



TO: Elizabeth Pauli, City Manager
FROM: Jeff H. Capell, Hearing Examiner
 Ronda Cornforth, Senior Real Estate Specialist, Public Works Real Property Services
COPY: City Council and City Clerk
SUBJECT: Ordinance Request No. 19-0555 – Street Vacation 124.1396 – June 11, 2019
DATE: May 23, 2019

SUMMARY:

An ordinance granting a petition to vacate the southerly 250 feet of Chandler Street, lying north of Center Street and south of a previously vacated segment of Chandler Street.

COUNCIL SPONSORS:

N/A

STRATEGIC POLICY PRIORITY:

- Foster a vibrant and diverse economy with good jobs for all Tacoma residents.
- Assure outstanding stewardship of the natural and built environment.
- Encourage and promote an efficient and effective government, which is fiscally sustainable and guided by engaged residents.

BACKGROUND:

Greenwood Property Mgmt. LLC (“Petitioner”) petitioned the City to vacate a 250-foot length of Chandler Street that runs northward from its intersection with Center Street (the “Vacation Area”), and ends at a section of Chandler Street to the North previously vacated. Six parcels of real property abut the Vacation area with five different owners, all of whom are in favor of the vacation. The vacation would rectify encroaching improvements on both sides of the Vacation Area (East and West), enabling these improvements to remain and serve the business operations of which they are a part. This segment of Chandler Street is currently not connected in any meaningful way to the City’s street system other than as access to Center Street for the abutting parcels. This access function will remain and be protected by a reciprocal easement agreement to be executed among the abutting owners. Existing City utility facilities should be protected by easement reservations in the vacation ordinance.

ISSUE:

Whether the Council should approve the proposed street vacation, and if so what conditions should be imposed?

ALTERNATIVES:

The Council could (1) choose to follow the Hearing Examiner’s Recommendation and approve the requested vacation, (2) the Council could approve the requested vacation under conditions different than those recommended, or (3) the Council could deny the vacation petition.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Hearing Examiner has determined that the requested vacation meets the criteria for approval of such petitions as set forth in Chapter 9.22 of the Tacoma Municipal Code and Chapter 35.79 of the Revised Code of Washington. Therefore, the request is hereby recommended for approval, subject to the conditions contained in Conclusion 8 of the Hearing Examiner’s Report and Recommendation to the City Council.

ORIGINAL



FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A