

3.1 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND AESTHETICS

This section evaluates two major aspects of land use for the *Proposed Action*, *Proposed Action Alternative* and *No Action Alternative* – Land Use Compatibility and consistency with adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations (**Section 3.1.A**), and Aesthetics (**Section 3.1.B**). Key documents that are summarized and evaluated as part of the consistency analysis include the City of Tacoma *Comprehensive Plan* and zoning/land use regulations in the City of Tacoma.

3.1.A Land Use Compatibility, Plans, and Regulations

The City of Tacoma *Comprehensive Plan* and *Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC)* direct the City to evaluate the compatibility of the proposed development with adjacent land uses. For residential development projects, such as the *Proposed Action*, land use compatibility involves a combination of considering housing types (e.g., single-family detached, townhouse, apartments), density (i.e., the number of dwelling units per acre), and intensity of the development (e.g., lot size, lot width, setbacks), and the provision of open space consistent with Planned Residential Development (PRD) code requirements.

3.1.A.1 Affected Environment

The 116-acre *The Point at Northshore* site occupies the central portion of the North Shore Country Club Estates PRD District. This PRD District was adopted by the City through a PRD rezone in 1981, and, in addition to the property that is the subject of this DSEIS, included Divisions 2, 3, and 4 of the residential PRD development. The total acreage of the 1981 PRD rezone was approximately 338.5 acres.

The central portion of the PRD District is a privately owned 18-hole golf course that is open to the public for a fee. The golf course facility includes a club house, restaurant, parking area, driving range, and other associated golf course amenities. Located within this central area and adjacent to the golf play area are several ponds and significant trees. The following condition of the 1981 PRD rezone states that the golf course was relied upon for approval of the PRD rezone request (Condition E):

“The applicant shall submit a legal agreement, which is binding upon all parties and which may be enforced by the City of Tacoma. It should provide that the property in question will maintain and always have the use of the adjacent golf course for its open space and density requirement which has been relied upon by the applicant in securing approval of this request. In this regard, the agreement attached to File No. 128.9 may be used in concept (See ATTACHMENT NO. 4). However, the Examiner believes that there must be more certainty provided to insure the golf course use, which was relied upon to gain the density for this request, is clearly to the applicant’s proposed use in perpetuity.”¹

This condition was implemented through a combination of a Concomitant Zoning Agreement and an Open Space Tax Agreement. A recent Pierce County Superior Court ruling has upheld the continued validity of those 1981 agreements against a challenge by the owners that they

¹ City of Tacoma Hearing Examiner Report, Decision, and Recommendation to the City Council *In the Application of Nu West, Incorporated (formerly: North Shore Associates)*, File Nos. 120.924, 125.238, and 127.140, (March 2, 1981).

were no longer valid and not binding on the golf course property². The Pierce County Superior Court Judge also ruled that while these two agreements were still valid and binding on the golf course property, the owner is entitled to file a request to modify the PRD zoning condition and, thus, modify the effect of these agreements as part of this project application.

Table 3.1-1, Figure 3.1-1 and Figure 3.1-2, and Appendix E show the existing land use and development characteristics of the golf course site and the development adjacent to the golf course. **Table 3.1-1 and Appendix E** provide a description and estimate of existing development intensity, based on an evaluation of current aerial photographs of the site and vicinity. **Figure 3.1-3 through Figure 3.1-14** provide photographic information of the affected environment. The locations for the photographs were selected to provide the best comprehensive representation of the variety of views, including territorial views from adjacent properties, views of the proposed development site, and views across the site to more distant or scenic viewpoints, such as the Cascade Mountains and Mount Rainier.

**Table 3.1-1
EXISTING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO
NORTHSHORE PRD DISTRICT**

DIVISION	DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS	SQ. FT. / NO. of UNITS
Adjacent to PRD District¹		
Division 1 Northshore Country Club Estates (Single-Family Detached)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	493,859
	Total Units	217
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	2275.82
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	9,600
	Lot Width (ft.)	77
	Lot Setback – Rear (ft.) - Side (ft.)	30 9
Within PRD District¹		
Division 2 Tuscany (Single-Family Detached)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	623,708.21
	Total Units	253
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	2,465.25
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	13,000
	Lot Width (ft.)	80
	Lot Setback - Rear (ft.) Side (ft.)	65 10
Division 3 “On the Green” (Multi-Family Apartments)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	153,535.85 ²
	Total Units	545
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	281.71 ³
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	N/A ⁴
	Lot Width (ft.)	N/A ⁴
	Lot Setback – Rear (ft.) Side (ft.)	40 between structures: 20
Division 3 “The Links” (Multi-Family Condominium and Apartment)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	85,436.40
	Total Units	70
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	1,220.52
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	N/A ⁴
	Lot Width (ft.)	N/A ⁴

² *City of Tacoma, et al. v. Northshore Investors, LLC, et al.*, Pierce County Superior Court No. 08-2-04025-4, “Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment” (February 3, 2009).

DIVISION	DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS	SQ. FT. / NO. of UNITS
	Lot Setback – Rear (ft.) Side (ft.)	10 between structures: 20
Division 3 “Wind Dance” (Single-Family Detached)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	178,176.39
	Total Units	72
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	2,474.67
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	5,000
	Lot Width (ft.)	50
	Lot Setback – Rear (ft.) Side (ft.)	20 5
Division 4 “North Shore Country Club Estates” (Single-Family Detached)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	528,854.90
	Total Units	231
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	2,289.42
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	11,000
	Lot Width (ft.)	80
	Lot Setback – Rear (ft.) Side (ft.)	50 10
Division 4 “Newport Lane” (Multi-Family)	Total Rooftop (sq. ft.)	105,906.08
	Total Units	83
	Total Rooftop per Unit (sq. ft.)	1,275.98
	Lot Area (sq. ft.)	9,625
	Lot Width (ft.)	20
	Lot Setback – Rear (ft.) Side (ft.)	20 between structures: 35
¹ Information is an estimate of average lot dimensions using GIS data available at City of Tacoma’s GovME website. Side setback estimates reflect closest distance from building edge to property line, unless otherwise noted.		
² Total rooftop square footage of all “On the Green” apartment buildings.		
³ Assuming Multi-Story Apartment Buildings of 2-3 stories.		
⁴ The housing units in the multi-family developments are not fee simple ownership units, i.e., full ownership of land and building. Therefore, given the number of units in a development, measurements of lot area and lot width do not provide an accurate means of comparing density between multi-family developments and single-family homes.		

Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

Consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the City of Tacoma has adopted a *Comprehensive Plan* to guide future development and fulfill the City’s responsibilities under GMA. The land use element of the *Comprehensive Plan* is embodied in the Generalized Land Use Element (GLUE). The GLUE designates the Northshore area as suitable for low intensity development as shown in **Figure 3.1-15**. The low intensity designation is the most prevalent type of development in the City. The predominance of single-family detached homes on individual lots and a relatively quiet neighborhood environment are characteristics of low intensity residential areas. Residential density in the low intensity designation may vary and can range up to about 15 dwelling units per gross acre.

Several *Comprehensive Plan* policies address land use compatibility and aesthetics to encourage new, infill development to be consistent in scale, mass, character, type, and appearance with the existing surrounding residential neighborhood (LU-UAD-1, H-NQ-2, LU-RDLI-6 and LU-RDG-6). The *Comprehensive Plan* policies also encourage compatibility, innovative development techniques for larger scale residential developments, and maintaining

required development standards to protect existing residential uses (LU-RDG-1, LU-RDG-5 and NET-1.3).

Policy LU-RDG-6, which provides general direction for protection of established residential areas, states:

“Encourage residential development of mixed structural type and design, as well as unique building and site arrangements to increase affordable housing options and achieve appropriate densities provided that the development is compatible and the desirable characteristics of the surrounding area are maintained.”

Policy LU-RDLI-6, which is specific to the Low Intensity designation for the golf course, states:

“Permit the innovative development of large-scale low-density residential projects consisting of varied housing types in appropriate locations within low intensity residential areas provided the density; design and scale are compatible with the character of surrounding properties.”

Tacoma Development Regulations

City of Tacoma Land Use Regulatory Code

Summary: Title 13 of the *Tacoma Municipal Code* regulates land use within the City in terms of uses allowed within various zoning districts and the development standards that are applied to such uses. Some of these development standards are included in **Table 3.1-2** below.

**Table 3.1-2
CITY OF TACOMA LAND USE REGULATORY CODE
TMC 13.06.110 & TMC 13.06.140**

DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS	STANDARD	
	R-2 Zoning	PRD Zoning
Min. Average Lot Width (ft.)	50	50 ¹
Min. Lot Frontage (ft.)	25	25 ¹
Max. Height Limit for Main Structures (ft.)	35	35
Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	20	See Footnotes 2 and 3
Rear ⁴	25	7.5
Side ⁴	7.5	7.5
Corner Lot Side ⁵	7.5/10	7.5/10
Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	5,000	---
Area per Dwelling Unit (sq. ft.)	---	5,000
¹ Lot area and lot width requirements for plats within PRD Districts shall be the same as for the residential district with which the PRD District is combined; however, the Hearing Examiner may modify said lot size and lot width requirements if specific criteria are met. See <i>TMC 13.04.240.C.1</i> and <i>TMC 13.06.110.C.4</i> .		
² A minimum separation distance of 15 feet is required between structures, exclusive of detached accessory structures, in a PRD District. See <i>TMC 13.06.140.F.1</i> .		
³ The required front yard setback is 20 feet when adjacent to a dedicated arterial street. See <i>TMC 13.06.140.F.1</i> and <i>TMC 13.06.110.C.1</i> .		
⁴ PRD District rear and side setbacks for townhouse developments are measured from the edge of the structure rather than from each unit.		
⁵ Where the rear lot line of a corner lot abuts the side lot line of the lot in the rear, there shall be a side yard on the street side of such corner lot of not less than one half of the required front yard of the lots in the rear. But such side yard need not exceed ten feet. See <i>TMC 13.06.110.C.2</i> .		

3.1.A.2 Impacts of the Proposed Action and Proposed Action Alternative

The *Proposed Action* assumes development of the entire *The Point at Northshore* site (i.e., the existing golf course), with final buildout consisting of 860 new single-family dwelling units (366 detached single-family units and 494 attached townhouse units). Full development is projected to occur over a six-year timeframe, commencing in 2010.

The *Proposed Action Alternative* would be similar to the *Proposed Action*, except that there would be fewer residential units constructed (approximately 340 detached single-family units and 330 attached townhouse units). Under this alternative, an open space transition area would be located between the proposed residential building lots and the existing adjacent developed areas. The proposed single-family detached residential area (i.e., the South Area) would also be developed without any reduction of lot area, lot width, or setback standards, resulting in a lower overall density and intensity. The proposed townhouse residential area (i.e., the North Area) would be developed with a reduction in lot area and lot width, but no reduction in setback standards.

The information below provides an analysis regarding consistency with plans and policies, and a comparison of the open space, density, and intensity impacts from the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative*.

Tacoma Comprehensive Plan

The site is located within an area characterized by single-family detached, townhouse, and apartment development. All of the single-family homes in the neighborhood are situated on lots exceeding the lot sizes proposed for the *Proposed Action* or the *Proposed Action Alternative*, with the smallest average lot being 5,799 square feet. These smaller single-family detached lots are located within the “Wind Dance” development which is located within the interior of the golf course on the north end of the site. These lots are also characterized by side yard setbacks of 5 feet, which are the same as those proposed for the *Proposed Action*. All other single-family lots are characterized by side yard setbacks greater than 7.5 feet, which are the minimum proposed for the *Proposed Action Alternative*. See **Figure 3.1-1** and **Figure 3.1-2**, and **Table 3.1-1** and **Table 3.1-6**.

In addition to the single-family detached development, the existing surrounding development includes condominiums and apartments. These developments include a variety of building and site arrangements, and are generally located on large development parcels situated within the interior of the golf course or within the northern portion of the PRD District adjacent to the existing arterial streets. See **Figure 3.1-1** and **Figure 3.1-2**. The *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* would include townhouse style buildings that would be located on individual lots. The size of these buildings ranges from 1,600 to 10,000 square feet, with 2 to 7 units, respectively. The minimum building separation for the *Proposed Action* is 10 feet. The minimum building separation for the *Proposed Action Alternative* is 15 feet. The *Proposed Action Alternative* also includes an open space transition zone to provide for additional building separation between the proposed and existing development areas. No apartments are proposed with either the *Proposed Action* or the *Proposed Action Alternative*.

Both the *Proposed Action* and the *Proposed Action Alternative* are consistent with the low intensity designation which may vary and can range up to about 15 dwelling units per gross acre. See **Table 3.1-4** and **Table 3.1-5**. The proposed small lot sizes and setbacks for the *Proposed Action* would not be consistent with or protect the established character of the surrounding neighborhood. The lot sizes and setbacks for the *Proposed Action Alternative* would also not be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, but would result in overall less density and intensity. See **Table 3.1-1** and **Table 3.1-6**.

Tacoma Development Regulations

Open Space Impact

The golf course was identified as a significant open space and recreation element of the 1981 PRD approval. It served not only to satisfy the amount of open space acreage required by the PRD District (i.e., *TMC 13.06.140F.6* – a minimum of one-third of that area of the site not covered by buildings or dedicated street right-of-way shall be maintained as usable landscaped recreation areas), but also serve a qualitative purpose – to provide a significant design element around which much of the surrounding PRD residential development was designed. Modification of the PRD rezone and development of the golf course property should only be permitted to the extent it is demonstrated that the proposed open space meets both of these open space functions and requirements.

Currently, the majority of the PRD District open space area is associated with the golf course. In the 1981 PRD rezone, the Hearing Examiner noted that the total PRD rezone site was approximately 338.5 acres and the golf course, which the Proponent proposed as open space and recreational use as part of that PRD application, was approximately 112 acres. Since the golf course was proposed for open space and recreation in 1981, and since the golf course acreage represented approximately one-third of the total PRD rezone acreage, the open space requirements of the 1981 PRD code were deemed satisfied by the condition restricting the golf course to open space and recreational use without the need to precisely calculate compliance with the usable open space requirements. Now that the golf course area is proposed for development, it is necessary to evaluate current open space within Divisions 2, 3, and 4 and the two development alternatives (i.e., the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative*) to determine whether usable open space requirements for both the original PRD rezone and the new development are satisfied.

Table 3.1-3 provides a simplistic summary of the existing and proposed open space for the entire PRD District. More detailed calculations, based on a variety of development assumptions and scenarios, is included in **Appendix C** to this DSEIS. In general, a minimum of one-third of the site not covered by buildings or dedicated streets shall be usable open space and recreation area. After removing buildings and dedicated streets from the calculations, approximately 22.22% of the PRD District shall be usable (approximately 90 acres). The usable open space requirement of the PRD District is contained in *TMC 13.06.140F.6*. and states:

“Usable open space. A minimum of one-third of that area of the site not covered by buildings or dedicated street right-of-way shall be developed and maintained as usable landscaped recreation areas. All open space shall be maintained free of litter and of conditions constituting a potential public nuisance.”

Table 3.1-3 provides area calculations based on two different code interpretations in regard to what site characteristics can be considered and included as “usable landscaped recreation areas.” For purposes of Code Interpretation A (i.e., Code Int A), private yards are included in the area calculations. For purposes of Code Interpretation B (i.e., Code Int B), private yards are not included. If private yards are included in the usable open space calculations, both the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* provide more than the minimum area requirement. If private yards are not included in the usable open space calculations, the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* would need to be revised to increase the usable open space area to a minimum of 90 acres. It is noted that the table below assumes an average building footprint for the existing structures within the PRD. Further, private roads have not been included as part of the open space area within this table. For calculations including the private roads as open space area, please refer to **Appendix C** to this DSEIS.

**Table 3.1-3
EXISTING AND PROPOSED OPEN SPACE AREA WITHIN
NORTHSHORE PRD DISTRICT**

1981 EIS ¹	No Action PRD District			Proposed Action		Proposed Action Alternative	
	Acreage	Existing Code Int A	Existing Code Int B	Code Int A	Code Int B	Code Int A	Code Int B
Golf Course	112.00 ac						
Div. 2	1.32 ac						
Div. 3	32.75 ac						
Div. 4	2.79 ac						
Total	148.86 ac	262.05 ac ²	115.08 ac ³	172.73 ac ⁴	44.55 ac ⁵	176.35 ac ⁶	66.95 ac ⁷

¹ Draft EIS for North Shore Country Club Estates, pg. 164.

² See the “Average Building Footprint” scenario of **Appendix C**. This number is based on the size of the entire PRD, minus the public right-of-way, private roads, and average building footprints of the existing structures.

³ See the “Full build-out of the PRD to the property lines (i.e., zero-lot line)” scenario of **Appendix C**. This number is based on the size of the golf course plus the HOA property.

⁴ See the “Average Building Footprint” scenario in **Appendix C**. This number is based on the size of the entire PRD, minus the public right-of-way (existing and proposed), private roads (existing and proposed), average building footprints of existing structures and the Proponent’s proposed building footprints of the 860 units.

⁵ See **Appendix C**. This number is based on the existing HOA property and the Proponent’s proposed open space tracts, pond/slopes tracts, shared access facilities tracts, and useable landscaped recreation areas tracts. Note: information regarding Proponent’s proposed tracts is obtained from Sheet 1 of the Preliminary Plat Map submitted to the City of Tacoma on August 29, 2008.

⁶ See the “Average Building Footprint” scenario in **Appendix C**. This number is based on the same methodology as the *Proposed Action*; however, it reduces the number of units proposed by the Proponent to 340 detached structures (avg. footprint of 2,600 sq. ft.) and 330 townhouses (avg. footprint of 940 sq. ft.). Further, it includes in the open space area, the proposed transition zones, which contain approximately 22.4 acres.

⁷ See **Appendix C**. This number is based on the existing HOA property, proposed transition zones, and the Proponent’s proposed open space tracts, pond/slopes tracts, shared access facilities tract, and useable landscaped recreation areas tracts. Note: information regarding Proponent’s proposed tracts is obtained from Sheet 1 of the Preliminary Plat Map submitted to the City of Tacoma on August 29, 2008.

In addition to the mathematical usable area calculation, the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* must be evaluated for impacts to the open space requirements for the 1981 PRD rezone (i.e., the golf course as a significant design element). The golf course is a significant design element and, as was contemplated with the PRD District approval, the

residential components of the PRD District were built around and oriented to the golf course. The *Proposed Action* includes open space that is scattered throughout the proposed development area, with the largest area being approximately 110,000 square feet. (Tract L in Phase III). The *Proposed Action* Alternative would include open space scattered throughout the proposed development area, and would include open space transition zones that would vary from 20 to 75+ feet in width. These zones, together with rear yard setbacks, would result in a building separation between the proposed and existing buildings that would range from approximately 37 to 195 feet.

Density Impact

Both the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* include a mix of single-family detached and single-family attached townhouse dwelling units. **Table 3.1-4** provides information for both the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* in regard to the proposed number of dwelling units (i.e., the number of homes) and related density calculations. **Table 3.1-5** provides a comparison of the current and existing density. All of the alternatives include fewer dwelling units than the maximum allowed by *TMC 13.04.240.C.1*. Generally, the proposed density of 5.56 du/ac for the PRD District with the *Proposed Action Alternative* is more similar to the 5.35 du/ac density in the existing development areas.

**Table 3.1-4
NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS AND DENSITY PER PHASE**

Types of Units	Phase	Maximum Units Allowed by Code ¹	Dwelling Units	Unit Density (units/acre)	Dwelling Units ²	Unit Density (units/acre)
Single-Family Detached Units	I	299	204	5.92	340	5.24
	III	264	162	5.34		
Townhouse Units	II	222	275	10.78	330	6.47
	IV	221	219	8.61		
TOTAL		1,006³	860	7.42	670	5.76

¹The number of units allowed in a PRD is based on the underlying zoning district, in this case R-2 (minimum lot size 5,000 sq. ft.), according to *TMC 13.04.240.C.1*.

²The number of units in the Proposed Action Alternative is estimated based on the developable land available after accounting for open space mitigation areas.

³To determine the maximum number of units allowed, the gross square footage of the proposed PRD site is divided by the minimum lot size of the zoning district. Without consideration of development phases, the gross acreage of *The Point at Northshore* (116 acres) would allow 1,009 units.

**Table 3.1-5
COMPARISON OF PRD DISTRICT DENSITY**

Existing PRD District	Existing PRD District without Golf Course	PRD District with Proposed Action	PRD District with Proposed Action Alternative
3.58 du/ac	5.35 du/ac	6.2 du/ac	5.56 du/ac

Intensity Impact

As has been previously stated, both the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* include a mix of single-family detached and single-family attached townhouse dwelling units. The development intensity varies based on these different dwelling units and their related building types. In general, the townhouse buildings (1,600 to 10,000 sq. ft.) result in more building mass than the single-family detached buildings (1,900 to 2,600 sq. ft.). Other development characteristics (e.g., lot area, lot width, setbacks) for the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* are included in **Table 3.1-6** below.

**Table 3.1-6
COMPARISON OF DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS**

DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS	PROPOSED	
	Proposed Action	Proposed Action Alternative
Single-Family Detached Lots		
Min. Average Lot Width (ft.)		50
Min. Lot Frontage (ft.)		25
Max. Height Limit (ft.)	35	35
Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	10-20	10-20
Rear	15-25	15-25
Side	5	7.5
Corner Lot Side	10	10
Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	3,600	5,000
Average Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	4,944	---
Townhouse Lots		
Min. Average Lot Width (ft.)		16
Min. Lot Frontage (ft.)		16
Max. Height Limit (ft.)	35	35
Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front	10-20	10-20
Rear	15-25	15-25
Side	5	7.5 ¹
Corner Lot Side	10	10
Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	1,740	1,500
Average Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	2,893	---
¹ A minimum separation distance of 15 feet is required between detached buildings in a PRD district; therefore a setback of at least 7.5 feet is required from building face to lot line. See TMC 13.06.140(F)(1).		

3.1.A.3 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

No adverse impact to land use compatibility, including plans and regulations, or aesthetics is projected to result from the *No Action Alternative*. The existing 18-hole golf course and related uses are consistent with the City’s plans and regulations. The existing 18-hole golf course provides open space and views. The open space and views would remain unchanged, except as may be potentially modified by maintenance and growth of existing vegetation in the immediately adjacent development areas or as may be potentially modified due to changes in

the golf course operation. Future market demand, financial considerations, and economic viability which may affect the operation of the course are not considered and are not evaluated under the *No Action Alternative*.

3.1.B Aesthetics

3.1.B.1 Affected Environment

Current use of the proposed *The Point at Northshore* site is golf course, recreation, and open space. This use was originally approved as part of the 1981 “R-2 PRD” rezoning of the site. Except for Division 1 located adjacent to the southwestern portion of the golf course, the existing adjacent residential development was developed as part of the “R-2 PRD” rezone, with orientation that took into consideration the site elevation, golf course, and open space design that is now proposed for development. Homes surrounding the golf course have been built and purchased with the expectation of continued golf course views and/or golf course frontage. However, in the recent Pierce County Superior Court litigation, a group of adjacent homeowners’ claim to a third party beneficiary or other equitable right to restrict the use of the golf course was rejected by the Superior Court Judge. The homeowners have appealed a portion of the Superior Court ruling. However, a Court of Appeals decision is not likely before the City takes action on the Proponent’s applications.

The residents in the immediate vicinity of the project site enjoy territorial views of the existing 18-hole golf course, which is generally situated at a lower elevation than the existing homes surrounding it. The golf course is currently vegetated with a variety of mature coniferous and deciduous trees and provides a large open space area that visually enhances those properties that abut and surround it. Some of these homes, while enjoying a territorial view of the golf course, also enjoy some scenic views of the Cascade Mountains to the east, Mount Rainier to the southeast, and views of the Port of Tacoma to the south.

Figure 3.1-1 and **Figure 3.1-2**, and **Appendix E** show the existing characteristics of the golf course site and the development adjacent to the golf course. **Figure 3.1-3** through **Figure 3.1-14** provide photographic information of the affected environment. The locations for the photographs were selected to provide the best comprehensive representations of the variety of views, including views from adjacent properties, views of the proposed development site, and views across the site to more distant viewpoints, such as the Cascade Mountains and Mount Rainier.

3.1.B.2 Impacts of the Proposed Action and the Proposed Action Alternative

The *Proposed Action* assumes development of the entire *The Point at Northshore* site (i.e., the existing golf course), with final buildout consisting of 860 new single-family dwelling units (366 detached single-family units and 494 attached townhouse units). Full development is projected to occur over a six-year timeframe, commencing in 2009. Using 3-D model information, **Figure 3.1-16** through **Figure 3.1-39**, and **Appendix B** show the existing land use characteristics (i.e., *No Action Alternative*) and the potential impacts of the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative*. **Appendix B** also includes further information regarding the assumptions utilized for creating the 3-D model, including topography, building massing and vegetation growth. Existing trees were located according to an aerial map. The variety and size of the

existing trees were also estimated using the aerial image. The locations for the video pathways and view snapshots were selected to provide the best comprehensive representations of the variety of views, including views from adjacent properties, of the proposed development site, and across the site to more distant viewpoints, such as the Cascade Mountains and Mount Rainier. **Appendix E** provides a summary of the nature of the impacts related to the *Proposed Action* and *Proposed Action Alternative* (e.g., type of housing proposed in relation to existing housing; building massing, proximity, and setbacks; changes in views; changes in topography; changes in landscaping, etc.).

3.1.B.3 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

No adverse impact to Aesthetics is projected to result from the *No Action Alternative*. The existing 18-hole golf course provides open space and views. The open space and views would remain unchanged, except as may be potentially modified by maintenance and growth of existing vegetation in the immediately adjacent development areas or as may be potentially modified due to changes in the golf course operation. Future market demand, financial considerations, and economic viability which may affect the operation of the course are not considered and are not evaluated under the *No Action Alternative*.

3.1.2 Mitigation Measures

Proposed Action

As provided under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the *TMC*, it has been determined that the proposed development will have significant adverse impact on Land Use Compatibility and Aesthetics and, therefore, the following mitigation is required:

1. Prior to or concurrent with engineering plans for the first phase of development, the Proponent shall provide revised development plans for the entire site that demonstrate the ability to provide the minimum required usable open space.
2. As described in **Figure 3.1-40**, Transition Zone Mitigation, the Proponent will be required to designate open space transition zones for the areas of the proposed development that will abut the existing property. As applicable, these areas shall be designated for a mix of public recreational tracts with associated landscaping or private landscaping tracts. Pursuant to subdivision and platting standards of *TMC* 13.04.260, the Proponent shall include notes on the face of the Final Plat that create perpetual restrictive covenants, stating that these tracts shall be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association and reserved exclusively for public recreational purposes, with associated landscaping, or private landscaping purposes.
3. As described in **Figure 3.1-40**, Transition Zone Mitigation, the Proponent will be required to retain existing evergreen trees and associated understory vegetation in many of the open space transition zone areas. This tree retention may require site design modifications, including but not limited to: relocating and/or eliminating buildings and other site improvements, wider open space transition zones, and changes in site grading, and infrastructure design.
4. As described in **Figure 3.1-40**, Transition Zone Mitigation, the Proponent will be required to install landscaping in many of the open space transition zone areas. This landscaping (“Visual Screen” or “Filtered Screen”) may require site design modifications, including but not limited to: relocating and/or eliminating buildings and

other site improvements, wider open space transition zones, and changes in site grading and infrastructure design.

A. Filtered Screen – Provides Visual Separation

- (1) A mix of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs spaced to create a filtered screen.
- (2) At least 50% deciduous trees spaced no more than 20 feet on center (2-inch caliper at planting).
- (3) At least 30% evergreen trees spaced no more than 15 feet on center (minimum 6 feet tall at planting).
- (4) A mix of evergreen and deciduous shrubs that achieve a height of 6 feet within 3 years, spaced no more than 5 feet apart.
- (5) Groundcover that achieves full coverage within 3 years.

B. Visual Screen – Softens the Appearance of Parking Areas and Building Facades

- (1) A mix of evergreen and deciduous trees spaced to create a continuous canopy.
- (2) At least 70% deciduous trees spaced no more than 25 feet on center (2-inch caliper at planting).
- (3) A mix of evergreen and deciduous shrubs that do not exceed a height of 4 feet at maturity, spaced no more than 4 feet apart.
- (4) Groundcover that achieves full coverage within 3 years.

5. Prior to approval of engineering drawings, a final landscaping plan showing the location and type of proposed and required landscaping shall be submitted to and approved by the City. The landscape plans shall identify the surveyed location of trees to be retained and the provision of a tree protection note for protection for the Critical Root Zone (CRZ) of trees to be retained. The CRZ of a tree is generally described as an area equal to a 1-foot radius for every 1-inch diameter of tree. This plan shall also include all: rights-of-way, parks and recreation tracts, stormwater tracts, and open space transition area tracts. All final landscape plans shall conform to the requirements of *TMC* 13.06.502.A, Planting Requirements, and shall include the following minimum requirements:

A. Rights-of-Way (Public and Private)

- (1) Street trees, a minimum 2-inch caliper, shall be installed at a ratio of 3 per every 100 feet of lineal street frontage for all public and private access streets greater than 40 feet in right-of-way width, unless otherwise specified (see Transportation mitigation). Trees planted within 10 feet of such access ways or property line boundary are considered street trees for the purposes of this requirement.

B. Parks and Recreation Tracts

- (1) The southeasterly entrance, from 33rd Street NE, to the proposed development shall include a prominent water feature which clearly highlights the entrance to the development. This water feature shall be installed on either the easterly or westerly side of the south entrance, as depicted by Thomas V. Rengstorf Associates in **Figure 3.2-4**.

- (2) Trail marker signs, delineating the access points to the non-motorized trail system, shall be installed on all trails.
 - (3) Benches and picnic tables shall be distributed among the community picnic and active recreation play areas.
 - (4) High quality, vinyl, minimum two-rail fencing shall be installed around community picnic and active recreation play areas, such as play structures and sport courts.
6. Pedestrian facilities, common recreation facilities and stormwater drainage facilities may be allowed in the required open space transition zones without requiring additional buffer area, provided the intent of the buffer is met and the function of the facilities is not compromised.
 7. The existing stormwater drainage ponds that are proposed to be relocated and/or reconfigured shall be incorporated into the site design as an amenity and located in and/or adjacent to the perimeter of the site to provide for separation of the proposed residential development from existing uses. Stormwater ponds shall be attractively landscaped and integrated into the site design in the final design plan. "Stormwater ponds" do not include Joe's Creek, Wetland #1, and Wetland #2.

Proposed Action Alternative

Mitigation would partially be incorporated into the design as a result of the open space transition areas (i.e., the provision of open space transition areas as described in **Figure 3.1-40**, Transition Zone Mitigation) and lower overall dwelling units based on the different development characteristics (i.e., the density and intensity characteristics described in **Tables 3.1.4 and 3.1.6**). All mitigation measures of the *Proposed Action* would also be required for the *Proposed Action Alternative*.

3.1.3 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Significant unavoidable adverse impacts to *Land Use Compatibility and Aesthetics* are anticipated as a result of *The Point at Northshore*. The impacts will vary based on the final location of the various elements of the development (i.e., location and types of buildings; location and amenities within open space areas; landscaping and street trees; location of infrastructure, such as roads and stormwater ponds). Mitigation with the open space transition zones described above will reduce, but not eliminate the level of significance of these unavoidable adverse impacts.