



**TO:** Elizabeth Pauli, City Manager  
**FROM:** Jeff H. Capell, Hearing Examiner *JHC*  
 Troy Stevens, Senior Real Estate Specialist, Public Works Real Property Services *ts*  
**COPY:** City Council and City Clerk  
**SUBJECT:** Ordinance Request No. 18-1512 – Street Vacation 124.1389 – January 8, 2019  
**DATE:** December 14, 2018

**SUMMARY:**

Request for an ordinance granting the petition to vacate the westerly portion of South 1<sup>st</sup> Street lying between South G Street and Tacoma Avenue South, to facilitate a new senior housing development.

**COUNCIL SPONSORS:**

N/A

**STRATEGIC POLICY PRIORITY:**

- Ensure all Tacoma residents are valued and have access to resources to meet their needs.
- 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:**

5 South G LLC, a Washington limited liability company (“Petitioner”), has requested the vacation of the westerly portion of South 1<sup>st</sup> Street lying between South G Street and Tacoma Avenue South (the “Vacation Area”). The Vacation Area is 80 feet in width at its western face, but is relatively small in total area. Exhibit 2 from the hearing record provides a depiction. The Petitioner has represented that, if its petition is granted, the Vacation Area will be used to facilitate the development of a senior housing project. Evidence from the hearing showed that the Vacation Area is not needed for any material right-of-way purpose, and that no property becomes landlocked, or otherwise has its access become materially impaired by the vacation. Water and gas utility lines currently present in the Vacation Area will need protection through the retention of easements, if not relocated prior to City Council action.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the Council should approve the proposed street vacation?

**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 of Law 7 of the Hearing Examiner’s Recommendation to the City Council.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

N/A

**ORIGINAL**