



Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan and EIS

Comments received on the PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

Planning Commission - September 20, 2017

The public comment period began on August 11, 2017 and concluded on September 15, 2017. A total of 37 separate written comments were received, and 14 individuals testified at the September 6th Public Hearing. In addition, written comments provided at the August 30th Informational Meeting and the minutes of the September 13th Council IPS Committee meeting are included.

In order to allow more time for review, staff provided the comments to the Planning Commission in two batches. The following is a complete list of comments.

Comments provided on 09/15/17:

Comments (batch 1)

- Adkins, Jori 09-07-17
- Alexander, Angelia 09-14-17
- Bearden, Robert 09-10-17
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Group 09-13-17
- Brekke, Eleanor and John - Brekke Properties 09/06/17
- Brekke, Eleanor and John - Brekke Properties 09/15/17
- Brown, Charles – Cascade Government Affairs 09/14/17
- Castle, Jon 08/18/17
- Coalition of Private Property Owners 09/11/17
- Coman, Kristine 09/14/17
- Dammeier, Bruce – Pierce County Executive 09/14/17
- Dearth, Dave – Dobler Management Co Inc 09/14/17
- Dobler, Kathryn – Dobler Management Co Inc 09/13/17
- Engel, Dennis – WSDOT Olympic Region Planning Manager 09/11/17, 11:52 am
- Engel, Dennis – WSDOT Olympic Region Planning Manager 09/11/17, 2:58 pm
- Hansen, Donald 08/21/17
- Kaster, Liz – Active Transportation COI Manager, Puyallup Watershed Initiative 09/14/17
- Kelly, Kathy 09/06/17
- Kriner, Kerry – Puget Sound Energy 09/13/17
- Lopez, Evelyn Fielding 09/13/17
- McCament, J.J. – McCament and Rogers 09-14-17
- McIvor, Kristen 09/15/17

- Towey, William 09/14/17
- Chen, Anthony, Director of Public Health – Tacoma Pierce County Health Department 09/11/17
- Pow, Amy - Tacoma Pierce County Health Department 09/12/17
- White, Heidi – 09/10/17
- Written comments (08-30-17 Informational Meeting)
- Public Hearing transcript, including comments from the following people:
 - Fyalka-Munoz, Valerie
 - Brekke, Eleanor and John
 - Rohloff, Nikki
 - Mann, Jeffrey
 - Alexander, Angelia
 - Pow, Amy
 - Dergan, Venus
 - Konopaski, Christian
 - Bowen-Bennett, Beverly
 - Bearden, Bob
 - Burkhalter, John
 - McCament, J.J.
 - Leighton, Justin

Comments provided on 09/20/17:

Comments (batch 2)

- Bowen-Bennett, Beverly 09-15-17
- Burkhalter, John 09-15-17
- Chipps, Eric – Sound Transit 09-18-17
- Fyalka-Munoz, Valerie 09-15-17
- McCament, J.J. 09-15-17
- McDaniel, Christine 09-14-17
- Merton, Maddie, Tacoma Pierce County Economic Development Board 09-15-17
- Stavish, Darin, Pierce Transit 09-15-17
- Terwilleger, Debbie, Metro Parks Tacoma 09-15-17
- Underwood-Bultmann, Liz, Puget Sound Regional Council 09-15-17
- Council IPS Committee meeting minutes 09-13-17



Tacoma Mall Neighborhood Subarea Plan and EIS

Comments and Responses Summary (Discussion draft)

Planning Commission - September 20, 2017

This document updates the Summary of Key Themes provided in the 09/15/17 Planning Commission packet. It includes the key themes of all comments received through the end of the comment period. In addition, staff have provided recommendations for updates and refinements to the draft proposals. The intent is to request the Commission’s concurrence, or further direction, on the next phase of work on the project.

Comments are grouped into general categories according the chapter structure of the Subarea Plan. Since connectivity and pedestrian access standards received a lot of attention, they are each summarized separately.

<p>GENERAL COMMENTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for City focus, investment and high level goals of the plan 2. Avoid making anyone feel that they are losing through City actions 3. A plan for thoughtful growth is needed, it must be appropriate to market realities 4. Clarify that this is a long range plan and an ideal vision 5. Be clear regarding requirements vs. options, what is occurring with Plan adoption 6. Edits and clarifications 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Consider text updates, edits and clarifications reflecting these comments B. Integrate ongoing staff review for clarity, conciseness and consistency
<p>URBAN FORM:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for creating a more positive image and identity, aesthetic improvements, walkable urbanism actions and transit-oriented development 2. Developments should include yard space (rather than front stoops) 3. Different views of the vision for the Northwest District 4. Large blocks can be a benefit to business recruitment efforts 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Reaffirm minimum 600 x 600 foot block scale vision B. Flexibility for larger scale development with pedestrian connectivity
<p>LAND USE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General support for proposed zoning and Regional Growth Center expansion 2. Clarify relationship between the Subarea, Downtown, and the South Tacoma Manufacturing/Industrial Center 3. Strengthen design, landscaping and onsite open space development standards 4. Questions regarding Subarea Plan boundaries (car dealerships not included) 5. More parking is needed in the neighborhood 6. Front doors should not face alleys 7. Permitted building heights are too high 8. Make warehousing a permitted use at the Puget Sound Energy site 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Reflect comments on planning context B. Finalize Madison District zoning C. Clarify front doors facing alleys approach D. Call for enhancements to City design review E. Update Comp Plan Urban Form Chapter for consistency

<p>9. Limit the number of townhouses and/or make them more attractive/accessible 10. Question on the link between building height and green streets</p>	
<p>HOUSING:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns about involuntary displacement 2. Proposed affordable housing targets are too low 3. Add more information on current housing costs 4. Target the creation of housing affordable to lower incomes 5. Require and incentivize some units to be affordable 6. Provide senior/inter-generational housing projects in the area 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Consider affordability targets, reflecting goal of housing choice in all City neighborhoods B. Consider further actions to promote affordability C. Strengthen call for citywide housing actions
<p>TRANSPORTATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for overall transportation approach 2. Transit station relocation, high capacity transit, Loop Road, I-5 offramp, and pedestrian improvements are high priorities 3. Proposed revisions to Near and Midterm project priorities 4. Question regarding benefits and alignment of the Loop Road 5. Differing perspectives on where the transit station should be located 6. Add an I-5 off ramp at 47th/48th Street 7. Proposed S. Wright should not be a bike boulevard 8. Better bike/ped link to South Tacoma Way/Water Flume Trail 9. Add a bike route on S. Puget Sound Ave. 10. Add a direct transit route to the Tacoma Dome Station 11. Various comments regarding street design 12. WSDOT clarifications regarding I-5 off ramp 13. Consider making some residential streets one-way 14. Pierce and Sound Transit plans and funding do not currently reflect the proposals 15. Identify a funding source for transportation projects 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Consider <u>minor</u> revisions to projects prioritization and bike/ped network B. Add a near-term parking strategy action C. Identify strategy to coordinate with transit partners and WSDOT on implementation D. Reflect WSDOT comments
<p>CONNECTIVITY PLANS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing connectivity is an important goal for this neighborhood 2. The proposal balances goals of preserving large parcels and increasing connectivity 3. The proposal would be an excessive burden, stifle development, take private property rights, and is too ambitious given current market realities 4. Proposed process is onerous and complex 5. Thresholds proposed are too low 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Modify Connectivity Plan process to accomplish the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Increased thresholds based on building footprint size ✓ A clear, predictable process ✓ Discretionary City review of project

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Opposition to proposed S. 37th Street and S. Wright Avenue 7. Clarify City funding role 8. City should pay for S. 37th Street if it is needed, and extend it eastward to Fife St. 9. Larger blocks should not be required to subdivide beyond 600 x 600 feet 10. Connectivity should be planned at the time of major redevelopment, not before 11. Replace the proposed connectivity plan requirement with internal bike/ped network based on the Tier 3 bicycle/ped connections 12. Sites with restricted access should be exempt 	<p style="text-align: right;">impacts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> B. Consider modifications to Figure T-9: <u>Priority New Connections Tiers Map</u> including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Show Tier 2 connection points ✓ Extend proposed S 37th St to Fife Street C. Provide decision framework for the Planning Commission to finalize recommendations
<p>PEDESTRIAN ACCESS STANDARDS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for proposed pedestrian access standards 2. Concern that pedestrian connections would reduce safety 3. Frequency and size of connections too high and would divide up properties 4. Threshold should remain 50% not 15%, tenant improvements should be exempt 5. Clarify how standards work with topography, rounding 6. Sites with restricted access should be exempt 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Clarify how proposal would apply to sites of varying size B. Consider exemptions and exceptions for certain land uses, topography, other circumstances C. Reduce requirements for alterations valued between 15 to 50% D. Reduce size of proposed through-connections (e.g., 14 feet or two 7 foot sidewalks)
<p>ENVIRONMENT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for stormwater strategy, green streets, and tree canopy actions 2. Prioritize planting evergreen trees 3. Put stronger emphasis on protecting the aquifer 4. City implementation of the stormwater strategy should address maintenance, equity of costs 5. Provide for maintenance of landscaping 6. More emphasis on green building standards 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Highlight significance of protecting the aquifer B. Reflect final decision on Madison District zoning C. Call for citywide green building review
<p>COMMUNITY VITALITY:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for local serving services and amenities 2. Crime is a big issue in the neighborhood 3. Choosing a new name needs to reflect authentic community engagement 4. Support for parks, open space actions, Madison School as a community hub 5. Metro Parks Tacoma and Tacoma School District should implement the parks vision 6. Clarify what it means to show a proposed park on a map 7. Current proposal does not include enough/the right parks 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Call for authentic community engagement on neighborhood name B. Clarify that parks principles and map are conceptual and aspirational C. Call for further review on creating small scale open spaces with development D. Engage with MPT and TSD to clarify

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. A large park is not needed, do smaller green areas 9. Remove the park in the Mall District which is privately owned land 10. Specific comments regarding various proposed parks (e.g., dog park, skate park) 11. MPT agency comments – cannot commit to plan without separate action 	<p>implementation approach</p>
<p>SHARED PROSPERITY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for City investment up front EIS and other catalytic actions 2. The economy of the area is fragile, changes in retail industry could be a concern 3. City should prioritize supporting business expansion, retention and recruitment 4. Prioritize recruiting businesses with a track record of good ethics and good wages 5. Diversify the types of businesses in the Mall 6. Consider actions to prioritize locally owned businesses versus national chains 7. Look for strategic and catalytic city actions to create business opportunities 8. Avoid an over-concentration of improvements in the Lincoln Heights (NE) and Mall (SE) Districts 9. Consider designating vacant/underutilized parcels in the NW District as catalyst sites 10. The Mall should have a movie theater, continuing walkability, events, art displays to turn it into a community resource 11. US Post Office is a major asset and should not be displaced 	<p>STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Carefully review proposed connectivity and pedestrian access standards B. Review proposed Development Regulation Agreement criteria C. Consider revisions to Catalyst sites map in NW District, Post Office site D. Integrate CAI report key findings
<p>UTILITIES AND SERVICES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for coordinated planning approach to support future growth 2. Add recycling to discussions of solid waste 3. Undergrounding of utilities is a priority 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Consult Solid Waste regarding recycling and food waste
<p>IMPLEMENTATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make sure that infrastructure is keeping pace with development 2. Development should pay for the cost of addressing impacts 3. Local Improvement Districts would be challenging for low income households 4. The City must follow through with implementation of non-contentious catalyst projects 	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Develop an implementation tracking mechanism in the EIS B. Highlight the importance of funding actions, including study of an impact fee approach