

Housing Outreach Feedback – June 2014

Housing Focus Groups

The following questions were presented to participants of the June 2014 Housing Focus Groups during a small group break out session. Below each question is a summary of responses received by community members during these sessions.

PLEASE NOTE: Items with an asterisk (*) were mentioned by more than one small group. The number of asterisks equates to the number of small groups that mentioned the subject.

1) What housing will you need in the future that doesn't currently exist?

- a. Housing types/qualities, in general:
 - i. Accessory Dwelling Units
 - ii. Senior housing**; active living communities
 - Note: some felt the city has enough senior housing
 - iii. Affordable housing **
 - iv. Multi-unit housing
 - v. Urban mid-rise housing
 - vi. Condominiums with access to services
 - vii. More HUD homes – only 22 in the City
 - viii. Rentals
 - More affordable rentals
 - More rental options
 - ix. More smaller complexes
 - x. In general, more diverse housing options/choices; reconnect community
 - xi. Housing needs to be within walkable distance to services
 - Access to transportation, amenities, and closer to the city core
 - Closer to transportation to make better connections to regional transportation opportunities
- b. Housing specific to age groups or special needs:
 - i. Affordable for young adults (people in their 20s) **
 - Small housing/small lots near parks
 - Cottage housing **
 - Townhomes, mixed housing
 - Transitional homes
 - ii. Transitional homes for elders or disabled – not nursing homes, but independent living within walking distance and sufficient space
 - iii. Transitional housing from homelessness
 - iv. Affordable homes for families that want to invest in the community

2) What type of housing would you like to see more of (for you or in general)?

- a. Housing types:
 - i. Senior housing***
 - ii. Affordable housing for young families/people

- Younger generation and graduating students need housing
 - iii. Affordable housing in general
 - iv. Homeless shelters, small rentals (lack of public showers for homeless)
 - v. Condominiums
 - Current condos are antiquated; should be corrected.
 - vi. Apartments: less units in one area/building
- b. Neighborhood Character Qualities:
 - i. Walkable neighborhoods **
 - ii. Access to services (close to destinations/community interaction)***
 - Increase transit, downtown access
 - iii. Higher density near Central Business District (CBD) ***
- c. Other:
 - i. Encourage economic development
 - New housing for employers (i.e. housing for young adults)
 - ii. Homeowner Associations (HOAs)
 - iii. People should be able to live in the city's core

3) Name or describe a neighborhood you like – in Puyallup or elsewhere.

- a. Puyallup:
 - i. Northeast Puyallup area
 - ii. Southeast portion of Puyallup (good ambiance, walkability, mixed use)
 - iii. Peach Tree Lane area
 - iv.
- b. Elsewhere:
 - i. University Place
 - ii. Downtown Orting (easy access, trails, biking)
 - iii. Seattle's University District
 - iv. Queen Anne, Seattle (transit services, small-scale commercial)
 - v. Bellingham (walkable buses are accessible, amenities (restaurants, parks, etc), and people are outside and active)
 - vi. Redmond
 - vii. 79th and Canyon – miss traffic, but lacking amenities (i.e. childcare)
 - viii. Not Bonney Lake
 - ix. Bay Point in CA (grid, small enough, cohesive)
 - x. Boise (street fairs, sense of community, coffee shops, etc.)
- c. Desirable Neighborhood Qualities:
 - i. Diverse neighborhoods (mix of age, income, size) **
 - ii. Access to amenities/ services (parks, stores)
 - All should have access to these, rich or poor
 - iii. Downtown feel **
 - iv. Place for children to play (esp. age 10-12+)
 - v. Quality of life
 - neighborhoods that generate foot traffic
 - farmers markets
 - vi. Greater sense of community and opportunities to engage
 - vii. Neighborhood cohesiveness
 - viii. Houses downtown

4) Discussion: neighborhood layout (street layout, building orientation, amenities, etc).

- a. Street layout:
 - i. Grid pattern
 - ii. Grid with park inside
 - iii. Good connections of roads (i.e. for efficient fire/police access)
 - iv. Cul-de-sac neighborhoods; favored by some, but not all:
 - These neighborhoods create security for families
 - These neighborhoods create isolation and decrease public involvement
 - No cul-de-sacs **
- b. Amenities:
 - i. Sidewalks, walking paths, pedestrian connectivity, walkability *****
 - ii. Pocket parks, gardening options, connecting people with their neighbors **
 - iii. Ma and pop stores **
 - iv. Small convenience stores near neighborhoods for better access **
 - Grocery stores, coffee shops, small-scale
 - v. More access points to schools (encourage multiple modes of transportation to schools)
 - vi. More open space and residential links to open space; green belts
 - vii. Neighborhoods should be closer to amenities
 - viii. Transit access
- c. Other:
 - i. Mixed neighborhoods with different housing types yet make sure they are compatible
 - ii. Smaller lots to appeal to younger families (more people and community interaction)
 - iii. Keep the community character the same but provide more amenities (such as train services)
 - iv. Create cohesiveness, “together-ness”
 - v. Community should increase relationships
 - vi. Shared responsibility
 - vii. Front porches

5) What level of zoning flexibility are you comfortable with (variety of housing types, neighborhood retail)?

- a. Elements of zoning people are comfortable with:
 - i. Design standards – compatibility with neighborhood size and uses
 - ii. Bulk and scale
 - iii. aesthetics
 - iv. Mixed use and higher density*
 - v. Single family residential
 - vi. Neighborhood diversity
 - vii. Apartments near services
 - viii. Ask what the specific neighborhood wants
 - ix. Integrate housing architecture with types of uses
 - x. Increase flexibility

- xi. Flexibility shows forward motion and is a good thing.
 - Flexibility in zoning is acceptable if well thought out
- b. Elements of zoning people are not comfortable with:
 - i. Demolishing single-family houses to replace with multi-unit complexes in downtown
 - ii. Some preferred no flexibility – especially for restaurants in residential areas because of the lack of potential business, would eventually become a problem; suggested solutions for this scenario:
 - Suggest multiple businesses in a small complex
 - Smaller grocery stores should do well for business and community

6) What should the city do to increase housing variety (including affordable housing) – require/incentivize/market driven?

- a. Market driven response to housing variety seems too late at this point.
 - i. There should be a market strategy that is not market driven
- b. Incentivize affordable housing:**
 - i. Mix of incentives – driven by design standards **
 - ii. Incentives, community ‘come together’ to convince developers that there are enough people to buy affordable housing
 - Strategize how to create affordable housing and don’t rely on just incentives
 - iii. If affordable housing is ‘incentivized’ and not ‘mandated’, City should monitor if incentives are working and be prepared to take more direct measures to ensure availability of affordable housing meets the demand of local households below Area Median Income (AMI).
 - iv. Incentive driving housing for new, displaced homeless; possibly tax incentive if renting to lower income below market rate
- c. Require affordable housing:
 - i. Inclusionary housing: design is key**
 - Portland examples discussed
- d. Other Comments/Ideas:
 - i. Consider an economic strategy
 - ii. Require and incentivize housing variety
 - iii. Golden givens - habitat for humanity
 - iv. Community support architecturally and socially is important
 - v. Help with costs for low-income families
 - vi. Economically diverse
 - vii. Subsidized/Section 8 housing for homeless:
 - Housing First program: this program has shown that when people using substances get housing it helps them stop using.
 - Locations near existing services and bus lines
 - a. Not in center of neighborhoods
 - b. Old mill homes around Pioneer convert to cottage housing?
 - Ask the homeless what they want

- a. Most of them grew up, went to school, lived and worked here. The recession has increased homelessness.

Additional Comments from Focus Group Participants:

- “As a young adult I am content with most areas of Puyallup. However, working in a ‘WalMart’ area (as in this is 1 block away) doesn’t make a good environment for me. My apartment complex holds bad people; and in return issues arise outside of the store by me. Better housing is too far from shopping, food, doctors, work, etc. “
- “Everyone hates traffic but can’t get out of their cars.”

Online Housing Comments

During the months of May and June 2014, community members had the opportunity to provide comments regarding housing through a comment field available on the project webpage. Comments received are as follows:

- “More affordable multifamily housing near downtown.”
- “As my husband and I look to downsize, we find limited options in the City of Puyallup. The availability of condos are very limited and single story homes with small lots are rare and at a premium. We would encourage condo/duplex/single story communities that are close to amenities.”
- “We have enough affordable housing, what we need is upper class homes to attract new talent. More affordable housing attracts more criminals. Pretty simple.”
- "South Hill Puyallup has been inundated with ugly housing developments...cheaply-made homes sited only a few feet apart, and low-income apartments...and many in areas which were previously cherished wild, open spaces. Downtown has fared little better. As you can imagine, the influx of non-working residents into Puyallup (in the past 25 years that we have lived here) has dramatically changed the character of our small city for the worse. I'm seeing gang tags routinely now and unsupervised teens misbehaving in the parks. If I were to vote regarding housing here in my community, my vote would be for a moratorium on developments of all kinds, but especially apartments. Owner-built homes would be the priority for our area.”
- “We need more small housing that's affordable for small families and single parents. I find it hard to live in the Ballou/Rogers zoning area with my 2 children. Housing in that area is more expensive then say on the east side of Meridian. I had to move because I couldn't afford to live within walking distance of those two schools any longer.”
- “Our local churches are "inviting" homeless from all over the county by their programs. I have been told some of the "pastors" of these churches don't even live in Puyallup. Everyone can see the amount of homeless in the city has increased to an alarming level from their programs. Please don't let Puyallup become the "Mecca" for homeless.”
- "I am a senior citizen living just a couple of blocks west of the city limits (have been here 37 years). I very much want to stay in this area but cannot much longer maintain a

home my size. I am very interested in the establishment of a continuing care retirement community in our area. I am very supportive of the Wesley Homes Bradley Park proposal because of it being comprehensive, non-profit and faith based. I hope the city will also be supportive of that development. We need senior housing that can accommodate a variety of needs, plus be close to local businesses and transportation.”