



MINUTES

(Approved on 5-6-2020)

TIME: Wednesday, April 15, 2020, 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT (virtually): Anna Petersen (Chair), Jeff McInnis (Vice-Chair), Ryan Givens, David Horne, Christopher Karnes, Brett Santhuff, Andrew Strobel, Alyssa Torrez

ABSENT: Carolyn Edmonds

A. CALL TO ORDER AND QUORUM CALL

Chair Petersen called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. A quorum was declared.

Brian Boudet, Planning Division Manager, welcomed and thanked the Commissioners for joining the first Planning Commission virtual meeting. He also briefly introduced the three discussion items on the agenda.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

The agenda for the meeting was approved. The minutes for the March 4, 2020, meeting was approved as submitted.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public comments were not accepted at the meeting. No written comments had been submitted previously as directed in the agenda notice.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Consolidated Plan 2020-2024

Darian Lightfoot, Neighborhood and Community Services Department, provided an overview of her presentation, consisting of the evaluation approach and funding allocations for the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, key findings from the needs assessment and market analysis, and the proposed Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plan.

The 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan had three (3) major goals, for which there were outcome indicators to evaluate the progress of each and help develop the next five-year Consolidated Plan (for 2020-2024). The funding allocations of each year in the last cycle were presented. Ms. Lightfoot furthermore presented the Equity Index, which was used to determine targeted neighborhoods in the City and assist in strategy development. Also presented were highlights from the needs assessment and market analysis, including housing cost burdens, shortage of public housing, vulnerable populations, average housing cost of Tacoma in comparison to that of Pierce County and Washington State. Based on these data, priority needs and populations were identified to address in the next Consolidated Plan. Ms. Lightfoot continued with the framework of the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, featuring main goals and their outcome indicators. She additionally covered the projected funds for the next five years of the plan.

In reference to the information on vulnerable populations (2019 Point-In-Time Count Results), Commissioner Givens was concerned that it did not thoroughly portray the homelessness situation and might come across as downplaying the issue. Ms. Lightfoot acknowledged the concern and explained that,

as a strategy used nationwide, the point-in-time count was a snapshot to help gauge the situation in a community. Its information helped with setting goals in the Consolidated Plan but was not meant to serve as a full report.

The Commission provided concurrence that the proposed Consolidated Plan 2020-2024 is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and ready for the City Council's consideration and adoption.

2. Capital Facilities Program 2021-2026

Nick Anderson, Office of Management and Budget, began by stating the three (3) intended takeaways and the agenda of his presentation. He gave a summary of the Capital Facilities Program (CFP) as well as explained how it fit in with other planning documents. He went on to describe the two (2) work streams in the CFP development process. Then, Mr. Anderson presented the scope of work for the updated CFP 2021-2026, key dates in the process, and next steps involving the Planning Commission.

Vice-Chair McInnis looked forward to reviewing the projects for the CFP 2021-2026 and requested additional background information on them, particularly how they made it on the project list. Commissioner Givens would like to see maps associated with the projects, especially transportation-related ones, for more efficient review in relation to the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0

Mesa Sherriff, Planning Division Services, facilitated the Commission's review of the public comments on the proposed code amendments received during the public hearing (March 4, 2020) process. Before going into the comments and staff's suggestions for potential modifications to the proposal, he briefly reviewed the proposed housing types and the application process of the Residential Infill Pilot Program 2.0.

Generally, the public comments showed support for the program. The prominent concerns involved adequate parking availability, increased burden on existing infrastructure, and streamlining the administration of the program. For each issue, Mr. Sherriff offered proposed modifications, along with pros and cons of the subject. On top of the issues mentioned in the public comments, Mr. Sherriff brought up the Commission's decision prior to the public hearing regarding the requirement for a two-family dwelling to appear as a single-family dwelling.

Chair Petersen initiated the discussion with the reality that, during this quarantine period, there were more cars parked in a neighborhood at any given time, than during "normal" days. She encouraged everyone to take a walk around their neighborhood for a casual check of the parking situation. She added that having more parked cars on a street would have a calming effect on traffic as moving cars tend to go slower with closer attention paid to the road. About impact on infrastructure, she argued that utility providers would speak up if the demand went beyond their capacity. In regard to the appearance of two-family/multi-family dwellings, Chair Petersen suggested a walking tour to check out examples in various areas of the City.

Vice-Chair McInnis agreed with Chair Petersen on the parking requirement. However, he raised a concern that utility providers would take a different approach in determining mitigation and permit fees (e.g., an expanded single-family development vs. multiple units development); he would like the program to be in communication with the utility providers early on. Brian Boudet, Planning Division Manager, advised the Commission to include those concerns in their Letter of Recommendation to the City Council.

Moving forward, Commissioner Horne suggested adding conditions to the parking requirement, i.e., removing the requirement if in close proximity to a transportation corridor. He also indicated that he was indifferent about the appearance of multi-family dwellings. Commissioner Givens concurred with Chair Petersen and Commissioner Horne about the parking requirement. He also discussed the two-family/multi-family appearance and minimum lot sizes. In addition, he inquired about the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) threshold for multi-family dwellings and the earliest adoption time for the program. Staff expected that the program would be adopted in the summer.

Commissioner Santhuff supported Vice-Chair McInnis on his comment concerning fee structure and felt it should be addressed. On the topic of parking requirement, he wanted developers to document parking needs and limitations of the project in their application. Referring to Ryan Meacham's comment provided in the packet, Commissioner Santhuff stated that it was important to have multi-family dwellings blend in with their surroundings in single-family areas to preserve the characters of the neighborhoods; the challenge could be overcome in the pilot phase through creative designs, which hopefully would yield good examples for future projects and code changes. Commissioner Karnes was also in agreement with other comments on the parking requirement.

Chair Petersen further discussed the appearance of multi-family dwellings, elaborating that the design manuals needed to provide clear instruction on what they should look like. Commissioner Santhuff asked other Commissioners whether they would support requiring developers to include parking considerations in their application; several Commissioners agreed. Regarding Commissioner Givens' comment on the lot sizes, Chair Petersen indicated that reducing the minimum lot sizes would be a significant modification and may not be appropriate after the public review. Commissioner Santhuff requested data on the number of 6,000 square-foot lots in the City available for potential infill.

E. TOPICS OF THE UPCOMING MEETING (subject to change)

- 1) Home In Tacoma – AHAS Planning Actions 2020-2021
- 2) 2020 Amendment Package
 - Heidelberg-Davis Land Use Designation Change
 - View Sensitive Overlay District Height Limit Change
 - Transportation Master Plan Amendments
 - Minor Plan and Code Amendments
- 3) Pierce Transit's Destination 2040 Long Range Plan Update (Letter of Recommendation)
- 4) Tideflats Subarea Plan

F. COMMUNICATION ITEMS

The Commission acknowledged receipt of communication items on the agenda.

Brian Boudet, Planning Services Manager, informed the Commission of meeting cancellations from the TOD Advisory Group, Housing Equity Taskforce, and City Council's Study Sessions. He also indicated that the pandemic would most likely affect the Work Program and other items involving the Commission.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 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/