

From: Michael Gordon <michaelgordon5454@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 4, 2024 4:06 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: HIT Tacoma

I wish the city of Tacoma would come clean with this HIT Tacoma. Changing the zoning will obviously complicated ones' living environment. Additional infrastructure i.e. sewer, lighting, water, power and parking just to name a few. If multi-story structures are allowed, just imagine a family of 4 moving in next to your single family home. Where are the children going to play right outside the 4 story building? What if that new 4 person family wanted to have 3 to 4 guests come over for a barbecue/meal, where would those guests park? It's obvious the underlying motive is to garner MORE taxes. Common sense tells us a city would recieve MORE taxes if the city of 200k crammed in another 50k or more. When you put 2 dogs into the same kennel, that may be OK. Now, try putting in 20 dogs into that same space, what do you think will happen? This is ANOTHER democratic liberal not well thought out concept. How many on the Tacoma Council will this impact? Decades ago, New York and a couple of other large US cities experimented with large-scale housing projects. All this did was to invite crime, social stress and chaos. It's time state politicians stay out of the freedoms remaining!

From: Kit Burns <kburns.wcb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 2:55 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Planning
Subject: Community Forum - HIT-2 - SCALE, FORM AND CHARACTER

Note that HB 1110 indicates the following as does HIT-1 and HIT-2:
... During the 2022-23 legislative session, House Bill 1110 was passed to implement **middle housing** across the state,
structures that are compatible in scale, form and character with detached single-family houses.

HIT2 does not do this.
It is deeply flawed. REJECT and REVISE this proposal as it is now proposed.
Vote NO. Back to the drawing board.

The Units on the left show what is not compatible in scale, form, character, with single family houses. They are from another planet.

In a UR-1 Zone. You can put 8 units on a 6,000 square foot lot. This is 8 units on a 6,500 sf lot with parking for two vehicles as planned off of the alley. You can see this at **1436 East 31st**. It is not accessible by mobility disabled. It does have small trees that appear they will remain small.

They are considerably higher, lacking in form and character, than neighbors.

In a UR-1 this far exceeds the state HB-1110 basic requirement. The HIT-2 needs to be more than just amended.

Because of the height and density, and fundamental other requirements, **it eliminates Middle Housing.**
There is no 'transition' when you have 8 units on a UR-1 lot and 6, 8, potentially 12 on a UR-2 lot. And then upto 16 on a UR-3 lot.



These do not comply with HB1110.
They are not ". . . compatible in scale, form and character with detached single-family houses.



On either side of this completed development are single family houses. Yet for some reason per Resolution 41531 the City Council just granted units at addresses 1434 and 1436 a tax exemption.



Next door and adjacent. Housing.



The view of single family homes across the street.

HIT-2 does not comply with HB1110. It is overly aggressive and will make Tacoma a "build anything anywhere".

Transporation is not compliant as bus route 41 comes by only every 30 minutes. The requirement to comply with a "Major Transportation Stop" is not being followed.

It does not explain how this "creates affordable housing."

It will take more study with clear direction to make the proposal reviewable.

REJECT AND REVISE.

Kit Burns
PO Box 2341
Tacoma WA 98401

From: Kit Burns <kburns.wcb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 4:29 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Kit Burns; Planning; Schultz, Shirley; Chavez, Ramiro; Huffman, Peter
Subject: Community Forum - Level of Service - LOS - PDS Planning Department Services

Dear Mayor and City Council,

The **Level of Service Requirements** by the State of Washington will be a challenge in Tacoma for multiple reasons. The Planning Department needs to make revisions to the process which is obvious.

Additionally, **yet seldom mentioned**, is the requirement for the developer to provide *clear, complete, and correct applications*. I find that they are not complete and coordinated, *which as a result, hinders review time for permits*.

Also I find that the applicants don't respond completely to the City Staff in their response. I have a permit (not from me) by an applicant which shows multiple issues of this type.

I would be happy to meet with you, the City Manager, Planning Dept. and Public Works to discuss this issue. It will take more than a code revision to resolve.

The City website shows a need to make significant changes from the City's viewpoint. It does not discuss the "other half" of the application from the developer, which needs to be part of the discussion.

See the PDF screen shots from the City's website.

PERMIT TIMELINE

Welcome to Planning & Development Services Permit Timeline page. The data that you see below is a 6 month snap shot of our permitting performance. We are striving to improve department performance which can be seen with our 2025 goals below, for more information on our [Strategic Plan Click Here](#)

Current data: January 1st, 2023 to June 30th, 2024

Due to a recent significant increase in new permit submittals, review timelines are taking longer than usual. We appreciate your patience as we work through the current high permit volume.

	LOS Target - 1st Review LOS Target	1st Review Median	% Met First Review LOS	Average Review Cycles - Permits Issued
Commercial Alterations	4 weeks	4 weeks	53%	1.9
Commercial New Buildings	8 weeks	10 weeks	17%	3.1
Residential Alterations	3 weeks	1.4 weeks	98%	1.4
Residential New Buildings	4 weeks	2.9 weeks	94%	2.0
Site Development	4 weeks	8.1 weeks	7%	3.1
Work Orders	4 weeks	6.6 weeks	11%	2.9

Residential – Single-Family, Duplex, and Townhomes 1-2 Units
Commercial – Triplex, Multi-Family, Mixed-Use and Non-Residential Buildings
ePermits – Many permits are available for same day issuance, to learn more see our [Getting an ePermit Tip Sheet](#)

From this website there are additional details and links available. Please keep in mind this does not address the deficiencies created by the applicant.

There are important obligations from the applicant that are not being met and must be prior to code requirements.

The state law is written so applicants only have to pay 80% of the initial fee. Also if the LOS is not met, they can get a return of review fees back. This could be costly to the City and particularly if the burden is put fully on the City when it likely will be the application which is incomplete.

This must be evaluated with a great deal of caution.

The City has a procedure that impacts the project review which I find disturbing and costly to manage and coordinate.

The "offsite work" is actually a separate permit from the project. This makes a project hard to coordinate, review, and inspect. I can assure you that needs to change.

Do not proceed with any ordinance revision until multiple review issues are clearly addressed.

Also the new urban design review board will likely cause more delays as the process and procedures have not been worked out.

It will cause confusion as it is like having a new building department within the building department.

Sincerely,

Kit Burns

--

Kit Burns

PO Box 2341

Tacoma, WA 98401

"Things don't just happen. They are made to happen."

---John F. Kennedy

From: Kit Burns <kburns.wcb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 4:59 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Cc: Planning; Heidi S.; Cathie Raine; Michelle Mood; Jodi Cook; Georgette Reuter; Esther Day
Subject: Community Forum - Planning Commission - HIT 2 Housing Density - Compatibility
Attachments: IMG_9284.jpg; IMG_9283.jpg; Snapseed.jpg; IMG_9286.jpg; IMG_9282.jpg; IMG_9278.jpg; IMG_9288.jpg

Note that HB 1110 indicates the following as does HIT-1 and HIT-2:
... During the 2022-23 legislative session, House Bill 1110 was passed to implement **middle housing** across the state,
structures that are compatible in scale, form and character with detached single-family houses.

The Zones UR-1 and UR-2 allow this to occur in a single family neighborhood. It means there is no Middle Housing and virtually no difference between zones.

This must be stopped. HB1110 suggests 4 units in a UR-1 and 6 units in a UR-2 zone.

The HIT-2 allows 8 units (UR-1) and 12 units (UR-2) and 16 units in (UR-3).

There are many deficiencies such as lack of parking. Seattle did a study of renters. They found 81% of renters have cars. Very similar to what we find in Tacoma.

TRANSPORTATION: HB1110 recommends that they be located near a Major Transportation Stop. Tacoma has some but the proposed Code does not have the basic requirement of 15 minute frequency. It instead allows for a 30 minute frequency. This is not acceptable and will strand residents.

610 S34th Street (near Lincoln HS) feel free to share my photos - kb



Scale, Character, and form are not meeting HB1110. Nor do they meet HIT1 and what the citizens were told for design appearance. And why only small trees?



An exceptionally wide ROW that is not planted with the future in mind.



Small trees.



Not mobility friendly to most. Will prevent disabled renters.



The neighborhood will not recover from this oddity. Out of scale, out of touch. Not improving the neighborhood.



A small amenity space. Does the landlord ensure the community space is well maintained or is it the residents? It will make a huge difference over time. I would like to know what the City is doing to ensure success of this and similar projects.



So there are four parking spots. I think at this location the cost is and additional \$100 a month.

8 units and 4 parking stalls. The neighborhood will be flooded with cars.

I would like to have the City Council confirm that they have walked the Madison neighborhood between S 38th and S 47th and between S. Pine and South Tacoma Way. On a Saturday. That is Home in Tacoma 2.

Vote No on HIT2 as currently proposed. Send it back to the Drawing Board.

It needs to make sense PRIOR to making Amendments.

Feel free to contact me to discuss my concerns and that of the Citizens of Tacoma.

thank you,

Kit Burns

Kit Burns

PO Box 2341

Tacoma, WA. 98401

“War is meant to be endless”. Stop War.















From: Georgette Reuter <gee.reuter@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 5:08 PM
To: Kit Burns
Cc: City Clerk's Office; Planning; Heidi S.; Cathie Raine; Michelle Mood; Jodi Cook; Esther Day
Subject: Re: Community Forum - Planning Commission - HIT 2 Housing Density - Compatibility

Thank you Kit!!

You provided numerous excellent points with which I and others totally agree.

The City needs to listen to its residents and go back to the drawing board for Home in Tacoma 2 and follow the state's guidelines.

Georgette
TUFF
Advocating for Tacoma's tree canopy

On Mon, Oct 7, 2024 at 5:04 PM Georgette Reuter <gee.reuter@gmail.com> wrote:

On Mon, Oct 7, 2024 at 4:59 PM Kit Burns <kburns.wcb@gmail.com> wrote:

Note that HB 1110 indicates the following as does HIT-1 and HIT-2:
... During the 2022-23 legislative session, House Bill 1110 was passed to implement **middle housing** across the state,
structures that are compatible in scale, form and character with detached single-family houses.

The Zones UR-1 and UR-2 allow this to occur in a single family neighborhood. It means there is no Middle Housing and virtually no difference between zones.

This must be stopped. HB1110 suggests 4 units in a UR-1 and 6 units in a UR-2 zone.

The HIT-2 allows 8 units (UR-1) and 12 units (UR-2) and 16 units in (UR-3).

There are many deficiencies such as lack of parking. Seattle did a study of renters. They found 81% of renters have cars. Very similar to what we find in Tacoma.

TRANSPORTATION: HB1110 recommends that they be located near a Major Transportation Stop. Tacoma has some but the proposed Code does not have the basic requirement of 15 minute frequency. It instead allows for a 30 minute frequency. This is not acceptable and will strand residents.

610 S34th Street (near Lincoln HS) feel free to share my photos - kb

Scale, Character, and form are not meeting HB1110. Nor do they meet HIT1 and what the citizens were told for design appearance. And why only small trees?

An exceptionally wide ROW that is not planted with the future in mind.

Small trees.

Not mobility friendly to most. Will prevent disabled renters.

The neighborhood will not recover from this oddity. Out of scale, out of touch. Not improving the neighborhood.

A small amenity space. Does the landlord ensure the community space is well maintained or is it the residents? It will make a huge difference over time. I would like to know what the City is doing to ensure success of this and similar projects.

So there are four parking spots. I think at this location the cost is an additional \$100 a month.

8 units and 4 parking stalls. The neighborhood will be flooded with cars.

I would like to have the City Council confirm that they have walked the Madison neighborhood between S 38th and S 47th and between S. Pine and South Tacoma Way. On a Saturday. That is Home in Tacoma 2.

Vote No on HIT2 as currently proposed. Send it back to the Drawing Board.

It needs to make sense PRIOR to making Amendments.

Feel free to contact me to discuss my concerns and that of the Citizens of Tacoma.

thank you,

Kit Burns

Kit Burns

PO Box 2341

Tacoma, WA. 98401

“War is meant to be endless”. Stop War.

From: Esther Day <Dayesther214@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 7:02 PM
To: Woodards, Victoria; Walker, Kristina; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Bushnell, Joe; Hines, John; Sadalge, Sandesh; Scott, Jamika; Daniels, Kiara; Diaz, Olgy
Cc: City Clerk's Office; Planning; Pauli, Elizabeth
Subject: FAILURE TO GIVE VOTERS/CITIZENS A VOICE

Dear City Council, City Clerk, City Manager, Planning department,

The City of Tacoma continues to plan high impact development without giving ALL CITIZENS/VOTERS a MEANINGFUL voice.

Having attended multiple community meetings and other meetings later, there was never anyone there that could take down our concerns and respond to us. NEVER!!!

Stop HIT-2 and do what the State has offered in HB 1110.

It has become apparent that none of you have individually read the entire Growth Management Act. It is highly recommended that you do so before you proceed.

Once again, I will say – it is becoming increasingly apparent that you are not representing the best interests of ALL who elected you, yet that is what they expected (representation) when they did elect you. To those councilmembers serving on a Transit Board and Commissioners that are appointed to the transportation board – **YOU NEED TO RESIGN FROM THE CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER CITY POSITIONS BECAUSE YOU DO NOT REPRESENT THE CITIZENS/VOTERS OF THE CITY OF TACOMA.**

Sincerely,
Esther Day

From: Louise <auntzoo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 2:14 PM
To: Woodards, Victoria; Walker, Kristina; Rumbaugh, Sarah; Bushnell, Joe; Hines, John; Sadalge, Sandesh; Scott, Jamika; Daniels, Kiara; Diaz, Olgy; Esther Day
Cc: City Clerk's Office; Planning; Pauli, Elizabeth
Subject: Re: FAILURE TO GIVE VOTERS/CITIZENS A VOICE

I'm not generally a religious person, but the biblical phrase "No one can serve two masters" absolutely applies here. Council members that are appointed to the transit board cannot possibly serve the interests of the citizens who elected them. Unless HIT-2 is brought for a vote by the people, it simply becomes a business transaction between Sound Transit and select individuals.

STOP HIT-2 NOW OR LET THE PEOPLE OF TACOMA DECIDE!

Louise Dreyer

On Monday, October 7, 2024 at 07:02:28 PM PDT, Esther Day <dayesther214@outlook.com> wrote:

Dear City Council, City Clerk, City Manager, Planning department,

The City of Tacoma continues to plan high impact development without giving ALL CITIZENS/VOTERS a MEANINGFUL voice.

Having attended multiple community meetings and other meetings later, there was never anyone there that could take down our concerns and respond to us. NEVER!!!

Stop HIT-2 and do what the State has offered in HB 1110.

It has become apparent that none of you have individually read the entire Growth Management Act. It is highly recommended that you do so before you proceed.

Once again, I will say – it is becoming increasingly apparent that you are not representing the best interests of ALL who elected you, yet that is what they expected (representation) when they did elect you. To those councilmembers serving on a Transit Board and Commissioners that are appointed to the transportation board – **YOU NEED TO RESIGN FROM THE CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER CITY POSITIONS BECAUSE YOU DO NOT REPRESENT THE CITIZENS/VOTERS OF THE CITY OF TACOMA.**

Sincerely,

Esther Day