

1

2

Agenda

Potential Amendments


- Zoning Map (3)
- Setbacks (1)
- Unit Lot Subdivision (1)
- Parking (1)
- Pedestrian Connections (1)
- Homeownership Incentives (1)
- Trees/Landscaping (7)

Next Steps




Affordable Housing Tacoma

2



3




4

Zoning Map

Proposed Amendment(s):

1. **DM Hines – 49th & Waterview**
Change proposed zoning near North 49th & Waterview from UR-1 to UR-3
2. **CM Sadalge – 49th & Wilkeson**
Change proposed zoning near South 49th & Wilkeson from UR-1 to UR-2
3. **CM Sadalge – 54th & Alaska**
Change proposed zoning near South 54th & Alaska from UR-1 to UR-2




5

Setbacks

Proposed Amendment(s):

4. **CM Bushnell – Side Yard Setback**
Clarify that the expanded 8-foot side setback is only required for buildings that include units whose primary entrance faces that same side yard (it does not automatically apply to all side yards with a walkway)




6

Unit Lot Subdivision

Proposed Amendment(s):


- 5. **CM Sadalge – Unit Lot Subdivision**
 Modify the language in the Unit Lot Subdivision section to be more inclusive of other types of entities (beyond just Homeowners Associations, HOAs) to allow for shared utility maintenance and costs, as long as it provides the necessary oversight.
 - Allows other models, like Community Land Trusts, Habitat for Humanity, etc.



Parking Requirements

Proposed Amendment(s):

- 6. **CM Rumbaugh – Reduced Parking Area**
 Reduce the size of the Reduced Parking Area (RPA) by removing those portions along the 6th Avenue and South 19th Street corridors that go beyond the State's requirements



Pedestrian Connections

Proposed Amendment(s):

7. CM Bushnell – Pedestrian Walkway Connection

Modify the pedestrian walkway connection requirement as follows:

- 1 to 2 units: minimum 3-foot width
- 3 or more units: minimum 4-foot width
- *Current proposal is 4-foot width, regardless of number of units*



9


Homeownership Incentives

Proposed Amendment(s):

8. CM Sadalge – Homeownership Incentives

Add the following incentives for new developments that are owner-occupied:

- Do not require alley access if the alley is not currently developed
- Reduce on-site tree credit requirements to the minimum “floor” level (without requiring a Tree Credit Fee)
- Waive any Canopy Loss Fees for removed trees
- Increase the rear yard height limit in the UR-1 and UR-2 districts to 35-feet (*from 25 feet*)
- Allow street trees to count toward the on-site tree credit requirement (at 100% credit)
- *Applies to ADUs (if owner lives on-site), townhouses, condos, community land trusts, other non-profit ownership models, etc.*
- *Applies at development stage – require legal agreement with developer to ensure project is designed for ownership and units are sold by developer*




10

Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

9. DM Hines – Tree Preservation for non-development sites
10. DM Hines – Increase flexibility for City use of mitigation fees
11. DM Hines – Reduce on-site tree credit requirement “floor”
12. DM Hines/CM Sadalge – Remove discretionary Variance requirement
13. CM Rumbaugh – “Tree Banks”
14. CM Rumbaugh – Modified standards for large tree removals
15. CM Sadalge – Reduced on-site tree credit requirements




11

11

Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

9. **DM Hines – Tree Preservation for non-development sites**
Remove the proposed Tree Preservation portion that applies to non-development sites from this package and immediately initiate a separate, broader policy discussion, about expanding the City’s Urban Forestry Program and further implementation of the Urban Forest Management Plan, including examination of:
 - Tree preservation standards citywide (beyond just the UR zones)
 - Appropriate City resources for tree planting and maintenance
 - Regulatory and non-regulatory tools for tree preservation



12


12

13

Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

10. **DM Hines – Increase flexibility for City use of mitigation fees**
Modify and clarify that the City should use the mitigation fees (Tree Credits Fees and Canopy Loss Fees) to plant trees in the same Watershed as the project that generated the fees
 - *Current proposal is within 1/8-mile of the site*
11. **DM Hines – Reduce on-site tree credit requirement “floor”**
Reduce on-site tree credit “floor” to 10% in all UR zones, while still requiring payment of the in-lieu fee
 - *Current proposal is 20% in UR-1 and UR-2, and 15% in UR-3*




13

14

Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

12. **DM Hines/CM Sadalge – Remove discretionary Variance requirement**
Remove Variance requirement for reducing on-site tree credits or removing large trees, but:
 - Maintain the proposed incentives for tree preservation, including the enhanced tree credits and flexibilities on development standards (setbacks, parking, etc.)
 - Maintain the Tree Credit Fee (in-lieu fee) for projects that don't meet on-site tree credit requirements
 - Maintain the Canopy Loss Fee for projects that remove large trees



14


Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

13. CM Rumbaugh – “Tree Banks”

Create a “tree banking” tool that allows projects to meet their on-site tree credit requirements by planting trees (or paying to plant trees) on other properties:

- Must be located within ¼-mile of the project site, if on private property
- Could be on private property or public/quasi-public property, such as schools, parks, religious organizations, etc.
- Requires appropriate controls (like a conservation easement) to ensure trees will be planted and maintained



15

15


Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

14. CM Rumbaugh – Modified standards for large tree removals

Modify the standards for removing large trees by requiring payment of the Canopy Loss Fee, and:

- Require replanting an equivalent amount of tree canopy (“inch-for-inch”) – for example, removal of a 20-inch tree would require planting of 20-inches of new trees, which could be ten 2-inch trees. New trees can:
 - Be replanted on the property
 - Be planted on a private property within ¼-mile of the site, as long as there are appropriate controls to ensure planting and maintenance (like a conservation easement)
 - Be planted on a public/quasi-public property, as long as there are appropriate controls to ensure trees are planted and maintained (like a conservation easement)



16

16


Trees/Landscaping

Proposed Amendment(s):

15. CM Sadalge – Reduce on-site tree credit requirements
Reduce the on-site tree credit (canopy equivalent) requirements by 5% in each UR zone:

	UR-1	UR-2	UR-3
Baseline	35% 30%	30% 25%	25% 20%
Bonus Level 1	30% 25%	25% 20%	20% 15%
Bonus Level 2	25% 20%	20% 15%	15% 10%

17




17




Recap

Potential Amendments

- Zoning Map (3)
- Setbacks (1)
- Unit Lot Subdivision (1)
- Parking (1)
- Pedestrian Connections (1)
- Homeownership Incentives (1)
- Trees/Landscaping (7)

18




18

Next Steps

Date	Meeting/Action
October 22	Study Session (potential amendments)
October 29	First Reading of Ordinance
November 19	Final Reading of Ordinance
February 1, 2025	Effective Date



A large graphic for an affordable housing study session. The text "Affordable Housing" is written in a large, bold, teal font. Below it, in a smaller, brown font, is "Home in Tacoma Project – Phase 2 Council Study Session". Underneath that, in a smaller teal font, is "October 22, 2024". On the right side, there is a detailed illustration of a tall, multi-story brick building with many windows. To the left of the building are several green trees and light blue clouds. In the bottom left corner, there is a small logo for the City of Tacoma featuring a mountain and the text "CITY OF Tacoma".