ROLL CALL

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Election of Officers 2018 - 2019

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Consideration of the Minutes for February 28, 2018

February 28, 2018 PC Draft Minutes.pdf

PUBLIC HEARINGS

WORKSESSION TOPICS

Downtown Planned Action EIS
1) Staff Memo 03 21 18
2) 2018 EIS Boundary
3) 01 10 18 Presentation

Affordable and Infill Housing Strategies
1) STAFF MEMO 032218
2) Affordable housing strategy table

OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

CITIZEN COMMENTS - Time permitting and addressing items on the agenda

ADJOURNMENT

The City Council Chambers is wheelchair accessible. Those needing assistance with hearing devices should contact the City Clerk's Office (253-841-5480) the Friday preceding the meeting.
Subject:
Election of Officers 2018 - 2019

Presenter:
Katie Baker, Senior Planner | Kbaker@ci.puyallup.wa.us | 253-435-3604

Recommendation:
Election

Background:
The Planning Commission will elect a Chair and Vice-Chair to serve for 2018 - 2019.

Council Direction:

Fiscal Impacts:

ATTACHMENTS
Planning Commission Agenda Item Report

Submitted by: Michelle Ochs
Submitting Department: Development Services
Meeting Date: 3/28/2018

Subject:
Consideration of the Minutes for February 28, 2018

Presenter:
Michelle Ochs | 253-841-5485 | MichelleO@ci.puyallup.wa.us

Recommendation:
Review and Action

Background:
The Planning Commission will review and act upon the minutes from the February 28, 2018 meeting.

Council Direction:

Fiscal Impacts:

ATTACHMENTS

- [February 28, 2018 PC Draft Minutes.pdf](February%2028,%202018%20PC%20Draft%20Minutes.pdf)
City of Puyallup
Planning Commission
Puyallup City Hall – Council Chambers
February 28, 2018
6:30 PM

(These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of six years from the date of the meeting and are available upon request.)

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS
PRESENT: Vice Chair Chris Larson, Donnie Juntunen, April Sanders, Art Seeley

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: Chair Pat McGregor, Laurie Larson

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Development Services - Tom Utterback; Senior Planner – Katie Baker; Assistant Planner – Rachael Brown; Administrative Assistant – Michelle Ochs

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. A quorum was established.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Sanders moved to approve the agenda, with a second by Mr. Seeley. The Commissioners unanimously approved the agenda.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

November 15, 2017 & December 13, 2017
Ms. Sanders moved to approve the minutes as submitted, with a second by Mr. Juntunen. The Commissioners unanimously approved both sets of minutes.

AGENDA ITEMS

Public Hearing – Small Cell Wireless Facilities, Draft Code Amendments, PMC Sec. 20.59
(Recording start time 01:25)
Mr. Utterback gave a PowerPoint presentation on this item, and talked about current zoning standards, the current status of small cell wireless facilities in Puyallup, and the process of the draft code amendments to date. Mr. Utterback explained that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider potential code amendments to a section of the municipal code which deals with wireless communications. Mr. Utterback did a page-by-page review of proposed changes to existing sections of Puyallup Municipal Code (PMC) Sec. 20.59, as well as
the new, proposed code section. He noted that staff supported deleting one word (“existing”) from the first sentence of Sec. 20.59.050 (5-f). He also briefly went through the 2/27/18 comment letter from AT&T with the Commission, noting that it was the only written comments directed to the Commission for this hearing. Mr. Utterback explained the code amendment criteria to be met for Planning Commission’s recommendation.

- Mr. Seeley referenced proposed Sec. 20.59.050 (7), asking about any possible concerns by staff on “overloading” a building outside of right-of-way with too many antennas, Mr. Utterback explained that the proposed cumulative visual effects section for small cells mounted on poles would also apply to small cells attached to buildings, so that it allows staff to be comprehensive in or out of the right-of-way. Mr. Seeley asked if new Puget Sound Energy (PSE) utility poles will be wooden or metal, Mr. Utterback responded that staff’s understanding is that they will be wooden.

The public hearing for Small Cell Wireless Facilities opened at 7:06 p.m.

Linda Atkins – (Attorney for T-Mobile) - Ms. Atkins acknowledged the revisions made by staff in the draft code in response to her earlier comments, then made further comments regarding different proposed code sections.

Lelah Vaga – (Network Engineer for Verizon Wireless) - Ms. Vaga thanked staff for their work on the draft code and their consideration of the input given by the wireless providers during this process. Ms. Vaga explained why small cell wireless moving into Puyallup is so important because of the rapidly evolving technology.

Carol Tagayan – (Representative with AT&T)
Ms. Tagayan thanked the Commission for their work on the draft code, and echoed Ms. Vaga’s comments regarding the importance of this technology in Puyallup.

David DeGroot – 3021 26th Ave SE – Mr. DeGroot thanked staff for the code revisions made regarding earlier comments he had submitted, and made further comments regarding concerns about residential areas.

The Public Hearing for Small Cell Wireless Facilities closed at 7:21 p.m.

In response to Mr. DeGroot’s comments, Mr. Utterback stated that the Commission could consider the RM (multi-family) zone along with the RS (single-family) zone stated in Section 20.59.050 (8), subsection p. In response to a Commissioner question, Ms. Vaga commented that sometimes it is appropriate to place a macro site on a large apartment building, as it doesn’t affect the residents and doesn’t visually impact the neighborhood.

Scott Snyder, an attorney with Ogden Murphy Wallace and consortium counsel for the City, addressed comments made during the public hearing. Mr. Snyder suggested that the Commission add one further minor change to the end of proposed Sec. 20.59.050 (8-q).

The Commission made comments to the effect that the draft code strikes a good balance between the wireless providers needs and the public interests.

Mr. Juntunen made a motion to approve the draft code as written, with a second by Ms. Sanders.
After some discussion, Mr. Juntunen included these two text revisions in his motion:

- deleting the word “existing” in the opening sentence of Sec. 20.59.050, sub-section 5-f., as had been proposed by City Staff.

- adding additional verbiage to the end of Sec. 20.59.050, sub-section 8-o regarding that these standards not “prohibit” the provision of personal wireless service, as suggested by Mr. Snyder.

The Planning Commission voted, and the motion passed 4 – 0.

Public Hearing – Planned Development Rezones (Recording start time 01:02:51)

Ms. Brown gave a PowerPoint presentation, explaining what Planned Developments are, and why staff is proposing to replace them. Ms. Brown explained that they are proposing changes to the following Planned Developments: Peach Park, Crystal Ridge, La Grande, Leone Heights, and Stewart Crossing. Ms. Brown explained the criteria for approving the rezone, and the timeline towards completion.

The Public Hearing for Planned Development Rezones opened at 7:57 p.m.

Leonid Polischuk – 1501 5th St SE – Mr. Polischuk stated that he lives near the hospital and talked about concerns regarding heavy traffic, a question of an increase in property taxes, and why his area wouldn’t just be zoned commercial.

Glenn Markovits – 3306 24th Ave SE – Mr. Markovits stated he lives in Rodesco, adjacent to Crystal Ridge, and voiced concerns regarding high density and heavy traffic in the area with the Shaw Road project scheduled to start soon only contributing to the issues. Mr. Markovits also stated that he is concerned about possible future development in Crystal Ridge that would also contribute to the issues.

Helen Vajgert – 3920 15th Ave SE – Ms. Vajgert lives in Crystal Ridge and voiced concerns regarding density, possible future development, high crime rates, and heavy traffic.

Julie Buell – 1712 Amber Blvd SE – Ms. Buell asked what the benefit is of the rezoning to the City, and voiced concerns regarding heavy traffic.

Allen Zulauf – 2515 43rd St SE – Mr. Zulauf voiced concerns regarding increased density and traffic issues.

Mark McCoy – 3718 15th Ave SE – Mr. McCoy inquired as to why this proposed rezone is happening, that it appears to be for development reasons. Mr. McCoy asked if an exception could be made for the Crystal Ridge development.

The Public Hearing for Planned Development Rezone closed at 8:09 p.m.

Mr. Larson summarized the citizen comments and asked staff to respond. Ms. Brown stated that some of the green belts in Crystal Ridge are wetlands and it is against city, state and federal regulations to develop on it. Ms. Brown explained that staff is proposing these rezones to make it easier for residents of these Planned Developments to come in and get a permit for their existing parcels, that would otherwise have to get an approved Planned Development.
Mr. Utterback stated also that the PDR (Planned Residential Development) zone standards are very tailored to each of these Planned Developments, therefore making it more difficult for someone to look up in the City Code what they can do with their property.

Ms. Vajgert inquired as to whether someone could come in and purchase the houses abutting the houses in the Highlands, tear them down, and build townhomes in their place. Mr. Utterback responded that row townhouse development is not permitted by right in the proposed RS zone, plus the lots in that area would not be easily re-subdividable because of the RS-zone minimum lot size requirements.

Mr. Markovits commented again and asked if there could be an additional dwelling unit on properties. Mt. Utterback explained that accessory dwelling units are allowed in all residential zones with strict standards.

Several of the Commissioners stated that the greenbelt is protected and no development can happen whether it is zoned PDR or zoned RS.

Mr. Juntunen inquired as to what would happen if the Commission left Crystal Ridge out of the rezone, Mr. Utterback responded that if the Planning Commission and the City Council were to not act on Crystal Ridge, it would just remain zoned PDR.

Mr. Seeley made a motion to approve the rezones from PDR to RS as specified in Ms. Brown’s presentation, with a second by Ms. Sanders.

Mr. Seeley explained that the protections from development of the wetlands exist whether these Planned Developments are zoned PDR or RS, and that rezoning these Planned Developments would also not affect traffic in these areas. Mr. Seeley also noted that the Crystal Ridge Homeowner’s Association (HOA) would control the green belts regardless of the zoning proposal.

The Planning Commission voted, and the motion passed 4 -0.

OTHER COMMISSION BUSINESS

Mr. Utterback commented on the exiting Planning Commissioner that is leaving, Pat McGregor; and explained the status of possible incoming Commissioners.

Ms. Baker stated that the March 14, 2018 Planning Commission meeting is cancelled.

Mr. Larson informed the Commissioners of an upcoming Planning Short Course in Fife on March 21st, stating that it is free to sign up and is a very informative course.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.
Subject:
Downtown Planned Action EIS

Presenter:
Katie Baker, AICP | Senior Planner | (253) 435-3604 | kbaker@ci.puyallup.wa.us

Recommendation:
Information/Discussion

Background:
Following issuance of a Proposed Final EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) in February 2018 and an associated 14-day public comment period, the City has now issued the Final EIS for the Downtown Puyallup Planned Action Ordinance. Due to its size, the Final EIS document is not included in this packet but can be accessed on the project webpage: http://www.cityofpuyallup.org/1462/Downtown-Planned-Action-EIS.

At this upcoming Planning Commission work session, the project consultant will be on-hand to provide a presentation and lead a discussion on the proposed package of code amendments included in this Planned Action Ordinance. If adopted, these amendments would facilitate the additional growth assumed in the alternative scenarios of the EIS. The first half of this presentation was previously given at the January 10, 2018 work session; the full PowerPoint presentation is attached for your review prior to the meeting.

For more information on the project background and its various components, please see the attached staff memo and presentation.

Council Direction:

Fiscal Impacts:

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) Staff Memo 03 21 18
- 2) 2018 EIS Boundary
- 3) 01 10 18 Presentation
To: Planning Commission
From: Katie Baker, AICP, Senior Planner
Subject: Downtown Planned Action/EIS
Date of memo: March 21, 2018
Date of PC meeting: March 28, 2018

Introduction
Following issuance of a Proposed Final EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) in February 2018 and an associated 14-day public comment period, the City has now issued the Final EIS for the Downtown Puyallup Planned Action Ordinance. Due to its size, the Final EIS document is not included in this packet but can be accessed on the project webpage: http://www.cityofpuyallup.org/1462/Downtown-Planned-Action-EIS.

At this upcoming Planning Commission work session, the project consultant will be on-hand to provide a presentation and lead a discussion on the proposed package of code amendments included in this Planned Action Ordinance. If adopted, these amendments would facilitate the additional growth assumed in the alternative scenarios of the EIS. The first half of this presentation was previously given at the January 10, 2018 work session; the full PowerPoint presentation is attached for your review prior to the meeting.

For more information on the project background and its various components, please see the information below.

Project Summary
In 2011, the City undertook a project to bring together a “transfer of development rights” (TDR) program with an update to the Puyallup Downtown Plan, the preparation of a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a Planned Action implementing ordinance. The City completed a number of steps in that process including holding a scoping meeting, analyzing the potential issues identified, issuing a Draft EIS in April 2012, and receiving comments. As City staff and project consultants were preparing the response to those comments and the Final EIS, the City Council chose to terminate the project, largely due to concerns related to the TDR program component of the project.

In early-2017, City Council re-initiated the Downtown Planned Action project, with the direction to pick up only the Planned Action/EIS component where it was left off in 2012. Any work on development of a TDR program could occur under further direction at a later date. The City then rehired the consultant team working on the original Planned Action and over the summer and fall of 2017 have been working to update the analysis and proposed mitigation. At this time, the bulk of that work has been completed and we are preparing to issue an addendum to the prior document. This will include a comment period followed by preparation and issuance of a Final EIS. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a recommendation of a preferred alternative, which will include code and comprehensive plan amendments in order to fully implement. It is anticipated that the City Council will be presented with this recommendation in the spring of 2018.

What is a "Planned Action"?
“Planned Actions” are authorized under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA - RCW 43.21C.030), and provide more detailed environmental analysis during formulation of planning proposals rather than at the
project permit review stage. Because of the upfront environmental review, projects that are consistent with City plans, the Planned Action Ordinance, and EIS mitigation measures are not subject to additional environmental review or appeals. Essentially, Planned Actions expedite the review process for developments that are consistent with adopted plans.

The advantage of the Planned Action process is an increase in certainty and predictability, and a decrease in processing time, resulting in real cost savings for applicants. The advantage for the City and citizens is improved economic development and implementation of adopted plans.

Planned Actions do not change the City’s plans. Only the City can do that through the regular planning process. Planned Actions are intended to expedite development proposals that:

- Are consistent with adopted City plans;
- Are identified in a planned action ordinance;
- Have had their significant impacts adequately addressed in the EIS.

Where planned actions exist, they can provide a significant economic development incentive.

The planned action ordinance brings the environmental analysis and mitigation measures within the EIS together with the City’s plans and development regulations, providing the basis for expedited review of development proposals. Cultivating Puyallup will bring these measures to the City, and ultimately it is the City Council who will have the final authority to adopt, amend or choose not to implement the planned action process for Puyallup.

**Project Proposal**

The Downtown Planned Action considers tools that promote economic development and downtown revitalization by implementing a "Planned Action" Environmental Impact Statement (PAEIS or EIS). The PAEIS will expedite the processing or projects that are consistent with the City's adopted plans for Downtown. The proposal also includes amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan, including the Transportation Element, and Capital Facilities Plan, and the municipal Code. Municipal Code amendments would change development standards governing the size and scale of buildings and forms of parking that would result in greater building density and intensity, and a greater amount of population and employment.

The Proposed Action(s) are:

- Comprehensive Plan Amendments (Transportation Element, Capital Facilities Plan)
- Development Regulation Amendments
- Planned Action Ordinance

This SEPA EIS is intended to address the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts that could occur as a result of approval of the comprehensive plan and development regulation amendments associated with the Downtown Puyallup Planned Action, as well as impacts from potential future development activities over the approximately 20-year buildout horizon (2035 per Comprehensive Plan). The EIS is intended to provide decision makers with relevant information needed to consider the range of Proposed Action(s) and their probable, significant adverse environmental impacts. The City is proposing that future development within the Downtown Puyallup EIS study area be designated by the City of Puyallup as a Planned Action, pursuant to SEPA (WAC 197-11-168).

**Alternatives**

For purposes of environmental review under SEPA, two study alternatives that meet the objectives of the City and a No Action Alternative have been identified. The two Study Alternatives bracket the range of land use
intensities that the study area could accommodate, given the existing City of Puyallup Comprehensive Plan designations and zoning classifications of the area.

Alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS include:

- **No Action Alternative** assumes growth consistent with that projected in the existing Comprehensive Plan and development regulations (e.g. Downtown Plan, Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map, Zoning map, and related development standards), and assumes that individual project-specific SEPA review continues.

- **Study Alternative 1** is based on the assumption that modest development standard amendments are made, a Planned Action Ordinance is adopted and that growth and development proposals are generally in the middle range between the No Action Alternative and Study Alternative 2. Comprehensive Plan amendments would be made to the Transportation Element, and Capital Facilities Plan.

- **Study Alternative 2** is based on the assumption that a Planned Action Ordinance is adopted, and more extensive changes are made to existing codes that provide incentives for growth and development (such as increased height, FAR, lot coverage, modification of open space requirements, and reduced parking standards), and that population and employment are significantly increased over existing plans. This is considered the maximum intensity alternative studied in this EIS. Comprehensive Plan amendments would be made as described for Study Alternative 1.
The map features are approximate and are intended only to provide an indication of said feature. Additional areas that have not been mapped may be present. This is not a survey. Orthophotos and other data may not align. The County assumes no liability for variations ascertained by actual survey.

ALL DATA IS EXPRESSLY PROVIDED AS IS AND WITH ALL FAULTS. The County makes no warranty of fitness for a particular purpose.
Purpose & Location

Purpose

- Promote economic development and downtown revitalization

Tools:

- Municipal Code amendments
  - Change development standards governing the size and scale of buildings and parking
- Planned Action – advanced State Environmental Policy Act review
  - Expedite the processing of land use approvals for projects consistent with adopted plans
History

Draft Amendments and Draft EIS: 2011 and 2012

- Puyallup considered a series of policy and code proposals called “Cultivating Puyallup”
  - Transfer of Development Rights Program
  - Planned Action, and
  - Associated Comprehensive Plan policy and zoning code changes
- Draft EIS
  - completed in April 2012
- Final EIS
  - developed in July 2012 but not published

Current Proposals

2018 Efforts

- Complete the Final EIS
- Consider
  - Planned Action Ordinance
  - Associated Comprehensive Plan changes (e.g. Transportation plans)
  - Zoning code changes

A Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program is not proposed for action in 2018.

If the City pursues a TDR program in the future it may rely on applicable analysis in the 2012 Draft EIS.
Objectives

**Required under SEPA | Per the City’s Downtown Neighborhood Plan Goals**

- The Downtown Center land use pattern has a **dynamic mix of uses** that complement one another ... while being sensitive to the established character and existing patterns of development. (DT-1)
- The core downtown area is **enhanced as a pedestrian oriented commercial (POC) land use district** area through mixed-use development and development standards. (DT-2)
- The downtown designation as a **Regional Growth Center by Puget Sound Regional Council** is maintained and encourages land uses and other attributes to further the RGC status. (DT-3)
- The Downtown urban form **allows new development that facilitates the pedestrian experience** ... (DT-7)
- The ... **streetscape includes public spaces, sidewalks, street trees**, and other pedestrian amenities... (DT-8)
- The **significant historic resources of the downtown are protected and enhanced** through incentives, designation, and development standards. (DT-10)
- Assure that the **street circulation system, parking, pedestrian and bicycle circulation system, and public transit services** are reasonably **safe, convenient and efficiently serve** the ...area. (DT -12 to DT-16)
- Downtown incorporates a **public realm that includes public spaces, cultural amenities, parks, and trails** ... (DT-9)

---

Alternatives

**Different ways of achieving objectives – required under SEPA**

- **No Action – Current Plans and Codes and Trends**
- **Study Alternative 1** –
  - Modest development standard amendments are made
  - A Planned Action Ordinance is adopted, and
  - Growth and development proposals are generally in the middle range
- **Study Alternative 2** –
  - More extensive changes are made to existing codes that provide incentives for growth and development
  - A Planned Action Ordinance is adopted, and
  - Population and employment are significantly increased over existing plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Study Alternative 1</th>
<th>Study Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dwellings (units)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Square Feet</td>
<td>446,526</td>
<td>871,541</td>
<td>1,136,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>3,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIS Topics & Public Input

**Draft EIS**
- Land Use
- Aesthetics
- Historic Resources
- Stormwater
- Transportation
- Utilities: Water, Sewer, Solid Waste, Telecommunications, Electrical, Natural Gas
- Public Services: Fire, Police, Schools, Parks

**Public Input**
- Scoping comment period and meeting – 21 days
- Draft EIS Comment Period and Open House – 30 days
- Limited comments received
  - Four residents
  - Pierce Transit

Proposed EIS Completion

- Prepare proposed Final EIS
  - Respond to prior Draft EIS comments
  - Update analysis
    - Minimal change to existing conditions on the ground
    - Alternatives – Growth and nature are same
    - Explain City’s updated plans – e.g. Comp Plan, System Plans
    - Update: Land Use, Stormwater, Utilities, Public Services
    - Retain other analyses: Aesthetics, Historic
- Voluntary 14 day comment period
- Final EIS issued

No Action – current code

Study Alternative 2
Code Changes

Reviewed by Architect and Transportation Team

- Some of the present code presents barriers to mixed use development or to the desired pedestrian character
  - Parking Standards:
    - Parking requirements effectively limit density and retail size.
    - Calibrate parking to bedrooms.
    - Recognize proximity of transit.
    - Address shared parking distances that are walkable.
    - Use floor area ratios.
  - Floor area ratio: The definition should exclude any portion of a structure used for parking.
  - Pedestrian-Oriented Plaza: Define more, and provide choices to ensure usability and quality.
  - Heights – adjust to address both residential and office floor to ceiling heights, set minimum ground floor height so there is usable retail space.
  - Calibrate density bonuses to the value of the item desired (e.g. parking is costly, plaza less so).

---

Code Changes – Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Study Alternative 1</th>
<th>Study Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Maintain current parking standards</td>
<td>Reduce minimum parking rates; modify shared and onsite parking standards</td>
<td>Eliminate minimum parking rates; establish maximum rates; modify shared and onsite parking standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Maintain current height maximums; zones range from 36 to 75 feet depending on bonuses</td>
<td>Retain height range, but alter height bonuses; establish minimum ground floor height</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 1 but more extensive changes to height bonus system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Maintain current base and maximum stories</td>
<td>Amend stories. Allow waiver of stories to be considered for mixed use buildings where maximum height is respected.</td>
<td>Amend stories. Allow waiver of stories to be considered for mixed use buildings where maximum height is respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>Maintain current floor area ratio approach</td>
<td>FAR definition – exclude parking. Add FAR standard for all zones.</td>
<td>Similar to Alternative 1 but greater FAR standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Retain current approach – only applies in RM-20.</td>
<td>Replace with FAR standard</td>
<td>Replace with FAR standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Code Changes – Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Study Alternative 1</th>
<th>Study Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Street</td>
<td>Retain 25-50% of ground floor commercial standard in CBD and CBD-Core</td>
<td>Require 50% retail frontage along Meridian and one block depth on side streets off Meridian.</td>
<td>Require 75% retail frontage along Meridian and one block depth on side streets off Meridian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>Retain current range of 50-100% in zones</td>
<td>Increase lot coverage in RM-20, RM-Core and CBD; retain others</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Retain current open space standards</td>
<td>Modify pedestrian open space standards in CBD</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-level step back</td>
<td>Retain current standard depth of 6 feet for 60% of façade at third story</td>
<td>5-10 foot setback at 30 feet in height</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setbacks</td>
<td>Retain current standards</td>
<td>Modify front yard standards for RM-20 to match RM-Core</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is a planned action?

- Defines range of future development – type & amount
- Analyzes potential impacts in an associated EIS
- Environmental “homework” completed in advance
- Adopts an ordinance with thresholds & mitigation
- Developers & public have clear rules

- Future development would not need additional SEPA review when consistent with Ordinance
- Proposals still go through permit review
- Can help facilitate private and public investment in the study area
Planned Action

State Rules

- According to SEPA, a Planned Action is defined as a project that:
  - Is designated as a Planned Action by ordinance or resolution;
  - Has had the significant environmental impacts addressed in an EIS prepared in conjunction with or to implement, a comprehensive plan or subarea plan, master planned development or phased project…;
  - Are not essential public facilities, as defined in RCW 36.70A.200, unless an essential public facility is accessory to or part of a … planned action;
  - Is located within an urban growth area; and
  - Is consistent with an adopted comprehensive plan or subarea plan.

Planned Action Process
Planned Action Ordinance

- Development must show it fits in the frame of the EIS analysis
  - Sets a bank of development (e.g. uses, dwellings and jobs)
  - Sets a bank of traffic trips
- Identifies mitigation measures in addition to the City codes
- Development must comply with City permit requirements and planned action ordinance
- Development applicants benefit from fitting with Vision and Requirements – do not need to redo SEPA documentation

Schedule

- Issue Proposed Final EIS: February
  - Voluntary Comment Period: February
- Respond to comments and prepare Final EIS: March
- Planning Commission Hearing: April
- City Council Review: May
- Adoption: May/June
### Code Changes Detail

**January 10, 2018 | Downtown Planned Action**

---

### Code Changes

#### Parking

- **No Action:** Maintain current parking standards
- **Study Alternative 1:** Reduce minimum parking rates; modify shared and offsite parking standards
- **Study Alternative 2:** Eliminate minimum parking rates; establish maximum rates; modify shared and offsite parking standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Study Alternative 1</th>
<th>Study Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multifamily:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multifamily:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maximums</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Core: 1 / DU</td>
<td>CBD-Core: 1 / DU</td>
<td>Multifamily: 1.9 / DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-Core: 1.5 / DU</td>
<td>Commercial: Office/Retail - Within 0.25 miles of Sounder: 1 / 650 SF GFA</td>
<td>Office/Retail: No greater than the No Action Alternative minimums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other zones: 2 / DU</td>
<td>Greater than 0.25 miles of Sounder: 1 / 400 SF GFA</td>
<td>Exemption for the first 5,000 SF commercial space in CBD and CBD-Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shared parking:</strong> use ULI model</td>
<td><strong>Shared parking:</strong> use ULI model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office: 1 / 300 SF GFA</td>
<td>Distance to offsite spaces: 1,000 feet</td>
<td>Distance to offsite spaces: 0.25 mile (1,320 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office: 1 / 300 SF GFA</td>
<td><strong>Distance to offsite spaces:</strong> 300 feet</td>
<td><strong>Distance to offsite spaces:</strong> 0.25 mile (1,320 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail: 1 / 300 SF GFA</td>
<td><strong>Shared Parking:</strong> Up to 75% of required daytime parking can be used at night or on weekends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance to offsite spaces:</strong> 300 feet</td>
<td><strong>Distance to shared spaces:</strong> 300 feet</td>
<td><strong>Distance to offsite spaces:</strong> 0.25 mile (1,320 feet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Code Changes (cont.)

Height

- No Action: Maintain current height maximums
- Study Alternative 1: Retain height range, but alter height bonuses; establish minimum ground floor height
- Study Alternative 2: Similar to Alternative 1 but more extensive changes to height bonus system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Study Alternative 1</th>
<th>Study Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Core: 65 feet</td>
<td>CBD-Core: Base 40 feet, height bonus up to 55 feet</td>
<td>CBD-Core: Base 40 feet, height bonus up to 65 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD: 40 feet; height bonus up to 51 feet</td>
<td>CBD: Base 40 feet; height bonus up to 50 feet</td>
<td>CBD: Base 40 feet; height bonus up to 55 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Core: 50 feet; up to 60 feet with bonuses</td>
<td>Remaining zones same as No Action</td>
<td>Remaining zones same as No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-20: 36 feet, up to 46 feet with bonuses</td>
<td>Establish minimum ground floor height of 14 feet</td>
<td>Establish minimum ground floor height of 14 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG: 50 feet, with bonuses to 75 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL: 40 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code Changes (cont.)

Floor Area Ratio – amount of building space in relation to parcel size

- No Action: Retain FAR in CG and CL zones
- Study Alternatives 1 and 2:
  - Change FAR definition to exclude parking
  - Add FAR standard to other zones (FAR differs)
  - Replace RM-20 density with FAR approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Study Alternative 1</th>
<th>Study Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD-Core: None</td>
<td>CBD-Core: 2.0 residential; 1.5 office</td>
<td>CBD-Core: 2.75 residential; 2.0 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD: None</td>
<td>CBD: 2.0 residential; 1.5 office</td>
<td>CBD: 2.75 residential; 2.0 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Core: None</td>
<td>RM-Core: 2.5</td>
<td>RM-Core: 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-20: None</td>
<td>RM-20: 1.0</td>
<td>RM-20: 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG: 4.0</td>
<td>CG: 4.0</td>
<td>CG: 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL: 1.5</td>
<td>CL: 1.5</td>
<td>CL: 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Code Changes (cont.)

Lot Coverage

- No Action: Retain current range of 50-100% in zones
- Study Alternatives 1 and 2: Increase lot coverage in RM-Core and CBD and RM-20; retain others

Retail Street Frontages

- No Action: Retain 25-50% standard in CBD and CBD-Core
- Study Alternative 1: Require 50% retail frontage along Meridian and one block depth on side streets off Meridian.
- Study Alternative 2: Require 75% retail frontage along Meridian and one block depth on side streets off Meridian.
Code Changes (cont.)

Open Space

- No Action: Retain current open space standards
- Study Alternatives 1 and 2: Modify pedestrian open space standards in CBD
  - CBD-Core: Require pedestrian open space at key intersections along Meridian. 15 foot landscaped setback abutting RM; 30 feet landscaping abutting RS

Code Changes (cont.)

Front yard setbacks

- No Action: Retain current standards
- Study Alternatives 1 and 2: Modify front yard standards for RM-20 to match RM-Core
  - RM-20: 10 feet, or 5 feet with bonuses
Code Changes (cont.)

Upper-level step back

- No Action: Retain current standard depth of 6 feet for 60% of façade at third story
- Study Alternatives 1 and 2: 5-10 foot setback at 30 feet in height
TYPICAL LOT:
14,400 SF

EXISTING CODE BUILDING A:
FAR: 1.5
DENSITY: 42DU/ACRE
HEIGHT: 35'
PARKING: 1/DU, 3/1000 SF RETAIL
EXISTING CODE BUILDING B:
FAR: 3
DENSITY: 75DU/acre
HEIGHT: 75'
PARKING: 1/DU, 3/1000 SF RETAIL

NEW INFILL HOUSING TYPE
GREEN ROOF
COMMUNITY GARDEN AND CHICKEN COOP
ROOFTOP TERRACE AND WIND TURBINE

4TH FLOOR COMMON TERRACE

4-500 SF STUDIO LOFT UNITS
COMMON ROOM
PARKING STALLS
GROUND LEVEL UNITS
SECURED BIKE STORAGE
COMMERCIAL/RETAIL SPACE
NEW INFILL HOUSING TYPE:
FAR: 2.5
DENSITY: 110 DU/acre
HEIGHT: 55'
PARKING: .5/DU, RETAIL EXEMPT
Subject:
Affordable and Infill Housing Strategies

Presenter:
Chris Beale, AICP | Senior Planner | (253) 841-5418 | cbeale@ci.puyallup.wa.us

Recommendation:
Review/Discussion

Background:
Staff will present the final set of amendments related to the Affordable and Infill Housing Strategies work program before a hearing later in 2018. Please see the attached staff memo and table for additional information.

Council Direction:

Fiscal Impacts:

ATTACHMENTS

- 1) STAFF MEMO 032218
- 2) Affordable housing strategy table
At the Wednesday, March 28, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, city staff will continue to provide the Planning Commission with further information regarding a possible package of code amendments intended to support affordable and infill housing strategies; city staff will review draft code text with Planning Commission, specifically focusing on the following areas:

- Short platting – quantity of lots which can be created through short plats
- Improvements required at the time of short plat approval
- Associated Comprehensive Plan amendments needed to support the project

The intent of the March 28, 2018 meeting is to substantively review the topic areas above. Staff is preparing to complete community outreach on the entire package, with a public hearing expected later this year.

If you have any questions, please contact Chris Beale, AICP, Senior Planner at 253 841.5418 or at cbeale@ci.puyallup.wa.us.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Action/Policy Question</th>
<th>Potential for addressing housing affordability</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE)</td>
<td>Provides for time limited tax abatement for multi-family housing, including affordable housing, in residentially deficient urban centers located within the city of Puyallup.</td>
<td>Possible expansion of the Multi-Family Tax Exemption program outside of downtown core; possible study areas include South Hill Regional Growth Center and River Road Mixed Use Center</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>The MFTE provides an eight (8) year, limited tax abatement for multi-family units in areas designated and a 12 year tax abatement for projects wherein designated affordable units are established. This could have a high potential for creating more market rate units at a lower rent cost (8 year) and has a high potential for creating designated, set aside affordable units if a developer utilized the 12 year exemption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Height/density bonuses</td>
<td>Provide building height and/or residential dwelling unit bonuses for mixed use commercial buildings where affordable units are created.</td>
<td>Height bonuses/density bonuses in C, RM and MX zone districts wherein residential uses are created.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Since these bonus incentives would only apply to projects where set aside affordable units are created, this would be considered an incentive with a high potential for creating affordable units given that the incentive is directly tied to the creation of new units that are set-aside as affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flexibility in lot sizes</td>
<td>Provide additional flexibility in lot sizes or possibly deregulate lot dimensions and sizes for infill lots</td>
<td>Examine possible changes to lot dimension standards for infill lots (i.e. new lots created through short plats in existing residential areas).</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This tool could result in smaller lot sizes with resulting smaller units; this does not guarantee the unit(s) created would be affordable, so the probability for 'truly-affordable' units as a result of this approach is lower than other incentive strategies. Small buildings reduce construction costs and could create market rate units that are comparably less expensive to rent or purchase than larger units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fee reductions or waivers</td>
<td>Possible elimination or reduction in fees assessed during building permitting</td>
<td>Possible fee waivers for Impact Fees (Parks, Schools, Traffic) and Systems Development Charges (utility hook up fees) for projects that create affordable units</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This incentive has a high potential to affect the creation of set-aside affordable units by reducing the cost of new construction related to new affordable units. Careful policy consideration of the public benefits of a new affordable unit with the loss of road and utility impact fee revenue meant to offset new impacts. City may be required to cover portions of exemption with other public funds; per RCW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expedited permitting</td>
<td>Provide expedited permit review process of affordable unit projects</td>
<td>Provide an alternative permitting ‘pathway’ that places projects proposing set-aside affordable housing ahead other applications.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This is a supportive incentive that could work with other incentives to affect the creation of affordable units. This incentive may not actually create affordable units, but may assist developers of affordable units to permit and construct units more rapidly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parking requirements reductions</td>
<td>Reduce or eliminate off-street parking requirements for affordable units</td>
<td>Modification of the off-street parking ordinance to reduce or eliminate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Off-street parking is a major expense to development; this incentive could reduce the cost of developing affordable units. Given that affordable units have a lower rate of return for a market rate housing developer, this could help to offset the cost of developing affordable unit(s) and should be considered a valuable tool to incentivize affordable housing. Careful policy consideration should be undertaken to determine possible impacts to surrounding streets and parking facilities by off-setting off-street parking requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duplex/triplex permitting requirements</td>
<td>Examine permitting process for new duplex and triplexes units</td>
<td>Possible changes to Conditional Use Permit requirements and lot size requirements for permitting of duplexes in limited scenarios; examine possible expanded scenarios for duplexes in RS zones</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This incentive is meant to create more infill units, which may increase available supply and reduce market rate unit rents only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Affordable Housing Strategy

### Menu of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Action/Policy Question</th>
<th>Potential for addressing housing affordability</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Development Agreements</td>
<td>Possible policy regarding affordable housing for projects which receive a DA where housing units are created</td>
<td>Create a city policy that development agreements (DA) involving residential projects create affordable units as a condition of DA approval</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This strategy could have a high potential for affecting affordable housing creation. The City Council would have discretion to require the provision of affordable housing through a policy set up in the city’s Development Agreement ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Voluntary residential upzones</td>
<td>State law authorizes the city to possibly require affordable housing set aside when an ‘upzone’ is requested by private party related to a zone which allows residential uses</td>
<td>Create an ordinance that requires a landowner to provide a portion of a development as affordable when they receive a rezoning that increases the dwelling unit development capacity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Since this would be a mandatory requirement for the creation of affordable units, this strategy should be considered a high potential to create new set aside units. Careful policy consideration should be made regarding this strategy’s impact on proposed upzones and redevelopment, more generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City-initiated upzones</td>
<td>Require analysis and mandatory affordable unit provisions for areas where city-initiated upzones allow for additional units</td>
<td>The city may examine the city’s multi-family housing density allowances in the Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This strategy is similar to the voluntary upzones (above) strategy; this process would require the city to conduct a housing affordability study when the city proposes an area-wide rezoning that would result in additional residential development capacity. This would require all development within an area of city-initiated upzoning to provide affordable set aside units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs)</td>
<td>Possibly require units created out of a future city TDR program to be set aside as affordable</td>
<td>If the city structured a future TDR program to allow height or dwelling unit bonuses for purchase of TDR credits, a policy could be implemented that additional dwelling unit bonuses provide some set aside affordable housing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This strategy is ranked as a medium potential - despite the fact that this strategy would result in the creation of set aside affordable units. Further analysis may show that it would be difficult to implement this strategy without strong market conditions for development. The purchase of TDR credits would already add to the cost of a possible development and the creation of affordable units would impact the developer’s return on investment, making it difficult to implement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Affordable Housing Strategy
### “Menu of Options”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Action/Policy Question</th>
<th>Potential for addressing housing affordability</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>’Tiny’ houses</td>
<td>Creation of a definition of and permitting pathway for tiny houses</td>
<td>Examine current definition of RVs and Accessory Dwelling Units and determine how to handle permitting of single tiny houses on residentially zoned lots, and groups of tiny homes.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The city zoning code does not currently differentiate tiny houses – most of which are constructed on trailers – from RVs. Tiny houses are very affordable to build and can be considered affordable by most measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units – impact fees</td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units – impact fees</td>
<td>Examine the current fee structure and cost of permitting an accessory dwelling unit; determine possible reductions in fees to make permitting secondary dwelling units more affordable.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This incentive has a medium potential to affect the creation of new accessory dwelling units by reducing the cost of new construction related to an accessory unit. Careful policy consideration of the public benefits of a new ADU with the loss of road and utility impact fee revenue meant to offset new impacts. City may be required to cover portions of exemption with other public funds, per RCW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Manufactured homes</td>
<td>Allowances for manufactured home parks</td>
<td>Examine current use allowances and design standards for manufactured home parks and determine possible allowances and design requirements</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Currently, only manufactured home parks that existed prior to July 1, 2005 are ‘grandfathered’ into the city’s RS (Single family) zoning code. No new manufactured home parks may be permitted in the city currently. Parks can be a market rate affordable housing option given the relatively low cost of the unit itself and the location, which would not require land purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cottage housing</td>
<td>Cottage housing ordinance</td>
<td>Examine now ‘sunset’ demonstration ordinance allowing cottage housing in the city; determine if ordinance should be re-adopted as a demonstration or permanent</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Cottage housing is an infill strategy that allows small units to be built in a clustered location, with shared common open space (in lieu of single lot development. The units may offer a diverse housing choice that could be viewed as relatively more affordable than traditional detached single family development on individual lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Affordable housing bond/trust fund</td>
<td>Affordable housing bond/trust fund</td>
<td>Study a possible (voter-approved) bond measure to provide dedicated funding for the capital cost for development of affordable housing units in the city</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Given that a dedicated funding source could result in the funding of construction of set aside affordable units, this strategy ranks as a high priority tool. The funding derived from a bond measure could provide a pool of funding for a housing authority or nonprofit affordable housing developers to access to construct new, affordable units. However, this would require voter approval and should be considered and studied in depth by the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Land surplus/public-private land development</td>
<td>City policy regarding development outcomes for property that is deemed surplus by council, or other property where the city partners with a private developer to re-develop</td>
<td>A city policy regarding the creation of affordable units as a result of a development, or re-development, of a city-owned property. If the city surpluses a property or partners with a developer, a condition of the sale or partnership for development could include a mandate to create affordable housing units</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Given that this policy would result in the creation of set aside units through the sale or a public-private partnership for re-development, this should be considered a high priority tool to consider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>