



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. 19-0430 – Street Vacation 124.1393 – May 7, 2019
DATE: April 22, 2019

SUMMARY:

Request for an ordinance granting a petition to vacate a portion of East K Street, together with an adjoining alleyway segment, lying between East 25th Street and East 26th Street, westerly of East L 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:

Lentz Properties LLC (“Petitioner”) is one of four owners of real property abutting a short length of East K Street and an alleyway lying between East 25th Street and East 26th Street, and west of East L Street. Neither the street segment nor the alleyway have ever been improved for public traversal since their dedication by plat in 1891. Neither connects on both ends to existing streets in the area, nor do they provide access to any abutting parcels in their current unimproved condition. The Petitioner’s stated purpose in seeking this vacation is to enhance its ability to develop or expand existing use of its real property and to address transient use of these unopened, unimproved right-of-way areas. All three other abutting owners originally gave their concurrence with the petition. Sound Transit rescinded its approval shortly before the hearing was held over concerns about potential alignments for its Tacoma Dome Link Extension project (*See Findings 1, and 7-10, and Conclusions 3, 7, 8 and 9*).

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.

[Cont.]

ORIGINAL



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. Looking to Conclusion 9.B., the Council may want to impose a timing condition to be met before final approval of a vacation ordinance by second reading. Therefore, the request is hereby recommended for approval, subject to the conditions and one special consideration contained in Conclusion 9.B. of the Hearing Examiner's Recommendation to the City Council.

FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A