



MINUTES

(Approved on July 6, 2022)

MEETING: Regular Meeting (virtual)

DATE/TIME: Wednesday, June 1, 2022, 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Anna Petersen (Chair), Christopher Karnes (Vice-Chair), Ryan Givens, Robb Krehbiel, Brett Santhuff, Anthony Steele, Andrew Strobel, Alyssa Torrez

ABSENT: Morgan Dorner

A. Call to Order

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

C. Approval of Minutes

- April 20, 2022

Vice-Chair Karnes moved to approve the agenda and minutes of the April 20, 2022, meeting as submitted. Commissioner Givens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Public Comments

Chair Petersen reported that comments were not accepted for Discussion Item F-1, which was the subject of a recent public hearing; no comments were received for Discussion Item F-2; and comments regarding Public Hearing Item G-1 on tonight's agenda are accepted through June 3, 2022.

Council Member Walker expressed appreciation for the Commissioners and thanked them for their service.

E. Disclosure of Contacts

There were no disclosures of contacts.

F. Discussion Items

1. Home In Tacoma Phase 2 Scope of Work – Debriefing of Public Hearing

Elliott Barnett, Senior Planner, facilitated the Commission's debriefing of the public hearing on April 20, 2022, concerning the Home In Tacoma Phase 2 scope of work. He provided an overview of project scoping input sources; what is in the draft scope and themes of public testimony on engagement efforts, zoning, standards, and affordability and anti-displacement; related policy efforts; work efforts of 2021-2022 Affordable Housing Action Strategy (AHAS) Action Teams; anti-displacement work plan objectives; and project milestones and next steps.

Commissioner Givens stated that low-scale zoning may be problematic for creativity in adaptive reuse efforts in the future.

Commissioner Steele suggested prioritizing where growth efforts will first be directed.

Commissioner Strobel suggested identifying what body has purview over certain issues.

Chair Petersen agreed with Commissioner Strobel on identifying issues that are not in the purview of the Planning Commission and provided comments on needing affordable housing, housing in place, housing stability, and development options.

Discussion Item F-2 was postponed until after the public hearing.

G. Public Hearing

1. College Park Historic Special Review District

Chair Petersen called the public hearing to order at 5:37 p.m.

Reuben McKnight, Historic Preservation Officer, presented an overview of the proposed College Park Historic District, background on the proposal, effects of the proposal, the Landmarks Preservation Commission's (LPC) review process and public outreach, LPC's recommendation, and the Planning Commission's review process and timeline.

Chair Petersen outlined the procedures of the public hearing. Commissioners introduced themselves.

Chair Petersen called for testimony. Seventeen people testified, as follows:

1. **Peter Stanley** – I live in a potentially affected house. I want increased housing availability, affordability, and opportunity in Tacoma. The College Park proposal makes building, renovating, and reinventing more difficult. It will raise housing costs locally and adds to the pressure to sprawl across the county. It is the opposite of what I believe the Tacoma Planning Commission should be promoting. My neighborhood is not a museum, not a Potemkin village. It's my home, and I love it. I love that the neighborhood contains inexpensive student housing, triplexes, and apartments, as well as nice old houses. We have good access to transit, businesses, and so on. This proposal would make all of those community assets more difficult and expensive to build and maintain. I enjoy my historic house, but I hope to retain the freedom to make my own decisions over it. An example – I once removed one window in my house because the modern option was much less expensive than the period-correct replacement. However, I replaced the window with modern pane because I needed to make the cracked window safe. So, we could rent the house out for two years, so we could move, and so my wife could go to grad school. That's a long chain of events, but it's the sort of decision that happens in real life. And it's this type of decision that the College Park historic district proposal would like to take away from every individual in the neighborhood. This proposal simultaneously reduces property rights by imposing aesthetic requirements which perpetuate the cultured norms of 100 years ago onto current residents but also harm everyone who doesn't already own a house here by increasing costs and limiting density. A club of homeowners should not be able to impose its aesthetic opinions over neighbors' homes through the power of the city code. I didn't want to buy a house with an HOA – which is why I didn't do so. Instead, I live in this wonderful neighborhood without additional limitations on property rights. Please reject the proposal.
2. **Liz Kaster** – I'm here as a resident of the proposed College Park historic district, and I ask the Planning Commission to reject this proposal. I've lived in this neighborhood for most of the past 17 years. During that time, I've lived in dorms, an ADU, a small rental, and now, I own a 109-year-old home here. I'm deeply invested in this neighborhood. What I love most about this neighborhood is not the buildings, it's the people, and right now my current and potential future neighbors are struggling. In the 10 years, I've owned my home, our property values have doubled. I think few of us have seen our salaries doubled during that same time. In previous meetings, supporters of this effort have highlighted how historic districts raise property values as a significant benefit. I think that's the last thing we need. Over the past few years, many of my former neighbors who were renting on my block have tried to find affordable housing to stay in the neighborhood and have been unable to do so. I do not want to live in a neighborhood where only the wealthiest Tacomans can afford to live and that's increasingly becoming our reality. This is a walkable transit-rich neighborhood steps away from the thriving Sixth Avenue business district, exactly the type of place we should be encouraging more diverse housing types to meet our environmental, equity, and

transportation goals. The proponents of this measure regularly cite that 55% support of area residents, but we don't make urban planning decisions by majority vote. Even if most homeowners in the neighborhood would love the opportunity to see our home values rise and to make new housing more expensive and difficult to build, letting a small group of homeowners make exclusionary and self-interested decisions is not in the best interest of Tacoma now or in the future. I have a five-year-old, and we tell him it's fine if there's a food or activity that he doesn't love, but he shouldn't yuck someone else's yum. Part of living in a city is that there's some buildings with architectural styles you may think look bad or out of place. If a kindergartener can accept that he cannot control everything about his world, we can too. I believe Tacoma needs to focus on looking for ways to welcome new neighbors and focus on affordable housing solutions. While I understand the intent of this effort may be focused on preserving historic buildings, the impact will be to make it more challenging to build affordable housing that meets the diverse housing needs of our community. I hope the city rejects this exclusionary proposal.

3. **Deborah Cade** – I live at 908 N. M which is on the North Slope Historic District, and I've been here for 27 years, which has basically been the time from the time that the historic district started being developed. I've seen this neighborhood go from a neighborhood that was really kind of struggling to one that is now sort of touted by Realtors as a desirable neighborhood. That's largely the effect of the market, not just about the work that people have done on the homes here. But I support the designation of the College Park neighborhood as a historic district just based on the experience that we've had in our neighborhood. It has really encouraged people to take better care of the houses, and I think that the demolition requirements or the demolition prohibitions fact is that demolition is considerably more difficult here has done a lot to protect the neighborhood. This neighborhood was really kind of targeted at the time for a lot of demolition, and replacement of homes and historic buildings with newer apartment buildings, and that has the effect of replacing and losing a lot of what was affordable housing, and also losing a lot of housing that is built with materials and craftsmanship that simply doesn't exist anymore. The comp plan supports historic preservation. One of the main goals is really avoiding demolition and loss of those resources. I understand the concern about the design review requirements, but it's hard to justify the demolition prohibition if we don't retain the integrity of the neighborhood and the integrity of the buildings. So, they kind of go hand-in-hand. Please recognize that this is consistent with the comprehensive plan goals for historic preservation, as well as for avoidance of demolition of historic buildings and of viable housing, and please support this historic designation.
4. **Rick Aramburu** – I'm an attorney in Seattle, representing tonight the College Park neighborhood association and speaking in favor of passing on the recommendation of the Landmarks Preservation Commission to the City Council. I want to speak about some of my experience as a lawyer in historic preservation efforts. In that regard, the historic character of the neighborhood is already well established through its designation on the National Register, but I want to talk about three other issues that I think are important for the Planning Commission and for the community. First, historic preservation really helps create and preserve neighborhood cohesion and communication. It enhances the attention given by neighbors to their homes, the maintenance of their homes, and the pride in their community providing a common bond. Secondly, historic designation already enhances some of the design criteria found in the existing code. For example, the homes are oriented toward the street without garages and driveways and other things, and access to the community is substantially off of existing alleys - features that are no longer really typical in residential areas but they provide assistance to the community. Porches and transparent facades are also important, as is the differing architecture and construction forms which is dramatically different than what you see in some of our suburban communities. The third point is that historic preservation is really consistent with affordable housing and with Home In Tacoma priorities. Regulation is mostly to the front facades of the buildings. The rear part of most of the lots here which are accessible by the alleys would provide for the ease of building ADU/DADU kinds of additional residential housing in the community without a lot of conflict on neighbors or to the streetscape. So in conclusion, the Landmarks Preservation Commission recommendations should be passed on to the Council, where it can make a decision affecting priorities in the community, so we urge the Planning Commission to do so.

5. **Heidi Stephens** – I live in South Tacoma which has just as many deserving homes and potential historic districts, which I appreciate some commissioners noting. However, that doesn't make College Park any less deserving, and I fully support its approval. In response to commissioners' concern of historic districts near colleges, some of my fondest memories were walking through those lovely historic neighborhoods on my way to campus. Even though I didn't live in those blocks I aspire to one day and wanted them preserved. Meanwhile, those beautiful areas were accessible to me just by their existence. It's not a stretch to connect that such a designation essentially does preserve tree canopy by default. Historic districts, which retain existing structures and undisturbed soil with mature trees, are being environmentally responsible and sustainable. If an area experienced redlining in the past, that isn't a reason to destroy what currently makes it desirable for all people now. With Home In Tacoma rezoning, we do need some protected areas. And when Home In Tacoma was being sold to us, we were told that historic designation is the method to keep vintage houses historic context, instead of becoming isolated between contemporary buildings. This will be proof of follow-through on that. I did find it odd for some to suggest that those who purchased homes in pleasant neighborhood shouldn't expect for it to stay that way, yet others suggested that less desirable areas could expect to get even worse. This was from the previous discussions and prior meetings. I say both of those residential areas are deserving of preserving what's good in addition to improving them. So, it is very possible to preserve College Park while also developing density and non-polluted areas, and it's necessary. That's the purpose of City Planning. Due to Home In Tacoma's broad rezoning though, these historic districts become even more important to preserve and College Park is deserving of your approval.
6. **Jeff Ryan** – I live at 3017 N. 13th. I have been an architect here in Tacoma, specializing in historic preservation for over 35 years, and I've been a resident in the district for the last 25 years. And I'm also the author of the nomination before you. I would like to reassert our strong support for the nomination effort. A nomination that took over 1200 hours to research and prepare. One that has been reviewed and edited on the national and state, and most recently, the local level by the Tacoma Landmarks Preservation Commission. A nomination that was accompanied by over 400 signatures of support representing over 55% of the residents within the neighborhood – a majority support of the nomination, and yes, it is true that this is not an election and a majority doesn't rule. It does show overwhelming support for this. This is usually the hardest part of putting a nomination forth for a district and that has been the thing that was lacking and others that have tried like Old Town. So, it is important to know that we have 55%. A nomination that is supported by the Tacoma Municipal Code, and the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan through numerous goals and policy statements found within. I think Reuben did a good job of showing many of the ones from the Urban Form, Design and Development, and Housing chapters, as well as the Historic Preservation Plan for the city. Each of these chapters addresses the importance of historic neighborhoods in the City of Tacoma, and community building, which goes along with nomination efforts and the listing. We simply ask for a fair non-biased review of this guidelines under the Tacoma Municipal Code – not missing information or fear. We just would like to have it looked at in a fair and reasonable way. Historic districts/historic neighborhoods are affordable housing in the United States. Existing homes are far more affordable than new. Existing historic homes over 50 years are far greener than the most current efficient homes. It takes 20 to 30 years for an efficient home to match a historic home of 50 years of age. We have locked in carbon. We have all the embodied energy sitting here, and to lose that through demolition creates a giant hole for somebody to create a new home to actually build all that energy back. These historic districts are key to a sustainable future. That's why they do it in Europe. That's why they do it in other cities. This is a sustainability issue as much as a historic issue. We just simply would like you to review this fairly and send it on to the City Council for their review and hopefully their approval.
7. **Huy Pham** – I'm with the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation. The Washington Trust is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving the places that matter in Washington State. In accordance with our mission, we affirm that the proposed local historic district, as listed on the National Register of Historic Places that invite the State Advisory Council on Historic Preservation convened through the State Department of Archaeology and historic preservation and ultimately approved by the National Park Service, is very much congruent with the City of Tacoma's Comprehensive Plan and Home In Tacoma goals as they relate to housing and sustainable

development. Phase one of the Home In Tacoma project packet commits to adopting policies that (policy two) allow diverse missing middle housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, cottage housing, and small multifamily in designated low-scale areas, including most currently single-family neighborhoods; and (policy four) ensure new housing is well designed and complements the scale of the neighborhood. Of the 582 buildings within the proposed historic district boundary, there are already 24 duplexes, seven triplexes, three quadplexes, and three buildings with six or more units, two of which are listed as historically contributing. Speaking to policy goal number two, this means that the missing middle housing that the City of Tacoma seeks is already found within the proposed district in both historic and contemporary development patterns. Speaking to policy number four, given that historic designation at any level does not restrict density or use beyond a property's exterior aesthetic qualities, the application of a historic design review process and the special evaluation incentives that do come with historic designation, can only further stimulate well designed and complimentary development, when existing single-family structures are converted into multiplexes or new structures are built onto the 73 non-contributing or vacant lots. On the other hand, without local protections, neighborhoods are dependent on the goodwill of developers and market opportunities to produce affordable but high-quality housing – when any of those 509 historically contributing structures are planned for replacement. Furthermore, speaking to sustainability, chapter four of the Comprehensive Plan, Environment and Watershed Health, identifies five goals, two of which most relate to the proposed Historic District designation. Primarily, goal number one ensures that Tacoma's built and natural environments function in complementary ways and are resilient to climate change and natural hazards. The National Trust for Historic Preservation's Preservation Green Lab concludes in their 2016 study that comparing buildings of equivalent size and function, building reuse almost always offers environmental savings over demolition and new construction for both carbon emissions and producing transportation construction materials. We look forward to submitting a more detailed version of this letter soon after this meeting.

8. **Holly Powers** – I am 38 years old. I have lived in this neighborhood for 15 years, including in my current home, which is between North 9th and North 10th on North Junett Street, which I own. I have lived in it for nine years with my husband and now my two young children. I plan to live in my home until I retire at least – which if all goes well is another 30 years. I have a tremendous amount of pride in my home and in my community – which is why I want to encourage you to absolutely reject the College Park historic district proposal. My family wants to see diverse housing types in our neighborhood. We want to see urban density. We know that density is better for our environment and better for the long term future for our region. We want to see affordable housing, and we believe this is better for our community and better for Tacoma. We want to see diversity in housing types and in families of our neighbors and in residents in this neighborhood. This neighborhood needs to be part of the solution for our city, one that can evolve as the city evolves and as we change and grow. We want to be a welcoming and diverse neighborhood and we want our neighborhood to be accessible to many. Let there be no mistake, this proposal is at odds with those aspirations for our future. For Commissioners who support inclusivity, diversity, and responsible environmental planning and policy, this should be a clear decision. Please decline this designation that will take us backwards and not forwards into the future which my family looks forward to participating in, in our beautiful and diverse neighborhood.
9. **Eric Quist** – I live on North 13th, and I am opposed to the establishment of the College Park historic district. First, a fee of \$175 to \$500 to have a proposed change reviewed is nothing more than an additional tax – a tax on one's right to make changes to one's own property. Not everybody can afford this. Our neighborhood is diverse, with people from all different ages and economic circumstances, including many on fixed incomes. Not everyone could afford this fee, especially now, when we're seeing prices rise for the cost of living. Second, the character of our neighborhood has not changed in the 40 years that my wife and I have lived in the same house. People just aren't doing much to change the character of their homes. Consequently, the proposed College Park historic district won't add much if anything other than additional fees and paperwork. Third, I understand that most requests from homeowners and existing historic districts are routinely approved. So, what purpose does the historic district serve if the vast majority of those requests are routinely approved? This proposed historic district seems to me is merely a solution looking for

a problem, a problem that for all intents and purposes doesn't exist. We don't need to solve a problem that doesn't exist. Fourth, I remain convinced a significant number of people think the proposed Historic District will prevent the city from moving ahead with the Home In Tacoma initiative. The fact that questions about the effect of the proposed historic district on that initiative were asked during the informational session a few days ago, leads me to believe that many don't know or understand this will not prevent the city from moving ahead with its plans should it choose to do so. I also understand that the decision to proceed is not subject to majority vote of the residents of the district. It disturbs me however, to think that the city might go ahead with this project under the assumption that most people approve of it when in fact, they don't have all the facts. I was one of the 7000 or so people who received the postcards asking whether I approved or disapproved of this proposal. Nowhere did it say what effect this would have on Home in Tacoma. I would urge that Planning Commission not recommend that the City Council approve this. I don't think we need it. I think it's unnecessary, and I think it will increase everyone's costs.

10. **Rich Arneson** – I live in the proposed College Park area. I am also in the electric utility industry. I'll just point out a few things. Governor Inslee signed into law not too long ago, a new law that says that by the year 2030 no new gas vehicles will be sold into Washington state. The reason why that is important here is that in order for homes to incorporate this new technology, charging at the home is an important criteria. That is most easily accomplished if the home has a garage, or a carport or some other kind of driveway so that the charging is off-street. Attempts at curbside residential charging in Tacoma and other areas around the country are actually mostly disappointing. I don't quite know how or why but it's just not working the way it had hoped. So, I would urge that there's accommodation to appropriate viable at-home charging be explicitly encouraged, even with this historic preservation, if it is to occur. Think of it as a way to bring the past, to the present and into the future for something that is vitally important to all of our community and world. Also, I'll say that, assuming that there's legislation for electrification of space and water heating systems at homes, they will have or could have some exterior impacts, especially with the placement of heat pumps. I just say that forcing this type of equipment into places that do not make engineering or economic sense, will have consequential impacts to mitigate climate change. So I urge you that you have leeway in these considerations.
11. **Julie Turner** – I think maybe we need to look at what the Tacoma Municipal Code actually says, "The City finds that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation, and continued use of landmarks, districts, and elements of historic, cultural, architectural, archeological, engineering, or geographic significance located within the City are required in the interests of the prosperity, civic pride, and ecological and general welfare of its citizens." Now, that's a lot of words to say it's important for us to keep pieces of our past to show us where we want to go. As John Steinbeck always said, how are we going to know it's us, if without our past. So, in fact, if you read the College Park application all the way through, you will find that Mr. Ryan knows a lot about Tacoma history, and you will learn a lot about it just by reading this. We can remember these homes and styles in this neighborhood where there's examples of the young professionals in Tacoma from the turn of the 20th century, and of the working people that rode the trolley to work in the morning and rode it home at night. These are kinds of places we need to preserve, just as much as we preserve the huge buildings downtown that we have on the Historic Register. I urge you to pass this on to the Council because we need to remember these homes of ordinary people and how they lived then. These are the people who, while they were living their lives, actually made Tacoma what it is today.
12. **Ryan Johnson** – I am a homeowner and neighbor in the proposed College Park district, and I want to thank you to the Planning Commission for this opportunity to testify. I want to speak on behalf of myself and my family. I have lived in this area of Tacoma since 2013 and bought a home here in 2015. We love the neighborhood – my wife and six-year-old son. Every day, it is just an amazing and special place. I want to support everyone out there that is encouraging the Planning Commission to reject this. We are already seeing and feeling the effects of our neighbors who can't afford to live here anymore. This proposal really just limits diversity for our neighborhood. It limits the growth, and it's about making it less inclusive. It's about affecting economic diversity. It's, in a lot of ways, less about preserving buildings and more about preserving a way of life. And frankly, it amazes me that people are spending so much time on this. I'm not wanting to take away the work

that people have done on this, but there are so many other pressing matters in our city and in our whole Tacoma neighborhood right now that need our support. It feels really elitist, and it feels like something that's incredibly privileged to even think about. So, my family supports all the other families out there that have talked about rejecting this, and I hope the Planning Commission could feel deeply about rejecting this.

13. **Susan Ryan** – I am a co-applicant for this nomination. I would like to ask you all to have open minds and open hearts as you prepare to make your deliberations and final recommendation to approve or deny this nomination. You have been given great power and privilege as commissioners, and with this power, you can stop this nomination, as some who have testified would like to see that happen, from ever reaching our elected officials. I find this fact to be quite troubling in a democratic society. I also want to say I'm sorry to all of those who feel that this nomination will somehow create a gated community that is elitist, is disrespectful of others, and would limit the opportunity for anyone else to live within these boundaries. Many of you have lived here for 60 years. I've lived here 25 years, and it's a range of people. It's always been this way since my time here. We like it because it isn't all homogenous, like suburbs tend to be. I have lived my life around historic architecture and vintage finds. I like things with a personality and history much like others that live around me. I was raised by parents from the Depression era, and the term sustainability was not one used, but we were taught to reuse and repurpose. Being good stewards of our environment is what this is all about. It's only natural to be interested in creating historic districts in my current neighborhood of 25 years, like I said – a neighborhood of closely built, compact pre-World War II homes that have adapted through the years, yet still retains its collective historical integrity. My house was built to have borders in the attic. Many homes around me have been adapted and turned into apartments and triplexes within, or a house with a single apartment in the basement or somewhere in the house. It hasn't limited any of this. However, with current pressures from newer developers, in a wish to do away with old and new must be better, it's all the more important that the city recognize what the city has. For years, I have actually tried to encourage the city to do nominations and encourage other neighborhoods throughout the city to become historic districts, if they choose. It is not easy, but the city needs to step up too if they want to see this happen. This part of Tacoma is one of the earliest developed, so it only makes sense that there would be more historic districts currently in the city in this area. It's just the way it was.
14. **Tom Lowe** – I just like to make a comment about the density within the historic district. The University of Washington did a study, and it turns out that our census block, regardless of its size, has a higher population of non-whites than most of the Northwest and parts of the Central area of the bi-population. So, we are a very diverse community, and we are not a nominating this district to be exclusive. We are very inclusive. Part of that is an impact due to the UPS college population, and it does flow. We do have a lot of diverse dwellings within the district as well. I encourage the Planning Commission to move this forward to the City Council.
15. **Tim Merlander** – I live on North 9th Street, and the reason I think the high cost of living here – I've lived here 30 years – is due to the real estate market and developers. When I purchased this home 30 years ago, it was very inexpensive. Now, houses near me have sold for \$600,000. The people around me and myself are astounded. Since people are moving here from Redmond and Bellevue and the real estate people are seeing, you know, money signs in their eyes, so that's the reason I think that housing is so high in this area. It's just ridiculous. We do have diversity here. Not as much as other areas of Tacoma, assuredly, but that doesn't mean that I think passing this College Park initiative would change that. We do need affordable housing, certainly, and if you look at other parts of town, they're not affordable housing which are being built now. It's just ridiculous. Bare land is being bulldozed and turned into these high-rise apartments or four-story apartments, and the cost is expensive. It's not cheap. So, we do need to find affordable housing somewhere in the city, for certain. I'm for the College Park historic district, and we need to rein in the real estate people and the developers and say, you've got enough money – that's enough.
16. **Wendy** – I want to state that I think that the arguments being made against this proposal around it promoting inequity and encouraging lack of diversity are completely wrongheaded. I moved here from Seattle, and one of the main reasons was the fact that the developers were buying a lot of these older, small, more modest homes, and then putting these mega multistory buildings there;

and that was virtually making them even more expensive than the homes would have been when they were just left in their historic states. I don't want to see that happen here. I feel like we have a real treasure on our hands in this neighborhood. I'm really privileged to be able to live here, and I understand that real estate costs are high. But I don't think that the argument that's being made that they're going to only go up if we make this a historic district is correct. I think that's wrong. And I think that, as other commentators have stated, there are a lot of other factors at play here. I think we need to just realize that we're trying to control, not the lifestyle and our neighborhood, but the way that the architecture looks, full stop. If we want to talk about real estate prices, we wanted to talk about the other issues in terms of systemic inequity in our community, I'm happy to do that, but I don't think that is what's going on here. I'd like us to stay focused on preserving the architecture and the history of our area.

17. **Allie Rucker** – I live in the College Park historic district with my young family, and I would just like to echo the previous caller. We simply think that this is about preserving architecture, and it's really that simple. There's a lot of other arguments being thrown into this that truly have nothing to do with what this is about. This is a noble effort that I think a lot of volunteers have thrown a lot of good time behind because people care about it, and people care about the integrity of the neighborhood and the architecture. It's really that simple. I really believe that it's really hard to hear these other arguments that are very valid about other things in our community, but simply not this. This is about preserving architecture. We've left gentrified neighborhoods that developers have completely taken over, unfortunately, but not Tacoma – we love Tacoma because that has not happened here yet, and that's also not what this is about. This is simply about preserving architecture. We love our neighborhood, and we fully support the College Park historic nomination.

Chair Petersen closed the public hearing at 6:40 p.m., reiterated that written comments are accepted until Friday, June 3, 2022, and thanked those who testified.

The Planning Commission recessed at 6:40 p.m. and reconvened at 6:45 p.m.

Chair Petersen asked if Commissioners had any questions or requests for information for staff to respond to at the subsequent debriefing of the hearing on a later date.

Commissioner Givens requested scenarios on how the approval of this proposal would affect design requests.

Commissioner Krehbiel requested information on how this proposal would impact or intersect with electric vehicle charging and solar panels.

Chair Petersen asked how the Historic Preservation Code handles the placement of charging stations, heat pumps, and air conditioners.

Vice-Chair Karnes asked if there is information or statistics on demolitions as a result of neglect that may have been prevented by a historic designation and asked whether design requirements would apply to noncontributing and new structures in the district.

Commissioner Santhuff requested insight on the types of projects in the historic districts and if they are being routinely approved, how the tax incentives program is being used by homeowners in historic districts, and a breakdown of the housing types in the proposed district.

Commissioner Steele asked about diversity as it relates to historic redlining and the effects it has moving forward.

F. Discussion Items

2. Planning Commission Annual Report and Work Program

Brian Boudet, Planning Manager, presented an overview of the Planning Commission's Annual Report and Work Program, including the reporting requirement, a general timeline, sources for work program development, annual versus off-cycle amendments, items expected to be completed in 2022, the preliminary Work Program for 2023, the very preliminary Work Program for 2024, and other on-going and emerging issues.

Vice-Chair Karnes asked if there will be a potential need for special meetings and stated that discussions on commercial zoning and the Pacific Avenue Subarea Plan are high on his priority list.

Commissioner Steele stated he is interested in infrastructure, particularly road maintenance, and asked that all communities of Tacoma be included while developing portions of the One Tacoma Comprehensive Plan (as part of the GMA Update effort) to improve outreach to the under-served population.

H. Upcoming Meetings (Tentative Agendas)

(1) Agenda for the June 15, 2022, meeting includes:

- 2023-2028 Capital Facilities Program – Public Hearing
- 2023-2028 Capital Facilities Program – Debriefing and Recommendation (tentative)
- Home In Tacoma Phase 2 Final Scope of Work
- Pacific Avenue Corridor Subarea Plan and EIS

(2) Agenda for the July 6, 2022, meeting includes:

- Design Review Program Update
- Planning Commission Annual Report for 2021-2022 and Work Program for 2022-2024

Chair Petersen stated that she and Vice-Chair Karnes will not be at the June 15th meeting and asked for volunteers to serve as chair pro tem and vice-chair pro tem.

Commissioner Givens nominated Commissioner Strobel for Chair Pro Tem. Commissioner Strobel accepted the position for the June 15th meeting.

Commissioner Santhuff volunteered for Vice-Chair Pro Tem for the June 15th meeting.

I. Communication Items

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

- (1) Chair Petersen reminded the Commission to submit their comments for the letter concerning the Tideflats Subarea Plan and EIS.
- (2) Lihuang Wung, Senior Planner, informed the Commission that this will be Chair Petersen's last meeting and thanked her for her service over the past 7 or 8 years. Commissioners Givens expressed appreciation for Chair Petersen's service.

J. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 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/