to allow the vision, but not just the only one. We need to include and strengthen anti-displacement strategies, and ensure that we make affordable housing requirements, and encourage community land trust development.
- 15) **Karen Bolland** – I think that the City does need more housing. I don't agree with some of your ideas on how to go about it. I agree with the person who mentioned sweeping change perhaps not being in the best interests of Tacoma because Tacoma is a very beautiful City and a very lovely place to live. Witness all of the Seattleites who are moving to our City in order to escape Seattle as well as some of the people from Ballard, one of our neighbors has her daughter and son-in-law and the new baby living with them because Ballard had become impossible to live with a new baby. I think one of the things that I'm very concerned about, as some of the changes that Tacoma is looking at, is a really basic look at education. I think that it's really important to try to give excellent education to people throughout the City. I don't know what the educational levels are at different places in the City, but I've spoken to many people from many walks of life, and so many of them have had really poor opportunities at a good education. I've spoken to people in grocery stores who

are taking care of the checkout counter and many of those people say there's no chance for me to go to college or to do anything more than what I'm doing here. I think that's a very sad thing to have happened.

The meeting was recessed at 6:34 p.m. and resumed at 6:39 p.m.

- 16) **Tobias Nitzsche** – I'm a resident in central Tacoma and I serve on the Tacoma Central Neighborhood Council. Tonight, I'm not speaking on behalf of the board but as a resident and my experiences with that kind of access. First, I want to say thank you to the Commission for all the work that you've done so far. And thank you to Elliott for his presentation at our Council. It's no small task. I appreciate that we're doing something to tackle the issue of housing choice and affordability. As a resident, I am concerned about housing access, affordability, and gentrification. My hope is that Tacoma continues or even improves its representation of people within its boundaries. However, I'm not here to discuss whether Home In Tacoma is good or bad but rather the process that's moving forward, specifically the amount of time offered to people to consider the two scenarios available and provide comment. As a board member on a Neighborhood Council, I'm perhaps more tuned to the proposals and projects going on in our City than the average person. The upfront process of soliciting feedback on preferred housing types, locations, and needs has been going on for well over a year. However, the scenarios presented are the first time that people get to see what came of all that activity. It's the first time that there are visuals of what is being proposed and people can start to consider the outcomes and potential impacts. As a board member of the Neighborhood Council, we started to become engaged in the City's presentations late in December, and we're able to finally host a meeting early March. I think we're the first Neighborhood Council to present on the matter. At the time, the map for the two scenarios was not available to look more closely at. Some people today still do not know what Home In Tacoma is. All this in the middle of pandemic does not seem an adequate amount of time to consider such a large proposal. I'd like to ask the Commission that the definitions and limitations are better defined now before comment is closed. I'd also like to ask that the process for engagement and comment on these two scenarios be extended at least three months before making a recommendation to City Council, and that significant more opportunities for engagement are offered. This project will undoubtedly have the biggest impact on housing in a century and the proposal put forth deserves to have an equal amount of consideration by the ultimate stakeholder – its residents.
- 17) **Jessie Gamble** – I'm the Government Affairs Director for the Master Builders Association of Pierce County (MBA Pierce). MBA Pierce is in support of the concepts proposed here within the Home In Tacoma plan. First and foremost, I would like to thank Tacoma's PDS staff for their many months' work of public outreach, thoughtful analysis of the implications of these changes. In consideration of the building and housing industries ideas on these proposals, MBA Pierce is supportive of the Home In Tacoma plan's intent to transform zoning throughout the City to better allow for missing middle housing, be it scenario one or two. This endeavor along with updating the ADU section of the code will better allow for more infill housing development. Additionally, the proposed adjustment to final plat procedures will allow for greater process efficiencies to help homes be available sooner. Through the process of the next phase of this endeavor, MBA Pierce encourages the City to allow for fee simple townhomes to encourage attainable homeownership for a greater range of income levels. Furthermore, we understand that there are a lot of reasonable requests to ensure design standards that are established and adhered to, as Tacoma moves this project along. MBA Pierce and the building industry are eager to be able to assist on that effort. The Home in Tacoma plan is legislation that the City needs to better reach its housing goals.
- 18) **Kimberly Freeman** – I want to tell you how much I appreciate your service and all the work that has gone into these proposals. I think that at this time, we do need to diversify our single-family zone, and I think there's a lot of infill opportunities throughout the single-family zones. So I agree with a lot of the concepts and both of the proposals. I actually think we're probably best not going with option one right now. I'm happy to see that we're looking at the midscale types. My three comments that I haven't heard before... One, I actually think that the midscale in both proposals need some adjusting. I think there are some areas that are not quite appropriate. There's a lot of

residential streets, even some transit streets that are residential and I don't know if that works. I actually think we're better off in the shorter term keeping it on major arterials and high-capacity transit routes, so that we do really focus the infrastructure in the investment. Secondly, I think that we really should be adopting the package with the design standards and the incentives. I'm very concerned with the incentives that are not actually going to achieve what we're trying to achieve, which is wide affordability of housing. So I encourage us putting forward the complete package before adopting this proposal. And my third point is we've spent 30 years on the mixed use centers, but there are 13 mixed used centers and only four have really seen growth in the past five or six years. I would love if the City would please go back and look at the other centers and why aren't we seeing growth in the centers. What infrastructure investments do we need to make? There's a lot of stimulus money coming through. Now's the time to make those investments, and really being able to get housing in the short term while working on diversifying the neighborhoods in the long term.

- 19) **Jim Straub** – I'm a homeowner and parent in North Tacoma. I wanted to speak tonight in support of both plans, but especially the second plan to transform housing in Tacoma. Before I moved here, I lived in a number of places including LA and Seattle. So I have seen firsthand the horrible outcomes that happen when a City chooses to build less housing than it has newcomers moving there. You wind up with housing scarcity, unaffordability, and increased homelessness. Too often, a process as zoning, parking regulations can be used by special interest groups to prevent apartments from being built in their communities as a way to keep lower-income newcomers away from their communities. I think since we have a lot of people moving to Tacoma, we need to build a lot of housing. But my second reason is more idiosyncratic for supporting this. Since I moved here, I happened to be in North Slope on Division by the Frisko Freeze. My neighborhood, for historic reasons, is a big mixture of houses – duplexes, four-plexes, and apartment buildings. It has been the most wonderful community to be raising a kid in. I have no idea where people get it that having an apartment building in their neighborhood is going to somehow hurt their family experience; ours is great. By having a larger number of people per square mile in our community, we have multiple cafes and restaurants in walking distance. You know what's a nice part about being a six-year-old? Taking a walk in the evening to go get an ice cream cone with your family. My son has numerous friends in apartment buildings who have different socio-economic class backgrounds than him. It's kind of nice to have all those people in one little area. I promise you, I walk by apartments every day - it's okay, nothing bad happens. Even better, it gives us a property tax windfall, which maybe in the future the City could do all kinds of cool things. So anyway, just to reiterate, I really want to say this plan is impressive. I love it. It would have saved Seattle, and number two if I had a vote.
- 20) **Leslie Malo** – First of all, I also want to acknowledge all the work everyone has put into it, but also raise the question about how rapidly we had to process this. I think that we can really have both but we have to have the City planning that you're trying to do right now. What I'm concerned is that my son bought a property up on Strawberry Hill overlooking the Tacoma Dome, close to the transit center, as a lifetime investment. I can see everything, this great view and by this ancient house, and revitalize it, which is I think wonderful. Then we voted in 2019 to allow multi-family units, and I think those are a great idea but there should be a little bit of view protection for the people who've already invested up in the Strawberry Hill area, which is a historic but lower socioeconomic region. I think we can have both. Why can't we have some height limits, have multifamily dwellings, and also have some respect for some of the view ones. What I'm concerned about is that we put high-rises all along the corridor. It will be rapidly like what happened in Stadium and Proctor and I'm very worried about that. I'm a retired pediatric surgeon, I want children growing up in compounds; just like the other gentleman was saying that apartment complexes aren't the issue, but please respect people who did invest in the area and we can have both.
- 21) **Ben Ferguson** – I own a local architecture practice that specializes in housing of all types and scales. I'm pro-development. I'm a proponent of zoning changes that make Tacoma more equitable and affordable, and we need more housing to support the goals of the Home In Tacoma Project. However, I urge the Planning Commission as our citizen advisory panel that oversees zoning

changes to slow the process down to ensure Home In Tacoma can create new opportunities for housing while limiting the unintended consequences that accelerate current issues or create new ones. I have concerns about this plan that include but are not limited to the extent of the medium density zone in the transform plans. It appears like an algorithm based on a set of rules rather than the actual fabric of a hundred fifty year old City. 45-foot buildings are proposed by the warehouse or mansion where there's no transit, while obvious zoning candidates like Sprague are ignored. A more thoughtful approach is warranted. In both plans, the medium density zones are evenly spread around the City and result in 45-foot apartment buildings out of context. In scenario two, entire neighborhoods, like the Historic North Slope neighborhood are gone. Everything east of Proctor from 6th to 32nd could be rezoned for four-story multifamily buildings. And while it won't happen overnight, how many years do we need to have one single 45 foot tall building between a craftsman and a bungalow? It just doesn't make sense. We should phase this in a thoughtful way and limit the amount of land, so that the development will happen where the City wants it, along transit lines where there's existing infrastructure. And we don't want to create an incentive for people to come in and buy up existing houses and knock them down so that we can replace them with buildings that are out of scale for a neighborhood. I've sent other comments into the City and I hope you'll slow this process down, so that our neighborhoods can be listened to.

- 22) **Angela Garner** – I'd like to thank the Planning Commission for your time and effort and the City of Tacoma for recognizing the housing crisis and taking active steps in creating solutions. I am a homeowner in Tacoma and I'm in favor of the Home In Tacoma Project. Specifically, I support scenario two - Transform Housing Choices. I believe this change will be positive for our community and residents. Developing more housing in our neighborhoods will only increase property values, which is a positive for homeowners. By creating more housing opportunities, it's helping our communities but also giving a place for people to live near their work and surrounding families. This will also create more jobs in Tacoma when it comes to hiring builders and everything else involved in these developments. It will help boost the economy by having more people spending money in the communities that they live and reside in. Additionally by creating more or both low scale and midscale residential housing, it would allow for more room for multi-generational families and extended family space to be near and around each other, more families can live closer, longer together. Specifically in my neighborhood and immediately surrounding neighborhoods in the South Tacoma area, it's pretty unattractive and I would love to see the Improvement in these eyesores.
- 23) **Adam Reichenberger** – I am the Housing Policy Coordinator representing the Healthy Homes Program for the Tacoma Pierce County Health Department. It sounds like my colleague Amy Pow will be speaking directly after me representing the Healthy Community Planning for the Health Department. I'm here tonight to ask the City to consider adoption of the National Healthy Housing Standard. The standard can further the City's environmental impact mitigation efforts and, at the same time, provide the co-benefit of positively impacting community health. Inadequate housing disproportionately affects children, people of color, low and fixed income households, and those with chronic medical and behavioral health issues. Children are particularly vulnerable to influences from the residential surroundings. The quality of the environment where young people learn and grow has serious implications for their physical health, behavioral and emotional welfare, school achievement, and economic opportunity. It affects them directly and indirectly through its impact on their parents and other significant adults in their lives. The National Healthy Housing Standard outlines several codes that would ensure Tacomans have equitable access to healthy stable resilient housing. Many of these codes work in tandem to mitigate the environmental impacts of Home in Tacoma. In fact, the World Health Organization has outlined a few strategies that embody these co-benefits, which are already incorporated into the standard. The standard bridges the health and building code communities by putting modern public health information into housing code language and installing health-based measures to fill gaps in current property maintenance policy. It serves as a complement to the municipal maintenance codes, and other housing policies already in use. The Affordable Housing Action Strategy acknowledges the decades upon decades of racist policies that continue to impact our community today. The action strategy and the Home In Tacoma proposal begin to address this inequity through affordability and opportunity. I urge this

Commission to complement those efforts with the National Healthy Housing Standard to ensure those affordable opportunities will be healthy and stable and resilient.

- 24) **Amy Pow** – I'm the Principal Planner for Tacoma Pierce County Health Department. The Health Department has been advocating for relaxing single-family zoning to facilitate missing middle housing over the last decade because housing determines health. We did support the two Land Use proposals to change the Land Use designations to accommodate more affordable housing. Increasing density along walkable buffers, along transit corridors, can encourage walkability, support social connection, and benefit transit ridership. It is, however, important to ensure infrastructure capacity is available and level of service is concurrent with growth. We recommend conducting a study to identify the maximum development cap that could be supported by the current level of service. The City should coordinate with Pierce Transit to ensure service concurrency before parking requirements are relaxed. Racism is a public health crisis. We welcome the inclusion of anti-displacement and anti-racism strategies in this amendment. These strategies will give the vulnerable populations the opportunities to build, to find a stable housing and build wealth. Besides mitigation, we urge the City to take a proactive community development approach to prevent displacement upstream. In terms of implementation, we ask the City to consider a phase approach to first relax single-family zones in neighborhoods where opportunities are rich. Zip codes can determine one's health. If well implemented, this can become a pathway to create integrated and inclusive neighborhoods. There's no better time for Tacoma to showcase from base code to build pedestrian friendly neighborhood to support missing middle housing. There are numerous public health benefits in adopting this code.
- 25) **Jamie Sandberg** – I'm a North End resident and a local architect, who works on all types of housing with everyone from custom home owners to developers of large multifamily projects. I thank the Planning Commission and the PDS staff for their efforts thus far on this effort. I want to say that, though, I probably stand, in a career sense, to benefit greatly from the more aggressive of the two plans. I would like to encourage the City to pump the brakes just a bit on this process and allow for more public input, especially from people who are in the expertise of housing and development. You might learn quite a bit from those groups if you just spend a little more time collecting hard facts and data to make the smartest decision possible for Tacoma. I fully support the why of this proposal, not necessarily the how just yet, until we get a little further in that regard. I am an architect who fully supports walkability and density, but I also am concerned that the more aggressive of the two options is going to cause a major issue for our infrastructure. I don't think it's going to be able to keep up and I'm concerned that unless we reassess impact fees on the developers, we're going to hear it bad from the homeowners who are going to be passed this cost on. I also would like to urge the Commission to please expand the 12-year multifamily tax exemption program to more areas throughout the City to incentivize developers of all sizes to provide affordable housing. Finally, I'd like to say please work with local developers and architects to address the parking issues of the current commercial zones. Please encourage missing middle housing however you possibly can.
- 26) **Mike Fleming** – As the lay person, when I learned of these proposals, they were just kind of jaw-dropping in their magnitude when considering rolling R-1, R-2, R-3 all into one category. After learning more about them, I just want to say whatever you recommend, I agree with a phased implementation. Try it, evaluate it, refine it – somewhat like you did with the Infill effort. I also want to comment on affordable housing. It's a real struggle to really achieve something that works. I know there's an array of solutions. I know typically Minneapolis was one of the models and their actions included even reviewing and revising codes to allow modular homes as they're less money to build. I preferred the evolved scenario initially if I had to make a choice.
- 27) **Heidi Stephens** – I am for affordable housing, but I'm opposed to both of these scenarios. Tacoma already has designated growth centers, which haven't been seen through yet. Of the three other areas of America I found, which removed single-family homes zoning, they are two to three, four times bigger than Tacoma, and none are allowing for three to four story apartment buildings in former single-family homes zones. One city is allowing only for duplexes in formerly single-family

home areas, one is up to three-plexes, and only one is even allowing up to four-plexes. None are allowing for three to four story apartment buildings in formerly single-family home neighborhoods. And even those small transitions in those cities took them years, not a few months. Worse, this will do nothing to actually offer affordable housing nor for the homeless. The City instead will be deferring tax revenue, but the builders are only promising a few small studio apartments at market rate for a short amount of time, which does nothing to assist a low-income family. Plus, this will actually drive up the cost of home since nearly every house which goes on the market will now be a potential profit for a developer, who will likely be able to outbid every family every time. Seattle has already sadly realized that expecting for-profit developers to actually create long-term affordable housing does not result in affordable housing, because they are building for maximum profit. And Seattle is now left with an infrastructure nightmare there. My neighbors have no idea about this plan. From what I've seen, the City's presentation only included a photo of an apartment building for the first time tonight, but still isn't showing the reality of it next to a single-family home. The Planning department never once reached out to our Neighborhood Council, but they did meet with builders. So without extending review and comment time, it could appear that anyone who's in favor of these plans either stands to make a profit or sadly being lied to about this ever creating affordable housing. I thank you in advance for reading the written comments I'll submit with actual realistic alternatives.

- 28) **Heidi White** – I live in the South Tacoma area and I totally agree with Heidi Stephens on what she just said. One thing that I had a problem with is I don't like neither one of the proposals. Keep our single dwelling homes. Leave them alone. We want them. That's why we bought here. That's why we want them. We want a quality of life that you can't get living in an apartment building regardless of what other people say. One thing is the outreach to the citizens in Tacoma was horrible. There were 870 responses on the survey that went out. The survey was confusing. Many people couldn't do it because they don't have computers. They don't have technology. I just think that it needs to be done a little differently in order for people to make more comments. I hope that the City would also increase Fire and Police because in South Tacoma, we've had our homicides up 500%. The crime is astronomical in the City. As for affordable housing, you got to be joking with people if you're telling them that things are going to be affordable in the City. This City is hot and nobody under \$17 or \$18 an hour is going to be able to afford a little \$1,100 studio apartment. I want people to be housed. I want them to have it. But the only way that's going to happen is if the City of Tacoma builds it and they rent it.
- 29) **Felicity Devlin** – Since time is short, I must limit remarks to the midscale proposals. First, I'm very concerned by the rush to roll out. Unlike low scale infill, it's received very little public outreach. Second, despite the scale of the proposed zoning, I've seen no really in-depth discussion or analysis of the potential impact and cost to neighborhoods yet. Three or four story apartment buildings will bring enormous change to a street. They'll reduce space for gardens and reduce privacy, especially in areas already densely packed. There will be more residents. Yet less open space. Tree canopy will be lost. There will be greater congestion. The Planning department says these neighborhoods will become noisier. Some districts that are already growing fast may be severely impacted if opened up to have more development. A neighborhood with taller buildings can gain expensive views and be a particular risk for displacement of residents – for example, McKinley and Lincoln. What affordable housing will we gain? Economic analysis shows that rents and midscale apartments won't be any lower than rents in our mixed use centers. We still have lots of room for development there. I have to say it's jarring to see the pink circles drawn all across the midscale scenarios map. Proposing so many different neighborhoods for redevelopment. It's even more jarring to realize the City's plans are for midscale buildings to eventually replace the existing houses. These are people's homes and communities we're talking about. While the Planning department says change may be gradual, it's likely some neighborhoods will change fast, unraveling quickly once midscale building start to arrive. To me, it feels as though the City is planning a huge experiment on our neighborhoods with extremely unpredictable results. So I'm asking you to slow this down. We need formal consultation with Tacoma residents and far more analysis of potential consequences. Start small and fine tune midscale zoning to those areas that

could benefit rather than being harmed. Please don't risk a rush proposal doing irreversible harm to Tacoma neighborhoods and its communities.

- 30) **Anthony Johnson** – Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the hard-working men and women of Tacoma. My name is Anthony Johnson. I live near Wapato Park and I'm born and raised in Tacoma. I'm the Tacoma agent for Laborers Local 252 representing 700 hard-working families here in Pierce County and I'm here to encourage more opportunities for more neighbors. Please change the zoning laws throughout Tacoma and increase the density. This will allow more people to move into our communities and I appreciate being able to communicate on this publicly. I also would like to express concern that the sudden change to the (Tideflats and Industrial) non-interim regulations are not being given the same public community opportunity or comment opportunity. Both housing and industry are important for our vibrant future for our beautiful City.
- 31) **Hayley Henry** – I'm a resident in East Tacoma and Strawberry Hill. Unfortunately, this is not the first time that I'm talking to you guys about rezoning my neighborhood. In 2019, you proposed to increase the density in my neighborhood, which was eventually rejected by you and City Council. I'd like to remind you of why that was. First off is public commentary. It's sad that it's not even two years, it was June 2019. And here we are having to speak again about why this is not appropriate for our neighborhood. In addition, Strawberry Hill already has existing zone, but we already support missing middle housing. The high density zoning is supported in McKinley Neighborhood Center. This impacts views and, therefore, home values. There's a lack of adequate supporting services and infrastructure. There's a lack of connectivity to surrounding business districts. In addition to that, this is a historical area. McKinley Park was developed in 1901. Although we don't have recognition like most affluent areas like North Tacoma, this area is a historical area. The roads are in horrible shape. The sidewalks sometimes don't exist. It's on the top of the hill. The closest schools are being closed. We have had unequal community engagement compared to the North End. The North End was notified and engaged in this proposal in January, and I received a flyer in mid-March. So if you wanted engagement, you've already heard how we feel about it and you're not giving us time to respond as a lot of people had mentioned. In addition, you are removing one of the only affordable areas in the neighborhood and the City of Tacoma to be a homeowner. This just feels like you're perpetuating redlining.
- 32) **Matthew Montequin** – I want to echo some of the comments made by Heidi Stephens and others here. I'm opposed to both options. Let's be clear. This is a windfall for developers dressed up as a proposal for equitable and affordable housing, when in fact it will do neither. It will just expand the pie for developers to gobble up. It will ruin our neighborhoods and their historical character with monstrous and unsightly boxes. Just look at Seattle's ruined neighborhoods – wall to wall cars, teardowns and destroyed historical neighborhoods. Are those neighborhoods in Seattle more affordable? Are they more equitable? Seattle's driving out their minority population, and they're still building those boxes and tearing down historical small craftsman homes. Are these options green? The best housing from an environmental standpoint is what's already there. Please don't "Seattle" my Tacoma.
- 33) **Barb Shivers** – I did just hear about this from a Council Member, so I have to agree with some of the other people but I'm starting to notice this happen a little more frequently where things are being pushed through with not as much notice or public responses. I've lived in this neighborhood for about 25 years. I live in the North End and I just think about the idea that most of the people around me have as well. My neighbors next to me for 40 years, my neighbor behind me 65, the one across the street 35, the one next to her 40, and we live in one of the safest neighborhoods in Tacoma. I think the reason why is because people that come here stay. I've been in this house since 2008 and I moved five houses down from the house on the corner that I lived in since the 90s. So I think you know, there's something to be said for building that kind of relationship and community. When you introduce short term residents, people who move in and out in a shorter time, you just don't build communities like that. They're not invested in their neighborhoods either because they are not going to stay there. So that brings a completely different element. Of the two proposals, of course, I'm going with the first as it's less invasive, but even that, to be honest with you, one of the

things that bothered me was that you said straight out in the proposal without any single family residences. Why are we excluding that entirely in either plan? That doesn't make any sense to me. That's kind of singing how we do things these days. It's like that cancel culture idea. I don't want to get rid of all of that. Now you might propose something with partial changes some places, but let's keep single family. There's no reason to get rid of it.

- 34) **Melissa Hubbard** – I've lived in my house for almost 28 years here in the North End Tacoma. My neighborhood is all single-family. I purchased a home in a single family neighborhood where all of our homes are single story homes. Yet we fall in the area where you can build the four-story apartment in your proposal. I didn't buy in a neighborhood full of apartments. I bought in single story neighborhood where it's comfortable for my kids to play out in the neighborhood and have the privacy. If you build something that's four stories next to me, I've lost all of my privacy in my backyard to enjoy my little blow-up pool and I've lost all of my sunshine as the four-story apartment's going to shade what little piece of property I own. Why not let me as a property owner decide whether I want to have an ADU or a tiny home or turn my home into a duplex, to add more rental units? I'm so opposed to this. I have so much to say and it's just not coming to me. They're not going to bring affordable apartments to our neighborhood anyway. We've seen that in all of this building that has gone on in the north. These property owners, these developers are building \$2,500 a month apartments that nobody can afford. My daughter's a nurse and can't afford to live in these apartments in the North End. She had to rent there. I wasn't notified, I just found out about all of this today. An apartment building next to me would force me out of my home because I don't want to live next to an apartment building. And then where am I supposed to move to? You say that changes aren't coming eminently. Everything starts in July.
- 35) **Jim Pickering** – Thank you to the Planning Commission and to the Planning staff. I will state up front that I favor scenario two. I recognize that there are two issues at play here – availability and affordability. There are separate issues but interrelated. I also appreciate the incremental nature and extended timeline for the change in these plans, and understand that many of the details await Phase 2. I am not even 70 years old yet, but I think I will probably be dead before most of the things that are envisioned in this plan happen. It's not going to happen overnight. This is not something that's going to happen quickly, but we need to begin the process of moving forward now because the changes are so many years down the line. If we don't start this process now, we're going to face some dire consequences countywide. No action now means more urban and suburban sprawl and more lost land out in the county. We're going to grow. We have to grow, we have to change, but it's not going to happen overnight. Somebody is not going to come into my neighborhood here in the West End and put up a four-story apartment building next door. It's not going to happen. Especially if you look at what the standards are, the footprint in this neighborhood would be a house-sized footprint. So I encourage change to happen and it needs to get moving forward now. The details are forthcoming. I understand that.
- 36) **Gia Mugford** – I'm speaking to you from the Wedge Historic District tonight, sandwiched between the North Slope and Hilltop. I'm the owner of a contributing historic home built in 1903 as a 6-bedroom. Today, that structure is a duplex, which provides affordable market rate housing for myself and my tenant, and is a three-bedroom in total. I take great care of my home. I know my neighbors. I live across the street from a four-story apartment building and I would like to say that the Wedge is actually a fantastic example of the success of middle housing. I would encourage everyone to go and look at it and think about the fact that Tacoma's answer doesn't have to be Seattle's high-rises. In fact, that isn't even what we're discussing tonight. I'd like to commend the project that I've been following since the beginning and throw my support behind the Transform Tacoma scheme. I do as an earlier speaker has said think that the algorithm needs some tuning, that careful attention should be paid to the existing good fabric of neighborhoods and that should be preserved and built around.
- 37) **Troy Serad** – As the owner of a 1905 home on Strawberry Hill, I strongly support the Home In Tacoma Project and specifically scenario two. We need to transform our housing choices. I understand that change stresses people, but this City has an obligation to grow and to grow

responsibly. Having sensible zoning reforms that allow missing middle housing is not extreme. It is the type of housing that never should have been prohibited in the first place. Most of the areas that we love and enjoy are these neighborhoods that developed when strict single-family zoning was not the law. Single-family zoning was implemented by this City following decades of racist real estate and financial practices that codified into law. All the special benefits and privileges that many of these commenters are now clamoring to preserve. This is wrong. This debate should be less about saving views or preserving pockets of wealth and more about how single-family zoning has denied housing opportunities for so many of our neighbors since 1953. It has denied opportunities for homeowners who wish to more fully develop their own property. This proposal isn't for developers. It is for regular homeowners and people like me. Strict single-family zoning has absolutely no place in a vibrant equitable City. It is high time for Tacoma to transform its housing choices through this very basic reasonable modest zoning reform. And to that point, a comprehensive environmental review of this basic policy change, whatever that could possibly mean for this proposal, is totally unnecessary.

38) **Mark Perrow** – One of the problems I have is that a moderate housing is not a four-story apartment building. In our area, we have a lot of houses that are one-story houses, and sticking a four-story apartment building in the center of that really takes the burden on the person whose house is next door, because they no longer have privacy. They'll have people parked in front of their house. They'll have more noise. They'll have a lot of stuff. So what you're saying is that we need to have more housing but the burden should be on the people who live next door where we're going to put it. The other thing is that this should be a decision by the City of Tacoma, not by a small subcommittee. This should be something that goes through as a valid issue. Let everyone in Tacoma be able to vote on where they want to come or go, not on what a small group of people feel should have. That's all I have to say.

39) **Vanessa Dolbee** – I've been a resident of the City of Tacoma since 2008, and I'm also a planner by trade. I fully understand the issues that we're discussing tonight. I've been a planner for more than a decade. However, I have concerns regarding the assumptions of this proposal. And first is that the assumption that housing type variety does not guarantee affordable housing or guarantees affordable housing, attainable housing, or homeless housing from my experience. What you're proposing is upzoning, which is what we are talking about which actually incentivizes redevelopment, typically by large developers. The outcome of this proposal might be missing middle housing such as townhomes. Ultimately, the sale prices are going to be run by the free market which is why earlier tonight, I heard the master builders are fully supportive of this proposal because they want to make money. Just because we have different housing styles such as town homes or condos, it's going to sell for what the market bears and not going to be affordable. The other things I want to add is that we need to have infill housing that's going to maintain environmental equity. Based on this proposal, one of the things that Tacoma hasn't done is preserve our urban canopy. So if we're going to adopt this type of proposal and encourage redevelopment, we need to have stronger tree preservation ordinances that retain our tree canopy in our open spaces. Lastly, I want you to know that the missing middle continuum graphic that you've been showing also include single family housing and this should be a part of the plan, not eliminated from the plan.

40) **Rebecca Chellot** - I live in the North End. I used to live out just on the border of Tacoma and Puyallup. I grew up on welfare. So I know the whole spectrum personally and I just want to really emphasize that this proposal is not going to create affordable housing. That's the way it's being sold, but that is not what it will accomplish, because as somebody else just said the free market is going to determine the prices. So developers are going to put in the most expensive that they can get on the market because they're about making a profit. Meanwhile neighborhoods will be damaged, or even in some cases destroyed. We have one of the largest historical districts in the United States here, it's part of our history. And I don't know anything about the redlining, I've read a little bit about in the paper. I'm shocked and horrified about that but penalizing our neighborhoods and destroying the character of our neighborhoods, and we have so many great neighborhoods, it would just be a tragedy for this. Saying that Tacoma is going to make sure that we have housing

standards or design standards is just ludicrous. Looking at some of the horrible things that have been approved and built into our neighborhoods, I mean, look at the shoebox that Annie Wright was permitted to build, look at some of the apartment buildings on 2nd and 3rd and North Yakima. They totally don't match the character of that neighborhood in any way, shape or form. So we need a lot more time to consider this to comment and to do a lot better job of deciding what the impact should be and could be on this. But this is not going to make for affordable housing and we should stop calling it that.

The meeting was recessed at 7:32 p.m. and resumed at 7:37 p.m.

- 41) **Ken Miller** – Thank you for the opportunity to speak and for all the work that the staff and the Commission have put into this proposal. I support the Home In Tacoma Project. I think the theme of my comments will be facts over fears. I'd like to make a couple of points. First, I don't read Home In Tacoma as the City's affordable housing solution. There is a larger context, the Affordable Housing Action Strategy, which does a lot to tackle affordability. Home In Tacoma is aimed at the so-called missing middle. Second, people who fear their housing values will be depressed may want to look at some of the studies that have come out of the University of Washington, out of Minneapolis, and other places that show the opposite. In fact, upzoning results in higher value single-family properties. And third, for those of us who fear that big apartment buildings with transient populations will ruin the character of our neighborhoods, consider if those tall buildings were owner-occupied instead of rentals. Consider if they were all white people, would we be less fearful than we are currently? I'm supportive of the proposal. I support transformation. We are a City. We have the burdens and the opportunities of a City. People who want to spread out have lots of suburbs to move to.
- 42) **Kevin Chung** – Thank you Chair Petersen and Planning Commission for the opportunity to comment on the Home In Tacoma Project. My name is Kevin Chung and I'm speaking in strong support of housing scenario to transform housing choices. I'm a first-time homeowner who moved to Strawberry Hill in the McKinley neighborhood in 2018. Competing in the hot market was challenging as a younger buyer with a modest income, seeking financial and housing security via homeownership. Over the past three years, I have watched Tacoma's housing market skyrocket at an alarming pace as home values at my neighborhood increased far beyond what I and many others can afford today. Had I waited to pursue homeownership, I would not have been able to afford a house in this neighborhood, perhaps not in the City. Given the region's current housing market trends, these financial barriers only increase at the detriment to our communities. The challenge is clear. We desperately need more housing. I applaud the City of Tacoma for taking progressive action on a region's housing crisis with the Home In Tacoma Project. It is past time to eliminate the racist and rampant single-family residential zoning code, which presides historical redlining and dominates our current land use. Implementing diverse and expanded housing options can help bring more opportunity to our neighborhoods, whether through rental or ownership. The addition of missing middle housing in McKinley will give more people access to many positive qualities of this area including proximity to Downtown, expanding transit options, easy Interstate access, scenic views and parks. An increase in density can optimize our neighborhood's economy of scale for social, commercial, educational and infrastructure opportunities. I look forward to the continued development of the Home in Tacoma Project, as well as further coordination with all the stakeholders needed to make this transformation a success. Our particular interests are robust design guidelines, anti-displacement measures, affordable housing mandates, and continued public engagement. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.
- 43) **Daniel Dye** – I thank you, first of all, to both Planning and Development Services staff and to the Planning Commission for all of your work on this project. I am speaking tonight in strong support of scenario two, Transform Housing Choices. I have been a resident of Tacoma both in Proctor and some much-maligned apartments as well as now a first-time homeowner in East Tacoma. To speak a little bit about why I was able to afford to buy a home in Tacoma, I was able to afford a home in Tacoma because I found one of the few duplex developments happening in Tacoma right now on the east side. We have a great community here that has been slightly hampered by the pandemic,

but I think you'll see that the group of people living in these duplexes are very much families, young professionals or older retired people. You're seeing that a lot of vibrancy is coming in because we have allowed things to grow in such a way that is not just single family, which is not affordable to many people. I'd also like to speak in support of increased density bringing vibrancy to Tacoma. As a resident of Proctor, I could tell that a lot of the reason the businesses there thrived and the neighborhood was so loved by everyone was because of the density that occurs in Proctor. Last but not least, I'd like to talk about the fact that this is not going to change things there overnight. This is indeed going to be incremental change. Even if we were to upzone everything tomorrow, it takes time to build things. It takes time to pull permits. It takes time to create traffic impact analyses. I know that, I write some of those as part of my job. Things are not going to change. This will be a decade or a generational change.

- 44) **Tim Gilman** – I have been born and raised on the East side, bought my first house on the East side of Tacoma, and am closing on a house again on the East side of Tacoma, on McKinley Avenue just in the next couple weeks. I believe that the design and scale that you have talked about, getting growth right and supporting infrastructures. One of the main things here within our East side community for the last 30 years, we have not had a grocery store. So if you're going to grow the community whichever way you want, I think you have to support the infrastructure. We need a grocery store. We need the infrastructure. So we have to have that as it's vital to our community. We are right next to the transit center, and we have a great East side. I would hope that we look at all the infrastructure in the design and scale and that's all I got.
- 45) **Deborah Cade** – I live in the North Slope Historic District and I've submitted written comments on behalf of the Historic District board, but I just wanted to make a few comments tonight. As has been pointed out by a couple of other speakers, the North Slope and Stadium Districts and other neighborhoods that predate zoning are really a great example of how a mix of multifamily and single-family housing can work in the neighborhood. The problem is that City is not starting with a white piece of paper in this situation. You're looking at existing neighborhoods that are already established. So in order to accomplish these kinds of zoning changes, there's a number of things that we would look for that we're not saying in these current proposals. First is some kind of demolition and protection that really goes beyond just the list of historic districts. I totally agree with a couple of the other speakers that there are beautiful historic homes and historic apartment buildings throughout Tacoma. Those really all should be protected from demolition and not subject to being torn down and redeveloped. We also need a better commitments and more detail on design standards that include addressing parking and traffic impacts. Those are really critical for our support. We're being asked to just trust the City on this that there will be some kind of design standards without knowing what they're going to be. We also need more commitment and more detail on what will be affordable. Even what's defined as affordable now, is it really affordable to a low income or very low income occupant? We also think that this needs to take a lot more time. This has been completely undertaken during the pandemic. It started in January, just shortly before the shutdown started. We need more opportunity for more public involvement and more information from people throughout the City.
- 46) **Robert Cohee** – I've been a resident with my wife and two children who have grown up. One's moved over on the 96th and Yakima, the other one will be moving in to our residents as we will age in place in this wonderful old home on the east side of Valley View Terrace in East Elm Street. Yes, I have a view. I'm a teacher of self-defense for the Eastside Community Center and my children went to Lincoln. Single family housing is not racist, it's diverse. If anybody has ever come to the East side, lived on the East side, walked in the East side, it is a diverse community. It is lacking a store. It's been taken away from us. It's all kinds of things like streets and sidewalks that need to be addressed. They've been neglected for many years and there's been many commentary with City officials in the past. Great town. Great City. Let's continue to work together to keep the communities together. Keep the old vibrant communities around. It's great history. We need to maintain a contact with their history. If you've walked around the streets as we have, our diversity is amazing from the East side of Tacoma through Downtown Tacoma and all the way back to the East side. You can walk, we've done it, we've continued to do it this day at 58 and 60 years old. So

I would like us to kind of re-evaluate some of these things that we're putting in there. It seems a little disconnected. We appreciate the effort you put in these things, but there seems to be disconnect from what these original developments were put for, mine originally developed in 1895. Again, appreciate you guys for your long efforts and time in this, but Tacoma is a great City and a very diverse City and is not as racist as I keep hearing.

- 47) **Becky Young** – I support the Home In Tacoma Project in the most transformative form that can be wrestled through the process. After everything, we've been hopefully learning and relearning over the past several years. I will be proud to see my City make change that can help bring more equity, justice, and creativity to urban planning. Also, I would like to say I have owned a single-family home two blocks from the Wheelock Library since 1995, I'm almost next door to Safeway and right smack dab in Proctor, I would like to say that Proctor is not ruined, not even close. Proctor is thriving, lively, walkable, and fun. I would like to see it get more diverse. Wouldn't it be great to have more districts like Proctor all over the City? And parking in Proctor, the only time that it's really hard to find parking is on Saturdays when the farmers market is open and you could still find parking a couple blocks away. I usually walk but when I need to drive to the pet food store and get a giant bag of dog food, I can always find a parking space, unless it's on a Saturday. And housing values, the big apartment buildings have not made my house value go down. I bought it for \$140,000 in 1995 and it's somewhere up around \$650,000 now. Anyway, Proctor resident in favor of the project.
- 48) **Venus Dergan** – I live in South Tacoma. I'm a longtime resident and board member on the South Tacoma Neighborhood Council. I'm going to be commenting both as a resident as a council member on some of the concerns I have in regards to the Home In Tacoma Project. First, I want to thank Robert the previous speaker speaking about his diverse neighborhood. I live in a diverse neighborhood also, it's not racist. We have a diverse number of people, single family dwelling homeowners in my neighborhood that I'm very proud of. I've lived here most of my life. I actually live in the house that I grew up in that was my father's first home and hopefully can age in place. That was my plan. I love Tacoma, but I think this plan creates barriers to homeownership for low-income homeowners, first time or other of all races. I also would like to say that I'm concerned about the outreach during the pandemic. Being on the Neighborhood Council, I attended the Community Council. It's called a meeting this past month and asked the question about how many neighborhood groups were there outreached to. And out of eight Neighborhood Councils, only three actually had a meeting in regards to this. We have 200,000 people in the City of Tacoma, 800 comments is not even a fraction of the residents of Tacoma. This is not outreach. This is not feedback from the residents of Tacoma. This is a real concern the City of Tacoma needs to do a better job in their outreach. Also as a resident and a neighborhood council member, I'm also finding that developers are bidding on lots in my neighborhood where there used to be single family homes. I attended the informational meeting and was advised that this would not happen by developers, the developers wouldn't bid on lots where there were existing homes, and they wouldn't tear them down; but that's not the case. Design standards are not being met. This has been an ongoing problem. I've been on the Neighborhood Council and fought this in my neighborhood for years. Design standards, even for single-family dwellings, that don't match the character of our neighborhood have been allowed. We've had City leaders comment on this but this is been allowed by the City. This will not be affordable housing. This was addressed in the informational meeting. I thank you for your time, but please be mindful of who are going to own these multifamily units in Tacoma. It will not be local.
- 49) **Yvonne McCarty** – I'm the Chair of the Northeast Tacoma Neighborhood Council and I believe I'm the first person from Northeast Tacoma to speak on this call. I think that although there was engagement over the past year, there really wasn't a detailed plan until March. We had to call an emergency meeting last Thursday to even get a presentation from the Planning department to review this project and we haven't been able to meet again since then. I'm not understanding the urgency, with which was said in the presentation. It was said that this change won't happen overnight. So what is the hurry? What really is the hurry? We're in the middle of a pandemic as many people have said. Slow down. Extend the comment deadline. Really ensure that the people are engaged and know about this. I can tell you that the people that I talk to in Northeast Tacoma,

no one knows about this. No one there, barely scratching the surface. I haven't even looked at the documents in full great detail yet, so slow down. Slow down and really engage the people. Maybe wait till we can meet him in person again, that's enough on that one. The second point I'd like to make, this deserves a full environmental impact statement (EIS). The environmental impacts could be huge and it deserves a full EIS with such a drastic change. The last comment I will make is that this project should, like any other major project, be rolled out through a pilot first. Let's carve out a piece of the City, or maybe a couple pieces of the City, see where the infrastructure is in place to support this more readily and do a pilot. Look for unintended consequences. Look for issues. Don't do this all at once to the entire City. It doesn't make any sense not to pilot this first before changing the zoning across the entire City.

- 50) **Esther Day** – I just learned about this not too long ago, I've been busy with CDC and COVID. And that brings to mind the fact that I believe that this project, while it has a worthwhile issue to deal with, we are dealing with COVID and people that are sequestered in their homes. We are also dealing with people who are having mental issues, job issues, and sustainability issues in our own homes. This is not the time to try and pass this important process through. I agree with last speaker that we need to do a pilot program. We need to test the waters. We also don't need to start giving developers incentives to build here. They either want to build here or not. We don't pay them. We don't charge people taxes as to give these developers the opportunity to do that. Also, we need green space for children. More importantly, these single family homes that you're proposing to impact, their land taxes will go up at the same time. There are seniors like myself who just retired and who's going to pay a lot higher taxes. And for what? I want to live in my home until I die. That's the same with a lot of people. Some of the speakers indicated that theirs is not a racist community. I have black, I'm Latina, and my neighborhood is very easy going, and we love one another and we work with each other. This is not a racist community. Let's do a pilot program. But first let's do an outreach to all the people in Tacoma. Let's have face-to-face meetings at the schools or whatever. Let's teach them what's going on. Let them have a say. Don't pass this through so quickly. I know you've worked very hard and I appreciate all you do. As a former Planning Commissioner, I've walked in your shoes. So I understand but please don't push this so fast and think carefully about all of this.
- 51) **Stoughton Bailie** – I just had some quick comments that I wanted to make. There have been a couple people who are speaking as residents of the East side of Tacoma, and it sounds like they've had generally good experiences with their time there. I've been living here for about four or five years now, and crime is a huge concern. I've had my car broken into twice. I've had a car erupted flame after it was stolen and used as a mobile drug den. I've had to intervene in domestic disputes, someone beating on their girlfriend chasing her down the street. We talk about walkability here, I don't feel safe walking really anywhere unarmed around this part of town. Also I've been living next to this disused and totally falling apart school that has homeless people living in it. It's 10 minutes to the nearest grocery store, 15 minutes to the nearest hardware store where you have to get on two different freeways to get there. Plenty of bars and fast food and corner stores around here. Also, Urgent Care seems to have been disappearing. It seems you have to drive halfway across town to get any sort of medical treatment. Roads and sidewalks are in severe disrepair. There were two apartment buildings that were recently opened in McKinley that are 400 square foot apartment for a \$1000 a month, which is insane and they are exempt from property tax. I have some much more important concerns in my mind for East Tacoma in regards to safety and services than expanding zoning laws. Making population more dense here, making my property taxes increase, and I'm seeing virtually benefits from those taxes from the lack of services and safety.
- 52) **Ivy Clarke** – In the housing proposals, I think they promised development that is sensitive in terms of design principles and also respect surrounding houses. In walking around my neighborhood and looking at what's currently being done, I don't actually see this happening. I've seen four-story structures built next to the store at home, which I don't think is being sensitive to design principles. I've seen two to three story structures that are higher than surrounding two-story homes. So what I'm saying is that I think that the comparable design standards that are close to the current housing really needs to be enforced with developers. I don't see it being done now. Also the point about

affordable housing, which was on the first page of this presentation earlier, I don't see that's actually coming out of this either. I just looked up around one of the newest buildings that have gone up and they are definitely market run. For example, the smallest studio out of three options is \$1,300-\$1,350. To me, that is simply not affordable. I think that builders should be required to offer a certain number of affordably priced dwellings because lower-income people cannot afford \$1,350 for a place that doesn't even have a bedroom. Also, there's been a lot of conversation about building more housing along transit routes and having used the current transit infrastructure - it's currently lacking in terms of realistically accommodating people who won't necessarily have parking in these new houses and still have to commute to work. If we are going to have one car per household or less, if we live in an apartment building, we need to seriously look at the transit infrastructure options and make sure that's adequate.

- 53) **Tom Rickey** – This is Tacoma's attempt to provide affordable housing. There's a lot to be said in favor of that goal. I'm not sure this proposal is the way to go about it. The sweeping change for Tacoma, yet with the postcard campaign providing little awareness to the many who would be affected. The proposals allow for unit apartments in a single-family neighborhood or to convert larger homes will change the entire fabric of a neighborhood. This will increase traffic and create parking problems on narrow crowded residential streets, and increase property crime because of additional cars left on the streets. The associated real cost would not be anywhere near affordable for the average family. Before further action, City Council and planners should immediately conduct a physical tour of once-great City of Seattle to see the unintended consequences of such extreme levels of infill. This will not solve affordable housing problems, and it's getting worse. Block after block of great old homes torn down by developers. Ballard now has high density totally inadequate parking both on and off street, super high housing costs both in purchase and rental. Rooms alone rent there for a \$1,000 a month, homes over \$4,000. Net loss for the City to residents for the quality of life. We start out as a win-win became a win for the government and the planners, and the loss of the residents. We like to really see a lot more ADUs here in Tacoma. We're taking adjacent vacant land or, worse, tear down existing homes. It's a waste of precious environmental resources in a neighborhood. Having developers and speculators making four-plexes next to single family is just too much. This is too important of a decision to be made by Councilmembers alone. A lot needs to be looked at. Promulgate more of this information extensively through the citizens, and then do the right thing and put it to a vote to the citizens of Tacoma.
- 54) **Kimber Starr** – I'm the Executive Director for the Homeless Community Land Trust. I'm also a board member of TCRA, a local realtor and formerly homeless. Parts of this plan that I really like are the focus on missing middle housing and infill housing, as well as increasing density and diversity of housing types. I really love that addressing the lingering impacts of systemic racism and facilitating homeownership and wealth building opportunities for communities of color is an important part of this plan. I definitely support and prefer plan two but anything would be an improvement over what we currently have.
- 55) **Nathan Rosenbaum** – I have an opportunity to build a 25-unit multifamily building on a property I own in a transitional area within Tacoma's North Slope Historic District. The new structure would be built on the north side of the parcel, which currently has a 23-unit historic charming brick veneer building on the south side built back in 1918. I renovated the existing building over the last two years retaining its historic charm as possible, keeping the transoms, the hardwood floors, clawfoot tubs. And they now provide workforce housing for the community with the average unit rent of about 20% of HUD's one-person AMI for Tacoma. Last fall, my focus turned to the development potential at the north side of the parcel. I worked with an architect specializing in historic preservation to develop preliminary sketches. The new building would be similar in design and character to my existing building. Again, the rental rates would be affordable designed to meet workforce housing needs. Unfortunately, I could not make the project work under existing land use regulations, specifically around required parking spaces and setback requirements. So I suspended all work on the project last fall. I believe this project would be consistent with the vision outlined in the mid-scale residential designation. The City would gain in many ways. Most notably, it would open up affordable housing in a nice neighborhood that otherwise might not be accessible. And I

just want to note that I'm on my own, I've never done something on this scale. I genuinely care about the community. Also, I'd ask that you please consider an expansion of housing incentives including the MFTE, the 12-year affordable housing option. Also, please consider extending the transfer of development rights (TDRs) to include multifamily properties this area. At the start, the City could conduct a windshield survey of structures in a district to determine which might qualify for TDR incentives and if preservation of these structures would be meaningful to the City. Finally under existing zoning restrictions, structures like my existing building would be impossible to develop and yet the character of early 20th century multifamily buildings is highly desirable and worth emulating in the new zoning code revisions.

- 56) **Liisa Pangborn** – I've been living on 6th Avenue for 18 years. I love my old house. I love my neighborhood. I love my City. I support increasing housing choice and density and the intentions of the plan, but I have some concerns about the assumptions that the plan is based on and also how these will be executed. There have been some very thoughtful comments so far. I'd like to, in particular, address sustainability and affordability. Affordability has been a focus of the City for the past 10 years like Elliott mentioned. I think it'd be really important to see what has worked and what has been successful and how is that experience being applied to this new plan. Like has been mentioned, density does not equal affordability. We've seen this up and down the West Coast and places that have seen rapid growth. We don't need to repeat their mistakes. I also work in architecture and can second that developers are not here for the greater good as a whole, one or two might be great. That Wedgeview project by WC Studio is lovely, but in terms of creating quality of life over profits, not usually their first goal. Secondly, the most sustainable structure is the one that already exists. So how will the zoning encourage its adaptive reuse? How will it minimize demolition? My neighborhood in particular is a really successful mix of multifamily that exist within old houses. So how does the plan encourage that and not just tear down? The old housing stock in Tacoma is a really finite resource. This is very special to this area to have this kind of history. I don't want to see us take it for granted. I don't want to become a Bellevue or Bonney Lake or place that has no soul or nameless strip malls that are built anywhere in the country. This is like my greatest fear. Lastly, how will the design standards work with the code like people have mentioned? Responding to the context of the neighborhoods and things like that and not just building code minimum and what the maximum heights that are allowed for profits. I also second pilot project, phasing this in, and also a longer comment period to include more stakeholders.
- 57) **Georgette Reuter** – We've been living in the north end here on North Union for about 50 years and we've certainly seen a lot of changes happening in Proctor over that time, most of them good and wonderful, like the renovation of Washington Elementary School and the addition of the Wheelock Library. But we're not in favor of this rush approach that's been initiated by the Tacoma Planning Commission. We're very much appreciative to all the hard work that you've done, but we think that the whole process should be slowed down, so it could include more of our citizens. Certainly you've all talked about tonight about how COVID-19 for this past year has devastated our lives in so many ways. So many people have been unable to really participate and know about these changes that you proposed. Also for those of you that think that the zoning changes could come about slowly, we'd like to remind you about what's happening in Proctor, how just five short years ago a six-story Proctor Station Apartments was built, followed by six-story Madison25 Apartments. And now Mike and Paula right next door to Washington Elementary School in a single-family home are possibly going to have a next-door neighbor of another six-story building and possibly the UPS Store on Proctor; that full block could be torn down, demolished and be made into apartments. So we would really prefer to slow down the process, enable citizens to give a lot more input because we love our neighborhoods and we do like change but we want change that improves our neighborhood and improves the livability.
- 58) **Nick Malo** – I live on East Side Tacoma and Strawberry Hill. I'd like to strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed rezoning of Strawberry and McKinley Hill, and express my concerns on the broader rezoning changes throughout Tacoma in this proposal. The current proposed rezoning of Strawberry/McKinley Hill basically overhauls entire neighborhoods at the expense of residents and existing property owners. Its replacement will cost us a unique piece of Tacoma's history.

Scenario one encompasses the majority of these areas while scenario two will turn all of it into midscale residential. Effectively the proposal allow most or all the area to be redeveloped in the large rental buildings, which goes against the stated intent of a smooth transition. I won't go over it again, but for this is second time in two years that this upzoning is proposed. And based on the exact comments as last time, it just isn't congruent with the area as the City Council and Planning Commission agreed. I also have broader concerns about the implementations, which disproportionately concentrates high density housing in southern Tacoma districts. The East side and South end already allows the highest density compared to other districts and have highest percentage of multi-family residential zoning, as the East side has 4 out of 17 high density mixed use centers. The East side also has the second highest population in the district. These southern districts have 48% of population, meanwhile northern districts like North and West and Northeast have 35%. Comparatively, south Tacoma districts provide 30% of that land and north Tacoma has 53% meaning 14.1 Tacoma citizens per acre here in south Tacoma districts and 5.8 in north. I think we need a balanced density across the areas and make a concerted effort on where infrastructures is actually supported versus just where it's been zoned. Also, I think that property protections like the view sensitive overlay and historical special review, which are concentrated in North End, West End, and Northeast should be applied throughout Tacoma and there should be some site-specific reviews before implementing this.

- 59) **Nathan Schumer** – I really love the transformative option. I think in housing, it's really hard to lead and I appreciate the work on this and your leadership. I live in the North End. I'm a homeowner. I have two kids. We live in the Proctor area, what I really appreciate about this neighborhood is the density, access to amenities, the ability to walk around. I think we've heard a lot about green space for children and things like that. And I just wanted to put the name checked as well. I'm also part of a group and we've heard a lot from North End residents already tonight. So I just want to name check the group I'm part of, which is North End for More Neighbors, which is in favor of these zoning changes. I'll send you a letter about that as well. And what I keep hearing is concerns that this is happening too quickly. I think with all of our crises, with time, and with policing, because all these things, I think we can see that when we add more process, it's like we're denying people. When we say we need to think about this a few more years, we're telling people like you're not going to have a house or you're not going to live here, you can't buy a home or things like that. I think we need to really reflect on what we're saying. I'd love to see in this plan more inclusionary zoning, residential service areas, loosened parking requirements. Think about where transit is going to be in the future. And I would love to see, as part of the green building, some emphasis on moving away from natural gas.
- 60) **Teri Wiseman-Kuhlman** – My husband and I have lived here in the Stadium District for over 30 years, and I want you to know that we are both in favor of housing equity and justice. But equally as important, we haven't seen or heard anyone addressed livability. What metrics are being used to determine how much density a community can sustain before livability declines? So do we have a livability standard that we're trying to meet other than for housing equity? If so, what is it? In addition to that, we're in agreement with everything others have said about infrastructure and what needs to happen to support it. The second thing I want to ask is I do not see on any of these plans for additional green spaces being required for all these people that are being added. Is this not a livability requirement? What I really would like to see is for decision makers to directly address both of those issues. Either this is not part of the plan, or that it is a concern and what they're doing about it – before we agree upon either option one or option two.
- 61) **Athena Brewer** – I am the Chair of the South End Neighborhood Council and I fully support the transform option for the Home In Tacoma plan because we need more affordable housing in Tacoma. As evidenced by the number of homeless folks on our streets these days, being able to live in this town is a privilege and we want to include more people in Tacoma, to be able to live here affordably. Coming from Seattle, from my experience, the mixed use style of City in Seattle or Capitol Hill or Beacon Hill and the like was really wonderful, and it was vibrant. I don't think that it detracts from the neighborhood at all. I appreciate that people are concerned about the changing neighborhoods, but I encourage folks to think of it as a positive and to welcome this change that is

much needed. We do not support delay in this project because we need as much housing and as much positive change as we can get. It's an urgent need in Tacoma. We support these positive changes for Tacoma going forward.

- 62) **Otto Matsch** – I've lived in Tacoma since 1975. We've raised our kids here, they're adults now. I looked at these plans and it's hard to tell which is worse. I don't want to be too harsh on you, but we don't have much time. It's difficult to think of proposal that would make Tacoma less desirable to live than this policy that has been come up with, cramming more people into a given area. The reason people live in single-family neighborhoods is because that's the neighborhood they want to live in. Some people want to live in apartments, that's fine. But cramming more housing into a smaller area or into an existing area does not create affordable housing. The housing price is based on the prices that people are willing to pay for it. By driving more people in, it's going to drive other people out who don't want to live in such crowded neighborhoods. There is no economic logic to saying that it's going to make more affordable housing available. What it will do is increase the housing, but that doesn't bring the price down because the price is not controlled by the house itself, it's controlled by who wants it. I'm going to cut my remarks short here. I've only got 20 seconds left. I think that both of these proposals should be rejected. You can go back to square one and start over again. This is the second time in two years that we've got to go through this stuff. I think it's driven by politics and not driven by rational thinking on what is good for a zoning policy.
- 63) **Nanette Reetz** – I've been a resident in Northeast Tacoma for 30 years, raised my three children here who all have a home in Tacoma now. I'm also on the Northeast Neighborhood Council as a board member and have been for several years. I reject both of these programs and I agree with the gentleman that spoke before me. I believe this might be more about politics and incentives for the developers than it is about the City of Tacoma and our livability. The woman speaking about livability, I really agree with that. My experience with Tacoma politics over the last five years being involved in the LNG project and other things that have been rammed through with people and poor notification is that this is another lack of the public trust. This is a violation of the public trust. Not enough people have been notified about this program. I'm the second person other than Yvonne, she and I are the only people in Northeast on this call today, we have over 20,000 people over here. Nobody knows about it. So I agree with Yvonne McCarty that you go back, and you do a pilot program, and you re-evaluate these programs, and do a test model, and make sure that you look at all the consequences, all the good and the bad. I'm not opposed to affordable housing. We want that for everybody, but this is a poor plan. This is a rushed plan. You can see by an article on King 5 News that came out today in which City leaders said, although change doesn't happen overnight, they're committed to move quickly. That's a problem with the City of Tacoma. City Council and City Planning, you move too quickly and you don't include the community. So I asked you to extend the comment period to go back to the drawing board. We just found out about this at our Northeast Neighborhood Council meeting which Yvonne called an emergency meeting for last Thursday; and the gentleman that gave the presentation was vague at best, the language was missing information, it was vague and confusing, and the math that he had was completely incorrect. We had to correct the map over at least a dozen times. In Northeast Tacoma, we have very limited services over here. So why would you bring more density to an area that already has very limited services for the community? So that hasn't been taken into account in any of the planning. Although I appreciate that your hard work, I wish you would go back, slow down and include the community in your decisions.
- 64) **Halley Knigge** – I grew up and spent most of my life in the Proctor neighborhood. Proctor is not being destroyed. Stop being ridiculous. Proctor is absolutely thriving. I've also heard a lot of people tonight repeating old tired long debunked talking points. I've heard a lot of folks reference the cost of the apartments in Proctor and use that to claim that this project will not make housing more affordable. More inventory equals more affordability. I'm here to say tonight that I love this project. We are on a high-speed train to a climate disaster and we know that one of the best ways cities can combat the climate crisis is through urban infill and creating compact walkable cities. We cannot afford not to do this. We owe it to our children and our grandchildren. I just want to say I am really impressed with both of these proposals, especially proposal number two. I really like the

parameters they put in place around neighborhood character. I'm not going to give more specific feedback because you all are the experts and you did a beautiful thorough job at creating a transformative vision for a more equitable and inclusive City. To all the commentators this evening who oppose this, I encourage you to look inside your heart and ask yourselves, why are you clinging to the false idol of the status quo over coming together to reimagine a vibrant and inclusive community that is welcoming and supportive to all of our neighbors and good for the planet? Really awesome job, project team and Planning Commission.

- 65) **Brendan Haigh** – I am a resident here in District 1 off Proctor. I've been living in Tacoma for about 20 years. I just wanted to say that I think these were great plans. I'm really excited about the plans to bring more density to Tacoma. I'm sure it's been a lot of work and a lot of hassle, so thank you to everyone on the Commission. The feedback I have is in the evolved housing plan, I think it would be great if we could have midscale housing up to a block and a half rather than a half block off of the corridors, just to allow for the slightly denser development there. I think that's the one comment I have. Other than that, thank you very much. I think you guys are doing the right thing and you've got your eye on the ball in terms of what we need to do to make the City more affordable, more sustainable, and to help our fellow residents and our neighbors to live here.
- 66) **Karen Dinicola** – I would love to see the planners set out as a goal to increase the quality of life of every neighborhood in the City. Every neighborhood deserves its own unique plan and approach to increasing the density of housing, something that is appropriate to the character and the services available and the need for services, and green space and improved walkability. I think that's the job of the planners, to actually plan. Planning is not look at housing in isolation, you have to look at everything about every one of these neighborhoods. We have eight Neighborhood Councils, but we have 800 or more neighborhoods in this City. I would agree with some of the commenters that so far Proctor hasn't been ruined but boy, I really feel for the people who are looking at a structure three times the size of their house going up 10 feet away from that house. They invested their life in transforming that into a home with a garden and a place that they wanted to live out their days. Nobody in any part of this City that's invested that much into a home should have to give that up because of poor planning. So I would love to for there to be a lot more thought about preserving mature trees, identifying places to plant more, protecting them, building transit centers across the City because we don't have transit centers except in two places, and figuring out where the cars will go because they all need a place to spend the night.
- 67) **Jill Jensen** – We understand that it takes a lot of effort to do what you have done, but I do have some concerns. First of all, I have been on the North End Neighborhood Council previously and I have just recently learned of this. Because of the pandemic, having to be out of state helping family members, so that's unfortunate. But if that happened to me, it could happen to other people easily. I feel like there should be more time allotted for people to be informed about this. I know that you guys have all been working on it, but other people might not be aware of it. At least for me, I was assuming that the new constructions that went on with the building apartments of Proctor and now on 6th Ave were supposed to provide some affordable housing. Unless I'm mistaken, I don't know that they have any affordable housing within them. So I question why we're giving tax breaks to the developers when it's not really answering our needs. Part of me would like to see what happens with those already in the works in terms of people being able to occupy those buildings and how much of the need is met just by those buildings. Also for adjusting affordable housing, I would like to see that perhaps an idea would be to create a bond with in Tacoma that people could invest in. I know personally I would love to invest some of my own money into that so that it would be affordable housing, truly affordable housing, that the residents who live there could have ownership in. I think that that would go a long way to answering the needs, that they would end up having truly an investment within their own community. We have lots of areas where we could also incentivize the developers to take on these vacant properties and create a home for people who deserve what we all want. So I encourage you to slow down, I would love to see this be taken to the people for a vote.

- 68) **Beth Marshall** – We don't have the infrastructure for this over here. We don't have parking. We don't have affordable housing. Creating more apartments isn't going to bring affordable housing. It's just going to be more expensive housing. I've lived here for 30 years. I want to move now. This is ridiculous.
- 69) **Tara Cardinal** - I started working in Tacoma in 2013. My husband has been working in Tacoma around the same time. We both work in public and health services. We've been home owners in the central area of Tacoma for the last five years. This caught us by surprise as I've been hearing in some of the other comments. We weren't aware of the survey that went around. For that reason, we agree with the others encouragement to perhaps postpone or delay or pause the advancement of either of these options. We have concerns not only with the lack of input from all the different areas of Tacoma, but we don't want to become a cheaper housing option for folks in Seattle. Sound Transit is not having their rail coming here until 2040. I-5 commute is already horrific. The comments about the apartment pricing in Proctor make us very concerned that this increase in density is not going to make the affordability that we would all like. In the arguments of equity, we're concerned that north and west side of Tacoma have the best parks and schools; we would like to see those things developed in the central area, the east side, and the other places. We're concerned that there's not a mid-level in either of the options at a significant amount. Above North 19th where the new light rail is going in, but the central, the north side of South 19th, which is already a commercial area while our neighborhood is being encroached upon by mid-level. So we do encourage a pause. We would encourage, if we moved forward at all, starting with the evolved but not advancing any mid-level. We would encourage not advancing any mid-level options beyond the current mixed use areas that currently exist in the current zoning and to see what happens in the coming years with the light rail on 19th and through Hilltop before developing advanced infrastructure. That will also give us time to develop schools and parks in these areas.
- 70) **Gary Kammerer** – I would say that this whole process seems very rushed without very much time for public consideration or input. I live in the North End. I've been a Pierce County residents since 2010 and owned a home here since 2014 in the North End. I'm opposed to either one of these programs, especially the second one. I think this whole process should go for a vote.
- 71) **Jodi Cook** – First of all, thank you very much for being probably the hardest-working volunteer Commission in the City. You have been assessing a very important topic, which is affordable housing in Tacoma. Many of the comments have already been made that I will pass by, but I will say I definitely support low-scale affordable housing, but I also support low scale infill housing, providing that it really does represent the architectural structures that are shown in the photos on the Home In Tacoma project. For that to happen, they have to be part of the building code. One point I want to bring up is the equity index tool, which is a phenomenal tool that uses a lot of data sliced and diced a lot of different ways to help the City develop policy. I think one thing that when I take a look at the map itself and it is graded by color for high opportunity areas down to low opportunity areas. I would ask the City to change the paradigm. We're focusing very much on the areas that developers want to develop because it can have a higher profitability associated with it, but it does not support truly bringing in and raising up the lower opportunity areas of our City. It was shared with me that Pierce County did a buildable lands report. First of all, Tacoma has a lot of buildable land, but one of the areas was the South Tacoma Avenue area and the Nalley Valley area. What if we do what a previous person spoke to? And that is to create a City bond that would allow for housing to be built, but it would only be for financed ownership, not rentals where that cannot be stabilized for families, but help them build through real estate and economic wealth to provide security for their families while they are paying off their mortgage. I think the most important thing is providing stability to the children who end up getting moved around a lot because their parents are not able to afford the escalating cost.
- 72) **David Roberts** – My question is with regards to infrastructure - two types, both public education and physical infrastructure for serving the community in terms of water and sewer. In terms of education, we live in a single-family residential neighborhood that would be impacted by this. We live close to a new school that has recently been built, Grant Elementary. That's where our son

would go and it's already at capacity; there's no ability to take on additional population. And our house would happen to be right across the street from what the zoning impact would result in, in terms of being four and five-unit complexes. We're not far from the 6th and Alder development. We want to live in this community because it's diverse, it's walkable to restaurants, etc. We appreciate that. However, I don't think the infrastructure currently supports it for education. And we bought specifically single family residential because we wanted to have a single family residential home to raise our son. The second part of that would be in terms of physical infrastructure – be it drinking water, wastewater, stormwater. The Department of Ecology is already pushing at a statewide level in terms of restrictions on nutrient loading to the Sound, and I know that Tacoma and others have already had two lawsuits in the last couple of months with Department of Ecology over proposed limits to nutrient discharge to the Sound as a result of wastewater treatment. Having increased population growth in this area is going to make that more challenging to meet. So from that perspective, I would think that any plan that would increase this, be it increased population in the City, be it from a transportation, water, sewer, etc. There really has to be some connection here in terms of the proposed increased density and the infrastructure to support it. The wastewater thing happens to be one that's eminent.

Chair Petersen closed the public hearing at 8:53 p.m. and reiterated that written comments would be accepted until 5:00 p.m., Friday, April 9, 2021. She thanked those who testified for their feedback.

Chair Petersen asked Commissioners what additional information they would like staff to provide at the next meeting. Commissioner Givens asked for the underlined strike-out changes in the One Tacoma Plan, for which Mr. Barnett referred him to the agenda packet of the February 17 meeting. Vice-Chair McInnis requested support information for why the SEPA process was sufficient for this project, as well as response to the comments about infrastructures. Commissioner Strobel was interested in feedback from Metro Parks, the Tacoma Public Schools, Pierce Transit, and Sound Transit about the proposal. Chair Petersen wanted outreach efforts to be highlighted. Commissioner Karnes commented on the potential consideration of commercial zoning for missing middle housing.

F. TOPICS OF THE UPCOMING MEETINGS

- 1) Agenda for April 21, 2021 meeting includes:
 - Home In Tacoma Project
- 2) Agenda for May 5, 2021 meeting includes:
 - 2022 Amendment – Review of Applications
 - Home In Tacoma Project

G. COMMUNICATION ITEMS

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

- 1) Status Reports by Commissioners
 - Commissioner Givens informed the Commission that the Housing Equity Taskforce meeting had been moved to a time during working hours, which he would not be able to attend. Any Commissioner interested in serving in his place would please contact Mr. Barnett.
- 2) Brian Boudet, Planning Division Manager, briefed the Commission of the following:
 - Starting in May, the Commission would start reviewing the 2022 Annual Amendment package, consisting of three private applications.
 - The Commission was asked to think about what had worked well and what could be improved in regards to public meeting processes, in preparation for future discussion.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 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/