January 4, 2016

For the past month, staff have been sorting, coding, and organizing the feedback received about the Draft Plan. During the five-month comment period, people had several options to share their thoughts, including email, mail, website comment box, Facebook, Twitter, and the Consider IT online community conversation and survey. The 430 attendees at open houses in October and November had the option to fill out a survey, record comments on easel pads and sticky notes, and access to iPads to log comments online. All of that input is being gathered and organized in a single database.

Staff continue to review and synthesis of all that input. This document contains verbatim comments received from the options listed above. Additional public feedback about the Draft Plan is posted on our website (2305.seattle.gov), including a packet of letters received from 41 stakeholder organizations and results of the survey on the 10 key proposals. Although closed to new comments, the Consider IT online community conversation is archived and still available for viewing.

A Community Engagement Progress Report summarizing all the activities and feedback for 2015 will be coming in January. Look for the release of the Mayor's Plan and the Final EIS, and Final Equity Analysis in March or April of 2016.

Date: 07/08/2015

Name: Roger Pence

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I've scanned all the documents released today -- summary, plan, and appendices -- and can find no maps of the urban villages, particularly the urban villages that the plan proposes for expansion.
I need a good useable map of the North Beacon Hill Urban Village, showing both current boundaries and the proposed expanded boundaries.
Thank you
-Roger Pence-
Seattle/Beacon Hill

Date: 07/08/2015

Name: Alejandro Astudius

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

What Seattle needs is a space for center parks to room around for pullie, because we are already loaded with big buildings and no more park, most especially for seniors and retired people.

Date: 07/09/2015

Name: Donna Seo

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Hello,
My name is Donna, and I'm currently working on gathering data on Seattle' Urban Growth.
Do you mind answering some of these questions?
· I was wondering if Amazon's planned expansion is going to play a huge factor into your planning.
· Are your projections for an increase in jobs and housing units including Amazon's new employees?
· Will Amazon be making any sort of monetary contributions to Seattle's plans? If so, how much, and what will their contributions be used for?
· How many of the people moving into Seattle's new housing units are Amazon employees?
I hope to hear back soon! Thank you for your time!
Best,
Donna Seo
Visual Design Intern, frog

Date: 07/09/2015

Name: William Gohde

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

Hello Draft Plan Authors,

On the whole, the plan is constructive. It does read like a fairytale…all sweetness and light, but lacking.

Without taking to task everything covered, I'll focus on just one issue:. The idea of moving multi-story structures into single family neighborhoods threatens the very reason people are living there. People move out of the city to avoid congestion - and I'm not talking about cars. I am not against sensitive development that takes into account the integrity of neighborhoods. Unfortunately, this has not happened in West Seattle, where massive development is currently underway. Not only are the structures brazenly oversize, they are cookie cutter designs. Having sat through various presentations, I have yet to hear from any of the architects say how proud they were of their structures. All have that bland, vanilla, total lack-of-character, look. God knows how they will look like five years hence. Having lived in Chicago, I have a good idea. They are effectively destroying a community. What has replaced people-sized structures are stone monoliths that effectively cut out the sunlight, channel the wind, and are anything but warm or inviting. It's interesting to note, the developers and designers of these structures don't live here and have no shown little regard to what might compliment the village feel. And now the city is thinking about spreading this malaise into neighborhoods, the place people have fled to get away from the congestion of the city. Ironically, it is the neighborhoods of Seattle that have made the city so liveable.

Moreover, most buildings under construction (West Seattle is a prime example, as is Ballard) have conveniently been given a waiver (by the city) to bypass the need to provide adequate parking. I find this exceedingly interesting, since Metro has cut routes forcing people to drive and park near bus stops. (In the Junction you will find cars parked everywhere – due to cut back on Metro routes, people are forced to drive.) I fail see the rationale used by developers that people living in their new edifices don't need cars. This is based on what - wishful thinking? No, it’s an economic motive. No garage, less cost to them. Follow the money…

Let’s suppose a person wants to go to visit friends in Bellevue. Or a job requires someone living in West Seattle to go to Ballard. Any idea how long that would take? Or is it even feasible? What about someone who has a business meeting in Burien or White Center? The construction worker who has to go to his job site? The trades people, the waitperson, the person working at Starbucks, the Macy's salesperson - anyone who lives where there is no bus service available - or reachable - unless they have a car. I just returned from a client meet this morning. There was no way to get there without using my car. The idea of everyone taking public transportation is a pipe dream. People still need their cars…for emergencies, birthday, going out for dinner, the theatre, on a date, etc. (Incidentally, bus stops at night are not the place to be. And while bicycle lanes are good, bikers constitute a minute portion of those going to work.) I'm not promoting cars, but one has to recognize their validity as a means of getting around - especially here.

Seattle has conveniently ignored mass public transportation for years. The need is now finally recognized. The city is paying the price - actually homeowners are - again – asked to pay the price. Interestingly, developers and contractors have been conveniently omitted in the plan for raising transportation monies. Small wonder, since they sit on the committee. It reminds me of the fox-in-the-chicken-coup analogy. Incidentally, everyone (no exaggeration) I've talked to is dead set against having their real estate taxes increased. If you check, homeowners are already footing the bill for a large

number of projects - parks, schools, etc. Homeowners are not a bank from which the city can draw from whenever it needs cash...which seems to be a never ending need. What I find interesting, is your plan totally ignores the question of how can the city save money instead of spending more.

In conclusion: While the overall study of where we would like to see Seattle in 15-20 years is noble, I find it incredible that the very city government that has failed to address current issues is trying to address the future. Seattle's current track record is weak - the Bertha snafu, the homeless issue, the lack of light rail, the Seattle Public School funding problem, crime, and I could go on. It's nice to think about what our needs may be tomorrow, but let's focus on today as well.

One last comment: I noted that the Urban Villages are singled out as employment centers. And this is based on what jobs?

Thanks for allowing me to sound off. I still love the city. Your efforts are laudable, but more work definitely needs to be done.

Sincerely,

Bill Gohde

Date: 07/10/2015

Name: Judith Hance

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

The city needs to coordinate with Metro regarding this aspect of the plan. Metro's current plan will eliminate my access to such transportation.Route #71 is my only choice, and it is scheduled to be eliminated in 2016. Apparently city planners are not talking to Metro.
I am 80 years old. I do not bike on city streets, and do not know how long I will be able to drive. I have planned to stay in my house for the rest of my life. I will have to drive and park on the street in NE Seattle in order to get to public transportation, and the plan calls for parking to be eliminated on many streets.
I realize I am in an age minority, but I have been paying Property taxes since 1991. Don't old folks and physically handicapped deserve to be able to get to church, library, and shopping?

Date: 07/13/2015

Name: Kathryn Klunk

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Hello,
I was reading the article on the King 5 website about potential improvements of problematic intersections and wanted to submit a suggestion. The intersection of Ninth and James, leaving Harborview Medical Center can be quite challenging during peak hours. Much of the traffic is attempting to turn left onto James to access I-5 and the left turn lane backs up and also impedes the four way stop in front of the hospital. The turn arrow is rather short and the traffic traveling down James,

unfortunately, "blocks the box" when their light turns red so at times only one or even not a single car can make the turn during the green turn arrow. I'd love to see some improved timing of lights or some sort of way to keep the folks from blocking the intersection to allow better flow. Thanks!

Date: 07/14/2015

Name: Leon Park

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

My driving time could frequently be cut in half if every light would not turn red as I approach them.

Date: 07/14/2015

Name: Scott Dearden

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

My plan would eliminate all trafffic congestion during peak morning and evening drive times by over 50% IMMEDIATELY...As well as making the D.O.T millions in revenue annually.Seeing other cities would almost certainly implement this very basic idea I would like to have some sort of recognition and not just have this idea stolen...Please advise what forum woukd be appropriate to submit...
Sincerely,
Scott

Date: 07/14/2015

Name: Dana Spencer

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I'm confused - on the map of 'Distributing Growth' I see:
A new residential urban village is
proposed around the North Link 130th
Street Station.
However, the station is planned to be 145th - please let me know if/how this info will get corrected and back in sync with our regional planning partners.
Thanks.
Dana Spencer

Date: 07/14/2015

Name: Ann Stevens

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I am one of two volunteer forest stewards in Ravenna Park. We also work in Cowen. We have been doing forest restoration in the parks for over 10 years. Why are Cowen Park and a big part of Ravenna

Park proposed to be added to the urban village that surrounds the future light rail station? Most of this area is currently managed as natural area and I need to know if you are contemplating changing this. Ann Stevens
--
[10/21/15]
As you can see, I sent this question back in July and have never gotten a reply. Can you tell me where to direct the question to get a response? Ann Stevens
--
[11/2/15]
i just looked at the map again on the website. The boundary bumps out to include Ravenna Park to 20th Ave. This is NOT a boundary based on 10 minute walk or it would not bump out like that. And, the line bumps in to avoid any of green lake park. So I still need an explanation that makes sense as to why the map is drawn to include a big part of Ravenna Park. Ann Stevens
--
[11/6/15]
I have a conflict with the meeting in my area or I would come. How else can I get my questions answered? Ann Stevens
--
[11/19/15]
Wow.that gives me one day to comment now that I have some idea why the boundary goes where it does. Can you point me to where the plan tells the implications of land being within the boundary? Ann

Date: 07/15/2015

Name: Lori Bjorklund

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

I've read certain sections of the plan, but I seem to only have found policies, not actual plans. Is there another document that addresses the plans for helping alleviate transportion congestion, is there a plan in existance with local utilities for somee of the policies set forth in the land use section, are there any plans to partner with railway companies to utilize track on the west side of the city to alleviate the parking lot that is now 15th Ave W?
If you could show me the corresponding plans that accompany the policies, I would appreciate it.
Thank you,
Lori Bjorklund

Date: 07/15/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

"Seattle 2035 is a citywide conversation" is bull! The media has now leaked the Mayor's stealth plan to do away with single family zoning, you should be ashamed helping support the destruction of people's lives and neighborhoods.

Date: 07/15/2015

Name: Katie

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

I know it's a small piece of the puzzle and I am of no means educated to make suggestions but I've always wondered why we do not have all way diagonal pedestrian crossing downtown.
There are so many pedestrians and it makes it impossible to move anywhere during congested times due to the fact that you are unable to turn on your green due to crossing pedestrians.
Just a thought....

Date: 07/16/2015

Name: Theresa Lourde

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

I have many concerns about the plan beginning with who was on the committee that drew it up. It's great the developers and low-income housing advocates got a voice, but what about middle income residents.
I firmly believe that parking should be included with housing. Most people in the city have a car. Families need cars. Have you ever had a young child have an accident or get sick quickly and you need to make it to the hospital/emergency room? Mass transit/taxis don't cut it. My experience has been that people who don't own cars spend a lot of time getting rides from people who do own cars. It's like vaccines. The reason they can get by without a car is because they have friends/family who own cars.
I am against getting rid of single-family zoning. I know the plan would say that we are not getting rid of single family zoning that it is just being modified. That is not the case. Changing zoning to include triplexes, duplexes, and mother-in-laws definitely will change the character of the neighborhoods in Seattle in middle-income areas. People who own property in the wealthier parts (View Ridge, Wedgewood, etc.) of the city won't have an issue, but people who own property in the less wealthy sections of town such as Greenwood and Crown Hill will lose their neighborhoods to growth.
I don't have a problem with increasing apartment buildings on the arterials. There has been a lot of development, but moving that development into single family zones makes our neighborhood less livable.
I was open to the idea of mother-in-laws until I read the details. The current plan discusses having premade plans that builders could use so they could get their permit quicker. It mentions things like modular units. A modular unit house was built a block from our house. It is another one of those ugly, cube buildings that does not fit in with the architecture or neighborhood character. I saw that the proposal is that the owner will not to need to live on the property of a mother-in-law. I envision ugly, modular buildings slapped down on rental property where the owner is only focusing on how much money they can make. Historically there have always been mother-in-law housing (legal and illegal). This housing, for the most part, has fit in with the neighborhood and allowed for reasonable rents and a way for the owner to make some income. The owner had a vested interest (usually) to make the housing attractive enough because they were living there too. Removing this requirement change
s all of the incentives. Now the only incentive is to make money, forget about the neighborhood.
Finally, micro-pod housing. I don't support where it is currently zoned to be built. I know that there has been a lot of discussion about it. Recently there were changes made in the requirements to build micro-pod housing. The proposal suggests going back and loosening the requirements. I strongly disagree.

Date: 07/17/2015

Name: Julie Jackson

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

I have commuted to downtown Seattle for 35 years, and the exits off Mercer (Express Lane) and Union (regular lanes) have become dangerously congested.
The Mercer express lane exit backs up for blocks, because of the increased volume to that area; the Stewart Street exit backs up for blocks, because South Lake Union workers don't like the Mercer exit so are now exiting at Stewart and then heading north); and the left express lane (rejoining the regular lanes of I-5) also backs up for blocks, meaning just the one center express lane theoretically continues to flow. People do everything to get around this giant mess, mostly using the center lane to speed up and then cut into exiting traffic lines, often stopping the entire center lane (the only lane that SHOULD be moving) while they try to cut into an exit lane. They also bypass the entire Stewart exit line and then cut over from the center lane at the last minute to exit at Stewart, essentially creating a third exit lane there. I reported this to the State Patrol, but nothing has been done....and it is extremely frustrating to sit in a long line every day and watch that happen every
few minutes.
Not only that, I was in a REALLY bad accident at the Stewart Street exit in October 2013, caused by someone going 70 mpg rear-ending me while I was stopped for the Stewart exit. From the damage to my car and the scenario, I am convinced that he was driving fast down the center lane, someone pulled out or stopped, and he swerved to the right lane and crashed into me.
Why do they not at least put barricades to the left lane of the Stewart exit, so that people can't cut over from the center lane and squeeze in to exit.
Also, when you exit at Union, cars turn left into a garage, come out from under the convention center, and turn right to go to uptown (often for conventions). Most of these people don't know what they're doing, and they literally STOP when they first come out of the Union exit, meaning all the traffic backs up onto the exit. I don't know how many times I've been in a line waiting to exit only to round the corner of the exit and find no traffic...or more likely one car STOPPED in the middle of it all trying to get into the right lane, while those cars coming under the convention center into the right lane try to exit left. This is ridiculous.
There are many other problem areas in Seattle, but with these situations, just one or two cars can essentially affect the commutes of THOUSANDS of workers...and that's not right.
Julie Jackson

Date: 07/18/2015

Name: Paul Munz

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Thank you for reaching out to Seattle to receive comments and observations about the HALA Committee's recommendations to Mayor Murray. I would very much value the opportunity to talk with City of Seattle Senior Staff or any member of the HALA committee to fully express my deep and significant knowledge and observations about life in Seattle in 2015 and visions for the next 20 years. As such, I am providing a short bullet point set of comments to facilitate your understanding of how this Plan has created a sense of frustration among myself and many citizens of Seattle. I submit the follow

important comments, as observations, experience and personal thoughts:
1) Composition of the HALA committee: I am truly shocked that the city has allowed a committee (represented largely by contractors, developers and architects) the power to develop this 20 year vision of the future of Seattle. This committee composition does not even come close to passing the red-face test regarding reasonableness.
2) Current Density in Seattle: I live close to existing urban density clusters (residential urban villages) and travel through these fast growing areas multiple times each day. I own a car, but walk or use a bus to go just about everywhere. Since 2010, the fast growth and increase in high-density development has already had a real impact on my commuting life. Buses are always full - Metro has no ability to budget and physically handle the large number of new residents that are now starting to fill into the new Capital Hill buildings. I love our new light-rail and use it whenever possible, but I am very concerned that our expanding light-rail capacity is significantly insufficient to handle growth even in the short-term (next 5 years). I very much worry about totally packed light-rail cars becoming a reality before too long.
And...our major congestion point of light-rail is our downtown tunnel corridor. So, how do we integrate the HALA recommendations with our current transportation reality and then project forward 20 years?
3) HALA Recommendations to Create Lower Housing Costs: I wish that I did not have to say this, but the recommendation to add 10,000 new housing units over the next ten years to create opportunities to relieve the city's housing affordability problem will just not happen. As an example, during the last four years, the city has seen a tremendous number of new rental units added to the city's housing inventory and monthly rental costs have continued to rise during this entire period. And, the expectation is that this will continue. This is an indication of the national and, increasing world view, that Seattle is a desirable location to live and work. Even if the city responds with tools to try to keep housing costs stable or affordable, it will not be the reality - housing costs will continue to increase. The clear winners in this will be builders, developers and designers and not the rest of Seattle's citizens.
4) Respect for Seattle's Neighborhoods: the HALA committee recommendations come at time when many hard working people, who have been quiet during recent years, have become more uncomfortable with the quality of life in Seattle. We feel we have lost control and that the city is being manipulated by contractors and developers who are only motivated by profit - parties that do not feel a responsibility to take care of our neighborhoods and Seattle.
Please reflect, slow down and respect us. We do have vision...as much as you. You have not asked us to work to develop that reality for Seattle during the next 20 years. I have many ideas, recommendations and experiences...
Paul Munz

Date: 07/21/2015

Name: Sylvia Schweinberger

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use

Comment:

I am for relaxing the requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units to allow homeowners to rent them even when the homeowner does not live in the home.
But please do not confuse the definition of Single Family Zoning by adding housing types that are currently classified Multi-Family to the Single Family Zoning classification.
By this I mean, duplexes, triplexes, rowhouses and stacked flats should not be added to the definition of Single Family Zoning.
There is a place for multi-family housing and it has been done well. That place is on land that has been zoned Multi-Family.

Duplexes, Triplexes, Rowhouses and Stacked flats have different parking requirements, different requirements for the percentage of land that can be covered on a lot, and different requirements for electricity, gas lines, water and sewer lines and parking than Single Family Homes. They are in a different category for a reason and should remain that way.
Multi-family housing needs more oversight during construction to ensure that infrastructure can support it, including design review, traffic impact studies, environmental impact studies. These are not provided for under Single Family Zoning laws.
If you change the Single Family Zoning definition it will be difficult if not impossible to bring the required infrastructure randomly to supply developments all over the city. It is much easier to do this by slowly expanding multifamily zones so that utility pipes can be large entering a mult-family zone to provide enough water and natural gas to all housing.
No only that, allowing Builders to build multi-family housing on any property they wish is essentially allowing builders to plan the city in a random unorganized fashion.
This cities neighborhoods are valuable. They are the reasons people want to come here and live here. And they should be preserved. They can be preserved if we stick with the zoning system we have today and slowly increase the size of multi-family zones. You don't need to radically and randomly redefine Single Family Zoning. You need a comprehensive plan that doesn't just destroy what people value most about Seattle.

Date: 07/21/2015

Name: Rance Dewitt

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

GO ASK THE ONLY ONE WHO KNOWS..... https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJkaLFGFSgE

Date: 07/21/2015

Name: Rance Dewitt

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Buy locally within the state for open air markets... (aquaponics- coming to Ellensburg @ my site WWW.EAGLENEST.

Date: 07/24/2015

Name: Anon Anon553

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Seattle’s founding fathers did not foresee the need for off-leash areas. We now know that in order to have well-behaved dogs it is essential that we give our dogs adequate, regular exercise, socialization and training. In an urban setting this is difficult. Many dog breeds were selectively bred for stamina and running. It is impossible to keep up with many dogs on leash even at a trot, so off-leash areas are the only feasible way to enable city dwellers to exercise their dogs on a regular basis. This is a public safety issue that concerns everyone.

The trouble with Seattle's many off-leash areas so far is that they are configured like corrals. Putting dogs that don't know each other into a corral together is a recipe for dog-on-dog squabbles that can accelerate into incidents that are not only unpleasant for the site users but condition dogs for bad behavior that spills out into the world at large and unfairly imposes liability on the dog owner. In a city that has one of the toughest bite laws in the country, this constitutes irresponsible city government, and it's unnecessary. There are better ways to design off-leash areas.
We are experiencing a population explosion. We have a beautiful city and we want to keep it that way, but the off-leash situation has got to change if we are going to maintain a city that is liveable, peaceable and safe. I maintain that we can do a better job of accommodating the needs of the city's dog owners without impacting the natural areas we want to protect, but we do have to come up with a bit more land for off-leash activity.
We know a lot more about dog behavior than we did 30 years ago when we first considered an off-leash program. The city would be wise to consult people in-the-know about dog behavior: experienced dog trainers, behaviorists - people who know the current science as well as people with experience in public education. There is a wealth of knowledge to draw on. This is an area of expertise that should inform the vision of Seattle going forward. The city will have to do more than survey the dog owners themselves. That will only tell the city what people want and what people want may not be what is best for them. The average dog owner, even the above average dog owner, does not have experience working with thousands of dogs, does not have broad experience with the entire spectrum of different breeds, not to mention owners, or have an in-depth knowledge of how dogs think that behaviorists and professional dog trainers do.
In Seattle I figure we have now close to a million dogs and that number is growing at a rate of 7,000 new dogs a year. The City has got to address the growing problem of how to get the dogs into a manageable state before civil strife reaches crisis proportions. It is said that Seattle is dog-friendly but I have met several people who said they were leaving Seattle because they couldn't find enough places to walk their dog off-leash. If you have a working breed of dog that was bred for hunting, herding or guarding, you have a dog that might have issues in a group of dogs off-leash in a corral. These type of dogs comprise a large share of the population. Since most of Seattle's off-leash areas are corrals, this leaves many dogs without a way to get a good workout (and into a more manageable state) and this means it is hard for their owners to get them into a manageable state in Seattle. This makes Seattle a precarious and difficult place to live.
When Seattle first considered its off-leash program it convened a blue ribbon panel that included local dog trainers. Seattle should take another look at what reputable dog trainers and behaviorists have to say. It will save the city having to retrofit its facilities later and save the city from becoming more and more unliveable.
Lucy Flanagan
Responsible Dog Owners for
Responsible Cities

Date: 07/29/2015

Name: Bill Fetterley

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Callison RTKL is looking to get involved in the review process of "Seattle 2035". We would like to specifically focus on the Elements that most directly influence the Built Environment, Growth Strategy & Land Use for example. If you have any thoughts on the potential for working together please share

them.
Thank you,
Bill Fetterley

Date: 07/30/2015

Name: Bob Shawcroft

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

I have just taken a quick look at the 2035 Comp Plan to determine where it is that planners and others are trying to direct us.
While I can read about things such as “core values” and “proposals” I did not see anything regarding what the vision is for Seattle. What are the real objectives that are guiding the plan… in other words what will it look like in 2035? Values are one thing, but they do not define desired “end states”.
Please direct me to these statements if I did not look at it in enough detail. In my years of planning, teaching and managing I have repeatedly found that unless we clearly state “where” we want to end up it is somewhat fruitless to say “what” and “how” we should move ahead as we have no clear destination in mind against which we can measure our progress.
I look forward to your help in better understanding how this plan will provide us all with a Seattle to which we can relate and buy into.
Bob Shawcroft
Sent from Surface

Date: 08/01/2015

Name: Glen Stockwell

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Hello,
I first came to Seattle in the early 50's, attended the Seattle World's Fair in 1962 and I have been coming to Seattle many times every year.
Seattle has WA State's largest Port and Seattle is the Gateway to the World's (Import & Export) trading partners around the world.
Seattle City Council, King County and City of Tacoma, Thurston County and Pierce County all should help with President Franklin D Roosevelt's the "Final Fast Track Completion of the Columbia Basin Project by 2022"! The completion of this project will bring thousands of long term well paying jobs to Western WA for the next Century!
I have a powerpoint presentation of my proposal. Would your group allow me to come and give a presentation?
Respectfully,
Glen R Stockwell
Chairman of WA State Economic Development NP Corp.

Date: 08/01/2015

Name: Janice Van Cleve

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

The Seattle LGBT Commission submitted a number of recommendations to be included in the 2035 plan. I urge you to adopt every one of them. I served on the LGBT Commission 1992-1997 and I know how hard they work. Their recommendations are very important to all of us in the LGBT community. Thank you.

Date: 08/02/2015

Name: Barbara Downward

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I was unable to send my comment on your feedback link- it is where do I find comments about pets- dogs and cats. Pets affect the quality of shared public space

Date: 08/05/2015

Name: Judith Mountaingirl-Black

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

I try to avoid communist Seattle....

Date: 08/05/2015

Name: David Sucher

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Kute!

Date: 08/11/2015

Name: John McCloud

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

We would hope by 2035 to see the bureaucratic catch-22 nonsense that you've created deconstructed or demolished to reinstate common sense practices. We, as a public are tired of getting screwed by you on a daily basis to prop up your overloaded processes that seek only to extort further monies at every turn. Your "planning and development" dept. has gone from securing public safety and adhering to building codes to creating and enforcing processes and inventing codes to further these processes that incur further costs at every turn or review, and will continue this way until you bleed the public dry.
-Sick of it.

Date: 08/13/2015

Name: Keith Kyle

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Hi,
As a Crown Hill resident, I just want to send a quick note in support of an upzone and urban village expansion in Crown Hill. This area is clearly a good location for increased density and street amenities upgrades. It is also an obvious location for a future rail location.
Additionally -- I want to log my support for all upzones and urban village expansions considered above that are planned to be walking distance from a rail station. Particularly 130th - which needs an upzone in order to get a rail station.
Thanks,
Keith

Date: 08/13/2015

Name: Zachary Lubarsky

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

We have a great opportunity to recreate a walkable Belltown/Queen Anne when 99 comes down.

Date: 08/14/2015

Name: Robyn Meyer

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

I live near much of this new development in Crown Hill and am a small business owner in Ballard. While your ideas sound great on paper, they are seriously flawed in practice.
The first major irritation is the idea that the urban villages don't need parking. That is simply untrue and can't be changed due to kids, lack of bus service to jobs and the fact that people live here to get outdoors to ski, hike, camp, and enjoy the mountains. These activities ALL require cars and gear.
The new development on the corner of NW 90th St. and 15th Ave NW is a perfect example. The church was torn down, 12 nice-looking new townhomes were built each with a one car garage. The bus stop was removed causing my neighbors and I to walk an additional 5 blocks (now 11 total) to get to a bus going downtown.
Now, even though these townhouses have one parking spot, the 4 hour parking signs around Soundview park were removed and have become private, tax-payer funded parking for these new townhouses. Thousands of people use that park, but now the parking for the masses is removed for private homeowners whom the City and the Council WRONGLY assumed would live a car-free lifestyle.
We are onto the bigger problem now. 16 more units are going up next door that DON'T have parking! Don't forget, you removed the bus stop. Where do you suppose these people will park? Can you have them certify they won't have cars?
There's a development that went up about two years ago a little further north on 15th Ave NW and doesn't have parking. Those folks all park in the other parking strip that folks going to Soundview Park used to use. Now, that entire parking strip in front of Whitman middle school has become more tax-payer funded parking for the Urban Village units you allowed to be built without parking!

This is a total sham. Once again, it sounds utopian on paper, but is 100% not reality. Even one car garages aren't enough in these townhouses.
This note is too long, but the second major irritation is the insane development in Ballard that won't help affordability due to the lack of 2 and 3 bedroom units. All these units' inhabitants as well as the additional density this proposes in Ballard need to get downtown or South Lake Union, wherever the jobs are. However, the busses are full by the time they get to 15th and Market and there is this little issue called the BALLARD BRIDGE!! You need to seriously increase the volume that it can handle BEFORE moving forward with this latest proposal.
Put the 4 hour parking signs back up so the masses can continue enjoying the Soundview park!! Removing them is contrary to your carless utopia and additional pandering to the out-of-state developers.

Date: 08/14/2015

Name: R Keith Unterschute

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

There is a huge movement across the country for small dwellings though current building codes block this form of housing at every turn. There are a lot of reasons for it but affordability is the biggest. Retirees could live in the Accessory Dwelling and rent out their homes. Accessory Dwellings are perfect for singles.
The current solution to more housing in the city seems to be apartments, apodments or other multi-family dwellings inserted into single family neighborhoods. By contrast the regulations for Accessory Dwelling (Mother-in-Law) Units seem to be unnecessarily strict.
Examples include the requirement for an additional parking space on the lot when an Accessory Dwelling is built. Perhaps a less restrictive approach that still meets the intent of the current law is to provide each home with two or three off street parking permits. If an Accessory Dwelling is built and the main home uses the provided parking permits then whoever lives in the Accessory Unit won’t be able to have a vehicle or the main house will have to give a vehicle up.
Another example is the inclusion of a deck more than 18 inches high as part of the land coverage calculation to determine the footprint of the Accessory Unit. Including the deck coverage only if an Accessory Dwelling is multiple stories high might be a better approach. I am a proponent of not consuming an entire lot for dwellings but the whole concept of land coverage as they relate to Accessory Dwellings is a bit odd given that houses can now be built that virtually consume the lot as long as they are a single building. The reason for lot coverage limitations on the size of an Accessory Unit should be reevaluated.

Date: 08/14/2015

Name: Paul

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Hello
Single family neighborhoods are the American dream and it seems the city of Seattle does not think much of this dream. Why does the city want to consider major impact to neighborhoods? The high density housing does not even fit in with current neighborhoods. Ballard is a great example. In this

neighborhood the designs of the high density housing do not even match each other. Looking to build, just because we can is not smart.
High density housing/apartments can be useful for a city, but our city is not ready for this. A realistic mass transit system needs to be in place before we have should have high density housing plans outside the downtown core.
Please think about the people who live in these areas.
It seems Seattle does not want to make the city family friendly. If we keep with the high density plans, people who want to live the American dream of having their own home will live outside of the city.
Look at other cities that have tried this. They end up with companies outside the city and reduce their tax base and are unable to continue with some of their vital programs.
Please look at the long term and ways to make city a better city for all.

Date: 08/19/2015

Name: Doug Fowler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hi there,
First, thanks for putting together such a fantastic website explaining the 2035 initiative. Here is my comment/question:
I live at Midvale Ave N in a small pocket of SFH that will remain between the Wallingford and Fremont urban villages. It seems weird to me to leave such a tiny pocket, and I'm curious whether this was done intentionally and, if so, why.
Thanks,
Doug

Date: 08/20/2015

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

You need to give your name in order to comment on this?
--
[8/21/15]
Ok but why is that necessary? Seems an invasion of privacy.
--
[9/11/15]
That's certainly true. Looks like you could use a screen name, so that works for me. Thanks.

Date: 08/21/2015

Name: Kim Scrivner

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Greetings Seattle,
I would like to comment about the Housing element in the 2035 comprehensive plan. I commend the goals toward affordable housing and green infrastructure. What I would like to see strengthened,

particularly under the Diversity of Housing and Housing
Construction and Design sections, is protection against having micro-units be the only affordable housing available (which is becoming the case now). The plan now supports diversity in housing but will this equate to more and more tiny units?
Micro-units are great if they are priced below market rate and utilized for students, transitional housing and for people choosing to save money on housing costs. However, micro-units are becoming the only thing affordable, even for middle-income groups.
In addition, many new developments - even in 'regular' units - the developers pinch square feet out of usable living space including usable decks. By doing so, the city looses the benefit of 'eyes on the streets' from what should be apartment decks and some level of elbow room inside the units. There are no 'eyes on the streets' from Juliet balconies.
Please consider, along with your flexibility to developers, some level of protection for the people that actually have to live in these units in terms of affordable square footage. It will be a sad case for Seattle if apartments that are way too small or even 'dorm like' are the only housing 'affordable'.

Too many micro-units and tiny 'regular' units without adequate deck and outside space do not equate to housing that is 'healthy'. They are great options in some circumstances but should not be the solution to affordable, long-term housing.
Thank you,
Kim Scrivner
98117

Date: 08/21/2015

Name: Jamie Lawver

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Please make sure that you exclude Olympic Manor from the proposed expansion of the urban village. Based on the initial draft parts of 21st St. NW would be included in the village.

Date: 08/24/2015

Name: Simon Blackledge

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Hey Planning and Development. How's it going? I was thinking about the land use and how the growing population can get housing. I was wondering what you think about this idea.
As we grow in population, one of these days we are going to run out of forested land. To combat the high population density and deforestation why not we create skyscraper apartments and probably even tower block offices in the designated areas; on the seattle map? That way, we will have more people housed and we wouldn't have to walk very far to get to our commute; besides an elevator ride.
Here is an example of a Skyscraper apartment or a Tower Block
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tower_block
As far as cheep housing in concerned, I suppose the cheapest kind of housing I can think off is underground apartments. No body would want to live in an underground apartment due to lack of ventilation making the cost ideal for those going financially broke. To avoid safety issues in an

underground apartment; we could
-Create a garden green house to circulate the carbon Dioxide and oxygen; assisted by air ducts and good natural lighting from above.
-Have a fire station in the apartment.
Once a fire sets off in an underground apartment, a fire fighter will be working in the underground apartments to put out the fire quickly before carbon monoxide poisoning kicks in.
Thanks :)
Sent from my iPhone

Date: 08/26/2015

Name: Silvia Hjelmeland

Draft Plan Element: Utilities

Comment:

Seattle recently approved a 5% rate hike for City Light. I've cut electricity use significantly over 10 years. What "Lean Management" measures is Seattle requiring at City Light. Enacting them doesn't require high paid executives.

Date: 09/03/2015

Name: Georgi Krom

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Attention Seattle Dept. of Planning,
We are 30+ year homeowners who live in a tudor style home in Queen Anne. Historic preservation is very important to us and the language in Seattle 2035 should be strengthened to preserve historic buildings. Integrate planning of preservation into the city's growth. These buildings are part of our history and make for a vital city.
Additionally, the recent conversation about more density in single family neighborhoods should be refined. Some areas with existing commercial buildings can be expanded with more density, but quiet streets within neighborhoods should be left alone. The ugly construction of cheap multi-family boxes next to charming bungalows must be stopped! The charm of Seattle neighborhoods is why we live here. Don't screw it up.
Sincerely,
Georgi and Steve Krom
Seattle homeowners and taxpayers

Date: 09/04/2015

Name: Daniel Burnstein

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development:

I am disappointed that the draft of the city's Comprehensive Plan does not emphasize the preservation

of the built environment as an important civic asset. Most people are particularly attracted to neighborhoods that maintain a significant amount of building stock from the decades prior to World War II. Seattle is not an old city, but we do have significant stock going back to the late nineteenth century. Please let's preserve what we do have, it's irreplaceable. Please help keep Seattle beautiful and livable by enhancing zoning or other regulations that will ensure that pre-World War II buildings will be saved from demolition.

Thank you,
Daniel Burnstein
Professor Emeritus of History, Seattle University

Date: 09/04/2015

Name: Jennifer Tucker

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I'd like to submit my comments to you regarding the Historic Preservation component of the new Comp Plan for 2035.

It seems the language on historic preservation policies has been weakened a bit. I would like to see:
- Expansion of historic preservation goals
- Integration of historic preservation into the planning process and into other plan elements….since we are all very connected at the foundation of things
- A strengthening of the Inventory policy

Thank you for your time.

-Jennifer Tucker

Date: 09/06/2015

Name: Jacqueliene Thomas

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Against Mayor and Council member O'Brien's new proposal
Developer friendly Mayor Murray and Council Member O'Brien schemed up another plan to profit developers. According to the department of planning and development, there are buildable lots in the City of Seattle without changing the zoning. Developers want to use the existing utility systems, and make easy money on the citizens. The way the City hall is issuing the building permits caused congestions in the city, and making it impossible to deal with the utility problems. We are facing the world-wide drought, and major weather changes due to overuse of energy and congestion. We should not be dreaming of growth. We have to stop the growth. To deal with the sky-rocketing rents, the city should implement the rent control, and other more creative solutions such as tele-commuting, and building satellite cities, and building better public transportation. We have not seen any energy reduction policy on new buildings. There have not been much solar panels installed on the new buildings. The on ly interests of these two politicians is to do favors to developers.

Date: 09/11/2015

Name: Mike Ruby

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

You all found that it took you longer than you'd planned to get the draft EIS and the draft Comp Plan amendments written. Well, it is going to take us longer than you'd planned to get it reviewed. I'm requesting the review period be extended to Thanksgiving. The period between Thanksgiving and Christmas would be ideal for you to be working on our comments.

Date: 09/11/2015

Name: Mike Ruby

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

attached
--
Mike Ruby
Envirometrics, Inc.

Date: 09/13/2015

Name: Mark Spitzer

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hello 2035 Comp Planners

I shared some thoughts with a friend
She thought it would be worth sharing them with you

I took a look through the Summary

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/DraftPlanExecutiveSummary.pdf

It feels written to be non-controversial – even though our rate of growth and housing issues are very controversial
It does include a page on 'values':

1. Race and Social Equity We need to address displacement and the unequal distribution of opportunities to sustain a diverse Seattle. The Draft Plan promotes equitable access to housing, jobs, education, parks, community centers, and healthy food.

2. Environmental Stewardship Seattle protects rural areas, forests, and green spaces in the city by taking

on a significant share of the region's growth and concentrating that growth in urban villages. The City is committed to become carbon neutral by 2050. The Draft Plan calls for development that makes biking, walking, and transit viable options, so people can be less car reliant.

3. Economic Opportunity and Security Jobs and livable wages create opportunity and stability in Seattle's communities. The Draft Plan includes policies that help the City accommodate and direct employment growth. It also addresses the education and skills residents need to fill the new jobs in Seattle.

4. Community As Seattle grows and becomes more diverse, the Draft Plan encourages more public participation in decisions affecting all aspects of City policies.

I think I would group Environmental Stewardship and Economic Opportunity together, since they are so often in direct conflict.

I think I would group Community and Race and Social Equity together, since they also are often in conflict.

Of the various planning issues, the continuation of the Urban Villages concept is the most obvious and, I think, the most sensible
On the whole it has worked well, though the transitions around the edges could use tuning.

Unfortunately, it's not accompanied by an equally strong Transportation section.
This is because when we passed the Growth Management Act, we didn't also pass a corresponding Transportation Management Act
So now we have to juggle local traffic with buses managed by Metro and rail transit managed by Sound Transit

Land Use and Transportation need to be directly connected in the planning process.
We struggle with that here all the time

And I don't mean working towards walking/biking/bus/car equity, all of which is good.
I mean the rapid and robust incorporation of more Light Rail and Sounder Rail.
The only thing that's going to make mobility possible is separate ROW frequency and reliability.

The biggest land use challenge is housing – not so much apartments and condos,
but how to deal with increasing the density in single family neighborhoods.
It's a hot potato issue but it needs to be addressed,
and not in the clumsy way the committee dropped on everyone.

For example, just building neighborhoods out to existing zoning envelopes,
and at the same time making it easier to do ADU's would add capacity and spread it equitably throughout the city.

Don't give up. My advice to friends has been that growth is the right kind of problem to have.
We need to learn to be patient during the growth spurt.
But we also need to be impatient that it's taking so long to get improved transit in place.
Transit mobility is the cure for automobile congestion – just look at any great city.

So that's my once-over two or three cents.

Mark Spitzer

Date: 09/14/2015

Name: @spenceroncities

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

ICYMI @Seattle2035's comment period on the Draft Plan has been extended to 11/20! More info http://2035.seattle.gov http://pic.twitter.com/H7ZJ8cUyFb

Date: 09/15/2015

Name: Alison Roxby

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities

Comment:

Right now the growth discussion is all about housing, specifically, packing in as much housing as possible. Where are the additional services!! There are no new soccer fields, no new schools, no space at the pool, not enough transit to get around, no new trees being planted…. Without services, additional housing LOWERS the quality of life in the city. I do not support the contraction of green space around seattle and as a parent I can tell you we are not providing parks, recreation and outdoor activities that our children need. Our overcrowded and outdated school packed with portable classrooms are shameful.

We need impact fees so that those who PROFIT from our housing boom also CONTRIBUTE to improving the quality of life in Seattle.

Alison Roxby

Date: 09/15/2015

Name: Sarah Martin

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Good Morning,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Comprehensive Plan.

When meeting new people lately, I often hear two things about this city:
1. Seattle has great neighborhoods.
2. Longtime residents are being priced out of their homes.

Our neighborhoods are great because of the people, places, unique histories, and experiences. Our neighborhoods developed of a different era and, as a result, are less dense than might be ideal today,

which contributes to displacement of longtime residents. Despite the extreme economic pressures, we have to be much smarter in how we address density or we risk destroying the character of our neighborhoods. I fully support conservation overlays and smart infill regulations that are respectful of historic context, and I want to see stronger language in the plan about this.

We all know residents – good people with good jobs – who've already been priced out of their homes. Often, they are trading places with 23-year-old video gamers who typically have short-term perspectives and aren't as invested in their community. This perhaps is an over-generalization of stereotypes, but this type of transition is happening at an alarming rate.

We are at a critical point in the city's history that requires some hard decisions to be made by our local government officials. Please, in this long-term plan, strengthen the goals and policies to address change to our older districts and neighborhoods more aggressively by:
1. Better integrating preservation and sensitive reuse into the planning process and into all plan elements.
2. Expanding the historic preservation goals beyond a half-page of weak statements (page 140). Alarmingly, preservation is an afterthought in this plan.
3. Strengthen efforts to identify through historic resource surveys what parts of the city are worth sensitive redevelopment.

Again, thank you for the chance to comment.
Sarah Martin
Renting resident, Wallingford neighborhood

Date: 09/17/2015

Name: Jack Bernatovicz

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Anna Michel, An Huynh, and others

Date: 09/18/2015

Name: Sharon Scherer

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Conservation of historic single family neighborhoods, developed in subdivisions platted with 2500 square foot lots, serves the goals of mixed income communities, affordable single family homes, historic preservation, relief from density, and space for trees.

Date: 09/18/2015

Name: @ForterraNW

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Give feedback to the City of #Seattle. It's a great way to add your voice to the conversation! #forthisplace
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Puget Sound is expected to have over 5 million people by 2040. How should we plan for this growth? seattle2035.consider.it #Seattle2035

Date: 09/18/2015

Name: @arcadenw

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

This fits our #authenticity focus of our latest issue http://t.co/bjdiR1rsOP
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Big plans in the works for a historic building at nearby Saint Edward State Park – take a look: bit.ly/1O43zjc

Date: 09/20/2015

Name: Debbie Pessein

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

What are your thoughts on this:
http://www.healthandindustry.org

Date: 09/20/2015

Name: Martha Tofferi

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

There are many great things about Seattle - its city scape is one.While Seattle grows and creates 'new stuff,' it is important to keep in the city scape some of today's and yesterday's architecture so that we do not become - just another dot on the map. Towards the end of keeping us a city that stands out from the rest, we must wrap our arms around and even hug historic preservation.
The 2035 Plan should connect and even integrate historic preservation in any planning process. Creating an inventory - by a recognized authority - is also essential. I don't know but doesn't Historic Seattle have a mandate from the city to be the authority on historic presservation?
I know we all sometimes get caught up in the 'gotta have all this new stuff,' but I hope that Seattle in 2035 will not look like the next iteration of the iphone.
Let's be smart, save that which makes us unique, and remember that newer can be lots worse than historic and unique. I remember that we used to have a magnificent Central Library which 1906 Central Library opens in Seattle looked like this.
One of the many places I visit when in Portland is their lovely central library which for whatever reason is still there. Thank you Portland!
Historic preservation is essential if Seattle is going to keep and enhance its standing in the greater world.
Martha Tofferi

Magnolia

Date: 09/22/2015

Name: Lottie Eskilsson

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

After having reviewed the Draft Plan I have some comments, a couple of them not directly related to the urban issues discussed in the proposed Comprehensive Plan but which may affect future developments in the city:

- Cars and Parking:

I grew up in a European country where the cities were not designed around the car like the American cities on the West Coast are. Anyone visiting European cities knows how difficult parking can be there. Why do we want to build new construction here and build in the same restrictions that a couple of centuries of urbanization has caused in Europe? We are not building new housing units and commercial areas in tight historic areas where space is very tight and new construction has to fit in between existing buildings. It seems ridiculous to build new housing without parking spaces, as it will cause a lot of problems to remedy the situation in the future. Even if we aim at developing urban villages with some amenities like grocery shopping within walking distance, many of us will still need a car to go to other parts of the city or across the lake. There is no Costco within walking distance of any housing developments that I can think of; parents need to take kids to activities. Sure there are buses and Car-to-Go and, of course, bicycles, and there are people who don't need a car. But I think we are too optimistic in thinking that the new housing will continue to have that type of population that are happy to bike around wherever they go. It is also interesting to notice the recent studies in the news that point out that the Seattleites favor larger vehicles than the general population does.

It is better to implement minimum parking requirements at this time than trying to fix it in the future with, for instance, area parking permits (that, of course, bring revenue to the City), or to construct parking areas and garages at a later time. If the first inhabitants of the housing unit do not use a car, they can park their bikes and paddle boards there, rent it out to someone who needs it, or use it like so many of us do – as storage space. I realize that it is space that cost money to build, but it is a matter of spending the money now or later when there is a parking crisis.

The Comprehensive Plan should make provisions for accommodations of future parking garages and areas in the urban villages and other areas in the city instead of blocking that possible development. Greater flexibility in the Comprehensive Plan is needed. For instance, an area presently used as a Farmers' Market can be developed in the future as a garage structure under a covered market. We cannot foresee all developments in the next 20 years, and I think it is possible that some facilities will grow in ways not expected, and vehicular access may be required.

The car is not likely to disappear even if they may be different in design and engineering. They will likely be much more fuel efficient and environmentally friendly, but I doubt that a personal transportation vehicle will disappear completely even with improved public transportation systems (which I strongly approve of and encourage the development of).

- Traffic Control:

This may be outside of the area of the Comprehensive Plan, but incorporation of computerized synchronized traffic lights like the system installed in City of Bellevue could help the traffic congestion in downtown Seattle. It would benefit both vehicular traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians, and save energy as well. At this time it is amusing to drive uphill on the streets from downtown to Capitol Hill or First Hill and always hit a red light at the avenue intersections, while one can easily roll downhill on a "green

wave." Better traffic light organization and synchronization could also benefit public transportation vehicles which could receive "priority treatment."

I recognize that there is a price tag connected to this system.

- Solid Waste Management:

This is another comment which may not be within the urban issues in the Comprehensive Plan but affects the environment in the city. It is incomprehensible that a city like Seattle with a population so intent on saving the environment by creating all kinds of requirements for reducing waste will still ship its solid waste to landfills in Oregon for future archeological expeditions in 2,000 years. Why are there no plans to develop a waste-to-energy incineration plant like the ones used all over Europe and in some locations of the US? Not only do they incinerate the non-recyclable garbage, they produce energy and recover some metals and chemicals without producing air pollution. In my European hometown the incineration plants generates the city's central heating. And believe me, the people there recycle everything they can meticulously and even transport it themselves to recycle collection stations.

There is a big price tag for this item, but then I think there is an even bigger price tag for transporting and landfilling the garbage without any recovered substances and a future methane filled area.

- High-Rises:

The Comprehensive Plan does not put enough restrictions on high-rise building development. Too many have already been constructed in downtown, too close together and not in any way architecturally coordinated to create an interesting skyline or streetscape. The high-rise buildings alter the micro-climate; the wind gusts can be very heavy in downtown Seattle today; there is more shady and dark areas now; and the street trees miss the sun.

I am not saying that I liked the old parking lots, but I miss the light coming through where there were lower buildings and building plazas providing light spots, i.e., Rainier Square. It also seems easier to orient in a city where you have variation in building volumes.

Very tall buildings should not be allowed outside the downtown areas. Tall buildings should be carefully located so that changes in micro-climates are minimized. Day lighting standards and requirements should be considered when locating tall buildings and the surrounding construction.

- Historic Preservation:

The Comprehensive Plan should restate the preservation goals in the previous plan to emphasize the importance of integration and maintenance of historic structures and features in the city.

- Minor issues:

Food odors: LU5.14 discusses regulation of odors. I think a reference to food odors (for instance, from commercial kitchens) is justified to put emphasis to that; maybe different vocabulary to distinguish from other unpleasant smells.

Graphics: I had some problems connecting the maps and illustrations with related legends: the colors did not seem to match.

Date: 09/22/2015

Name: Nancy Zager

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Housing

Comment:

New condominiums are being built all over Wallingford, and of course they are changing the character of the neighborhood. I would like to suggest that allowing such buildings to go up on 45th Street will have a devastating effect on this area. It is now the central shopping and restaurant area. The reason it will be destroyed is that even though these new buildings will all have shops on street level there will not be as many as now exist and the rents will be so high that the existing businesses will not be able to

afford them. We will lose our local restaurants and shops.
Sent from my iPad

Date: 09/26/2015

Name: Leo Griffin

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Environment

Comment:

Seattle has not been doing a good job of preserving significant trees on sites that are being developed. The City basically just gives the developer a green light to take down (or damage beyond repair) trees that are on the site. Tree inspectors don't actively visit sites. The city also does not seem to have any policy to protect evergreens which reduce air pollution.
The City has a policy to strive to increase the citywide tree canopy (E1.2)but it seems to only be willing to do that via trees on the parking strip or in parks. Parking strips are limited in the trees that they can support and there is a lot of the city that is not parks. Trees seems to be one of the global warming issues the City doesn't take seriously and they definitely play 4th fiddle to the City's goal of hyper-density. If the City took the tree policy seriously more trees would be saved. The City's current metric of evaluating whether trees are significant also seems flawed. It compares the trees against ones listed in "Trees of Seattle" and if the tree isn't close in size to the one in the book, it is a goner. The flaw with this methodology is that by comparing them to large trees in the book, it makes the assumption that new small and medium sized trees are as plentiful as pennies. Unfortunately medium sized trees aren't as plentiful as pennies; they are getting torn down rapidly and so the supply of exceptional, large trees is likely to be reduced.
There is also a poor water quality issue that the city is contributing to and that is partial paving of alleys. The City has allowed developers to asphalt formerly gravel alleys. They allow this installation of impervious pavement and usually it is put in place without drainage. The new partial paved alleys increase stormwater sheetflow and washes out the remaining gravel alley and sends this all into the storm drain (NPDES issue). There are four partial paved alleys within a three block radius of my house. At an open house for the very expensive, multi-million water treatment facility (near the former Yankee Diner in Ballard) I brought up the issue and asked why does the City say they encourage pervious pavement, but don't make developers put it in? The multi-million dollar project is necessary because stormwater is increasing. I asked the spokesperson for the water quality containment project why isn't pervious pavement used? "It has maintenance issues," was the reply. The maintenance issue is that it has to be swept once a year. It seems like sweeping would be a lot cheaper solution than building a stormwater treatment vault, and the pervious pavement would have less impact on the neighbors. Please consider policies to eliminate the use of asphalt on partial paved alleys. The second class citizen who live on the washed out gravel section of the alley would appreciate it.

Date: 09/26/2015

Name: Leo Griffin

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Instead of hyper-dense, ugly, monstrous apartments that create a shadow of despair around Seattle, the City should adopt Portland's incentive model of $10,00 toward putting in more mother-in-law apartments. Portland's program has been operating for the last five years.

Even though Denny Westneat wrote about this in his column the City seems only willing to consider ideas that the HOLLA committee made.
The mother-in-law incentive program has additional advantages. It saves some of the older historic homes, it saves Trees which are torn down with new construction, and it reduces the amount of debris going to the landfill. It likely also has a lower carbon footprint than building new housing and is likely more popular with the neighbors. This may not be acceptable in all areas but there are a lot of areas in the City where it could be encouraged.
The City should encourage this incentive but not to people who rent their homes out on Air BNB. We have a home near us in Fremont that is being rented out for $400 a night.
The City should also stop being so parochial about housing. They treat it only as a City problem that only the City can solved. Affordable Housing in Seattle is a regional problem and refusing to work with other jurisdictions because the City thinks it knows best is not a good plan. Shoreline is impacted by Seattle housing policies, Renton is impacted by Seattle's Housing Policies, White Center is impacted by Seattle Housing Policies. The sooner that the City realizes housing is a broader problem than the Seattle boundaries, the better chance there is of developing a broader regional solution to solve housing issues. Seattle used to be recognized as a leader in working with other jurisdictions. Now it feels like they need to act like the kid that is too cool to acknowledge you. It reminds me of the refugee problem in Europe; each Country doing their own thing wasn't really the way to solve that problem.

Date: 09/26/2015

Name: Leo Griffin

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

The City of Seattle should have cultural and historic preservation as a higher priority. The City's current philosophy is that we can't save anything historic because we need more housing. This is a very shortsighted policy; it is irresponsible for Seattle to give up on historic preservation. If New York, London, Paris and other Cities of the world can value historic preservation why can't Seattle?
Even when structures have been designated historic, all the city requires is for the developer to slap a couple of paragraphs in a report that is added to the development permit.
Probably the biggest "history killer" is the City's hyper density zoning. It has killed most historic homes in areas that are in or near urban villages. The older structures can't compete with the current hyper-density incentives. Previously homes were encouraged to have space between the house next to them, trees, landscaping, etc. The current zoning dis-incentivizes that. Buildings are built right up to the sidewalk with no setback. Increased stormwater runoff is encouraged, via the absence of trees and vegetation.
Mayor Murray has shown a total lack of interest in Historic Preservation. Preservation advocates didn't even get a seat at the table in the recent Housing Panel. If developers are the only ones at the table it isn't surprising that the recommendations favor developers.

Date: 09/26/2015

Name: Leo Griffin

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

The City should abandon its current policy of "designed congestion", where it seeks to remove street

parking, reduce lanes, and generally trying to gridlock Seattle. This policy is very aggravating and increases pollution and global warming. It doesn't do anyone any good if you have to circle the block four times to find parking in Ballard, Fremont, Capitol Hill or other areas of the City. The policy is also terrible for the elderly and the mobility impaired; parking four blocks away is difficult for people that are impaired. Plus this policy limits the delivery of freight that the City needs to survive. Bellingham has it right. They have designated delivery spots every block or two downtown so that trucks can make deliveries and be on their way. Seattle has taken a "we must design for a car-free future that may not happen" philosophy instead of doing a more accessible, reasonable, responsible and phased in approach for transportation. Please abandon the current policy of designing so that everything is congested. Put reasonableness and traffic throughput back into the transportation equation.

Date: 09/29/2015

Name: @Seaofchangefilm

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 would like to share hidden problems blind people facing in shared space roads in UK https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=NOObDPOSm-g

Date: 09/30/2015

Name: Judith Hance

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I note that this plan omits mention of consideration for senior citizens and the physically disabled.
The plan is for "working people" now and in the future.
I have paid property taxes in Seattle since 1991. I am now 80 years old. I live alone in a single family home, and with luck, this will not change. I may or may not be alive in 2035.
I demand that attention be paid to this part of the population. We need public transportation within walking distance of our homes,
seven days a week. We deserve to be considered in making plans for Seattle's future. Everyone will be old some day. What do you want your life to be like?
Seattle has become a city of separate enclaves or neighborhoods that we don't visit any more because traffic is so bad, a bus won't get us there, and if we drive, there is no place to park. I miss those other neighborhoods with their personalities and amenities.
Light rail will not be the answer, because stations are too far apart to be practical. There should continue to be a bus in my neighborhood that I can take to church, library, University District, Seattle Center, and the Convention Center and downtown.
My church has 800 members and two services on Sundays. Our property is not large enough to have adequate off street parking.
The library is in the same situation. Yet there are plans for bicycle lanes to fill our street parking places.
I have no faith at all in the city planning department, and most folks I talk to agree with me.
This plan, as written is too general in its descriptions. It needs details tailored to each neighborhood in order to get any support from me.
Judith Hance

Date: 09/30/2015

Name: Pam Jones

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

It appears that the Othello/Brighton Orchard urban village map would negatively impact families currently living in the area, particularly low-income residents and people of color.
As a single mother and person of color, the proposed changes would force me and other people like me out of the community and probably out of Seattle. I would be forced to move either because of the increased property taxes which will come with the changed zoning and insufficient access to capital to redevelop my property from single-family to multi-family housing.
Up-zoning is being forced upon a community which can least fight against the changes; and yet, will be negatively impacted the most by them. The residents of this community are the ones who can least adapt to the changes.
I understand that The Othello Station Community Action Team (OSCAT) has submitted a letter in support of the proposal, but this group does not represent me or most of the residents living in the impacted area. Please do not look at this group as a representative of me or most of the residents living in Othello Station/Brighton Orchard.
Thank you,
Pamela Jones

Date: 09/30/2015

Name: Dick Wagner

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

I am Dick Wagner, Founding Director of The Center for Wooden Boats, the hands-on small boat museum on South Lake Union. Here aer my comments:
Our Mother Nature has given water to be used for transportation. On the water there are no potholes, traffic lights, hills or valleys. We need no more bridges, tunnels or freeways. Electric buses can be built and maintained at far less cost than buses on wheels and trains on tracks.
Each neighborhood should leave their autos in a free parking lot within walking distance of their residence. The lot would be surrounded by cedars, fir and hemlock. This would leave the streets clean, quiet, accessible for walking on and free of toxic air.
Plant trees on all streets and freeways. If right-of-ways are wide enough, plant trees down the middle. Create a Street Tree Commission. Shorelines should be planted with indigenous plants. They will attract indigenous butterflies, birds and mammals.
All the street ends at shorelines should have rainwater holding tanks to keep street waste from polluting rivers and lakes.
Preserve all buildings of historical significance. Do not allow new buildings that would take away views of the sea, lakes, rivers or mountains.
Each neighborhood should have a medical clinic within walking distance of homes and schools. Each neighborhood should have an annual festival. One block-long street can be closed for the day in order to have fun and bring neighbors pride of place. The event should not be taxed or require a costly permit. Each neighborhood needs a library, a park and a playground. Each park should recruit volunteers from the neighborhood to do maintenance.

There is a dilemma for hard-working service people and the dense buildings of Seattle. The working class cannot afford residences within or near the buildings. There should be apartments or condominiums in walking distance that carpenters, electricians, cleaning people and others can afford. The low-cost homes would be on the lowest floors with lack of view and traffic noise. Instead of hour-long commutes to dense urban areas both ways, give service employees affordability and livability

Date: 09/30/2015

Name: Rebecca Fox

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Is this the wrap up of the required periodic update per RCW 36.70A.130?

Rebecca Fox

Date: 10/01/2015

Name: Dick Wagner

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Environment, Growth Strategy

Comment:

Mother Nature has given us water to be used for transportation. On the water there are no potholes, traffic lights, hills or valleys. We need no more bridges, tunnels or freeways. Electric boat buses can be built and maintained at far less cost than buses on wheels and trains on tracks.
Each neighborhood should leave their autos in a free parking lot within walking distance of their residences. The lot would be surrounded by cedars, fir and hemlock. This would leave the streets clean, quiet, accessible for walking on and free of toxic air.
Plant trees on all streets and freeways. If right-of-ways are wide enough, plant trees down the middle. Create a Street Tree Commission. Shorelines should be planted with indigenous plants. They will attract indigenous butterflies, birds and mammals.
All the street ends at shorelines should have rainwater holding tanks to keep street waste from polluting rivers and lakes.
Preserve all buildings of historical significance. Do not allow new buildings that would take away views of the sea, lakes, rivers or mountains.
Each neighborhood should have a medical clinic within walking distance of homes and schools. Each neighborhood should have an annual festival. One block-long street can be closed for the day in order to have fun and bring neighbors pride of place. The event should not be taxed or require a costly permit.
Each neighborhood needs a library, a park and a playground. Each park should recruit volunteers from the neighborhood to do maintenance.
There is a dilemma for hard-working service people and the dense buildings of Seattle. The working class cannot afford residences within or near the buildings. There should be apartments or condominiums in walking distance that carpenters, electricians, cleaning people and others can afford. The low-cost homes would be on the lowest floors with lack of view and traffic noise. Instead of hour-long commutes to dense urban areas both ways, give service employees affordability and livability

Date: 10/03/2015

Name: Kelly Rench

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Diane,
I live on 17th Ave. NE and am just now hearing of a master plan that would annex my street to Roosevelt. It is my understanding that this may include an up-zone. I am absolutely appalled that I have not been notified of this draft plan. Please include me on any notifications regarding meetings, input opportunities and outcomes for this process so that I can ensure my neighbors are kept abreast of this process and have due time to comment and be heard.
I'd also like to request that you email me a PDF or a link to the daft plan. I work in the architecture/engineering world and know that stronger more robust outreach goes into park planning than anything DPD does for urban planning.
Kelly Rench

Date: 10/04/2015

Name: Terry Abendroth

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

From: Terry Abendroth
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2015 1:11 PM
To: Carroll, Patrice
Subject: Seattle's comprehensive plan

I stumbled on the meeting list while looking for the exact boundaries pf the urban village on Queen Anne Hill. I never did locate these boundaries, just the overall map. I am concerned about the future up zones surrounding these villages. Can you tell me what meeting to attend to take a look at the city's plan for this area?
Thank you, Terry Abendroth

Date: 10/06/2015

Name: Jake Jaramillo

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Hi Kevin,
I've noticed that the "Policy Crosswalk" document postsed on the Seattle 2035 website proposes the omission of the following policy from the revised Comprehensive Plan:
"T32 - Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment."
Do you have insight into what is behind this proposed change?
Best regards,
Jake and Cathy Jaramillo
Seattle Stairway Walks: An Up-and-Down Guide to City Neighborhoods

http://www.seattlestairwaywalks.com

Date: 10/06/2015

Name: Wallingford Community Council,Mary Fielder

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Transportation

Comment:

Hello. There's a lot to digest in this proposal and I offer the following comments -
First, you can read the entire document and then be surprised to learn that Seattleites actually do drive private automobiles. All planning is directed at walk/bike/transit infrastructure. There's no mention of parking or automobile congestion, and the rare mention of the term "car" is always pejorative. Seattle streets, it seems, are to be devoted to bicycles, pedestrians, and buses. This is so conspicuous, and obviously intentional, that this goal - animus toward automobiles - should be included in the summary of Core Values. If planners and elected officials intend for Seattleites to be forced out of their cars, they should have the decency to be accountable for the goal. One of the ironies is that failure to plan adequately for park-and-ride capability threatens the viability of mass transit infrastructure. WE NEED MORE PARK AND RIDE LOTS IN SEATTLE.
Second, there is no comprehensive plan to pay for any of this growth. What little mention of funding there is is confined to the term "levy" - this means taxpayers and ratepayers. This is not unusual - these comprehensive plans often defer consideration of costs or funding to subsequent initiatives. But they don't have to get into the weeds to simply state, as a Core Value, that development will pay an appropriate share of its own costs. (These costs paid by developers will be passed on to the new residents and businesses that are attracted by the new development. To the extent that existing residents and businesses benefit from the new infrastructure, costs will be apportioned to them as well). DEVELOPMENT SHOULD PAY FOR DEVELOPMENT. Third, the plan makes no attempt to visualize what the Seattle economy will look like in 20 years (except that it will be "green" and "fair"). The economic development piece is deferred to other planning efforts, but they need to make some credible effort to get some of this right - there aren't going to be enough barista and Uber jobs for a city of 1,000,000 people. One obvious example - if the jobs are going to be in outlying areas, that's where the residential/commercial planning needs to focus. Infill is green (as in carbon) to a point, but beyond that point, it's just green (as in money).
Thank you for all your efforts in this huge challenge, Mary Fielder, Chair, Wallingford Community Council Parking Committee

Date: 10/06/2015

Name: Mike Larson

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

I rent my first floor affordably as an ADU - so I actively support reasonable densification. I also have a full array of solar panels on my roof - which are in danger of being shaded if the apartments adjacent to my property are replaced by taller buildings. The solar install was not a small investment in my property and I checked the zoning regulations prior to making my decision. What options will I have if this solar array is compromised due to taller buildings constructed on an adjacent property? Thanks.

Date: 10/07/2015

Name: Jane Savard

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Would you consider holding an Open House at the Belltown Community Center?
Jane

Date: 10/07/2015

Name: Jake Jaramillo

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Dear Ms. Carroll,
We have written and spoken throughout the community about the value of Seattle's built legacy of public stairways. We represent thousands of readers of our book, Seattle citizens who value the stairs for many reasons: for connection to parks, work and transit; for exercise; and for the joy of exploring new neighborhoods.
We're writing to you now to express our huge concern about the following proposed change to the city's Comprehensive Plan. In the "Policy Crosswalk" document, the "Trans" tab shows that existing policy "T32" would be deleted. That to-be-deleted policy reads:
"T32 - Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment."
Deleting this strong policy statement about how the city views stairways is a big concern to us and many others. It suggests that there will be a lessening of stairway maintenance, rebuilding and even abandonment of stairway right-of-ways.
Our stairways provide a unique amenity to our city. It would be a huge loss to abandon them. We ask that you work to remove this proposed change from the Comprehensive Plan.
Best regards,
Jake and Cathy Jaramillo
Seattle Stairway Walks: An Up-and-Down Guide to City Neighborhoods
http://www.seattlestairwaywalks.com

Date: 10/07/2015

Name: Lindsey

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

I was just looking at your Seattle 2035 - Draft Comprehensive Plan website and see that your website has the potential to become very popular. I just want to tell you, In case you didn't already know... There is a website network which already has more than 16 million users, and most of the users are interested in websites like yours. By getting your website on this service you have a chance to get your site more visitors than you can imagine. It is free to sign up and you can find out more about it here: http://bbqr.me/4fj5 - Now, let me ask you... Do you need your site to be successful to maintain your business? Do you need targeted visitors who are interested in the services and products you offer? Are looking for exposure, to increase sales, and to quickly develop awareness for your website? If your

answer is YES, you can achieve these things only if you get your website on the service I am describing. This traffic service advertises you to thousands, while also giving you a chance to test the service before paying anything at all. All the popular websites are using this service to boost their readership and ad revenue! Why aren't you? And what is better than traffic? It's recurring traffic! That's how running a successful site works... Here's to your success! Read more here: http://tgi.link/dcf2

Date: 10/08/2015

Name: @CommonAgendaNow

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Provide feedback to @Seattle2035 during upcoming Open House sessions throughout #Seattle http://2035.seattle.gov/calendar/ http://pic.twitter.com/rAscTqD8mk

Date: 10/08/2015

Name: @CommonAgendaNow

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Looking for an easy way to access all of the great @Seattle2035 documents and resources? Visit their profile @ http://commonagenda.net/trending/seattle-2035/

Date: 10/08/2015

Name: Katy Nally

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

[no content; image attached]

Date: 10/09/2015

Name: Zach Lubarsky

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Fix our housing shortage and see income inequality decrease further!

Date: 10/09/2015

Name: @_KevinTempest_

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

Our new research with @c40cities on urban lock-in is hot of the press! @Seattle2035 @CeresNews @NewClimateEcon https://twitter.com/c40cities/status/652490233523662848

Date: 10/09/2015

Name: Norine Anderson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please keep the neighborhoods as single family residences.

Date: 10/11/2015

Name: Beate Helmke

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Is the Sand Point Way area projected to be mixed/commercial all the way to 95th NE intersecting?
At this point it is classified as residential to my knowledge.
Thanks in advance for letting me know.

Date: 10/12/2015

Name: Scott Brown

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

From: Scott Brown
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2015 8:16 AM
To: Carroll, Patrice
Cc: O'Brien, Mike; Scott BrownBusiness
Subject: Re: Ballard Hub Urban Village Opportunity

Hi Ms. Carroll, can you please respond to my inputs regarding Ballard Urban Village expansion and the opportunity on the 3200 block of NW Market St? I am pasting it again here.
thank you,
Scott Brown

I was referred to you by Councilman O'Brien's office. I'm writing because there is an opportunity to make a further expansion of the Ballard Urban Village that is not included in your current map. The opportunity is to extend it one block west of its current limit along NW Market St to include the 3200 block of NW Market St. This would be a win-win-win opportunity for Ballard, the city, and the owners and residents on the block. Councilman O'Brien visited me here in July, toured our block, and agreed that the addition of the 3200 block of NW Market St to the Ballard Urban Village is a good opportunity for the following key reasons:
1. The majority of lots on the 3200 block of NW Market St are multifamily, both LR-2 and LR-1. The character of the block is strongly multifamily, not single family, and the city's zoning specifications are also strongly supportive of LR-1 zoning for these 10 single family lots.
2. We are adjacent to Metro Major Transfer Point 44 (east-west/UW), and 17X, 18X, 29, 40 (north-south/downtown).
3. The Ballard Senior Center is on our block.

4. The Ballard Locks is 1 block from our block.
5. We are one block from the Burke-Gilman Trail leading shortly to Golden Gardens Park as well as all destinations East.
6. Two LR-2 apartments are on our block and several large apartment complexes are on the adjacent block.
7. The 10 single family homes on our block are identical 1948 post WWII construction that is extremely energy inefficient and architecturally insignificant. These 10 homes are surrounded by LR-1 and LR-2 on 3 sides but "trapped" because SF5000 zoning does not allow us to utilize our lots to their greatest and proper use (multifamily as our neighbors are across the street and on both sides).
8. We have a major street parking problem on our block during Ballard Locks events and all fair weather weekends that could be significantly addressed with development of diagonal-in parking on the south side and alley parking behind our 10 single family homes. This could be connected to all future development projects and would benefit not just our block but Ballard Senior Center members, bus commuters, Ballard Locks event-goers, and nearby block neighbors (reduce spillover to their blocks).
9. Rezoning-enabled LR-1 development would multiply city tax valuations by at least 3-4 times, at no risk or cost to the city.

Please contact me at your earliest opportunity to discuss the best way to help you get our block included in the Ballard Urban Village expansion.
thank you,
Scott Brown, owner/resident

On Fri, Sep 11, 2015 at 6:59 AM, Scott Brown wrote:
Hi Ms.Carroll, have you received my email regarding Ballard Urban Village Expansion opportunity on the 3200 block of NW Market St? I will call to follow up next week if I haven't heard back from you. I hope you will see the advantages I highlighted in my email and will make the short trip to our block to see them and talk to us in person.
Scott Brown

On Sat, Aug 29, 2015 at 12:15 PM, Scott Brown wrote:
Hi Patrice, I received your out of office email, and I'm looking forward to talking to you after you return Friday 9/4. Thanks in advance for your attention to the outstanding opportunity to add the 3200 block of NW Market St, immediately adjacent to the Ballard Urban Village, to the expanded Ballard Urban Village plan. We have a rich combination of the qualities desirable in the urban village, noted in my email above, so this is a singular opportunity for Ballard and the owners and residents on our block.
thank you,
Scott Brown

On Wed, Aug 26, 2015 at 12:09 PM, Scott Brown wrote:
Hi Patrice, I haven't heard back from you regarding an excellent addition to the proposed expansion of the Ballard Urban Village. Is there a number I can follow up with you at?
thank you,
Scott Brown

On Fri, Aug 21, 2015 at 9:35 AM, Scott Brown wrote:
Hi Patrice,
I was referred to you by Councilman O'Brien's office, then David Goldberg. I'm writing because there is an opportunity to make a further expansion of the Ballard Urban Village that is not included in your current map. The opportunity is to extend it one block west of its current limit along NW Market St to

include the 3200 block of NW Market St. This would be a win-win-win opportunity for Ballard, the city, and the owners and residents on the block. Councilman O'Brien visited me here in July, toured our block, and agreed that the addition of the 3200 block of NW Market St to the Ballard Urban Village is a good opportunity for the following key reasons:
1. The majority of lots on the 3200 block of NW Market St are multifamily, both LR-2 and LR-1. The character of the block is strongly multifamily, not single family, and the city's zoning specifications are also strongly supportive of LR-1 zoning for these 10 single family lots.
2. We are adjacent to Metro Major Transfer Point 44 (east-west/UW), and 17X, 18X, 29, 40 (north-south/downtown).
3. The Ballard Senior Center is on our block.
4. The Ballard Locks is 1 block from our block.
5. We are one block from the Burke-Gilman Trail leading shortly to Golden Gardens Park as well as all destinations East.
6. Two LR-2 apartments are on our block and several large apartment complexes are on the adjacent block.
7. The 10 single family homes on our block are identical 1948 post WWII construction that is extremely energy inefficient and architecturally insignificant. These 10 homes are surrounded by LR-1 and LR-2 on 3 sides but "trapped" because SF5000 zoning does not allow us to utilize our lots to their greatest and proper use (multifamily as our neighbors are across the street and on both sides).
8. We have a major street parking problem on our block during Ballard Locks events and all fair weather weekends that could be significantly addressed with development of diagonal-in parking on the south side and alley parking behind our 10 single family homes. This could be connected to all future development projects and would benefit not just our block but Ballard Senior Center members, bus commuters, Ballard Locks event-goers, and nearby block neighbors (reduce spillover to their blocks).
9. Rezoning-enabled LR-1 development would multiply city tax valuations by at least 3-4 times, at no risk or cost to the city.
Please contact me at your earliest opportunity to discuss the best way to help you get our block included in the Ballard Urban Village expansion.
thank you,
Scott Brown, owner/resident

On Thu, Aug 20, 2015 at 11:36 AM, Goldberg, DavidW wrote:
Thank you for your email. I still have Mr. Knight’s email from May 2014 on this topic. The focus our work and community engagement for Urban Design and Transportation Framework is the central portion of Ballard. The Draft Comprehensive Plan includes a proposal to consider expanding the urban village to the east, and you may provide comment to Patrice Carroll (cc’ed here) requesting your area also be considered for expanding the urban village.
best

David W. Goldberg
Senior Planner
City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

From: Scott Brown
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2015 1:36 PM
To: Goldberg, DavidW; Kambuj, Aditi
Cc: Scott BrownBusiness; Dave Knight; O'Brien, Mike
Subject: Ballard Hub Urban Village Opportunity

Hello David and Aditi,
I was referred to you by Councilman O'Brien's office. I'm writing because there is an opportunity to make a further expansion of the Ballard Urban Village that is not included in your current map. The opportunity is to extend it one block west of its current limit along NW Market St to include the 3200 block of NW Market St. This would be a win-win-win opportunity for Ballard, the city, and the owners and residents on the block. Councilman O'Brien visited me here in July, toured our block, and agreed that the addition of the 3200 block of NW Market St to the Ballard Urban Village is a good opportunity for the following key reasons:
1. The majority of lots on the 3200 block of NW Market St are multifamily, both LR-2 and LR-1. The character of the block is strongly multifamily, not single family, and the city's zoning specifications are also strongly supportive of LR-1 zoning for these 10 single family lots.
2. We are adjacent to Metro Major Transfer Point 44 (east-west/UW), and 17X, 18X, 29, 40 (north-south/downtown).
3. The Ballard Senior Center is on our block.
4. The Ballard Locks is 1 block from our block.
5. We are one block from the Burke-Gilman Trail leading shortly to Golden Gardens Park as well as all destinations East.
6. Two LR-2 apartments are on our block and several large apartment complexes are on the adjacent block.
7. The 10 single family homes on our block are identical 1948 post WWII construction that is extremely energy inefficient and architecturally insignificant. These 10 homes are surrounded by LR-1 and LR-2 on 3 sides but "trapped" because SF5000 zoning does not allow us to utilize our lots to their greatest and proper use (multifamily as our neighbors are across the street and on both sides).
8. We have a major street parking problem on our block during Ballard Locks events and all fair weather weekends that could be significantly addressed with development of diagonal-in parking on the south side and alley parking behind our 10 single family homes. This could be connected to all future development projects and would benefit not just our block but Ballard Senior Center members, bus commuters, Ballard Locks event-goers, and nearby block neighbors (reduce spillover to their blocks).
9. Rezoning-enabled LR-1 development would multiply city tax valuations by at least 3-4 times, at no risk or cost to the city.
Please contact me at your earliest opportunity to discuss the best way to help you get our block included in the Ballard Urban Village expansion.
thank you,
Scott Brown, owner/resident

Date: 10/13/2015

Name: Dick Wagner

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being

Comment:

Please add these to my comments already submitted:
The cost of parking should be “Pay What You Can”. The money will go to the disadvantaged people of Seattle for residence, food, health care, learning skills and jobs,
Each neighborhood with a shoreline should have wooden rowing boats used and maintained by neighborhood volunteers. The construction of the boats should be funded by the commercial operations in the neighborhood.
Dick Wagner
Founding Director

The Center for Wooden Boats

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @futurewiseWA

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Don't forget to join us today over at @Seattle2035!

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @SoundTransit

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

.@Seattle2035 And Central Link was just the start! Light rail to UW/Cap Hill next year, Northgate in '21, Bellevue and Lynnwood in '23!

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @bluliner

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

@SoundTransit @Seattle2035 Is not further south to Angle lake worthy of mention?

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @spenceroncities

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

@Seattle2035 As people live more compactly, more diverse, higher-quality parks are needed. Expand streets as parks! https://twitter.com/Seattle2035/status/654706718274748416

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @greenseattle

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Set goals for parks and open space that focus on quality, equity, and proximity to jobs and residences. http://ow.ly/TrX1A @Seattle2035

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @PresentOccupant

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

@greenseattle @Seattle2035 Quality including #quietude, please.

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @spenceroncities

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@jordonez @Seattle2035 @Seahawks a few more championships would make the district more beloved!

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @Seasports12

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@Seattle2035 it needs what the stadium district study proposed

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Talk about a blast from the past! @FuturewiseWA is tweeting today for #Seattle2035.
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
.@Seattle2035 One idea is to improve our Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) program. Learn more from @UrbanistOrg: bit.ly/1GfbUhK

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: Linda Mitchell

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

[In response to 10/15/15 listserv re: Draft Plan Open Houses]
Surprised not to see one of these downtown?

Date: 10/15/2015

Name: Rebecca Baker

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

Keeping cities green: Avoiding carbon lock-in due to urban development

This paper examines carbon 'lock-in' risks from an urban planning perspective, comparing two scenarios of urban development over the next 15 years to gauge the emissions implications of different choices.
http://www.sei-international.org/publications?pid=2829
Rebecca Baker
--
[paper attached]

Date: 10/17/2015

Name: Donn Cave

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

The Urban Village is not a bad idea, but it's already wearing thin in practice. We're losing much of the particular value of some neighborhoods under the weight of over-developed bloat, while vast residential deserts remain somewhat barren of walkable destinations. It isn't a trend you want to project out to 2035. Look through the city to find places that have the potential to serve as neighborhood villages, instead of punishing the neighborhoods that were already walkable on their own by turning them into little cities.

Date: 10/18/2015

Name: Jim Borrow

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Having reviewed the online EIS statement, I'd like to express my preference for Alternative 3 of the 4 growth alternatives.
I believe growth should be directed toward urban growth centers and urban growth villages that will be served by light rail. In addition to the light rail that currently exists within Seattle, it is possible that more light rail will be built within Seattle to bring more reliable rapid transit to other areas of the city. Even with the improvements that have been made bus service is inconsistent and unreliable. I think Alternative 3 strikes the proper balance between growth and maintenance of the character that makes Seattle a remarkable place to live and work.
Sincerely,
James and Janice Borrow

Alternative 3
Guide Growth to Urban Villages Near Light Rail

page16image5176
•Higher level of growth in urban centers and villages close to light rail
•Adjusts boundaries of urban villages near light rail to be within a 10-minute walk of stations
•Possible new urban village around the potential light rail station at NE 130th Street & I-5

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Rance Dewitt

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

This cute visual is identical both for Japan and the US- illustrating the absolute necessity for TPP as a gathering of nations from the Pacific Rim to work together for future survival. FUKUSHIMA is forgotten- but it too is a 'cute visual' of mounting RADIOACTIVE waste that can come tumbling down with the least tremor. One is a like image of the other. Every TPP partner has a vested interest in preserving the Pacific Ocean. Donald Trump is perhaps the only 'business' person capable of being non-political. youtu.be/Njp8bKpi-vg

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Jean Tinnea

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Use parcel boundaries so both sides of a street are the same part of/not part of Urban Village.
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Extend Union St. Urban Village to 20th Ave to include the vibrant businesses and community gathering spots already active. Rezone the E. Union UV as proposed by DPD (see Quan Lin.) to add housing and jobs in our \'hood: 40\' 20th-21st/65\' 21st-24th.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Add the block between 21st and 20th into the Union Street Urban Village. There is more commercial activity on Union between 21st and 20th than between 21st and 23rd. On the north side of Union the building on the corner of 21st and Union was built in 1929. It houses Central Cinema, 2020 Cycle, CommuniTea, Mind and Body Pilates, Hollow Earth, Rudis, and others. The commercial buildings at the corner of 20th and Union include Chuck\'s Hop Shop, Katy\'s Coffee, Magpie, and a chiropractic clinic.
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Splitting neighbors who face each other on a common street is not always best. Easiest for cartographers, but that should not rule the process.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Lucas Simons

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?

Is parking as a key function of public right of way a key function on all public right of way? Is each function more or less important depending on where they are in the city (in UC, UV, outside UV)?
This survey seems kind of silly. Most of the proposals aren\'t really disagreeable. Can it be framed more in a way to find what proposals respondents think is more important in relation to the other proposals?

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Sarah Kavage

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
2. this works in theory - in practice I\'m not sure
6. single family
9. ?
10. THESE ALL SOUND GOOD BUT ARE MEANINGLESS W/O CONRETE ACTION
TRANSIT! Where is the transit that we are guiding growth to? Many of the UVs have taken as much growth as they can stand...with the result of getting pushed out of our neighborhoods + suffering the indignity of slow, infrequent transit (plus continued rate hikes).
I hate to sound NIMBY but this is not fair...single family...[cut-off on scan]
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Yes! I think the major unintended consequence of driving growth to urban villages has been the loss of our neighborhood landmarks - many of our familiar commercial districts have been changed beyond recognition. landmarks lost = a sense of dislocation, loss of identity, loss of the distinguishing features of the UV neighborhood.
To continue! I think requiring mixed-use everything is a mistake. Require smaller storefronts to support small businesses. Give serious incentives for historic preservation in UVs.
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
1. in single family neighborhoods
2. in single family neighborhoods!
7. this relates to my comment above...
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
also:
TRANSIT!!
also:
AFFORDABLE HOUSING!! DO SOMETHING ALREADY

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
How did item 4 get here? It looks out of place

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Identify other new urban village locations that can grow into great nhood centers with high transit demand. It\'s especially important to create these new UV in low displacement risk areas that don\'t yet have good transit - Madison Park, Magnolia, Wedgwood, Sand Point.
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
3. I would put all 3 of my picks here if I could.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Thank you for doing this - I think you need to get this survey out other than just through these meetings
Affordable housing & efficient transport need to be the main focus of this plan as these are the two major deficits we currently face. To maintain diversity within neighborhoods, there should be different types of housing in each: basic, mid-range, and high-end. Giving developers a choice of either building affordable housing or contributing to a fund may cause a lack of diversity in neighborhoods that attract wealthier residents, as developers cater to those higher-paying tenants...[cut-off]...the high demand. The city needs to set limits on how much high-end housing is allowed within our micro neighborhoods...[cut-off on scanned page]
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
1. where it makes sense
2. define [parcel lines] please
4. Sidewalks may need to be built to make it more liveable - these shouldn\'t be an exclusionary criteria
6. Over time the UV will encompass both
7. Isn\'t an UV an economic area too? (Free-lard is an example so is parts of CD & Capitol Hill & First Hill)
I agree with the urban village concept in terms of encouraging transit and economic development, but I think the focus on UVs will disproportionately impact these areas. SF-zoned areas need to decrease/change and allow more multi-family options
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
2. isn\'t this how all SF homes currently are?
3. & 4. these are similar depending upon where they are built, no?
7. Only when it makes sense & so it doesn\'t oversaturate the area, resulting in empty storefronts or only chains because the rents are too high - Capitol Hill is overflowing with this problem right now
I think it\'s a mistake to not allow multifamily housing development outside these designated UVs. The recommendation made by the HALA committee that Mayor Murray struck down needs to be put back on the table. Otherwise, ...[cut off of scan]...neighborhoods will bear the brunt of the [increasing] population.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Ballard and Lake City are de facto urban centers. So make them so officially. Kirkland and Issaquah have proposed absurd urban centers in wastelands where their residents don\'t want to go so it\'s unclear whether they\'ll really accomodate that many people. The reason they designated them seems to be to get light rail priority. If those dubious urban centers are on the books, then Seattle\'s two other real and successful urban centers should be on the books too.
There\'s a gap between those who qualify for...[cut off of scanned page]
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Include a full 10-minute walk circle around frequent transit nodes - all multifamily.
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Walkability is top priority, everything else will fall into place. Minimize the number of steps between destinations.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
1. Whole walk 5 min better
5. Work w. Port
9. What do you mean
Please include neighborhood update maps. They are moving together. Incentivize family housing, affordable rent and home ownership. How to ensure enough single family homes! How to make design better - no more HARDY PANELS. NO MORE Boxes.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Liz Campbell

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
2. (note edit made) [crossed out \"parking\"]
10. (down town elementary)
I really like the bones of this plan...would like to see a fleshing out of some specifics as well as finishing neighborhood planning with sensitivity to prevalent wages and cost of housing balanced.
May we please have comp. plan presentation in Belltown for some of the N. Downtown urban centers/villages (Belltown, Uptown, Denny Triangle)
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing

expanded boundaries?
[Avoid boundaries that divide parks or natural areas]: I think boundaries that require shared stewardship are good
Yes...(this seems odd I know)...the wealthier parts of my neighborhood shave of from the rest of the neighborhood, and that hurts the whole.
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The impact of buildings on infrastructure (sewage in particular.)
Not displacing working class housing/usage.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
sufficient infrastructure - geat - that\'s called concurrency!
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
[Row housing] w/ the little yards in back!
GARBAGE COLLECTION
Encourage BIDs to make it not feel like you\'re living in a sea of trash (ah-hem...Pike St.)

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Andrew

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Concurrency of providing services and transportation in exchange for accepting density is essential
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Allow overlaps + sharing
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Tandem cottages

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Give consideration to existing undesignated - but historic residential neighborhoods (Capitol Hill - Miller Neighborhood). No off street parking to many homes - if allowing adjacent multi-family. Always always require parking for every unit - for example! How is a 74 unit housing on 21st E (North of Madison) allowed to have no car parking - they used the bike trade off - so have 52 bike spaces instead - this is not

helping livability in an way - reconsider this loop hole
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Consider parking on street for homes without off street options. Keep historic neighborhoods - protect scale in existing historic buildings single family + multi-apartments

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Rachael Lassegue

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Concerned appropriate affordable housing not addressed
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Maintain integrity of neighborhood

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Mike Steckler

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Create zoning to allow 2 small houses on one lot

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: Mike Usen

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
3. How?
Upgrade Ballard to UC if served by HCT.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
4. keep stadiums out of industrial land
There should be more time alotted for public Q&A. It allows for more of a community discussion, answer questions in a way that every one can learn and makes it look less like the city is trying to pull one over on us.
6. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?

Expand them where people want to live

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
1. What is \"walkable\"? What does that mean in steep slope zones like Capitol Hill? especially for families with small children, disabled, etc.
5. though I need to review it more closely
6. FOR FAMILIES!!!
9. What does that mean? \"Current practices\" and policies seem to be a constantly shifting target
10. though, gawd, Seattle Public Schools is a mess re: upper management/administration. they don\'t instill confidence that this could be achieved.

Date: 10/19/2015

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

4. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
More neighborhood planning
8. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Urban agriculture. Small manufacturing to provide lower skill jobs (less focus on service industry jobs)

Date: 10/19/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Seattle 2035 Draft Plan Open House Notes
Miller Community Center
October 19, 2015
(Note: Comments were recorded on blank easel pads. The sorting by themes was done after)
Community Character

1. The aesthetics count. I don’t like the cheap modern architecture next to old character homes.
2. Incentivize preservation of character homes, lowrise zones.
    a. Preserve original facades.
    b. Tearing down releases carbon.
3. Too much modern ‘Lego’ architecture.
    a. No more orange hardy panel.
4. When eliminating SF homes, need design review.
5. Incentives to keep original buildings instead of tearing down.
6. Keep façade/character of existing housing – ex: craftsman style.
7. Tighter Design Review.

8. Houses must blend and co-exist with existing historic style. Respect history (aesthetic, style, modulation).
    a. Must hurry because hideous buildings going up.
9. Capitol Hill neighbors care deeply about the character and beauty of our homes and neighborhood.
    a. New development does not fit - - it is forever, and it is an insult to our neighborhood history.

Parking

1. Seattle has to address car storage issue. (Even if a tenant commutes by transit/bike, they usually have car).
2. A lot of employees drive to work in my area. When parking requirement was removed, didn't anticipate this growth.
3. Putting No Parking zones (new housing units) in neighborhoods that are not walkable is a way of keeping families out. Most of Seattle needs a car if there are kids. Only areas in parts of Capitol Hill, downtown, U-District are areas that should allow No Parking developments.
4. I have a family (8 yrs.) and choose to live without a car. I value being able to walk to school, grocery stores, library, retail, restaurant and friends. I disagree with previous comment re: need for parking . Neighborhood centers/villages should not require parking.

Housing

1. Have to consider >60% AMI too, not just very low income.
2. Some higher cost new units should be in outlying areas to minimize displacement.
3. I think the ADU regs are key, and duplexes could be allowed most places.
4. Consider reducing minimum lot sizes in SF areas.
5. Leave room for FAMILIES in centers like Capitol Hill - - too many pods and studios, not enough 2-bedrooms going in (and, those should be affordable too).
6. Adding vitality – should be a mix of unit types in development (i.e. family size units).
7. Reevaluate housing diversity options in all SF zones.
8. Encourage development of basic and mid-range apartments (i.e. not just high end).
9. Studio apartments might get to housing affordability for that demographic, but families can't live in apodments – desperate need for diverse housing. (+1)
10. Can the fee in lieu of on-site affordable units equal what it would cost to develop the required units on site??YES
11. Expanded "housing choices" should be citywide, not just within urban villages.
12. Incentivize family units
13. Affordable home ownership opportunities – including affordable home ownership.
14. Preserve affordable housing and increase transit service.

Parks & Open Space

15. The proposed Comp Plan "update" would be a devastating blow against open spaces, cultural areas, and trees. The website and handouts are not honest about the dozens of deletions and changes that would weaken the protection and promotion of open spaces, trees, etc. Urban Villages and Centers in particular would lose their current priorities for green spaces. You must issue specific, honest lists of the many parts of the current Comp Plan that would be deleted or weakened. Be honest with the public!
16. Address livability deficits in growth areas (e.g. parks)? please! (for parks) (+1)
    a. ?crosswalk link.
17. NEED PARKS AND GREEN STREETS in Belltown and Lower Queen Anne – extend Bell Street and growing Vine Street!

Urban Village Strategy & Boundaries

18. Yes to transit-based density.
19. Yes to urban village expansions:
    a. "Build everybody in so we don't push anybody out".
20. All not in E. Union Urban Village – Central Cinema, Chuck's, Katie's Coffee, Magpie, 20/20 Cycle.
21. Explain what UV is and how they are changing.
22. Ballard and Lake City should be Urban Centers. (More appropriate than Suburban Centers).
23. Northern boundary of N. Rainer UV does not make sense – park is property of state.
24. Yes to urban village boundary expansions. We should all be growing together, not just pushing all of the city's growth onto a few places.
25. Construction costs for different types of development should be included in the equity analysis. Concentrating development in fewer places will rely on more high-rise construction producing more expensive housing. Expanded urban village boundaries could allow the city to meet growth projections with less expensive wood frame construction. Boundary expansion especially makes sense in areas with low displacement risk.
26. Consider consolidating Madison-Miller and 23rd- Union villages.
27. Allow more corner store and small offices. Helps SF area be more walkable.
28. If we only expand UV boundaries near light rail and rapid ride stations, and we only put those high capacity transit investments in dense neighborhoods, are we condemning large swathes of the city to never get the density that would facilitate high capacity transit investment? Could we create a new UV designation for neighborhoods that don't yet have great transit to build towards becoming a place that warrants more transit investment?
29. "My little post office gone; veterinarian – gone; cobbler – gone; my vacuum repair – gone; Harvard Exit – gone; hardware store – gone, 15th Ave Video – gone. But, oh-boy! . . . another over-priced restaurant. How does this help our livability??"

Transportation

30. It doesn't appear that, re: "Other Plans", the changes to bus routes (Metro's recent plan) were considered. Was public transit weighed in? Cuts to routes in densifying areas would seem not.
31. ROW Allocations – One big issue is Pike/Pine garbage. It takes up space – it makes for a crappy living environment. How is it considered when making use of the streets and sidewalks?
32. When weighing walkability and proximity to transit, are you considering topography, especially in high elevation/steep gradient areas like Capitol Hill, especially for families, disabled, etc.? (Trying to get small children up a hill).
33. Add definitions of the 6 essential functions of the ROW.
34. Preserve affordable housing and increase transit service.

Local Plans

35. More density. 23rd & Union should accompany new park/public open space. Need investment of new park at 23rd as part of any rezone.
36. Open Space @ 23rd & Union?
37. Belltown needs STS station.
38. Belltown needs STS plan presentation.

Other

39. Expand the website to detail the many ways in which policies now in the Comp Plan would be deleted or changed to reduce the current requirements for local conditions to be considered and neighborhood planning to be done before the zoning changes are adopted.

40. The Comp Plan proposals don't provide an accurate list or explanation of the many deletions and changes from the current Comp Plan. You've got to be straight with the public! Provide lists of everything that would be deleted! And, list every change, as hundreds of them are highly substantive, not "housekeeping"!
41. Meeting format?don't cut the Q & A short. Free-range Q & A because it helps people learn from each other.
42. Present rezones with Comp Plan info – information on neighborhood planning.
    a. Balance sheet of permits in the pipeline.
43. "We need concurrency between accepting density and receiving the transportation and other benefits promised." We are getting the density and less transportation, [bus services will be cut when Capitol Hill light rail opens].
44. Proposals need to acknowledge aging population e.g. see above comment – bus services will be cut when Capitol Hill light rail opens). And good luck for the poor person describing this. ?
45. Must consider how to achieve carbon neutrality. New buildings should be more green – i.e. solar.
46. Sensitive groups to address?veterans – need a lot of services – more diverse.
47. Property taxes are going way up. Makes me wonder about supporting levies. ˜ 20% increase.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: @SeaTransitBlog

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@mjgiarlo @Seattle2035 I bet you have to go back to the original GMA/neighborhood planning to find out.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: @mjgiarlo

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@SeaTransitBlog @Seattle2035 K. It feels like a bit of a missing link.

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: @futurewiseWA

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Good crowd at Miller Community Ctr talking @Seattle2035 tonight. Four more mtgs coming up! http://2035.seattle.gov/calendar/ http://pic.twitter.com/fP7tcbMSB8

Date: 10/19/2015

Name: @HDC_SeaKC

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

The comp plan reflects the vision for Seattle's future—so don't miss out on this opportunity to speak up! Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Tonight is our first Draft Plan Open House! Miller Community Center, 6-8pm. Stop by!

Date: 10/20/2015

Name: Gabrielle Glass

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I live in the university district and fully support the expansion of neighborhood boundaries. The expansion of these boundaries would allow for a greater variety of living options within this city. Overlaid onto this expansion should be a finer grain details for neighborhoods. The plan as it reads now is vague about the changes which would occur, which should be a city based priority, not solely neighborhood based.
First I would propose including smaller commercial districts in the up zone, in a scale fitting within the scale of the surrounding neighborhood. An area like Tangletown, surround by single family homes yet still with it's own identity. These areas should be made stronger to expand the variety and scale of neighborhoods for living and working.
second, I would propose that changes to existing buildings in the core of a neighborhood, like 'the ave.' have greater restrictions on them. While a neighborhood changes, the communal spaces, like main streets and parks, should be slow to change. The slow to change shared spaces would provide a constant in a neighborhood and help ensure that the identity of a neighborhood isn't uprooted.

Date: 10/20/2015

Name: Anita Bowers

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am very pleased to see your plans for the Seattle neighborhoods. Please include Montlake in this process.

Date: 10/20/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

this this a million times this. @Seattle2035 http://pic.twitter.com/hr1Tkn5AcC

Date: 10/20/2015

Name: @mjgiarlo

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

What's the history behind the portion of Rainier Ave S. btwn Orcas & Rose not being an urban village? Missing link? @SeattleDPD @Seattle2035

Date: 10/20/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

ummmmm
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Should our Draft Plan prioritize minimizing displacement of marginalized populations and businesses? bit.ly/1Ll71Wy #Seattle2035

Date: 10/21/2015

Name: Julia Holden

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

Hello,
I recently learned of the plan to expand the Urban Village boundaries in Ballard and Crown Hill. I do not support the expansion of the boundaries due to issues with transportation and congestion in both these areas. Expanding density into additional Single Family zoned areas will create additional demand on an already overtaxed transportation system. Current traffic challenges exist for both buses and cars.
I regularly ride the “Rapid Ride” into downtown Seattle. Calling that Rapid is laughable. Buses do not show up on schedule and on average take 45 minutes to travel 5 miles. Until there is a non street based transportation option in Ballard (ie light rail, monorail,etc), we should not continue to expand the areas where density is allowed.
I urge you to reconsider this proposed expansion and instead focus on growing density closer to areas who have light rail. Creating additional density closer to the new UW light rail station would be an excellent alternative.
Thanks
Julia Holden

Date: 10/21/2015

Name: Charles Wheeler

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

We need bicycles that follow the rules of the road. Definitely not the San Francisco model of running red lights. I see lots of bicycles without lights front or back. Older people do not ride bikes and need bus transportation.
http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/bike/Laws.htm
which says: Riding at Night - For night bicycle riding, a white front light (not a reflector) visible for 500 feet and a red rear reflector are required. A red rear light may be used in addition to the required

reflector (RCW 46.61.780).
From the state is http://www.dol.wa.gov/driverslicense/docs/driverguide-en.pdf
Obey all traffic laws – Traffic law violations cause most bicycle/motorist collisions. By following the traffic laws, bicyclists help tell drivers where they are going and when. Drivers should take responsibility for knowing the laws that apply to bicyclists. AND •• When riding at night, the bicycle must have a white headlight visible for 500 feet and a red reflector visible for 600 feet to the rear. A flashing taillight or a steady red taillight may be used in addition to the red reflector.

Date: 10/21/2015

Name: Gordon Padelford

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Land Use

Comment:

Hello,
I support increased density and a pedestrian friendly small business core around the 23rd and Jackson intersection as part of this update. Incentivizing small businesses, especially minority owned businesses to be able to afford to operate in this neighborhood hub is important given the pressure that increased zoning can cause. I would also like to see even more zoning to allow five residential stories over one commercial floor construction than is currently being proposed in the urban village, especially along the arterials of 23rd and Jackson.

Date: 10/22/2015

Name: Michael

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hello 2035,
Per the map provided in Seattle 2035 it seems to me that the Magnolia Village commercial area is zoned Neighborhood Commerce. Is Magnolia Village NC-40?
Michael Plunkett

Date: 10/22/2015

Name: @FHOARCH

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Did you know Seattle is expecting to add 120,000 people, 115,000 jobs by 2035? Great online input site @Seattle2035 http://ow.ly/TJfoY

Date: 10/22/2015

Name: Jorgen Bader

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Jorgen Bader
October 2, 2015
Department of Planning and Development
Attn: Seattle 2035
RE: Seattle 2035.
Draft Comprehensive Plan
Dear Planners:
The Draft Comprehensive Plan needs revision in its sections (1) on urban villages and their boundaries and (2) to provide for public plazas. The proposed extension of the Roosevelt Urban Village lacks g1·ounding in reality; the failure to provide for public squares in urban centers shows both an ignorance of urban planning and hist.ory and a lack of vision for Seattle's coming density.
Roosevelt Urban Village
Seattle 2035 maps, especially the appendix, shows the "Green Lake/.Roosevelt Residential Urban Village," expanding to the east to 16th Avenue N.E.; to the south-east in a curved diagonal to take in whole blocks of the Ravenna neighborhood north of Ravenna Park from N.E. 64th at 16th Ave N.K to N.K 62nd St. at 2Qth Avenue N.B.,; and to the south of this enclave to gulp down Ravenna/Cowan Parks and the part of the neighhorhoods of the University District north of Ravenna Boulevard N.E. None of the :::tffected blocks asked for these extensions and none of the neighborhood associations rleclare that they rlesire them. HistoricaHy, 15th Avenue N.E. haR been the divide between the Ravenna neighborhood and the Roosevelt neighborhood. School aged children living on the west went to Green Lake Elementary; those on the east went to Ravenna Elementary. The Department of Neighborhoods maps and its statement boundaries show 15th Avenue N.E. as the divide. Businesses located on the west use "Roosevelt" to identify their location; those on the east use "Ravenna." A few years ago, the City proposed an up-zoning of the Sisley Block hetween N.E. 65th St. and N.E. 66th St. and 14th Ave. N.E. and]5th Ave. N.E. Residents from both sides of 15th Ave. N.E. opposed it··· they wrote letters, submitted petitions, and filled the Roosevelt High School Theater for the City Council hearing. Those from the east side especially objected lest the up-zone set a precedent for up-zoning the areas to the east. The councilmemhers, who voted for the up· zone, tried to soothe the audience and mitigate the impact of their actions by saying that there were n0 plans to up-zone any eastwru·d areas; they later repeat.ed that limitation in explaining their votes at the City Council meeting that enacted the ordinance for the upzone. Residents in the extension area have been active in the Ravenna· Bryant Community Association--- one was president for several terms; at least two have been secretaries; and many have served on the board of di1·ectors. They have made it very clear that they want to keep the residential character of their ne)ghborhood as curxently existing. Those south of N.E. 65th St. have worked hard for traffic detours and calming to keep traffic out and keep their enclave a single family neighborhood. The Seattle 2035 extension runs completely contnu-y to the area history and community desire.
Historically, Cowan/Ravenna parks have been the divide between University Park and the University District on the south and Ravenna on the north east of 15th Avenue N.E. and Roosevelt on the west. The Department of Neighborhoorls maps and community councils use that divide. 1t benefits the parks since both abutting neighborhoods take a community int.erest in them and donate volunteer hours ca1·ing for them. The street grid system, hus service, school attendance pattern~ , daily travel and commercial patt.erns tie the area south of the parks to the University District- not the Roosevelt district. The community associations strongly oppose the ext.ension. Last August, the City created an assessment district, called the University District Business Improvement Area ("BIA"), to charge businesses, apartments~ and condominia a special assessment like a tax for the purpose of sponsoring decm·ations in public spaces, economic promotion, street cleaning, and~ among other activitie~, neighborhood planning. 'l'he BIA runs up to Ravenna Boulevard from Roosevelt Way to 17th Ave. N.E .. DPD's draft comprehensive plan would encompass the northerly properties within the Roo~evelt Urban Village for

planning pm·poses. At the same time, the City will be taxing them fo1· planning in the University District Urban Center.
This proposed extension shows a failure to follow GS 2.3, page 24~ and a need to make it more explicit. GS 2.3, page 24, states: "ERtablish boundaries for urban centers, urban villages, and manufacturing/industrial centet·s that reflect existing developmentpatterns, intended community characteristics, and recognized neighborhood areas." It should be revised with these additions: "Establish boundaries for urban centexs, m·ban villages, and manufacturing/industrial centers that reflect existing development patterns, intended community characteristics, historic commercial relations, community opinion, the street grid, and recognized neighborhood areas (including particularly those of the Department of Neighborhoorls).
The Department of Neighborhoods proposal paid no attention whatever to the underlined factors. The Comprehensive Plan should add anothe1· GS as follows: 'Whenever an extension of an urban center or urban village is proposed, the proponent must accompany the recommendation with a report explaining how the extension would implement each enumerated factor and benefit the residents/businesses in the extension area."
With this extension, when queried, the planners gave no good reason for up· setting the long established pattern. With this proposal, DPD's desktop planners have created a lot of anxiety and exti·a work for affected residents without any sound basis on the ground.

Plazas and Community Focal Points On June 20, 2013, the Department of Planning and Development published the "University District Urban Design Framework (called the "Framework Study" for short). It was prepared by the "City", the University of Washington, and the Urban Design Working Group in conjunction with the U District Livability Partnership Steering Committee over the course of several years with community input. The Framework Study called for an urban square in the heart of the University District. The "University District Open Space Fonnn", prepared with participation of the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation and the Department of Planning and Developmen4 recently adopted by the University District Partnership, has a square/plaza as a prominent feature. The square/plaza would allow people to assemble and express their grievances or support; hold rallys; let people en mass participate in important events (watching an event with others on a large screen often adds enjoyment to a spectator); host a farmers' market and exhibits, open air theaters, concerts, candidate forums, and Chautauqua's; set up facilities for temporary activities (such as half court basketball hoops, large surface chess and checker boards, and children's play structures); provide outdoor play areas for children in the neighborhood day cares; serve as assemblage/mobilization space during emergencies; and just allow harried residents a place to sit, relax, and enjoy the sunlight. Pioneer Square in Portland serves as an example .. Open Space/Squares have been central to building a sense of community. Plazas harkens back to antiquity, e.g. Roman and Greek cities had large plazas in their center; in the middle ages, cities throughout Europe had large open squares, often in front of the cathedrals. Cities laid out in 19th Century Latin and South America and in the Eastern United States (e.g. New York city (Washington Square), Washington, U.C., and Philadelphia,) and of course, San Francisco. Such squares are prominent in the modem era in Paris, Copenhagen, Berlin, Dutch cities, and Prague, among others. Open space/squares adds to the quality oflife, and some experts say, to assure healthful, productive and esthetically and culturally pleasing The draft Comprehensive Plan needs supplementing to properly provide for such public squares in urban cente1·s. The draft Comprehensive Plan in GS 4.14 (p. 32) calls for urhan villages to be wa1kab1e; in GS 4.26 (p. 33) to consider the needs of the community; in ED 1.4 (p. 118) to enrich the neighborhood bm::iness districts through int.egration of design, public art, public space, and cultur'll spaces and programming. PG l (p. 130) comes the closest of any goa]~ or strategies t.o mentionjng plazas or puhlic squares. It needs the word "gathern addecl as shown 1n 1t::~lics in the qunte. "Provide a variety of outdoor and indoor spaces throughout the city for

all people to play, learn, contemplate, gather, ~nd build community." (Italicized word added) rrhere should be ~ strategy to provide public squares or plazas for the public to assemhle in large numbers in urban centers for recreation, community activities, and exercise of First Amendment Freedoms, especially in those neighborhoods with a high concentr~bon of college age youth . Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Yours truly I
;~;~&
I
J01:gen Bader

Date: 10/23/2015

Name: Rance Dewitt

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

www.eaglenest.us

Date: 10/23/2015

Name: @joe_landon

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Speaking about #Space #Entrepreneurship at @Seattle2035 next Friday. Lineup has @spaceflightinc + @kymetacorp: http://ow.ly/TJwMD

Date: 10/23/2015

Name: Jon Morrison Winters

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

Good morning! Just a quick comment that more coordination between SDOT's plans and the Comp plan would be nice. While SDOT is planning for a Graham St Light Rail station in 2020, partially funded through the Move Seattle Levy (assuming it passes), your maps still don't show the new station. To wit: http://2035.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/othello-sf-zones-and-expanded-UCUV.pdf If the plan is moving toward more TOD, this feels like a glaring omission.
Moreover, the urban village strategy doesn't appear to consider my neighborhood, Hillman City, in a coherent manner. It chops us up into plans for Columbia City and Othello. It would be nice to see some planning that is neighborhood-centric, as opposed to amorphous "planning areas." The urban villages in Rainier Valley are too big for walkability. It would be better to see three distinct "urban villages" composed of the walksheds around the light rail stations at Columbia City, Othello, and Graham St.
Thanks.

Date: 10/24/2015

Name: Kate Forster

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I live on Northeast 62nd Street, between 17th and 20th Avenues. I strongly oppose the redrawing of Roosevelt's boundary to include this little single-family enclave from 65th to Ravenna Park, and from Brooklyn to 23rd Avenue. I have watched the rather bewildering changes in the Roosevelt corridor from 45th to 50th, with high-density buildings and very little provided parking. I understand that rapid-transit generated density is inevitable, even desirable. Building on the Sisley properties can only be an improvement, and I look forward to the tasteful properties that will replace the Sisleyville slum.
On the other hand, the homes within the confines described above have historical significance, are beautifully maintained, and will offer a green, natural area for strolling and dog-walking to the denizens of the condos planned for Roosevelt. Changing the zoning of this neighborhood raises the spectre of 7-story condos bordering the parks, pushing out families who chose this area because of its desirability and neighborliness. This is a neighborhood which sponsors an annual Easter egg hunt and a family-oriented block party. For many years, an ice-cream social was hosted in the grassy area of Ravenna park. These activities cannot take place in a high-density environment.
Preserving green, single-family enclaves is an amenity to those who will live in the high-density zones that will line the light rail's route. Greed is the only reason I can think of for turning our city over to developers. Single-family neighborhood preserve the humanity and beauty of our Emerald City. I urge you to resist destroying Ravenna Northeast.
Kate Forster

Date: 10/25/2015

Name: Jeffrey Cook

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Hello Seattle City Planners and Council~
Below are my comments on the proposed comprehensive plan. I will be attending an upcoming meeting and will add my comments in person as well as sending them in this letter for the record.

My comments fall into four main categories:
1. Livability
2. Compatibility
3. Involvement
4. Transport and Parking

1. Livability and 2. Compatibility
Reinstate language from previous comp plan LU11, "Discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community"

Reinstate language from previous comp plan UV55, "Seek to provide open space in conjunction with major public projects such as utility and transportation projects, with the amount of open space based on the size of the project"

In the current draft of the plan, LUG1, clarify what "allowing infill development compatible with established context in areas outside of centers and villages" means, especially the word "Compatible".

Structures should not be able to tower over adjacent properties, or push directly up the property line of existing homes.

In the current draft of the plan, LU1.7, clarify what "Require future land use map amendments only when needed to achieve a significant change to the intended function of a large area" will result in. At this point, the meaning is vague and it is unclear who will make the determination on this change.

In the current draft, LU5.3, "Control the massing of structures to make them compatible with the area's planned scale, provide a reasonable ration of open to occupied space on a site and allow the building to receive adequate natural light", the language should read "Make them compatible with the area's EXISTING scale. Who determines what "reasonable ration of...space" is? or "adequate" natural light? These terms are vague and open to developer abuses.

In the current draft, LU5.4, "Establish maximum height limits to maintain the desired scale relationship between new structures and existing development" should strike the word Desired (By whom?) and replace it with the words "A Fair and equitable relationship". The middle of this goal has unfinished language; "And, especially in lower-scale residential areas." What does this refer to?

In the current draft, LU8.2, "Protect designated single-family areas intensity that are predominantly in single-family residential use, or that have environmental or infrastructure constraints". What does any of this sentence mean? If the goal is to protect designated single-family neighborhoods from becoming multi-family neighborhoods, even in urban villages, then this goal is good but the wording is unclear. ALL single-family neighborhoods, currently established, should be protected in order to maintain the full-spectrum of housing available to future Seattle-ites and prevent urban flight.

LU8.10 "Reflect the character of existing low-density...and setbacks". This is a good goal. Retain.

From the previous plan, LU81, "Limit building heights to establish maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent building, and limit view blockage" should be reinstated.

And most importantly to reinstate from the previous plan:
LU94 "In order to maintain a consistent and appealing character in low-density multifamily areas, adopt development standards that help ensure new development and converted structures contribute positively to the character of multifamily neighborhoods and are compatible with abutting single-family zoned areas in terms of scale, opens space an setbacks, siting and unit orientation"

3. Community Involvement:
At every opportunity in the current plan draft, pursue options to make sure that the community has a voice in all aspects of city planning which affect their properties, lifestyle, and quality of life.

4. Parking
Several aspects of the current draft plan are troubling in regards to automobiles and parking. It is not realistic to simply assume no one will drive in the coming 20 years, and to penalize people for doing so is not a solution to our current traffic problems.

From the former plan, reinstate LUG6.1 "Provide safe parking and loading"
From the former plan, reinstate T-39 "In determining parking policies, consider Parking spillover into residential areas"

In the current plan, LU6.15, "Discourage the development of major, stand-alone park and ride facilities within Seattle". Why discourage this? More people would take transit if they could find a safe place to leave their car during the day. Not everyone lives so close to a bus or train stop that they can only take public transit. I for one would take the train more often if I could drive my car near a station and leave it there. As it is, I have a 30 minute walk to the train. Give people more options to participate in the mass transit system by encouraging, or at least not discouraging, parking areas located outside of the downtown core.

Thank you
Jeffrey Cook
Beacon Hill resident

Date: 10/26/2015

Name: Michael Huber

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

I attended a presentation at the Crown Hill center on Sat 10/24.

After much discussion it became apparent that there were two separate initiatives being discussed regarding the Urban Village of Crown Hill (CHUV):

1. Zoning may change for the area currently designated the UV. We were told that the discussion will be throughout 2016 and into 17.

2. Expansion of the CHUV is being considered under the 2035 plan.

My comments below refer to both those initiatives, wo will leave it to you to decide how to categorize them.

a. Upzoning was discussed. I do not see how in good conscience the City can/could allow developers to pay to be able to go beyond or around current Single Family zoning restrictions. I truly hope that this is not happening….. but then, I wonder, how do previously SF zoned areas of Ballard suddenly have condos and townhouses sprouting forth!
b. If Crown Hill is a Village, then the City should provide us sidewalks and storm sewers BEFORE allowing developers to put up structures that do not fit in with the current single family norm. Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should you simply defray the implementation of infrastructure to the developers themselves. It would be haphazard, inconsistent and probably poor quality. If having the City take on the responsibility is a costly deal-breaker, then oh well. You can have your development in areas that already have sidewalks – like Ballard. Maybe work on Urban Villages that already have such infrastructure and leave Crown Hill and Bitter Lake and other North-of-85th areas alone. See comment “e” about our lacking a Community Center.

[[[For the record, I don’t care if we get sidewalks. They tend to limit the parking, and change the “fixes” that we have come up with. Also, one of my tactics for slowing cars down is to walk very close to the

middle of the road where I can also more effectively mouth the words “Slow Down” as the cars swerve around me.]]]]

c. If we indeed are a Village, then let us have our own 20mph speed limit on the residential streets. Seattle has a pilot program for that, but are you doing it in any Villages? I have argued for MANY YEARS to have the Mayor simply decree that henceforth the residential limit shall be 20 instead of 25. So much cheaper than all the speed bumps and traffic circles and jut-outs and swerves to slow cars down. About 2 years ago the Legislature finally given cities that option. Speeding is usually not a problem South-of-85th because the sidewalks and parked cars create a natural road diet. But not so along the long streets of Crown Hill – from Holman to NW 100th, from Mary to 12th NW – where cars routinely speed to get from 15th and 85th to Blue Ridge and Broadview, and vice versa.

d. I am PERFECTLY okay with allowing ADU and DADU in our CHUV. And I like the idea of a group of small cottages too. The additional parking will be a minimal impact to our village, and these units provide the needed low income rental spaces. No need to add sidewalks just for these (see comment “b” above)!

e. The City folks told us that Urban Villages have parks and community centers. Please know that Crown Hill does NOT have a community center. Ballard, Lake City, Loyal Heights, etc. all have official Community Centers, but Crown Hill has the old CH School which is NOT an official Seattle structure. We all fought hard to keep the school from being sold and turned into condos. We had to fight also for the City to finally give us a park at that site; you were about to renege on the 1999 levy that had included that site. One of my fears is that Small Faces -- which owns the Crown Hill school building and leases it to ARC Ballet and Gilbert & Sullivan Society and a handful of other tenants – will not be able to maintain it. If they sell, then Seattle should step up to buy it from them to create a TRUE Community Center! Our Village needs no less….
That is all for now. I hope that the City representatives who attended the 10/24 meeting provides you the feedback they heard from others.
m
Michael Huber,

Date: 10/26/2015

Name: @joe_landon

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Nice seeing you today @b0yle! Hope to see you at Friday's @Xconomy @Seattle2035 event.

Date: 10/26/2015

Name: Joshua Berger,David Gering,Jason Gross,Terri Mast,Vince O'Halloran,Lindsay Pulsifer

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

October 26, 2015
Tom Rasmussen, Chair of Transportation Committee
Seattle City Council
Scott Kubly, Director

Seattle Department of Transportation
RE: Request to defer any consideration of the Occidental Avenue South street vacation

Dear Councilmember Rasmussen and Director Kubly:
We are a coalition that shares significant concerns about the proposed development of a major regional spectator sports arena at the intersection of First Ave. S. and South Holgate St. in the SoDo district of Seattle. Our concerns are centered on the additional vehicular traffic the arena will generate, and its negative economic and environmental impact on Port of Seattle operations, existing sports facilities, Seattle commuters, the maritime industry, and the SoDo business, manufacturing and industrial district. On September 3, 2015, the Seattle Design Commission voted to recommend to the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) that a portion of Occidental Ave. S. be vacated for purposes of providing land for and access to the proposed sports arena. Under Seattle procedures, the Commission's recommendation moves to SDOT and the City Council.

We respectfully request SDOT and the City Council defer any consideration of the Occidental Ave. S. street vacation petition until all "final transaction documents" (which were defined by the December 3, 2012 Memorandum of Understanding) have been agreed upon by all parties. We believe that neither SDOT nor the Council can today make the requisite finding that the street vacation is "in the public interest." Only after the final arena transaction documents have been negotiated, and all mitigation measures—and impacts that cannot be mitigated—are known, can SDOT and the Council understand the full impacts of the proposed street vacation and make a determination that is based on facts and grounded in the spirit of the MOU.

Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, Chair of Transportation Committee
Scott Kubly, Director, SDOT
October 26, 2015
Page 2
Background on SoDo Arena Street Vacation

On December 3, 2012, Seattle, King County, and WSA Properties et al. (collectively "WSA") executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) pertaining to the proposed SoDo sports arena.1 Among other things, the MOU required WSA to obtain "[a]ll permits necessary for construction, use and operation of the Arena, and all parking and other facilities accessory to the Arena."2 Included in these permits are a Master Use permit and "all other permits or approvals required for the project…"3 Although not mentioned in the MOU, one of the required approvals is for WSA to obtain a vacation of Occidental Ave. S. because this street directly underlies the proposed arena.

WSA is pursuing this street vacation per Seattle procedures. On or about March 19, 2013, WSA Properties et al. filed a petition for street vacation and this petition was referred to the Seattle Design Commission. On May 21, 2015, the Commission approved the "urban design merit" of the street vacation and, on September 3, 2015, the Commission made a finding that the vacation provided a "public benefit." The Occidental Ave. S. street vacation petition matter now moves to SDOT and the City Council for their respective consideration and approval. It is important to note that the Design Commission's recommendation addresses only a single criterion among the many policy considerations—the project's design merit-- that must be considered in determining whether an arena in this location is in the "public interest."

SDOT now must "prepare an analysis for the City Council including a recommendation whether the

vacation should be granted or denied, recommended conditions, mitigation measures, and the specific public benefits of the proposal."4 Following receipt of SDOT's recommendation, the Transportation Committee of the City Council holds a public hearing on the proposed vacation. The Committee "may accept or alter the SDOT recommendation, including altering or adding conditions or mitigation measures or refining the public benefit proposal." The Committee forwards its findings to the full Council for consideration and final action.

SDOT and the Council Should Defer Consideration of WSA's Street Vacation Petition Until All Final Transaction Documents Have Been Negotiated

We believe neither SDOT nor the Council should act on WSA's street vacation petition until the parties to the MOU (WSA, Seattle, and King County) have negotiated final transaction documents, as anticipated by Section 23 e. of the MOU. It is not until this time that either SDOT or the Council can fully assess the "public benefit" of the proposed street vacation.

1 A copy of the MOU can be found at
http://www.seattle.gov/council/attachments/2012arena/20121008mou.pdf
2 MOU § 25 a.
3 MOU § 4.
4 http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/streetvacations.htm

Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, Chair of Transportation Committee
Scott Kubly, Director, SDOT
October 26, 2015
Page 3

Our request for deferral is based on the fact that, at this point in the arena approval process, there are numerous open-ended and unresolved mitigation issues that need to be addressed. Until these issues are resolved, it is impossible for SDOT or the Council to make an informed "public interest" determination. The following highlights several open-ended, unresolved mitigation issues and outlines why they are relevant to whether the street vacation is in the "public interest."

- Consideration of Alternative Sites: The MOU requires the City of Seattle to conduct a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review of the proposed SoDo arena; this SEPA review requires the City to consider alternative sites, including the Seattle Center.5 Whether the proposed SoDo arena, and the vacation of Occidental Ave. S. underlying the arena, is "in the public interest," however, hinges heavily on whether the Council concludes the SoDo site is preferable to alternative sites. Until the Council resolves this issue neither SDOT nor Council can meaningfully make the determination whether the vacation of Occidental Ave. S. is in the public interest. The Council-sponsored study evaluating future options for Key Arena, and the impact of a new SODO arena on Key Arena and Seattle Center finances, was recently completed. It provides a fact-based analysis that should support the decision process.
- Consideration of Nearby Mitigation: The MOU requires the City, in its SEPA review of the arena project, to consider "a comprehensive traffic analysis, impacts to freight mobility, Port terminal operations, and identification of possible mitigating actions, such as improvements to freight mobility, and improved pedestrian connections between the arena and International District light rail station, the Stadium light rail station, and the SoDo light rail station."6 Similarly, the MOU requires the City to determine, based on the SEPA documents, whether "it is appropriate

to proceed [with the SoDo arena project] with or without additional or revised conditions based on the SEPA review."7 This means that the City must determine the extent of mitigation and infrastructure improvements and who (the City, County, or WSA) should be required to finance and implement these mitigation measures. SDOT and the Council must make these important mitigation decisions before determining that the vacation of Occidental Ave. S. is in the public interest. This should include an accurate and comprehensive identification of impacts that cannot be mitigated and how they impact the "environment," as that term is defined by SEPA.

5 MOU § 5.
6 MOU § 5.
7 MOU § 24 b.

Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, Chair of Transportation Committee
Scott Kubly, Director, SDOT
October 26, 2015
Page 4

- The SoDo Transportation Infrastructure Fund: The MOU specifies that the final transaction will include a "SoDo Transportation Infrastructure Fund." 8 The purpose of this fund is to provide funding for nearby transportation improvement projects. But the MOU specifically provides that this fund "will not be utilized to fund any Project-specific transportation infrastructure mitigation required through the permitting and SEPA process for the Project."9 Because it is unknown what the final mitigation requirements will be, it is unclear today the extent to which the arena's SoDo Transportation Infrastructure Fund will offset the street vacation's impact on SoDo transportation corridors.
- Economic Impact Analysis: The MOU required WSA to fund a City-commissioned "economic impacts analysis" of the proposed SoDo arena.10 It states that the analysis "shall study the net economic costs and benefits of the construction and operation of the arena in the geographical areas that would be affected by the construction and operation of the arena, including without limitation retail, commercial, industrial and freight transportation." We believe the Council must evaluate the arena's own economic impact, and its impacts on the Port and other businesses, before considering whether WSA's street vacation request is in the public interest.
- MOU-Sanctioned Land Use Initiatives: The MOU also includes a clause committing the City to a land use study for the vicinity of the proposed arena, with the participation of stakeholders. The intent of the study is "to develop new land use mechanisms to maximize the economic viability of the Duwamish Manufacturing / Industrial Center, and civic vitality of the Stadium Transition Area Overlay District." MOU 22b. The study was completed in 2013; however, the City still has not taken action on the industrial lands advisory committee study findings and recommendations. In fact, the City's current draft Comprehensive Plan Update does not include the industrial committee's recommendations. This is another area where the MOU-triggered mitigation is not yet defined. Yet, the disposition of the recommended land use provisions is a critical factor in the City's ability to determine "public benefit" for the Occidental Ave. S street vacation petition.

In conclusion, we believe that in the absence of an agreement on the full range of mitigation measures required by WSA, and a clear understanding of any remaining impacts that cannot be mitigated by proposed measures, it would be inappropriate and contrary to sound public policy

8 MOU § 11 a.

9 MOU § 11 a.
10 MOU § 23 g.
Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, Chair of Transportation Committee
Scott Kubly, Director, SDOT
October 26, 2015
Page 5

for either SDOT or the City Council to proceed with WSA's street vacation petition process. We urge SDOT and the Council to defer any consideration of WSA's street vacation petition until after the Council has approved the final transaction documents.
We welcome the opportunity to discuss this further.

Sincerely,
Joshua M. Berger
Coordinator
Washington Maritime Federation
David Gering
Executive Director
Manufacturing Industrial Council
Jason Gross
Vice President
ILWU Local 19
Terri Mast
President
Inland Boatman's Union
Vince O'Halloran
Seattle Branch Agent, Sailors' Union of the Pacific
Executive Secretary and Treasurer, Puget Sound
Ports Council, Maritime Trades Department AFL-CIO
Lindsay Pulsifer
Managing Director
Maritime Division, Port of Seattle
cc: The Honorable Ed Murray
Seattle City Councilmembers

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: Andy Reynolds

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Just want to register a protest. Not sure why most of the areas that are stereotypically middle class and up have evening times. There's only one in an area that is clearly people of color has an early morning start time. That reflects to me that you don't expect much interest from that group. Not an inclusive way to behave.

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: Brian Regan

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Please show the differences (if any) on the 2035 Land Use map from the current Comp Plan map.

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: Edward Boyer

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I urge that a new Key Proposal be added, namely to Protect Single Family Homes.

Such a proposal should be added to protect single family homes. New growth need not be in Seattle proper. Tech company growth can be encouraged in outer areas connected by mass transit. Making more dense living areas near settled single family home areas makes them more expensive and encourages rezoning to remove single homes in favor of high rises. This would not make Seattle more affordable, compare Manhattan.

Leaving out any proposal to protect Single Family Homes is not in the best interest of thousands of Seattle citizens who live in single family homes and is a way to target taking out Single Family Homes in favor or more dense areas.

Edward F. Boyer

Edward F. Boyer, WSBA # 4432
Attorney at Law
Boyer Law

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

yes. vacate redundant streets. preserve land for housing
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Should the Plan deemphasize parks acreage goals, and instead encourage a variety of public open spaces? bit.ly/1LpWINK #Seattle2035

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

yes. vacate redundant streets. preserve land for housing
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035

Should the Plan deemphasize parks acreage goals, and instead encourage a variety of public open spaces? bit.ly/1LpWINK #Seattle2035

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: Matthew McCoy

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Can I get a more detailed map on the proposed areas with new mandatory affordable housing

Thank you
Matthew McCoy

Sent from my iPhone

Date: 10/27/2015

Name: Peri Hartman

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Hello,
I would like more information on the proposed zoning changes for uptown and queen anne, regarding the seattle 2035 plan. I've looked on the web pages and found a land use map but haven't found any specifics on zoning. Can you point me to that please.
Thanks,
Peri Hartman

Date: 10/28/2015

Name: @joe_landon

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Excited to be in good company for @Seattle2035 event on 10/30. It's not too late for tickets. http://ow.ly/TUGIU @Xconomy

Date: 10/28/2015

Name: Rebecca Laszlo

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear "City Leaders,"
I support creating safe, healthy, affordable homes in my community because:
"It creates a healthy, business community."
Over the next 20 years, my community's most important housing needs will be:

"Mixed use and mixed income housing."
The City could do more to ensure affordable housing by:
"New taxes or developer fees."

Date: 10/28/2015

Name: Laura Benjamin

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Dear "City Leaders,"
I support creating safe, healthy, affordable homes in my community because:
"everyone deserves the right to live in a safe, healthy and affordable home; to not have to chose between rent and other needs"
Over the next 20 years, my community's most important housing needs will be:
"creating and maintaining healthy, affordable, family-sized housing"
The City could do more to ensure affordable housing by:
"better monitoring and enforcing housing conditions, implementing MFTE and bedroom minimums to provide housing opportunities for families"

Date: 10/28/2015

Name: Monica Joe

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear "City Leaders,"
I support creating safe, healthy, affordable homes in my community because:
"More people deserve to live near valuable social and economic resources that this city has to offer."
Over the next 20 years, my community's most important housing needs will be:
"Those who are getting priced out due to gentrification. More people are wanting to live in urban areas but everyone should have a chance! Especially those who are already living here. Let's not displace them!"
The City could do more to ensure affordable housing by:
"Exploring their entire toolkit. There are tons of tools available for affordable housing! Work with the private market and provide incentives. Everybody wins."

Date: 10/28/2015

Name: Megan Espinoza

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear "City Leaders,"
I support creating safe, healthy, affordable homes in my community because:
"It is a basic human need/right. Everyone should be able to live in the community they work in/want to be in. Our community benefits from having a range of voices from diverse racial and economic backgrounds."

Over the next 20 years, my community's most important housing needs will be:
"Housing for the homeless population that continues to increase in Seattle. Housing for low wage and middle income workers who are not the focus of the current development market."
The City could do more to ensure affordable housing by:
"Supporting economic policies that promote the development of affordable housing. Making the inclusion of affordable units in all new development mandatory."

Date: 10/30/2015

Name: Andrea Snyder

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development

Comment:

The City and Chamber could help coordinate the funding and technical assistance services out there to minority-owned businesses. So much of these services are in English only or are just unknown to these populations.

Date: 10/30/2015

Name: Kji Kelly

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

Re: Recommendations on Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments
Dear Ms Sugimura,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft, specifically the proposed Arts & Culture Element where the Historic Preservation component now resides. Historic Seattle is the only citywide nonprofit dedicated to protecting Seattle's unique character through our efforts to educate, advocate, and preserve. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan is to meet the requirements of Washington Growth Management Act and set forth a 20-year vision for the city's growth. It should provide a bold vision that aligns with the plan 's four core values- race and social equity, environmental stewardship, economic opportunity, and community- and guides the development of goals and policies. Historic Seattle has strong concerns that historic preservation is not prominently featured throughout the Draft Plan. The re-use and rehabilitation of historic buildings is a key component of each of the Plan's four core values.
In our current economic boom, we are witnessing the demolition of our historic buildings at an alarming rate. Each time a historic building is demolished, Seattle loses an irreplaceable piece of its unique character. The Draft Plan highlights critical core values vital to our City yet does not acknowledge the role historic buildings play in these values. These core values cannot be achieved without the preservation of Seattle's historic buildings.
Why does historic preservation matter?
• Our older buildings play a vital role in defining Seattle's sense of place and the character of its neighborhoods. Since the city adopted its landmark preservation ordinance in 1973, it has established 8 historic districts and designated more than 450 individual sites, buildings, structures, and objects. The city's Historic Resources Survey, last updated in 2000, includes over 5,000 properties. These places contribute to Seattle's identity and quality of life, create a distinctive sense of place, and serve as tangible reminders of where we came from. If we continue to tear down old buildings, the city will lose its authenticity and what makes it a great city. It will become anonymous, without its historic compass.

• Reinvesting in historic properties sparks economic revitalization. Preservation and adaptive use projects provide important economic benefits to the community by stimulating neighborhood revitalization, creating local jobs, and attracting local businesses.
• Historic preservation is sustainable development. Reusing and rehabilitating a historic building is more socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable than demolition and new construction. Building reuse almost always offers environmental savings over demolition and new construction. The city should demonstrate its leadership role and embrace the adage, "The greenest building is one that is already built." Historic buildings enhance community character and preserve affordable housing.
The Preservation Green Lab's Older, Smaller, Better report demonstrates that neighborhoods with a "fine-grained mix of old and new buildings" were more economically, socially, and culturally vital than areas with mostly newer, larger buildings. Additionally, these neighborhoods already have density between 30 and 100 residential units per acre. Historic preservation goals and policies do not exist in a vacuum. Preservation encompasses all of the plan's core values and should be balanced with other goals and policies. The 159-page draft plan references the term "historic preservation" in various sections (LU5.17, LU7.2, LU14.15, LU15.5, H4.9, and ED1.4) and "Historic District and Landmarks" are referenced on page 67 under the Land Use Element (LUG16, LU16.1-LU16.4). However, historic preservation is not treated as an important and broad priority shaping a sustainable and livable city.
One of the biggest challenges will be finding strategies to accommodate anticipated growth, while also preserving historic buildings and respecting neighborhood character. Areas slated for high-density development must strike a balance between historic preservation goals and other policy objectives. Tools must be developed to manage this change.
What is proposed is a weak Historic Preservation component (ACG5) within the new Arts & Culture Element having little relevance to the rest of the plan's goals and policies. The proposed policies do not convey a robust historic preservation program.
What are the specifics of Historic Seattle's position?
The attached memo provides our comments and recommendations to better integrate historic preservation into the new Comp Plan by:
• Expanding the Historic Preservation goals
• Strengthening the Historic Preservation policies
• Strengthening and expanding the proposed survey/inventory policy
• Connecting the Historic Preservation component with other Comp Plan elements
The city's most vibrant urban neighborhoods are those with a high concentration of historic buildings and mixed-scale development. The city needs to invest in its future by balancing new growth with the existing building fabric. The Comp Plan should value stewardship of historic properties as an important priority along with clean water, natural resources, open space, environmental stewardship, and social equity.
As we continue to grow, the city will face design and development challenges, as well as opportunities. Seattle 2035 should lay out a path that leverages our historic and cultural resources in achieving healthy, complete communities. If historic preservation continues to be marginalized within the Draft Plan, Historic Seattle fears that our city will lose all the qualities that make it a desirable place to live, work and play.
Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Kji Kelly
Executive Director
--
Recommendations for the Historic Preservation Component
Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan

Historic Seattle offers the following recommendations to promote preservation and enhance planning, regulations, and incentive tools:

EXPAND THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION GOALS

The Draft Comp Plan distills the Historic Preservation component down to one goal (page 140): ACG5- Preserve assets of historic, architectural, archeological or social significance. Seattle Municipal Code (Chapter 25.12- Landmark Preservation) states "the economic, cultural and aesthetic standing of this city cannot be maintained or enhanced by disregarding the heritage of the City and by allowing the unnecessary destruction or defacement of such cultural assets."

The Historic Preservation component should establish a long-range vision for how historic and cultural resources will be used in the future. Other goals to consider include:

• Foster stewardship of neighborhood, place, and landscape as contributors to the city's viability and vitality
• Promote a broad, comprehensive definition and awareness of historic preservation
• Celebrate the diverse physical form and fabric of the city
• Promote the city's historic and cultural resources as an economic asset
• Promote the environmental benefits and opportunities of preserving and adaptively reusing historic buildings
• Prioritize preservation and rehabilitation opportunities as a strategy and planning tool in Seattle's land use regulations

STRENGTHEN THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION POLICIES

The draft plan outlines six policies related to historic preservation and cultural resources. The language found within the Draft Comp Plan is weaker than the existing plan and three of the policies (CR12, CR14 and CR15) have been removed. Other policies to consider include:

• Identify and establish alternative means to protect the historic character of neighborhoods selected as urban centers and villages
• Protect the scale and character of the established urban fabric, while encouraging compatible and context-sensitive infill development

Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive use of buildings to conserve resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment

• Promote seismic and energy efficiency retrofits of historic buildings to reduce carbon emissions, save money, and improve public safety
• Identify historic resources that can be successfully used to meet the city's housing goals
• Encourage the creation of ecodistricts to achieve sustainability and resource efficiency at a district scale
• Develop planning tools to conserve and protect older neighborhoods that have a unique scale and identity, but are not currently protected
• Encourage adaptive use of historic community structures, such as meeting halls, schools, and religious buildings, for uses that continue their role as neighborhood anchors
• Mitigate impacts of new development on historic properties
• Identify, preserve, and protect archeological resources

STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND THE PROPOSED SURVEY/INVENTORY POLICY

The survey and inventory policy (AC5.3) should prioritize and expand future inventory efforts that:

• Focus on areas of anticipated growth as part of future planning projects
• Encourage preservation in areas that are currently under-represented
• Maintain and conduct periodic updates to the city's Historic Resources Survey identifying potentially significant resources

Additionally, these efforts should go beyond the baseline inventory and take a more proactive approach to nominate and designate individual properties and historic districts.

CONNECT HISTORIC PRESERVATION WITH OTHER COMP PLAN ELEMENTS
Historic preservation is integral to all four of the plan 's core values and should be referenced throughout the Plan's goals and policies:
• Land Use- encourage building and site designs that respect the unique built natural, historic, and cultural characteristics of Seattle's neighborhoods. A study by the Preservation Green Lab, Older, Smaller, Better, documents how the character of buildings and blocks- their human scale, structural rhythm, massing and aesthetic balance- contribute to the urban vitality of a neighborhood. The Comp Plan should use this to inform land use policies and encourage context-sensitive development that fills in gaps within the established urban fabric.
• Housing and Economic Development- include adaptive use projects as part of the solution for providing quality, affordable housing options. Rehabilitation of existing housing units and other building types (i.e., former schools, warehouses, etc) provides residents with choices and contributes to a variety of housing options.
Rehabilitation of historic buildings is pivotal to responsible neighborhood development. Projects benefit both small entrepreneurs and larger developers taking advantage of tax incentives. The PGL's Older, Smaller, Better report provides clear and powerful data that these older buildings draw a higher percentage of local businesses than new construction.
• Environmental Stewardship- the city should demonstrate its leadership by developing a strong policy that encourages stewardship of existing buildings as part of its sustainability goals. The policy for establishing energy-efficient standards (Policy E15.6) places emphasis on high-performance new buildings as a means of reducing the greenhouse gas emissions.
As the adage goes, "The greenest building is one that is already built." Building reuse offers environmental savings over demolition and new construction. It saves on landfill space and energy expended in recycling materials from demolition, not to mention the building's embodied energy. Life spans for new buildings are often 30-40 years vs. more than 100 years for most historic structures.
• Neighborhood Planning- older buildings play a vital role in defining Seattle's sense of place and the character of its neighborhoods. Updates to the citywide neighborhood planning policies should take into consideration a neighborhood's distinctive physical characteristics including building scale, massing, materials, etc.

Date: 10/31/2015

Name: David Hoff

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I have just seen your proposal for our neighborhood. I wish the person who drew the dashed lines would have visited the neighborhood before marking up her/his map. The dashes make no sense, going through the middle of houses and making arbitrary turns. And, had the person visited the neighborhood, he/she would have noticed how special the area is, particularly the area east of 15th that abuts the park, and the unique three block long Naomi Place. I can' t see how destroying these neighborhoods is in the best interest of anyone.
Please be more specific as to where you are drawing your lines, make sure all involved in this potentially devastating change actually visits the area effected, and re-draw the lines to end at 15th to prove that Seattle can accommodate most of the state's growth and still maintain some of the character that attracted folks into neighborhoods even before the Big Boom.

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Marilyn Spotswood

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hi,
My husband, two kids and I are residents of Ravenna. We LOVE our neighborhood. Have you driven through on a weekend afternoon to see all the kids running around; adults walking to/from the grocery store; bikers traveling along the greenways; young moms pushing strollers along the sidewalks; neighbors gathering on street corners to catch up? This is a quintessential Seattle neighborhood that all of us who live here love and cherish. Please preserve this wonderful place.
I am horrified by the proposed expansion of the Roosevelt Urban Village. The proposal shows boundaries that cut right through Ravenna (seemingly cutting through some homes??). Why? It's my understanding that we have met the city's goals for increased density with 1400 new residential units planned in this area over the next 3 years.
When is the madness going to stop? This endless quest for high density is slowly but surely destroying our city and neighborhoods.
Marilyn Spotswood

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Meredith Regal

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft proposal - thank you.
My husband and I have lived in Ravenna for nearly 30 years. We support more bikes and public transit, and we also believe that density is necessary. We love New York City, which is the epitome of urban density. But to do away with the classic Craftsman houses and gardens in our area would be a travesty. The area around Roosevelt High School is perfect for density, and it makes sense to build up that part of the neighborhood. But doing away with anything east of 15th would be deeply disturbing to us. We might even consider moving, because we wouldn’t be able to enjoy peaceful neighborhood walks, which we love, and would certainly not enjoy the quiet that we currently are fortunate enough to appreciate. Please reconsider changing anything east of 15th.
Thank you,
Meredith Regalj

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Patricia Finlayson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

If one looks at population maps of Seattle or visits various districts, one is struck by the large number of areas where poverty or disinterest or lack of community spirit results in ample spaces for smart growth and community amenities to be located. Developers are not clamoring to build there despite the needs. Instead they encourage city council, building and planning departments to damage existing functional

neighborhoods to cram in more affluent bodies thus destroying the very traits which lead people to be attracted to those neighborhoods.
The south Lake Union building boom has yet to provide a single location for individuals of low or moderate incomes to replace those torn down to build their overpriced and sterile apartment housing for Amazon. So the argument that building density assures reduced housing prices doesn't prove out in this city. The University of Washington proposed partnering with a developer to provide reasonably priced housing for new faculty in the University District. The resultant concrete and glass bunkers don't seem to have attracted the target market. Perhaps the uglification of Ballard and the lack of any design criteria or requirements besides smoke alarms alerted them to the fact that shortly that too would join the list of less desirable places to set down roots.
A few cardboard signs in the neighborhood encourage stopping for pedestrians. They're supposedly put up as temporary by an organization called "zero/vision Seattle". This lack of vision (zero) is increasingly applicable to the whole building/planning apparatus of the city of Seattle as well as the elected officials who say one thing while running for office but turn around and do the opposite once they're in office.
Pat Finlayson

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Laurie Hemingway

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Well said, Woody. ;)
Laurie
Sent from my iPhone
On Nov 1, 2015, at 1:47 PM, "Woody and Lori" wrote:
I am adamantly opposed to having the Ravenna neighborhood, including Cowen and Ravenna Parks, incorporated into an expanded urban village. Why compromise such an outstanding, livable neighborhood with a great sense of history and community? We love living here but feel like our concerns are being ignored and that the City really wants us to leave.

Why not listen to the recommendations of the Roosevelt neighborhood plan that called for high density at its core, tapering down to the single family residence neighborhoods east of 15th? I support increased density in this core area, including more low-income housing, but also favor maintaining strong single-family neighborhoods such as ours. Currently, we feel under siege. Does the City really want to get rid of its single family neighborhoods? It seems that way.

Meanwhile, the kind of density that is being built is almost universally ugly (consider Ballard, Northgate, and Roosevelt), devoid of adequate pedestrian space, parks or greenery. It is transforming Seattle into a generic city without character and with low livability. In fact, what Seattle is currently doing is throwing up density, literally and figuratively. This is a bonanza for developers, but terrible for neighborhoods, trees and green space, and for any sense of community.

What is the vision for Seattle? To turn it into a monoculture of tall apartment houses minus trees, green spaces, pedestrian amenities or single-family neighborhoods?

Let's strike a balance between increased density in appropriate urban core zones complemented by single-family residence areas, great parks and green spaces. Keep the high density and urban village

boundary within the Roosevelt core area.

Respectfully,

Woody Wheeler

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Woody Wheeler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am adamantly opposed to having the Ravenna neighborhood, including Cowen and Ravenna Parks, incorporated into an expanded urban village. Why compromise such an outstanding, livable neighborhood with a great sense of history and community? We love living here but feel like our concerns are being ignored and that the City really wants us to leave.

Why not listen to the recommendations of the Roosevelt neighborhood plan that called for high density at its core, tapering down to the single family residence neighborhoods east of 15th? I support increased density in this core area, including more low-income housing, but also favor maintaining strong single-family neighborhoods such as ours. Currently, we feel under siege. Does the City really want to get rid of its single family neighborhoods? It seems that way.

Meanwhile, the kind of density that is being built is almost universally ugly (consider Ballard, Northgate, and Roosevelt), devoid of adequate pedestrian space, parks or greenery. It is transforming Seattle into a generic city without character and with low livability. In fact, what Seattle is currently doing is throwing up density, literally and figuratively. This is a bonanza for developers, but terrible for neighborhoods, trees and green space, and for any sense of community.

What is the vision for Seattle? To turn it into a monoculture of tall apartment houses minus trees, green spaces, pedestrian amenities or single-family neighborhoods?

Let's strike a balance between increased density in appropriate urban core zones complemented by single-family residence areas, great parks and green spaces. Keep the high density and urban village boundary within the Roosevelt core area.

Respectfully,

Woody Wheeler

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Woody Wheeler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Well said! You express our thoughts on this eloquently.

Woody and Lori
----- Original Message -----
From: Judy Bendich
To: 2035@seattle.gov
Sent: Sunday, November 01, 2015 12:54 PM
Subject: [Ravenna West NG 4827] The dotted lines around Ravenna Park and the currently intact neighborhood
Dear Person or Whatever or Whoever made this map:

As you can see from the address below we live in the area circled by a dotted line that meanders in a peculiar fashion through my neighborhood and even includes Ravenna Park. We endorse truly low-income housing, endorse mother-in-law apartments, but cannot understand why the City seeks to destroy this neighborhood. Single family homes (with mother-in-law apartments) are fine. Destruction of this area with high density housing is not. Neighborhoods that have both high density and single family homes are compatible and one should not be sacrificed for the other.

The Roosevelt/Ravenna community has already exceeded the high density housing requirement under the current comprehensive plan – and well beyond 2035. The high density area now exists from 15th Avenue NE to the west and along the arterial NE 65th Street. High density zoning and building is rampant the entire length of Roosevelt NE, 12th NE, and will soon encompass most of 15th NE and University Way south of Ravenna/Cowen Park.

The area to the east of 15th NE to 20th Avenue NE and around Ravenna Park is unique. The annual Easter egg roll takes place just across from my house – in a patch of green in Ravenna Park and has been going on for over 25 years. NE 62nd Street is a designated "greenway," heavily used by dog owners, pedestrians, children, and bicyclists. The area south of NE 65th Street between 15th and 20th Avenues NE is lovely, with well-maintained homes and friendly and concerned neighbors who care deeply about this neighborhood as a living vibrant community. Many people come here to enjoy the park, picnic, or even engage in "tournaments" a la Renaissance Faire. You can hear the frequent hoot of the barred owls, occasionally see a scarlet-throated pileated woodpecker, and enjoy the serenity of a walk in the ravine. In spring the huge yellow flowers of the skunk cabbage dot the stream banks running through the park and even wild trilliums peek out from the underbrush. (Hard to imagine that serenity continuing to exist under this proposal.)

The dotted lines on the 2035 map make no sense. There is no indication within those dotted lines exactly what is intended other than vague higher density. The dotted lines seem random, cut through existing homes, and generally make no sense. Has anyone bothered to actually visit this neighborhood and talk to the people who live here?

High density should begin and end at 15th Avenue NE and even there – due to the park - should not extend more than a block south and north of NE 65th Street. What you really should be focusing on is making current and future high density development esthetic and compatible with the neighborhoods – not the god-awful structures such as in Ballard or that are now popping up in the U. District and along NE 65th Street. There should be building set-backs, court yards, and other spatial planning requirements that make the neighborhoods people-friendly and welcoming. Every "urban village" needs real food stores within walking distance (not high-end, unaffordable places like Whole Foods; there used to be a

small QFC, now gone, where the rapid transit station is being built). A neighborhood needs a real hardware store and other stores that people need in a true "urban village." It needs lots of open, green space in between the high density buildings. Where are these on your maps? "Comprehensive" planning should be real, thoughtful, and thorough. The dotted lines on the map are none of these.

Please include us as completely opposed to the "dotted lines."

Sincerely,

Judith and Arnold Bendich

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Judy Bendich

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Person or Whatever or Whoever made this map:

As you can see from the address below we live in the area circled by a dotted line that meanders in a peculiar fashion through my neighborhood and even includes Ravenna Park. We endorse truly low-income housing, endorse mother-in-law apartments, but cannot understand why the City seeks to destroy this neighborhood. Single family homes (with mother-in-law apartments) are fine. Destruction of this area with high density housing is not. Neighborhoods that have both high density and single family homes are compatible and one should not be sacrificed for the other.

The Roosevelt/Ravenna community has already exceeded the high density housing requirement under the current comprehensive plan – and well beyond 2035. The high density area now exists from 15th Avenue NE to the west and along the arterial NE 65th Street. High density zoning and building is rampant the entire length of Roosevelt NE, 12th NE, and will soon encompass most of 15th NE and University Way south of Ravenna/Cowen Park.

The area to the east of 15th NE to 20th Avenue NE and around Ravenna Park is unique. The annual Easter egg roll takes place just across from my house – in a patch of green in Ravenna Park and has been going on for over 25 years. NE 62nd Street is a designated "greenway," heavily used by dog owners, pedestrians, children, and bicyclists. The area south of NE 65th Street between 15th and 20th Avenues NE is lovely, with well-maintained homes and friendly and concerned neighbors who care deeply about this neighborhood as a living vibrant community. Many people come here to enjoy the park, picnic, or even engage in "tournaments" a la Renaissance Faire. You can hear the frequent hoot of the barred owls, occasionally see a scarlet-throated pileated woodpecker, and enjoy the serenity of a walk in the ravine. In spring the huge yellow flowers of the skunk cabbage dot the stream banks running through the park and even wild trilliums peek out from the underbrush. (Hard to imagine that serenity continuing to exist under this proposal.)

The dotted lines on the 2035 map make no sense. There is no indication within those dotted lines exactly what is intended other than vague higher density. The dotted lines seem random, cut through existing homes, and generally make no sense. Has anyone bothered to actually visit this neighborhood and talk to the people who live here?

High density should begin and end at 15th Avenue NE and even there – due to the park - should not extend more than a block south and north of NE 65th Street. What you really should be focusing on is making current and future high density development esthetic and compatible with the neighborhoods – not the god-awful structures such as in Ballard or that are now popping up in the U. District and along NE 65th Street. There should be building set-backs, court yards, and other spatial planning requirements that make the neighborhoods people-friendly and welcoming. Every "urban village" needs real food stores within walking distance (not high-end, unaffordable places like Whole Foods; there used to be a small QFC, now gone, where the rapid transit station is being built). A neighborhood needs a real hardware store and other stores that people need in a true "urban village." It needs lots of open, green space in between the high density buildings. Where are these on your maps? "Comprehensive" planning should be real, thoughtful, and thorough. The dotted lines on the map are none of these.

Please include us as completely opposed to the "dotted lines."

Sincerely,

Judith and Arnold Bendich

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Hendrika Meischke

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Sir or Madam,
I am writing to express my concern regarding the plans for expansion of the parameters set out for the Urban Village expansion of the North Seattle Neighborhood (Roosevelt square, 65th and 15th Ave NE). Although it makes perfect sense to increase density around the light rail station, expanding the zone for density to encroach on streets like Naomi Place, that have great historic value for the city of Seattle, would be a mistake. I do not live in the street affected by the plan but greatly value visiting those neighborhoods and I hope that the city will consider re-drawing the eastern border to end at 15th to preserve the character of this neighborhood.
Sincerely,
Hendrika Meischke
resident of Ravenna neighborhood

Date: 11/01/2015

Name: Lori Cohen

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Thank you for soliciting comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan. While the City must plan for an increased population, the draft plan will destroy many of our wonderful neighborhoods.
In the Introduction, the plan states: "By concentrating growth in the urban villages, Seattle can strengthen successful aspects of the city's character, continuing to encourage growth in dense,

pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use neighborhoods at appropriate locations throughout the city."
"Strengthening aspects of the city's character" should include maintaining its wonderful single family residences and its parks.
I am both surprised and appalled to see that the draft contains a proposal to extend the boundary of the Roosevelt Urban Village. The definition of urban village is to provide "more flexibility in changing between commercial, mixed use and residential development activities". Commercial and mixed use in the proposed expansion of the urban village is absolutely inappropriate. The proposal includes a line that includes many beautiful old homes in Ravenna as well as Cowen and Ravenna Park. This is not acceptable.
The density in this neighborhood should be consolidated near the current Roosevelt business district. The Roosevelt and Ravenna neighborhoods have long supported density and have a good plan for doing so. In fact, as I understand it, 1400 new residential units are planned in this area over the next 3 years. This development will meet the City's goals for increased density.

The proposed Urban Village boundary must be reconsidered by the City. Thank you.
Lori Cohen

Date: 11/02/2015

Name: A Knight

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

The Comp Plan needs to address the importance of preserving our historic landscapes (parks and boulevards)in retaining the character and quality of life in Seattle.
Please incorporate the expanded historic preservation goals suggested by Historic Seattle, but also add specific mention of the important role of the nationally significant Olmsted parks and boulevards to the future livability of Seattle.
Please send me the language you propose to include.
Also the language in the second sentence in the Historic Preservation Discussion is too vague - using the term "more flexibility". This is not consistent with National Landmark status and protection standards. This sentence should be deleted. A sentence stating that "Historic resources should be incorporated within Seattle's growing urban fabric in a way that retains their significance to the character and history of Seattle." would be more appropriate.
Thank you,
A Knight

Date: 11/02/2015

Name: Ken Sparks

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

The continuing incompetence of DPD when the issue is historic significance is again illustrated in the failure to comprehend that architectural history and preservation is not “arts and culture” and the proposed plan fails to address such issues as:
Expanding the Historic Preservation goals
Strengthening the Historic Preservation policies

Strengthening and expanding the proposed survey/inventory policy
Connecting the Historic Preservation component with other Comp Plan elements
No surprise but it would be nice for the city to be as responsible as other major and minor communities worldwide.
Ken Sparks

Date: 11/02/2015

Name: Barbara Fristoe

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Beacon Hill already has racial and economic diversity, although probably not ideal. Building high occupancy buildings around the Beacon Hill light rail will not necessarily improve diversity. The current building on North Beacon Hill is not low income and there is no reason to believe that additional high occupancy building would be available to low income tenants. All of the building around Seattle seems to favor the developers. I am opposed to limiting single family homes in this area.

Date: 11/02/2015

Name: Mary Gilman

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please include me in email and/or mailing updates on the urban village expansion element of the comp plan draft proposal.
Mary Jean Gilman, Landscape Architect
MJ Gilman Landscape Architecture, LLC

Date: 11/02/2015

Name: Debbie Mclaughlin

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am opposed to changing the boundaries on North Beacon Hill to allow changes in our zoning. It is contradictory to the Urban Village Plan that was developed by the community which committed beacon hill's character to remain single family homes.
Debbie & Mark Mclaughlin

Date: 11/03/2015

Name: Kayla Schott-Bresler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of the Housing Development Consortium Seattle-King County (HDC), please accept the attached comments on Seattle's Comprehensive Plan Housing Element update. Please don't hesitate to be in touch with our staff with any questions or follow-up. We greatly appreciate the work that has gone into this update and look forward to working with the City as this process moves forward.

Thanks,

Kayla Schott-Bresler

Kayla Schott-Bresler, Policy Manager
Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County

Date: 11/03/2015

Name: Mary Coltrane

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hello - I enthusiastically support Historic Seattle's recommendations regarding the Comprehensive Plan update. See below:
Recommendations to better integrate historic preservation into the new Comp Plan
- Expanding the Historic Preservation goals
- Strengthening the Historic Preservation policies
- Strengthening and expanding the proposed survey/inventory policy
- Connecting the Historic Preservation component with other Comp Plan elements

Additionally, I believe the process for this critical update has been deficient in involving Seattle citizens and neighborhoods. This is particularly true in the development of the draft plan. Now we are being asked to endorse it, or to not endorse it, with minimal opportunity to shape the plan. The development of the original plan in the mid-90s should have been a model for this update.
The city is doing too much without adequate citizen input. Survey Monkey is no substitute for public meetings as the plan is being developed. A few meetings after the fact is not sufficient. And most concerning is the make-up of the city council that approves the plan. This should only be done by the new city council, after a substantial public involvement period in which they hear and learn about neighborhood interests and proposals for addressing these issues. With Nov. 20th as the new deadline for comments, it is unclear whether the process will move forward into 2016, or the plan will be approved by the lame duck council.
I would like to see a public involvement report to the new city council.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Mary Coltrane
Olympic Hills

Date: 11/03/2015

Name: Betsy Steele

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035

I am writing to voice my concerns on the proposed expansion of the Roosevelt Urban Village designation included in Seattle 2035 - Draft Comprehensive Plan.
The Roosevelt/ Ravenna area is designated as a Residential Urban Villages (RUVs) per the color code in the map that is contained in the report (see below). Roosevelt RUV is being targeted for expansion into the adjoining single family zoning in quite a haphazard way. This proposed change will destroy many lovely, well maintained old homes and irreparably damage the fabric of this community. I am asking that the expansion of the Roosevelt RUV be eliminated and that current boundaries are maintained.

I have read through the whole report and while I agree with many of the stated goals in this report, I find that your goals are not always supported by the policies and actions being proposed. I have taken a lot of time to study your report so I ask that you take the time to read my comments fully. I have refrained from commenting on all the proposals put forth in this report, just those that will personally affect me and my quality of life.

Neighborhood Planning (page 6 of the Overview Document)
Neighborhood planning is a way to make the Comprehensive Plan relevant at a local level and to reflect the history, character, and vision of the local community. Changes to citywide neighborhood goals and policies focus on planning priorities, community outreach, consistency with citywide policy, and using plans to guide City investments. No changes are proposed to specific neighborhood plans.

If there are no changes proposed then why is the Roosevelt RUV expanded past 15th to the East and why are there a dotted lines extending far into the adjacent neighborhood? The extent of the new boundaries is a significant change and therefore your report is in error right from the start. Second, taking space away from single family areas and taking away historic parkland is not respecting the history and character of this neighborhood and does not reflect the vision of the community who lives here. Once again your report in not internally logical and factual. It is a linguistic pretzel to hide the reality of what is really being proposed.

Our neighborhood has a comprehensive Roosevelt neighborhood plan that was developed with input from all, that addressed adding density by adding high density at its core, tapering down to the single family residence neighborhoods east of 15th. Why is this plan being changed now? Not only have the bold lines been expanded to 20th Ave NE and beyond, but the dotted lines even further. Why are there plans to add high density in single family areas and Cowan and Ravenna parks when green space in Seattle is disappearing?

I fully support affordable housing throughout the city and in the Roosevelt Urban Village. But why are all recent developments in Roosevelt/ Ravenna (such as the new apartments recently completed on 65th just east of Roosevelt) being allowed to charge outrageous rents up to $3,000 per unit? There are high rise condos planned for 65th and 15th on the Sicily properties. What percentage of them are going to be affordable? These developments are bringing more and more cars into the neighborhood without any allocated parking for the residents. Even if the new residents take public transportation not all workplaces will be served by the light rail not coming until 2021. They will still need cars to go shopping and to seek green space since by tis plan half of our local parks will be given over to high density development.

Why are these high end developments being allowed to flourish, enriching developers and providing housing for the wealthy? What about the development of the old Children's Home Society (on 65th and

30th) where the beautiful old trees were bulldozed and huge houses built covering most of the land with little greenspace and with price tags starting at $1.5 million dollars? Is the City now saying that since all available land has been handed over to these developments built for the rich that the city needs to bulldoze more single family residences to make way for affordable housing? What guarantees are in this report that will deliver on that goal of affordable housing? So far in the Roosevelt RUV middle-class families are being pushed out in favor of the rich, what is the city doing to stop this kind of development?

Introduction to the Full Draft Report (page 5)

The main goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to guide the physical development of the city. However, in shaping how we create new spaces for people to live, work, and play, this Plan also promotes better access to jobs, education, affordable housing, parks, community centers, and healthy food for all of Seattle's residents.

The current and future proposed development in the Roosevelt area does not support this main goal. High rises are being built for the rich, the closest affordable grocery store was destroyed to make way for the mass transit station which will not come on-line until 2021. We are lucky to have good schools in our area but with the increased density they will soon be overcrowded. Further investment in infrastructure is what is needed as density increases in the current designated areas before more density is added, taking away single family neighborhoods and open space and replacing them with more concrete palaces for the wealthy. Our streets are being turned over to bicyclists and cars limited. We need easy access to emergency services and we need basic necessities to which we can easily walk if we are not going to be allowed to drive in our neighborhood.

Seattle's Urban Village Strategy (page 9)

By encouraging both business and housing growth in the urban centers and urban villages, the Plan makes it possible for more people to live near job opportunities as well as near services that can meet their everyday needs. In this way, more people are able to walk or bike to some of their daily activities, creating more activity on the sidewalks and streets and making these communities more vibrant. It also puts more people near transit service, so that they can more easily use buses or light rail to get to other job centers, shopping or entertainment. This access is useful for all residents, but particularly those with limited incomes or physical limitations that make them reliant on public transit.

Accommodates Seattle's expected growth in an orderly and predictable way
• Strengthens existing business districts
• Promotes the most efficient use of public investments, now and in the future
• Encourages more walking, bicycling, and transit use in the city
• Retains the character of less dense single-family neighborhoods outside of urban villages

The Roosevelt RUV plan does not provide useful access for all residents in Roosevelt/Ravenna! As a senior on a fixed income I no longer have the option to shop in my neighborhood thanks to the loss of QFC on Roosevelt. I am now forced to drive to the University village or the Safeway on 75th and Roosevelt to do my shopping. This has a negative impact on the environment. To take the bus to go grocery shopping would take over and hour and a half, (I've checked this out via the Seattle Metro planning tool) not to mention the difficulty of carrying bags of groceries on and off the bus and walking several blocks to get to the bus and from the bus to my home. I could try to do this daily to have lighter

bags but seriously? Or I could walk, but the shortest distance is through the park with lots of stairs and an older woman walking in the park is making herself an easy target. Oh wait, you are going to eliminate that part of Ravenna park so maybe it will be safe enough to walk through concrete jungle instead of green trees and fresh air.

Second, when you expand the Urban Villages into single family neighborhoods how does that align with your strategy to retain the character of less dense single-family neighborhoods outside of urban villages? It seems to me that the Roosevelt/Ravenna has already exceeded the high density housing requirement under the current comprehensive plan and boundaries – and well beyond 2035 ? that your intention is to extend the high density into old established neighborhoods and parks. Why is this neighborhood and its parks being targeted to more density when it has met the current goals? I find it unacceptable to take away single family options to provide for unaffordable high rises.

You admit:

However, the long-sought prosperity in these communities has sometimes come at the cost of changing the character of the neighborhoods and forcing some former residents and businesses to leave. Those who left were often lower-income households, whose housing was replaced by more expensive new buildings, or who could not afford the rising rents brought on by the neighborhood changes. (page 10)

But still you persist in executing these same failed policies! Currently those failed policies are being executed within in the current Urban Village boundaries, and now you are proposing an vast expansion of those dreadful policies into bordering neighborhoods and displacing more and more long time Seattle residents. I first moved to Ravenna in 1963 and have recently been forced to consider moving somewhere else ? probably outside of Seattle ? due to the increasing property tax burden (I am not an ATM machine as you seem to think) and reduced services available in my neighborhood. I can only surmise that your real strategy is to replace long-time residents with new younger, wealthy high tech workers without families.

Environmental Stewardship (page 7)

Even as the city becomes increasingly urban, Seattle is committed to protecting and restoring the natural environment. By taking on a significant share of the region's growth, Seattle helps protect rural farmed and forested areas from development. And by concentrating growth in urban villages, we help preserve the existing green areas in the city, including the areas that now contain low-density development.

Environment (page 123)
GOAL
EG1 Foster healthy trees, vegetation, and soils to improve human health, provide wildlife habitats, reduce drainage costs, give residents across the city access to nature, and increase the quality of life for all Seattleites.

POLICIES
E1.1 Seek to achieve an urban forest that contains a thriving and sustainable mix of tree species and ages, and that creates a contiguous and healthy ecosystem that is valued and cared for by the City and all Seattleites as an essential environmental, economic, and community asset.

E1.2 Strive to increase citywide tree canopy coverage to 40% over time.

E1.3 Use trees, vegetation, green storm water infrastructure, amended soil, green roofs, and other low-impact development features to meet drainage needs and reduce the impacts of development.

E1.4 Increase the amount of permeable surface by reducing hardscape surfaces where possible and maximizing the use of permeable paving elsewhere.

E1.5 Promote sustainable management of public and private open spaces, trees, and vegetation by preserving or planting native and naturalized vegetation, removing invasive plants, improving soil health, using integrated pest management, and engaging the community in long-term stewardship activities.

E1.6 Strive to manage 700 million gallons of storm water runoff each year with green storm water infrastructure by 2025.

E1.7 Promote the care and retention of trees and groups of trees that enhance Seattle's historical, cultural, recreational, environmental, and aesthetic character.

What is shown in the map as proposed for Roosevelt/Ravenna is exactly the opposite of this goal! Once again a contradiction of the goals and deception on the part of the city. You are proposing to take away existing green space not preserve it nor add to it. Shame on you, for this deception.

We already have an urban forest in Cowen and Ravenna parks. Taking land from these parks to increase density is idiocy and counter to the stated goal and policy.
Paving over single family neighborhoods to make way for high rise apartments and condos will reduce tree canopy, decrease permeable surface and increase storm water runoff. How can expanding the Roosevelt/Ravenna residential village and destroying the surrounding neighborhoods and parks be in keeping with this goal and policies? Our current neighborhood plan is one of good environmental stewardship will still allowing for development and higher density. It allows for growth at the core while preserving the existing parks and tree canopy in the single family areas.

P1.11 Make the most of the limited available land by developing parks and open spaces so that they can accommodate a variety of active and passive recreational uses. (page 131)

Again, by designating Cowen and Ravenna parks for more density, your proposed action are directly against this policy. Adding more high rise apartments on the edge of the park if not directly in the park, appears to reward those lucky wealthy few with a good view of the what is left of the park. I see how it will generate high property taxes for the city but it will deduce green space and destroy parkland. Are we now privatizing our parks, giving away the land to the developers to turn a handsome profit while destroying habitat and quality of life for residents ? This is madness!

Diversity of Housing (page 99)

H3.3 Allow and encourage housing for older adults and people with disabilities, including designs that allow for independent living, various degrees of assisted living, and skilled nursing care, in or near urban centers and villages with access to health care services.

Do senior citizens have no place in Seattle outside of assisted living and nursing homes? This is the nightmare of many senior citizens. Who says that we all can afford expensive assisted living and nursing care? Is the city going to pick up the tab for this?

It has been shown that the longer a senior can live in their own home the happier and healthier they are. News Flash! There are more and more of us Baby Boomer coming. We are people who have paid our taxes, supported our schools, have been good citizens and finally have paid off our mortgages. The fact that we are being thrown aside is a condemnation of Seattle and a sad commentary on the moral fabric of Seattle that there are actual government plans to displace seniors. How bold to actually put these on paper for all to read. Remember senior citizens vote in a higher percentage than younger people to which you are catering.

H3.4 Encourage the development of housing with affordable family-sized units in urban centers and villages with access to parks, and other child-focused amenities and services.

H3.5 Considering allowing additional housing types that respect existing neighborhood character in single-family areas, particularly within or near urban centers and urban villages.

If you want to encourage mother-in-law apartments in the Roosevelt area I am totally in support of this mixed use, but high density is not about an additional few units, it's all about high rise buildings with maximum use of the land, no green space and no play areas for children. How can high rise apartments at outrageous rents support affordable housing? How can taking parkland away help families with children? How can block after block of apartment buildings with the resulting toxic air be healthy for children? Even in the single family areas of Roosevelt/Ravenna the yards are not adequate for children to run and play. Houses are on average 10 feet apart and front and back yards quite small. Families depend on our parks for recreation for their children. Adding high density does not respect the existing character of the Roosevelt/Ravenna area.

All development I have seen thus far has been targeted for maximum use of land, no setbacks, no greenspace and no parking. I have seen more and more once permeable land paved over with concrete. Buildings go right up to the sidewalks, (see the new development on 65th and 21st Ave NE) there isn't even a little patch of green to separate the buildings. Not too long ago there was a house there with trees and grass. Score one for developers and one against the environment.

I would suggest that the policies in your report be enforced in the currently designated urban residential urban villages before they are expanding into single family housing areas resulting in more blight of the concrete jungles spreading in Seattle. Very soon we will no longer be able to call ourselves the Emerald City if we continue to take away trees, greenery and open spaces.

This report is a travesty of misleading statements and outright lies. In my opinion caters to developers and wealthy newcomers to Seattle. It does nothing to protect its vulnerable citizens from exploitation in fact it encourages it.

Thoughtfully,

Betsy Steele

Date: 11/03/2015

Name: Judith Leconte

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Greetings
Please seriously reconsider the proposed 2035 changes to the Roosevelt Urban Village boundaries. The boundaries are bewildering when applied to the actual geography of the area. This needs more vetting and community input.
I suggest consulting with those who live, work and recreate in the area.
Judith M. Leconte

Date: 11/03/2015

Name: Kayla Schott-Bresler

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

RE: Housing Development Consortium (HDC) Comments on the Seattle
Comprehensive Plan Housing Element Update
To Whom It May Concern:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City's Comprehensive Plan Housing Element update. HDC greatly appreciates the impressive work that has gone into updating the Housing Element and strongly supports the City's efforts to plan for affordable housing.
HDC is a coalition of more than I 00 nonprofit organizations, private companies, and public partners committed to the vision that all people should have the opportunity to live in safe, healthy, affordable homes in communities of opportunity. In setting forward the pattern of residential and commercial growth over the next 20 years, the Comprehensive Plan plays a tremendous role in determining whether Seattle residents of all incomes can find affordable homes near work, school, transit, and other important services. Therefore, it is vital that the Housing Element includes strong, specific policy statements outl ining the City's commitment to creating, preserving, and monitoring affordable housing opportunities.
Specifically, HDC encourages you to consider the following comments as you work to finali ze the Housing Element.
Equal Access To Housing
HDC strongly supports efforts to ensure all people have fair and equal access to housing. The City should promote strategies that increase access and remove barriers to stab le housing, including policies that ban discrimination based on source of income or criminal history. The City should also continue its leadership in promoting a "Housing First" approach to homelessness. We recommend adding more detail to Hl.S to outline the City's commitment to specific policies and models that will increase equal access to housing.
Supply of Housing
Increasing Seattle's overall housing supply will help meet growing demand and can help slow the increase in housing prices. In some cases, however, new development replaces housing that was more affordable to low and moderate wage Seattle residents. In working to increase the supply of housing overall, the City should promote policies that limit displacement and encourage a net increase in affordable homes over time. Housing intended to replace units demolished or convetted to different or

higher-end uses should be affordable and available to low-income families.
Diversity of Housing; Housing Construction & Design
Planning for a diversity of housing types is important for meeting the needs and preferences of different household sizes, income levels, and populations. We strongly support efforts to facilitate the construction of affordable housing through increased efficiencies in design review, which we urge the City to reflect in H3.2. Additionally, as more moderate income families struggle to find housing that is both affordable and of an appropriate size, we support the City's continuing efforts to encourage the development of affordable, family-sized homes in close proximity to parks, schools, transit, and educational opportunities, consistent with H3.4. HDC supports efforts to allow flexibility and innovation in construction and design, particularly as it pertains to increasing attractive and affordable housing options for extremely low-to middleincome households. It is critical that the City continues efforts to promote the health and safety of housing, as refl ected in H4.1 .
Housing Affordability
Like all cities in King County, Seattle is required to plan for the housing needs of households across the income spectrum, including those with incomes below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI). The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) set guidelines for the percentage ofhousing that should be affordable to those with moderate, low, and very-low incomes, including those with special needs. The CPPs also recognize that the greatest need exists for households with incomes below 30% AMI and that addressing this need will require funding, policies, and collaborative actions by all jurisdictions working individually and collectively. Seattle's Housing Element should make mention of the CPPs and Seattle's responsibility to plan for its share of affordable housing.
•!• Monitoring
Recently, Mayor Ed Mmny, in consultation with the Seattle City Council, set a goal to create 20,000 income-restricted units over the next decade. Meeting this goal will require the implementation of a number of new strategies and an increased commitment to existing tools that we know are working, such as the Seattle Housing Levy. With this new commitment- and with a monitoring requirement coming from the CPPs- we suggest adding a policy to the Housing Element which will require the monitoring of Seattle's progress toward meeting affordable housing needs. We suggest the fo llowing language: "Monitor and evaluate over time Seattle's p rogress toward meeting affordable housing goals and needs. Report regularly on numbers of income and rent restricted units. Review and revise housing policies and strategies, especially where monitoring indicates that adopted strategies are not resulting in adequate affordable housing to meet the need."
•!• Intergovernmental Advocacy
Meeting Seattle's affordable housing goals will require increased resources from the state and federal government. We suggest editing H5.15 to reflect the role Seattle's legislative and intergovernmental relations efforts will play in supporting state and federal funding: "Encourage and advocate for new federal, state, and county laws, regulations, programs, and incentives that would increase the production and preservation of extremely low-, very low, and low-income housing. "
•!• Addressing the Spectrum of Need & Expanding the Toolbox
Seattle should plan for affordable housing across the needs spectrum- from those experiencing homelessness to first time homebuyers. The Housing Element includes a number of strong strategies to promote affordability, and we appreciate the work that DPD has done to draft these policies. Specifically, we support the Housing Element policies which promote:
• The preservation and development of affordable housing
• Inclusivity in neighborhoods with the services residents need to thrive (education, employment, transit, etc.)

• Efforts to stem the tide of displacement
• Investment in underserved areas consistent with community priorities
• Increased access to stable, safe and healthy housing, including relocation assistance The rapid increase in rents and home prices in recent years has created unique challenges around housing Seattle's moderate income households, those earning between 60 and 80% AMI. Because it is difficult to access public subsidy to create housing for these households, tools that leverage the power of the private market to create affordable homes are critical. Development incentives tied to affordability, like the Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) program, help meet this need. H5.17 should fully reflect the City's commitment to providing incentives ofthis type and should list examples of other effective incentive tools, such as impact fee exemptions, permit fee waivers and reduced parking requirements, that incentivize the construction of affordable housing and promote long-term affordability.
•!• New Development & Contributions to Affordable Housing
HDC believes there is a shared responsibility between the private and public sectors for addressing affordable housing needs, particularly as the market is unable to meet the growing demand for housing our workforce. In line with the Mayor and City Council's efforts to require affordable housing alongside new development, we urge you to add a policy to the Housing Element to "Require the provision of affordable housing by new development." Hundreds of jurisdictions across the country have successfully used inclusionary housing to address affordable housing needs and create inclusive, mixed-income communities. Seattle's Comprehensive Plan should reflect the City's recent commitment to this national best practice.
Commercial development, and particularly research, laboratory, and medical facilities, has a strong nexus with increased demand for affordable housing.' As written, H5.18 does not reflect a strong commitment to require major institutions and those entities building under development agreements to provide affordable housing. The current policy has not resulted in the affordable housing necessary to meet the housing needs of moderate and low-wage employees. We strongly urge the City to amend this policy to state: "Require planning for contribution toward affordable housing needs for extremely low-, very low-, and low- income households as part of major institution master plans and development agreements approved by the City when such plans would lead to housing demolition or employment growth. " This policy statement reflects an equitable expectation that all new development will contribute to affordable housing. We appreciate how the Housing Element balances the creation ofhousing overall with policies specific to creating housing affordable to very-low, low-, and moderate-income households. Seattle's existing affordable housing need is immense, and as the City continues to grow, it will become increasingly difficult for lower income individuals and families to find homes they can afford near their jobs in the city. Implementing the affordable housing policies contained in the Housing Element- swiftly and fully- is critical for ensuring Seattle can remain a place for people of all incomes to call home.
Thank you for this opportunity to comment and for your time and attention to these critical housing issues. HDC is following this update very closely and will continue to engage our members throughout the process. We are happy to answer any questions or provide additional details on our comments.
Sincerely,
IM~
Kayla Schott-Bresler
Policy Manager
1 David Paul Rosen & Associates, " Administrative Review Draft: Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study and
Economic Impact Analysis," May 13, 2015.

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: Kji Kelly

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

On behalf of Historic Seattle, please find the attached cover letter and recommendations for the historic preservation component to the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. As the only citywide nonprofit and preservation development authority dedicated to protecting Seattle's unique character through education, advocacy and preservation, I encourage the City to utilize historic preservation as a meaningful tool to achieve the Plan's four core values of race and social equity, environmental stewardship, economic opportunity and community.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Kji Kelly
Executive Director
Historic Seattle

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: Lisa Connolley

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

I anyone looking through the lens of 2009's "Quiet Crisis" report or the Homeless state of emergency at all?!?!?!? A lot of talk of up-zoning but how are we addressing the reality of displacement that has happened in light of this???

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: Ezedike Black Power Ohamadike I

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

You need trains (from Everett to olympia) and cheap housing.
The homeless issue cannot be solved.

Date: 11/04/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Build some roads and stop being Dicks..

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: Justin Wormdahl

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Knock it all down & give it back to the native American's.. Getting around up there is a nightmare,especially in a commercial vehicle. Just saying..

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: Darren Tjoelker

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Amen! Make the HOV lane for trucks traveling through! Hello... Not that hard to figure out... Well... I guess if your a politician that doesn't know shit...

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: @SeaNeighborhood

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

What will Seattle look like in 2035? Be a part of shaping our future.
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Join us 11/5 or 11/7 for a Seattle 2035 open house. Tell us what you think about our Draft Comprehensive Plan. 2035.seattle.gov/calendar/

Date: 11/04/2015

Name: @OEMDeGo

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Help shape what Seattle could look like over the next 20 years ... attend the next Open House!
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
Join us 11/5 or 11/7 for a Seattle 2035 open house. Tell us what you think about our Draft Comprehensive Plan. 2035.seattle.gov/calendar/

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Karen Hardy

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please consider using 15th NE as the boundary for roosevelt urban village. The random dotted lines goes thru some well maintained 100 year old homes. This is a Ravenna park neighborhood with a history of maintaining the homes in the area. We are not part of the Sisley properties and should not be lumped in a rezoning area for urban development . We are a stable area without tear down homes. As a tax payer

for many years, supporter of schools, parks, transportation we ask you to maintain our family homes in NE Ravenna.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Brian Rulifson

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hello Comprehensive Plan folks and City Council Members,

I support adding a "Community Involvement" Element to the Seattle Comprehensive Plan. I've attached and consideration of the attached example of such a chapter: Seattle Comprehensive Plan - PROPOSED Community Involvement Element.pdf

I hope you will support an element such as this as well!

Sincerely,

Brian Rulifson
Resident of Fremont
--
Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.
Community Involvement Element.
DRAFT - 8 October 2015.
Table Of Contents.
1.1. Introduction.
1.2. Principles.
1.2.1. PRINCIPLE "P1": Holistic Solutions.
1.2.2. PRINCIPLE "P2": Social Equity, Including Environmental Justice.
1.2.3. PRINCIPLE "P3": Transparency.
1.2.3. PRINCIPLE "P4": Accountability.
1.2.4. PRINCIPLE "P5": Continuous Improvement.
1.3. Goals.
1.3.1. GOAL "G1": Community Involvement As A Partnership.
1.3.2. GOAL "G2": Full And Meaningful Participation.
1.3.3. GOAL "G3": Accessible And Effective Participation.
1.3.4. GOAL "G4": Community Knowledge, Experience And Wisdom Harnessed Through Valued Participation.
1.3.5. GOAL "G5": Strong Civic Infrastructure.
1.4. Actions.
1.4.1.1. ACTION "A1.1": Implement partnership.
1.4.1.2. ACTION "A1.2": Implement partnership communications.
1.4.1.3. ACTION "A1.3": Network the partnerships.
1.4.1.4. ACTION "A1.4": Establish participant responsibilities.
1.4.2.1. ACTION "A2.1": Implement continuous involvement.
1.4.2.2. ACTION "A2.2": Implement high standards of notification.
1.4.2.3. ACTION "A2.3": Enable multi-demographic involvement.

1.4.2.4. ACTION "A2.4": Demonstrate equal opportunity.
1.4.2.5. ACTION "A2.5": Implement inclusion on advisory board and commissions.
1.4.3.1. ACTION "A3.1": Achieve accessibility.
1.4.3.2. ACTION "A3.2": Eliminate burdens.
1.4.3.3. ACTION "A3.3": Implement lessons from the 2004-2014 Comprehensive Plan.
1.4.3.4. ACTION "A3.4": Implement "quality of life" metrics.
1.4.3.5. ACTION "A3.5": Implement concurrency metrics.
1.4.3.6. ACTION "A3.6": Create a Performance Accountability Program (PAP).
1.4.3.7. ACTION "A3.7": Establish a "call log" system.
1.4.3.8. ACTION "A3.8": Implement website quality standards.
1.4.4.1. ACTION "A4.1": Conduct community analysis.
1.4.4.2. ACTION "A4.2": Enable community participation in data collection.
1.4.4.3. ACTION "A4.3": Open data.
1.4.4.4. ACTION "A4.4": Implement data utility.
1.4.4.5. ACTION "A4.5": Implement mechanisms for networking knowledge.
1.4.4.6. ACTION "A4.6": Enable multigenerational involvement.
1.4.5.1. ACTION "A5.1": Build community capacity.
1.4.5.2. ACTION "A5.2": Implement community planning and investment decision-making literacy.
1.4.5.3. ACTION "A5.3": Build agency capacity.
1.4.5.4. ACTION "A5.4": Implement the Community Engagement Manual (CEM).
1.4.5.5. ACTION "A5.5": Implement the Community Involvement Program (CIP).
1.4.5.6. ACTION "A5.6": Implement the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).
1.4.5.7. ACTION "A5.7": Enable Community Involvement Program evolution.
1.4.5.8. ACTION "A5.8": Promote & reward civic responsibility.

1.1.
Introduction.
Ever since the words "we the people" were first laid in writing, there has been a belief that a more perfect union can be formed through wider participation.
This belief is to be fostered in this Comprehensive Plan.
Values such as social equity, stewardship and community can only be reliably achieved if community involvement is fostered.
Economic opportunity & security can only be reliably achieved if community involvement is fostered.
As a culture of laws, reasonable application of law can only be assured if access to the process of writing, monitoring and enforcing the laws is widely distributed.
Results tend to be better -- more durable, more equitable and more accountable -- when a diversity of people are involved in the scoping, development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of plans and investment decisions.
No one person, agency, organization, business, or government can provide all things that the city's diverse communities need.
Collaborative partnerships and inclusive community participation in planning and investment decision-making are essential to creating and sustaining a prosperous, healthy, equitable, and resilient city.
This city has a long history of community involvement. We owe it to those who have participated before us to honor their participation by continuing to open opportunities.
As this is an information age with rapidly-evolving tools, there is now the greatest possible range of outcomes. There has never been a larger potential to either utilize or squander the immense civic assets amongst us.
Such responsibility shall not be left to chance, but rather must be designed into the Comprehensive Plan

and all offspring of the plan.
Likewise, budgeting for performance of this element cannot be left to chance. Budgeting for the implementation of any other element of this plan must be accompanied by budget for this element to not be a violation of this plan.
As monitoring is a necessity in this element, performance assessments must also be budgeted for, and designed into, the accomplishment of this element.
It is the City's responsibility to promote deep and inclusive community involvement in planning and investment decisions.
A new paradigm of community involvement and engagement -- one that supports intercultural organizing, recognizes that diversity is an advantage, and works to achieve equitable outcomes -- must be embraced and integrated with the city's neighborhood organizational structure to create a robust and inclusive community
involvement system.
The following definitions are provided for reference when mentioned in this chapter.
-- Definition of UNDERSERVED: Provided with inadequate service.
(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/underserved).
-- Definition of UNDERREPRESENTED: Inadequately represented.
(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/underserved).
We the people hold these Principles (in section 1.2) and have established these primary Goals (in section 1.3) contained in this element of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan. In order to achieve these Goals while respecting these Principles, we have listed these Actions (section 1.4) in the comprehensive plan for its implementation.

1.2.
Principles.
Principles are goals which every Action of this Element must serve.
The principles are as follows.
1.2.1.
PRINCIPLE "P1": Holistic Solutions.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which solutions address root cause and consider all elements of a situation, rather than disenfranchising one interest in service of another.
1.2.2.
PRINCIPLE "P2": Social Equity, Including Environmental Justice.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which opportunity exists equally for all community members, with none being underserved or underrepresented, in planning and investment processes and decisions.
A condition in which planning and investment decision processes account for the potential for unequitable distribution of burdens, benefits, and outcomes.
DEFINITIONS:
Social equity: Fair, just and equitable creation and implementation of public policy.
Environmental Justice: The equitable treatment and meaningful involvement of all people in public decision-making, as it applies to the development, implementation, and enforcement of laws, regulations, and policies that govern the uses of air, water, and land.
1.2.3.
PRINCIPLE "P3": Transparency.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which city planning and investment decision-making processes are clear, open,

documented, and publicly audited.
1.2.3.
PRINCIPLE "P4": Accountability.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which processes make clear to the community what individual is responsible for making each decision, and how community input is utilized, with systems designed to assure responsive interactions.
1.2.5.
PRINCIPLE "P5": Continuous Improvement.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition of continually building on learning rather than "re-inventing the wheel".

1.3.
Goals.
Goals are achieved through the Actions listed in 1.4.
Performance of the goals is to be measured by evaluation of accomplishment of the Actions, except when measuring the performance of the Comprehensive Plan itself.
The goals are as follows.
1.3.1.
GOAL "G1": Community Involvement As A Partnership.
DESCRIPTION:
City operations as a genuine partnership between all communities and interests.
City operations as a genuine partnership between public employees/electeds and members of the public.
City processes which promote, build, and sustain relationships, and communications with individuals, communities, neighborhoods, businesses, organizations, institutions, and other governments to ensure meaningful community involvement in planning and investment decisions.
City processes which result in fair distribution of information, with all partners equally informed (unless expressly forbidden by law).
1.3.2.
GOAL "G2": Full And Meaningful Participation.
DESCRIPTION:
Community members have meaningful opportunities to participate in and influence all stages of planning and decision-making, including issue identification, project scoping, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and enforcement.
Public processes which engage the full diversity of affected community members, including historically underserved and underrepresented individuals and communities.
1.3.3.
GOAL "G3": Accessible And Effective Participation.
DESCRIPTION:
City planning and investment decision-making processes designed to be culturally accessible and effective.
Use of acknowledged best practices and a wide variety of tools to promote inclusive, collaborative, and robust community involvement.
Practices published in advance with a process for effectiveness review.
1.3.4.
GOAL "G4": Community Knowledge, Experience And Wisdom Harnessed Through Valued Participation.
DESCRIPTION:

Community and civic participation, with a full range of cultural perspectives, integrated with sound technical analysis, for superior planning and investment decisions.
1.3.5.
GOAL "G5": Strong Civic Infrastructure.
DESCRIPTION:
Civic institutions, organizations, and processes designed to encourage active and meaningful community involvement and to strengthen the capacity of individuals and communities to participate in planning processes and civic life.

1.4.
Actions.
Performance of the Goals (section 1.3) is to be measured by evaluation of accomplishment of the Actions, which are numbered, not in priority, but in reference to the numbering of their associated goals.
The actions are as follows.
1.4.1.1.
ACTION "A1.1": Implement partnership.
DESCRIPTION:
Create and document sustained partnership with:
-- Individual community members, including historically under-served and underrepresented individuals, including those of low-income, those of color, and those with limited English proficient (LEP).
-- Subject-based communities of knowledge.
-- Location-based communities of knowledge.
-- District coalitions, neighborhood associations, and business district associations.
-- Businesses, employees, unions, and related economic organizations.
-- Community-based, faith-based, and interest-based nonprofit organizations and groups.
-- Institutions, governments, and tribal sovereign nations.
1.4.1.2.
ACTION "A1.2": Implement partnership communications.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish, utilize, and document open processes of communication between partners.
1.4.1.3.
ACTION "A1.3": Network the partnerships.
DESCRIPTION:
Aid district coalitions, neighborhood associations, business district associations, and community-based organizations to increase participation and to reflect the diversity of the people and institutions they serve.
Facilitate greater communication and collaboration among district coalitions, neighborhood associations, business district associations, community-based organizations, etc.
1.4.1.4.
ACTION "A1.4": Establish participant responsibilities.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish clear responsibilities for (paid and unpaid) participants in planning and investment decision-making
processes.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
1.4.2.1.
ACTION "A2.1": Implement continuous involvement.

DESCRIPTION:
Establish processes for publicly publishing preliminary timelines simultaneous to their publication within government, with date of publication and best estimate for publication of an update.
1.4.2.2.
ACTION "A2.2": Implement high standards of notification.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish, publish and utilize standards for notification of affected and interested community members and recognized organizations about administrative, quasi-judicial, and legislative planning, land use and infrastructure project decisions, with enough lead time, and relevant information, to enable effective participation.
1.4.2.3.
ACTION "A2.3": Enable multi-demographic involvement.
DESCRIPTION:
Evaluate and document participant demographics throughout planning and investment processes to assess whether
participation reflects the demographics of affected communities. Adapt involvement practices and activities accordingly to increase effectiveness at reaching targeted audiences while refraining from using exclusion to manipulate participation ratios.
1.4.2.4.
ACTION "A2.4": Demonstrate equal opportunity.
DESCRIPTION:
Demonstrate that planning and investment decisions have been reached without disenfranchisement of individuals or groups of individuals, including those of color, of low-income, of limited English proficiency, of Sovereign Tribes, and of other communities that have been historically underserved or underrepresented in public processes and decisions, and/or have historically carried a burden of adverse effects from city planning and implementation in the USA.
1.4.2.5.
ACTION "A2.5": Implement inclusion on advisory board and commissions.
DESCRIPTION:
Conduct a public audit of the processes for selection of personnel for advisory board and commissions (such as the Planning Commission), and the outcomes of these process in regards to inclusion of historically underrepresented viewpoints, and overrepresentation of individuals who can be perceived as having a commercial motive for participation.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
1.4.3.1.
ACTION "A3.1": Achieve accessibility.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish procedures to enable community involvement processes to be broadly accessible in terms of location, time, and language, and that they support the engagement of individuals with a variety of abilities and limitations on participation.
1.4.3.2.
ACTION "A3.2": Eliminate burdens.
DESCRIPTION:
Demonstrate that plans and investment decisions eliminate associated disproportionate burdens (e.g. adverse environmental, economic or community impacts), or provide scientific justification for usage of minimization and mitigation in cases where the disproportionality is not eliminated.
Document the science utilized in decisions to use (and not use) plans and investments to address disproportionate burdens of previous decisions.

1.4.3.3.
ACTION "A3.3": Implement lessons from the 2004-2014 Comprehensive Plan.
DESCRIPTION:
Assess results of the 2004-2014 Comprehensive Plan for issues related to health, safety, transportation, infrastructure, schools, services, police, fire, utilities, housing affordability, environment, equity, etc.
Inventory the recommendations of the 2014 "Seattle Sustainable Neighborhoods Assessment Project" report, and provide a timeline for when each recommendation will be implemented (or a consensus reason for non-implementation).
1.4.3.4.
ACTION "A3.4": Implement "quality of life" metrics.
DESCRIPTION:
Create an employee / volunteer study group to propose a set “Quality Of Life” metrics for use in planning and funding decisions.
1.4.3.5.
ACTION "A3.5": Implement concurrency metrics.
DESCRIPTION:
Create an employee / volunteer study group to propose a set concurrency metrics for use in planning and funding decisions.
1.4.3.6.
ACTION "A3.6": Create a Performance Accountability Program (PAP).
DESCRIPTION:
Create a Performance Accountability Program (PAP) which lists goals, expectations and measures for performance of all city employees with customer-facing roles.
Form a volunteer shadow system, with volunteers tasked with learning about and monitoring the performance of each department in the government.
1.4.3.7.
ACTION "A3.7": Establish a "call log" system.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish a publicly visible "call log" system by which requests of city personnel are tagged with an ID number, and the requestee logs when the request was closed.
1.4.3.8.
ACTION "A3.8": Implement website quality standards.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish, publish, and employ website quality standards for the city government's websites.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
1.4.4.1.
ACTION "A4.1": Conduct community analysis.
DESCRIPTION:
Create a continuously improving public database of quality of life data, including community-verified needs gap analysis, trends and historical context applicable to each community.
1.4.4.2.
ACTION "A4.2": Enable community participation in data collection.
DESCRIPTION:
Provide meaningful opportunities for individuals and communities to be involved in the creation of inventories,
mapping, data analysis, and innovation.
1.4.4.3.
ACTION "A4.3": Open data.

DESCRIPTION:
Establish procedures for data to be open by default, and for audits to ensure awareness of this policy and accessibility of the data sets.
1.4.4.4.
ACTION "A4.4": Implement data utility.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish procedures for public audit of data quality and for the method of determining which data improvement to prioritize.
1.4.4.5.
ACTION "A4.5": Implement mechanisms for networking knowledge.
DESCRIPTION:
Provide clear documentation for the rationale supporting decisions made in planning and investment decision-making processes.
Document the issues raised in the community involvement process, how public input affected outcomes, and the rationale used to make decisions.
Measure actions taken to increase innovation and enable value creation.
1.4.4.6.
ACTION "A4.6": Enable multigenerational involvement.
DESCRIPTION:
Establish processes for the continuous inclusion of all ages, without resorting to exclusion to accomplish it.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
1.4.5.1.
ACTION "A5.1": Build community capacity.
DESCRIPTION:
Enhance the ability of community members, including those of historically under-served and/or under-represented groups, to develop the relationships, knowledge, and skills to effectively participate in planning and investment decision-making processes.
1.4.5.2.
ACTION "A5.2": Implement community planning and investment decision-making literacy training.
DESCRIPTION:
Provide training and educational opportunities to build the public's understanding of health & safety, land use, transportation, and other government action topics and to increase capacity for meaningful participation in planning and investment decision-making processes.
1.4.5.3.
ACTION "A5.3": Build agency capacity.
DESCRIPTION:
Increase City staff's capacity, tools, and skills to design and implement processes that engage a broad diversity of affected and interested individuals and communities, including those of historically under-served and under-represented communities, in meaningful and substantive ways.
1.4.5.4.
ACTION "A5.4": Implement the Community Engagement Manual (CEM).
DESCRIPTION:
Document a public process of assessment of current practices, develop new tools through ongoing process evaluation and improvement, and create, maintain, and actively implement a community engagement manual which details best practices for how to conduct community involvement for planning and investment decision-making.
1.4.5.5.

ACTION "A5.5": Implement the Community Involvement Program (CIP).
DESCRIPTION:
Create and maintain a Community Involvement Program that supports community involvement as an integral and
meaningful part of the planning and investment decision-making process.
1.4.5.6.
ACTION "A5.6": Implement the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).
DESCRIPTION:
Establish and support a Community Involvement Committee (CIC), an independent advisory body consisting of representatives selected by each of the 13 District Councils, to evaluate and report on the community involvement processes for individual planning and investment projects, before, during, and at the conclusion of these processes.
Create a volunteer team to evaluate the city's performance in increasing civic intelligence and participation.
Study and report on the fairness, efficiency and efficacy of methods of communicating across city departments and with the citizenry for, for example, capital improvement projects.
1.4.5.7.
ACTION "A5.7": Enable Community Involvement Program evolution.
DESCRIPTION:
Enable the Community Involvement Committee (CIC) to formally evaluate the effectiveness of the Community Involvement Program (CIP) periodically, and advocate for specific program and policy improvements.
1.4.5.8.
ACTION "A5.8": Promote & reward civic responsibility.
DESCRIPTION:
Promote & reward civic responsibility, both within communities and at an individual level.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Elena Louise Richmond

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I heard about the plan to upzone my neighborhood for the first time last night. I live on the edge of Crown Hill cemetery so I am one of the impacted residents. Someone from the city needs to go door to door to ask us for our input. At the very least, all of us need to be part of the process.

As things stand now I am 100% against any proposal that could so (potentially and almost for certain) radically alter my neighborhood.

Elena Louise Richmond

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

6. Comments:
More SFR on 10k sqft lots, you [commies?]
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Stop the Stalinist centrally planned [nightmare?]
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
See above
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
These are irrelevant [concerns?] that will serve only to increase housing costs.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Jayson Morris

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I like [form-ansed?] (form based?) codes = better rqtms
Developer\'s can understand what they need or not need to do
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
See above

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
We need to include ALL city depts. in this expansion
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
We need parking.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Catherine --

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Do no turn Crown Hill into anothe Ballard
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
No zoning changes in Crown Hill

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Lauren Rock

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. However, I think your designation of \"frequent transit\" needs to be better considered in relation to the center of urban villages. why is Ballard\'s transit hub not near downtown Ballard?
8. safety

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

4. Comments:
2. unclear
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Zoning must be updated in tandem to have real impact and create opportunities for density
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Reduce requirement for parking for accessory dwelling units

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
5. get rid of all fremont industrial (ASCO sucks)
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Urban hubs should be hostile to cars

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Michael Huber

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

6. Comments:
7. along major arterials
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Each urban village should have an official city community center, sidewalks, storm sewers, and traffic control

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Make sure that uncontrolled townhouse and apartment and condominium building does NOT happen, as it has in Ballard
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Keep the high density, high rise apartments/condos/townhouse along the arterials and insist that low income and commercial businesses be included. Also provide parking.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Land Use

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
The will end the wishes of the people who live in the affected area.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Things I don\'t like:
The draft plan eliminates adopted neighborhood plans
Removes provisions SF criteria as a consideration for elimination of SF zones
Eliminates neighborhood focus - see [LU6Z?]
Eliminates parking requirement resulting in [decreased] livability in established neighborhoods
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Do not eliminate the neighborhood planning process. -LU5
Make developers and business pay a greater share for growth! Also consider [increase] of B&D taxes for realtors, developers, builders, architects, and [leanders?], all of whom are reaping [increased] profits from growth

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Attempt not to radically distort existing established neighborhoods
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The plan needs to establish shorter term metrics to evaluate and perhaps adjust the plan in 5yr increments
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Have an ongoing mechanism for feedback and keep the approach flexible if the approach is not meeting the desired ends

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Liz Cunningham

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Stop destroying trees! Stop taking down landmarks important to the community.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
More transparency. How about listening to the neighborhoods\' concerns.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Buildings are sprouting up daily, but sidewalks, crosswalks are inadequate

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
lightrail connection nodes
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Fixed intersection at 5th Ave N, Queen Anne Dr, Raye St, 6th Ave N, and 4th Ave N
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Community/Information centers

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Jimi Nagler

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Make better laws (and enforce them) to control the construction crews that mess up and block our streets and sidewalks during the building of these urban villages
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Need a lot of underground parking to get those ugly machines off the street; taking up so much space on the side of the street just for the one person who drove them in. Some people need their cars, but most people just have their little private room [illegible] around with them. Get them underneath!

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Ethan Van Eck

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
There should be a transparent process with [illegible] impact on growth in urban villages. Effort needs to be made to get metrics to see infrastructure [illegible] up with growth. The [illegible] growth management?

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Growth needs to be managed in a way that monitors growth and makes adjustments according to specific metrics re: impact[illegible] needs [life transportation?] [illegible]
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Don\'t build [illegible] of tall buildings in HUB\'s

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Proximity to bus rapid transit or rapid ride type lines. The [illegible] doesn\'t not need to focus only on areas where two routes intersect. I would expand the designation along corridor within a walkshed of these stops - such as on 15th Ave NW where only 1/2 block is currently in higher density zoning.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Diversity of housing types needed in urban vilalges need to include multifamily housing designed for families
There needs to be more transit priority treatments on our streets. Take a lane for transit so people who ride the bus don\'t get punished by sitting in traffic.
Planning for schools is important. But facility, siting, and development should create flexible spaces that accomodate growth and decline in enrollment without buying large parcels of land, surplusing and selling off
I would look at zoning boundaries and urban village boundaries that do not make sense as provide no transition opportunity and change them (rationalize them).

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Sara Baker

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. Comments:
4. I agree with this provided the CID is cared for, not negatively impacted.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Plan for schools
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Create a master urban plan for schools

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Kay Willhight

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. Consider disabled and elderly. 10 minutes, too far, bring back more bus zones.
2. and bicycles!
3. Ballard has far surpassed 2020 growth projections
7. Parking is key. Create safe municipal car and bike garages
8. Do not give/sell City Light substations with mature landscaping to developers or homeless encampments
6. Comments:
7. This is already happening in Ballard.
8. not appropriate
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
1. Keep bicycles separate from pedestrians!
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More lighting on sidewalks
Remedy breaks in residential (concrete) infrastructure by charging contractors/developers impact fees

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

4. Comments:
9. too vague
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Existing capacity!
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Negotiate with neighborhood councils where rezoning
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Be sensitive to the impact on existing neighborhoods
Engage the community. DO NOT do it to us but with us
NEVER BARGAIN without our representation. The grand bargain was very bad that way.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Niels Andersen

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
2. parking needed
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Avoid boundary creep. Area that are single family shouldn\'t have encroaching commercial multifamily
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I favor greater density, but cars will not go away, units still need associated parking.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. transit first, then development
2. light and air
5. not to dictate but to inform
8. demonstrate before development
9. What does this mean - adapt practices to policy
10. Impact fees are key
6. Comments:
4. depends on where - arterials first - no if broadcast
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Arterials should receive the bulk of the larger or more dense development. Some neighborhood single family is integrated to a community. Density must allow for natural light and air and green space along the street and on developed lots.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The goals of the plan should not dictate what is going to happen to healthy neighborhoods. Density should be concentrated along arterials and in existing areas zoned for that. No changing of zones without review under current requirements.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Protect housing stock that is in good condition. Do not take away the green streetscape that is the heart of single family neighborhood community space where people meet and become a community. This is key for emergency plans etc. and self-sufficiency.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
5. and communicate to residents
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Looking at just how much green (lawns, trees, shrubs) can be maintained

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Please look at making zoning tight enough so that developers have to provide mixed income / affordable housing available
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
I work with young city employees that have no chance in renting, let along buying within city limits - making their commute short and life more liveable. This does not need to be corrected with density - lots of small high rise apartments. It takes careful planning.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Jeff Hawk

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Synchronize and vastly speed up all forms of transportation: cars, rail, busses, etc. Equity is bunk without job creation and everyone needs maximum mobility to get to work. All forms of Seattle commutes are disastrous.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The uptown viewshed around the space needle needs to be preserved. This is a valuable asset, like Paris\' Eiffel Tower. Don\'t ruin it for all of Seattle to come.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Walking is awesome, but if I can\'t get from uptown to any other urban village in ten minutes, you\'ve failed. Please don\'t take us backwards.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Elaine Wine

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. Comments:
9. What does this mean?
6. Comments:
4. it depends on context around it!
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
2. can be built
Yes - think of future! More than a 10 min walk shouldn\'t be a deal breaker and we need more density - make boundaries that make sense
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Some concepts are so general - hard to comment.
Plans here are a bit confusing on urban village vs rez. hub etc.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Quality and investment - preservation of green spaces, older housing. So much \"crap\" is being constructed in ballard - it\'s ugly - it makes me want to move so little car by investors building housing

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Do not draw boundaries in a way that cuts down trees or compromises existing greeneries.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Please preserve our skylines. I am disheartened at the thought that my zone could get re-zoned and new housing allowed to exceed existing land use guidance.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Consider building a more expansive light rail or train
Build more sidewalks
Remove telephone lines and [bury?] them underground

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Ken Jensen

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Prioritize sidewalks north of 85th to connect to and radiate from transit stops
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Increase density in villages to encourage and support transit
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Incentivize grocery stores near dense residential areas. This will encourage shopping without the need for cars to carry heavy grocerys a long distance. Provide density increase with grocery-type retail in mixed-use developments.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: John Flowers

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
See what other cities throughout UW have tried and what [illegible] went RIGHT and which went wrong - ask planning staff to find such examples and put them on your website. NIMBYism is blocking known solutions.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Too much reliance on light rail - which is obsolete and has been obsolete for 20 years. (Just google the key words \"light rail\" and \"obsolete\" to verify this)
For affordable housing, consider giving low interest loans or sale of affordable housing bonds - with

public [illegible] station and [illegible] encouraged
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
A fast (at least 100mph) polution free maglev \"mothertrain\" to haul passengers and freight down the medians of the I-5 and I-405 freeways. See [illegible] for such a system that can be built for 20% of the cost of light rail. Then [illegible] community can build elevated \"spur lines\" and transit stations. [illegible]

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Safety of walking involves lighting and
eyes on the street.\" This implies that walking through an industrial area in the dark when no one is working is not \"walkable\"
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
\"Ten minutes\" is not realistic for folks who can\'t walk well. They are \'marginalized\' because the government doesn\'t include them among the marginalized.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
If bus routes are changed or service reduced - will down-zoning happen? (Be serious)

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
2. must have parking - not everyone can \"walk\"
3. how else can it be \"user friendly?\"
6. Comments:
1. make restrictions/zoning easier to navigate
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
community neighborhoods single family, are what make it a community
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
More transparency - more communication - not all people have the time/energy to constantly be checking the DPD website - need other forms of comm./updates and notification of meetings/progress/citizen concerns
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Who determines the final outcome? Voter or city council?

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Historic housing stock should be considered affordable and be protected. The department of neighborhoods historic preservation program is a resource to educate planners about the value of community and historic preservation.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Preserve existing housing like Tacoma
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Single family zones could be removed from the urban villages and protected. Urban village boundaries should be redrawn to remove SF-5000 trapped by the current boundaries.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
I thing it\'s off that only half my block is included in the Crown Hill expansion. My suggestion would be to \"round up\" and include whole blocks.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Selena Carsiotis

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
9. State law - GMA
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
1. Safe routes to school. All public schools. Student walk/transportation map
Look at clusters of higher density WW2 housing near Holman Road as extens. of Crown Hill
Crown Hill should extend NE along Holman Road which is a transit corridor and also has huge QFC and essential services. There exists clusters of low rise, world war, MF housing.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Crown Hill should only accept density IF impact fees have been authorized by City Council. These fees can be used to build new sidewalks - near clusters of WW2 housing
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Affordable housing: impact fee exemption one extra story parking requirement waived along Rapid Ride corridors
incentives

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Economic Development

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Thanks Seattle 2035!!!
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Affordable retail space in mixed-use buildings for minority-owned businesses!!
Equitable transit-oriented development!
More care taken in planning neighborhood level capital projects to make sure existing businesses don\'t suffer (like the CID during streetcar construction and the waterfront during seawall construction)

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
More housing options.
Access, availability and affordability

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
2. movement of traffic
6. with increased parking off street
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
increase parking by allowing owner to park in \'cut out\', driveway

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Bonnie Mizock

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
more light rail

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

4. Comments:
9. What does that mean?
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
What is the history of the neighborhood? What are its strengths and assets? Will you destroy these places by allowing huge zoning changes?
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I DID NOT KNOW THAT these meetings were happening. Your publicity is dreadful.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The population is aging - bicyles, buses, 10 minute walks are hard for people over 70

Date: 11/05/2015

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
8. Quality living for people. People need a place to go in personal times. think beyond cars
6. Comments:
Plan for open space as density increases - to reduce a stressful environment
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
To make an urban center livable there needs to be open space where people can go to just enjoy themselves - beyond shopping, dining, appointment - open space to play
Example - westlake center recent improvements, u village, areas of seatting - kid playground. Open space in street in belltown - \"living\" is not going somewhere for employment or consuming - it is about just enjoying the neighborhood.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Density follows transportation: without adequate public transit maximum density will not be achieved

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Ben Mitchell

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I\'ll add my strong endorsement to the proposal to increase the diversity of housing types

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
People purchased homes based on the \"neighborhood\" climate\" - now your proposal(s) would allow higher density by allowing larger/expanded apartment homes.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
So much sounds like a done deal does not seem there is still time to influence various aspects of the plan
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
You have decided to expand the urban village concept - you then plan to allow developers to build larger/multiplex buildings. Ruins the reason folks bought single-family homes

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Cher Woywod

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Avoid destroying character of existing neighborhoods - example - Aurora/Lichten Springs 84th St. Existing single-family homes would eventually be zoned multi-family? Parking is already nightmare. Commuters park cars on this street to catch transit into town.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Parking! People may ride transit to work but many also have cars that must be parked somewhere.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
who/what is already there
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
As currently executed ignores what is already there. For example, exempting parking requirements when neighborhood already has inadequate parking
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Put in the transit first. Currently, areas are overbuilt without increased transportation alternatives.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Cliff Jones

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
This exercise will probably result in the same outcome as my previous participation in public meetings. My opinion and those of the other attendees will be ignored. The city will do what they want, and they will get a checkmark for holding the meeting.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Displacement of low-income communities through upzoning/redevelopment
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Consider more innovative outreach measures with community leaders, especially underrepresented communities. They are losing the most in our current growth phase, and real equitable progress cannot occur without their very [creative?] input.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Connect urban villages to one another. We all know that despite the best planning, people are more likely to live in one urban village and work in another than they are to live and work in the same one. Express bus service between UVs is smart.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Nikki Denofrio

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I\'m really glad you have specifically addressed the needs of older adults so many times in the Draft Plan. Please ensure that you are always taking their needs into account. I believe that the urban village model will be good for all ages. Let\'s not lose that focus as the older population increases.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More senior centers
Access to healthcare
Pleasant walkability: I walk frequently between the U-District and Wallingford, but I always have to jockey with cars - traffic is so bad they\'re just concerned with getting where they\'re going and not looking out for pedestrians. This make walking less fun.

Date: 11/05/2015

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing

expanded boundaries?
Upzone 15th Ave and better utilize the existing space there. There are many open lots and converted homes that could be developed to increase housing for the community
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Crown Hill\'s urban boundary should not be changed, rezoning or upzoning Crown Hill will be detrimental to the existing residents in single family homes.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Use the existing urban village space more efficiently before even considering moving boundaries in to single family neighborhoods. Upzone 15th to 60ft to make it more attractive to developers.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Elevate climate change in this discussion. Response to this challenge must be central going forward.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: David Wiegand

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. How hard to move transit, really?
2. and cycling, parking
4. Who cares?
9. Huh? Makes no sense.
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
5. But Georgetown & Ballard work....
Equity of current homeowners. How will these changes affect their current investment in their primary residence?
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
My understanding is that current zoning supports more than enough multi family dwellings and supports HALA. Why rezone our SF neighborhoods? How about HALA in Laurelhurst, Madison Valley, Magnolia Bluff, Seward Park, Sunset Hill? Politics??
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Move the bus lines. Encourage development priorities with carrots - not sticks. And don\'t mess up the qualities of established, diverse neighborhoods. We bought where we live intentionally (with intention)

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities

Comment:

4. Comments:
Needed a simply \"agree option\"
6. Too vague a question
8. Ballard/Crown Hill already dense
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Consider school zones! And impact of traffic on neighborhood streets. Near schools if there is higher density.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Plan needs to include school planning, i.e. new schools to accomodate more kids.
Strengthen design review code to protect neighborhood feel.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Why not Greenwood or Sand point?

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
9. What does this mean? Dictate to neighborhoods? No input?
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
If single family zones blocks are changed to include a lot of rented apartments with a transient occupants you will be negatively impacting neighborhoods particularly if you do not require adequate on site parking with all new businesses and new apts, condoes, town homes.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Do not think you will get everyone on buses, bikes, and walking. Your plans are not working now when permits are issued for increasing density without realistic creation of parking for apodments ect. Get real with a vision for residential neighborhoods and parking.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
It is not fair to residents in a neighborhood to add hundreds of apts units and allow builders to complete buildings and not pay for parking accomodations. In the end RPZ ask homeowners to pay for this error in good planning.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: H Tang

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Would love to see consideration of UV \"shape\" too: Walking to a part of the Aurora/Licton Springs village is good, but not if the interesting part I want to go to is at the other end of a long skinny village. Also, is future transit plans taken into consideration, or just existing transit? For example, east/west

transit out of Ballard (e.g. to UW) is poor.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Why aren\'t we formalizing de facto UVs in affluent areas so that they can get the same resources and planning that other neighborhoods receive? Eg: Queen Anne, Magnolia, Sand Point/Magnuson. HUGE social justice issue right there!!

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Laura Rose

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Require parking for all new developments otherwise nearby residences and businesses will be negatively impacted. Even if there is transit nearby - provide at least some % for those who will own cars and still use transit. Continue to require off-street parking spaces for permitted ADU and DADU\'s.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Sara Maxana

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Transit access is most important
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Coordinate with schools!!
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Flexibility in SF zones adjacent to urban villages

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Dave Boyd

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

4. Comments:
8. still need more parks
6. Comments:
Which [urban villages]? This depends on which UV - not all are or should be the same
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
5. (DON\'T) Ballard needs to plan WITH BINMIC!
UVs identified for expansion should truly have excellent transit service. Not sure that\'s true for Crown Hill!
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Complan should provide policy direction for a more fine-grained open space gap analysis that takes into

account arterials, topo and open space <5000 sf.
Why expand Crown Hill UV, which already includes significant SF, but not Greenwood/Phinney, which doesn\'t?
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
As UVs become more dense, the need for quality open space increases

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Debbie Carlsen

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Incorporate a LGBTQ Equity lens as a factor in planning. Increase multi-unit housing and expand the definition of what is a family. Ensure the MFTE is 60 Ami total income is taken from the collective household
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Incorporate a LGBTQ lens. Ensure job growth favors employers and businesses that upholds anti-discrimination practices - esp. for transgender people. Future development should include cultural preservation. The creation of a cultural space like a LGBTQ center that centers the most marginalized in our community
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
From a LGBTQ equity lens - there are more LGBTQ people living with disabilities than heterosexual people. Access to door front transportation like the Access bus is a livibility issue.

Date: 11/05/2015

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. contingent on whether you include a small intact neighborhood
4. who pays?
5. detailed with zoning
7. define [marginalized]. need rate increase controls and incentives
6. Comments:
3. with design guidelines
7. on arterials
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
What does [frequent transit] mean?
Get buy in from the community. Site with neighbors who want/need more growth. Stay away from establish single family homes. Do design for everything (that crap that\'s going up is often ugly and out of [style?])
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Your GHG criteria is not enough - the impervious surface zone, tree removal and systematic destruction of open space has WQ erosion. [Flooding?], [stamnate?], fish, Puget Sound and Heat Island [effect?]

[verification?]. Impervious Surfaces = GHG! What is [illegible] transportation? You cannot legally define \"open space\" as private patches with no [illegible] or public areas. Growth in urban villages does not prevent sprawl.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
[Illegible] strateiges. Fund rail. Affordability. Subsidized [communal?] rent. Low cost adaptive [reuse?]. Need to change zoning to fit 2010 code amendments. [Picture of \"Craftsman 1940\" next to \"$700K\" taller home] This is not livable and creates neighbor hostility.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Increasing density does not eliminate homelessness. We need to make social services and support (work opportunities) part of the plan so that people don\'t even enter into homelessness. Increasing density also increases taxes which can cause displacement to elderly who live in residential urban villages in houses.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Keep the community feel of the neighborhood. i.e. in Crown Hill, focus on developing 15th Ave first before considering to upzone the entire Crown Hill Residential urban village and remove SF zoning. Up zoning on 15th from 40-60th.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Mike Richards

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. more variety - less by box bldgs
2. add, preserve neighborhood character
5. and allow more neighborhood input
6. depends
9. consider changing some practices
6. Comments:
6. only in specified business areas
7. not in SF neighborhoods
8. NO!
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Transitive from NC-40 to SF areas with low rise-noncommercial
Either provide parking or require new residents not to own vehicles!
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Avoid affordable SF areas. Do not displace current residents who have affordable housing.
Inform an involve current neighborhood residents in planning development
Require a \"neighborhood impact study\" for larger development projects

10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Consider that everybody doesn\'t work downtown - and many of those that do have cars to use on weekends! This is Seattle and folks like to go out of town for recreation

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Irene Wall

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

4. Comments:
2. priority: mobility, access for people, storage of cars, access for businesses, activities
3. then do what?
6. too unlimited in scope
7. City has supported displacement in Hope 6 [illegible]
8. misses quantity
9. not without [illegible. nihord?] involvement
10. job of school district not the City
6. Comments:
1. only with owner occupancy
2. depends on size of lots
8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Only create or alter existing UV boundaries with concurrent active, neighborhood-based planning
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Still too convoluted, redundant and not making a clear, decisive start about managing impacts of anticipated growth
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Establish firm level of service standards for \"transit\" that go beyond [heat?]ways and address the user\'s experience, re no crash capacity!

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Do not expand crown hill urban village - sufficient multi-family unit growth already is alloted for along main arterials.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Don\'t look at the few remaining single-family neighborhoods as \"growth opportunity\" - stay out of these neighborhoods and focus on existing high density areas

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Do not increase size of \"Crown Hill urban village\" to include 10 min zone as it exists today. Growth is already plentiful along NW 85th St., NW 80th St., 15th Ave NE, and Holman Rd.
Add Tag to Answer Select Quote
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Do not look at the single family [RZ5000?] lots / residences as a growth opportunity high density already exists along bus routes - leave it there!

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
No not expand Crown Hill Village - plenty of multifamily properties exist along traffic corridors
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Don\'t look at single family / single resident properties to expand housing. focus on already existing apartment/condo properties

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Mark Perotti

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
You haven\'t defined what will be built in the proposed urban village boundaries. Nothing prevents large apartment buildings from going up next to SF homes. Also, you have no incentive for existing SF homes to put in ADUs. That is to say, the process should be streamlined - reduce the permit fees and process, facilitate financing with 3rd parties, etc. Are you going to streamline the ADU process in urban village areas only? I suspect that if you streamlined/incentivized ADUs across the city you would easily add a solid number of affordable housing units.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

4. Comments:
1. Most Seattle neighborhoods are w/in 10 minute walking distance from transit stop. How do you distinguish regular bus stop from frequent transit? Define frequent transit.

10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More detailed plan at the neighborhood level to consider unique features and needs and/or preferences through involving neighborhood residents, businesses, and other stakeholders.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Donn Dave

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Don\'t make neighborhoods beg to be recognized as new urban villages, do it proactively.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Parking policy to promote alternative transportation? (LU6) Bad idea, smells like \"war on cars.\"
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Trees should be mentioned in land use element. As they were in the current comp plan. Tree coverage in neighborhoods is very important.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Donn Miles

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
neighborhood input and planning initiatives
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Outside of urban villages single-family zones areas should be preserved and the character respected and enhanced, Affordable housing in existing brick apartment building should be preserved.
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More units for families with affordable housing near schools, groceries, parks and transit.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Seattle 2035 Open House
November 5, 2015
Leif Erikson Hall – Ballard
Community Character

Avoid street-facing garages.
1. KEEP PHYSICAL CHARACTER.
2. I’m ok with different physical character.

3. Be creative – retain character while accommodating more density.
4. Keep family, family – one house, one lot – one household, one lot.

More space on the ground floor that "activates the street".

1. Higher design standards for townhouses and apartments in urban village.
1. Keep character/design.
2. NEIGHBORHOODS CHANGE.

Look at transition between higher intensity zoning and single family.

1. Be careful of increases in height next to single family areas.

Housing

1. Allow more flexibility for more affordable housing.
a. Laneway housing
b. Small units
2. Don't restrict less expensive housing - - especially near good schools.
3. Very little income diversity in single family areas – or age diversity.
4. Transit oriented community should have this (income and age diversity).
5. Where are the condo options? Or, co-op building?
6. What can the City do? We are hurting our neighborhoods with just renters and not owners!
7. Also, we are hurting our younger generation who can't start with a first home – no equity!
8. Small lots could be 6-unit co-op building or condos instead of 3–4 500K townhouses.
1. Attached townhouse not desirable in single family zones.
2. I'm okay with townhouses in single family zones so long as they are designed well.
3. New whole variety of housing types if designed well.
1. No duplex or triplex.
2. Density must fit the neighborhood.
1. Allow non-owner occupied DADUs and ADUs – owner occupancy requirement is a bottleneck.
1. Car ownership is part of the bundle of housing costs. Save money by not having to drive.
2. Allowing more types of family or multifamily housing in single family zones makes sense.
3. Allow several households per house.
4. Offer incentives for improvements.
5. Offer incentives to increase density on single family owner-occupied homes, such as tax breaks.
6. Many people per home can be more energy efficient and feel safe.
1. We need legitimate, workable strategies to help folks stay in their single family homes–Low income tax credits, No/low interest loans for ADUs.
2. Allow/acknowledge multi-generational or extended families – and unrelated people – living in the same home.

Affordable housing in all areas of the city.

1. When looking at housing diversity, don't limit thinking to 4-packs and 6-packs - - be creative in your thinking.

Displacement

1. Help avoid displacement.
2. Displacement concern east of Othello.
1. Avoid displacement – property tax relief for low income households – especially for multi-generational households.

Parks & Open Space

1. Parks – small spaces to meet neighborhood needs – to relax, socialize.
1. Better parks.
1. Better trails map for Discovery Park, xxx.
1. Develop criteria for new parks focused on ACCESS, i.e. providing public open space in every

arterial quadrant.
2. Provide park space near high rise apartments. Seven high rises between 15th Ave. and 17th , Market and 57th – no place for dogs or children.
1. Keep parks free of for profit companies (aka zip lines, etc.). Try to generate money in other ways. Example: Billboards in parking lots. Example: There was a proposed for profit zip line in Lincoln Park. It did not go through. Corporations should not be in our parks.
1. Also, it's possible to have habitat for birds and wildlife now, but won't be if housing crammed into all available spaces.
1. Yes! to focusing on high quality commercial spaces instead of rigidly specified parks.
2. City proposal (7/20/15 Comp Plan Draft) removes all accountability.
3. Parklets, neighborhood parks, and large scale open space are all important.
4. Yes, keep corporations out of parks. Also consider the wildlife in any plan - - i.e. we have birds that live there and those birds that migrate through.

Urban Village Strategy & Boundaries

1. Yes – expand urban village to include walkshed.
1. Yes, include density near transit.
1. Yes – build density to accommodate people – alternatives to single family.
1. Make a 3-D representation of what zone heights are possible to help people visualize transitions at urban villages!
1. Yes – increase housing density near transit.
1. Yes to expansion, use walkshed boundaries.
2. Draw from boundaries in the Mayor's plan.
1. Makes sense to locate housing near transit – that's why we bought our house (Othello).
2. We like the diverse mix of people and housing.
1. Yes – expand urban village boundaries, but do mitigation to help people stay in their homes.
1. I'm okay with rezone from single family to multifamily, but keep same height and limited commercial.

Keep some areas single family.

1. I like the expansion idea.
2. Ballard UV should expand to include area around 15th and 65th. Multifamily makes sense there.
3. EQUITY FOR SE SEATTLE in terms of growth, density, affordable housing placement.
1. Favors expanded boundary. (+1)
1. There is a proposal to expand boundaries of urban villages, but no definition of what will happen in that expanded area. What prevents huge apartment buildings from going up next to existing single family homes? Nothing that I can see. This expansion is a blank check. (+1 Yes, exactly same concerns and questions).
1. Expanding UV's near transit makes total sense. But people beget transit, which you're proposing will now beget growth. How will we choose the transit options and geographies which will receive expansion? Some UV's are vastly under-utilized relative to plan (e.g. Crown Hill), while others are at capacity (Ballard). Wishful thinking only directs growth . . actually, very little!
1. Why not Laurelhurst/Sandpoint?!
1. Zoning changes should be part of the Comprehensive Plan comment and approval process.
1. Why expand? Make 1994 boundary area denser.
2. Alley as line – where does parking go?
3. Get the whole street – line.
4. RP2 – affordable with zone changes.
1. I oppose simplifying rezoning to enable ease of establishing multifamily in the middle of single family areas. This is intrusive and destructive of healthy AFFORDABLE neighborhoods, especially CROWN

HILL. (+1- I totally agree.)
1. Incentivize redevelopment along 15th.
2. Include school in UV – encourage walking.
3. Give neighborhoods choice regarding zoning.
4. SF zones - no zero lot line.
5. Focus more height along 15th – not SF.
6. We do not want Crown Hill's urban boundary changed. It should stay single family homes.
1. We don't want 6 townhouses on what were 2 single family homes. The neighborhood traffic is already too busy and fast.
1. Keep single family zoning in UVs.
1. Crown Hill is already a historic urban village. It is being upgraded by its residents and many new young families. We do not need this urban renewal to be reversed. We are no longer cheap real estate to be exploited.

Transportation
1. Address safe crossing of arterials.
1. Consider transportation needs of seniors, families with kids.
1. 24 hr. access to reliable transit (including bus and rail regionally).
2. Make it easy and people will abandon their cars and rely on transit.
1. Traffic = problem, so support thoughtful transportation that moves people where they want to go.
1. The City of Seattle does not control Metro Transit – King County does.
1. "Great transit" does not include light rail – light rail is obsolete – it's too slow, too expensive, and does not have its own right of way.
1. Please review intersections like the one at 4th Ave. N., 5th Ave. N., Queen Anne Drive, and Raye St.
1. Fix intersection at 4th Ave. N., 5th Ave. N., 6th Ave. N., and Raye St.

Parking
1. Look at parking impacts.
1. Provide parking in all dwellings.
1. Parking is important - - having more setbacks to allow for more open space/greenery. Parking needs to be required to avoid parking on neighborhood streets.
9. Require parking (+3),
10. Elderly and disabled will be displaced by eliminating parking and unrealistic "10 min." walksheds.
11. Rapid Ride takes too long because it goes through QA.
12. Concerns about traffic with density.
13. BRT needs to be rapid, with clear ROW access, especially dedicated lanes during peak hours.
14. BRT 'D' line is frequent – not rapid!
15.

Local Plans

Other
16. Laws/zoning support people with money. Laws/zoning should encourage less expensive options.
17. EIS: Look at drainage/waste with density (scoping comments).
18. Address property tax increases that could result from rezones.
19. Increased property values are also a good thing for property owners.
1. No new taxes! The expansion of boundary is not a good idea as it will change zoning for the property owners, and it will increase property taxes thus on most residences that have fixed incomes or are the average wage earner. This will cost an extra amount of $ each month to their budget which will

decrease their purchase power, and lower their standard of living.
20. SE needs jobs – higher paying, not just service.
21. Tie opportunity center with actual business operations.
22. SE needs office space – office and residents can work (Mercy Housing example).
23. Put development on the small Sound Transit leftover sites.
a. Engage small developers.
Infrastructure
24. Urban villages need parks, community center, libraries, infrastructure (e.g. Sidewalks anything north of 85th). (+2)
25. Infrastructure in Crown Hill.
26. Schools in urban villages.
27. Shops off of Holman or 15th – functional biz district.
28. I don't see evidence of a commitment to and plan for providing enough capacity for school population that will follow urban village expansions, esp. Crown Hill and Ballard. Where will the students go??
1. Homeowners are being asked to pay for "improvements" in Ballard area but are not realizing safety in basic infrastructure improvements. There are many more individuals sharing sidewalks with dog owners, dogs on leash, and bicyclists. Protect the pedestrians – PLEASE! Builders are not paying any development impact fees! Workers are taking few parking spaces on street.
1. Require builders to contribute money for parks, wider sidewalks – new streets where they build. (+1- I second this notion.)
Outreach & Engagement
29. DESIGN REVIEW code should be changed to give neighborhood more say on change/development.
30. Once sign up with email address, will get regular updates on meetings, times, etc.?
31. As a Crown Hill resident, this is the first I have heard that our area was considered for urban expansion. Was there no info earlier than this to advise us that this was being considered in our area?? (+1 This is the first I heard of it, too.)
32. Please notify Crown Hill residents! ?
33. We must work on better communication. Do not Ballardize Crown Hill.
34. Neighbors who live south of 85th NW are "out of the loop" as they do not identify as living in "Crown Hill". Many are unaware of being in its urban village.
1. No change in zoning or development standards without a City-sponsored neighborhood plan for Crown Hill urban village.
1. Only 1 in 40 households in Crown Hill know of this.
1. Get more neighborhood input!!
35. What does expansion of UV and zoning changes mean for seniors? They are in danger of displacement.
36. Is Office of Senior Services working with DPD and HALA?
37. What about LGBQ safe places? Can City help create/support these?
38. UV boundary expansion accompanied by planning narrow streets in Crown Hill.
39. Need school capacity.
40. Police presence
41. Complete disconnect between stated goals and actual policies. Tell people implementation impact . . not theory and dreams.
42. Focus on developing 15th Ave first before going into the neighborhoods and remaining SF zoning.
b. I have seen zoning on 15th Ave. from 40 ft. to 60 ft. so that developers have incentive due to

height.
43. Win-win for Crown Hill neighbors and 15th does not turn into Aurora!
44. Urban Village means people + open space + natural light and sky, trees and "leafy" spaces per Mayor's comments.
45. Promote a LGBTQ equity lens and address the housing crisis for low-income LGBTQ seniors. We need affordable LGBTQ senior housing.
46. Where is climate change in this discussion?
47. Is it possible to remove Crown Hill from the Urban Village Station?
48. Incorporate a LGBTQ lens and preserve cultural neighborhoods that serve marginalized LGBTQ communities – i.e. creation of a LGBTQ community center serving the needs of LGBTQ youth, POC, low-income trans* and seniors.
49. Need SF zoning and yards if the City is adding diversity.
50. "Marginalized populations" should include the elderly and disabled.
51. "Functions of ROW should better factor in residential parking needs and RPZs in areas with rapid redevelopment."
52. The proposed plan will have the opposite result to those stated here.
53. *Use rolled curbs to prevent wear on sidewalls of tires?public transportation/ROW.
54. Include a LGBTQ equity lens to urban planning, housing and development. When LGBTQ marginalized communities are displaced, we become less safe as we must leave Seattle or live in less safe neighborhoods.
55. Add a bike lane on 3rd Ave NW – north of Holman Road to allow safe bike access to Carkeek Park.
56. Where is climate change in this discussion???
57. Please look at density with the lens of affordability and open space/green/trees/air flow on each lot so we do not have high-rise canyon lands (like 15th & Market in Ballard) throughout.
58. Weak link is light rail. Too slow, not scalable.
59. Long commutes (traffic congestion) make it hard for employees to get to work.
60. Preschool investment might not be an effective use of $.
61. Speed limits are idealistic. Speed limits won't affect prioritizing safety.
62. Make sure you plan for enough schools if you build all that housing.
63. Kids: Schools/Parks – as we grow as a part of new development.
64. Preschool – great! What about infant care too?
65. Impact fees for schools and roads will free up General Fund $$ that can be directed towards housing.
66. New development should be designed to fit the context.
67. Proposed policy will displace low and middle income for the benefit of only a handful.
68. Changes to zoning could increase property taxes.
69. Don't forget about the people who have been here for a long time.
70. Design is important? more plaza space, more light. (Some new projects are OK) – Build community.
71. Much new housing is not affordable. It demolishes and replaces actual affordable housing for the benefit of developers, banks, and city revenue.
72. SEATTLE needs impact fees to pay for schools, parks, emergency services. Stop with the property taxes!
73. Creating long term affordable housing will not eradicate homelessness. We need social services, medical assistance, and short term assistance for people who are close to homelessness so they don't become part of the homelessness pool.
74. Maintaining so much SF housing drives up housing costs for everyone. Need more flexibility in

SF zones.
75. More office buildings.
76. Preserve SF areas and avoid displacing long term residents who have affordable housing now!
77. 'Affordable housing with every new development'. If adding new development, the affordable housing should be within that development in order to maintain equity and diversity within the affected neighborhood.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Ray Carter

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

You say "grow" like that is a good thing...

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Wayne Smith

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

We had one on 116 street between 5th and Lennox Ave. Nobody could get in.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Zach Lubarsky

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

It's growing regardless. The question is whether we grow up or out.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: Matt Ventura

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

First lets have the big quake then we can talk about growth.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: @BrockRides

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@SeattleCouncil 1880-1910 was insane. 70k in last 5 years seems so small by comparison. But we still might double @Seattle2035 projections.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

areas of lowest displacement risk for @Seattle2035 are nearly all single family zoning http://pic.twitter.com/4NnPeA5Fhn

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: @woolie

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @Seattle2035 homeowners experiencing massive equity gains unlikely to be displaced, news at 11.

Date: 11/05/2015

Name: @matthewplan

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@bruteforceblog I think the @Seattle2035 plan does a great job of laying forth the case for new growth areas. Now must act on findings.

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Alma Chaney

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Not quite two years ago, my husband and I became homeowners. We had been renters for years, and had spent three years living in Tacoma after rising rents priced us out of our Capitol Hill apartment. Being Seattle homeowners is truly a dream come true.
Will and I searched for a long time before finding a home we could afford in a neighborhood with the diversity and public transportation choices we wanted. Living in a home near the Othello light rail station means that we can leave our car parked six days a week, eat in local restaurants, and walk to the grocery store. As homeowners, we look forward to staying in the neighborhood for many years. We love it here and look forward to being a part of our community as it changes and grows.
I have looked at maps in the Seattle 2035 draft plan and if the Othello residential urban village is expanded as proposed, our house will be within its new boundaries. How would that change affect us? When we moved here we fully intended to stay for decades—perhaps for the rest of our lives.
Our neighbors have told us that if the urban village is expanded, we will have to move. They say that single-family homes within the new boundaries will be rezoned as higher density, and that when this rezone happens property taxes will be increased many times over. This, we are told, will be done with the aim of forcing homeowners like us to sell our property to developers so that the existing homes can

be demolished and replaced with higher density housing.
Can you please tell me whether this is true? We were forced out of Seattle by rising rents once. We thought becoming homeowners would give us the stability we wanted. Although we strongly support the creation of more affordable housing and increased density in Seattle, we hope we won't have to sacrifice our own home to make that happen.
Sincerely,
Alma Chaney

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: James Wilson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

"Your city, your future?"
You are the Seattle city government. You always have and always will do whatever you and the developers who own you want to do. Don't insult me by bothering to ask my opinion, because I know it doesn't matter one bit to you.

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Bruce Finlayson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am opposed to the arbitrary expansion of the Urban Village in the Roosevelt District proposed by the secret HALA committee (now made public). The Roosevelt District already proposed more density than the city had proposed several years ago, so the city just said we will do both plans and have even more. Now I understand the density goal for 2035 will be met in the Roosevelt District by 2017, 18 years in advance. To raise the bar even higher is unfair to the people who live here. The whole city needs to meet its density requirements, but they may be afraid to try since then the city may just raise the limits again.
Including Cowan Park and Ravenna Park in the Urban Village is absurd. Those are PARKS! They should not be developed with more housing. If that designation was just to increase the percentage of green space in an Urban Village it is a fraud – it is at the edge of the area and outside the area currently designated as an Urban Village. The houses here have a history of about 100 years, and they are still being kept up. Adding the residential houses along the park between 20th Ave. NE and 15th Ave. NE to the Urban Village is a direct statement from the city: we do not want single family residences.
When I watch what is happening in NE Seattle, I see ordinary houses (the most affordable ones) being torn down and replaced by five story boxes or million dollar houses. The five story boxes don't have enough affordable housing to offset the affordable housing that has been torn down. The City of Seattle is moving backwards: their policies lead to less and less affordable housing. My definition is: if you destroy affordable units that is a negative number; if you add affordable units that is a positive number. I've seen reports from the city that just count the new ones, ignoring the affordable housing torn down. Thus even the City's statistics are misleading. If you really want these big boxes to increase affordable housing then make the developers provide as many units in them that they tore down, to be rented at the rate the previous housing was, increased only as much as the Consumer Price Index each year. Then you would at least be keeping some affordable housing, whereas current policies lead to less affordable

housing.
The sketched lines on the HALA proposal expanding the Urban Village in the Roosevelt District should be erased.
Bruce Finlayson

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Peter Beske

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

The worsening traffic situation casts a very dark cloud over Seattle. :/

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Jayson Morris

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

2035 is a great way of having a vision in the way we might grow and understand how the vision in detail works with all the other plans in with the Community by holistic methods.... Great Job, City of Seattle!!!

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Ray Carter

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Or we can take reasoned steps to reduce, minimize or reverse growth .

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: EAT Ballard

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Cool!

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy

Comment:

With 120k residents and 115k jobs on the way, big changes are being evaluated in @Seattle2035. B'lard meeting tonite http://www.theurbanist.org/2015/11/06/seattle-2035-explore-the-draft-plan-and-weigh-in/

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

@UrbanistOrg @Seattle2035 more upzones in Northgate, please ;-)

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

@Charles_B_STB @UrbanistOrg @Seattle2035 and fremont, wallingford, green lake, west seattle, magnolia, etc etc http://pic.twitter.com/MOJMq2hnxS

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @david_sucher

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@Seattle2035
Subsidize them to live here.

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @UrbanistOrg @Seattle2035 what risk is this?

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@Charles_B_STB @UrbanistOrg @Seattle2035 displacement. the 2035 plan puts nearly all development in areas w/ higher risks of displacement

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @UrbanistOrg @Seattle2035 its also exactly where the high capacity transit is. Should we upzone away from the transit?

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

@Charles_B_STB @UrbanistOrg @Seattle2035 should we upzone where people can walk, bus or bike to DT...
yes.

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 It's more nuanced than that. The City is pursuing mitigation measures, like HALA and others

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 But that is why we advocated for this... http://www.theurbanist.org/2015/06/16/support-alternative-5-for-seattle-2035/

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

@UrbanistOrg @Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 i'm all in on HALA v. status quo, but triplexing doesn't go far enough. http://www.archdaily.com/618106/548-stradbrook-condominiums-5468796-architecture

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @antitrustmaster

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@UrbanistOrg @bruteforceblog @Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 upzone all of CA Ave SW!

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Weigh in on the Draft Plan for @Seattle2035 tonight in Ballard.
http://www.theurbanist.org/2015/11/06/seattle-2035-explore-the-draft-plan-and-weigh-in/

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: @melissajonas

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Things to do this weekend (while waiting for ballot drop Monday): @Seattle2035 Open House 11/7 9a-12p 5740 MLK Jr Way S. Important stuff!

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Steve Cohn

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Tom,
It was good to talk with you last night. I'll send some of my comments in writing to you prior to the comment deadline.
Though I couldn't stay for the presentations, I thought that the open house went very well. It looked to me that there was enough staff to respond to questions, and I thought that the boards did a good job of explaining the issues.
I hope that you received the attendance and feedback you were looking for.
As I mentioned, we have a group of Ballard residents reviewing the proposed Plan; I hope that you're open to coming (or have one of your staff come) to join us in one of our future meetings.
Congrats again on a good job!
Steve C

Date: 11/06/2015

Name: Linda Melvin

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Hello Tom,
Aditi Kambuj gave me your name as the expert who can answer my questions below.
I will, no doubt, have additional questions as I review the 2035 Plan, but for now,
could you please answer these?
Please and thanks.
Linda Melvin, Ballard

I reviewed the Comp Plan to see if I could find reference to "quotas" for future development units in the Urban Villages.
Under Growth Strategy, specifically Figure 3, Est. Urban Village Growth Rate. I found the following:
Housing Growth Rates suggested are percentages "above 2014 actual housing units."
Two rates were provided: with or without frequent transit (which required light rail or 2 or more bus lines).
For Hub Urban Villages, the Growth Rates were 70% with frequent transit and 40% without.
So a few questions come to mind:
New development units in Ballard are now well over 400% of what was predicted for 2024.
Will we have to absorb more development at that same 70% rate as the other Urban Villages?
Why are percentages based on 2014 actual units and not 2015 actual units?!? The Plan won't be finalized until 2016; surely the data should be updated by then.
And will development continue at this pace before we see light rail or increased bus lines?

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Jill Princehouse

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

My concern is not cars on the road. The easiest way to make downtown Seattle corridors car-free is to ban cars in those areas-much like, e.g., Oslo, Norway; Paris, France, and other European cities are doing.
My concern is lack of parking on Seattle streets-lack of required parking for each unit in a new building, especially apartment building. I live on Capitol Hill. Because of the proposed new Link station, Seattle has chosen to not require developers to provide parking as they build new projects. But ability to ride the Link or the bus doesn't mean people with cars that need to be parked won't move into these buildings. So with no parking requirement for developers, there are increased numbers of residents with cars for which there is even less street or building parking available.
In my building I have parking. But there are 3 new buildings close by currently under construction or proposed construction that have no required parking. Those cars will end up on the street. Currently cars parked on the street are owned by employees of businesses on 15th Avenue East, employees of Group Health, employees of other businesses, e.g., Catalysis, and people without off-street parking. I have become a prisoner of cars parked on the street. I cannot even have guests to visit because there is no parking for them. If I need maintenance, I pay more than I should because with impossible-to-find street parking, they allow an extra hour of work to my bill each day while they drive around and look for parking. And can you imagine carrying your tools and a sheet of plywood or sheetrock for three blocks?
Seattle needs to require developers to provide at least one off-street parking spot for each unit in a building. Not requiring parking is not keeping people from owning cars. It merely makes it impossible for residents to have guests and difficult to have maintenance people, because all the street parking is being taken up by apartment dwellers whose buildings have no off-street parking.
Please require developers to provide off-street parking for each unit in all buildings under construction. And by so requiring, allow me the opportunity to have access to street parking for guests, for maintenance workers, and others needing access to my building.
Jill Princehouse

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Donna Rueth

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

This is absolutely disgraceful! How can you eliminate the voices of those people living in the neighborhoods? We moved to Wallingford so that we could live in a place where single family homes were lived in by families and where our kids could enjoy a walkable neighborhood where trees and gardens encouraged a diversity of birds and other creatures. We do not want to be surrounded by towering blocks of apartments which will not be affordable, even if you pretend that they will.Don't destroy our community.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Skylar Thompson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Whatever plan eventually is adopted, a key component must be increasing density throughout the city, and in particular along existing rapid transit corridors. Increasing density makes providing many other parts of the plan (parks, transit, affordable housing) easier.
If given the choice between increasing density, and maintaining existing single-family zones, the end result should be an increase in density.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation, Utilities

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Infrastructure capacity ie sewer, water, elec
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Allow park and ride for light rail

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Availability of crosswalks
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Ballard, inclusion of the industrial waterfront in the urban growth plan.
Public access to waterfronts.
Smaller parklet options where land availability is limited.

Development of local identity within designated urban villages
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Access to natural spaces within the walkshed

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Consider what might be lacking in the neighborhood, so even if you can't include a park/facility in the boundary, increase the accessibility to that park/facility by expanding the boundary in that direction.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
We need to keep Seattle family friendly, addressing accessibility to parks, adequate family housing, and dealing with fear of crime and homeless populations.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Think about how families would [illegible] and more within neighborhoods, because places that are built to be family friendly help accomodate the elderly as well, and anyone in between.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Carson Hartmann

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. relative to mobility!
4. Don't feel that this is a priority seems $$$.
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Do urban villages speed up the process of gentrification?
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Do urban villages speed up the process of gentrification? Should this plan be put to a rote as opposed to a city project that a select few provide input on?
Are your outreach efforts comprehensive and inclusive? Who are you inviting to provide input and how?
Provide growth where opportunities are! North Seattle.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
EQUITY
DISPLACEMENT
AFFORDABILITY

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Tim Parham

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Economic Development, Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Urban villages should be designated in all areas within a 10-min walkshed of transit (light rail and bus). Sidewalks, parks, topography, are all less important than the 10-min walkshed. We can improve sidewalks and add parks.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Many in Othello support the expansion of the urban village boundary. My house and neighborhood would become a part of the urban village. Woo hoo!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Displacement of cultural institutions and small businesses. All neighborhoods need to grow to survive and thrive. Achieving social equity requires different strategies for each urban village,

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
safety - crime rate

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Dick Burkhart

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Improved transit, also greenways
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Looks good! Need flexible "displacement" strategies - lots of help for homeowners of modest means - to rehab or remodel houses to rent out rooms or flats or for extended families, also to reduce property taxes.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Encourage enough density in single family zones to support better transit and neighborhood corner stores.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Bill Davis

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Avoid gaps between neighborhoods

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Elderly access to public transit

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Matt Lubetich

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
3. feedback on '94 plan outcomes
7. balance
10. I'm told SPSchools has no money?
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Asthetically, I would like to see pyramid height with tallest structures nearest LR1 and scale down from there and into single family homes as the 10 min walk progresses outward.
I'd like to see the Space Needle asthetics protected regarding the heights of new developments in Belltown/Denny/SLU.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
If 5-7 story mixed use [fouliho?] [are?] developed in commercial space should also be affordable for small business to thrive. I don't like seeing empty commercial spaces in this type of development...Not good for community
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More ansillary facts should be provided to neighborhood inhabitants so best decisions can be made per individual/family.
Most of the draft key plan proposal are already parts of the "job" that should be done already. Need real questions. Specific questions not generic overviews.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Alma Chaney

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Maintain stability of existing communities and focus on the unique characteristics of each area.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I would like the city to address directly how changing urban village boundaries will affect people who are already living in the area and what will be done to ensure that they can remain in their existing homes.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Will Davis

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Not all urban villages should have the same mix of different housing types. Factors such as income levels and job opportunities should influence the mix.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Remember the importance of schools in the equation.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Carolyn Cooper

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Growth Alternative - go with 3 (near light rail)
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Zoning doesn't always match intent
developers rush to take advantage of that - needs to be fixed
too much development is considered in isolation (bldgs from each other, not including emerald Mile, streetcar, etc.)
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Keep spaces - building/tower separation
No concrete jungle

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Karra Wise

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
I would like to see more currant single homes that have plenty of room to house/rent to folks - make it semi-low income affordable option, maybe home owners get a tax break for being creative in keeping homes.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I feel like taxes going up for folks that are already struggling to keep their family home and are doing all they can with jobs etc...that would be a bummer -
what can we do with or to our homes to get a tax break. and how can the city help

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Sarah Valenta

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Economic Development, Housing

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?

Consider cultural community neighborhood boundaries set by residents rather than City and be sensitive to dividing those
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Invest in facade improvements in lower income communities. Invest in small business technical assistance. Invest in cultural community anchors. Invest in infrastructure that promotes jobs for people living in the community. Change zoning to allow for office space in retail zones.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Jobs, recreating, affordable housing and affordable commercial spaces easily accessible by affordable transit to people already living in Seattle. Help diverse and low income business owners and residents stay in Seattle.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rachel Eagan

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Economic Development, Housing

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Growth and investment centered around one or two urban villages to be effective and equitable. One or two urban villages cannot bear the load as the sole islands of affordability. In addition to the growth and investment that is likely coming to Othello (and we do need that investment) re-introducing affordability to Ballard, Freemont and Capital Hill is also necessary for the overall health of the city.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Facade improvements and culturally appropriate business technical assistance for current businesses to be able to prosper and benefit from the planned growth and investment.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Bike lanes

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. ? disagree
5. Should be flexible to change
6. Carefully - Some areas should be preserved
7. All types let's not program [illegible]
8. Do we get our $ [illegible] when they are [hear?] jobs
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing

expanded boundaries?
1. wark with these constraints
3. unless done smartly
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Very poor [JoG?] addressing peoples [concurrence?] - came in to a [illegible] and failed to connect - left the people feeling marginalized and dismissed - questions asked where fair and clear - answers should have been the same not "Go look at the boards and talk to the people back there"

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Adam Dodge

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

7. Comments:
Liberalize zoning and let the market decide to supply whatever the demand is for
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Urban villages should be expanded and drastically upzoned - like in Vancouver. Zoning in the rest of the city should be dramatically liberalized as well so that we're not forcing everyone into designated enclaves while intentionally maintaining legally mandated exclusionary zones in the majority of the city.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
It's too weak, too timid, and too planned. We should allow people access to the whole city, not force new people into limited designated zones. The urban villages strategy was crafted to protect a specific class of people at a specific point in time, based on a system of exclusion from the beginning. It was a bad idea in the 90s and is an even worse idea now.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The #1 thing the city could do - and at very low cost - is to create a cap-and-trade system for parking in urban villages and eventually the whole city. Columbia City is getting 1000+ parking spaces in a short timespan within walking distance to the station. This is extremely counterproductive to the future prospects of CC being a "livable, walkable, transit-rich urban village".

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Communicate to people living in the proposed urban village so they understand what the potential impacts will be.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
With the implementation of Seattle 2035, I am concerned with the increase of property taxes. Also, we need to look at possible economic decline if Amazon or other companies take jobs outside of Seattle.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Economic development - creating jobs around urban villages
Parking - deal with increase in cars and traffic regarding increased growth

Neighborhood disruption - take single zone houses, known them down to create large building complexes

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Displacement needs to be a higher concern. Growth in areas where displacement is lower
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Social Equity
Affordability to residents and business (diversity in services to the community)
Increase affordability requirements for zoning.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Maia Williams

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
3. Include in UV, don't develop. Increases resident access to green/open space
Don't just think about I-5 and light rail. What about other high transit areas?
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Avoid displacement (!)
1-for-1 replacement requirement (especially for affordable housing)
Encourage more growth where it will displace fewer people
*look at all high-transit areas, not just near light rail
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Affordability for residents and businesses
Think about creating community land trusts, mutual housing associations, and limited equity coops
Increase affordability requirements for mandatory inclusionary zoning

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Colleen McAler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

7. Comments:
4. need parking!
8. NO
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Existing SF homes and areas need to be preserved we house parents, kids, and seniors in them

"Now" means more expensive and more taxes which people cannot afford
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Limit height, bulk, and scale in any development
Require design compatibility with existing adjacent residences
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Green space must be preserved
Put transportation in place 1st before allowing development
Need sidewalks first before bike lanes

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Emma Catague

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Community members should be part of the decision maker
Maintain and respect the different culture within the areas
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Contract with com. members to do the outreach and com. mtgs Do that it is within their own languages and be able to explain the plan better, and not rushing
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Involve the community from the beginning of planning and not the end of it.
Understand the complexity and diversity of each community uniqueness and be able to preserved it within the plan.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Synergy is very important and the requirements for commercial. Space needs to be well designed i.e. certain areas are dead zones for commercial. Therefore should not be a requirement otherwise you face vacancies.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Connie Cox

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Please focus of race and social justice/equity and NOT kill the south end. Focus on displacement and keep people in their homes.

Balance parking requirements - parking is necessary. Respect current residents and not disregard their needs over the maybe new residents. We should not just be if we build it they will come. We should respect the values and quality of life that makes us desirable for the maybe they'll come.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Be respectful of all the work completed in the neighborhood plans. Most of the proposals contained within the plans (particularly CC/HC/H Plan) have not been implemented [due?] have already exceeded the growth planned for, be respectful of the work ideas and changes already implemented. No upzones in SF neighborhoods no height increases above 40!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Design review process should be expanded not simplified or streamlined. MORE review is necessary all new construction should fit within the look/feel/zoning of the neighborhood. not overwhelm..more design review.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
It is unfair to single family dwelling many who are long term and elderly. Yall seem to be moving citizens of this country out to make room
you seem to be planning for the unimportant population rules.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Daphne Schneider

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I'm very supportive of the plan - but we need to ensure that those currently in single family homes can afford to stay in them. We need strategies to maintain these, to include but not be limited to:
Acknowledgement of density from multiple/extended families in one home
Some sort of tax relief for lower income, non-senior home owners
Strategies to encourage remodels of existing homes, to support adding density (e.g. low interest/interest free loans)
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The fears expressed by Ron Momoda need to be addressed with concrete strategies - and these strategies need to be called out and hilighted

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture, Growth Strategy

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?

Support community cultural anchors that help build shared identity, include voices of color in Seattle growth leadership, and serve as economic drivers for equitable growth

Date: 11/07/2015

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
6. Depends on how it's done: spread it out, not just in UVs (17% shoulders all growth?!)
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Urban villages shouldn't have to take on all the city's growth. As unpopular as it was, the proposal to spread multi-family housing across the entire city seems more equitable. You can't please everybody, and the single-family NIMBYs need to come to Jesus on this.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The Columbia City and W. Seattle developments are HORRENDOUS. Huge, hulking blocks that blot out the sky and utterly change the neighborhood's feel. More density, yes, but not like this. Work with developers to balance affordability, aesthetics, and amount of residents in new construction. I like Japan's height limits that require certain amounts of sun light for existing homes when new buildings go up.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

5. Comments:
10. good luck with that
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Don't concentrate all development in UV's - allow things like adu's in all SF zoned areas of city
Keep property taxes affordable for current low income residents of UV's that get up zoned
Create real, permanent new low income housing in UV's
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Don't drive out low income people
Plant more trees everywhere. Plant larger trees where possible.
Support growth of arts and cultural orgs in UVs

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. Do we need to store cars on all streets?

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: David Sauvion

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
The plan should focus more on jobs. We know that the urban village strategy failed heavily during the past comp. plan period. Jobs (and living wage jobs) is a key part of what will keep this city affordable. Unless we start talking about low income housing, affordability is always going to be tied to income.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The urban village strategy throws a one solution fits all over the city. No specific attention is brought to opportunities for substantial employment centers outside of downtown/SLU. 115,000 in 36 neighborhoods is the equivalent of 3,000 jobs per neighborhood. That's unrealistic. Ignoring the fact that some neighborhoods have already far exceed their previous targets and planning for more growth is heading for the wall. Acknowledging and encouraging opportunities for large employment hubs in south Seattle ([illegible] Rainier Beach) where easy access to transportation already exists would deliver much greater results to achieve equity in Seattle.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Jobs! Especially those with a livable wage so they don't have to spend more than 35% on housing.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Include more social justice and equity supports to reduce the impact on our low income neighbors.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Retail space to match the neighborhood's needs now and in the future.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

5. Comments:
8. & SAFETY
7. Comments:
2. to medium lots with yards
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
It's good to have parks in all areas, but if we keep some single family residents we have yards and areas for children and families without them needing to "walk elsewhere" to enjoy the outdoors. I think we need to have blended areas of multifamily and single family - don't run single families out to the suburbs - (mayor's adage - place without displacing?)
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?

My idea of a village be it urban or not is to have the necessary things in that village for me to shop and spend my money within my village. Why would I need to take my dollars out to another village, which in turn makes them grow. But mine stalls because money is not turning over in that area. Urban villages should have grocery, retail, schools, entertainment, etc. residential, enough that would make me feel like staying in my village because it has all I need. We have lost neighborhoods - now we have villages

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
1. other considerations than walking
letting Seattle retain its distinct personality
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Remember we still have people that want to drive. Consider bicyclists for tax revenue.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Sharon Shaw

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. very concerned about the plan
7. Comments:
7. we have enough of those

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Joseph Ringold

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Would like to see more discussion of increasing capacity in single family zones. [illegible] in laws sub divided housing...All neighborhoods should play their role in accomodating growth.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: John Zilany

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Agree that regulations need to protect existing stock of affordable housing

Allow measures to increase density in SF zones (ADU's and multifamily units on corners.
Measures to discourage wanton destruction of existing housing stock for out of scale SF development
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More facilities for bicycles: racks, storage, lanes and repair stations
Neighborhood shuttles to light rail stations from beyond 10' distance
City must figure out more effective way to communicate with, listen to and include people of color in the discussion and implementation process

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: M Jonas

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Be aware / emphasize planning for entire life cycle - aging in [place?], young children, mobility-impaired
Integrate planning with schools and business / service districts
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Please start to plan for Graham Steet station / urban village
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Business districts and services - Walkable to where? not only parks and public spaces / transit
Plan for people to get what they need close to home. Keep commercial districts affordable for local small businesses

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Jhon Gilroy

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Efforts to maintain the historic character of urban villages when new construction occurs.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Rainier Valley needs more East-West connector options to mass transit. Basically fill in the gaps from Lake WA east over to West Seattle. Tax incentives for offices in Rainier Valley.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More opportunities for small businesses throughout the urban villages - not solely concentrated in retail zones or districts.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Ann Sammon

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing

expanded boundaries?
A commitment to infrastructure that supports walkability in the current urban villages is hugely important!
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Shuttle buses that move people from outside urban villages into the hub would bridge access gaps and help keep parking open in business districts for those coming from other neighborhoods.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Infrastructure, Infrastructure, Infrastructure to encourage walk and bike ability

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
10 minute walk radius seems like a good metric
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Equity and preventing displacement - whether we truly choose to prioritize this with investments of $ and legislation (rent control?!) will be very telling of who are as a city.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The idea of living without in a car us v. difficult for many Seattleites to imagine, but totally normal in other cities. Keep up the good work of helping people imagine what this change could mean for them! Less $ on transportation, [increased] quality of life, [increased] convenience for taking care of errands /life stuff. OR they can live in a more residential area outside the urban village! The fact is that, whether people like it or not, we'r ein a real city with a growing population, and we cant continue to act like Seattle is a town and use the same strategies that used to work.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Alice Birnbaum

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
The amount of change any one neighborhood absorbs over time. For instance, the Othello area recently absorbed a lot of growth with the development of New Holly and anticipates more with new apartments being developed around Othello Station. Now upzoning is being proposed too. It seem like Othello is being given more than its share.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I understand the need for development near transit, and I support it in general. However, my fears are:
How to manage new buildings' design so they don't destroy the character of the neighborhood? (e.g. ugly townhouses)
How to ensure developers will not purchase houses, etc., and then allow them to languish in disrepair or become neighborhood blight (e.g. squatters in old Seattle Times building)?

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Trees are important.
Minimize displacement, displacement, displacement.
Maintain current protections for affordable housing and neighborhood character.
Keep the Comp Plan's neighborhood focus.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
This plan is equal to urban removal, which falls disporportionally on people of color and low and fixed income residents.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Adhere to the guidelines which protect our green spaces.
Stop the land grab and focus on creating sustainable jobs with in the current boundaries of the urban villages.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Voter against the plan

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Guidelines 1 - hold property taxes at a fixed, current, for single family property owners so they/and me, don't get displaced would be a fair trade for the new boundary lines. Some east coast cities assess this way until there is a transfer of sale.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
implement a new tax assessment structure where exsisting single family property owners see no new increase in tax until there is a transfer of sale - model after some of the east coast cities.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
No new taxes - Keep single family zoning - this is a great alternative to open space and enjoying nature because single family residences will not be as built up if zoning changes.

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: George Dugdale

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Make necessary improvements to pedestrian streets

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Julie Congdon

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Make sure the walk routes are well-lit and safe, marked well

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Danielle Wallace

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
8. more discussion of equity?
10. consider current inequities
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
expansion shouldn't disproportionately communities with high displacement risk

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Create strict signage codes for businesses
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I define an urban village as a space you live, work and play in. There is no need to leave the village. If you have to leave, travel by bus, train, bike, walk or use a scooter.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Decreased parking and encourage use of public transportation, biking and walking. Really, don't even consider adding parking garages when building multi-family housing!

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Robert Stephens, Jr.

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being

Comment:

5. Comments:
10. Programs and housing, employment for veterans and their family
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?

Areas: (employment and housing) for veterans and their family...
Note: the Fire House 23rd and Yesler should be for veterans to use as a veterans center...info about vets. benefits
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Please add (policies to support) "Veterans and Their Family" into the elements...of the documents (e.g. place a veterans service officer (USO) in each one of the city's neighborhood centers...to help veterans secure information about veterans benefits and services)
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Bring back the "city level of the division of" veterans affairs...that was under the Department of Human Services...
Note Transportation for Veterans to VA Hospital

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Regarding Proposal #5: Who gets to propose zoning changes? Only the property owner?

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Andrea Clinkscales

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

5. Comments:
5. too technical
9. ? Vague

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. parking lots?
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
sidewalk parklets are great

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Measure more neighborhoods by single family homes. Stop measuring by just one measure of open space. Need to make more of measurement by how the $ surculates. In some neighborhoods and communities the $ would surculate 20-30 times before leaving the perspective areas. In the creation of the villages respect the cluture, and history of the neighborhoods and communities. STOP!! Gentrificiation!! of the Central Area Primarily and pushing people of collor out of Seattle generally.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Have a section in the Comp Plan that truely speaks to community participation, like the GMA. Really work with the neighborhood plans and the people who work with them, and live in the communities of the plans. Instead of measuring rentals, work and invest in people owning remaining in their homes as well as buying back into their neighborhoods and communities. MORE SINGLE FAMILY DEWILLING!! Stop!! Displacement and gentrification. Developers are Destroying neighborhoods and communities!!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More single family dwelling, less large buildings and complexes. The large building and complexes are destroying neighborhoods. Invest in making communities viable for small business. STOP!! allowing developers from taking over the process of building and growth in our communities and neighborhoods as well as Planning and Development. Work to involve education or the schools -> young people 14-24 need to be included -> to Seattle Public Schools

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Neighborhood plan design guidelines
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Why are South East Seattle neighborhood plans in the DPD "vault"/archives?
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More public spaces, pocket parks etc... in urban villages. Buy small lots under 10,000 sq ft

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Shelley Morrison

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Housing

Comment:

7. Comments:
4. Where are small condo or coop projects
5. condo [crossed out apartment]
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
2. lighting
Protect historic landmark districts -> 3-story limit!
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?

So much focus on rental

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

"1. Growth Strategy - how and where do we grow?
We think we should plan for growth near frequent transit (ex. light rail stations, priority bus corridors).
We propose to:
- Include areas within 10 minute walk of a frequent transit station into urban villages
- More people live in urban village with easy access to transit."
Comments:
But - what kind? What is growth?
Defined - Existing businesses should be able to stay.
Consider parking.
Sometimes people will have car.
Affordable. Has to be safe.
Walking distance.
Families with kids need to park drive.
Has to be accessible to [services?]
Well-light
Has to be safe
Support
Bike stations
Mini-buses

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

"2. City ""Rights of Way"" (streets)
We propose to accommodate six key functions in the public right-of-way (streets):
- vehicle travel
- safety and comfort for pedestrians
- access for businesses
- activities/place-making (""place-making"" means using parts of streets for little parks, festivals and sidewalk cafes)
- landscaping
- parking for cars, trucks and buses."
Comments:
Cars increase congestion
Bike/walk good for environment

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy

Comment:

"3. Growth Strategy
Measure and report growth and change. We currently measure how many units and jobs are created. We propose to add to the list - to include things like:
- Establish indicators - so we can work to close racial disparities to achieve equity. For example
 - Household income by race
 - High School graduation rates by race
 - Housing cost burdens (what percentage of income is spent on housing) by race
 - Etc.
- Report on these indicators to the public"
Comments:
It's a comp plan. It should include times indicators.
Should be included because helps to plan
But for what purpose?

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

4. Proposed Stadium District on the City's Land Use Map around professional sports stadiums. A stadium district would allow housing and hotels. The district would also protect the ability of trains and trucks to move freight through this area.
Comments:
Did not discuss

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

"5. ""Future Land Use Map""
An urban village is a business district and the neighborhood that surrounds it. We want to encourage many different activities in Urban Villages and Urban Centers. We recommend the city make it easier to allow a wide range of activities in these areas. Currently, the rules identified through the ""Future Land Use Map"" (the City's official map of what type of use is allowed on a piece of property) makes it difficult to change from one type of activity (such as business) to another (such as housing), even when it makes sense to do so.
- We will continue to define different activities and building sizes for different urban villages and urban centers.
- We will also make sure that areas within a 10 minute walk of frequent transit are included in urban villages. This can make it easier for more people to use the bus or train.
- We will encourage housing and job growth in these areas."

Comments:
Yes, but make sure you consult with local community
Affordable housing? Is it just [remers?]?
As long as consult residents who are there?
"w/ concerns see (1)
a. Yes but need to consider first: rent control, displacement, access-shuttles, existing businesses, existing people."

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

"6. More housing choices in urban villages - to accommodate more people
In order to accommodate the 120,000 new people moving into Seattle, we will need to change how we think about housing, where we locate more units, and to create different types of housing - to make more housing available people and to create more housing that is affordable to families as well as single people. Right now, there are place within our urban villages where only one house is allowed on each lot. We are proposing to allow different types of housing (houses and apartments) on lots in urban villages where only one house is now allowed."
Comments:
Residents have to make the decisions
Still need a local plan
OK to convert
Have concerns about SF changing
Has to be a plan
Concerned about allowing more apartments in SF areas of urban village
b. not unanimous
b. If cost affordable

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Economic Development, Housing

Comment:

"7. Minimize Displacement as the city grows
We propose to work to minimize ""displacement"" of marginalized people, businesses and communities (low income households, people of color and English language learners, small family-owned businesses). ""Displacement"" describes when people or communities move out of a neighborhood because they can't afford to stay, or their business and community network move out.
- Monitor risk of displacement
- Preserve existing and increase affordable housing
- Support existing and new small businesses with different government programs"
Comments:
Must be more than minimize. Make it zero displacement.
Make sure people can stay

Even stronger than minimize
If people push, we can make it no displacement
"Priority order:
1. Housing (for families), density
2. Your community's place of gathering
3. Your community's businesses"

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

"8. Parks & Open Space
As we grow, we need to create a new way to set park/open space goals. However, new land for parks is becoming more difficult for the city to buy. We want to focus on
- Making sure parks/open space are designed for people who will use them (places to sit for older people, place to play for children, etc)
- Making sure most people can easily get to open spaces by car and walking, from home or work"
Comments:
Walking
Access to transit is very important
At grade rail access
Multi language signage
Safety to rail access cannot be overemphasized
Code compliance
Coordinate park spaces with cultural centers

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

"9. Neighborhood Planning policies
When we plan for specific neighborhoods it is important that we include input, concerns, priorities from the diverse backgrounds of the community; that we include businesses, agencies, community based organizations, etc. We focus on neighborhoods that are either 1) growing fast or 2) need help with new services and new housing/jobs. We also use different City tools based on the needs and concerns of each neighborhood. We recommend that the current language be amended to capture our current practices."
Comments:
Would enhance

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities

Comment:

"10. Plan for and Locate Schools to Better Serve Seattle's Growing Population
The City and the Seattle School District should coordinate to better meet the needs of Seattle's children."
Comments:
SE schools need resources. SE schools need more resources to be on par with north end schools.
S Seattle needs more after school programs
School times should consider needs of families
More relationship and coordination
Better coordination with existing community center - more after

Date: 11/07/2015

Name: Rainier Open House groups

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

How to address displacement
School zone
Safety and policing
Sustainability - utilities, design, coordinate infrastructure, more solar
Rent control
High no. affordable housing
Displacement - keep people in n.hood

Date: 11/07/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Seattle 2023 Comprehensive Plan Open House Nov. 5, 2015
Yes/ No answers are from the "guided groups."
Notes on easel pad are from everyone.
1. Growth Strategy – how and where do we grow? We think we should plan for growth near frequent transit (ex. light rail stations, priority bus corridors). We propose to:

- Include areas within 10 minute walk of a frequent transit station into urban villages
- More people live in urban village with easy access to transit.

YES NO
a. Do you agree that it is important that we guide growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of frequent transit? Grp 1
Grp 2
Grp 4
b. Do you have concerns about guiding our growth to so that more people live in areas near frequent transit? If so, what are they?

- Be mindful of seniors who may not be able to walk as far.
- Support growth near transit BUT needs to be safe, well, lit & comfortable to walk to stop, esp. for seniors, disabled

- Stations need to be closer; if not, more routes & more circulators in neighborhood
- Better regional connections (3 buses from Renton)
- Need safety, lighting
- Need shelters for transit
- Offer some areas of various modes
- Please add programs, employment for our veterans and their family
- Don't put all the growth in urban villages
- Allow more ADUs and small additional development in all SF across the city
- More equitable growth
- Why not more shuttles to light rail? Urban Hubs suffer from higher density + people will still drive & park in the Hubs to access light rail. Shuttles would reach more residents and reduce parking & traffic + over growth in smaller area.
- Be mindful of business groups also
- City has compounding the problem of affordability for the average income earner. Seattle lobbyist are/ have been down in Olympia pushing for a mileage tax and expanding powers to tax homeowners- city need to stop putting the financial burden on the average income earner. No to expanding boundaries as this means new zoning designation on property which means higher tax assessment. I can't afford another $100+ a month for property taxes!
- Not enough public spaces (pocket parks, etc.) as amenities to ease pressure of density.
- The transit walkshed for North Beacon Hill doesn't = am to the hills into around (?)- it extends to the east where there is a steep hill but not to the west far enough where is less hilly. Please review it. Also, on Beacon Hill, the walkshed should go further south to include business around Hanford & Jefferson Park. That's where people want to walk.

Write on easel pad

c. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban village expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?

- Greenspace preservation
- Urban canopy to achieve goals
- Housing price
- Neighborhood Plan design guidelines
- Include North Beacon Hill Neighborhood Plan which was updated in 2010. It cost $800,000 to produce and incorporated feedback from many minority communities.

The check in events has hundreds of residents in attendance. Write on easel pad

2. City "Rights of Way" (streets): We propose to accommodate six key functions in the public right-of-way (streets):

- vehicle travel
- safety and comfort for pedestrians
- access for businesses
- activities/place-making ("place-making" means using parts of streets for little parks, festivals and sidewalk cafes)
- landscaping
- parking for cars, trucks and buses.

YES NO

a. Do you agree that it is important the City accommodates all of these needs? Grp 1
Grp 3
Grp 4

b. OPTIONAL What are the most important needs the city should consider when designing and improving streets?

- Pedestrian safety/bike safety
- Separated bus lanes can help both transit and cars move more quickly
- Rainier doesn't feel safe for peds – due to traffic
- Why are bus fares going up? Should be free
- Downtown has lots of congestion
- Automated speed and ticketing for safety
- Does or will the change help or impede the flow of traffic?
- Save roads – social justice issue for lower-income families who need to drop family members for care, etc.
- Need to improve access to transit (LRT) – can't get to the station easily, consider shuttle to LRT stations
- Is data/information being collected on the Rainier Ave raod diet
- No more road diets, e.gg 75th is too steep for safe biking
- Need new right of ways for biking
- Need more direct transit service to VA facility
- Improve east-west access, particularly to transit
- Do shuttle pilot project to LRT in RV
- Consider connection from West Seattle to Beacon Hill Station
- Stop with deleting/eliminating lanes! City has done this on Rainier/57th, Rainier/Edmunds, 125th Ave N going into Lake City, Roosevelt Way/Northgate Way. Bring back the car lands & make it safer for bike riders and other users of road. Stop wasting our tax dollars on eliminating lanes.
- Create more space for cars in order to reduce traffic
- We should be concerned about pollution
- The city should develop measures for emission controls
- Mobility access for disabled residents
- Can we make more efficient use of time and money (streetcar)?
- Round-abouts are unsafe in RUVs because cars park so close to corners -> should have clear vision and maneuverability
- Consider one-way streets in Columbia City – Angeline, Edmunds, Ferdinand, Hudson – from Rainier to 42nd. They are basically one-lane streets
- Build complete streets - curbs, sidewalks, ramps, parking for vehicles, bike land and street lights that work! Don't piecemeal these elements in. The Second Ave bike lane is an example of how just adding in an element doesn't work well – it blocks access to hotels and restaurants. I see people unloading luggage into it at the hotel at Second and Cherry all the time. Getting in/out of a cat that is dropping/picking up is now much more dangerous. So is crossing the street with the confusing street lights that were added in.

Write on easel pad

3. Growth Strategy: measure and report growth and change. We currently measure how many units and jobs are created. We propose to add to the list – to include things like:

- Establish indicators – so we can work to close racial disparities to achieve equity. For example
- Household income by race
- High School graduation rates by race
- Housing cost burdens (what percentage of income is spent on housing) by race
- Etc.
- Report on these indicators to the public

- YES NO

a. Do you agree that it is important that we monitor and report on growth and change citywide and in urban villages? Grp 1
Grp 2
Grp 3
Grp 4
c. OPTIONAL What other thoughts do you have on this topic
Question 3c: What other thoughts do you have on this topic?

- Unanimous – yes to indicators.
- Public safety, crime rate, higher priority for south Seattle (and all neighborhoods)
- Environmental rehab in industrial lots near stadium—important consideration
- Compatible uses
- Include other public health indicators (e.g., asthma) if possible
- Be sure to measure and track jobs and employment disparities. More jobs = more opportunities.
- Veterans and their family
- Give property tax relief to existing home owners in upzoned parts of urban villages
- Monitor and report on urban village growth? Sounds like we as a city will still ignore addressing any solutions on what needs improvement! Housing affordability is out the door if boundaries change because zoning will change and taxes will go up! Tax assessor office said themselves—"tax for intended highest and best use"!
- Stricter design review on NC-zoned apartments and buildings in urban villages. Keep giant, ugly boxes out of neighborhoods.
- How do residents of the villages develop community solidarity and safety nets?
- How does the village become a constituency of informed voters?
- Proposal #3 is very important
- What does transportation choices mean? Need clarity. Is there a congestion measure?
- No diversity measure? Write on easel pad

4. Proposed Stadium District on the City's Land Use Map around professional sports stadiums. A stadium district would allow housing and hotels. The district would also protect the ability of trains and trucks to move freight through this area.
YES NO
a. Do you agree that it is important the City create a Stadium District on the City's Land Use Map?

c. OPTIONAL What other thoughts do you have on this topic
Geoff Write on easel pad
5. "Future Land Use Map" An Urban village is a business district and the neighborhood that surrounds it. We want to encourage many different activities in Urban Villages and Urban Centers. We recommend the city make it easier to allow a wide range of activities in these areas. Currently, the rules identified through the "Future Land Use Map" (the City's official map of what type of use is allowed on a piece of property) makes it difficult to change from one type of activity (such as business) to another (such as housing), even when it makes sense to do so.

- We will continue to define different activities and building sizes for different urban villages and urban centers.
- We will also make sure that areas within a 10 minute walk of frequent transit are included in urban villages. This can make it easier for more people to use the bus or train.
- We will encourage housing and job growth in these areas.

YES NO

a. Should urban villages include areas within a ten minute walk of very frequent transit? Grp 1
Grp 4
b. Should City rules make it easier to change from one type of activity to another in urban villages and centers? Grp 2
Grp 4
c. What other thoughts, concerns do you have on this topic?
Write on easel pad
6. More housing choices in urban villages – to accommodate more people
In order to accommodate the 120,000 new people moving into Seattle, we will need to change how we think about housing, where we locate more units, and to create different types of housing -- to make more housing available people and to create more housing that is affordable to families as well as single people. Right now, there are places within our urban villages where only one house is allowed on each lot. We are proposing to allow different types of housing (houses and apartments) on lots in urban villages where only one house is now allowed.
YES NO
a. Do you think we should allow more types of housing in urban villages? Grp 1
Grp 3 Grp 1 (strong)
b. In areas where only one house is allowed per lot in urban villages, which types of housing would you like to see?

Backyard cottages Grp 4* Grp 5
Small houses on small lots Grp 4* Grp 5
Row house Grp 4* Grp 5
Small apartment buildings (up to 3 stories tall) Grp 4* Grp 5
Large apartment buildings (up to 7 stories tall) Grp 4* Grp 5
High rise apartment buildings (up to 16 stories tall) Grp 4* Grp 5
c. OPTIONAL What other thoughts, concerns do you have on this topic?
* if cost affordable
6.c. What other thoughts or concerns do you have on this topic?

- Preserve Single Family zones – families will leave Seattle without this living option
- Tax Base is Single Family – Taxpayers who are paying for transportation, parks, and schools. Preserve their lifestyle and provide access with sidewalks and connections to good transit
- Support preserving single houses on single parcel
- Study the residents needs more
- Property devaluation is a big concern, does not make financial sense
- Is there an incentive to do this?
- Affordable family size housing is very scarce
- ADUs are good but don't increase height limits in single or multifamily areas.
- Veterans and their family
- If city really wanted to encourage accessory dwelling units, city would 1) not charge permit fees which would help landowners spend their money on the actual construction of the accessory dwelling unit
- The displacement of current residents of SE Seattle, especially POC.
- Lack of access to capital and living options for People of Color in SE Seattle
- The city is watering down the language of the Comp Plan when it comes to community involvement in neighborhood plan
- The Mayor does not support the neighborhoods; his focus is on the wellbeing of

developers and big business. Time for the Mayor to go

- Mayor Murray needs to be a 1-term mayor
- Concern about lack of parking requirements in residential urban villages; hurts everyone especially with limited transportation options, cars are not going away by 2035
- Townhouses are wasteful in that they require a lot of duplicative facilities – each on has stairs and bathrooms on almost each floor. That is a lot of extra material & energy. Small scale flats are more economical to build and require less material. Change the code to make these possible in multifamily zones and on large lots. Change the liability to builders as well to encourage this kind of development. Right now a builder is liable for 7 years for a flat type building but only one year for a townhouse. Make the liability equal so that there is incentive to develop flats as well as townhouses.

Write on easel pad

7. Minimize Displacement as the city grows

We propose to work to minimize "displacement" of marginalized people, businesses and communities (low income households, people of color and English language learners, small family-owned businesses). "Displacement" describes when people or communities move out of a neighborhood because they can't afford to stay, or their businesses and community network move out.

- Monitor risk of displacement
- Preserve existing and increase affordable housing
- Support existing and new small businesses with different government programs

YES NO

a. Do you agree that it is important that we should minimize displacement of marginalized households and small businesses as Seattle grows? Grp 1
Grp 2
Grp 3
Grp 4 Grp 1

b. Are you worried that you, your community or your community's businesses will be displaced in the near future? If so, what is important to focus on? (check all that apply)

Housing Grp 2
Grp 4
Your community's businesses Grp 2
Grp 4
Your community's place of gathering (ex. Filipino Community Center, church, specific business, etc)
Grp 2
Grp 4

c. What other thoughts, concerns do you have on this topic?

7.c. What other thoughts or concerns do you have on this topic?

- Need to look at social equity first, before deciding where, when and what kind of developments make sense
- Important (most important) to minimize displacement of minority and marginalized
- Much more resources should go to high displacement, low opportunity areas
- Displacement has been and is a constant concern
- City should support small immigrant businesses when transit improves
- Small and immigrant-owned businesses that helped grow Seattle through hard times should be supported to continue in place through future prosperity
- Veterans and family
- Rent too expensive for families
- Jobs have left neighborhood. People have to travel to Bellevue, Kent

- People moving because community spaces move
- City does not want the city to be affordable for certain wage earners. Why is the city promoting in Olympia a tax on each mile we drive or proposing a tax to property/homeowners living near bus stops – city needs to hopefully change direction to keep costs low for average wage earner with these new city council members 2015/16
- Minimize NO displacement
- Need to meet family sizes
- Need to include active spaces like p-patches
- Build more smaller houses. We will learn to live with this, it saves cost (travel) and time
- Need to be affordable
- Space for youth and teens; young adults to have meeting, gathering, recreational and social space within neighborhood

Write on easel pad

8. Parks & Open Space

As we grow, we need to create a new way to set park/open space goals. However, new land for parks is becoming more difficult for the city to buy. We want to focus on

- Making sure parks/open space are designed for people who will use them (places to sit for older people, places to play for children, etc)
- Making sure most people can easily get to open spaces by car and walking, from home or work

YES NO

a. Do you agree that goals for parks and open space should focus on quality, equity and how easily people can get to them from homes or jobs? Grp 1
Grp 2
Grp 4

b. We need to use the land we have. Do you support:
Using streets that are turned into public spaces, such as plazas
Plazas and open space that are created as part of new development

c. OPTIONAL What is important to you for parks and open space?

- Require greenspace, plazas, walking corridors from all new developments
- Keep in mind passive, quiet green spaces, not just bikeways for the 5% or dogs
- More off-leash dog parks that don't have to be fenced
- New goals seem good – would like to see how performance will be measured toward them of shifting away from tried measures.
- Veterans and their families
- Coordinate parks with cultural centers e.g. Eritrean association
- We always talk about parks – why don't we talk about the lovely land that single family offers and preserve that? I like to walk down the street and enjoy people's yards/open space – I don't necessarily have to go to a park to enjoy nature – keep single family zoning ad make it so single family property owners can't build all the way to property lines – look at setbacks again.
- That there be more
- This plan to stop requiring open space is a mistake. The city is selling off public spaces all over Seattle.
- Acres SPR property at Jefferson Park – undeveloped
- Neighborhood plans in DPD "vault" – going nowhere
- Sound Transit parcels along MLK – empty!
- City Light selling off substations – 100's of acres sold to developers
- BUY MORE LAND!!!
- Create parks with a mix of activities so your family, seniors can use it (BBQ, skate park,

walking, exercise, etc)

- Do not allow plazas to be commercialized (limit)
- Acquire small lots for pocket parks – get rid of the 10,000 s.f. rule for acquisition. Do not sell off public property – convert it to parks and public facilities. The idea that ownership by different departments means that land/facilities must be sold off is bogus. Seattle must adopt the attitude "we are one!". Do not develop our natural spaces into active recreation – preserve it for natural habitat and wildlife. We need that too!

Write on easel pad

9. Neighborhood Planning policies

When we plan for specific neighborhoods it is important that we include input, concerns, priorities from the diverse backgrounds of the community; that we include businesses, agencies, community based organizations, etc. We focus on neighborhoods that are either 1) growing fast or 2) need help with new services and new housing/jobs. We also use different City tools based on the needs and concerns of each neighborhood. We recommend that the current language be amended to capture our current practices.

YES NO

a. Do you agree the Comprehensive Plan neighborhood plan policies should reflect the way we plan for neighborhoods now? Grp 4

b. What are your thoughts on how City staff should work with neighborhoods?

- Diversify means of communication, gaining input, sharing information so that more voices are heard/included in decision-making.
- Less top-down more grassroots.
- Less linear.
- Better outreach to community.
- Veterans and their family.
- Engage people where they already are and bring interpreters
- Senior centers
- Daycares/schools
- Community centers
- Faith based
- Libraries
- Neighborhood council meetings
- Fewer meetings, more input
- Work harder with disability commission to discuss accessibility
- Listen for who isn't talking – collect more demographic data and target outreach

Write on easel pad

10. Plan for and Locate Schools to Better Serve Seattle's Growing Population

- The City and the Seattle School District should coordinate to better meet the needs of Seattle's children.

YES NO

a. Do you agree that the City should plan for and locate schools to better meet the needs of our children? Grp 1
Grp 3
Grp 4

b. What are your thoughts on this topic?

- I very much support working with neighborhoods on local school planning. Would be interested to know how Comprehensive Plan process has/hasn't involved the school district.

- We won't need any schools if we eliminate single family neighborhoods!
- Need more non-owner occupied ADU and detached housing;
- Focus on Veterans and their families.
- Work with business districts and service providers to create and maintain community.
- Aging in place/Accessible housing.
- Neighborhood planning is an ongoing process as the neighborhood evolves --- single adults become families/senior etc.…
- Consider accessibility across the life cycle.
- What was the previous boundary? A 5 minute walkshed? Please clarify thanks. A 10-minute walk for whom? Seniors with disabilities?
- Why was this ignored when we spend millions on light rail?? Give us park and rides on MLK Way.
- Have the School Board be more accountable to the City Council. We should never have sold two very valuable school buildings/parcels in the last 10 years – The City knew our population is growing! Queen Anne High School gone! School in Leschi – gone! Keep Van Asselt School on Beacon Ave.
- Coordinate school location and capacity planning with growth areas.
- Need City/School/Community partnership.
- Yay! We have an education levy. Make it used for poor schools and kids who need it (this is not what happens).

Write on easel pad

HALA

- Passiv house
- Cluster houses are needed
- Innovation in code (+ two checks, one smileyface)
- Remove barriers to condo development with due diligence
- Be creative – respect the need for multi-generational homes
- Plan for aging in place- accessible housing
- Limit displacement
- Encourage development of workforce housing
- Veterans and their families
- Smaller commercial spaces
- Look to Portland & diversify the number & types of housing zones- we are too limited.

Misc. Post It Notes

- Need more density in Othello to support a better town center and to prevent sprawl
- Need the HALA proposals to reduce displacement
- I totally support this. Modest increases in density are a necessary part of promoting affordability in Seattle
- Preserve character housing in U.V.s
- Require parking on site for new restaurants, apodments and apartments. Keep single family zones.
- School district planning needed now to accommodate growth
- [Regarding transportation mobility] The same is true for people who drive

Group 1 Ethiopian Community Comments (4 people, Host – Geoff)

How to address displacement

Growth

- But, what kind of growth, what is growth

- Defined
- Existing businesses should be able to stay

City Right of Way

- Consider parking
- Sometimes people will have cars
- Affordable and has to be safe
- Walking distance. (ie. Henderson – families with kids need to park, drive!
- All of these (six functions for ROW)
- Cars increase congestion
- Bike/ walk good for environment

Growth Strategy

- It's a comp plan; it should include these indicators.
- But for what purpose?
- Should be included because it helps to Plan

Future Land Use Map

- Yes, but make sure you consult with local community.
- Affordable housing? Is it just renters?
- As long as consult residents who are there?

More housing choices

- Residents have to make the decisions
- Still need a local plan
- Not unanimous (about more types of housing in urban villages)
- Concerned about allowing more apartments in SF areas of urban villages
- Have concerns about SF changing
- Out to convert
- Has to be a plan

Minimize displacement

- Must be more than minimize; make it zero displacement
- Make sure people can stay
- Even stronger than minimize
- If people push, we can make it no displacement

Schools

- SE schools needs resources
- SE schools need more resources to be on par with northern schools

Other

- Question – any plan to consult these: a lot of property owners have to say; businesses; youth groups, involve youth groups

Group 2 Filipino Community (12 people, Host – Aditi)

Growth Strategy

- Has to be accessible to seniors
- Has to be safe, well light, support

Parks

- Walking
- At grad rial access
- Access to transit is very important
- Multi-language signage

- Safety to rail access cannot be overemphasized

Schools

- South Seattle needs more after achool programs
- School times should consider the needs of families
- Better coordination with enlisting community center, more after school
- More relationship and coordination
- More outreach to community leaders and they should reach out to their community
- Schools zone – safety and policing
- Sustainability – utilities denigh, coordinate infrastructure, more solar

Group 3 Eritrean Community (11 people, Host –Robert)

- Rent control
- High number of affordable housing
- Displacement – Keep people in neighborhood
- Code compliance
- City Right of Way

o Bike stations
o Mini-buses

Parks and Open Space

o Coordinate parks spaces with cultural centers

Group 4 (6 people, Host ?)

Growth Strategy

o Yes (agree to guide growth within 10-minute walk of transit), but need to consider - rent control, displacement, access + shuttle, existing businesses need affordable,existing people- first

Displacement: 1st priority –housing for families, 2nd priority – community gathering place, 3rd priority- community businesses

- Neighborhood Planning – would enhance

Eritrean group (? People, Host – Brennon)

Major issues are:

- Housing supply, price and where they will go
- Transportation
- Crime
- Pollution

- City should work closely with other cities as many people, especially the poor, need to live outside the City and work inside
- Mixed income communities like Yesler are good but there should be more affordable housing in them
- Encourage family size affordable units
- MHA and incentive programs should require units be affordable for life of the building not 50 years
- Want a range of housing options, especially those types that are more affordable
- Need soccer fields that aren't just available for organized leagues
- More culturally relevant programming in community centers – such as Eritrean dance
- This is due to lack of funding and lack of connection
- Would help get elders involved
- More programs to help get 7th and 8th graders connected to careers – especially jobs with the City and with local employers
- Preschool should support foreign language child care options (Eritrean in particular); this is

important for integrating the community

Date: 11/08/2015

Name: Shame On You

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

The public must be allowed to comment, anonymously. There are too many reprisals in this city against individuals the political people do not like or will not listen to.

Date: 11/08/2015

Name: Jonathan Howard

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

The intersection of 105th, Holman, and Greenwood Ave N should be the center of an urban growth village. Within two blocks of here there are 32 small businesses and about 10 restaurants. Commerical zoning, with lots of curb cuts and parking makes pedestrian activity even more dangerous than just dealing with the very high traffic of the intersection. But people still walk.
There are 7 multifamily buildings of over 12 units within 3 blocks of the intersection.
With the move Seattle levy, the No. 40 bus, already a frequent route, will become a Rapid Ride+ bus and even more frequent. It serves this corner, as does the also-frequent 5.
We need better land use policies to keep out drive-thrus and other pedestrian unfriendly uses. People already walking here, lets make it more convenient.

Date: 11/08/2015

Name: Steve Okamura

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

i have noticed many "apodments" being built in and around town. they don't appear to have off site parking for tenants. the city should mandate this for developers as it negatively impacts home owners living near these units. many of those homeowners have lived in their neighborhoods for years and it's not fair that they have to suffer the consequences (lack of parking). can the city build (co-build with developers) parking garages in some of these densely populated areas?

Date: 11/08/2015

Name: Bobbi Miller

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

You're not doing enough to protect the ecosystem. When I see the word "could" it tells me that you're giving lip service to the environment and when it doesn't happen, you'll say you tried, and didn't promise. We are already losing trees with increased density - houses are 5' or less apart. There are no

lawns, trees, shrubs - that doesn't help climate change, it hurts it. This play does not go far enough to protect the environment. I already am surrounded by McMansions that don't fit the neighborhood, blocking light for plants and built to cover every square inch of their plot - this does not bode well for children, urban wildlife, or people in general.

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: Christa Barke

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:
As a member of Historic Seattle, I was made aware of the fact that the new Plan does not properly address Seattle's historic buildings and what it means to our city to preserve them. There are more than a few people living here who have a feeling for the "charm" of the city which includes older structures that can still be used even though they may need rehabilitation.
Many people travel the world to see other cities and their antiquities and find joy in what they see. Why should we raze all our older buildings and have nothing to show of our past?
I am in complete agreement with the letter sent by Historic Seattle to Diane Sugimura on October 30, 2015.
Please, add me to the list of citizens who want the wording in the Plan to express everyone's concern about the remaining historic structures in our city.
Thank you for your consideration.
Christa Barke

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @archibot

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

.@jeremyReding and I are tweeting from @Seattle2035 today (now that I'm back in the office). So if it seems like the city got snarky…

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @melissajonas

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@Seattle2035 Can you add both as a choice? I enjoy the skate sculpture at Jefferson as a visual piece, but the same art is also interactive.

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @GordonWerner I like this fountain I saw in Kawasaki, Japan that did hourly music and light shows...

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities

Comment:

@Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 like at the Seattle Center?

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@GordonWerner @Seattle2035 this one https://youtu.be/Bzz4y5822zk the concept could be used in many different ways...

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 so you want more of what we have in the Seattle Center (maybe smaller scale)

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@GordonWerner @Seattle2035 small scale would be useful in smaller spaces.

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@GordonWerner @Seattle2035 could also just do light shows against sculptures...

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

@Charles_B_STB @Seattle2035 what? you don't want literal geysers of water drenching downtown shoppers and office workers? ;-)

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@GordonWerner @Seattle2035 maybe in the summer. Days like today have enough natural wetness...

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @Charles_B_STB @CreateToConnect rainy winters is what makes our sunny summers so wonderful

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @GordonWerner @CreateToConnect maybe a rain barrel art project that doubles as a water source when the summer is too dry?

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @Charles_B_STB

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @GordonWerner @CreateToConnect all the more reason to invest early before our droughts get that bad.

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture

Comment:

@Seattle2035 does it have to be temporary?

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 ahh ... I think temp stuff that plays with our wx is great ... permanent stuff even better

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @GordonWerner

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 and easily relocatable

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @ottsatwork

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @DesignNerds_SEA Before, it was Cal Anderson Park. Now it's Chophouse Row, Seattle Central Library and Olympic Sculpture Park.

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: @ottsatwork

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

You can comment online for that same question re: communities of color, immigrants, low income folks. #Seattle2035
Seattle 2035 @Seattle2035
What's the best strategy to mitigate displacement of marginalized populations over the next 20 years? bit.ly/1Ll71Wy #Seattle2035

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: Alma Chaney

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Not quite two years ago, my husband and I became homeowners. We had been renters for years, and had spent three years living in Tacoma after rising rents priced us out of our Capitol Hill apartment. Being Seattle homeowners is truly a dream come true.

Will and I searched for a long time before finding a home we could afford in a neighborhood with the diversity and public transportation choices we wanted. Living in a home near the Othello light rail station means that we can leave our car parked six days a week, eat in local restaurants, and walk to the grocery store. As homeowners, we look forward to staying in the neighborhood for many years. We love it here and look forward to being a part of our community as it changes and grows.

I have looked at maps in the Seattle 2035 draft plan and if the Othello residential urban village is expanded as proposed, our house will be within its new boundaries. How would that change affect us? When we moved here we fully intended to stay for decades—perhaps for the rest of our lives.

Our neighbors have told us that if the urban village is expanded, we will have to move. They say that single-family homes within the new boundaries will be rezoned as higher density, and that when this rezone happens property taxes will be increased many times over. This, we are told, will be done with the aim of forcing homeowners like us to sell our property to developers so that the existing homes can be demolished and replaced with higher density housing.

Can you please tell me whether this is true? We were forced out of Seattle by rising rents once. We thought becoming homeowners would give us the stability we wanted. Although we strongly support the creation of more affordable housing and increased density in Seattle, we hope we won't have to sacrifice our own home to make that happen.

Sincerely,
Alma Chaney

Date: 11/09/2015

Name: Julianne Dalcanton

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hi —
As a long-time resident of an "Urban Village", I would like to address one issue with the Draft Plan.
There are many services that the city provides that can make a dense neighborhood more livable. A number of these are projects like traffic calming, sidewalk ramps, and tree planting. My experience in advocating for these on our "residential but very dense" street is that the process by which a neighborhood advocates for these amenities *strongly* favors single family, low density neighborhoods with few rentals, as opposed to the neighborhoods that are actually absorbing most of the growth and dealing with the negative impacts that can come along with increasing density.
As but one example, requests for traffic calming require that a supermajority of the local residents sign a petition. In our high-density neighborhood, this required a *huge* amount of work (done by a very few number of people), because there were hundreds of households that had to be reached. It took us close to 6 months to get the needed signatures.
In contrast, a much less-trafficked, low density (single family) region further down the same street — with much less car and pedestrian traffic — got traffic circles quickly and with little fuss, because of the small numbers of households that were required to sign. This process also strongly favors amenities being added to the most affluent communities, not only because they're more likely to be single-family, but because the level of community participation requires knowledge of city procedures, safety in going door-to-door, and investment of time.

My request is that as the city zones for more density that you explicitly codify plans to revise the distribution of amenities to favor those regions with the most growth. High density areas should have an easier — not harder — time of getting traffic calming, sidewalk improvements, pocket parks, and tree planting. These amenities should also be offered automatically, to guarantee that they are distributed equitably (much like how the schedule of street light bulb replacement was changed).
thank you,
Julianne Dalcanton

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy

Comment:

Ha. Unfortunately no. Cc @Seattle2035 https://twitter.com/imboande/status/664092035536687104

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @imboande

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @Seattle2035 Schade. Difficult to quantify, but rapid expansion of accessible urb housing would presumably have some effect.

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

@imboande @Seattle2035 our most vocal nimbys try to argue it doesn't

---

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @imboande

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @Seattle2035 :-/

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

@imboande @Seattle2035 same NIMBYs whine about commodification of $900k detached homes, claim to be leftists

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @antitrustmaster

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@imboande @bruteforceblog @Seattle2035 Check out the DEIS for comp. plan: http://2035.seattle.gov/deis/. Sec. 3.2: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cs/groups/pan/@pan/documents/web_informational/p2273569.pdf.

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @bruteforceblog

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@antitrustmaster @imboande @Seattle2035 might want to re-think this whole 'density focused on arterials' thing. http://pic.twitter.com/o0PtYyC0H0

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @pdxwlf

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 Thanks so much for the support! We'd love to hear more from @DesignNerds_SEA on ideas to participate! Please DM us for more!

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @DesignNerds_SEA

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@seattle2035 Thanks for inviting us! Sorry we couldn't dive deeper during what turned out to be a busy monday.

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: @imboande

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @antitrustmaster @Seattle2035 To be fair, a real shift to EVs, if it happens, would mitigate much of this.

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: Julianne Dalcanton

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Hi —
I'm writing to you with a comment on the draft plan of the HALA recommendations.
The health of a city depends on having housing for all stages of life. As the density of Seattle increases, more and more people will be spending their lives living in high density housing of one form or another. However, there is currently a major hole in this plan that I have yet to see addressed.
The vast majority of the new housing that is coming on line has 2 or fewer bedrooms. These are the easiest units for developers to market to the influx of young workers coming to the city, and financially, three 2 bedroom units can be sold and/or rented for less than two 3 bedroom units. As such, the preponderance of 1-2 bedrooms is unavoidable without city intervention.
I believe that the city needs to be looking further down the line. Many of these young immigrants to Seattle will someday have children, and as their household grows, they will typically look for housing with more bedrooms. However, as it currently stands, there is zero incentive for developers to provide such housing. People who want more than 2 bedrooms will be forced into single family housing (which is more expensive, and which may not be what people who have come to value high-density living would want) or to leave Seattle's city limits. We do not want the city to be only a place for young adults and retirees. Instead, we need to ensure that there is some housing stock available for the middle stages.
If we wish to remain a vibrant, growing city that people wish to live in *throughout* their lives, then we need to make sure that there is some way to also increase the housing stock for growing families. In the absence of market forces that would drive developers to develop some number of 3 bedroom units, no such units will be built, even though the addition of such units would benefit the city in the long term. The city should therefore consider incentivizing development that includes at least one 3 bedroom unit. While Seattle obviously needs more 1-2 bedrooms than 3 bedrooms, it needs more than zero of the latter.
thank you,
Julianne Dalcanton

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: Chris Hubbard

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am in an area near Roosevelt that is slated to become a "residential village" -- what does that mean? And especially what does that mean in terms of zoning, as I currently live in a single-family neighborhood. Thanks!

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: Paul Campbell

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Where are the Seattle 2035 open house meetings? The web page seems broken.
I just get a whirring dot and then

unavailable.
http://2035.seattle.gov/calendar/?trumbaEmbed=-view%3D

Date: 11/10/2015

Name: Tom Leahy

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear City of Seattle:

We oppose the arbitrary and capricious expansion of the Urban Village in the Roosevelt District and/or Ravenna neighbor proposed by the secret HALA committee (now made public). This proposal is a complete betrayal of due process and democracy. No one from the City took input from the affected neighborhoods before issuing this report. This is completely top down. It will also wreck the distinct character of Seattle neighborhoods, which the City is always pointing out as one of the positive aspects of the City. The City of Seattle, unfortunately, is now trying to wreck our neighborhoods.

Ravenna and Roosevelt are already taking on more density than the City is asking for. We have done our part. The City's plan to increase more affordable housing is sham. The only reason the City is doing this is to appease developers: A group that the City can never say no to. This is sad.

We could go on, but our neighbors below have already summed up our position.

So please put as down as completely opposed to the City's HALA proposal expanding the Urban Village in the Roosevelt District and/or Ravenna neighborhood.

Thank you.

Tom and Jennifer Leahy
P.S. Below are examples of two comments/letters that we are in complete agreement with.

Dear Person or Whatever or Whoever made this map:

As you can see from the address below we live in the area circled by a dotted line that meanders in a peculiar fashion through my neighborhood and even includes Ravenna Park. We endorse truly low-income housing, endorse mother-in-law apartments, but cannot understand why the City seeks to destroy this neighborhood. Single family homes (with mother-in-law apartments) are fine. Destruction of this area with high density housing is not. Neighborhoods that have both high density and single family homes are compatible and one should not be sacrificed for the other.

The Roosevelt/Ravenna community has already exceeded the high density housing requirement under the current comprehensive plan – and well beyond 2035. The high density area now exists from 15th Avenue NE to the west and along the arterial NE 65th Street. High density zoning and building is

rampant the entire length of Roosevelt NE, 12th NE, and will soon encompass most of 15th NE and University Way south of Ravenna/Cowen Park.

The area to the east of 15th NE to 20th Avenue NE and around Ravenna Park is unique. The annual Easter egg roll takes place just across from my house – in a patch of green in Ravenna Park and has been going on for over 25 years. NE 62nd Street is a designated "greenway," heavily used by dog owners, pedestrians, children, and bicyclists. The area south of NE 65th Street between 15th and 20th Avenues NE is lovely, with well-maintained homes and friendly and concerned neighbors who care deeply about this neighborhood as a living vibrant community. Many people come here to enjoy the park, picnic, or even engage in "tournaments" a la Renaissance Faire. You can hear the frequent hoot of the barred owls, occasionally see a scarlet-throated pileated woodpecker, and enjoy the serenity of a walk in the ravine. In spring the huge yellow flowers of the skunk cabbage dot the stream banks running through the park and even wild trilliums peek out from the underbrush. (Hard to imagine that serenity continuing to exist under this proposal.)

The dotted lines on the 2035 map make no sense. There is no indication within those dotted lines exactly what is intended other than vague higher density. The dotted lines seem random, cut through existing homes, and generally make no sense. Has anyone bothered to actually visit this neighborhood and talk to the people who live here?

High density should begin and end at 15th Avenue NE and even there – due to the park - should not extend more than a block south and north of NE 65th Street. What you really should be focusing on is making current and future high density development esthetic and compatible with the neighborhoods – not the god-awful structures such as in Ballard or that are now popping up in the U. District and along NE 65th Street. There should be building set-backs, court yards, and other spatial planning requirements that make the neighborhoods people-friendly and welcoming. Every "urban village" needs real food stores within walking distance (not high-end, unaffordable places like Whole Foods; there used to be a small QFC, now gone, where the rapid transit station is being built). A neighborhood needs a real hardware store and other stores that people need in a true "urban village." It needs lots of open, green space in between the high density buildings. Where are these on your maps? "Comprehensive" planning should be real, thoughtful, and thorough. The dotted lines on the map are none of these.

Please include us as completely opposed to the "dotted lines."

Sincerely,

Judith and Arnold Bendich

I am opposed to the arbitrary expansion of the Urban Village in the Roosevelt District proposed by the secret HALA committee (now made public). The Roosevelt District already proposed more density than the city had proposed several years ago, so the city just said we will do both plans and have even more. Now I understand the density goal for 2035 will be met in the Roosevelt District by 2017, 18 years in advance. To raise the bar even higher is unfair to the people who live here. The whole city needs to meet its density requirements, but they may be afraid to try since then the city may just raise the limits

again.
Including Cowan Park and Ravenna Park in the Urban Village is absurd. Those are PARKS! They should not be developed with more housing. If that designation was just to increase the percentage of green space in an Urban Village it is a fraud – it is at the edge of the area and outside the area currently designated as an Urban Village. The houses here have a history of about 100 years, and they are still being kept up. Adding the residential houses along the park between 20th Ave. NE and 15th Ave. NE to the Urban Village is a direct statement from the city: we do not want single family residences.
When I watch what is happening in NE Seattle, I see ordinary houses (the most affordable ones) being torn down and replaced by five story boxes or million dollar houses. The five story boxes don't have enough affordable housing to offset the affordable housing that has been torn down. The City of Seattle is moving backwards: their policies lead to less and less affordable housing. My definition is: if you destroy affordable units that is a negative number; if you add affordable units that is a positive number. I've seen reports from the city that just count the new ones, ignoring the affordable housing torn down. Thus even the City's statistics are misleading. If you really want these big boxes to increase affordable housing then make the developers provide as many units in them that they tore down, to be rented at the rate the previous housing was, increased only as much as the Consumer Price Index each year. Then you would at least be keeping some affordable housing, whereas current policies lead to less affordable housing.
The sketched lines on the HALA proposal expanding the Urban Village in the Roosevelt District should be erased.
Bruce Finlayson

Date: 11/11/2015

Name: Barry Broman

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Start with updating the freeways, and roads? That way we can support the people coming here to live. And we won't have to try and dodge all of the potholes by going into other lanes. Then we can talk about homes.

Date: 11/11/2015

Name: David Neiman

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

Please see the attached .doc for my comments on the draft 2035 Comp Plan
Regards,
David Neiman
Neiman Taber Architects
HALA Committee Member
--
Comp Plan 2035 Comments:
On the whole I support the 2035 Comp Plan, which I find to be a vast improvement over it predecessor. See below for some elements of the plan where I would like to note either strong support or dissent.
URBAN VILLAGE MAP

Strong Support for:

- Expansion of Urban Village around transit stations at Beacon Hill, Crown Hill, Othello, Mt. Baker, Rainier Beach.
- New UV at 130th transit station in Pinehurst with large walkshed.

Good, but should go further:

- Urban Village expansion in Ballard, Columbia, WS Junction should be bigger, given the location of the station on the edge of the current boundary.
- Fremont UV expansion seems trivial, should be more significant.

Areas where action is needed:

- There is still a gap between the 23rd, Madison-Miller, & First Hill/Cap Hill that is not in an Urban Village. This was a bizarre omission that should be corrected in the 2035 plan. This area seems like the very definition of a central neighborhood well served by transit & amenities.
- The Wallingford Urban Village should expand to the north & south of 45th on the east end of the UV.

SINGLE FAMILY ZONES

The HALA report was unambiguous that our longstanding policy of maintaining exclusive single-family zones has become untenable.

Support:

- LU8.5 – Expand the types of housing that can be built in single family zones. Should be explicit to consider allowing duplex, triplex, cottage, courtyard and other similar kinds of traditional neighborhood scale ground-based housing types compatible in scale with single family homes.
- LU8.11 – Allow large sites to be redeveloped more densely that traditional single family to provide housing opportunities in SF neighborhoods that are more affordable than single family development
- Comp plan 2035 does not contain a clause prohibiting the rezoning of SF parcels. Strongly Support.
- LU8.12 – Support, but should be changed to strike “low-income” from the language. Housing choices are important for everyone at all income levels.

Oppose:

- LU8.8 – Minimum lot sizes are like minimum home sizes: They are exclusionary& deny opportunities for smaller, less expensive infill homes .

MULTI-FAMILY ZONES

Support:

LU9.1: Rezone portions of the city to increase the amount of land available for multi-family development.

LU 9.7: The city should support MF development with ground level open space and family-friendly amenities by creating incentives that reward developers that provide it.

LU9.16: We should add a new goal aimed at matching housing supply to demand. Support innovative design, new housing types, and encourage the creation of housing supply that can meet the needs of a housing market that is rapidly changing.

Oppose:

LU9.3: Strongly oppose the idea of “balancing” the need for new housing stock with preservation of neighborhood character. That might be an appropriate goal in a single family zone, but the MF zones are areas of the city where housing production is the priority. The character should and must change.

LU9.4: Remove the words “ compatible scale”, and “maintain views”. These are not realistic or appropriate goals in neighborhoods transitioning from 1-2 story bungalows to 4-5 story apartments.

LU9.6: Multi-family uses should have some reasonable accommodation for incorporation of small scale commercial use without a need for re-zoning.

LU9.10&9.11: The description hops right from low-rise ownership housing to mid-rise housing. The middle scale of 3-5 story apartment buildings is missing from these descriptions.
HOUSING
Support:
H2.1 thru H2.5 Promote housing innovation that accommodates growth, builds more housing, provides more access for more people to more neighborhoods.
H2.7: There is a huge inventory of underused public land, either sitting idle or used for surface parking, that could be put into productive use to provide affordable housing.
H4.7: Promote flexibility in our land use code to achieve better quality housing that can adapt to changing needs.
H5.1-H5.23: Strongly support the goals derived from the HALA report (except goal H5.10, see below)
Oppose:
H3.2: I can think of no example of a successful policy that uses development and design standards to promote affordable housing preservation. The HALA report is clear that this is a goal that requires the commitment of resources (money) to subsidize rents and purchase properties. Restricting development as a means of increasing affordability is a foolish and counter-productive strategy.
H5.10: This goal sounds either naïve or as the basis for draconian restrictions on the use of private property. Affordable housing requires the commitment of resources, which requires taxes. "Encouraging" rental housing owners to pursue the cities affordable housing goals without incentive or compensation is a form of rent control, with all of the attendant downsides.

Date: 11/11/2015

Name: Asher Miller

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Any long-term master plan that doesn't include serious upgrades to mass transit AS A PREREQUISITE to increased growth and density is a non-starter.
My family lives in Whittier Heights. My wife works downtown, and her evening commute on the 28 is regularly close to an hour. The transit and road infrastructure is already groaning under the weight of increased density and growth--this, before many of the finished condos in Ballard are even occupied. Transit times have gotten significantly worse in the past two years, and developers haven't contributed ANYTHING toward better mass transit.
This plan looks vague and toothless, and doesn't go nearly far enough with regard to mass transit.
TOD and urbanization means NOTHING without mass transit upgrades; it's simply unchecked development benefitting developers and speculators at the expense of existing (and future) residents and the community at large.
NOT GOOD ENOUGH. Try again.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

A lot of the affordable housing discussion focuses on those with low incomes. But the single family housing prices are also unaffordable. I know a few families , with working professionals (both parents),

that cannot find family sized housing in the city. Instead of buying a Seattle house, they rented a very large house in Bellevue instead and commute by car to Seattle every day (which they say is faster than commuting from Ballard.)
SF housing isn't affordable unless you work for M'Soft or Amazon.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Arts and Culture, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I like seeing arts, culture and small business represented within plan elements. Not only do we need to manage growth but also keep the soul of our city - all the things that make it interesting and unique. That is created through those things above.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Love the idea of moving toward more frequent transit to make it easier to use and planning housing around those transit corridors. But am cautious on too much re-zoning around SF housing. I like creating the transition in scale from dense outward. Many friends starting families have moved out o Seattle to have a house with yard and all still commute in to work. I'd like to work to avoid too much of that.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Monique Jong

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
safety for residents (speed monitoring)
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
How to reduce one's carbon footprint??
Lightrail stations are no way near a 10 min walk!!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
TAX implications for everyone living in urban villages
Keep if affordable and don't impose all these changes at the expense of one's taxes!! -social equity!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Douglas Whitfield

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

7. Comments:
NONE
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Adequate parking. Building zero parking facilities/apartments should charge developer for stress it puts

on city parking - street parking.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Stop approving zero parking developments. We don't all commute downtown!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Mass transit will not solve all our transportation problems. Allow cars to play a role in our future! Keeps the city connected with other employment centers. That...[cut off on scan]...the city affordable - [cut off].

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
height transition from current zoning/heights.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
accomodation for aging population
make sure that permitting and building codes catch up with plan!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
"10 minute walk" needs to include waiting times at traffic lights.
"Frequent transit" needs to include 15 min or better at nights and on weekends.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
On-street parking should be lowest R-o-W priority inside urban village boundaries AND on the arterials connecting the centers of urban villages; make room for protected bike lanes and transit-only lanes.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: May Wang

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Easy parking, biking route, or alternative way to get around after off bus or away station. Urban villages only benefit people live close by that area. For 20 minutes walking distance people become a painful experience. If parking and biking can be easy, it will increase more usage and benefit more tax payer. (City public bike is strongly recommended). See example of Taiwan doing in Taipei. Good example to see!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?

Criminal rate control is very important. How do I walk at midnight without scare. Set up more camara or patrol? That may help. I still don't know if I feel comfortable on walking on the street for 10 min by myself. More light set up to decrease hidden area can be another thing may help....

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Steve Fischer

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Map frequent transit on the comprehensive plan in lieu of counting actual bus headways

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Kim Schwarzkopf

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Consider accessible green space - expanding access (don't just consider any park - ie: gold course is not accessible..now.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Great work - Hope that Seattle can work more closely with King County Council and also Port of Seattle -> and the expanding industry
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Consider the young people and provide more opportunities for them to get involved.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Need to have more beautiful buildings built

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Keith Howell

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
9. ?
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?

Reuse cottage (accessory dwelling units) code
Get rid of parking requirements
Get rid of owner occupancy rule
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Mass transit options
Bus
Rail

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Mathew Mannella

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Maintain public safety by proper policing. Consider the needs of car owners by appropriate zoning and open parking areas.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
To many, walking and taking public transit is not an option during the week. We rely on our vehicles for work/transportation. Parking consideration is a must! Especially for businesses that do not have parking and rely on city streets.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. driver safety!
6. and higher!
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
We need more transit. We tend to build the housing first assuming the traffic will come and it doesn't.
Traffic/transit impact fees!
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
more neighborhood traffic circles
More driver education -> too many changes, too fast! Use humor!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More pocket parks - like Ercolini in West Seattle (48th Ave SW and SW Alaska?)

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Shirley Schurman

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

7. Comments:

1. must be small and only on 50' lots so land not all covered
3. these are very attractive if done correctly - only in apartment lots specifically zoned for them
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
No expansion of west seattle urban villages
No zoning changes
West seattle has excellent bus service - please - no light rail
Don't do it. There is already sufficient capacity.
No basketball/hockey stadium with baseball/football stadiums
Preserve parking
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
West Seattle was treated unfairly with the urban village plan when it was implemented originally. Magnolia (closer to town than we are) got none. We have greatly surpassed our original goals - don't ask more of us! Do inforce parking requirements originally set for apartment buildings, we got more than our share of urban villages. The city council didn't listen to us then either!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Provide parking. It is one thing to take transit to work but living without a car is very confining and limiting. Do things to attract families. Families need a car. Too many one bedroom apartments!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
3. how are the villages doing? have they hit their goals?
4. to what end -> no more stadiums!!
9. are practices not in keeping to policies?
7. Comments:
5. building with no parking requirements is questionable
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
be honest when talking about transportation/transit that activities will not likely reduce congestion - it is here to stay

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Need more urban villages. Thus the increases are not defined to [AFRV?] areas. Let's look at magnolia, queen anne hill, madison park. These areas would have to have affordable housing thus creating school diversity.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Bob Rhea

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Existing urban village boundaries should not be changed! Alot of people worked hard on these plans to help the city do the comp plan.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Instead of revising current urban villages - city should consider establishing new and additional urban village in other city areas such as magnolia. (Could be social justice issue!) Georgetown area (race and social equity issues, as well!)
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More priority should be given to maintaining and preserving history of neighborhood buildings - ie make it easier to designate historic buildings and architecture.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

7. Comments:
mother-in-law
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
There are areas where ven when housing are affordable - there aren't services available - such as high point "no" grocery store close by. Maybe have [illegible] as building would find it affordable to put a store (by grocery store)!!!!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Should look at more areas where urban villages could be like "Magnolia" area.
also
There is a lot of property in the [Sarah?] Park area and Beacon Hill - these areas should be developed and not just left to deteriorate.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Mark Olsoe

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Preserve historical height restrictions allong California Ave. This will save small, service oriented businesses and avoid creation of a dark, lifeless canyon on California. See how well preservation worked on Ballard Avenue. High rise developement should 1/2 block away from California Ave. This would allow creation of an urban village without losing the character of our junctions.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Use small buses to reinstate density of transit to ALL neighborhoods. i.e. bring back 55/56 service.
Preserve PARKING!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Sharon Nuxoll

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
quicker transport in/out of stadium areas more street lights in SODO and industrial areas
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
can we shut down the main street in front of Pike Place to cars and make it a park So pedestrians and tourists can walk around safely and enjoy our city? Hard to drive around there, anyway.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Light rail from West Seattle to Airport and Eastside is needed so West Seattleites can rely on public transit instead of taxis/cars to the airport!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

5. Comments:
5. (red zone) :)
6. expand Morgan/Admiral UV with more "L" zones
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
I understand and agree with the logic of expanding the current boundaries where the current transit is located (the junction) is there an opportunity to expand the boundary in the Admiral and Morgan junctions as well. Possibly a "lower weight" than the junction but more density (less SF zone) in "L" zones. I believe this can give urban dwellers options. They can live in a taller, denser village or a shorter denser village
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Can the urban village "core" be considered a "Red zone" where there is a higher scrutiny or design. The current design review board/process does not result in better design. For example, require __% of brick on your building when in the red zone.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Geoffrey Bartelmes

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
I think there is too much expansion along the lightrail urban villages in the south end. This will push out more of the lower middle class and destroy the racial mix. I don't want Seattle to become totally white

tech workers. Expansion should increase in the north Seattle villages vs more in the south. Roosevelt/Greenlake, Northgate need expansion and why isn't there one in Magnolia. The rich excape this plan?
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
SODO and south SODO along the light rail route should be a urban vilage to promote living and working there. The industrial/manufacturing is disappearing from sodo to Spokane St. So a urban village would be prefect there.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Different height buildings!! Broadway is a tunnel of 6 story buildings. In Japan a mix of heights on a block is required so sunlight can come in!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
I didn't see anything about addressing the food desert in Delridge.
3. When your choices are limited by that, you end up choosing childcare that you must drive to. Transit does not become an option when trying to pick up from childcare when it's a distance away
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
I think there should be more encouragement (towards developers) (and zoning) to develop land so that people can make better us of transit. Ie encourage office development/business in urban villages. Having all the big offices downtown help to create congestion for people trying to get downtown. Move the jobs closer to urban villages.
Encourage more development of affordable full time childcare. Most of the daycares in WS have 1-2 year waiting lists or are not affordable. Childcare selection is based on those issues.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Paul Buchanan

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Is "respond to organic growth" a strategy?
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Point out more explicitly how the points tie together. Why those ten are important together
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Establish now ones where there is capacity, agility and space

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I would like to see most of the new units going into the urban centers, not the urban villages
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Let's move away from road diets (especially on main arterials!) and focus on improving our mass transit systems. 20 mph, too slow!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Supplement standard bus transportation - uber style vans run by city?

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
What is "transit-rich"? Besides rapid ride in and out of the downtown core, my neighborhood of the Morgan Junction urban village is not convenient to travel outside of with current transit options. Yet, we continue to add density in the form of residences. It would be nice to expand services and commercial opportunities with the added population as well.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
If the area actually is transit-rich and if not...parking. Example, I live in Morgan Junction and work less then 16 min away in South Park but can't take a bus. It would take over an hour.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
3. annual report
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?

1. 10-min walk time include impediment avoidance
Do not reclassify residential urban villages to urban villages in this planning cycle.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
In multi-family housing count households (shared food stores) to count units

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: David Kerlick

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Artists of all stripes are driven out of Seattle by redevelopment and high rents. Arts on Capitol Hill are expiring under corporate redevelopment. Set aside arts districts!
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Stadium area development should be paid by corporate sports teams and their $ billionaire owners. END tax subsidy for private, for-profit teams!!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
High density kills neighborhood merchants. Broadway is all chain-stores now and no longer worth visitors.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Seattle 2035/HALA Meetings | West Seattle |November 12
Flipchart Comments:

- 10-min walk doesn't work for elderly and handicapped
- Contract rezones will allow greater height than HALA proposes
- Scale the edges of the urban center for lower heights
- Support adding ADVs to non-conforming structures like existing garages
- More investment and developer in highland – encourage ownership
- Don't raise heights on high street:
  - A block over is better
  - Height should be equal to historic limit
- Westwood is a transit hub, so the UV boundary should reflect
- Make sure DPD is enforcing the code rather than providing advice to avoid conflicts of interest; allow fewer exceptions
- Allow more height next to 65'-86' zones
- Plan with the school district
- Pay attention to the Longfellow Creek watershed/habitat – environmentally critical, density should reflect this
- Require green stormwater infrastructure in watershed, especially on hills
- Make Camp Long and golf course more accessible, especially along Genessee
- Genessee is a scary pedestrian route, especially on south side

- We need more transit for existing urban villages
- Better coordination with regional transit agencies
- Have no minimum parking only in light rail areas
- Make sure you consider parking in the plan
- Better transit service and connectivity throughout west Seattle
- Don't just focus on railroad in LRT
- Have LT to west Seattle in ST3 package
- Require more than 90% angle buildings. We have enough boxes!
- Concerns at SW 35th rechannelization:
  - More congestion, harder to cross
  - Slow traffic down through other means
- Support access to Westwood Village transit hub
- Do more education for drivers near signals, bike lanes, etc
- Allow RPZs in areas close t major bus transit routes, near rapid ride C line
- Identify bus routes that are defined as "Frequent" services in the plans for West Seattle
- Alki/Harbor Ave is underserved by regular service. Considering limited growth, density and unusual traffic peaks (sunny days), is there funding that should be tapped?
- More traffic circles at uncontrolled intersections
- Trolley/bus down California/Alki/Admiral/Alaska/Morgan/Fauntleroy Ferry or Westwood
- Better driver education with all the new bike lanes. Also, new people to Seattle don't know about uncontrolled intersections!
- Better connections from West Seattle to light rail. (Takes >1 hour to bus to airport, 30 min to drive. Why wouldn't you drive?)
- Map frequent transit on the comp plan map in lieu of relying on actual bus schedule headways
- Safe routes to schools should support private and public schools
- More water taxis, connect the west Seattle water taxi to the C line
- Look at NE I-5 choke point at Seneca – relieve choke point
- How does the city preserve family-owned, service-oriented small businesses in the face of redevelopment and rising rents?
- Will new heights lead to a "canyon"? Especially Alaska & California
- Given the increase in population in the Junction, when are we going to get a hospital?
- Make sure you preserve existing affordable units. Don't incentivize displacing tenants from existing affordable units. Make sure affordable housing is distributed across the city (not concentrated)
- We need to monitor emissions from the port modernization with the addition of 1M TEUs/year added to the current total of 500,000
- How do you transport the elderly and disabled within 10-min walkshed?
- Can we have opportunities t readjust the current Morgan/Admiral urban village boundary to fix what we have learned since they were created and to add more density/transit? Not all in the junction.
- I think it's accepted that urban sprawl is not efficient, and the general concept of the hub, urban v's, etc are so cool! Nice work. Please reconsider micro-housing, I don't think it promotes a "goal" life style, and by adding supply of higher quality housing (supply-demand) the same is accomplished. Thanks! Nice work!
- Ensure that unites are monitored so people don't take advantage of the system. Incentivize and motivate people to move through the system?
- How do we incentivize those who are in "affordable" housing to move out of the system and into market-based units? Are we promoting career-stasis?
- Working to consider terminal 5 as something other than industrial use
- More neighborhood parks like Ercolini Park

- Solve the coming dark canyon on California by keeping historical height restriction on California Ave and allowing taller building ½-block east and west of California Ave
- Put recycle and trash cans at tent encampments under freeway, bridges etc., and pick up daily by SPU.
- Make west Seattle golf course more accessible to pedestrians, especially along Genessee (major bus route)
- Currently, verbiage in design review standards refers to existing building when evaluating the quality of materials, architectural standards, volume, transit, landscaping, and other criteria for new construction. For example, two apartment buildings of different community value could list existing buildings as comps in the design review process; once constructed, one new structure would add value and the other subtract value. Could the language be reviewed to reflect the goal/objective more, and disincentivize use of low-quality comps less? Thank you!
- City should be able to encourage larger businesses to locate in neighborhoods that currently don't have job opportunities
- No hospital in West Seattle – need one
- A hotel in west Seattle would be good
- Increases in traffic are making our neighborhoods more isolated
  - Better mass transit network needed to link neighborhoods
  - Foot traffic, ferry, water taxi service
- Support growth in Westwood/Highland Park UV
- Green and open spaces are work $1B a year in benefits and savings to this city. Support valuing the green infrastructure and integrating it as an asset in city cost-benefit analyses, assessment and reporting to keep our citizens healthy in perpetuity
- Consider expanding Westwood Village around its transit hub
- Need more transit to support growth (e.g. Morgan Junction)
- New development drives up property taxes and makes it hard for low-income families and seniors to stay)
- Maintain and expand green and open space for public health and ecosystem service benefits and savings
- Compile a list of 110 year old structures in Seattle to understand what we have, before we tear it down, to demonstrate commitment to retaining our heritage
- Put affordable housing in SODO

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Edward Johnson

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

I would bet my retirement that Seattle will screw this up BIGTIME just like every single other thing that they've tried. Except for Big Bertha, that worked out so well, and ahead of schedule.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Jean-Antoine Meunier

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

You're free to leave. Good luck finding that utopia.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Edward Johnson

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

I did leave. Seem to be pretty angry about someone complaining about all the tax dollars Seattle and Washington state wastes.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Edward Johnson

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

I dont recall replying to your thread anyway Jean. Whats the skin off your toes all about? What interest might you have? I was thinking, maybe I am missing something. However given the track record with the floating brige, the alaskan way viaduct, and Big Bertha I doubt anything good will come about from this.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Edward Johnson

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

I dont think anyone minds paying taxes when they get something from it (other than the politicians and the contractors). There's too many buffoons wasting tax money and getting nothing accomplished. Think of what we could have if it were spent wisely instead of like they were playing Whack A Mole.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Mike Abernathy

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Yes, update the freeways and roads so all the douches moving here for their tech jobs have a smoother drive to work.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: @ak_helmick

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

If you live in West Seattle, and you aren't at this @Seattle2035 meeting... And you call people NIMBY's, shame on you.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: @NWUrbanist

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

At the @Seattle2035 open house in West Seattle tonight.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: @NWUrbanist

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Great turnout at @Seattle2035 open house. That's it for tonight, summary will be on the blog tomorrow! http://pic.twitter.com/6cvGLj5G74

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Andrew Curry

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please do not expand Alaska Junction urban village any further. Expanding the urban village up the steep hill from Alaska to Edmunds would allow developers to buy up single family homes in what is a neighborhood with a diverse mix of backgrounds, ages, and incomes. Is your intention to coerce/force middle class families to move whenever a neighbor sells their home (and subsequently they are neighbors to tall mixed use developments)? Do you want to displace Seattle's middle class families? We already face extreme traffic problems getting into and out of West Seattle. Is additional density really viable when the city refuses to address transportation issues with viable options for commuters to work spaces throughout the region (not just downtown)? Bike lanes, light rail, busses that share the road with cars and trucks don't work for everyone. Do you not represent middle class constituents already residing in the city? These policies seem geared toward future residents at the expense of current middle class residents. Why not annex White Center and or Burien to accommodate city growth. This seems better than punishing hard working middle class families who did their research and bought in single family neighborhoods because that's where they wanted to live (before you up and changed the rules beneath them and at their expense). If you actually care about the impact on current residents, please stop by and talk to every homeowner you hope to displace with this particular expanded urban village and tell us why we should be sacrificed for people who do not yet, or may never choose to, live in Seattle.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please do not expand the boundaries of the West Seattle Junction Urban Village. We are already experiencing unprecedented levels of development here, and our infrastructure cannot keep up.

Although we supposedly have "frequent transit," waits are long, there are daily bus cancelations, the routes in question serve the same general areas of the city (that is, there's not a lot of route diversity among the different bus services available) and no one really believes light rail will make it out here. It's increasingly difficult to exit the peninsula via our one main gateway- the West Seattle Bridge- and I've seen no reasonable proposals to ease congestion. Despite the idea that urban villages attract jobs, that's not really the case in the West Seattle Junction (other than retail and restaurant jobs). Most people who live in West Seattle do not work in West Seattle. Biking is not a reasonable commuting solution for most, and this is still a very car-dependent area. I understand that many want to make Seattle less car-dependent, but it will remain that way until there are frequent and reliable alternatives available to us. There are other urban village areas that do not face quite the same transportation/geography constraints as the West Seattle Junction, and I urge you to focus on expanding the urban villages that already have feasible transportation solutions available.
Thank you.

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Kathy

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I have been a resident in West Seattle for 5 yrs. I moved here for the charm, the smallish community feel, the parks, the small shops, wonderful restaurants, and the appeal of all the vintage, very unique houses that offer beautiful views of the city and of Puget Sound and the Olympics. If high rise condos/stores continue to be built we will continue to lose our skyline, lose the West Seattle charm and run out a community that very much cherishes this town as it was prior to the condo invasion. Keep the high rises downtown and help maintain our city's appeal as it once was. I am so disheartened by all the destruction and construction in our town. PLEASE STOP building!!!

Date: 11/12/2015

Name: Dennis Fillbrandt

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

I love the shipping industry to stay in Seattle.
It's it true nature.
Create this with city growth

Date: 11/12/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Please dont waste our taxmoney. Big Bertha is a huge waste and your planning is fallable at best. Decades have passed and how much tax dollars have the DOT, Seattle, and Washington state wasted? No onw is accountable for the bloat and waste. No one.
Its only tax money though.

Date: 11/13/2015

Name: John Gerhard

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

In the 2035 plan, I did not see any concrete commitment to fund infrastructure before growth occurs.
a- There is a defined plan that directs developers' property investments.
b- There are no pre-defined baseline protections for those on fixed / low income.
So where is the money coming from..? I provide out-of-the-box, actionable, funding solutions, paid for by the developers/property owners to include in the 2035 plan - before approving future growth:
1) Developers and property owners of mixed use (retail-residential, work-live, office, etc) and residential apartment buildings, in particular those with waived / reduced parking, must be required to directly fund King County Metro / Sound Transit to support local transit growth requirements. That funding commitment is best implemented as a condition of permit but now it must be retroactive for all high density properties.
How to implement:
a- For each high-density development, the City or County annually assess a transit-specific fee based on the maximum number of permitted building residents (not units).
b- That fee will be the $$ equivalent of a negotiated annual ORCA card for every building resident and employee BUT not passed on via rent increase.
c- The annual assessed fee is paid directly to a King County Metro/Sound Transit fund.
d- It is then up to each renter / lessee / retail employee / office employee to request an ORCA card, with proof of residency.
e- Unclaimed funds are to be banked for economic down cycles.
f- King County should not allow the annexation of any County lands until each municipality demonstrates that transit infrastructure is sustainably funded as part of the master plan.
2) Growth provides economic benefit to the local community, city, county and state. The economic benefit associated with every resident and business in mixed-use developments, is measurable. Since the city infrastructure that supports these properties must be sustainably funded, even when buildings have vacancies:

a- City monitor occupancy and assess a 'vacancy tax' on all unoccupied rented/leased residential, office and retail space 'equivalent to the lost economic benefit to the community.' I propose 25% to 30% of rental / lease price.
b- Vacancy taxes are to be banked for economic down cycles.
The vacancy tax will ensure sustainably funded infrastructure (independent of property taxes) and drive down rents until an 'affordability v benefit' equilibrium is achieved. And keep the lion's share of income from these properties, local.
3) Multi-modal transportation issues.
a- Implement a bicycle 'tab fee' of $15, applied to all cyclists in greater Seattle (or King County) over 16 years of age, to offset the cost of cycle friendly solutions in the city.
b- Eliminate, or modify, parkway green space to create or expand bike / pedestrian paths and improve accessibility.
c- Before taking away street parking, in favor of protected bike lanes for a limited number of riders: 1) study the economic costs to employers whose employees park and walk to work, businesses whose customers can no longer shop, impact on community events/fundraisers, and on residents whose family

and friends will no longer be able to visit, &c.; 2) aggressively cite bicyclists who violate a- rules of the road and b- those cyclists who ride in the roadway adjacent to the protected or outside shared bike lanes.
Note: I support cycling as a viable and responsible transit mode. But a cyclist is not a car, a pedestrian and a cyclist, at their whim.
Example - In West Seattle, the birthplace of New York-Alki, Alaska Junction is transitioning to a transit-isolated Tenement Junction - infrastructure funding significantly lags growth (as will the 2035 Plan). Roads are increasingly congested, bus service is woefully inadequate. The Water Taxi and Shuttles remain the best service to / from both Seattles, but service hours are significantly reduced during fall and winter months.
About me: I am a resident of West Seattle. I am retired, a community volunteer and UW volunteer.
For a sustainable community,
John ? Gerhard?

Date: 11/13/2015

Name: Janet Boggs

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am very concerned about the extension of the urban village. It appears to include our property at 6205 20th Ave NE without any notice or consultation with us. It also includes a large portion of Ravenna Park. I protest the inclusion of our property--our house, our neighborhood--in this experiment without notice. I also protest your plans for Ravenna Park. Leave it alone. Leave our neighborhoods alone. Stop destroying Seattle neighborhoods. Concentrate growth downtown and around the immediate areas surrounding the light rail stations. But not beyond those areas. We need to strongly consider this rush to growth and whether we really want it. I for one do not. We are making Seattle unlivable.

Date: 11/13/2015

Name: Ian Crozier

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I prefer Alternative 4 - build around transit. I would prefer another option that would be to build everywhere. Development is less of a burden if we all share the load.
My chief concern about development is the size of buildings. Enormous blocky bland new urbanist buildings do nothing positive for street character. Buildings of varying dimensions, especially long buildings with narrow street frontage, make for interesting, attractive, and economically and socially vibrant streets. How about a fee that rises exponentially with parcel footprint size? To incentivize small buildings (which are benenficial for the community) and efficient use of space.

Date: 11/13/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

--we want more protections for industrial lands in Seattle;
--we want zero "up-zoning" of already existing industrial lands city-wide;
--we want more protections for our Port and freight corridors;
--we want projected job growth and planning to line up with our Port's job growth plans in Seattle

Date: 11/13/2015

Name: Chris

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Thank you so much for hosting the community meeting in West Seattle. I especially appreciated the presence of staff at this event; I felt that the department was well-represented and sincerely interested in engaging us. I hope that continues. I'll be posting a 'thank you' on my own social media site to spread the word!

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Christoph Strouse

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development

Comment:

The city should establish a "program" to help marginalized, ethnic, immigrant communities to create co-ops. These cooperatives would be community owned; business, property and solar energy organizations which would then #7 minimize displacement of marginalized populations and small businesses as Seattle grows

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Christoph Strouse

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Environment

Comment:

The City SDPD should research the cost benefit of establishing all urban centers (UC's) as EcoDistricts.
These ecodistricts would be centered at TOD's
Ecodistricts could establish solar energy and storage coops
Ecodistricts could establish micro water districts through local
Ecodistricts could establish urban agriculture coops (vertical farming, aquaponics, etc.)
Ecodistricts could establish equitable, sustainable developement and resil[cut off on scan]

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Christoph Strouse

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

HALA should create an innovative rental rate pricing mechanism which utilizes city data to determine the percentage of population in an urban hub or village that has an income of "X" can afford a rent of

"Y" this would embed a variable rate model into all new "mandatory affordable housing developments" affordable housing is not a single fixed rate, its variable based on income stratification of the communities demographics

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

A metric to define low/mod/high density would be helpful
e.g. housing units/per area commercial sq. footage

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Land Use

Comment:

How will we work with NWSA / Port of Seattle w/ Terminal 5 and possible increase of industry area?

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Please add a few key streets in each neighborhood to the map for improved orientation
Where commercial zones meet single family zones, re-zone a portion of the SF-zone to LR, providing a transitional space for future development.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Does the WS Gold course count as "open green space"?
How does the city and county work with the port of seattle?

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development

Comment:

While projections speak for themselves, I'm curious of the effect of a declining tech industry, departure of Boeing or other catalyst behind the decline of cities (Detroit, St. Louis, Pittsburgh...)

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
Please clarify how HALA overlaps with 2035 Comp Plan and other growth plans (Kind CO/state etc.)
2, Strange wording I don't get this one
4. How do current businesses feel? No more stadiums please
5. Urban villages already suffering from too much density. Spread it out.
6. cottages/ADU's NOT skinny houses or tall townhouses. citywide? Not just villages
8. Maintain the parks we have already!
9. "No changes to specific neighborhood plans"
7. Comments:
1. with good design match the home style
2. if in context of other homes in neighborhood
3. perhaps on blocks adjacent to main arterial
5. closer to main arterials
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
This type of planning feels somewhat imposed. When a person spends $650,000+ to buy a house, they should be aware of what could happen in their neighborhood. It feels threatening to long-term residents. Developers seem to be waiting to build whatever they want on whatever lot they can buy.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Please include long-time residents in the discussion not just young newcomers. This city is composed of people from many different age groups and different income levels.
Please consider how the increased density has already affected urban villages adversely, in terms of traffic, parking problems, higher rents, an increase in homeless campers, litter, graffiti.
Wallingford is losing #16 Meridian next year, making it difficult to get a fast ride downtown. The walk to E line or freeway is a longer walk.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Most techies are male. Are these figures accurate for 2015? Chart needs editing! [taped in item "2010 Percentages of Population by Age and Gender]
Please remember that concurrency is supposed to occur when the city plans for growth. Some bus lines (44, E) are good, but some are not. Also, it is very difficult to get to some destinations. People are not likely to take a bus when it involves transfers. Also, some buses are way too crowded, and some are filled with people who be scary to some (more security?). E line stop at N 46/99 (aurora) involves stairs or steep slope. Hard [cut off bottom of page] disabled.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Jim Wilder

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
6. what specific types?

9. Are these good practices?
7. Comments:
All of these but subject to location within the urban village.
All of these are good, but we don't want high rises encroaching near parks, boulevards, etc.
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
3. or encroach near them with new visual blight.
Step back high rises to avoid encroaching near parks, landmarks, schools and special places, to prevent visual blight and unsightly "street canyons."
Allow flexible use of low-rise density (DADU, clusters, 2-story tiplex)
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Mass transit into and within the various urban villages is critical.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Prevent unsightly "street canyons" by stepping back zoning and requiring low-height setbacks adjacent to sidewalks.
Mass transit improvements, into and within the urban villages.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

7. Comments:
These choices are incomplete
Mixed use is appropriate on arterials [cut off bottom of page] small streets in single-family neighborhoods
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
A "village" definitionally means it is discrete and self-contained - schools, playgrounds, supermarkets, childcare and people-friendly area (with low rise and green space in between, and rapid transportation
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The underlying premise of 10 minutes from a transportation hub as a reason to eliminate single-family housing is fallacious if housing density is already met.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
See above. As usual, the questionnaire is "loaded" without opportunity for any nuance or explanation.
The dotted line in Ravenna to the parks Ravenna and Cowan should be removed.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. How you define "frequent transit" is important - should be 3 lines at <30 (not </= 30) minutes or ST station
7. Comments:

none of the above
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Be concerned about the transition of villages to the areas outside the village - define a "transition area" of 1 block back from the boundary where a much lower density is allowed.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
You need to have fewer exemptions from the policies - right now most are pretty meaningless because you can easily [draw?] for an exception
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
More park space
More money for community centers and senior centers

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Eric Larson

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

5. Comments:
9. Don't understand this statement

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Loren Landerholm

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Streamline permitting process at DPD and especially at SDOT within urban villages whatever size they end up being
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Consider eliminating critical areas designations and restrictions/prohibitions in urban villages so density can fill in the area over time.
Get someone in charge of all new and existing regulations that affect supply and affordability of housing. Run new regulations through affordability filter including permit fees/policies at SDOT, utilities fees/policies and DPD
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Eliminate max density limits (1 unit/2000SF in L1), institute minimum (i.e. no less than x units/squarefoot lot) density within portions of the urban villages

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Tim Motzer

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

5. Comments:

1. if tied to zoning changes to SF areas a bad idea
2. streets maybe to small to do this
3. what do you do with this information?
6. If you are talking about SF zones outside of the hub villages - NO
7. How do do this with new growth development
8. Need to tie funding of parks to [illegible]
7. Comments:
8. with lots of open space
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Bad idea if it includes single family zoned areas
130th streer proposed could compete with the city's ability to provide [illegible] services to [illegible] the level of growth [illegible] for Lake City and Bitter Lake Hub Village
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The plan does not deal with livability and does not cannot city re sooner as part of the budget process to support [anticoastal?] growth areas

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. At what cost to established locals? At what cost to watersheds and puget sound?
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Severely affects existing crucial thornton creek watershed and balanced neighborhood!
The pinehurst neighborhood is already balanced between owners and renters, ethnic groups, and income levels (see Sound Transit Document describing area). Also has more mature trees and wildlife, crucial to thornton creek watershed and therefore crucial to the health of salmon in Lake WA and puget sound. If you build on this area, you will destroy the watershed - and current residents. Doing this is truly evil. Paving = runoff = toxic water => puget sound.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Stay away from watersheds!! Please add "new units" where there are already brownfield sites such as around aurora where big box stores are failing daily.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Paul Zemtzov

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Yes, urban villages should be increased along transit routes with frequent and predictable bus lines, more "linear" urban village configurations should be considered - e.g. 35th Ave NE (or Aurora Blvd) should be considered a "linear" urban village

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I support increased densities in order to alleviate the housing shortage and affordability problem. Many European cities are perfectly pleasant and livable with extensive areas of row houses, townhomes, and even 4 to 5 story housing
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
As a "trade-off" for higher density, the city should plan and fund better/larger parks, community centers near or in the urban villages.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. I do not like the "bubble" approach to the 10-min walk.
3. If will slow if too much and help businesses
5. not if it rezones "randomly"
6. Neighborhoods are already doing this organically as appropriate.
7. including elderly and families
8. parks for the sake of parks. Not "mixed use"
7. Comments:
2. already on small lots
3. seems like not gaining much for all the negative of tearing down
4. along major roads
5-7. along major roads
7. 4 stories
8. NO.
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
A 10-minute walk along a major road is very different than a 10 minute walk through neighborhoods. 10-min walk should also be both TO and FROM station. Should depend on terrain and existing neighborhood boundaries.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
encourage ways to maintain the beautiful old homes in our city. encourage communication with the neighborhoods. I've gone door-to-door in my area and not many have known ANYTHING about your plan.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Drive around and find areas that need rehabilitation, like Lake City Way -> near the Roosevelt Station. Develop and bring transit there instead of the waste involved in tearing down perfectly fine homes.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Kimberly Sims

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

5. Comments:

All of the questions on this survey pale in comparison to the big question above. [transcribed in Q11]
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Ask the residents of an area what they want.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The character of "place" should always be preserved. This happens when policies allow for "organic development" with input from the inhabitants. The current model of development is a destructive one in that it doesn't honor "place". It is done by developers who don't care about a place. They only want to make money.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
If homeowners received a break on their real estate taxes for having mother-in-law apts. or a backyard cottage on their property then there would be more rental capacity in the city without high impact development, such as apt. bldgs. Also, the character of "place" would be preserved instead of being destroyed which is the current development model.
[comment at top of first page]
The whole plan ignores the big question: Do we want this growth? Is it good for the city? Will Seattle be destroyed? Is there enough water to accommodate this level of growth? Look at what has happened in California with severe water shortages.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Kristin Bailey-Fogarty

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. Keep it reasonable
4. ?
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
1. no one wants to walk over a HWY. [marked "Not Important" for cliffs/hills and "Very Important" for highways]
5. look at georgetown industrial can be livable
Yes. Have thoughtful, forward-thinking design elements where NC2 meets SF5000. [drew a picture of this]
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Right now, design requirements on this boundary are 10'-15' set back and 50'-55' (now 40', but surely moving to 50') height. This has catastrophic effect on property values of SF5000 residents, most of whom (like me) are lower middle class. It's also bad for livability. Decrease height on shared property line. Increase height on street.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Leigh Pale

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing

expanded boundaries?
Not all urban villages are the same. Crown Hill needs smart density development along 15th and arterials. That's where you can get the most housing. If you allow re-zoning of single family to anything other than ADU's, then developers will come into the SF area and build there and sell those units for an unaffordable amount of $. 15th and arterials that need improvement will not be developed because it's harder with out incentives.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Incentivize smart development along 15th and 85th first - a win/win for neighborhood
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Also, make transit work...Bus takes 45 minutes to get downtown from 85th and 15th.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

5. Comments:
3. projected target numbers are low
6. Do this incrementally, set multi-stage growth
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
5. Stop allowing retail and office in industrial areas

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: A Torland

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. what?
9. what planning?
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Yes, involve the current residents and actually LISTEN
Notify them by MAIL not osmosis
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Make growth more gradual and consider "older" and senior residents who have difficulty moving, both physically and financially
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Adequate parking since everyone will not live within 10 minutes!

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
outside of urban village -> Ensure new single family houses have limited foot print and height on lot. NO McMANSIONS!
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Automobile access needs to be accomodated for any building. Even if there's no parking for the building, there must be a pull-out for deliveries, moving trucks, etc. Bigger set backs to allow for walking and landscaping.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. PARKING
9. What does this mean?
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Don't forget to include Magnolia, Queen Anne, Laurelhurst, Sandpoint - they need to absorb density
Parking needs to be provided. Most people will continue to drive their cars!
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Emphasis needs to include middle-income households/home owners at risk of displacement who will then be unable to afford to buy another SF home in Seattle. They will flee to the suburbs and Seattle will become the city of short-timers.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Livable = a place someone would want to live, ie, trees, folige, considerate neighbors, quiet, parks, community feel, distinctive and appearling homes with character. Not urban ghettos a la Chicago projects from 1960s.
Walkable - pedestrian-activated crosswalks, level and well-maintained sidewalks. No free right turns! No rolling stops for bicyclists!
Transit-rich - U. District has it already - express busses run frequently

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
2. PARKING
8. do not equate parks with paved open space
9. don't understand!
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Do not draw expanded boundaries in order to justify building higher, denser, closer to sidewalks, and bending over backwards to developers, (as the mayor and city council have already done with the

"grand (giveaway) bargain."
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Maintain (and build) homes with larger areas for grass, shrubs and trees. Pay some attention to pedestrian safety. Don't allow bikes to make "rolling stops." License bicycle riders, and require that the obey traffic rules. Maintain sidewalks, wide enough to actually walk side-by-side.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
There must be more careful thought about preservation of architecturally significant single family homes within urban villages. If "neighborhood conservation districts" are too prescriptive, then let's explore other ways to maintain the integrity of some blocks which, precisely because they consist of homogeneous bungalows from the early twentieth century, help to create what I believe most people feel is a pleasing residential environment.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I think that density has gotten ahead of transit access. I don't think that all the people buying 3 bedroom townhouses will go down to 1 car.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Gabrielle Esser

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
More of these
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Will bus routes change to connect people outside of villages to villages and transit hubs?

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. should not be done illogically
2. not all streets need bicycle paths
6. with input from neighborhood and [limited?] to avoid speculation
9. ?
7. Comments:
1. residential urban villages
5. hub and urban centers
8. urban centers
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
I am opposed to the dotted line expanding Roosevelt east [illegible] Ravenna that meanders to 20th around Ravenna Park. This is NOT a clear guideline for future redevelopment - [illegible] as an identifiable neighborhood of Ravenna. I think the urban village [illegible] should be [incred?] to 16th north of 65th and have [illegible] zoning. 4 stories [all illegible]. NOT to 17th
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
[Illegible] residential urban villages - those should not be [all illegible] - but should be buffers of [illegible]. Plans for more family housing, ground related [housing?] need to be strengthened if Seattle wants families [illegible].
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Future transportation plans other than the [amount?] [illegible] [illegible] should look at other communities of SF zones to create new residential urban villages where [illegible] SF [illegible x2] is not in good [all illegible].

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Chris Abbott

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

5. Comments:
8. Limit the riff-raff from dominating some these spaces.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Sarajane Siegfried

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

5. Comments:
9. and council districts

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Density should be decentralized and some new urban centers created.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Use tax policies to reduce SUV USE

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Urban design guidelines and upzoning that would prevent the "four-pack" or "six pack" townhouses and "metal block" apartments. We want more beautiful, higher density condos that support home ownership, transit investment, and sense of place
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
I'd like to see stronger commitment around reconciliation with Native American peoples who never received any reserve land within the Seattle City limits. We want more native art, cultural spaces, housing, jobs, culturally-appropriate education, access to food etc.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
END TO FREE PARKING!
A stronger anti-sprawl voice at the county and regional level. Suburban sprawl in the outer municipalities is what keeps Seattle low-density, car-oriented, and bland. I want to be able to buy a high density condo and walk everywhere and so does the rest of my generation. Protect open space to make Seattle flourish.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

5. Comments:
1. The Roosevelt expansion is an abomination.
2. It's not simply access; it's also convenience.
3. The current projects have been badly off
9. The city takes the elements that promote density; ignores amenitities
10. That's for the school district
9. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
3. Do not include at all
Use neighborhood boundaries as established by the department of neighborhoods and listen to community councils. All the community councils in the expansion zone of the Roosevelt Urban Village oppose the expansion.
10. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
"The relationship to the other plan" does not include the parks master plan; it should. It should include neighborhood plans adopted by the city. Your 10 key proposals have action verbs, except parks. Parks

just sets "goals." Nothing about acquiring, developing, improving parks. The guide fo 10-minute walk belies what the draft map does. With the Roosevelt urban centers the limits go beyond 10 minutes walking in the [illegible]; it assumes a jogger. Proposals should recognize existing neighborhoods and their plans , and keep roosevelt to roosevelt.
11. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
The plan document needs an index to help find sections. It has nothing on historic districts in the contents. Another blind spot is appreciation of veterans and their achievements.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Seattle 2035/HALA Meetings | North Seattle |November 14
Flipchart comments:

- UV boundary adjustments need more fine-grain thinking – have standards for consistency
- HALA conversation – be skeptical in negotiations with developers. Make sure the city is getting the best deal for the public. Be careful with “grand bargain”
- Coordinate HALA with zoning changes – don’t put cart before the horse. DPD making assumptions without public input on HALA
- With HALA upzones, be thoughtful about transitions between commercial and residential, especially SF residential. Ove higher portion of commercial building away from houses, or to main arterial (15-20’ setback). Put residential open space against residential
- Better urban design guidelines!
- Don’t expand the Roosevelt Urban Village. Respect neighborhood boundaries. The people east of 15th Ave NE identify with Ravenna and are single family. They have no affinity to Roosevelt and strongly oppose the expansion
- Detached cottage can be opportunities for home ownership
- Increase density in single family, but pay attention to character
- Reduce reliance on cars; don’t require parking, but monitor parking supply
- Not sure the frequent transit locations make sense – over-emphasizing these locations, other locations will see demand
- Urban villages were drawn to manage density, not to be dense areas
- Believes busses and transit emit more emissions than cars
- Draw boundaries around areas that need investment (“blighted”) – Seattle should recognize “pockets” of different development conditions
- Don’t upzone areas of well-established character homes
- Encourage long term investment in neighborhoods
- Roosevelt UV has plenty of capacity within the existing urban villages
- Need crossing of I-5 at 73rd to make light rail station
- Preserve existing affordable housing by not up-zoning (Roosevelt)
- Clarify that the city is considering only certain walksheds, not all walksheds
- Commercial zones along 15th Are under-used – use these to meet housing
- Oppose 130th station – freeway
- Figure out how to encourage development in existing C zones and nearer the center of villages
- Crown Hill needs planning; Aurora-Licton needs attention
- Need to make it easier for citizens to weigh in – City offer continuing education classes on city

processes, including rezones and development
- We need a switch to encourage collaboration between neighborhoods and City of Seattle New mechanism for citizen input to participation
- Yes – a mix of housing types in urban villages/single family areas
- Yes, allow duplex/triplex, ADUs in SF lots of neighborhoods
- Look at city lights survey tool – quick and easy way to offer opinion
- Climate action:
  - Long-term incentives for private property owners to install solar panels, insulation, etc. Note: SCL is running out of funds to do this!
  - Incentives to purchase electric vehicles
  - More and better (i.e. convenient) transit
- Municipal bank to provide:
  - Low interest loans for low-income housing. NOTE: Interest goes back into the general fund
  - Low interest loans for students
  - Low interest loans for infrastructure projects
  - Low interest loans for sustainable ("green") businesses
- Support increase densities in order to increase amount of housing. More housing will help affordability. Increase supply to meet demand!
- Consider conservation district idea more carefully – some aspects of preservation could be really good; Allow some protections for contiguous areas of older housing.
- Make backyard cottages easier
- Consider bringing back something like LDT zoning. (Some LR should drop down while others go up.)
- Appreciate what is old-historic
- Concern about Ravenna Boundary pushing south into the u-district
- Keep old houses/preserve structures
- Very concerned about including Cowen and Ravenna parks in urban village boundary
- Would like to see greater diversity of neighborhood-serving businesses in Roosevelt
- Encourage office=retail in Roosevelt
- Recognize historic character of historic homes
- Work on conservation districts – flexible historic preservation (university park)
- Mitigate adverse effects of development
- Design inviting streetscapes and entrances
- Don't allow high fences and hedges
- Create interesting frontages, sight lines into the lot = safer
- Little details in the front can soften the design
- Don't allow more duplexes/triplexes in university park –unique condition, unrelated student housing
- Safe tenant conditions – unrelated people – minimum square feet per unit
- Each neighborhood is unique
- Cottages okay on single family
- Redevelopment – cheapest housing goes first
- [Open House attendee] likes living near renters
- [Open House attendee] doesn't support Roosevelt urban village.
- Amend standards for backyard cottages soon, mother-in-law units
- Don't require parking space for MIL units/cottages
- Allow greater lot coverage for cottages
- Resolve fire code issues for backyard cottages

- backyard cottage on wheels "tumbleweed" – allows everyone to evaluate how appropriate; allows home ownership – own cottages on wheels
- Cottages allow home ownership for principle structure
- "cozimiums"
- Don't allow higher density in single family – Roosevelt
- Need parking in Roosevelt
- Allow attached rowhouses
- Walkability = good measure for establishing UV boundary
- Need plants, greenspace, birds, streets, space on the ground, accessible
- New development doesn't' have space for habitat
- Yes to density, but grow parks and real open space
- Really like people walking around the neighborhoods
- Likes condo
- Wants more affordable housing included in SF housing
- Quality of life important in UVs
- Don't include parks in urban village
- New development should include new parks
- Keep old houses affordable; shared house, different units keeps character
- Be realistic about topography – makes it difficult to take bus, more difficult in some neighborhoods
- Busses need to be cheap, comfortable, convenient
- Short-term parking for visitors
- More transit with density
- Need more family-size options
- Serve middle class home owners in addition to newcomers
- Livable neighborhoods
- Review planning commission's family housing study
- L1/L2 "family housing"
- Transition between SF & C
- 130th: complete the sidewalk grid in all UVs
- Prioritize sidewalks:
  - Routes to school
  - Arterials
  - Maybe not on certain residential streets
  - Trade-offs between trees and sidewalks
- Concern about more housing & more affordable housing
- Increasing density will meet needs of growing population
- Expanding around transit hubs will help with transportation problems
- Single-family zoning encourages large homes, not density
- In SF – townhomes
- Around hubs, allow 6 floors and yes, more density in Seattle
- Rent control discourages new housing
- More supply = lower rents
  - [To the above comment:] No! This is a myth! More complicated than that
- Funding should resemble % of users. Elders are not served by bikes. We must have sidewalks
- Urban center and urban villages must have sidewalks or they're not urban. Can't access transit without sidewalks
- Crown Hill urban village expansion – Important to consider that the existing core area of the

village is underutilized
- Large parking lots and big box retail
- If the boundary is expanded than new development will be encouraged outside existing commercial area instead of redeveloping the existing underdeveloped commercial areas
- Incentivize development along the arterials, e.g. allow 65' as an example. Do this in combination with not upzoning single family areas
- Still need transit improvements to/from crown hill
- Robots determining neighborhood
- Boundaries must be flexible and have neighborhood input on drawing boundaries. Otherwise, speculative buying and uncertainty will lead to deterioration of boundaries not logical and clear – not gerrymandered. Let neighborhood planning come up with plans for increasing inclusivity!
- Concerned about unsafe intersection. Bicyclists and motorizes on 65th NE @ NE 19th – no visibility
- It feels like bicyclists have every street in Seattle – too much. Still have older citizens that don't/can't bike who drive.
- Bike network – education is more important than structures. Need to influence drivers that are aggressive and abusive. A bike path doesn't change attitudes.
- License bikes! Bike etiquette!
- Bike riders need to obey traffic laws.
- There is no agreed upon street philosophy in Seattle. Agreements between peds and drivers, e.g. UK and vulnerable uses
- No free right turns for cars or "rolling stops" for bikes
- Are we getting ahead of ourselves in our bike infrastructure? What are the "hilly cities" doing? We can learn from them (not flat Copenhagen) and we need more separation between slow uphill and fast downhill cyclists
- Seattle should be more concerned about moving vehicles – not creating gridlock by reducing lanes/road diets
- Don't expand boundaries of Roosevelt urban village. Residents who live in the expansion zone are opposed
- Prioritize arterial streets for vehicles or else you increase cut-through traffic in neighborhoods
- The Comprehensive Plan should be based on the neighborhood plans. For example, University District urban design framework and university district partnership parks plan
- No minimum parking requirements does not equal no car ownership
- U district partnership does not speak for or represent the neighbors or the needs of the u District residents and neighborhood!
- 52nd and Roosevelt (UCD is there too) bikes and cares do not stop for peds trying to cross. Can't go south because of construction impacts
- Promote/incentivize/restrict access to downtown streets to HOV-only to increase circulation and decrease congestion
  - Car-free days
  - Open streets/ciclovia fests!
  - Transit-only corridors downtown
- Concern that neighborhood business districts will be strangled without some parking, e.g. Roosevelt @ 65th
- Can developers of low/no parking housing be required to promote/provide for non-car travel (enhanced bike parking, orca cards, car share memberships)? E.g. development on 11th just north of 45th with great bike parking and bike repair facility
- Where do street trees and rain gardens fall into the four modal plans?

- Coordinate comprehensive plan with HALA
- HALA equity map are nearly identical with no plan for preservation of existing affordable housing
- Require parking for elderly/handicapped in assisted multi-family structures
- Support nonprofits:
  - Land banking
  - Bridge loans
  - Maintenance loans-for-profit
- Don't forget open space and trees – developers should provide space or pay fee to buy it
- REAL open space = PARKS! (with foliage, trees, habitat!)
- Free universal full-day kindergarten first, before preschool. Why should parents pay for kindergarten?
- Encourage a public plaza atop the Sound Transit station in the University District = use vital space for housing and business. Subway station a vital transportation and density resource
- Schools for U District!
- Match parks with higher densities
- Fund parks maintenance
- Contribute to maintenance of school grounds as park resource
- Co-locate open space and childrens' playgrounds with affordable housing on surplus public land
- Include solar power generation o parks land (a significant public resource!)
- Conservation districts to protect neighborhood character
- Impact fees for parks
- How do we get the right level of open space/green space in the U District when all the emphasis is on increased density – we need infrastructure improvements, services, open spaces NOW!
- I'd like to see a city tree planting goal like Vancouver's Greenest City Action Plan, especially a street tree plan in/for low-income neighborhoods
- Show natural areas on FLUM – eg. WSDOT near Arboretum
- Support for UV strategy and expanding boundaries for transit
- Neighborhoods being sacrificed for growth – noise, view blockage, loss of trees, loss of neighborhood businesses
- Amazon and other new development impose externalities on rest of city and don't pay for it
- Allowing 8 unrelated is too many – maybe need minimum square foot per resident
- Students and other transients are not invested in neighborhood
- Keep owner-occupant requirement for ADU
- Single family areas provide "free" open space to city – don't lose this to new development
- Good idea to fill in current UVs before expanding boundary
- Need clear statement that curvy expansion lines are not final
- Comprehensive Plan needs to be more directive about climate change and emergency preparedness
- Can each urban village have a community center/evacuation/emergency disaster plan?
- Many UVs have grown well beyond 2024 targets – infrastructure is not keeping up
- Growth is changing nature of neighborhoods and not in a good way
- Does the city really want/need this growth?
- Concern about future water availability
- Difficult to grow sustainably
- Growth puts pressure on housing affordability
- Need bigger vision and look at overall growth
- Should stop catering to developers – they don't care about the City of Seattle

- More use of transfer of development rights program will support densification in the city and preservation of farm land outside the city. Let's support developers who care about preservation of agricultural lands
- Use urban centers as ecodistricts, with solar and micro water projects and urban agriculture
- Use vacant commercial space in new structures for family-size housing
- Develop laneways in north Seattle area where lots are large and could accommodate laneway cottages
- Single family lots help retain tree canopy and natural drainage that new development destroys
- Single family in urban village:
  - Detached cottages okay if designed appropriately
  - Attention to height, bulk, setbacks
- Need parking –busses = $800/month; subsidize
- Require developers to provide bus passes

Sticky notes on boards:
"What is Seattle's Comprehensive Plan?"

- Incorporate Neighborhood Plan with teeth, not advisory
- Pedestrians are not made safer by forcing existing sidewalks into becoming transit loading zones This is already a problem under current comp plan
- Increase density in residential areas that encourages
  - Mother-in-law apartments
  - Small cottages
  - Retention of green spaces
  - Transportation options
- Which means keeping development (i.e. paving over) away from crucial habitat areas such as Thorton Creek, which once carried 30% of spawning salmon in Puget Sound! Paving ? toxic run-off ? dead fish
  - [To the above comment:] Yes yes yes to this!
- Acknowledge the reality of climate change in this plan! Ask the big questions: do we want this growth? Should policies be put into place to limit it? Is there enough water?

Urban Village Strategy

- Small business rental control or subsidy
- Emphasize livability as a standard and impact fees for new development
- Bring employment
- The urban village expansion and rezoning of single family within urban villages only makes sense if:
  - First density is incentivized along the underutilized arterials that are already zoned multi-family, where there is room for big housing buildings
  - Transit and infrastructure is improved to keep up with growth. It can't support current needs now.

Rezoning will just encourage expansive development in neighborhoods without providing affordable housing or enough housing to meet goals. Incentivize smart development along arterials first; like 15th NW in Crown Hill

- Affordability should not preclude livability
  - Open spce and trees
  - Avoid street canyons
  - Larger building set-backs
- My neighborhood is already super diverse! See description in Sound Transit E.I.S. Your artificial development will destroy us

- New housing units in the urban centers favor the wealthy and drive out those of moderate means. The tall, long, boring streetscapes do not attract pedestrians. (e.g. 11th Ave NE, north of NE 45th St. for a great example)
  - [To the above comment:] Seconding what this community member said. The explosion of homogenous, high-income multi-use buildings decreases income and racial diversity of residents (which then exacerbates educational disparities) as well as the racial and income diversity of businesses! More access and integrations please.)

Relationship to other plans:

- What about the relationship between public schools and density increasing?
- Oh! And how about the neighborhood comp plan done in 2000?
- Growth management act (GMA) never intended for city livability to be sacrificed to "save" areas outside the city. Concurrency is a GMA mandate – 2035 Seattle is ignoring this.
- You keep making us densify, densify, densify, but King County has virtually no farms or real forest left. So far your plans do not add up.
- [under "Examples of Implementing Plans"] Robust urban tree canopy ordnances
- [under "Examples of Codes and Rules in Seattle Municipal Code"] Environmental protection includes a clear Climate Action Plan with clear steps to carbon neutrality.

Plan elements:

- Livability and affordability. Focus more n employment in urban villages and urban hubs. This will help create the opportunity for people to live closer to where they work and their children go to school. When people can live closer to where they work, traffic is reduced. People can spend more time at home or with friends/family, less fossil fuels burned, happier/healthier people. Live & work opportunities!
- We need to preserve what actual working habitat and watersheds are left, like Thorton Creek
- [under "Land Use"] Require larger setbacks (15 ft) on new buildings to allow for both sidewalks and trees
- [under "Parks and Open Space"]
  - We need green spaces not more cement in open space – permeable surfaces
  - We don't need creative new ways to define open space! We do need actual parks with plants and room for large trees to grow, and people to enjoy nature in the city
  - Don't include non-street level open space that the public isn't aware of and doesn't use. Ground-floor only.
- [under "Economic Development"]
  - Really important! Protect mom & pop, bring in industry (light and tech)
  - Businesses are fleeing Roosevelt as parking is slated to be removed and rents increase. Take a look at the north side of NE 65th St between Roosevelt and 12th Ave NE, Teddy's Tavern is for sale, 3 spaces are vacant, only Thrive is left)
- [under "Housing"] More low-income housing (0-30% AMI) with supportive services. Seattle Municipal Bank to finance these projects in collaboration with non-profit developers

Four Core Values:

- Tree ordinance for private and public property
- Permits require with approval by a lay/professional board
- Protect Lake City boulevards
  - 125 – replace with only seedless marshall ash
  - 35th – replace with only flame ash
- HALA, as the implementation of the Comp Plan, has no preservation plan and no city funding for preservation. This is the essence of racial equity/displacement
- HALA results in a huge net loss of affordable housing. Developers can tear out an unlimited

number of existing affordable units and are only required to replace a small fraction of them with temporarily affordable units, which can go market rate in a few years. HALA is going to devastate the working class in this city

- All you do right now is cut down mature trees or allow developers to do this. This statement is hypocrisy.
- Need a clear climate action plan!!! Concrete steps to become carbon neutral. What's the plan?
- You are planning growth and development directly adjacent to crucial watershed areas. This will damage, ultimately, Puget Sound. Get real hydrologists involved! Paving over ? toxic run-off ? fish kill in Puget Sound
- More should be done to mesh 2035 with meeting established environmental metrics, like greenhouse gas emission targets. (Related: reducing SOV transportation mode share)
- Make GHG reduction/SOV mode share reduction a more explicit goal of 2035
- Please discuss the community core value in the full plan document
- We need more open space, services and infrastructure improvements before the increased density is built!

Draft Future Land Use Map:

- Remember to keep zoning a communicative and flexible process Importance of design review boards and planners that are not subjective but keep overall community interest in mind.
- More multifamily residential needed within 5-6 blocks of transit routes w/ 15 min or more frequent service over 12/hr day, 6 days/wk
- 130th street urban village contingent on funding station no station = no upzone. Sidewalk grid required.
- All urban villages are not the same. Crown Hill got the designation UV because it was supposed to get the monorail.
- In Crown Hill we must incentivize development along 15th & 85th that are already zoned multifamily. Don't expand or rezone existing single-family; make sure 15th & 85h are made into quality housing areas first. That's a win-win for everyone. If multifamily is allowed in single family in crown hill, developers will build there first because they can sell those units for $700k, not affordable. The only way to achieve density goals is to build smart on crown hill arterials.

Ten Key Proposals:

- Develop more three-story units to maximize space for Seattle
- 3 stories looms over one story and makes it unlivable, leading to more three-story development (see all of Ballard!) Need stringent setbacks!
- Create L1 & L2 family zoning in and around urban villages
- 10 years ago, U-district had a 5 acres deficit of open space. Now we have significantly more density- how can we develop the greenspace?
- Ease restrictions on MIL and backyard cottages
- HALA does not address the need for more low-income housing!
- [re: parks and open space:] set measurable priorities and stick to them (i.e. levy creep)
- Use some parks space for community solar power generation. Put it on roofs of park structures.
- Create "more flexibility?" Meaning change at will?
- More flexibility – hmm – is this code for "kiss your neighborhood goodbye?" Cuz it has been so far.

Key Proposal 1

- 130th Street has no sidewalks!
- No expansion of HUV boundaries… make street imrpovements only. No zoning changes.
- More job opportunities needed within 10-minute walkshed of major transit lines, in areas all throughout city not just downtown and urban centers

Key Proposal 2

- This discussion framework needs to be closely focused on outcomes that can be measured and reassessed to change as the area implemented changes. Difficult challenge to devise these metrics!
- Will bus routes change to connect suburban areas to transit and link lines, especially new stations?
- Just because a person lives in an area that's considered "too high income" to take transit does not mean that transit should not be accessible and an option
- End free parking!
- Prioritize spot improvement to active transportation network
- Bus-only lanes downtown!
- No increase to HUV due to walking sheds
- Funding should resemble % of users. Elders are not served by bikes. We must have sidewalks.
- Two-way bike traffic on a one-way street is dumb and dangerous!
- New left-side bike lanes on caompus parkway force cyclists to make right turns across the path of straight-through motor traffic that doesn't have even a stop sign. This is almost certain to kill people. Designers are either clueless or malicious – I'm not sure which.

Key Proposals 3&4

- I agree with the goal of encouraging the preservation of historic buildings – it is what gives us any character or reference to our history. Why can't you apply that thinking to the period housing and unique architecture of my residential neighborhood? That is hypocritical.
- More lodging and entertainment venues needed to provide everyday activities. Eventually we'll come to our senses and tear down these two unethically built stadia, hopefully reclaim the embezzled $ from morally bankrupt sports owners. Replace stadia with public participatory sports complex.
- Some of Seattle's poorest most vulnerable homeless people currently live on the streets around the stadium district. Think about how fancy hotels, "historic" shopping areas, food services, etc will further displace these populations. High likelihood of outcry over gentrification and criminalization of poverty. Not a bad plan but it must include massive housing support for people currently sleeping rough in SODO.
- Promote access to shelters and transition housing for populations experiencing homelessness in this district.

Key Proposal 5

- Multifamily transition zones between single family and commercial
- [to quote at bottom of board:] then your process has so far failed! None of my neighbors have been aware of the tsunami of development that is about to destroy our street. If you want real opinions, why haven't you knocked on our doors?

Key Proposal 6

- Developers build to the max allowed by zoning. Therefore you know in advance what will be built by the zoning you set. If you want a variety of housing options, the land use and zoning have to be detailed and varied to direct developers to these varied options.
- More "missing middle" housing! Duplexes, triplexes, courtyard apartments, 4-plexes, rowhouses. People should have more choices besides single family bungalows and larger apartment/condo buildings
- Promote high quality, secure bike parking!
- Bring back LDT! Ditch L1!
- Building higher, larger and denser casts long shadows, less sunlight, less room for plants, shrubs, trees, birds and habitat for all creatures including human
- Transition zone should be in the design of hub urban village, not in the adjacent single family/multifamily zone

- You are not illustrating the multi-unit, too tall townhouses actually being built today on city lots, which destroy trees and shade their neighbors from sunshine (and increase parking density on streets with no relief planned)
- Transition zones away from urban villages should extend 2 to 3 blocks with gradual transition, including small 3-4 story apartment buildings to duplexes or triplexes farther from urban village. See Kitsilano neighborhood in Vancouver BC for good example.
- Restrict added parking
- Remove parking requirements
- Also housing that is accessible to people with physical disabilities. Townhomes have lots of stairs!
- I'd like to see new development with zero parking and developer-paid orca cards for all residents instead. Secure bike parking for all new housing units!
- Create architectural plans with different footprint for ADUs in u district or other urban centers. Provide plans for free, make it small and beautiful
- Make it easy to legally have/create these types of arrangements (1-2-3 at the bottom, divide house, ADU, etc)
- Mother-in-law suites/apartments are AWESOME. Remove barriers to allow for these more easily and frequently
- What if there was higher density (i.e. multifamily units) with parking underneath?
-

Key Proposal 7

- Require all new multifamily projects above a certain size to replace demolished apartments an single family units
- What about the displacement of middle income homeowners or households?
- If developers are eliminating more affordable housing than is maintained or created for the same level of AMI, you're creating less affordable housing, not more. That's what's happening now and will continue under HALA
- IN order to have affordable housing in new developments, fee in lieu has to be really high to force developers to actually include affordable apartments
- Encourage more employment centers in those parts of SE, SW, and very north end of city where opportunity index is low. These jobs should be mostly within 5 min of walk of transit line with 15 min or more frequent service 12-14 hours/day.
- Stop assuming that old housing is bad or inadequate housing. It is often more affordable than new.
- Create a program to support co-ops for marginalized communities to counter displacement
- Be careful who we make "grand bargains" with. Developers are in business to extract profit from land. That may be okay but let's be clear that profit is the primary agenda item for them – the community values or needs.

Key Proposal 8

- Protect and expand open space in NE district. Open up watershed to responsible public access and stewardship
- This kind of "open space" is no substitute for a real park with grass, flowers, shrubs and trees. (Just paint the asphalt blue?)
- 1st: meet requirements for open space in the L.C. hub. 2nd: allow residents to determine what the content and character is for open space. 3rd: provide $ to protect the watershed and allow access.
- 1st: Fund maintenance of existing (not with regressive tax). 2nd: Fund both capital improvements and maintenance. 3rd: Seek long-term $ strategies, not levies
- Make permits dependent on adequate parks within walkshed

- Fees on developers to buy open space, or development to include it
- Fix Hubbard homestead park at Northgate, funds were diverted
- Prioritize green space in south Seattle and other lower income neighborhoods. Access to parks is important.
- "Eyes on the street" are important to make new public open spaces safe. New plazas should have accompanied housing so that they feel safer at night.
- Set and maintain priorities – do not replace housing for parks

Proposals 9&10

- Do not realign district councils to match elected districts. Elected districts can change in future censuses, but longstanding neighborhood ties will be broken. The district coordinators work for the neighborhood, not the city council.
- Redefine neighborhood councils to coincide with seven new districts. Fund district offices within department of neighborhoods
- Schools downtown? Yes!

HALA boards:

- "preservation" – no plan! No funding!
- "inclusionary" – only 60% AMI and up
- Our community includes thousands of homeless children. How livable is that?
- What about "house sharing"? (Single persons living in a single family home together). This has been a strategy to address housing affordability for me, however it has left me in an area on the margins of the city that is not transit connected.
- Condos are better than townhouses. Build up not out. Seattle townhouses are ugly, bulky and do not support stormwater management needs
- Make L1 and L2 family housing zones per planning study (2014)
- I'm concerned about the bulk and stormwater management risk of 4-pack/6-pack townhouses. Build up not out.
- Keeping existing housing is better than building new stock.
- If you set back the top floor it will have a gentler effect on the feel of the street
- I think we need higher quality public real and urban design guidelines. Developers should be required to include high quality bike parking for all units instead of car parking which induces demand.
- "Affordable" – for whom? Income levels? Which income groups would you like to see served?
- "preservation" – how? No plan!
- No net loss of existing affordable housing!
- If people could afford to live where they work there wouldn't be such a great need for more transportation. More jobs in urban villages!
- No programs in NE Seattle. Northgate elementary has one of the highest poverty rates. Lake City doubled in density, especially immigrant families.
- Prioritize hiring of teachers of color and inclusion of people of color in curriculum. Less Eurocentric history, for example.
- Livability standards
- I'd like to see more culturally-appropriate educational initiatives to support native American students
- Gas increase, rent increase, food increase, less jobs for people with no work skills hurts small businesses.
- Future trend: climate change (carbon neutrality)
- Where do the facilities go because SPS is already stressed and over burdened.

Greenlake Urban Village Map:

- There is a walkway/pedestrian underpass under 15th by 6th that makes your potential walkshed

much longer
130th Street Urban Village Map:
- Build 130th Station
- Minimal zoning change in immediate proximity (1 blcok)
- Emphasize walkability improvements to street right of way and transit access
- Walkshed is not equal to no zoning change
- 130th Street Hub Urban Village may compete with city's ability to provide support for Lake City and Bitter Lake Hub Urban Villages

Other Map Comments:
- Magnolia, Queen Anne, Laurelhurts, Sandpoint neighborhoods should be included for increased density. Unfair, otherwise, to single family homeowners in existing "urban villages" where single family housing is still affordable.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Brooke Best

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comp Plan Draft. I'm particularly concerned with the Historic Preservation component, which is now included in the new Arts & Culture (A & C) Element.

The draft Plan's emphasis on increasing density, creating affordable housing options, and greening the built environment primarily through new development leaves a big gap about the role of historic preservation in achieving this vision. Historic preservation encompasses all four core values of the Comp Plan and should be clearly referenced in other plan elements including Land Use, Housing, Environment, and Economic Development.

I challenge the City to go beyond and create a bold vision that embraces historic preservation instead of shying away from it.

One of our City's greatest assets is the rich and varied historic and cultural resources – from truly unique and regionally/nationally significant places such as the Space Needle, Smith Tower, and Pike Place Market to more personal, less prominent places that are equally important to the community character.

Early on, the City recognized the importance of preserving and protecting its architectural and historical legacy when it adopted its landmark preservation ordinance in 1973. These places contribute to Seattle's identity, create a sense of place, and serve as tangible reminders of where we came from.

Our current economic boom has resulted in unprecedented demolition of our historic building stock. These fast-paced changes, seen downtown and in all the different neighborhoods throughout the City, is creating the much-needed increased density but at a high price, resulting in the erosion of the City's heritage, physical identity, and "heart and soul," not to mention an unaffordable City for many residents.

The issue of neighborhood character is an ever-growing concern among residents as they see more and more development that has no connection to place, which creates a tension between smaller-scale older buildings and new, large-scale development. This disparity between building size, scale, and massing puts economic pressure on historic resources. Pioneer Square is feeling the impact of encroaching high-rise, over-scale development on the historic district's overall character.

The proposed Historic Preservation component (ACG5) replaces the existing Comp Plan, where the plans and policies were laid out the in the Cultural Resource element. In some ways, the proposed

Historic Preservation component reads like an add-on with little relationship to the rest of the plan's goals and policies. The proposed policies do not convey a robust historic preservation program. Was the City's Historic Preservation Program consulted as part of this Arts & Culture Element update?

The component contains a singular goal (page 140), which indicates that preservation is not a top priority in achieving a healthy, vibrant community.

The draft plan outlines 6 policies related to historic preservation and cultural resources, but the language has been weakened from the existing plan and 3 of the policies (CR12, CR14 and CR15) are no longer included.

I offer the following recommendations to strengthen the Historic Preservation component:

STRENGTHEN/EXPAND GOALS

o Foster stewardship of neighborhood, place, and landscapes as contributors to the community's viability and vitality

o Promote the economic opportunities and benefits of historic preservation

o Promote the environmental benefits of preserving and adaptively reusing historic buildings

o Prioritize preservation and adaptive use opportunities as a strategy and planning tool in Seattle's land use regulations

STRENGTHEN/EXPAND POLICIES

o Identify and establish alternative means to protect the historic character of neighborhoods selected as urban centers and villages

o Encourage development that fills in gaps within the established urban fabric

o Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings to conserve resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment

o Promote seismic and energy efficiency retrofits of historic buildings to reduce carbon emissions, save money, and improve public safety

o Encourage the creation of ecodistricts to achieve sustainability and resource efficiency at a district scale

o Encourage the adaptive reuse of historic community structures, such as meeting halls, schools, and religious buildings, for uses that continue their role as neighborhood anchors

o Protect and preserve archeological resources

STRENGTHEN/EXPAND PROPOSED SURVEY/INVENTORY POLICY (AC5.3)

o Prioritize inventory efforts as part of future planning projects, with a focus on areas of anticipated growth

o Expand efforts to encourage preservation in under-represented areas and historic/cultural resources

CONNECT WITH OTHER PLAN ELEMENTS

o In terms of land use, the Comp Plan should encourage a balance of new, context-sensitive development that fills in gaps within the established urban fabric.

o In terms of in the environment, create a strong policy that promotes building retrofits as a means of achieving reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Comp Plan should demonstrate the City's leadership by developing strong policies that encourage stewardship of existing buildings as part of its sustainability goals.

Look around: the City's most vibrant urban neighborhoods are those with a high concentration of historic building stock and mixed-scale development. It is critical for the City to invest in its future by balancing new growth with the existing building fabric. Stewardship of our historic properties is an important priority along with clean water, natural resources, open space, environmental stewardship, and social equity.

Seattle 2035 should lay out a path that leverages our historic and cultural resources in achieving healthy, complete communities that provide a high quality of life for future generations.

Our children are counting on it.

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Donald Brubeck

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

2035 Planning Team:
Please find attached my comments on the draft plan.
Thank you for the opportunity to participate.
--
November 15, 2015
To: Seattle 2035 Planning Team
Subject: Comments on Draft Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update
The Comprehensive Plan obligates the City to provide infrastructure to accommodate growth targets. I am writing to support Comprehensive Plan elements that encourage the use of bicycle transportation. Improving our transportation network for safe use of bicycles for daily transportation is a cost effective way to accommodate growth, and has many other benefits for public health, community well-being, and environmental quality. If developed with care and with true involvement of the affected communities, bicycle transportation infrastructure improvements may also help fulfill Seattle's goals of equity and racial and social justice.
Comments on the overall Strategies:
1. Growth Strategy
The growth strategy is to "Guide more growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of frequent transit." I suggest that this be expanded to include areas within a 10-minute bicycle ride to frequent transit with ample bike parking.
2. Land Use
The land use provisions would "Designate a Stadium District on the Future Land Use Map, an area around the professional stadiums, where housing and hotels would be permitted while protecting freight mobility."
I suggest expanding this to include planning for transit, bike and walking access to and through the stadium district to protect freight mobility by providing alternatives to private vehicle access.
3. Transportation
I strongly support the strategy to "Move towards transportation service standards that consider all travel modes, including pedestrians, bicycles, cars, trucks, and transit."
4. Parks and Open Space
The plan would "Set goals for parks and open space that focus on quality, equity, and proximity to jobs and residences."
To achieve these goals, include policies that would promote park access by bicycle, and use of parks to provide safe walking and cycling connections as part of neighborhood routes accessible for all ages and abilities. This would particularly improve equity and quality of life for those too young to drive to parks.
Comments on Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update November 15, 2015
2
Comments on the Four Core Values
1. Race and Social Equity
The plan strives to address displacement and the unequal distribution of opportunities, to sustain a diverse Seattle. The Draft Plan promotes equitable access to housing, jobs, education, parks, community centers, and healthy food. For transportation planning I suggest inclusion of these strategies:

• Engage the whole community in outreach and planning.
• Use alternatives beyond standard public meetings and mainstream online social media to connect to disadvantaged and non-English speaking communities.
• Take special care that transportation infrastructure improvements are not just avenues of gentrification, improving districts to the point that low income people are pushed out by wealthier colonizers attracted by the newly improved conditions

2. Environmental Stewardship

Seattle protects rural areas, forests, and green spaces in the city by taking on a significant share of the region's growth and concentrating that growth in urban villages. The City is committed to become carbon neutral by 2050. The Draft Plan calls for development that makes biking, walking, and transit viable options, so people can be less car-reliant.

I support this goal. More than 40% of Seattle's carbon emissions are from surface transportation. Seattle cannot meet its Climate Action Plan goal to be carbon neutral by 2050, and protect its air and water quality from pollution, without making biking, walking, and transit viable options that are actually used for the majority of all trips.

3. Economic Opportunity and Security

Jobs and livable wages create opportunity and stability in Seattle's communities. The Draft Plan includes policies that help the City accommodate and direct employment growth. It also addresses the education and skills residents need to fill the new jobs in Seattle.

Providing safe, efficient, connected transit, bicycle and walking routes, with bike share and car share options, will help alleviate the high cost of new housing, and rental rate increases for existing housing, by making it feasible to live without the expense of owning a car. The growth in Seattle population is primarily in young adults, the age group most like to walk, ride or use transit.

Bicycle infrastructure is cost effective, keeping the tax burden down. It has far lower cost per mile and cost per trip than light rail, streetcar, or new vehicle lane construction. This adds to financial security for people on fixed income or low income.

Comments on Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update November 15, 2015
3

4. Community

As Seattle grows and becomes more diverse, the Draft Plan encourages more public participation in decisions affecting all aspects of City policies. The comments regarding Race and Social Equity apply to this value as well. Investments that promote walking and bike riding as viable options to driving a car are investments in public health and community life. They improve public health by reducing air pollution and noise, and reducing injuries and deaths caused by vehicle crashes. They improve the quality of community life on the streets and in neighborhood and downtown commercial districts.

Transportation Element

"Transportation systems will respond to travel demands, economic needs, development patterns, and changing lifestyles. Seattle will continue to work with regional transportation agencies to move people within the city and the region."

I support these Goals/Policies:

• T1.6 Improve connections to urban centers and villages from all Seattle neighborhoods, particularly by providing a variety of affordable travel options (bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities)
• T2.1 Designate space in the public right-of-way to accommodate multiple travel modes.
• T3.1 Develop and maintain high-quality, affordable and connected bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities.
• T3.9 Develop and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities that enhance the predictability and safety

of all users.
• T3.10 Prioritize bicycle and pedestrian investments on the basis of increasing use, safety, connectivity, equity, health, livability, and opportunities to leverage funding.
• TG6 Provide and maintain a safe transportation system that protects all travelers, particularly the most vulnerable users.
• T6.3 Invest in education measures that increase mutual awareness among motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

Comments on Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update November 15, 2015
4
I support the new draft consideration of right-of-way allocation and function, with the idea of multi-functional streets, making the best use of the streets we have. Allocate space on Seattle's streets to safely and efficiently connect people and good to their destinations while creating inviting spaces within the ROW (Goal TG2) I have concern about draft considerations #4 and 5 for integrating priorities:
"4. Prioritize shared and shorter duration uses". This may work against the need for full time separated bike routes in some places, having unintended negative consequences. Often, bicycle routes are best as separated routes, not shared.
"5. Relocate the most flexible uses to other streets or private property". This consideration could be misinterpreted in several ways, including considering bicycle use to be the most flexible use, and easiest to shunt off to longer, steeper, less convenient routes.
Level of Service (LOS)
I support the changes suggested by Puget Sound Regional Council is to a LOS standard that focus on all modes of transportation.
Sincerely,
Don Brubeck

Date: 11/14/2015

Name: Brian Palidar

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

On the whole I support the 2035 Comp Plan, which I find to be a vast improvement over its predecessor. See below for some elements of the plan where I would like to note either strong support or dissent.
URBAN VILLAGE MAP
Strong Support for:
• Expansion of Urban Village around transit stations at Beacon Hill, Crown Hill, Othello, Mt. Baker, Rainier Beach.
• New UV at 130th transit station in Pinehurst with large walkshed.
Good, but should go further:
• Urban Village expansion in Ballard, Columbia, WS Junction should be bigger, given the location of the station on the edge of the current boundary.
• Fremont UV expansion seems trivial, should be more significant.
Areas where action is needed:
• There is still a gap between the 23rd, Madison-Miller, & First Hill/Cap Hill that is not in an Urban Village. This was a bizarre omission that should be corrected in the 2035 plan. This area seems like the very definition of a central neighborhood well served by transit & amenities.
• The Wallingford Urban Village should expand to the north & south of 45th on the east end of the UV.

SINGLE FAMILY ZONES

The HALA report was unambiguous that our longstanding policy of maintaining exclusive single-family zones has become untenable.

Support:

• LU8.5 – Expand the types of housing that can be built in single family zones. Should be explicit to consider allowing duplex, triplex, cottage, courtyard and other similar kinds of traditional neighborhood scale ground-based housing types compatible in scale with single family homes.

• LU8.11 – Allow large sites to be redeveloped more densely that traditional single family to provide housing opportunities in SF neighborhoods that are more affordable than single family development.

• Comp plan 2035 does not contain a clause prohibiting the rezoning of SF parcels. Strongly Support.

• LU8.12 – Support, but should be changed to strike "low-income" from the language. Housing choices are important for everyone at all income levels.

Oppose:

• LU8.8 – Minimum lot sizes are like minimum home sizes: They are exclusionary& deny opportunities for smaller, less expensive infill homes .

MULTI-FAMILY ZONES

Support:

• LU9.1: Rezone portions of the city to increase the amount of land available for multi-family development.

• LU 9.7: The city should support MF development with ground level open space and family-friendly amenities by creating incentives that reward developers that provide it.

• LU9.16: We should add a new goal aimed at matching housing supply to demand. Support innovative design, new housing types, and encourage the creation of housing supply that can meet the needs of a housing market that is rapidly changing.

Oppose:

• LU9.3: Strongly oppose the idea of "balancing" the need for new housing stock with preservation of neighborhood character. That might be an appropriate goal in a single family zone, but the MF zones are areas of the city where housing production is the priority. The character should and must change.

• LU9.4: Remove the words "compatible scale", and "maintain views". These are not realistic or appropriate goals in neighborhoods transitioning from 1-2 story bungalows to 4-5 story apartments.

• LU9.6: Multi-family uses should have some reasonable accommodation for incorporation of small scale commercial use without a need for re-zoning.

• LU9.10-9.11: The description hops right from low-rise ownership housing to mid-rise housing. The middle scale of 3-5 story apartment buildings is missing from these descriptions.

HOUSING

Support:

• H2.1 thru H2.5 Promote housing innovation that accommodates growth, builds more housing, provides more access for more people to more neighborhoods.

• H2.7: There is a huge inventory of underused public land, either sitting idle or used for surface parking that could be put into productive use to provide affordable housing.

• H4.7: Promote flexibility in our land use code to achieve better quality housing that can adapt to changing needs.

• H5.1-H5.23: Strongly support these goals, mostly derived from the HALA report (except goal H5.10, see below).

Oppose:

• H3.2: I can think of no example of a successful policy that uses development and design standards to

promote affordable housing preservation. The HALA report is clear that this is a goal that requires the commitment of resources (money) to subsidize rents and purchase properties. Restricting development as a means of increasing affordability is a foolish and counter-productive strategy.
• H5.10: Unclear if this goal is simply naive or is intended as the basis for draconian restrictions on the use of private property. Affordable housing requires the commitment of resources, which requires taxes. "Encouraging" rental housing owners to pursue the cities affordable housing goals without incentive or compensation is a form of rent control, with all of the attendant downsides and unintended consequences.

Date: 11/15/2015

Name: Nikki D'Onofrio

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Housing

Comment:

The Draft Plan includes graphs on page 14 showing the gender and age distribution in Seattle, urban centers, and King County. While Seattle may continue to be a city that attracts young people, those distributions are very likely to change with a huge portion of our population aging and with people living longer than ever. 10,000 baby boomers are turning 65 every day in the United States. In 2035 those people will turn 85. As stated on page 141 of the Plan, "elders can help sustain our history and culture." This is something I have witnessed with my work with older adults, many of whom have lived in Seattle for their whole lives—sometimes 90+ years! As a city, we will all benefit from continuing to include the voices of older adults in planning and ensuring that as we look to the future, the needs of a diverse population of older adults are included. We must also ensure that Seattle's growth does not displace older adults.

I am very pleased to see that affordable housing and walkability are among the main goals of this plan, considering both how much I love to walk myself and how the U.S. Surgeon General recently launched the "Step It Up!" campaign, encouraging city planners to "design streets, sidewalks, and crosswalks that encourage walking for people of all ages and abilities" (http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/calls/walking-and-walkable-communities/sectors.html).

As Seattle goes forward with this plan, I encourage the city to ensure that services for older adults are available in all Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages, and Residential Urban Villages. For example, you have identified Northgate as an Urban Center and Lake City as a Hub Urban Villages, but neither location currently has a full-time senior center where older adults can access recreational and fitness opportunities, social services, healthy meals, and opportunities to connect with others, which reduces social isolation. One of the policy proposals is to "Encourage public and private efforts that support culturally appropriate food opportunities, including grocery stores, farmers markets, food banks and nutrition programs, especially to meet the nutritional needs of infants, children, elders, and other vulnerable populations in their neighborhoods" (CW 3.6). This should include more senior centers that are easily accessible by foot and bus.

H3.3 addressing the range of housing needed for older adults is an important part of this plan. I also encourage the city to consider multi-generational housing as we are seeing more and more grandparents caring for their grandchildren. When grandparents live in age-restricted housing, especially because this housing may actually be affordable to them, they face significant challenges in finding housing for them and their grandchildren.

I ask the Mayor's office to continue seeking the input of elders. I'll turn 50 in 2035, but despite my interest in gerontology and experience as an intern at a local senior center and MSW student at UW, it can be difficult for me to anticipate my own needs as I age. Please learn about the needs of older adults

now so that the City may better prepare for an aging population in 2035 and beyond.
Thank you.

Date: 11/16/2015

Name: Carey Holmes

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Good Morning Patrice,

I have been searching for the most appropriate planner for reviewing feedback on the proposed Urban Village Expansion in North Beacon Hill. Your name was given to me by Lisa Rutzick, Manager of Seattle Design Review Program. If this letter has not reached the correct person, please let me know who would the most effective contact for receiving community on this particular proposal. For ease of communication I have also copied the Department of Neighborhoods South District Coordinators as this pertains to their district.

The North Beacon Hill Proposed Urban Village Expansion map included in the 2035 Draft Plan (dated 8/10/15) illustrates a 'generalized expansion boundary' based on an assumed 10 minute walk to the Beacon Hill light rail station and the small 2-bus line transit hub located in front of the Beacon Hill station. The proposed boundary shown in this exhibit does not accurately reflect the 10 minute walk criteria, so I have attached a marked-up copy of this map with a proposed expansion boundary line revision that accurately reflects the 10-minute walk criteria. Please see attached.

The proposed boundary line revision is based on actual pedestrian research conducted by local community members who have tested the 10 minute criteria. All community members involved in this study are residents of North Beacon Hill, and physically active and healthy individuals in the 30 – 55 year old age range. The research did not take into account walk times for disabled individuals, individuals over the age of 55, or individuals accompanying children (which would likely decrease the 10 minute walkshed radius by at least 1 -2 blocks).

As you will see, there is a significant discrepancy between the generalized boundary included in the 2035 plan, and the specific local pedestrian research. Our assumption is that the generalized boundary did not take into account the significant topography drop that exists just a few blocks from the Light Rail station. The residents of North Beacon Hill would like for the 2035 Planning Team to strongly consider revising the North Beacon Hill Urban Village Expansion per the local pedestrian research and community feedback illustrated in the attached document. Our community appreciates the opportunity that DPD and the Seattle 2035 Planning Team has given us to submit feedback on this proposal. We hope to see this feedback implemented into Seattle 2035's 2016 Recommendation proposal.

Our community is happy to provide further feedback or discussion on this issue. Please let me know if we can be of further assistance to DPD or the Seattle 2035 Planning Team on this issue.

Thanks much,

Carey Dagliano Holmes
Design Professional Representative, DPD's South East Design Review Board

Date: 11/16/2015

Name: North Beacon Hill Community Group,Carey Holmes

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Good Morning Seattle 2035 Planning Team,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit community feedback on the Seattle 2035 Plan Draft. Below and attached is community feedback on the proposed North Beacon Urban Village Expansion for your consideration. Please review this feedback let us know what your next steps on this issue will be. For ease of communication I have also copied the Department of Neighborhoods South District Coordinators as this pertains to their district.

The North Beacon Hill Proposed Urban Village Expansion map included in the 2035 Draft Plan (dated 8/10/15) illustrates a 'generalized expansion boundary' based on an assumed 10 minute walk to the Beacon Hill light rail station and the small 2-bus line transit hub located in front of the Beacon Hill station. The proposed boundary shown in this exhibit does not accurately reflect the 10 minute walk criteria, so I have attached a marked-up copy of this map with a proposed expansion boundary line revision that accurately reflects the 10-minute walk criteria. Please see attached.

The proposed boundary line revision is based on actual pedestrian research conducted by local community members who have tested the 10 minute criteria. All community members involved in this study are residents of North Beacon Hill, and physically active and healthy individuals in the 30 – 55 year old age range. The research did not take into account walk times for disabled individuals, individuals over the age of 55, or individuals accompanying children (which would likely decrease the 10 minute walkshed radius by at least 1 -2 blocks).

As you will see, there is a significant discrepancy between the generalized boundary included in the 2035 plan, and the specific local pedestrian research. Our assumption is that the generalized boundary did not take into account the significant topography drop that exists just a few blocks from the Light Rail station. The residents of North Beacon Hill would like for the 2035 Planning Team to strongly consider revising the North Beacon Hill Urban Village Expansion per the local pedestrian research and community feedback illustrated in the attached document. Our community appreciates the opportunity that DPD and the Seattle 2035 Planning Team has given us to submit feedback on this proposal. We hope to see this feedback implemented into Seattle 2035's 2016 Recommendation proposal.

Our community is happy to provide further feedback or discussion on this issue. Please let me know if we can be of further assistance to DPD or the Seattle 2035 Planning Team on this issue.

Thanks much,

Carey Dagliano Holmes
Design Professional Representative, DPD's South East Design Review Board

Date: 11/16/2015

Name: Curt Green

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I recently picked up a copy of a survey on the draft complain at a public meeting in West Seattle. There is no instruction on the survey about where to mail it.
Was also told the survey was available on-line at 2035.seattle.gov. Unable to find it at that site.
Help please. Thanks
Curt Green
Sent from my iPad

Date: 11/16/2015

Name: Jiayun Chen

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being

Comment:

I understand the need for higher density city given the population growth. I don't have problems with increasing density in general, but I feel current laws are inadequate to regulate conflicts that can arise. I am wondering what measures will be taken to ensure noise and parking compliance given the higher density. In general, areas zoned as single family tend to not produce a lot of noise, and a family on a single family lot tend not to have too many cars that need to be street parked. If a previous single family house is turned into 3 townhome units each with their own garage and gets purchased by separate homeowners, it may not have a big impact on noise and parking for neighbors. However, if a single family house is turned into a high density rental boarding house and rented to 10 university students, then they may produce significant noise, not take care of property, and occupy an unfair share of street parking. This will have significant impact on the existing neighborhood, causing a lot of grievance. I feel we need to distinguish between these 2 use cases and treat them differently. What are some measures to prevent the second scenario from ruining a neighborhood?
--
Jiayun

Date: 11/16/2015

Name: Alan Bernahl

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

I have reviewed this plan and find it lacking in quality. Too much leaning on public transportation and not enough on roadways and providing better access for automobiles, especially at peak periods. With kids, shopping, visiting your elderly relatives you cannot use public transportation well. Also light rail serves only a few and more money needs to be put into buses that will serve the many areas of our community. I an disapointed with your conclusions and the overall plan. Back to the drawing board!

Date: 11/16/2015

Name: Kimberly Sims

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I attended the open house on Nov. 14. I was disappointed that questions were not allowed in a public forum so that attendees could hear everyone's questions. This was a big oversight on the part of the organizers. Most disturbing to me was that the big questions were
not being asked. Namely:
1) Is the projected growth a good thing for our city?
2) What impact will projected growth have on the city's infrastructure?
3) Who will pay for these impacts?
4) What impact will growth have on our water and air resources?
5) Can the city grow and keep a high quality of life for the beings that call this place home: trees, fish, wildlife, birds, insects, plants, soil microbes, humans etc?

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Yuval Fogelson

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

before after SEATTLE - http://www.urb-i.com/#!seattle/xpwx9

Date: 11/17/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Can consider allowing accessory dwelling units most places to add a small living space for students, relatives, extra income to pay increasing property taxes.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @SNGreenways

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

.@SNGreenways takes over @Seattle2035 acct today 8AM - 5PM
Share your comprehensive vision 4 Seattle transportation & land use!

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @SeaStrap

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 no way

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @SeaStrap

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

@Seattle2035 trouble is, if you can't afford a SFH or an apt/condo In a village, then you're living on an arterial with terrible Com zoning

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @SeaStrap

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

@Seattle2035 we need to recognize that multifamily housing in non-village areas deserve safe streets and walkability. Hybrid btw P&C zones

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @WillSeattle

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

@bruteforceblog @Seattle2035 @NEGreenways it's done due to higher MFH resistance in non arterial blocks by SFH racism

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @SNGreenways Would love to see street improvements and policies that you all think could be beneficial to pursue to 2035.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @QAGreenways

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

By 2035, I would like Queen Anne to have just one &$@%# greenway. @Seattle2035 (Censored to comply with city social media policies.)

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @QAGreenways

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

All I ask is for Queen Anne to get its greenway sometime before Goodspaceguy gets his Mars colony. @Seattle2035 @SNGreenways

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @kptrease

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @NEGreenways most desirable neighborhoods (judging by $/square foot) dense & walkable, not necessarily right on arterials.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @kptrease

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

@Seattle2035 @NEGreenways but all built pre current zoning. ie, housing form people will bid most money for is currently illegal to build.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @MHerschensohn

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

@QAGreenways @Seattle2035 @SNGreenways
Funny. It does. In 1940, The 1 2 3 4 (13) electric trolleys replaced all the streetcar lines.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @waymarkers

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

@Seattle2035 diverse and multiple options and opportunities are key! @PPS_Placemaking has the right idea! http://pic.twitter.com/LTeOWqY9VG

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @typewriteralley

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

In @seattle2035, I hope all of our bike infrastructure looks the same and is safe for ALL users.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @kptrease

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

@Seattle2035 2.5M would require 91k new residents (and housing for them) every year until 2035.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @kptrease

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

@Seattle2035 2.5M would also take our density to 29.6k/mi^2. More than NYC right now. Half again as much as SF.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @QAGreenways

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

By 2035, Seattle's paint-n-plastic bike infrastructure will wear away ten times over. Will we make it permanent? @Seattle2035 @seabikeblog

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @NoSpandexReq

Draft Plan Element: Transportation, Utilities

Comment:

@QAGreenways @Seattle2035 @seabikeblog I really want something other than popsicle stick infrastructure

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @NoSpandexReq

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

By @Seattle2035 we better have all all/abilities infrastructure

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: @kptrease

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@NoSpandexReq @HyperboreanWolf @Seattle2035 to be fair, buying every single child a balance bike would have impact you could see from space.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Michael Spence

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Dear Mr. Hauger and other members of the Planning Team:
I represent the owners of the ____ Admiral Way, which are located at the intersection of Admiral Way and 45th Ave. SW. __ Admiral Way is an 8,100 square foot 11-unit apartment building on a 5,290 square foot lot that was built in 1958. ___ Admiral Way is 1740 square foot triplex on a 2640 square foot lot that was built in 1912. Both lots are currently zoned SF 5000 and are located in the northwest corner of the Admiral Residential Urban Village.
At the time they were built, both buildings complied with the then-applicable zoning. However, in 1957, they were zoned RS 5000, even though the buildings were either built (in the case of __) or permitted (in the case of __). The triplex at __ Admiral therefore became legally non-conforming in 1957, and the building at __ was legally non-conforming the day it was built.
Despite this, the proposed Land Use Map for the Admiral Residential Urban Villages proposes to retain the single-family designation for these properties in the Comprehensive Plan. With this letter, we suggest that the more appropriate designation is Lowrise Multifamily.
There are many reasons why this makes sense. First, they are the only properties along Admiral Way within the Residential Urban Village that are designated as single family. Every other property along Admiral is designated Lowrise Multifamily, as you can clearly see in the attached screenshot, which is from the proposed Land Use Map itself:
Second, the property is located directly on at least four bus routes, and within five blocks (and therefore a 10-minute walk) of at least three more:
As such, it is less than a ten minute walk to frequent transit, which is a goal strongly supported in the GMA, other sections of the Comprehensive Plan, and the survey work your department has done:
Third, specific policy language in the proposed Plan update supports this designation, either in the Land Use Element or in the Urban Village Strategy:
From the Land Use Element:

LU 9.1: Designate as multifamily residential areas those places that are either predominantly occupied by multifamily development or are located where a greater concentration of residential development is desired at various intensities consistent with the urban village strategy

LU 9.6: Establish multifamily residential use as the predominant use in multifamily areas while limiting the number and type of non-residential uses, to preserve the residential character of these areas, protect these areas from negative impacts of incompatible uses, and maintain development opportunities for multifamily use

From the Urban Village Strategy:

Locating more residents, jobs, stores, and services near each other can reduce people's reliance on cars, thereby decreasing fossil fuels and greenhouse gas emissions. Increasing residential and employment densities in locations makes transit and other public services convenient for more people, and it also makes providing these key services more efficient. This can be a benefit to transit-dependent populations and to those who rely on other community services (p. 22)

The City will especially focus growth within urban centers and urban villages in the areas within easy walking distance of frequent and reliable transit service. The presence of transit reinforces the walkability and decreased car dependency intended in the urban villages by providing viable alternatives to cars for area residents and employees. The centers and villages also provide focal points for locating services and public gathering places. (p. 23)

GS 2.7: Promote levels of density, mixes of uses, and transit improvements that will support the use of walking, biking, and public transportation.

GS 3.1: Encourage residential growth in places around the city that are conducive to compact, well-served urban living.

I should also add that the Mayor's recently-completed Housing and Livability Agenda (HALA), otherwise known as the "Grand Bargain" speaks directly to this designation in Strategy MF.3:

Strategies MF.2 and MF.3 - Further the Urban Village growth strategy by expanding the boundaries of Urban Villages to reflect walking proximity to transit, services and amenities and by converting Single Family zoned land within Urban Villages to a more intensive use
To summarize, the properties are already developed with multifamily structures, they are the only properties along Admiral within the RUV that are not designated Lowrise Multifamily, they are located within a 10 minute walk of seven bus routes and a Lowrise Multifamily designation is strongly supported by specific policy language in the Comprehensive Plan and by a specific recommendation in the "Grand Bargain".
Thank you for your attention to this request. I may be reached if there are any questions.
Michael A. Spence | Helsell Fetterman LLP

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Bryan Kirschner

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Within 20 years the human-driven car will be extinct, replaced by autonomous cars. Traffic, parking, and accidents as we know them will be things of the past assuming we embrace computer-driven cars as a matter of policy. The technology is sound _today_.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Andres Tangalin

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

The proposed expansion of the North Rainier Urban Village into the Mount Baker residential neighborhood, and into the hillside adjacent to Cheasty Greenspace is not a practical solution. The expansion encroaches the Mount Baker neighborhood streets near Mount Baker Boulevard and Franklin High School. The green space near Cheasty should not be part of this proposed dense urban village expansion. This proposed expansion lacks sensitivity with the loss of green space and forever altering the character of the Mount Baker neighborhood as well as Franklin High School. Flat maps do not fully express how the actual edifices impose their visual and physical impact on the neighborhood and the traffic and parking activity that will follow.
The City to needs to look at the Town Center development still waiting to happen in all those empty spaces surrounding our Mount Baker Light Link Station.

Andres Tangalin

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Alison Van Gorp

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I wanted to drop a quick comment in support of the proposed expansion of the urban village in Mt Baker. I have not had a chance to review the full comp plan proposal, but i did review the proposal in regards to my neighborhood, Mt Baker. I supported the North Rainier rezone last year and now I support the proposed expansion of the urban village boundary. I think both concepts are mutually supportive and will help to keep housing costs more affordable while giving more families the opportunity to live in a great neighborhood.
I live and own a home less than a block from Franklin High School. It appears that the expansion will run right up the center of my street - affecting my neighbors homes but not mine (we will get all of the impacts but none of the financial benefits of the upzone). Yes, this could allow homes across the street from mine to eventually redevelop into higher density buildings. I am fine with that! I would welcome more people and more diversity to my block. Our neighborhood is a great place to live and our access to parks, open space and transit is some of the best in the city. More families should be able to enjoy these amenities, which are currently underutilized. I hope that someday we have more options for local dining and retail within walking distance and additional neighbors can help to make that vision viable. I welcome this change and the ancillary benefits it can bring to the neighborhood.
Thank you,
Alison Van Gorp

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: TJ Gallo

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Hello,
My original email bounced back to me, as it had an error in the email address. I am re-sending this to both parties with the correction.

The attached commentary is regarding the Developers request for a waiver to build a taller and bigger building than allowed at 2203 Eastlake Ave East. Among many other issues, this request blocks views and creates traffic issues for our local residents and we are firmly opposed to allowing the approval of this waiver.

Thank you,
TJ Gallo

From: TJ Gallo
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 3:51 PM
Subject: Project # 3016024 - Eastlake Avenue Development

Hello,
Please see the attached communication, concerning the rezoning consideration that is underway for the developers on Eastlake Avenue (Project # 3016024). I am an Eastlake resident for 20+ years and I am sending you this communication to contest the building code amendments, particularly the proposed height rezone request, currently in process on Project # 3016024.

Sincerely,
TJ Gallo
Founder & CEO
The Premier Companies, Inc.
Re: Project # 3016024 – Eastlake rezoning of height restriction request, proposed granting to developer allowing the rezone of the NW corner (lots 2203 and 2209) of Eastlake Ave. Dear Hearing Examiner and Seattle Council Members, I am an Eastlake resident and I am sending you this communication to contest the building code amendments, particularly the proposed height rezone request being done by Project # 3016024). As a 20 year Eastlake resident, I have seen much new development in our neighborhood. I have corresponded with many of our Eastlake community members whose general sentiment to new development is not negative.
Real estate acquisition with healthy development or re-development projects can improve the quality of existing land or real estate as well as improve the safety and overall appeal of a neighborhood. However, the current proposed request (Project # 3016024) to rezone the height restrictions does not fall within that objective. The residents of Eastlake have historically desired our neighborhood for many reasons. Eastlake is a charming neighborhood, offering great freeway access, close distance to downtown including restaurants, shopping and business. However, a primary attraction is that Eastlake offers these amenities while maintaining a friendly suburban feel, similar to more distanced communities, further away from the city 's core. This particular feel and desire is a vital part of maintaining the attraction to Eastlake, while continuing to conserve initiatives for families that care about safety, limited traffic congestion, freeway access, appeal and values of our neighborhood and respective real estate. This particular proposal to rezone (and increase) the current height restrictions is precisely where the disruption of vital neighborhoods begins. Current code height restrictions were originally mandated to protect the vitality of our neighborhood in all the ways that have already been mentioned. It is critical to our Eastlake residents that we continue to maintain these covenants (and the associated benefits).
I speak for myself as well as my friends and neighbors of the Eastlake neighborhood when I say that we firmly object to allowing developers to simply bypass these quality code initiatives in an effort to further capitalize on their land investment. The single-focused benefit to the developers is money. Developers can lower their fixed costs for construction across multiple floors and ultimately yield a higher

volume of units on the same piece of land. That is their exclusive objective, not staying in the neighborhood and ensuring that it maintains its vitality. This particular developer knew very well what the current height restrictions were when they purchased the land. Further, they had ample opportunity during their feasibility and pre-development stages to make educated decisions on the land acquisition and its buildable viability, under the current code. Requesting a rezone today, (particularly after their acquisition) is simply a capitalistic tactic, which is not taken kindly. This effort is clearly being done in hopes that the developers can reach higher profitability than they originally penciled into their financial analysis, while hoping that the neighbors of Eastlake might not catch this rezone request and have the chance to object to it. This transparent agenda is not to be taken lightly.

Some (but not all) of the negative impacts of a rezone would include:

- Further traffic congestion (which is already becoming significantly worse over
- the last 10 years) and associated risks of accidents and obstruction.
- Negatively growing concerns of "commercialization impact" to existing Eastlake
- neighborhood residents, whom already share a meticulously balanced blend of
- residential and commercial real estate interests.
- Loss of views of the city, which are highly desired, and are reflective in the
- prices that homeowners have paid for, when originally purchasing their homes.
- Decreases in property values for many Eastlake neighbors (many of whom have
- fought very hard to keep their homes during the most recent great recession).
- Further, value decreases (due to lost views, traffic, etc.) are measurable
- damages that can clearly be articulated and supported by strict appraisal
- guidelines, such as those listed in the Uniform Standards of Professional
- Appraisal Practice (USPAP).
- Increase in crime rates due to increased density, via excessive urbanization.

The Eastlake neighbors feel that we have already participated in giving our input on the tolerable building codes, as previously expressed when zoning regulations were originally and recently finalized. Further, as clearly outlined in design planning definition of Seattle's Residential Urban Villages, "The Plan designates 18 residential urban villages, including places like Columbia City, Admiral, Upper Queen Anne and Wallingford. These are places expected to experience primarily residential growth. They have capacity for some commercial growth within their smaller business districts."

This design philosophy was done with significant purpose, as to ensure that the "village" communities were specifically planned to continue promoting residential community living areas, which is directly conflicts increasing higher-density multifamily inventory. That inventory type belongs within the proper downtown Seattle districts, as already exists within those interior areas (i.e. Belltown, Pioneer Square, etc.) and is further articulated in the 2035 planning.

In conclusion, we ask you to continue to adhere to the existing code mandates on height restrictions. We further ask that you listen to our serious objections to this type of change and overall concerns to protect our Eastlake neighborhood today. Communities are best maintained and ultimately strengthened by the collaborative voices of the residents of that community. As Eastlake community members, we all have significant investments into our community (financial, emotional, building families, etc.) and we are asking for your help today to continue protecting what we have worked so hard to build and maintain. If the council has any trepidation about adhering to today's existing building codes, I ask that you put forth additional efforts into obtaining further community input and opinions, before making a decision. I would also ask that you keep me personally involved in this process, ensuring that myself, and my fellow neighbors have ample time and opportunity to voice our concerns and/or respond to any requests for information on the matter, before a final decision is made.

Sincerely,

TJ Gallo
Founder & CEO
The Premier Companies, Inc.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Rob Harrison

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the expansion of the Rainer North Urban Village.
I live in a single-family house near the intersection of 29th Ave S. and S. Walker Street. Our house is just one block from the proposed expansion of the Rainier North Urban Village, which looks as though it will extend to 28th Ave S. I would be happy to have our house included in the Urban Village overlay, but I also understand the logic of the new boundaries reflecting a ten-minute walk from the Mt Baker Link Station. Of course, our block would qualify if we were measuring walking distance to frequent transit, as the 7, 9, and 48 buses on Rainier Ave S and S. Walker are just 8 minutes away, and the 8 at MLK Way and S. Walker is just a five minute walk.
I support welcoming new people to Seattle. I support making wonderful neighborhoods affordable to more people, including my now twelve-year-old son, who if I am lucky may like to live near me when he grows up. To these ends I support increasing the amount and types of housing we can build both in our Urban Villages and in our Single Family Zones. I support making public transit easily accessible to more people. There is nothing about these ideas that is incompatible with the Olmsted plans for Mt Baker, or generally with the Mt Baker Town Center plan.
Sincerely,
Rob
Rob Harrison cPHc
Certified Passive House Consultant
HARRISON architects

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Angela

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hi there,

I am writing because it has come to the attention of the Mt. Baker neighborhood community that you are proposing expansion of the "Urban Village" farther into the residential streets near 30th Ave S and McClellan where I live. Having just moved into the neighborhood because I loved the integrity of the green space and single family craftsman homes, I am very concerned by the proposed expansion of the North Rainier Urban Village. There is no need to disrupt the stable Mount Baker neighborhood when development in the existing North Rainier Urban Village (including the vacant Town Center) has not even started! There are dozens of vacant lots or empty buildings that no one is leasing or building on. Until the city can prove out that this project will create a wanted development of businesses and residences that will get used, I think it is reckless to jeopardize the neighborhood we all love with more density and crime.

Thank you for reading,
Angela

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: William Gohde

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

The following are random comments regarding the Comprehensive Plan: First off, regarding off-street parking. By allowing multi-unit buildings a bye in providing parking is a gross error in judgement and a hardship on surrounding neighbors and businesses. The audacity of assuming people don't need cars and will take public transportation or ride a bike is ludicrous! Aside from it being a baseless assumption, it is extremely short-sighted. One look at the Metro map shows large neighborhood sections that are neglected or under served. People still use cars...cars that they drive to areas not served by a bus...they use cars for personal use, picking kids up from school, going to the doctor, going fishing, getting together with friends across town, etc. You get the idea. Note too, that cars are parked in the surrounding neighborhoods where there is bus service, effectively blocking residents access to their own homes. And to think everyone is going to hop on a bike, is ridiculous. (Incidentally, to help pay for all those new bike lanes as the plan proposes - cyclists should pay a bike fee for using the streets too.) Only a small minority of people actually ride and that number will probably not change significantly. Next is the interesting notion of allowing multi-unit housing throughout existing single family neighborhoods. What the city fails to realize is the reason people move out of the city: to escape the concrete canyons for raising families. It is what makes Seattle so livable and attractive. (Example: West Seattle has one of the largest concentrations of families in the city.) Any yet, the city feels fit to expand the very element that people are trying to avoid! No argument on the need for Urban villages...if their expansion is controlled and adequate transportation is provided. Case in point: West Seattle. Note on the Metro map West Seattle has received nothing more than a few more "C" route buses. There are no feeder buses and the concept of rapid transit is ignored. In WS case, transit takers now take up all available parking in the surrounding area to take the bus. This is fascinating, considering West Seattle is currently undergoing massive growth that rivals any neighborhood in Seattle. Writing glowing platitudes about what the future may look like is fine, but realistic reasoning and hard objectivity are also necessary. The Comprehensive Plan has a long way to go.
I would suggest for the second go-around you allow ordinary citizens to be part of the process. It is evident developers have already had their input. In closing, this a good start...now the real work begins.
Thank you.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Dashel Schueler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

As a Mount Baker resident, I support expanding the Urban Village boundary around the Mount Baker Station. Thank you.

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: David Berger

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please concentrate Mt. Baker/ North Rainier Urban Village development within the existing multi-family Village boundaries, adjacent to the transit station.
Please appreciate, value and leave be the historic Mt. Baker neighborhood communities.
---
david berger
writer/artist/producer

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: Linda Finney

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

To Whom it may Concern:

There are many undeveloped and unused properties around the current Mt Baker Station that fall under the original density plan boundaries. Developing those areas is what the city promised. Not increasing the boundaries into our historic single family neighborhood.
Mt Baker is an historic Olmstead neighborhood worth preserving.
The Urban boundary is proposed to creep in to our single family historic neighborhood and greenways.
The Mt Baker neighborhood has repeatedly worked on a design from 1999, allowing for growth on unused properties, but now you seem to want to up zone some of our small single family homes, losing middle income families.
Stick to the boundaries along MLK, and do not continue to creep up in to our working class neighborhood along the west side of Mt Baker Ridge (From Franklin HS to Bradner Gardens). Some of the same families that have settled the area have third and fourth generations living in this area. This is not a way to treat the citizens of this part of the city that have welcomed and supported light rail.

Linda Finney

Date: 11/17/2015

Name: JP Shapiro

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use

Comment:

I think the plan should adopt several policy positions with regard to upzoning and densification, to protect affected neighborhoods and persons/businesses at risk of displacement as larger buildings are allowed:
· One-for-one replacement of low-income units that will be lost during development
· Identify — in advance of up-zones — locations for displaced residents and businesses to move within their neighborhoods if they wish
· Identify buildings with important historical character and find ways to preserve them
· Ensure that mandatory inclusionary zoning is enforced so that we're adding to the affordable housing

supply
· Work to build more family size housing
· Work with the community to identify the amenities needed to ensure livability in affected neighborhoods
· Build out those amenities as new growth comes on line

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Seattle King County REALTORS,David Crowell

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

Dear Mr. Hauger and Mr. Kofoed:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. Please accept the attached letter as comments from the Seattle King County REALTORS® addressing the Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update.

Sincerely,

David Crowell, JD
Director of Governmental & Public Affairs
SEATTLE KingCounty REALTORS®
--
November 18, 2015
Tom Hauger via electronic mail
Kristian Kofoed
Department of Planning & Development
RE: Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update
Dear Mr. Hauger and Mr. Kofoed,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.
This year the Growth Management Act celebrates its 25th anniversary. There is much to celebrate. Seattle has led the way in helping to protect rural and resource lands. The public has been engaged in the planning process. We have seen tremendous investment in the city for commercial and residential uses. Many neighborhoods have been reenergized with progress being made in many more.
What's troubling, however, is while we have directed growth away from the rural area, we have not adequately accommodated growth in the urban area. Unmet housing demand in the urban area has spiked housing prices and condemned too many workers to long commutes. This impacts the very quality of life for families that the GMA pledges to preserve.
Job growth drives housing growth. A home is where each job goes at night. When we fail to zone for an adequate supply of housing relative to demand (as driven by jobs), housing prices rise and people travel farther from their job to find a place to live which they can afford.
Most home buyers in Seattle are struggling. Homes are selling for $500,000, prices are rising, and those that sell for median or less have multiple offers. According to the Northwest MLS, the October 2015 median sales price in Seattle for single family homes was $555,000 and $493,000 for single family homes and condominiums combined. A $500,000 mortgage demands an income well in excess of the area median income. Many buyers continue to rent in Seattle or drive away from Seattle until they qualify. There are at least four problems with this:

1. Long commutes reduce an individual's quality of life.
2. Long commutes create sprawl.
3. Long commutes can cause dislocation of existing residents.
4. Regardless of transportation mode, long commutes are costly to the commuter, the government and the environment.

The mismatch between what the median income can afford and what the median priced home costs is a problem that spills into other cities --- and other counties. When Enumclaw or Marysville serve as affordable housing for Seattle ---- it becomes a regional issue and the whole region suffers.

Seattle needs a housing strategy that recognizes the housing market is a continuum. It is interrelated. Greater housing options in one segment help the pricing equation in other segments. Fewer housing options hurt affordability everywhere. When the demand for housing outstrips supply, the market begins to behave like a game of musical chairs. Those with the financial wherewithal get a chair. Others do not. The way to change this dynamic is to first add more chairs --- or in this case more housing units.

Specific to the Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update, we need to commit to zoning for housing to meet actual demand for housing.

Realtors believe the HALA/Grand Bargain recommendations that address opportunities to add housing to all zones, including single family, will help resolve the severe shortage of housing supply relative to demand; an imbalance we see growing in the future if bold steps are not taken now. Proposals include the following:

Grow the urban villages

We have many low density areas in which a greater intensity of use could improve housing options and improve community character and quality. The following measures should be implemented:

More ADUs

Encourage more accessory dwelling units and backyard cottages. Existing regulations are relatively restrictive. Explore removing the owner-occupancy requirement.

Thoughtful urban village transition

At the edges of urban villages, encourage a transition in scale, height and bulk of buildings between higher-intensity and single-family areas. The transition area would allow low-rise housing types (duplexes, triplexes, cottage housing).

Simpler code

Remove duplicative single-family rezone criteria. Including rezone criteria in both the Land Use Code and in the Comprehensive Plan is unnecessary. It creates a longer, more expensive, two-step process to consider rezoning single-family parcels.

Encourage multifamily housing

To protect Seattle's legacy single family neighborhoods, it will be necessary to accommodate the vast majority of new growth in multifamily housing. To do so effectively demands a number of measures.

Increase the land available to multifamily housing.

HALA recommendation: New multifamily zoned land should be prioritized near green belts, open space and parks; near schools and community centers; and within walking distance of the frequent transit network.

Increase building heights in multifamily zones.

HALA recommendation: Modify height limits and codes to maximize economical wood frame construction

Change 65' zoning code height limits to 75' or 85'. This change would allow buildings to maximize cost efficiencies in "Five over Two" construction and would allow another story of housing on some sites without dramatically changing the scale of development. An 85' height limit could also be explored in conjunction with other adjustments to the building code to allow a sixth story of wood frame construction.

Consider increasing 30’ and 40’ zones: Upzones within this increment would significantly lower the per square foot cost of building new housing. The same or similar investments in construction of a base story and infrastructure could support five stories of housing instead of two or three with this change.
Consider building and fire code modifications to allow six stories of wood frame construction: Distinct from the proposals above, the City should review the possibility of stretching economical wood frame construction even further. This could take the form of building code changes to increase the height limit or allowed number of wood frame stories. This action needs careful vetting to ensure fire and life safety protection.
Increase flexibility on multifamily type
Remove code barriers to small flats or apartments in some multifamily zones. In some of the Lowrise multifamily zones, townhouse or rowhouse forms of development are favored by the code over stacked flats (apartments or condominiums located on different levels in a building). This can limit production of potentially greater numbers of housing units, or limit the housing product to ownership units instead of rental units. The City should change the code to allow more stacked flats in all Lowrise zones.
Remove recently created barriers to the creation of congregate micro-housing
Increase Zoned Capacity in Light Rail Station Areas
Seattle has underzoned its station areas. Greater intensity is needed to support ridership and leverage the major, long-term investment in light rail. Increase zoned capacity in these areas provides a golden opportunity for the city to promote more affordable housing units. As a matter of policy, station area density should be zoned for 50-year growth or more, rather than the 20-year GMA planning horizon.
Public property
HALA recommendation: Where feasible, make City owned property available for housing.
Simpler regulation, smoother process
For too many projects, design review adds costs and creates project delays with no added benefit for the project proponent or the public. In many instances, constraints placed on projects by design review make it difficult to meet the zoned density. The design review process should be revised to meet the aesthetic objectives of the program without adding undue costs or restrictions to the project.
Realtors place a high value on the goals of the Growth Management Act. The promise of a state made up of communities with a balanced set of attributes that make for a high quality of life and are growing in ways that are sustainable and equitable for all is as important now as it was 25 years ago. As a leader in the implementation of GMA, Seattle bears the responsibility of keeping the region livable. Housing is critical to the success of the act. We must take bold steps to plan for growth in a manner that is true and relevant to what's happening on the ground. If we do not, market-rate housing will remain less accessible to middle income earners and out of reach to lower-income earners.
Sincerely,
Tyler McKenzie, President Patti Hill, President-Elect
Seattle King County REALTORS® Seattle King County REALTORS®

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Dylan Glosecki

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Hello
Please find below my comments on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
Seattle needs to urbanize, densify and better connect it's urban centers, urban villages and transit hubs. growth must be dispersed through each of these areas and we must better connect our urban villages

and centers to each other via expanded mass transit with dedicated transit only lanes.
I will organize my remaining comments based on the 2035 draft plan open house boards that outline 10 key proposals:
Proposal 1 Ten minute transit walksheds
I support expanding urban village and urban center boundaries to be inclusive of 10 min transit walksheds and would encourage a realignment every 5 years to allow urban villages and centers to grow, if necessry to include expanding frequent transit hubs.
Proposal 2 Six functions in the right of way
Our transit network needs a combination of streetcar, gondola, bus rapid transit with dedicated lanes (more than just a "rapid ride" route) and light rail extensions that connect Seattle neighborhoods to eachother using efficient ring routes as is standard in any major city's transit network. Our local buses are fine getting in and out of downtown, but are much too slow moving people between urban villages and urban centers. people will always have cars as long as getting from urban village/center to urban village/center takes twice as long on a bus as it does in a car.
Proposal 5 Future land use map and urban villages
I support creating a future landuse map that communicates future developments in urban villages. I would advocate for treating each urban village similarly in broad terms, but to add an additional level of detail as to what type of development would be best for each particular area based on existing and anticipated future context. In this sense, each urban village would have a unique set of urban design guidelines. Utilize the neighbors and residents with experience in the building design and development rhelms to craft each unique set of urban village guidelines.
I support the draft landuse map, but encourage more rezones along those arterials with transit service to create more NC zones. Particularly along the busiest portions of arterials that are not appropriate for single family or street level residential use, regardless of whether these areas are in an urban village or center.
Proposal 6 Greater diversity of housing types in SF zones
This is one of the areas I feel most strongly about. We must open up the huge swaths of single family land in the city to more dense development, while increasing the affordable housing stock and housing options for families in Seattle as a whole. This proposal should be more significant in terms of getting more density into SF zones. Seattle's residential zones should allow an average approaching the 30 unit per acre mark of sustainable development to ensure the ability to develop to the generally accepted minimum density of 30 units per acre for sustainable development that is not car-dependent. Allow more LR housing typology in SF zones.
Additionally, small neighborhood retail should be allowed on to some extent in SF and LR zones.
Proposal 7 Minimize displacement as Seattle grows
Have the city work with developers and small business to find ways to transition existing businesses into the new buildings that could displace them. In mixed-use, multi-family projects, developers rarely rely heavily on rental income from retail space. Incentivize subsidized rents for small, neighborhood businesses in new projects by offering more developable area, greater heights, etc. in exchange for keeping the existing neighborhood business community intact.
Proposal 8 Parks and open space
I support converting right of ways to park space
Thanks for your time.
- dylan glosecki

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: University Park Community Club,Aileen Langhans

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:
University Park Community Council, on behalf of the University Park Neighborhood, is hereby submitting our formal comment letter regarding the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The letter is included in this e-mail as an attachment. Should you have any problem accessing its contact, feel free to contact me. Thank you for the opportunity afforded us to weigh in on this most important document, which is destined to guide Seattle's growth through the next twenty years.
Sincerely,
Aileen M. Langhans
--
UNIVERSITY PARK COMMUNITY CLUB

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development
Attn: Seattle 2035
Dear City Officials:
The University Park Community Club (UPCC), as representative of the University Park Neighborhood, appreciates the opportunity to submit our comments on the Draft Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Although its lists of goals are noble, its details provide us with a mixed sense of priorities. In a convoluted effort to support your guidelines and to justify them as the only solution to inequality of housing, jobs, and quality of life, the city has totally bypassed the established neighborhoods, many facing an onslaught from aggressive and invasive developers. It is the city's attitude and approach that have, rightfully or wrongly, caused neighborhoods and residents to lose confidence that any comprehensive plan will actually achieve the desired outcome. Indeed, even the word 'comprehensive' is questioned, as most of the plan fails to address many of the issues that should be included, examined and intermeshed, if the city truly wants to produce an integrated framework for future growth.
In a fervent effort to draw your attention to the priorities of our neighborhood, we hereby present a summary of several major issues and concerns:
1. One specific example of inconsistent policy is the University District Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): It recommends a major up-zone for our area, but infrastructure issues are discussed in a very cavalier manner, and mitigation measures are only mentioned as possibilities. There is something wrong this this approach. An up-zone must only be approved if issues such as transportation, schools, affordable housing, increased demand for social services, police, open space etc. are addressed in a comprehensive way, including the necessary funding. The 2035 Plan has nice statements, such as T1.1:"Provide sufficient transportation facilities and services to promote and accommodate the growth…"
However, this must be funded, and if the funding is not available, growth should be restricted. South Lake Union is not a glorious achievement. It is a failure to plan in a comprehensive fashion, and we do not want to see this repeated in the University District or elsewhere in Seattle.
2. An example of specific proposals that are in conflict with the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan is the expansion of the Roosevelt Urban Residential Village: This proposed expansion does not follow the 2035 Plans own recommendations. According to the "Urban Village Expansion Board" document on the 2035 website, the proposal for expanding villages is to include areas within a ten minute walk of frequent transit stations. The Roosevelt expansion all the way to the 20th Avenue Northeast Bridge over Ravenna Park is considerably further away than ten minutes from the future light rail station, so there must be another hidden reason for trying to make this expansion. Unfounded recommendations such as

this one do not inspire confidence in the overall approach, which is supposed to be fact driven and logical. It should also be mentioned that the Roosevelt expansion is not included in the "Urban Village Expansion Board" document. Why not?

3. The Comprehensive Plan does not address the parking issues in a practical and honest approach: Despite the overoptimistic talk about the quality of Seattle's public transportation system, cars are going to play a major role in the next twenty years and they have to be parked somewhere. The 2035 plan makes reasonable statements about off-street parking (LUG6, LU6.1, LU6.2), however our experience shows, that there is no will to enforce existing rules, and violations are routine. The plan does not mention enforcement action to ensure compliance with new or old rules. In general, the plan is silent on how to make sure that any new regulations are actually followed. Density increases lead to more conflicts and problems. This must be addressed by improved enforcement, not only for parking but for any regulation.

4. Schools, education and job training are a major concern for our neighborhood, but no quote can be cited, as schools are not even mentioned in the 2035 Plan apart from one page on "Youth Development" within ACG3: "Improved access to arts education in all schools."

An educated and well trained population is a basic requirement if the growth of our City is to benefit all our population. The fact that the 2035 Plan does not address this issue is a major deficiency.

5. Seattle's goal to provide parks, open space, and public squares become more important and necessary as density is increased and yards around homes shrink. That is why we are encouraged by P1.1¸which states: "Continue to expand the City's park holdings, with special emphasis on serving urban centers and urban villages and areas that have been traditionally under-served."

The city must provide strategically located green spaces that are safe and clean. In this day of cautiousness, families need to have local play areas within safe walking distance for their children. As a true sense of community is nurtured, the City must also encourage neighbors to look out for the children in their immediate surroundings.

Additionally of concern is the specific infraction of the City Parks Plan's goals within the University District. Although our Parks Plan was recently revised and the 'public plaza' concept was ranked as a high priority, there is yet no clear path to achieving this goal, especially how it will be funded. This is in spite of the fact that this concept and its lofty goals were also a component of the old 2005 plan, with the same recommendation.

How is this going to be funded? Again, if funding for open space is not available to keep up with growth, growth should be correspondingly limited.

6. Throughout the various sections of the Seattle 2035, there are references to neighborhood identity. Specifically, GS4.8 states: "Preserve characteristics that contribute to communities' general identity, such as block and lot patterns and areas of historic, architectural or social significance."

Seattle presently has access to a potentially valuable tool to preserve the unique identities of our established neighborhoods: specifically the Neighborhood Conservation District. This concept has a proven track record in cities across the country. So, it is perplexing that this strategy is actively discouraged by the Housing and Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) recommendation SF4: "Opposed Neighborhood Conservation Districts". We would like to see historic neighborhoods like ours maintained and not destroyed by developers in the name of creating affordable housing, without any guarantee that this will actually happen. Therefore, UPCC requests that the city take prompt measures to enact this strategy as an important feature of Seattle 2035.

7. The city's commitment to historic preservation is admirable, as stated in the Arts and Culture introduction: "Historic preservation recognizes and protects aspects of the culture in the built environment –buildings, districts, and designed landscapes that link Seattle's past… The benefits of historic preservation are not merely aesthetic. Preservation is integral to our economic development planning, and it enhances our city's attraction as a center for tourism…"

The UPCC requests that the City also acknowledge the wealth of older homes with fine architectural details which have survived in our various established neighborhoods. Even the city has recognized the contributions of many homes that have graced the University Park neighborhood for around one hundred years, as documented in its October 2014 inventory. This is just one example: "This historic property retains its relationship to the streetscape, historic building form and a sufficient amount of exterior historic building fabric (design features, cladding and/or window sash/openings) to contribute to the distinct character of the University Park neighborhood. This is a particularly well-preserved historic property that appears to possess architectural and/or historic significance."

We hereby request that the city encourage restoration over demolition of these fine homes, including compatible alterations, such as owner-occupied Accessory Dwelling Units and Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's and DADU's) and respectful owner-occupied duplexes. Specifically an issue in our in our neighborhood is the large number of legal and illegal duplexes and triplexes; their presence has created a serious impact on the community. Most of these are rented to students, and some are basically boarding houses. While we have no objection to reasonably managed ADUs or DADUs, we are opposed to loosening restrictions to owner occupancy requirements and to the maximum number of unrelated people allowed in these units. These potential changes are not directly mentioned in the 2035 plan, but are recommended by HALA. Before any such land use changes are implemented, a study should be made to clearly show that the addition of ADUs truly creates low income housing, and is not just a way for developers to squeeze more money out of our neighborhoods.

We further urge the City to recognize and celebrate the historic design and planning by the Olmsted brothers of the University Park streets (Ravenna Boulevard and 17th Avenue Northeast) and plantings as important contributions to the Seattle landscape.

8. The Comprehensive plan discusses the need for transition zones between the Urban Centers or Villages and the adjacent neighborhoods. Specifically, GS4.10 states the following: "Use zoning tools and natural features to ease the transitions between urban villages' moderate building intensities to lower-density developments of surrounding areas."

We request that these transition zones be specifically designed for and confined to the peripheral blocks within the boundaries of the Urban Centers and Villages, and that the city proactively mitigates any adverse impact from spillover into the adjacent family neighborhoods, as itemized in the Comprehensive Plan's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

9. In NP1.3, the city states this goal: "Develop neighborhood plans to be consistent with this Plan's vision and allow neighborhood plans to focus on issues that are unique to their areas."

This is very important to the health of our various neighborhoods. The City must realize that the proposed changes will have varying impacts throughout the city. For instance, a major concern in our neighborhood is the rule that allows eight unrelated adults to occupy a house/single unit. In other neighborhoods, the introduction of duplexes and triplexes leads to the addition of one or two more families. In our neighborhood, it leads to an additional eight to sixteen more unrelated adults, each with his own life, car and impact on the neighborhood's quality of life. Added to this is the fact that most of these tenants are transient in nature, with no long term commitment to or even acknowledgment of our community. Today they may create a major problem, but tomorrow they are gone, leaving the permanent residents to solve that problem. The UPCC directs the city to review this rule and its impact on various neighborhoods. It would make sense to add tighter occupancy restrictions in our neighborhood and those similarly affected by close vicinity to major institutions, for instance, reducing the number to four to five unrelated adults. Many University Towns have similar restrictions. This is not an undue hardship, as it will also create healthier and safer housing units for our renting population.

10. UPCC believes that Seattle should prioritize preservation and rehabilitation opportunities as a strategy and planning tool in its land use regulations. This should be promoted, especially with regards to historically significant buildings that already provide low-income housing for Seattleites. If these

buildings are razed and replaced by new construction, the lost affordable housing units must be totally replaced, along with an increase as dictated by the law; if not, the city will experience an increasing deficit in such housing stock. In fact, Seattle must create a slumlord law, aimed at preventing absentee landlords (like Sisley) from abusing their properties into deterioration, when the only choice becomes demolition. Many of the older buildings have had the same owner for years, but their upkeep has been withheld in anticipation of future profit-making projects. This leads to run–down neighborhoods, which drags the rest of the community down with it.

11. Certain features should be promoted in all residential zones, if the city truly wants to create communities that are welcoming, inviting people to explore and connect by foot, as they get to know their neighbors. This goal is suggested in LU5.9: "Enhance the visual quality of an area through standards for screening and landscaping appropriate to each zone in order to minimize the visual impact of new development on the surrounding neighborhood, the streetscape, and development in areas with less intensive zoning."

Basic design standards should be specified and promoted as an integral part of creating opportunities for social interaction. Some options include but are not restricted to the following:

- inviting and street-facing entrances
- appropriate use of hedges and fences that do not create a walled-off and disconnected feeling
- enhanced visual and natural landscaping, rather than the cement walls and paths that are presently popular with the box-like multi-family houses being constructed in family neighborhoods with the approval of the City AND
- setbacks for new buildings to create a sense of warmth, charm, and continuity within the community.

Not only will these basic features improve the streetscape, they will also address a variety of safety concerns, as residents shed their dependency on the automobile in preference to walking and using public transportation. Again, an appropriate strategy for implementing these standards is the Neighborhood Conservation District, a concept of which UPCC strongly approves but one which HALA vigorously opposes.

12. Seattle needs to develop an effective line of communication with all neighborhoods, as proposed in NP1.5: "Support neighborhood plan implementation to enhance the quality of these urban environments and to promote continued collaboration between the City and neighborhood groups."

It is only through respectful, open, and honest dialogue that a sense of trust is reached and neighborhoods can believe that the City has their future welfare in focus as a high priority. This includes easier access to the major alterations and deletions within the present Comprehensive Plan during the drafting of Seattle 2035, especially those designed to protect the integrity of Seattle's neighborhoods. An itemized list of those specific policies was buried deep within the official website and only included after citizen complaints. This strategy of 'omission' does not provide the citizens of Seattle with any sense of fairness or transparency.

13. Finally, in the exact wording of the plan, GSG4 states the following: "Maintain and enhance Seattle's unique character and sense of place, including its natural setting, history, human-scaled development, and community identity as the city grows and changes."

Most often expressed by the City is the desire to remake and redefine the Seattle. With the disposal of majestic buildings of historical pedigree and the disappearance of architecturally significant homes within our established neighborhoods that are relics of past decades, we have lost all confidence in our future. We fear that Seattle wants to dilute or even remove our past, sending the city off onto a sea of uncertainty, in which its identity becomes fluid and transient. Those of you who are fortunate enough to visit Europe and witness the amazing historical sites, large central plazas, and ornate architectural features surely must be left in awe at the Europeans' wisdom and foresightedness in placing a high

priority on historic preservation and celebration. Does our history not deserve the same acknowledgment and respect? That is why this quote above instills in us much hope that Seattle is committed to not only the diversity of its inhabitants, but to the rich diversity of its historical evolution that has shaped the city's very identity since its incorporation in 1869.

In review of the overall plan, we wish to re-emphasize the "comprehensive" component. In particular this plan must ensure that the growth of our City is managed in a comprehensive fashion, which means added density must be accompanied with the necessary infrastructure improvements. Without a documented path to achieve this we cannot support the 2035 Plan.

There are many other specific details too numerous to include in this letter, but we hope that these comments relay our overall feelings and concerns, as you finalize the details of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. While the plan's purpose is to guide city growth in the next twenty years, its impacts, both positive and negative, could take us on a path of no return. The city must reassure us that this path is one that creates the best and the greatest opportunities to revitalize our wonderful city.

University Park neighborhood is grateful to all municipal employees and officials and their dedicated service on behalf of the citizens of Seattle. We look forward to improved cooperation and open dialogue, as the goals of Seattle 2035 are refined and implemented.

Sincerely,

Aileen M. Langhans
Secretary, UPCC

PS. Let's not forget that Seattle is nearing a major milestone: our 150th Birthday on December 2, 2019. Hopefully it will be a time to truly celebrate.

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Aya Iwai

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

New developments need to have built-in parking. Even when these developments are built in areas with good bus service, these residents still have family and friends who visit and need places to park. Seattle is still a city that is heavily dependent on cars. By not building high-density residences without parking, I have witnessed current residents getting extremely stressed and at times belligerent about trying to park.

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Ron Momoda

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

11/2015 Comments to the DRAFT Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan UPDATE:

The Seattle 2035 Equity Analysis is a very important focus of the DRAFT Seattle 2035 UPDATE. The 4 growth Alternatives can only be found in the Seattle 2035 Equity Analysis. To make it easier to see how the Equity Analysis compares with the alternatives, I have combined the maps from the Equity Analysis Summary and the 4 Alternatives so they can all be viewed on the same page, see attachment.

It is very clear from the maps that SE Seattle's displacement risks are significantly higher, areas covered

in "red", when compared to the rest of the City of Seattle, covered in "blue". Alternative 3 & 4 will clearly hit SE Seattle the hardest with high displacements. This is a terrible mistake for the City to make. High displacement has serious consequences for SE Seattle. It is unreasonable to expect those who are the most vulnerable population will be able to overcome barriers to include language skills, higher level of education, higher incomes, job achievement so that they can compete successfully in the City colored in "blue" for jobs and housing to support their families.
Also, Alternatives 3 & 4 will displace many people of color in SE Seattle in the most diverse community in the United States. Displacement not only will mean families will have difficulty relocating to other parts of the City that they can afford, but displacement will break ties within their own community where shared customs, language, religious beliefs, family, provide support and stability.
The high risk of displacement is a major Equity concern for SE Seattle. Displacement will mean few options, and there are no mitigation measures to compensate for loss of community.
Therefore, I strongly disagree with Alternatives 3 & 4 and particularly in the Othello Urban Village, where I live, a boundary expansion into single family zoning. The Social Equity impacts will be severe.
I recommend that the DRAFT Seattle 2035 must consider a 5th Alternative to expand growth in areas where there are low displacements and higher opportunities. This will help create a more equitable distribution of growth in the City of Seattle without high displacement impacts.
Ronald Richard Momoda

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Marla Steinhoff

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I was in support of the rezone of the North Rainier Urban hub village in 2013. The footprint of this village is a blank slate for residential development in close proximity to the Mount Baker light rail station. I'm very concerned about the expansion of the upzoning outside the existing boundary into Mount Baker, an established residential neighborhood, and other areas as presented in the draft 2035 comp plan. I don't understand the rationale to expand now, when only one residential building has been constructed in the past two years within the existing footprint. The city should focus efforts in encouraging development within the existing footprint. We are starting to see some real progress in 2016 with the City's efforts to help spur equitable development where it matters, and the last thing this effort needs is another divisive rezone. If in the next 10-15 years or more, additional residential development is needed, expansion of the footprint should be considered. I can't imagine that the village would be close to developed in that timeframe. Please focus efforts in the North Rainier village as established in 2013 where essentially no residential development exists, is a blank slate, and in very close proximity to the light link station. Please do not displace hard working homeowners by expanding the footprint into Mount Baker and in other stable residential areas in the city.

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Barbara Warren

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear DPD, the attached document contains my comments on the Draft Comp Plan and expresses my agreement in some areas, and my concerns about the proposed changes in Ravenna, and the strategy of

growth proposed. Thank you, Barbara Warren
--
Comments to the Draft Comp Plan 2035

My name is Barbara Warren, a resident of Ravenna, who has been active in the adjacent Roosevelt Neighborhood Planning effort and an advocate of affordable housing and greenspace in Seattle. The following are my comments to the Draft Comp Plan and thoughts on what kind of growth Seattle needs:

General comments

1. More inclusive growth in Seattle through developing Mixed Income Neighborhoods---

I support more growth in the Urban Centers and Hub Urban Villages, and where appropriate in the Residential Urban Villages (RUV). I believe that the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing policy proposed by Hala is critical to implementation, but MUST NOT ALLOW developers to buy their way out of producing on-site housing in most projects. I applaud the Mayor's leadership in this area.

2. Expand the Number of Residential Urban Villages, rather than using arterials to expand housing, or expand current RUVs using only the 10 minute walkshed to light rail.

Rather than just expanding current RUVs, or eliminating all single family zoning from RUVs, I believe that more Residential Urban Villages (possibly a different category of village?) should be created strategically with neighborhood planning in the large swaths of Seattle that are primarily single family zones. (See NE Seattle, Magnolia, Montlake, Madison Park, Seward Park, Fauntleroy, etc.) The end result would produce a clustered mix of housing types in every residential village, including ground related family housing and single family houses. These should be centered in walkable neighborhood business districts with basic services and ideally a grocery store (unless we want Amazon to fly drones to everyone's house), so that most neighborhoods in Seattle would not depend on auto transportation.

I would prefer this approach rather than increasing density along the arterials just because that is easier politically as it is already zoned that way. Arterials are not the best place to increase housing, particularly family housing. There are small commercial districts in many places that could be expanded, or such development could be encouraged around schools for instance.

The currently trendy call for all light rail stations, in cookie cutter fashion, to be the focus of most growth is short sighted. While I believe in transit oriented development, the Light Rail Corridor is a regional transportation network that, if successful, should fill up with passengers from outside of Seattle before it even gets to Northgate during commuting hours. This is a long term proposition, but local Seattle public transportation networks and options need to be designed for better interconnectivity to more places than downtown. I'm not advocating trying to designate new RUVs before adopting the Comp Plan for 2035, but I do think that the Comp Plan should call for planning for new RUVs in the next decade, rather than just growing the existing Residential Urban Village, which mostly are located along the spine of Seattle following the Light Rail path.

3. The COMP PLAN DOESN'T DO ENOUGH FOR FAMILY HOUSING

Seattle had a higher population in the 1950's than it does now because families with children lived here. Now Seattle has the least percentage of families with children, more dogs than kids. The new housing that is being built is by and large not suitable for families. In my opinion, Seattle should do more to welcome families with children to Seattle. Perhaps not in every neighborhood, but it should strive to encourage neighborhoods that support families with children with good schools and expand inclusiveness and affordability in these neighborhoods to promote more equity. (the mixed income idea above plus expansion of Section8, etc.)

Comments of BW on Comp Plan p.2

Rather than top down planning, to make this more politically acceptable, I think existing single family neighborhoods should be awarded neighborhood planning money and given target goals to

create their own new residential urban villages and plans for expanding the mix of housing types where it makes most sense locally for new multi-family and transition zones of row houses with backyards, and other types of smaller scale housing compatible with single family housing given appropriate setbacks and limits so that the essential residential character can be preserved. This effort has to be aligned with long term transit and school planning, and use incentives of amenities like increased parks and community facilities to reward neighborhoods who achieve their goals. I also think that land trusts could be used effectively in such neighborhood planning to preserve long term affordability. The key to success here is giving the message, that single family zones do have a place in the city, and asking the residents there to be creative about expanding housing opportunities, with some immediate changes, and some projected for the future.

Ravenna/Bryant is apparently the largest "Neighborhood" in Seattle; it would be a good place to do a pilot program. There is already a "downtown Ravenna", a commercial district on 35th with various nodes, and proximity in Bryant to the Urban Center of University Village.

II. SPECIFIC CONCERNS REGARDING THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE ROOSEVELT URBAN VILLAGE TO INCLUDE PARTS OF RAVENNA, ESPECIALLY RAVENNA PARK

While extension of the urban villages by the 10 minute walkshed is a logical policy, it must be tempered by the reality on the ground, rather than just use the line that a GPS program draws. My concerns are as follows:

North of 65th, the east side of 15th and 16th Need to be Redeveloped from Landlord neglect

1. First , I do believe that the reality is that north of 65th St. on the east side of 15th and 16th, the horse is out of the barn; the single family houses have been torn down, left to deteriorate, or are in limbo. They should be rezoned to accommodate more density and provide a transition zone between Roosevelt and Ravenna. So I do not oppose the inclusion of 15th & 16th in the Roosevelt Urban village. However, as the grade steepens to 17th, and speculator neglect has not destroyed the viability of the neighborhood, I think 17th should remain part of the Ravenna neighborhood, not in the Roosevelt Urban village.

Ravenna is an Established Family Friendly Neighborhood with Architectural Significance

2. The dotted line meandering west through Ravenna does not respect the established boundaries and feeling of community in Ravenna. Ravenna has long been an enclave of family friendly housing with the center of our neighborhood at the Community Center and commercial district on 65th and Ravenna Ave. The boundaries of Ravenna have always been clear: 15th to the west, and Ravenna Boulevard to the South. I can't speak for the residents to the west and south of Roosevelt and how they identify, they may prefer to be included, or not.

3. This area of Ravenna contains one of the best collections of architecturally and historically significant craftsmen style houses in Seattle. I think this legacy is important to respect. These houses are in demand and have weathered 100 years and can house families for another century. There is a mix of bigger houses and smaller, more affordable houses that are now being filled with children again.

4. Clear lines need to be drawn to give notice to the residents so that they can invest in their houses such as replacing single pane windows, and other important carbon saving updates. Secondly,
BW Comments on Comp Plan p.3
a particularly sore subject in Ravenna, speculators and developers need clear lines too, so they will not be encouraged to buy houses and let them deteriorate while they are waiting for the zoning to change and profit from redevelopment. It is also a small way of keeping the houses more affordable, and avoiding displacement . The meandering dotted line is random and arbitrary from a neighbor's point of view.

Environmental Concerns for Ravenna Park Being Included in Urban Village

5. Ravenna Park is a “natural area” park, the deepest glacier carved ravine in Seattle with very fragile, very steep, erosion prone sides, and a stream fed with the ground water from the surrounding area. There has been a City led Restoration effort going on in Ravenna Park since 1994. It is environmentally fragile, and my concern is that the urban village designation would encourage inappropriate development around the park that would damage the ecosystem and hydrology for the stream that is now re-connected to Lake Washington, and thus the water quality of the lake might be compromised as well from increased impervious surface, and untreated storm water. It is not a park that can accommodate crowds of people.

I do not have the same concern for Cowen Park, which is an open neighborhood park, with a ball field, a children’s playground, and plenty of open space for dogs, people, etc. While it used to be part of the Ravine, it was filled in with the houses removed to build I-5. I think that the North side of Parks is often an appropriate place to build more dense housing, so that the residents can enjoy the park, but the buildings not cast shadows on the park. Not all parks are alike.

A Great City is More than Numbers

In another 100 years, Seattle may be underwater, or a city of high rises with only rich people living in their view towers. Density alone does not insure affordability, or solve climate change. But I hope that there will always be a Seattle with parks, trees and streams and views of Mt. Rainier that everyone can enjoy. I also hope that Seattle welcomes a mix of people, including families with children, and provides a mix of neighborhood choices without losing all of its architectural character. I think that is certainly possible for the next 20 years.

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Nick Gellert

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

The Comprehensive Plan cannot continue to pile on development in the Urban Villages without also meeting the other expectations/obligations of the Urban Village concept. It is time for the City (directly or through mitigation on developers) to invest in the other aspects of Urban Villages other than simply more density. This especially includes more parks and open space for the use of the increased population, in the areas of the increased density (not where they have to drive or otherwise work transportation systems to get to). For instance, in Wallingford/U District, there is added urban density without any new park space. There also is already an issue with bike/pedestrian traffic between these two areas. It is time to develop a real solution. How about a lid park spanning the area between 45th and 50th, which will add more open space, allow for safer transportation between the neighborhoods, and make both neighborhoods more livable urban villages. Up-zoning to allow more housing must be met with equal attention on other things that make life great.

More generally, transportation must be a key aspect of the comprehensive plan. This means that the City' plans must be coordinated with Sound Transit's plans and King County/Metro's plans. It does not work to say the City is going to allow more density where there is existing transportation corridors without assurance that Metro will continue to expand service on those corridors. We are seeing in Lower Wallingford a tremendous amount of added housing density (along Stone Way and elsewhere) while Metro cuts bus service running through that area. Busses are frequently so packed now that the bus does not stop for waiting passengers.

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Daniel Schmitt

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hello, I am writing to endorse the recommendations of my neighbor and fellow Greater Madison Valley Community Council member Kathry Keller, listed in the message below.
Thank you,
Dan Schmitt
Hi:
I have five major concerns about the draft comprehensive plan, Seattle 2035:
1. The role of Neighborhood Planning needs to be enhanced. Planning is a constant, while it might be quiescent in many areas, the local plan needs to be referenced, stewarded and refined when conditions change. Instead we have seen the plans shelved and new terms like Transit Area Planning or Action Plans. While some of the methods seem very useful, those processes have often created chaos, disengagement and polarization. We need a civic infrastructure that supports the local oversight and involvement in planning for local areas that is integrated with the local Neighborhood Plan as a living document.
2. Transparency and community engagement. A model such as Portland has would be critical for Seattle to effect rational plans that are credible.
3. Measures that lead to reprioritization and action are needed. Not every area starts in the same level of concurrency, those inequities should drive priorities. Measures can also show where we are out of whack, and there should be mandated actions to respond.
4. Mitigation or exceptions to general policies if consequences cannot be mitigated. The Draft EIS was very clear about certain consequences that appeared to have no legal basis for the city to mitigate. A general policy is one thing, but citywide whole sale land use changes that ignore predicted displacement or ignore the realities of landslide risks, along with no exception for local conditions and no consideration by local residents, can have far reaching damaging consequences.
5. The environment. I don't see 'sustainable' in the title of this plan and I do not see enough respect for the fact that we are living on this earth, polluting the waters, and driving out the birds and the bees.
Sincerely,
Kathryn Keller

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: James Alls

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

To DPD:
I am writing to provide my feedback to the proposed potential urban village expansion area near Cheasty Blvd. and Hanford St and S Horton St. I do not think expanding the urban village boundaries on the west side of Cheasty Blvd South of Hanford is a good idea. This is a tight neighborhood and I think it would have a negative impact on both Kimball Elementary School and the character of the neighborhood.
Traffic around Kimball is already terrible during drop-off and pick-up times. The streets are not wide enough to accommodate the volume of traffic. Adding more density so close to the school will only exacerbate this problem.
I would propose ending the expansion of the urban village boundary at Hanford St. and drawing the line

at Hanford east to meet Cheasty Blvd.
Thanks,
-Jamie Alls

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Katherine Laird

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

DOBRERO, LLC and DOBRERO TWO, LLC
Sent electronically: 2035@seattle.gov
City of Seattle
Planning and Development Department

RE: Public comments on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan

On behalf of Dobrero, LLC and Dobrero Two, LLC, I write to support many of the changes proposed in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, particularly with regard to the treatment of Urban Villages and increased density within UV zones. In that regard, we believe the City should go further in terms of zoning within the Green Lake/Roosevelt Urban Village. Finally, we specifically support and request that the zoning designation for tax parcel 9221400260 (NW corner of NE 63rd Street and 9th Avenue NE) be changed to NC3-65, which is consistent with the zoning across the street at the NE corner of 63rd and 9th Avenue NE.

The foundation of the 2035 Comp Plan is to direct increased density to the Urban Villages throughout the City. Within the Roosevelt neighborhood, the draft amendments propose to increase the boundaries of the UV. We support this increase in the UV boundaries. The properties along the west and southern edges of the Roosevelt UV zone are in close proximity to transit and bike routes along Roosevelt Avenue and Ravenna Blvd, NE, and the light rail station location and are ideal for Urban Village designation.

The new light rail station at the corner of 12th Avenue NE and NE 65th Street will be transformative to the Roosevelt neighborhood, and directing density to this portion of North Seattle is appropriate. This neighborhood will become one of the neighborhoods where residents truly will be able to walk and bike to work and play, without the need to get into a car. For this reason, we believe the zoning for all properties within the Roosevelt UV boundary should provide for more density. While there are a few SF zones within the current and expanded Roosevelt UV boundaries, it would be prudent to allow for greater densities even in the existing SF zones.

The 2035 Plan reflects a 20 year vision for the City. With the history of growth within Seattle as our guide, the 2035 Plan should anticipate growth similar to what Seattle has experienced in the past 20 years, and particularly within the last 5 years. That history would suggest the Urban Village boundaries should be even bigger/more inclusive, and certainly would support zoning to allow greater density. One need look no further than the residential development in the South Lake Union area and areas close to transit options such as Columbia City to know that providing people with transit options results in residential density opportunities. The Roosevelt light rail station and ever increasing bike and transit options support greater density throughout the Roosevelt UV zone. SF residences could continue to exist even if the zoning and zoning density change, of course.

Dobrero LLC owns the undeveloped property at the NW corner of NE 63rd and 9th Avenue NE (Tax Parcel 9221400260) (highlighted below) currently zoned LR 2; Dobrero LLC and Dobrero Two, LLC also own the two parcels across the street to the east, both currently zoned NC3-65. (6300 9th Avenue NE is the site of the Seattle Healing Arts Building, owned by Dobrero LLC.) All of these parcels are within the current UV boundary and the Light Rail station overlay (see zoning legend on Seattle Zoning map book 60). We believe this southern portion of the UV zone is ideal for more dense development. Roosevelt and Ravenna Blvd are within 2 blocks in either direction. Roosevelt and Ravenna are major transit and bike corridors. All of these parcels are walking distance to the major downtown bus stop on NE 65th Street, which allows easy and immediate access to the main and express lanes of I-5. All of these parcels are within 10 minute walking distance walking to the new light rail station. From a transit perspective, these parcels all support greater density. We respectfully request that the LR2 parcel be zoned NC3-65 to allow the greater density opportunity to be realized. As we mentioned above, the limited SF zoning pockets within UV boundary should also allow for greater density. Regardless, the Dobrero parcel certainly warrants greater density and a change in zoning to allow that greater density similar to the parcels and zoning across the street.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. This 2035 Plan incorporates the strategies Seattle needs to be ready for the future, both for future growth and future changes associated with greater transit options. We encourage the City to be bold in their vision and embrace even greater density within the Urban Village boundaries, particularly the Roosevelt neighborhood that has so much to offer in terms of proximity to highways, arterial roads for buses and bikes, and transit options, plus retail shopping, outdoors activities (Green Lake is within the combined Urban Village zone) and schools.

Katherine Kramer Laird
CenturyPacific, LP

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Gus Catalano

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I feel like Bryant area (55th-65th on 35th ave ne) could use more commerce and transit oriented development. Please consider turning part of it into an urban village or whatever else to promote more density/commerce.
Thanks!
Gus

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Kathryn Keller

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hi:
I have five major concerns about the draft comprehensive plan, Seattle 2035:

1. The role of Neighborhood Planning needs to be enhanced. Planning is a constant, while it might be quiescent in many areas, the local plan needs to be referenced, stewarded and refined when conditions change. Instead we have seen the plans shelved and new terms like Transit Area Planning or Action Plans. While some of the methods seem very useful, those processes have often created chaos, disengagement and polarization. We need a civic infrastructure that supports the local oversight and involvement in planning for local areas that is integrated with the local Neighborhood Plan as a living document.
2. Transparency and community engagement. A model such as Portland has would be critical for Seattle to effect rational plans that are credible.
3. Measures that lead to reprioritization and action are needed. Not every area starts in the same level of concurrency, those inequities should drive priorities. Measures can also show where we are out of whack, and there should be mandated actions to respond.
4. Mitigation or exceptions to general policies if consequences cannot be mitigated. The Draft EIS was very clear about certain consequences that appeared to have no legal basis for the city to mitigate. A general policy is one thing, but citywide whole sale land use changes that ignore predicted displacement or ignore the realities of landslide risks, along with no exception for local conditions and no consideration by local residents, can have far reaching damaging consequences.
5. The environment. I don't see 'sustainable' in the title of this plan and I do not see enough respect for the fact that we are living on this earth, polluting the waters, and driving out the birds and the bees.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Keller

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Deidre Palmer

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

On-Street parking issues surrounding Residential Urban Village designations are not thoroughly vetted or are even ignored. Upzoning these areas to LR 1,2,3 from Single Family Homes (e.g. Greenwood/Phinney) creates significant parking issues especially when you allow "market forces" (stated in LU6.3) to determine the amount of parking. This is code for developers putting in the least amount of parking or none at all to make a greater profit. And time and time again, city permits are choosing developers over residents, ease of use, safety, and just common sense. Instead of establishing a stated, coherent parking requirement when developing multi-family or "apodments" units that serves residents and developers, the city has purposely dodged the ball. This issue will not go away. Create a parking plan/parking requirements for developers that is realistic, not one that is a war on car owners. Until Scotty can beam us up, there will always be car owners.

--

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Jerry Jutting

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

I am opposed to increased density in existing single family zones, outside of urban villages, but I support ADU's. I also support increased density in single family zones within urban villages.

I'm an architect/developer in Fremont with a special interest in providing housing for low-income folks. I own a townhouse in Seattle that is now rented, through the Landlord Liaison Project (LLP), to a formerly homeless family. I also own a house in Bremerton that I lease to a non-profit that provides housing for nine formerly homeless women vets. I have a two bedroom ADU in my own house that's rented at below-market rates to a family with two small children. I'm currently working with my church on a feasibility study for a "shared" house for eight low-income young adults. These are all small-scale projects that could easily be replicated to serve many more people.

I feel strongly that here in Seattle we've become stuck thinking about building housing using a "big business" model (non-profit housing developers/low-income housing tax credits/linkage fees) at construction costs that often exceed market rate housing. This is an important tool but we will never build enough housing using only this model. Why aren't we also talking about "small business" models? I've spoken with Larry Todd at the LLP and he said they would be delighted to place clients in ADUs. Unlike the HALA proposal to "redefine" single-family zoning to allow up to three units, ADUs already are allowed in all Seattle single-family neighborhoods and have tremendous social and financial benefits. They disperse low income tenants throughout the city, they can be inexpensive to construct, they foster relationships between homeowners and tenants, and they provide financial stability to local residents (not outside investors). One last thing – when built into existing houses they have a very small carbon footprint. Let's start talking about what the city can do to promote the construction of more ADUs! Low interest loans? Tax holidays? Expedited permitting? Easier parking requirements? Marketing campaign? We need to create housing using both "big business" and "small business" models.

Speaking of "shared" houses, did you know up to eight unrelated people can share a house in any single family neighborhood? We could have a lot more of that kind of housing spread throughout the city with a little support from the Planning Department. They currently discourage it by limiting the number of bathrooms and requiring a single lease for the entire house instead of for each bedroom.

One final comment – I support the expansion of the Wallingford urban village to include the blocks north and south of 45th between Sunnyside Ave N and I5. This is one of the most transit rich parts of the city and it makes no sense not to increase density along this corridor.

Best regards,

Jerry Jutting

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: David Sucher

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Hello
Vision Zero is great idea but there is NO MENTION whatsoever in it in terms of what peds & bikers can do to be safer — which is of course to be more VISIBLE through lights, reflectors and bright clothing.
That element ought to be added to Vision Zero.
I recognize that many bikers think that "bright clothing = anti-bike" but that is crazy and City should resist such nonsense.

David Sucher

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Carol Bassett

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:
I would like to comment on the current planning in Seattle. Here are some of my thoughts:
1.Many in the residential urban village where I live (Wallingford) are completely unaware of the potential for up zoning. When they hear about it, they are very angry. What they did hear was that the Mayor was backing off on upzoning in residential neighborhoods. A lot of young families have moved here and have put a lot of money into renovating and remodeling.
2.Seattle needs to have respect for its history and retain at least some of the buildings that were part of that history.
3.Please consider all ages and levels of mobility when working on transportation elements. Not everyone can make it to a frequent transit line in 10 minutes time. Some stops are virtually inaccessible to people with disabilities or illness. In Wallingford, there are two frequent transit options, Sound Transit down I-5 and the E line. The E line stop is up stairs or up a steep ramp. The 16 Meridian is going to be a much slower route now with imminent changes, becoming an entirely new route, in 2016. Despite much protest, the King County Council voted to make the transition to this new line.
4.Plan buildings to fit in the context of the neighborhood. There is much discontent about ugly, cheap construction and constant detouring. Some of the townhomes look run down after just a few years.
5.Be realistic about cars and traffic. There are many workers who cannot take a bus to their destination, either because it would be too time-consuming, or because they must carry equipment, supplies, etc. Everyone who works in the city cannot live in the city, either because it is more affordable further out, or they choose to have an actual house with a yard.
6.Be aware that some of the apartments have displaced business that provided supplies, materials, and repairs for homeowners, and apartment dwellers. Now we must drive farther in order to find plumbing parts, for example. Favorite paint stores have moved, as well as bathroom fixture stores.
7.Air quality is deteriorating here in the residential urban village. There is black soot on the siding of the house and cement dust on the windows. We are breathing the air that contains that pollution.
8.Many people are calling the new apartments Soviet-style blocks. Design review is important. People need light and greenery. Buildings should be stepped, and should be set back from the sidewalk. Community gathering places should be incorporated. It means fewer apartments, but it also means quality of life.
9.Be sure to get input regarding bike lanes, and really listen before making changes. Some of the plans make very little sense. Some of the new arrangements have too much signage, color on the street, making it difficult for both drivers and cyclists to navigate.
That's all for now. Thanks for reading,
Carol Bassett
Sent from Windows Mail

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Kimberly Logan

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

1. A moratorium on the sale of public lands until the City Council completes their interdepartmental review of how the city disposes of surplus property.
2. The Parks Department must develop the public lands we already have, like the unused 15 acres of Seattle Public Utilities land west of Jefferson Park.
3. The Parks Department must reverse course and commit to continue with the current COMPLAN goal of providing 1 acre of land for every 100 residents.
4. The Parks Department must change the policy of only looking at parcels of 10,000 square feet or more.
5. The Parks Department must write a new policy that commits to a building of smaller pocket parks throughout Seattle, just as the Olmsted's recommended in their Plan for Seattle over 100 years ago.

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: Michael Kleiner

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

Hello,
I reject all elements of the 2035 or other Seattle Government initiatives involving:
1. The takeover of automobile lanes by bike lanes.
2. The placement of duplex of larger multifamily in single family residence neighborhoods.
3. Linkage fees or other non-market based attempts to control the price of housing in Seattle.

It becomes more difficult by the day to drive in this city, and that is attributable in significant part to the cluttering of auto lanes with sharrows and the takeover of auto lanes by bike lanes. To some extent I can live with dedicated bus lanes, though, as at least a significant number of people are transported in exchange for the lane. Bikers are such a minor part of commuting traffic, and will always be a minority portion of commuting traffic, whether you take over auto lanes or not. Seattle is too hilly and rainy, and many people simply can't conduct their daily lives from a bike.
The existing character of Seattle single family neighborhoods is something to be protected, not something to be fouled up by one-off randomly placed triplex units. They will create parking and noise problems, undoubtedly be architecturally inconsistent with existing housing. It will lower the value of existing single family homes sited next to those multifamily properties.
Non-market attempts to control house prices and rents will only backfire and create negative unintended consequences (e.g. massive non-refundable "key deposits", application fees, sclerosis in rent-controlled units turnover, etc,) - see Manhattan and San Francisco.
This City Council and Mayor have lost their minds. The ever-encroaching regulatory environment and higher taxes will only serve to kill off the economic growth we are currently enjoying. It may not happen overnight, but eventually, a city (and states for that matter) gets a reputation and people and businesses start to avoid it (see Detroit and Stockton for good examples).
Sincerely,
Michael B. Kleiner

Date: 11/18/2015

Name: David Sucher

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Hello
I'd like to see this proposal added to your thinking and hope it can be implemented sooner than 2035.
http://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/add-housing-by-allowing-one-triplex-per-city-block/
David Sucher

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

.@seattle2035 Draft Plan lands on Alt 4, lots of positive policy changes proposed. Comment on plan open thru 11/20 http://www.theurbanist.org/2015/11/19/seattles-draft-comprehensive-plan-takes-on-the-big-issues/

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: @westseattleblog

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Mentioned here - @Seattle2035 comment deadline is tomorrow (http://2035.seattle.gov)

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Scott Rockwell

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Dear Mayor, City Council and Planning Commissioners,
We are writing in regards to the proposed zoning changes in DPD's Seattle 2035 comprehensive plan. While we feel that increasing density within a 10 minute walking distance of major transportation hubs is a good approach, we are concerned about the lack of public process, insufficient analysis in certain Urban villages, and the omission of key regulatory tools.
1. In a random survey of 28 single family homes in a 4-block section of the Crown Hill neighborhood, NOT ONE SINGLE HOUSEHOLD knew of the proposed up-zone from single family residential to multi-family/commercial, nor of the public meeting that was held in Ballard to provide comments. Homeowners have the right to be notified of such changes and to have the opportunity to engage in a dialog with the city. These changes have the potential to greatly affect home value, neighborhood character and private investments.
2. At a minimum, homeowners should have been notified via a mailer letting them know that their properties are under consideration for these up-zone changes. We feel that the lack of information dissemination and loss of opportunity for a conversation are distressing.
3. The majority of homeowners in this area fully support walkability. However, DPD has not done it's due diligence in regards to the Crown Hill neighborhood: we have not seen an increase in transportation

modes, in fact we have lost service. East-West walking routes are severely hampered by the fact that 90th has a constrained pinch point which prohibits sidewalks being installed. DPD's map shows a private cemetery as colored green, indicating a public park - which it is not. Secondarily, there are private homes due north of the cemetery. Unless DPD is considering a taking via imminent domain, there is insufficient room for sidewalks in that key stretch. It makes no sense at all to then propose changing density levels on the east side of the cemetery.

4. The majority of homeowners in this area fully embrace accessory dwelling units. This allows for increased density while preserving the neighborhood character. We feel that this approach should be included in DPD's 2035 Comprehensive plan strategies.

5. Of major importance and an area that is lacking and cause for much concern is solar rights. Since 2012 the City of Seattle has seen a 34% increase in solar energy, the majority of which is on single family residences in the form of solar panels. This increase in renewable energy is due to the public-private partnership of homeowners embracing the Federal, State and City's incentive programs funding solar energy. Any consideration of up-zoning needs to have a solar rights component. While consideration to change many of the Single Family zones to Multi-family/mixed use is a good strategy for increasing density, it would have a detrimental impact on homes such as ours, where an apartment complex could go up next door, effectively blocking out all our sun light and negating our $45k investment in solar energy (note, the $45K does not include interest accrued on the loan over the next 15 years).

There are approximately 2,200 solar premises served by City Light, this includes residential, commercial and industrial. The general rule of thumb for residential solar is that it costs $5 per watt with all of the credits and incentives factored in. With a guesstimated array size of 5 kW per solar premise, 5000 watts per property x 2,200 = 11,000,000 x $5 = $55,000,000 in public-private investments. These investments need to be protected if Seattle truly intends to be a progressive city. Per City Light's website, even a small obstruction in the surrounding landscape, e.g. a utility or flagpole, (let alone a 65 foot structure) can result in significant shade losses. As little as 10% shade on a module can reduce output by as much as 80%.

Seattle City Light webpage
http://www.seattle.gov/light/solarenergy/solarfaq.asp

We respectfully request that solar rights be a component of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan and that homeowners have an opportunity to actually weigh in on any zoning changes that impact their properties.

Sincerely,
Scott Rockwell

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: City Neighborhood Council

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Seattle City Councilmembers, Mayor Ed Murray, Patrice Carroll, Tom Hauger, Seattle 2035 Team:

The CNC's Neighborhood Planning & Land Use (NPLU) Committee has been aware of the Department of Planning and Development's (DPD) outreach to obtain community input regarding the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan which is a complex and far reaching effort.

The City Neighborhood Council (CNC) recognizes the comprehensive planning process as a way to accept and manage population and jobs growth coming to Seattle, while managing transportation, livability and environmental considerations the community wants and the Growth Management Act

requires.

We acknowledge the Seattle 2035 team for extending the comment period through November 20th to allow the community to provide measured input and note that more time may have been beneficial for many volunteer groups across the city to review and respond. The CNC Neighborhood Planning & Land Use Committee (NPLUC) met no fewer than 6 times over the past two months, attended public meetings and exchanged countless emails and documents in this exhaustive evaluation process. The draft results of the CNC NPLU Committee efforts are attached. The draft five page summary consists of major goal and policy issues and an elaboration with specific editorial suggestions for most of the Comp Plan elements.

Thank you for your consideration of the CNC NPLUC draft comments regarding the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan update.

Sincerely,

Irene Wall | Cindi Barker
CNC NPLUC Co-Chairs

Laine Ross | Catherine Weatbrook
CNC Co-Chairs
--
November 19, 2015
Seattle City Council Seattle Mayor Ed Murray Seattle Dpt Planning/Development
Patrice Carroll, Tom Hauger
VIA EMAIL
Re: Seattle 2035 – Draft Comprehensive Plan | City Neighborhood Council (CNC) – Neighborhood Planning & Land Use Committee (NPLUC) Draft Comments
Dear Seattle City Councilmembers, Mayor Ed Murray, Patrice Carroll, Tom Hauger, Seattle 2035 Team:
The CNC's Neighborhood Planning & Land Use (NPLU) Committee has been aware of the Department of Planning and Development's (DPD) outreach to obtain community input regarding the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan which is a complex and far reaching effort.
The City Neighborhood Council (CNC) recognizes the comprehensive planning process as a way to accept and manage population and jobs growth coming to Seattle, while managing transportation, livability and environmental considerations the community wants and the Growth Management Act requires.
We acknowledge the Seattle 2035 team for extending the comment period through November 20th to allow the community to provide measured input and note that more time may have been beneficial for many volunteer groups across the city to review and respond. The CNC Neighborhood Planning & Land Use Committee (NPLUC) met no fewer than 6 times over the past two months, attended public meetings and exchanged countless emails and documents in this exhaustive evaluation process. The draft results of the CNC NPLU Committee efforts are attached. The draft five page summary consists of major goal and policy issues and an elaboration with specific editorial suggestions for most of the Comp Plan elements.
Thank you for your consideration of the CNC NPLUC draft comments regarding the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan updates.
Sincerely,
Irene Wall | Cindi Barker Laine Ross | Catherine Weatbrook
CNC NPLUC Co-Chairs CNC Co-Chairs

CNC NPLUC Draft Comments Attached
C: Kathy Nyland, Director - Department of Neighborhoods

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Amy Eastwood

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

To whom it may concern:
I oppose the Draft Plan's proposal to guide more growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of frequent transit. This plan puts an unreasonable burden for growth on the small, vibrant communities targeted as Urban Villages.
Further, Seattle is made up of many neighborhoods that each have their own personality, their own neighborhood associations, their own grocery stores, and their own small commercial districts. In the redrawing of Urban Village boundaries while only considering what is within a "10-minute walk", this plan calls for the annexing of one neighborhood by another, disrupting the neighborhood feel that makes Seattle what it is.
Finally, I believe the 10-minute walk rule is ridiculously arbitrary. By whom? An elderly grandmother? An athletic college student? To the transit center? From the transit center? Does it take into account stop lights? Street crossings? Meandering neighborhood streets? Or, is it a 10-minute walk as the crow flies?
I believe a better solution would be to determine areas that could handle large amounts of growth that are already zoned for higher-density land use and ensure that adequate transit reaches these areas.
I believe a better solution would be to work with *every* neighborhood to come up with ways in which all of Seattle can help absorb the growth that will occur over the next two decades, and, again, ensure that adequate transit reaches these areas.
I believe a better solution would be to increase the number of Urban Villages in Seattle, and keep them small, instead of expanding the boundaries of the few that have already been defined.
I believe a better solution would be to ease up on the allowances for attached and detached accessory dwelling units so that neighborhoods can absorb density (while adding what is often more affordable housing) without the cost of 100+ year old homes being torn down.
I am particularly concerned about the redrafting of the Roosevelt Urban Village boundaries. I live just southeast of 15th Ave NE and NE 65th St in what is currently Ravenna but would be annexed by Roosevelt according to the Draft Plan. I oppose any expansion of the Roosevelt Urban Village boundaries.
First, I walk this neighborhood daily, and I do not believe the dashed lines accurately reflect a 10-minute walk to and from the future light rail station. I urge everyone reading this email to try walking from Ravenna Park to the future light rail station in under 10 minutes. The distance and the steepness of the grade will make it impossible.
Second, the only reason I can see to include Ravenna and Cowen Parks is if the Draft Plan included the possibility to develop these parks. Please do not develop these parks. They are two of Seattle's treasures and should be treated with respect, not as a commodity for developers.
Third, the SF5000 lots in this area are very small - mine is under 4000 sq ft - making them impossible to develop without tearing down the existing house. Most of the houses around here were built over 100 years ago with materials such as old-growth Douglas fir, and I believe it would be a shame to tear a lot of these houses down.
Fourth, everything east of 15th is currently part of the Ravenna neighborhood. The area south of 65th and east of 15th is particularly close knit. Annexing a portion of Ravenna and calling it Roosevelt would

create a strange neighborhood dynamic.
Fifth, rezoning this area as an Urban Village feels like the city taking away our ability to grow naturally and instead handing it over to profit-driven developers. We already welcome the development of the boarded-up properties owned by Hugh Sisley. We already welcome growth along 65th and would like to see it also add to the commercial center of Ravenna between 20th and 25th. We already welcome density through DADUs in our backyards and ADUs within our homes, through neighbors who rent out their bedrooms, and through whole houses rented out to groups of friends. However, at all of the meetings I've been to about the Draft Plan, I've heard talk about adding even more density within neighborhoods through new housing developments such as duplexes and row houses. But, I don't believe that's the direction most development is going in this area. I try to keep up on the local development, and what I see being permitted are small-efficiency dwelling units. I have a close friend who works with developers, and he explained to me that developers could make around $6,000 a month in rent for a triplex or over $17,000 a month with 25 SEDU units, both of which could be built on the same lot. What this says to me is that after rezoning a neighborhood as an Urban Village, the developers that come in are not going to build the type of housing that the city is pitching, but instead they are going to build the type of housing that will make them the most money. In effect, this will only welcome single individuals into new development, a far cry from the diverse housing the city says would be coming. However, when a single-family home owner opens a portion of their property for rent, they can welcome another family to the neighborhood for far less in rent than even the triplex would go for. I would much prefer this last solution, which can already happen (and is already happening) without the Urban Village designation.
Finally, a few friends and I walked door to door in the area targeted for expansion, and of the 120 or so people we spoke with, only three told us they would like this area to become an Urban Village. (And, I'd like to note that all three also said they were planning on moving soon and hoped the Urban Village designation would allow them to get more money for their house from developers or investors.) We walked door to door even though we were explicitly told by people involved in the Draft Plan that you do not care what the neighborhood wants. However, I still feel it's very important for you to know that if you do decide to expand the Urban Village boundary and take a portion of Ravenna and give it to Roosevelt, you are acting against the neighborhood's wishes.
Thank you for your time and consideration,
Amy Eastwood

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Siri Unneland

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear City Planners-

As a resident of the Othello neighborhood in south Seattle, I'm deeply concerned about the impact of Alternatives 3 and 4 of the Seattle 2035 plan.
Alternatives 3 and 4 load the heaviest burden of the new development areas on the Rainer Valley, the exact areas that coincide with the highest risk of people being pushed out of their community. I believe these proposals would have a devastating effect on my lower income neighbors and local small businesses, irreversibly dismantling vibrant cultural communities that the city should actually be working its hardest to protect.

In the past, people of certain racial or ethnic backgrounds were barred from living or owning property in the northern parts of the city. The south was the only option. For many lower income and working class people, it was the only affordable place within Seattle. It is unacceptable to now create a set of policies purposefully steering growth in a way that is guaranteed to exponentially intensify the strong market pressures already pushing people out of south Seattle.
We need to pursue the hard work of crafting an equitable 5th proposal including stronger and more specific strategies to mitigate displacement. The city needs to approve a proposal that is more just, not intentionally stacking the majority of the cost of Seattle's growth on the Rainer Valley, but to disperse the growth more equally to areas with greater resources and less risk of displacement.

Thank you,
Siri Unneland

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Gregg Petrie

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Sirs:
I do not support the draft Seattle 2035 that will replace the "old" Comprehensive Plan. In particular it would degrade my neighborhood in the U district by adding major new growth expectations while removing protections that currently ensure some semblance of village-like livability in the U district.
Gregg Petrie

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Mike Ruby

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

Attached. Have fun!
--
Mike Ruby
Envirometrics, Inc.
--
Comments on Seattle 2035
Mike Ruby
November 20, 2015
Strikeout indicates removal and underline indicates an addition.
2035 Future Land Use Map
[The Future Land Use Map that accompanies the existing 2004 Comprehensive Plan illustrates the boundaries of the Urban Villages by an outline and shows the type of land use within the Urban Village by the appropriate colors. The 2035 Future Land Use Map shows the Urban Villages as a uniform color within the boundaries, eliminating the distinctions among Single Family, Multi-Family and Commericial/Mixed Use areas. Since the FLUM is the basis for establishing the locations of these different uses and requires amendment to change a basic use through rezoning, it appears this change

to a single color is intended to ease rezoning within the Urban Villages by eliminating the need to amend the FLUM when a rezone is requested. Thus it will take much less time and therefore give much less notice to the neighborhood of a potential zone change to a more dense classification, such as from Single Family to Multi-Family. As it is now, the community is on notice twice, which is still too little for most people to tune in. With only one notice and a short period before the Council votes, most of the community will not realize what is happening until the rezone has passed. This is the single greatest impact a City decision can have on the neighborhood - they deserve to be involved. But perhaps this is the intent - to minimize neighbor input to the process. I urge you to retain the existing FLUM approach of illustrating the various land uses within the village boundaries and not propose adoption of this greased-pig approach to land use planning.]

Seattle's Growth Strategy

Planning for Growth

GSG1 Have strategies that prepare the City for the challenges and opportunities of growth and that represent the needs and desires of a broad cross-section of the city residents and businesses owners in each neighborhood.

GS1.X (between 1.3 and 1.4) Recognize neighborhood planning and implementation as critical tools for refining and turning into a reality the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. Build strong, effective strategies for implementing neighborhood policies and goals. [From NG1 and NG6 of the 2004 Comp Plan]

Urban Village Strategy

GS2.2 Encourage investments and activities in urban centers and urban villages that will enable those areas to flourish as compact mixed-use neighborhoods designed to accommodate the majority of the city's new jobs and housing, provide services and employment close to

1

housing, and promote efficient use of public services, including transit, with housing options for a variety of households and a range of incomes. Guide public and private investment to further the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, including neighborhood goals and policies.

GS2.X Ensure growth is accompanied by sufficient infrastructure and services to support that growth. Provide adequate transportation options, utilities and other public services. Provide sufficient parks and open spaces accessible to urban villages to enhance their livability, enrich their character through visual and physical relief from density, protect environmentally sensitive areas and provide opportunities for enjoyment of the natural environment as well as active uses in areas developed for play and recreation.

GS2.12 Reflect Evaluate the area that is generally within a ten-minute walk of a frequent light rail stations in establishing urban village boundaries.

GS2.14 Maintain and enhance Allow retail commercial activity in hub and residential urban villages that supports the overall residential function and character of the village. Avoid displacement of commercial activity by exclusively residential development.

GS2.2X Protect wholesale commercial centers from displacement by residential development.

GS4.1 Encourage the preservation, protection, and restoration of Seattle's distinctive natural features and land forms such as bluffs, beaches, streams, and remaining evergreen foresteds lands and urban tree cover.

[Insert a new heading between GS2.15 and GS2.16 reading "Manufacturing/Industrial Areas"]

GS2.20 Retain land in the Manufacturing/Industrial Centers for industrial uses and develop stringent criteria for evaluating requests to remove land from a M/IC, recognizing the important economic resource the land in these centers represents.

(Pg. 28) The largest amount of residential growth is expected to occur in urban centers, furthering chances for people to live close to work. The next most significant share of residential growth will likely should occur in the various hub and residential urban villages that contain a light rail station throughout the city. More modest growth will be dispersed, at lower densities, in various places outside centers and

those villages, including along arterials where current zoning allows multifamily and commercial uses.
Growth Strategy Figure 3
Estimated Urban Village Growth Rates
Expected Housing Expected Job
Hub Urban Villages Growth Rate* Growth Rate*
With frequent transit ** 70% 50%
Without frequent transit 40% 50%
Residential Urban Villages
With a light rail station 60%
With frequent transit 40% 80% [this is so bizarre it has to have been an error]
but no light rail station
Without frequent transit 20%
2
* Growth above 2014 actual housing units or jobs by 2035
** Frequent transit means a light rail station or three two or more bus lines serving multiple destinations or two bus
lines with one on 10-minute service on-peak and 15-minute or less service off-peak.
[There should be no such thing as a Hub Urban Village without frequent transit. It is essential that we focus near-term growth near the light rail stations in order for the taxpayers to recover their rather substantial investment in the system. The modification suggested above should also be reflected in Growth Strategy Figure 1]
Built Environment
GS4.X Preserve and protect low-density, singlefamily neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited. [LUG8 in the 2004 Comp Plan]
GS4.Y Design public facilities and development regulations to emphasize physical and visual connections to iconic views of Seattle's built environment, such as views of the Space Needle, the downtown skyline, historic buildings, public parks and gathering places.
GS4.15 Design multifamily zones to be appealing residential communities with high quality housing, and development standards that promote privacy and livability, such as adequate set backs between properties and from the street, appropriately scaled landscaping, street amenities, and in appropriate locations limited commercial uses targeted for the local population.
GS4.17 Encourage the use of land, rooftops, and otherwise unusable spaces to contribute to urban food and solar power production.
GS4.23 Encourage street widths and building heights that are in proportion with each other by reducing requiring setbacks from the street and keeping reasonable or additional sidewalk widths for lower higher buildings.
General Development Standards
LU1.2 Use the Future Land Use Map, the land-use policies in this land use element, policies and goals in adopted neighborhood plans and criteria in the Land Use Code to determine the appropriate zoning designation for property in the city. Collaborate with the affected neighborhoods in developing recommendations for rezoning where it is needed to better reflect the community preferences for development and evolution of the area.
LU1.X Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses. [LUG2 in the 2004 Comp Plan]

LU1.5 Establish building height limits that are consistent with the goals of the urban village strategy, the goals and polilcies of adopted neighborhood plans for affected neighborhoods and the type and scale of 3
development intended for each zone classification. lLimit the zones that allow the greatest height and density of development to urban centers and urban villages.
LU1.6 Provide a harmonious transition in building height and mass where urban centers and urban villages border neighboring residential areas. The transition should occur within the established village boundary.
LU1.7 Require Future Land Use Map amendments only when needed to achieve a significant change to the intended function of an large area.
LU5.4 Establish maximum height limits to maintain the desired scale relationship between new structures, existing development and the street environment; address varying topographic conditions; minimize view blockage; and, especially in lowerscale residential areas [do what?-something is missing here]. In certain Downtown zones and in industrial zones, heights could be unlimited to allow for special types of development uniquely suited to these zones.
[Unlilmited heights are a personal ego thing and have no relationship to economic or social need.]
LUG2 Provide zoning and accompanying land use regulations that:
• Allow for a variety of housing types to accommodate housing choices for households of all types and income levels
• Support a wide diversity of employment-generating activities providing jobs for a diverse residential population, as well as a variety of services for residents and businesses
• Accommodate the full range of public services, institutions, and amenities needed to support a fully developed, diverse, and economically sustainable urban community
• Support the goals and policies of adopted neighborhood plans.
Special Uses: Public Facilities and Small Institutions
LU3.7 Allow public facilities and institutional buildings no longer used as originally intended (e.g., schools) to be repurposed for other uses not otherwise permitted in the applicable zone, using criteria to assess proposed uses for each vacant school building that are established as the need arises through a process that includes the participation of the building owner (e.g., Seattle School District), the City, and the surrounding neighborhood.
Special Uses: Telecommunication Facilities
LU4.2 Adopt standards to limit exposure to radio frequency radiation that are in keeping with federal standards peer-reviewed scientific evidence.
[Federal standards often lag behind the scientific evidence by several years due to necessary procedures for adopting federal regulations.]
General Development Standards
LU5.X In order to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while suppporting 4
redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan. [LU11 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
LU5.3 Control the massing of structures to make them compatible with the area's planned scale as expressed in the goals and policies of adopted neighborhood plans, provide a reasonable ratio of open to occupied space on a site, and allow the building to receive adequate natural light.
LU5.4 Establish maximum height limits to maintain the desired scale relationship between new structures, existing development and the street environment, especially in lower-scale residential areas; address and respond to varying topographic conditions; minimize view blockage; and reduce building

heights as you approach the shoreline and, especially in lower-scale residential areas. In certain Downtown zones and in industrial zones, heights could be unlimited to allow for special types of development uniquely suited to these zones only by what is needed to carry out industrial functions. In Urban Centers sub-areas may be designated where heights could be limited at elevations substantially higher than the surrounding area in order to define visual focii for the urban center.
LU5.7 Employ development standards in residential zones that address the use of the ground level of new development sites to help maintain existing patterns of landscaping, especially front yards in single-family residential areas, and to encourage permeable surfaces and vegetation. Encourage the preservation or planting of street trees and significant trees on development property as development occurs, except as necessary for public safety and to prevent harm to utility networks. [From LU41 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
LU5.Y Use the following tools to protect trees, appropriate to the size, importance and location of a tree:
• Providing flexibility in development standards
• Promoting tree retention through the design review process
• Promoting site planning and horticultural practices that are consistent with the reasonable use of property
• Educating the public and development community concerning the value of retaining trees
• Restricting the removal of trees on undeveloped land prior to review of a specific development proposal [From LU40 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
LU5.15 Establish controls on the placement, direction, and maximum height of lighting and on the glare from reflective materials used on the exterior of structures in order to limit impacts on surrounding uses, enhance the character of the city, and encourage energy conservation and avoid unnecessary illumination of the dark night sky.
LU5.19 Seek excellence in new development through a design review process that encourages multiple perspectives on design issues and that complements development regulations, allowing for flexibility in the application of development standards to achieve quality design that:
• Enhances the character of the city
• Respects the surrounding neighborhood context, including historic resources
• Enhances and protects the natural environment
5
• Allows for diversity and creativity in building design and site planning
• Furthers community design and development objectives as expressed in the goals and policies of neighborhood plans and design guidelines
• Achieves desired intensities of development
• Responds to the increasingly diverse social and cultural character of the city
Off Street Parking
Discussion
The main function of a parking space is to provide vehicle storage, either for a short period of time, such as for customer or visitor parking, or a long period of time, such as for resident or commuter parking. However, as we transition to an all-electric passenger vehicle fleet we will need parking places to also provide for the recharging of residential vehicles. . . .
LU6.2 Modify residential parking regulations, where parking is required, to recognize differences in the likely auto use and ownership of intended occupants of new developments, such as projects provided for low-income, elderly, or disabled residents. Residential parking regulations should require a minimum of parking spaces in multi-family structures to ensure opportunities for electric vehicle recharging and provide for installation of public recharging stations along residential streets.

LU6.3 Within Urban Centers rRely on market forces to determine the amount of parking provided in new development, in areas of the city that are well-served by transit, such as urban centers and those In urban villages that contain frequent transit service, without requireing a minimum parking requirement in these areas to be provided by new public, commercial and multi-family residential development that may cause parking spill-over to residential areas outside the village. Outside urban villages require parking for new development consistent with the size of the development and existing availability of parking in the area.
[Only in Urban Centers do building developers face sufficient market power that the market forces can arbitrate the correct amount of parking for a new structure.]
LU6.15 Discourage the development of major, stand alone park and ride facilities within Seattle's Urban Centers. Situations where additions to park•and•ride capacity could be considered include:
• At light-rail transit stations outside the Urban Centers
• At the terminusals for a major regional transit system (e.g., Washington State Ferries)
• Where opportunities exist for "shared parking"
• Where alternatives to automobile use are particularly inadequate or cannot be provided in a cost effective manner
Incentives
LUG7 Use development incentive programs to provide opportunities for affordable housing, historic buildings and viewscapes preservation and environmental resource protection through allowing exchange of development rights increasing density into areas targeted for growth while concurrently addressing the impacts of the added density on the livability of urban neighborhoods, with particular emphasis on addressing the housing needs of those residents who are least likely to be served by higher density development provided by the private market.
6
Single•family Residential Areas
LU8.4 Recognize detached single-family dwellings as the principal use in single-family residential areas and as the primary use permitted outright, with a household occupying a single family dwelling defined to encompass a great variety of income levels and lifestyle choices, however define a family unit for unrelated individuals as no more than six such persons in a single family residential structure, including those occupying an accessory dwelling unit, or no more than four times the number of units for a multi-family structure.
LU8.5 Allow the development of residential structures compatible with the existing pattern of low height, bulk and scale of development in those neighborhoods where and eEncourage accessory dwelling units and other housing types that are attractive and clearly accessory to the primary use and affordable to a broad range of households and incomes and do not compromise the existing pattern of low height, bulk and scale of development in the neighborhood.
LU8.9 Allow exceptions to minimum lot size requirements to recognize existing buildings sites created under earlier regulations and historic platting patterns so they do not become non-conforming, to allow the consolidation of very small lots into larger lots, to adjust lot lines to permit more orderly development patterns, and to provide more housing opportunities by creating additional buildable sites when they thatintegrate well with surrounding lots and do not result in the demolition of existing housing.
LU8.X Permit rezones of single-family designated areas, including lot size, when they meet the following criteria:
• The site is within an urban center or urban village
• The rezone supports the goals and policies of an adopted neighborhood plan
• The rezone is to a low-scale single-family or multifamily zone, compatible with adjoining singlefamily areas

• The rezone procedures are followed. [From LU59 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
LU8.Y Apply small lot single=family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when the following conditions are met:
• The site is within an urban center or urban village
• The rezone supports the goals and policies of an adopted neighborhood plan
• The rezone procedures are followed.
[From LU60 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
Multifamily Residential Areas
LU9.1 Designate as multifamily residential areas those places that are either predominantly occupied by multifamily development or are located where a greater concentration of residential development is desired at various intensities consistent with the urban village strategy and the goals and policies of adopted neighborhood plans .
LU9.4 Establish evaluation criteria for rezoning land to multifamily designations that support the urban village strategy, create desirable multifamily residential neighborhoods, maintain
7
compatible scale, maintain views, enhance the streetscape and pedestrian environment, and achieve an efficient use of the land without major impact on the natural environment. When rezoning land from single-family designation, the rezone must meet the criteria for single-family rezones. Do not allow the rezoning of commercial/mixed use to multifamily.
LU9.10 Within urban villages Ddesignate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings canare needed to provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas.
Commercial/Mixed Use Areas
LUG10 Create and maintain strong, successful commercial /mixed-use areas that provide a focus for the surrounding neighborhood and that encourage new businesses, provide stability and opportunities for expanding existing businesses and services, and promote economic development and neighborhood vitality, while also accommodating residential development in livable environments that are compatible with the desired commercial function.
LU10.4 Apply development standards that distinguish between pedestrian-oriented commercial zones, which are harmonious with and easily accessible to their surrounding neighborhoods, and general commercial zones which accommodate uses that are more dependent on automobile and truck access.
LU10.5 Support a wide range of uses in commercial areas, taking into account the intended pedestrian, automobile, or residential orientation of the area, the area's role in the urban village strategy and the goals and policies of adopted neighborhood plans, and the impacts that the uses could have on surrounding areas.
LU10.6 Encourage housing in mixed-use developments in pedestrian-oriented commercial/mixed use areas above the street level to provide additional opportunities for residents to live in neighborhoods where they can walk to services and employment.
LU10.11 Preserve active streetscapes in central pedestrian oriented commercial/mixed use areas and areas designated as desired commercial centers in adopted neighborhood plans by prohibiting limiting residential uses along the street frontage of the ground floor and by keeping those spaces available primarily for commercial uses, in order to strengthen commercial cores and accommodate fluctuating market conditions. Consider street-level residential uses on the margins of and outside these areas, and when street-level residential uses are permitted, find ways to give ground floor tenants privacy and to create visual interest along the street•front.
LU10.13 Assign height limits to commercial/mixed use areas independent of the commercial zone

designations but consistent with the intended intensity of development in the zone and the goals and policies of adopted neighborhood plans. Allow different areas within a zone to be assigned different height limits based on the appropriate height needed to: further the urban village strategy's goals of focusing growth in urban villages; accommodate the desired functions and intensity of development; provide a harmonious scale relationship with existing development; accommodate desired transitions
8
with development in adjacent areas, and address potential view blockage. Outside urban villages assign height limits that will discourage high-density development of housing, office buildings and similar uses more appropriately located in residential and mixed use zones in urban villages.
LU10.20 Prevent Encourage the conversion of general commercial areas within urban villages to pedestrian oriented commercial or mixed use zones where those areas are currently serving a regional commercial client base in keeping with the Plan's goals and urban village strategy.
LU10.X In general commercial areas, limit or prohibit housing or office development where:
•These uses could potentially conflict with the existing commercial function of the area or with the activities of commercial functions, especially the need for road transportation of goods
•The available land for general commercial activites is limited and displacement of some of the existing commerical uses may reduce the viability of the entire general commerical area [From LU137 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
Industrial Areas
LU11.7 Use the general industrial zones to promote a full range of industrial activities and related support uses. Distinguish among general industrial zones based on the amount of
commercial uses permitted. Protect marine and rail-related industrial areas from inappropriate levels of commercial uses and limit those uses through density or size limits. [From LU156 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
LU11.11 Recognize the unique working character of industrial areas by keeping landscaping and street standards to a minimum to allow for flexibility of industrial activities, except along
selected arterials where installing continuous sidewalks, street trees and providing screening and landscaping can address the specific need to offset impacts of new industrial development in high visibility locations and enhance the safety of pedestrians.
LU11.X Where industrial zones are within and adjacent to the shoreline, protect street ends and waterways and access to the street ends and waterways by the public from encroachment by adjacent uses.
LU11.Y Require conditional use approval for intensive uses located adjacent to residential and mixeduse areas and uses that would have significant impacts of other commercial and industrial uses adjacent to the proposed use. Employ setback requirements and additional controls where necessary to avoid adverse impacts on existing neighbors. [From LU164, LU166 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
Environmentally Critical Areas
LU17.10 Regulate development on abandoned solid waste landfill sites and adjacent areas to minimize the risks of ground subsidence, earthquake-induced ground shaking, and
methane gas build-up and release.
LU17.13 Seek to aAvoid net loss in area of wetland acreage, and require no net loss of wetland values or functions across the city, including, but not limited to flood control, water quantity and
9
quality, fish and wildlife habitat, and quality of life and educational benefits. Allow a
wetland's functions to be replaced either on or off-site, in certain circumstances. When wetland functions must be replaced off-site require an increased (e.g., +20%) level of replacement.
LU17.17 Regulate development in and around the banks of streams, creeks and lakes wetlands to protect the natural functions and values of these areas from the potential negative effects

of urban development. Regulate development in flood-prone areas to protect the public health and safety and to minimze property damage by flooding conditions. [From LU230 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
Transportation Options
T1.X Provide opportunities for public involvement in planning and designing City transportation facilities, programs and services, and encourage other transportation agencies to do the same. [from T3 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
TG2 Allocate space on Seattle's streets to safely and efficiently connect people and goods to their destinations while creating inviting spaces within the right-of-ways with adequate provision for street trees and separation of pedestrians from motor vehicle and bicycle traffic.
T2.11 Preserve and enhance the boulevard network both for travel and as a usable open space system for active transportation modes, recognizing its role as a part of the parks system.
T3.5 Prioritize transit investments on the basis of elimination of petroleum-powered vehicles, ridership demand, service to populations heavily reliant on transit, and opportunities to leverage funding.
T3.14 Implement new technologies that will enhance access to transportation and parking options and for the recharging of electric vehicles.
T4.4 Work to reduce eliminate the use of fossil fuels and to promote the use of alternative fuelspower sources.
T7.X Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment. [T32 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
T7.Y Look for opportunities to re-establish connections across I-5 by enlarging existing crossings, creating crossing under, or constructing lids over I-5 that can also provide opportuniities for development or open space. [T30.5 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
Capital Facilities
CF1.X Welcome recommendations from neighborhood organizations for capital improvements and the siting of capital facilities and collaborate with them in developing the capital facilities budget.
10
CF2.3 Seek to achieve 20% energy savings from a 2008 baseline across the City's portfolio of buildings by 2020. Reduce fossil fuel use in City buildings by 80% by 2020 and achieve net carbon neutrality by 20530. [From EG10 of the 2004 Comp Plan]
Environment
E1.2 Strive Develop and implement policies and programs to increase citywide tree canopy coverage to by 40% from a 2007 baseline by 2035over time
E2.2 Reduce Effectively eliminate combined sewer overflows by reducing stormwater inflows and increasing storage in combined system areas.
Climate
E3.X Achieve an all-electric transit fleet in Seattle by 2030 and an all-electric personal and commercial vehicle fleet by 2050. Provide convenient opportunities for the recharging of electric vehicles in multifamily
housing and in the public rights-of-way.
Parks and Open Space
Access to Open Space
P1.2 Identify goals for the City's future open space system that are realistic about the quantity of land that could be acquired, consider land managed by other agencies, and that drive improvements in the quality and usability of those spaces.
P1.5 Provide natural areas to preserve important natural or ecological features in public

ownership and allow people controlled access to these spaces while leaving sufficient undisturbed area to provide natural environments for wildlife.
P1.7 Encourage or require public facilities and private developers to incorporate on-site publicly accessible open space or and to provide appropriate recreation opportunities for building tenants within new developments.
P1.8 Use cooperative agreements with the Seattle School District and other public agencies to provide access to open spaces they control. Work with the Seattle School District to co-develop playgrounds on elementary school sites.
Park Activities
P2.3 Provide recreation and social programs that allow older adults to remain healthy and actively involved in their community. Cooperate closely with the independent Senior Centers to provide such programs
11
Maintaining Park Facilities
P3.3 Enhance wildlife habitat by restoring forests, and expanding the tree canopy on City-owned land and controlling public access to natural areas.
Neighborhood Planning
Introduction
...Many neighborhood plans contain policies that reflect a common vision for Seattle's future and therfore seem redundant with policies in other elements of this Plan. Future planning processes in neighborhoods should consider ways to limit such redundancy in order to provide more focus on the unique circumstances and aims for the individual neighborhoods. But the goals and policies of adopted neighborhood plans in this Comprehensive Plan are official and governing City policy to be utilized by City departments and staff in developing and implementing City proposals and actions.
NPG1 Help fulfill this Plan's values, vision, and goals by maintaining plans for neighborhoods, especially where the City wants or expects growth to occur, and by including growth goals, policies and strategies in those plans that are appropriate to each neighborhood and based on the desires of the neighborhood,
NP1.2 Engage a wide range of people from the neighborhood in each neighborhood planning process, including, for example, homeowners, renters, business owners, customers and employees, school parents and church communities, with special emphasis on groups who have historically been under-represented.
NP1.3 Develop neighborhood plans that while generally to be consistent with this Plan's vision and allow the neighborhood plans to focus on issues and development patterns that reflect are unique to their areas' desired character.
NP1.4 Assess as part of the City's budget process Consider neighborhood plan recommendations, strategies, goals and policies when prioritizing City capital investments and s

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Kelly Rench

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

I would like to see other more logical zoning mixes considered within the existing Roosevelt Urban Village boundary and along the already densifying corridor between Roosevelth and the University District before rezoning the historic bungalows currently within Ravenna Neighborhood.
Consider maximizing exiting zoning within the current Roosevelt Urban Village boundary. For example,

upzone the south side of NE 65th from NC4 to NC6 to match the north side of 65th.
The development of the NC4 zoned properties on the east side of 15th Ave NE from NE 65th to NE 68th in addition to the 1,000 plus units expected in the next 3 years should accommodate more than enough housing. This makes 15th Ave a smart and elegant boundary.
The housing stock along Ravenna Park and the east of 16th Ave NE is comprised of historic, 100+ year old craftman bungalows. This style of home is rare in NE Seattle and can only be found from 16th Ave NE to 20th Ave NE and Ravenna Park to NE 75. These beautiful homes are worth preserving since they tell the story and display the rich history of NE Seattle, Ravenna Park and the University of Washington.
The existing homes identified in the expanded boundary area already provide affordability and density with legal mother-in-law apartments, rental housing, townhouses and accessory dwelling units. Replacing them with a duplex, triplex or LR apartment would increase rents and force those in existing rental units with single family lots out.
Why isn't there an Urban Village designation for the University District? It contains a light rail Station and offers a strong development corridor between 15th Ave NE and Roosevelt Ave. north to the Roosevelt Urban Village. There is already dense, new and planned multifamily housing along this existing corridor that makes sense for accommodating more development.
Why isn't there an urban village planned for the UW Stadium Light Rail Station?
Why isn't there an urban village planned for Queen Anne?
If you do expand the boundary consider leaving the existing single family zoning as is. It makes good sense to maintain single family residences within the 10 minute walking zone to keep a fair and well rounded mix of walkable, affordable housing.
Thank you for listening and for your thoughtful consideration in exploring increased zoning height within the existing Roosevelt Urban Village in combination with creating a University District Urban Village and increased density along the connecting corridor.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Michael Moss

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Dear City Council,
I am writing to voice a few comments about the comprehensive plan, I am a 23 year resident/homeowner in Seattle.
1. I am hoping that single family zones will stay zoned ONLY for single houses. This keeps our neighborhoods with the same character they've always had, this is what makes Seattle great & unique!
In other words, preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences.
2. Parking: we need new buildings to provide parking, even if it does cost more $ for developers. It is NOT realistic to believe that people move to Seattle with no cars, and if no parking is built then on street parking will only get worse. Just look at Capitol Hill...
BTW Light rail/buses are NOT sufficient for most people to get around Seattle.
Please know & remember that this boom cycle will NOT last, and the beauty and character of Seattle needs to stay intact forever!
Thank you -- Michael Moss

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Sharon Scherer

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

The foundation of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan is the Urban Village Strategy and neighborhood planning. Maintaining the character of Seattle's neighborhoods includes the historic commercial buildings, multi-family buildings and single family houses inside the designated urban villages. The diversity of architectural styles, many reflecting ethnic or regional places of origin, contributes to a sense of place and a sense of an inclusive community.

A stable population base provides community stewards who pick up litter, clear storm drains, paint out graffiti, organize disaster response, report street light outages and broken water mains, reunite stray dogs with their guardians, deter crime and engage new comers. Home owners and renters who are satisfied with the livability of their neighborhood are more likely to establish roots. Up-zoning and opportunistic development will be detrimental to the livability of urban villages and the community stewards will likely relocate.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Marla Steinhoff

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Please do not expand on the existing footprint of the North Rainier Urban Hub village that was designated and upzoned in 2013. The footprint and zoning was developed over a multi year planning process that solicited input from the community. The community specifically asked that upzoning would not occur in the Mount Baker neighbhorhood. The new recommendation that expands the current footprint is based on HALA recommendations. HALA is a very exclusive group that did not have fair representation from the community at large, including a voice from the single family neighborhoods. Let's focus on development where there is a blank slate and in close proximity to the light link.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: John Flowers

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

John Flowers' holistic approach to the transportation portion of Seattle's 2035 Plan

Hello,
I am John Flowers, retired lawyer, now living in the Ballard neighborhood of Seattle.
Washington Governor Jay Inslee, Seattle Mayor Ed Murray, and other visionary political, business, and civic leaders have urgently requested us to think of bold, holistic solutions to global warming and traffic congestion, which are not unique to the Puget Sound region. These are national problems that require coordinated, intergovernmental cooperation, and compromise. These are my ideas on how to solve these urgent problems.
I have recently read in many newspaper articles and heard many politicians repeat the assumption that Light Rail will be an important part of Puget Sound's future transit plans, particularly the enactment of

ST3, now proposed by the Board of Directors of Sound Transit in a $15 billion ballot initiative measure for November, 2016.

However, Light Rail is obsolete. [To confirm that Light Rail is now obsolete and has been obsolete for about 20 years, just do a keyword search of "light rail" and "obsolete" on the Internet.] Light Rail is much too slow [averaging only about 30 mph], too expensive [averaging about $300 million per mile], and is not scalable to a regional transportation system. At most, it is a slow, expensive, obsolete, and dysfunctional fixed rail system that should never be expanded from Seattle to the entire Puget Sound region.

For less than $7 billion [which is less than half of the $15 billion projected cost of ST3], we can build a robust central "spine" of a regional transit system down the freeway corridor of I-5 freeway the entire distance from the northern border of Snohomish County, through King County, to the western border Pierce County, a distance of about 100 miles. Better yet, it could serve as a model for a "Warren Buffett Interstate High Speed Rail" system throughout the United States, which for the most part would be built on the [already paid for] rights of way of the Interstate Highway System, which was started the Eisenhower administration in the 1950s and completed in the 1960s.

Such a high speed rail system should use the "best science" available, which I understand is now maglev [magnetic levitation] technology. In fact, the inventor of a pollution free maglev powered train now lives and works in Port Angeles, Washington, and his patents are available for purchase and/or licensing. [To see his system, please go to his website at LevX.com.] My preliminary calulation of the cost of such a maglev system would be a fraction of the cost now being spent by Sound Transit for Light Rail and 3 times as fast.

In addition, such maglev trains in the median of freeways could also haul freight, which would generate substantial revenue to offset the cost of passenger rail. The reason freight revenue is so large is that freight is shipped or can be shipped 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, while commuter rail generally reaches its peak revenue only during rush hours [about 3 hours in the morning and 3 hours in afternoon], 5 days a week, Monday through Friday.

Within the city limits of Seattle, we could convert the Express Lanes to high speed maglev trains, thereby hauling up to 10 times as many commuters as cars now running in the Express Lanes, which are generally occupied by one person vehicles. Also we could partner with the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma to build an "Alameda Corridor" [now used by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach]. The container freight shipments from the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma would be shipped around the south end of Lake Washington and up the I-405 freeway corridor to pick up and deliver freight to and from Boeing, Amazon, and/or Microsoft, et al. Such an Alameda Corridor for freight would be a trench 50 feet wide, 33 feet deep, and have 3 guideway [tracks] in the bottom for high-speed maglev trains We could haul passengrs in the same corridor by putting arches or crossbars over the trench and putting a high speed rail for passengers on top. In more rural areas, such as Snohomish County and Pierce County, and other areas along the I-5 freeway corridor, we would not need such a trench. Simply putting 3 guideways on the ground in the medians of the freeways allow them to be built quickly, with minimum disruption to freeway vehicular traffic. We should design computer models to test these arrangements before they are built. This will allow for speedy delivery of freight, removing heavy semi trucks and trailers from the freeways, and creating substantial new revenue to offset the cost of passenger rail.

As an added, but not necessarily required, feature of this maglev train system, we can give the maglev train the ability to pick up and drop off passengers without the "mother train" being required to stop at the high speed rail stations, which would be spaced about 10 miles apart, on average. For example, if a fast train was going south from Everett to Lynnwood, anyone who wanted to get off at the Lynnwood station would move to the rear car. Then just before the "mother train" reached the Lynnwood station, it would release the rear car and the rear car would coast down an offramp and stop of the station, letting its passengers get off the train. Anyone who wanted to get on the "mother train" would come to

the Lynnwood station a few minutes before its arrival and get into a train car, with a small electric motor, which would accelerate [to 80 mph]down an onramp onto the main track just ahead of the "mother train". The "mother train" would slow down [to 80 mph], gently link up with the new train car, and then accelerate again [to 100 mph] on the main track, without ever stopping at the station. This idea is based on the International Space Station which exchanges astronauts by using the space shuttle while the space station itself is circling the earth at 17,500 mph. Only this would be much easier on the ground because the "mother train" would be going about 100 mph on a fixed guideway. This space station technology was developed by the local Boeing Company.

If manufactured locally and sold to customers in other states and around the world, such a maglev high-speed rail system, especially one with the ability to load and unload passengers without the "mother train" ever stopping at stations, would generate thousands of family wage jobs for our local skilled workforce. As an additional bonus, and a significant contribution to solving global warming, we could request or require [by imminent domain, if necessary] railroad companies with tracks down on the beach sand in places like Edmonds, Mukilteo, and Woodway to remove their tracks ["Iron Curtains"] which run through many of our neighborhoods and along our beaches, which generally block off public access to public beaches for miles and miles [much like the condominiums in Miami Beach, Florida]. Thus, if the railroads and other shipping companies want to ship freight in the coastal regions of Puget Sound [and eventually throughout the United States], they would need to negotiate and pay an easement right-of-way fee to the public entity running the maglev high-speed rail system in the median of freeways [just the opposite of what now occurs, for example, a public entity such as Sound Transit have agreed to pay $200 million for a 20 year right-of-way use of the railroad tracks between Everett and Seattle, allowing Sound Transit to operate 2 Sounder Trains in the morning and 2 Sounder Trains in the evening]. By shifting the freight shipments to the freeway corridors, we could utilize the rights of ways now used for railroad tracks ["Iron Curtains"] as new space for walkable communities,hiking trails, bike trails, etc.

Each city, neighborhood, or urban village along the route where such a maglev high-speed train operates could then decide what kind of "feeder system" it would use to funnel commuter passengers into the high-speed rail station. For example, in Ballard, we should investigate the use of the Monorail [constructed in t962 as a part of World Fair] to see how it is currently used. Is it used for commuters or just tourists? The Monorail now runs from downtown Seattle to the Space Needle, a distance of only about 3 miles. We should seriously consider expanding it [with a maglev elevated guideway] to the north to go to Northgate, thereby providing a clear alternative to automobile traffic now choking these communities through which it runs, such as Ballard, Crown Hill, First Hill, et al. Other communities could use small electric vehicles as "feeder systems" to shuttle commuters from their homes to the nearest high-speed rail station, much as we now shuttle schoolchildren in their school buses between their homes and schools. Each family utilizing such a shuttle system could save up to $500 or more per month by leaving one or more of their cars at home for one or 2 days per week or more as they became accustomed to the new commuter transit system.

Our children and grandchildren are expecting us to solve these problems as soon as possible. All of them can be solved with current technology.

We just have to persuade elected public officials to summon the political will and courage to find and utilize known solutions. It's not rocket science!

If you're interested in helping me organize an alternative transit solution initiative on the November 2016 ballot, please contact me.

Thank you.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Libby Rasmussen

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

Bus routes do it suffice anymore in Seattle. We need an extensive rail system. Also, more parks need to be added and developers cannot be allowed to leach off existing infrastructure & services. They should be required to add value to the area...not just suck up whatever they can get to make a buck.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Art Pederson

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

This is a comment about an addition to the Comp Plan necessary to adequately achieve the City's goals on addressing climate change. At the same time this addition will also reinforce the City's emphasis on good urban design.

Trees. The Comp Plan should strongly support the maintenance of the urban forest as a beautiful (urban design) and highly effective means to mitigate the urban heat island effects (UHIE) of urbanization and climate change.

Now the City's emphasis for combatting climate change is reduction in green house gasses (GHGs). While this is essential it does nothing to address the repetitive and continuing rises in urban average temperatures. Tree canopy is an extremely effective way to reduce UHIE (see The City and the Coming Climate by Brian Stone Jr.). It does this by absorbing short wave solar radiation instead of reflecting it back into the atmosphere as long wave radiation where it is trapped and increases ambient temperature, like buildings and pavement do.

It's surprisingly simple: cooling from absorption of solar radiation, cooling from shading, reduction in storm water pollution of our waterways through rain fall interception - and further cooling from the transpiration of the water absorbed from roots, sequestration of carbon dioxide, production of oxygen from this sequestration. All in addition to beautification of the urban environment.

The Comp Plan should contain strong direction to increase canopy coverage through reforestation of parks and public land, the passing of a robust and enforced tree protection ordinance and a broad range of development incentives and departure / waivers to encourage the retention of existing trees.

Thank you
Art Pederson
Broadview, North Seattle

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: John Niles

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

For the Seattle 2035 environmental record:

Speaking as a City of Seattle resident since 1982, I have been working for the past several years on the implementable transportation concept that deployment of automated vehicles into public transit service is an environmentally sustainable and best development path for the future of urban areas such as City of Seattle. This work is fully described at http://endofdriving.org .

This development path for automated vehicles is already being deployed in Europe as shown in photos in the lower right hand corner of the below graphic excerpt from an invited research summary poster I displayed on November 12, 2015 at the Disrupting Mobility Global Summit at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as follows:

What my work suggests should be incorporated into the transportation component of Seattle 2035, and of course, I can help on request to do that.

Please consider this email a comment for the SEPA environmental record for the Seattle 2035 plan.

Also, please insert the attached 10 page description of my recommendation "Environmentally Sustainable Deployment for Autonomous Vehicles" into the SEPA environmental record for the Seattle 2035 plan.

Thank you

John Niles

--

© Grush Niles Associates 2015 - 1 - endofdriving.org

Application Creep:

Environmentally Sustainable Deployment for Autonomous Vehicles1

Bern Grush, John Niles, Grush Niles Associates, 2015

There are two popular and somewhat utopian views of the future of the self-driving automobile. One is a long-fantasized, extra safe, super convenient, congestion-busting household vehicle that requires no attention to operate. The other is an on-demand robo-cab that rolls up to wherever you are within a minute or two of your request via smartphone and zips you to exactly where you told the app you want to go. Will one of these futures dominate or will they co-exist? Which future should a regional government prepare for?

David Levinson and Kevin Krizek open their new book: The End of Traffic and the Future of Transport2 with:

“Day-to-day driving experiences are a stark contrast to the advertising spooled by auto makers. Driving is at best functional, and at worst a dangerous hassle. Commuting by car is failing to spur happiness. Complaints about traffic are increasingly widespread.”

While this description of automobility is hardly new, it is clearly our admitted cultural truth in contrast to our evident preference given what a century of advertising, film and other media have promised. Cities that report a constant stream of traffic woes on radio and newspaper are common. For decades, large cities throughout the world have been up against the wall of urban growth, congestion, rising costs, and environmental degradation. In tandem, many cities continue to have well-documented deficits in transit, road maintenance, and bike lanes.

Many observers believe the developed world is on the cusp of a tsunami of automotive innovation that will enable miraculous relief from these circumstances. Others think it more likely this will generate a new and different wave of problems. Precisely because it is easy to see how this could go either way, planning for the next 20 years given an expectation of impending vehicle robotics is wholly unlike any other 20-year planning exercise we might have engaged in over the past few decades.

Because the robotization of transportation vehicles is both certain and uncertain, infrastructure and transportation planning have been put at a new kind of disadvantage. Specifically, we can be quite certain of someday(!) needing no human operator for nearly all vehicles in almost all circumstances—i.e., pervasive vehicle autonomy. Many of us prognosticate about the nature of some of the disruption that will accompany this technology. But most of the robotic future is dominated by uncertainty.

We read many contradictory predictions about robotics vehicles. These are often biased: a manufacturer’s spokesperson wanting to position their firm’s brand; a Transportation Engineering PhD student simulating or extrapolating hopeful solutions to an enormous set of problems; a

1 This essay is based an appendix that appeared in "Building Our Tomorrow: The Future of Ontario’s

Infrastructure. How the impact of megatrends and rise of new infrastructure will change the province (and Canada)" by Michael Fenn, former Ontario Deputy Minister and founding CEO of Metrolinx and published in August 2015 by the Residential and Civil Construction Alliance of Ontario. It has been changed and extended.

2 Levinson, D. and Krizek, K. (2015) The End of Traffic and the Future of Transport Application Creep: Environmentally Sustainable Deployment for Autonomous Vehicles 20151008 © Grush Niles 2015 - 2 - endofdriving.org safety engineer wanting to advance the life-and-death value of this technology as soon as possible; journalists awed by high-tech vehicle demonstrations they see at a trade show.3

Predicting vs. Hoping

All of this taken together leaves those charged with creating a regional or municipal transportation plan with many difficult questions. How quickly will the autonomous vehicle arrive? No one can ascertain the speed or time of arrival of full, body-out, autonomy—i.e., full pervasiveness in a region or city. We can easily imagine technical feasibility in most operating circumstances, but we cannot say when sufficient reliability will be exhibited in every circumstance—indeed, some credible thought-leaders express doubts about this.4 That means we don't know when (or if) any different sorts or scales of infrastructure will be needed, or how long what we might contemplate building in the interim will be needed.

Will robotics mean more or fewer vehicle kilometres traveled? Currently, humans are capped out at a worldwide average of about one travel-hour per day. If we can eat, play, sleep, read, work and shop instead of attending to driving, how much further might we choose to sprawl? Recent evidence appears equivocal. Many people who cannot drive now forego trips or have chauffeurs or use transit unwillingly. Will non-drivers with new freedom of mobility add to kilometres travelled, or increase the number of cars owned? This has been our behaviour for the past century.

Will robotics make travel cheaper? Humans now spend around eleven per cent of their disposable income on travel.5 Robotics will lower the cost of the vehicle, its fuel, its insurance and its parking fees. When something is cheaper, more is consumed. Will the travel savings be spent on longer trips? Or on bigger vehicles as is common in North America now? One might think rational travelers would spend the windfall travel budget on something else, but that is true of only some people.

Will new automotive players change the solution landscape? Will incumbent automotive manufacturers continue to stage gradual innovations and very appealing safety features to sell more semi-robotic vehicles for more model years, or will new apps-on-wheels players like Google, Apple, Uber and Tesla steal the puck? Both types of players want to sell more. Some new players propose to sell kilometres or trips. The incumbents sell vehicles and some of them are already thinking about selling kilometres, too. Others envision giving away trips as long as passengers shop during or at the end of the trip. All of this means more vehicle kilometres would be consumed.

In what priority order will robotic vehicle technologies dominate? Will the auto industry focus on household vehicles before or after commercial vehicles and for-hire ride services? What about transit vehicles such as buses or vans? Expecting all autonomous applications to happen quickly—say over a decade—may be physically, operationally, and socially impractical. Will governments set regulations and let automotive manufacturers make and sell what they can to household consumers, while letting the insurance companies work out the issues of mixed traffic—driver-in and driver-out—sharing the road?

3 A recent report published by the Conference Board of Canada is an excellent resource. See Automated Vehicles: The Coming of the Next Disruptive Technology at
ttp://www.cavcoe.com/articles/AV_rpt_2015-01.pdf

4 Schwartz, Sam (2015) Street Smart: The Rise of Cities and the Fall of Cars

5 Marchetti, C. (1994) Anthropological Invariants in Travel Behaviour, Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 47,
75-88. also http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marchetti's_constant

© Grush Niles 2015 - 3 - endofdriving.org

Will shared fleets or household vehicles dominate? Critically, the jury is out on the matter of vehicle ownership, even though hope-filled forecasts by some paint a utopia of inevitable, widespread vehicle sharing. Will most autonomous vehicles be owned as family vehicles are now? Or will the advantages of shared fleets be available to, evident to, and selected by the great majority of travelers so that the population of household vehicles shrinks dramatically—90 per cent according to the most optimistic accounts? Will the car become more of a travel service and less of an accessory—i.e., all about the trip, nothing about status? Many academics are on record as saying "few people will own autonomous vehicles; most will share them", but there are many reasons—rational or not—that most people currently prefer or select ownership, even while a tiny-but-growing few have found ways to avoid owning a vehicle. The backdrop of culture, habit, status, privacy and convenience of owning can be stacked against the rational, economic notions of sharing and be used very effectively by automotive marketers. That has already started. Will irrational consumption or rational conservation dominate? New excess or a surfeit of sharing? It's impossible to know which future will prevail. We face many debates.

Some simulation-based research has been generated for cities such as Austin,6 Lisbon,7 Manhattan,8 Stockholm9 and others. Consistently, these researchers find that each simulated autonomous vehicle can replace about ten current, family-owned vehicles (that's where the "90 per cent" comes from). But these simulations are realistic only in a constrained context. They have been parameterized using the origin-destination (O-D) data collected in the simulated cities, but in most cases the researchers imply or reviewers conclude that such figures can be extrapolated to the world vehicle population. Ronald Bailey writes:10 Researchers at the University of Texas, devising a realistic [our emphasis] simulation of vehicle use in [Austin] that took into account issues like congestion and rush-hour usage, found that each shared autonomous vehicle could replace eleven conventional vehicles. Notionally then, it would take only about 800 million vehicles to supply all the transportation services for 9 billion people. That figure is 200 million vehicles fewer than the current world fleet of 1 billion automobiles.

In the Texas simulations, riders waited an average of 18 seconds for a driverless vehicle to show up, and each vehicle served 31 to 41 travelers per day. Less than half of 1 per cent of travelers waited more than five minutes for a vehicle. In addition, shared autonomous vehicles would also cut an individual's average cost of travel by as much as 75 per cent in comparison to conventional driver-owned vehicles. This could actually lead to the contraction of the world's vehicle fleet as more people forgo the costs and hassles of ownership.

Does that 18-second average waiting time seem reasonable? There are several problems with these simulations and the conclusions most drawn from them. Research at Grush Niles Associates concludes that these simulations, constrained by the availability of useable O-D data, often contain unwarranted generalizations that cannot be reasonably extrapolated to suburbs and rural areas or work/service-related vehicles. Extrapolations such as echoed by Bailey must assume an inevitable and general willingness of all or most travelers to use shared vehicles. While there is much good to be said for a sharing economy, there is no evidence that all or most humans will engage this way. In fact, we can list dozens of barriers to such a general outcome. And we can also find ways to overcome some of these barriers to some degree.

6 Fagnant D., Kockleman K. (2015) Dynamic Ride-Sharing And Optimal Fleet Sizing For A System Of Shared Autonomous Vehicles, Proceedings of the 94th Annual Meeting, TRB. http://www.ce.utexas.edu/prof/kockelman/public_html/TRB15SAVswithDRSinAustin.pdf

7 International Transport Forum (2015) Urban Mobility System Upgrade: How shared self-driving cars could change city traffic, Corporate Partnership Board, OECD

8 Burns, L., Jordan, W., Scarborough, B., (2013) Transforming Personal Mobility. The Earth Institute, Columbia University

9 Rigole, Pierre-Jean, (2014) Study of a Shared Autonomous Vehicles Based Mobility Solution in Stockholm (Masters Thesis)
10 Bailey, R., The End of Doom, xxx

But it won't "just happen". We are dealing with humans who make many non-rational decisions based on personal, contextual or experiential criteria. In the coming decades, the success of the massive shared fleets these researchers simulate will depend more on revealed preferences and behavioral economics than on artificial intelligence.
What difference could robotics really make in the larger view?
We suspect that many would claim that the issues in owning versus sharing vehicles are a distant second to meeting the important challenge of getting to full automation in the first place. We argue the reverse. Sharing is fundamentally more critical but generally obscured from initial view since full robotics is a prerequisite to the deployment of massive shared fleets. Most researchers and authors realistically focus on what comes first. An analogy to this occurred 110 years ago, when the car was hailed as the solution to the horse problem. Society dove headlong into full-bore automobile-centric planning and automobile user-preference as we pushed the horse out of our cities. There was neither understanding nor mitigation of the eventual global effects. 110 years ago we were largely unable to foresee these effects and paid little attention to the few warnings on offer. Of course humanity is free to repeat this error, and the likelihood of doing so is high, especially as there are some closer payoffs from status quo business models and ownership-thinking if we do. There is a lot of traditional motivation at play here.
Emissions are, at most, only 20 per cent of the problem. We often consider the climate cost of the fuel a vehicle burns to be the measure of its environmental footprint. This provides a superficial illusion that an all-electric vehicle using energy solely from renewables solves the problem. While useful in the marginal sense of the next trip that an individual might take later the same day, it is far from true if we consider a fleet that doubles every 20 years. The embedded footprint from vehicle manufacturing and maintenance is equivalent to the first 150,000 km of an average fossil-fuel vehicle.11 The distributed value of the entire parking infrastructure reserved for the North American car fleet exceeds the value of the entire vehicle fleet; and that carries an even larger footprint cost, as well. Add in the road, bridge and tunnel infrastructure that is being installed at breakneck speed in developing economies to support motorized vehicles, then include the current cost (implied footprint) of all the crash carnage to see the full cost were vehicle population to double twice more on the way to 2050. If parking infrastructure + road infrastructure + injury costs + manufacture & maintenance + emissions—five roughly equivalent environmental costs, P, R, I, M, E—are weighed in a full analysis, then the total environmental burden of automobility, even neglecting the costs of congestion, is easily five times the simple emissions/CO2 burden environmentalists and journalists often focus on.
How can we turn such a large ship?
In spite of a plethora of unknowns—or perhaps because of it—regions and their surrounding municipalities can start now to develop policy direction that is more likely to make a desirable outcome of more sharing prevail than just hoping would do. By waiting, municipalities risk the consequences of being swept up by exponential innovation that government will find hard to track, regulate and manage. Picking a winner would almost certainly be worse, as such a municipality would burn a lot of treasure before being swept away by further unexpected innovation. If Uber gave regulators headaches in 2013-2015, the disruption wrought by robotics by 2035 would be a thousand times worse. It bears repeating: the
11 Berners-Lee, M., (2011) How Bad Are Bananas? The Carbon Footprint of Everything

20-year transportation future that starts now is harder to predict than any prior 20-year future since 1908.12

We know we cannot build our way out of congestion by simply deploying more of what we have built until now. And we know what we have now is inadequate to today's task. Without an ability to accurately predict the nature of motorized surface transportation vehicles in 2025, 2035 or 2045, we now cannot even design our way out of congestion. So how can Municipalities leverage all this innovation?

The only way to escape this conundrum is to innovate and integrate in order to find a better way through. We need to complement our notion of infrastructure to go far beyond physical facilities to encompass the methods, business models, vehicle access and use models, data and labour models that create transportation value. Road surface, tracks, heavy transit vehicles, schedules and routes will soon explain less and less of the total picture. Current preoccupations obscure our understanding.

As an example, the reason that so few people understand prime time or surge pricing from transportation network companies (TNCs), such as Lyft or Uber, is because most people see the drivers as chauffeurs—employees. But TNC drivers are not employees. They are volunteers. Prime time pricing calls them away from the dinner table, TV or their beds to drive in peak hours or at tavern closing times when rides are needed. The prior absence of such a ride pricing mechanism has meant that taxis are unavailable when most needed and circling pointlessly when they are not. Hence, the Lyft/Uber business model provides better service to its users, is cleaner for cities and encourages some users not to purchase a vehicle. It may also be cheaper than the bus in some ride-sharing circumstances, but this would likely remain a minuscule portion of passenger kilometers traveled.

Robotic vehicles, as indicated earlier, also have the potential to make big problems worse, especially congestion, sprawl, and a demand for even more traditional infrastructure such as roads and parking facilities. They will almost certainly wipe out any residual value in financially stressed public bus systems. As well, they would tend to entice away "choice riders", as Sam Schwartz warns:

It can become a vicious circle: the more transit becomes dominated by less affluent people, the more it becomes associated with poverty. And the more it gets associated with poverty, the less appealing it becomes for the affluent. Equity declines. 13

How should municipal and regional governments respond?

City governments that fight commercial, robotic, shared fleets—like some fought Uber—will lose. The cost per passenger kilometre on flexible, driverless vans, minibuses and robotaxis will be a tiny fraction of the same passenger kilometre on a bus. Some project as little as 25 per cent, but the jury is out on that, too.

Some pundits propose that cites or states set up testing grounds to be leaders and promoters for technology development. Why? City governments don't test pharmaceuticals. States and Provinces don't test new nanotechnologies. Why should they test robotic vehicles? Corporations do that.

Rather than test technology, local authorities should begin thinking through how their communities can encourage or even directly cause the building of large shared, robotic fleets

12 Henry Ford announced the Model T in October 1, 1908.

13 Schwartz, S. and W. Rosen, (2015) Street Smart: The Rise of Cities and the Fall of Cars

© Grush Niles 2015 - 6 - endofdriving.org

using P3 mechanisms. Local authorities should plan to disrupt their own public transit agencies head-on as a pathway to creating public robotic fleet services in a way that ensures equitable access for every citizen—a concept dangerously missing from the young, mid-chic, urban middle-class business model of today's TNCs.14

Today, at a time when the robotics are not yet ready, cities need to begin to create the preconditions

for the future they want to create.

The Puzzle of Infrastructure for Robo-Cars

Two critical unknowns among all these uncertainties provide an important key to thinking about the infrastructure issues associated with robotic vehicles:

• Given many possible paths for policy, will the majority of autonomous vehicles be owned or shared?

• Will they be gradually mixed in with human-operated vehicles or will they be somehow isolated to carefully constrained, perceptually-safer applications?

Owned or shared? Private ownership will lead to large extant fleets. Since these vehicles will not require a licensed operator, young, old and disabled passengers can now utilize a dedicated vehicle without a family member acting as chauffer. Hence some families will see owning an additional vehicle as a very rational decision—and the powerful marketing forces of the automotive industry will always prefer the high-volume, well-featured consumption model stoked by year-over-year feature-creep to a shared-vehicle model.

Conversely, a shared-fleet model, if used by a majority of travelers, would mean smaller extant fleets, dramatically reduced parking infrastructure (and space), and less congestion. As written above, we could require less than 25 per cent of our present vehicle population to operate concurrently. However, there is no assumption of fewer vehicles manufactured since shared use means shorter life cycles—i.e., manufacturers will still make a similar (or greater) number of vehicles.15 Once freed of cost of drivers, a larger fleet of smaller vehicles is far more flexible (and effective) for transit operations. Smaller, flexible fleets that offer better service at lower costs enables increased ridership. Increasing ridership, means increased employment. A fleet of shared vehicles of all configurations that (say) quadrupled ridership would certainly double employment. They just wouldn't be drivers. And this would happen over 20 years. Attrition and job-retraining are the solution, not layoffs and unemployment. Perhaps more people would work for P3 participants than be on the public payroll, but there is no need to lose jobs in this equation.

Freely mixed or constrained and isolated? There are many operational, social, and liability complexities involved in freely mixing driver-out and driver-in vehicles on the same roadway— the biggest elephant among the herd of elephants in this room being distracted driving.16 Even if these become solvable, there are tougher acceptability issues. Furthermore, traditional automotive manufacturers will prefer the mixed model, as it justifies many years of new safety, intelligence, infotainment, status and convenience features, while nurturing an ongoing preference for ownership. They will continue to use behavioral economics in every conceivable way. And they will mine the rich marketing opportunities across the full spectrum of partial-tocomplete robotic enablement, making driving in congestion more comfortable and taking advantage of the cultural predilection of "my car, my style, my way".

14 http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/public-transit-should-be-ubers-new-best-friend/

15 Wolfgang Schaefer (2014) http://www.planbeconomics.com/2014/11/continental-cfo-driverless-cars-by-2025.html (time= 6:40)

16 Richtel, Matt (2014) A Deadly Wandering: A Tale of Tragedy and Redemption in the Age of Attention

Application Creep: Environmentally Sustainable Deployment for Autonomous Vehicles 20151008

Using increasing automation as a gold mine for adding new and compelling features to each model year is an example or the common commercial practice known as feature creep. Clearly many automated and safety-related features should not be disparaged as feature creep, but what is the same is the year-over-year business model of incrementalism that stokes envy and sustains sales. Traditional manufacturers will not readily abandon this underlying success formula for creating demand and maintaining competitive advantage. Who wouldn't?

New players such as Google, Apple, Uber and others promising full, driver-out, robotics sooner than the traditional players see feature creep as unworkable. Astro Teller of Google[x], (now under Alphabet) the

business division overseeing the Google automated vehicle, at a keynote given at the South by Southwest Interactive in March 2015, says this best:

Even though everyone who signed up for our [self-driving car] test swore up and down that they wouldn't do anything other than pay 100 per cent attention to the road, and knew that they'd be on camera the entire time…people do really stupid things when they're behind the wheel. They already do stupid things like texting when they're supposed to be 100 per cent in control…so imagine what happens when they think "the car's got it covered." It isn't pretty. Expecting a person to be a reliable backup for the system was a fallacy. Once people trust the system, they trust it. Our success was itself a failure. We came quickly to the conclusion that we needed to make it clear to ourselves that the human was not a reliable backup—the car had to always be able to handle the situation. And the best way to make that clear was to design a car with no steering wheel—a car that could drive itself all of the time.

This and other evidence17 predicts that feature-creep will fail as vehicles become more automated. Well before becoming driver-out, a jump to full autonomy will be demanded. But we cannot move to pervasive robotics quickly. We'll need to creep our way there, as well. Teller's comment also predicts problems for mixing autonomous and non-autonomous vehicles. Collisions involving Google's autonomous vehicle operations to-date have mostly been blamed on drivers of ordinary vehicles, who rear-ended the Google cars. It may be that autonomous cars conform to speed limits more consistently or tend to stop more frequently or more suddenly and than do human-controlled cars.18

Application Creep

If driver-in/driver-out mixing is going to be problematic, it would make much more sense to put robotic vehicles to work earlier in constrained, un-mixed applications. For this path to the future, we introduce the term Application Creep, which focuses on lower risk, partially isolated applications with which we can begin cautiously: start out highly constrained and incorporate extreme oversight, before branching out and eventually disrupting traditional transit. The EU's CityMobil2, a small-vehicle test project in several cities, is an early example. Notably, these pilots also include research into financial, cultural, and behavioural aspects as well as effects on land use policies and how the new systems mesh with existing infrastructure.19 There are many other smaller-scale, spatially constrained applications such as military, university and employment center campuses. Parking lot shuttles at airports could be serviced by six- or ten-passenger vehicles running at modest speeds on clearly marked lanes (self-guided only) and tightly constrained to regular service on regular routes. Retirement communities could use such vehicles for local on-demand trips including to local shopping, entertainment and worship, with the vehicles beginning to determine best routes, rather than being constrained to fixed routes.

17 Richtel, Matt (2014) A Deadly Wandering: A Tale of Tragedy and Redemption in the Age of Attention

18 http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/02/technology/personaltech/google-says-its-not-the-driverless-cars-fault-its-otherdrivers.html?

19 http://www.citymobil2.eu/en/About-CityMobil2/Overview/

© Grush Niles 2015

Human attendants could be eased out only gradually, in order to provide continuity and comfort to early users and to help address changing labour demands. Such applications are numerous, can start almost immediately, and can be gradually expanded (hence creep) to include longer routes, allowances to handle passenger requests by smart phone (more like a jitney than a shuttle), and to increase route flexibility, length and detail. Urban areas could begin with smaller (shorter, simpler) bus routes at low speeds on constrained lanes at grade and without barriers, set up like bicycle lanes. If adjacent lanes carry driver-in motorcars, they would be traffic-calmed. These city systems would benefit from the experience of the earlier parking shuttles, campus applications and the retirement communities. This would indicate a degree of local government interest in supporting these earliest systems. City transit routes could expand in number, distance and flexibility—until transit is dominated by multi-sized

autonomous vehicles and each is scaled to purpose ("tailored").20 During the latter half of this shift, robo-taxi services could begin and would merge so that robo-taxi and robo-transit are on a continuous service spectrum.
Table 1: These five levels of Application Creep or Levels of Reach are five stages of spatial reach, each absorbing the prior stage, and eventually blending into spatially continuous, fully pervasive automation over increasingly larger areas until they bleed together. Level 1 starts with very small, independent local applications and ends at Level 5—essentially nationwide. This would take 30-40 years. The same amount of time it took the motorcar to completely displace the horse. This is distinct from the five SAE levels of Feature
Creep involving increasing levels of automation: [L1] driver assistance, [L2] partial automation, [L3] conditional automation, [L4] high automation, and [L5] full automation. The major difference is that the vehicles deployed in the gradually growing spatial applications would all be SAE level 5 from the first day.
20 Burns, L., Jordan, W., Scarborough, B., (2013) Transforming Personal Mobility. The Earth Institute, Columbia University.
Application Creep: Environmentally Sustainable Deployment for Autonomous Vehicles 20151008
© Grush Niles 2015 - 9 - endofdriving.org
The constrained, protected spatial applications allow greater technical autonomy, turning drivers into trip assistants and guides from day one.
Innovation and Integration
We can now reasonably begin the process of deciding how robotic mobility technology— especially where it involves sharable components—is to be deployed. We want to use this technology to completely transform surface transportation from transit that is cripplingly expensive and used across all trip types for five to seven per cent of passenger kilometres in the US and Canada. Shared vehicles (taxicabs, transportation network companies, and carshare) although growing in number now, still produce statistically miniscule passenger kilometres on a North American basis. Private vehicles—idle 95 per cent of the time—handle about 93 to 95 per cent of passenger kilometres in Canada and USA, respectively.
GNA research indicates that setting and beginning work on a long-run target of 80 per cent of all passenger kilometres to be traveled in shared vehicles—i.e., vehicles that belong to public, private or co-op fleets and that are busy from 40 to 80 hours per week instead of only eight or nine hours—should motivate an

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Lynda Tanner

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Hello,
I'm writing to voice my objection to the newly proposed expansion of part of my historic neighborhood, Mt Baker, as shown on the attached map.
My 1920's Craftsman home is located inside this new boundary and I'm concerned that if this new expansion is approved that instead of improving
unsightly abandoned buildings nearby, developers will turn historic homes into multi-family homes and change the look and feel of my neighborhood.
There have been many, many community meetings held over the years with people talking about improving the area around Mt Baker Rail Station.

We have problems with safety, litter and crime nearby which is probably why developers want to build on my street instead of on Rainier where it's
needed more.
I think the original North Rainier Urban Village plan that was decided on is a good plan that we should stay with.
In my opinion, the best way for our Mt Baker area to become safer and lesson urban blight is to rezone parts of Rainier into multi-family housing.
Once the City helps with incentives to build a few new buildings on Rainier, maybe then developers will also.
Thanks for taking my concerns into consideration.
Lyn Jacobs

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Maura Garcia

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

I am concerned about the lack of process and fast tracking of this process with serious and acknowledged selection of the most gentrifying racist approaches to expanding "urban villages." I requested public disclosure of maps and received no responses from DPD the Mayor or my council member on the proposed boundaries this summer and had no response. We need more time and real multiple community meetings and input on this process. The HALA ordinance was passed on a fast track and now we have only a few more days for comments. This lacks actual process for next steps, input, meetings and how the urban proposed dashed line blobs will be passed and what the new zoning in the area will be. Our current urban village has excessive unused capacity which does not indicate that an expansion is needed at this time. I am deeply concerned that this change will displace the current racially diverse neighborhood by driving prices so high only developers can buy current housing and only new rich white techies can buy the townhomes priced beyond current middle income family's needs. This will accelerate the destruction of an affordable neighborhood. The current urban village boundaries allow for NC and LR development and have significant available lots. There is not current need to expand this. We were informed that single family housing was not on the chopping block but in our marginalized area it is apparently up for sale.
Please provide clear responses on next steps on the proposed urban village boundary expansions - how to tell if your house is in the squiggle or not, who decides next? is it a DPD ruling or a council vote? Will there be evening meetings? Will there be 1 south end combined meeting (this is not a community meeting process), if implemented, how will the HALA zoning be implemented? will all Urban villages be NC or LR/ This is a very opaque process.
also making such large scale changes with a lame duck council and over the holiday season is another way that this is not Seattle nor an open community process.
Thank you,

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Jeff Jacobs

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hello,
I am against the proposed expansion of the North Rainier Urban village and ask that, instead of disrupting our Mt Baker Neighborhood, you instead stick with the original plan (https://towncenterfriends.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/56g-north-rainier-neighborhood-plan-12-1-99.pdf). As a homeowner directly affected by the proposed boundaries I am very concerned about the effects and don't understand why the underdeveloped areas west of MLK can't be looked at first. Please take this into consideration.
Thank You,
Jeff Jacobs

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Meg Hart

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Getting around expeditiously is paramount. Nothing breeds despair like gridlock and feeling trapped unable to move around with any speed. Giving up going places sours a friendly citizen, adds to grief and isolation of elders, exhausts and burdens young parents and their young kids, and breeds everyone's contempt for an inept municipal government.
Repair, expand roads and transit. Cars are necessary, so bite it at least until there are hi speed trains all over the city. And even then people will Need cars to get around (unless they are forcibly drugged into stupor), for non-work commute parts of their life
Why aren't companies being forced to use telecommuting? That is a head scratcher for sure. In the technology city why are companies not urging all workers to working at home. It's hypocrisy to the maximum! Everyone uses Internet, FromThe Office!
So enforce provision for parking spaces, keep roads repaired and expand space for vehicle traffic which also help buses move better. Build high speed corridors for buses which can be used later when the hi speed rails are built. Demand local companies increase their telecommuting.
Gosh so much more I could say about other things going but prolly you aren't gonna care much what we little people think, in the end. I will say this tho...Seattle was a nice friendly easy to live in place, up to not long ago. But now it's going into the shitter. Fast.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Carol Marks-Nicholes

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I feel that the developers are the only ones benefiting from this proposal. Increased traffic and crowding will be the only effect on those of us who live their. The whole feel of Crown Hill changed at the last attempt at light rail coming down 15th. Crappy stores like Dominoes and Smoke shops and cell phone stores moved in. It feels like Market street in San Francisco. It has completely changed the vibe of the area. We have a huge problem with crime coming not from the single family housing but from higher density housing. You can't go anywhere and find a parking place. Traffic on the Ballard Bridge is crazy. Going East / West on 80th and 85th is maddening. Your plan lets the market guide itself regarding parking and does nothing to plan for the increased density in the area. The developers are going to build more units near transit not parking for the cars you must know the tenants will have regardless of being

on a transit line. Be realistic and fight for the livability of this area. We voted for Urban Villages and all that came of it was more high rises and nothing else, period. We have already paid the price. Why don't you go to Madison Park and the area just past the U bridge? I think Sand Pt. Bryant Ravenna and Laurelhurst are all good choices. Or do they have too many connected residents living there? Let's think about sharing the Urban Village with idea with all of Seattle and not just a few areas that have already done their share for alleviating the density issue.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Buna Faircloth,Lance Matteson

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy

Comment:

This email is sent on behalf of Lance Matteson.
To Whom It May Concern:

I would respectfully like to offer a few comments on the draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Seattle:

1.I suggest including in long term industrial capacity zones the industrial area along the southern part of Martin Luther King Jr Way South, i.e., south of the Light Rail station in Rainier Beach and including the triangle within the city limits on the west side of I-5 but not contiguous with SODO. It is zoned industrial currently, is strategically located for manufacturing and industry (as well as appropriate office and wholesale uses), and these precious jobs-intensive uses areas should be protected in our long range vision.

2.I suggest more attention to living wage jobs creation and retention, especially in vulnerable areas such as SE Seattle. A few facts regarding SE Seattle in support of this:

· 1 out of 5 residents live in poverty.
· 1 in 3 children are poor.
· Between 2000 and 2009, household income dropped between 10 and 25% in Rainier, Othello, and Rainier Beach, while citywide income remained steady (Community Cornerstones).
· 65-85% of students living in Southeast Seattle are eligible for free or reduced lunch.
· More than 50% of Seattle's African American families were considered asset poor versus only 19% of white households.
· In 2009 King County African American households were down to a median net wealth of $4,900 (half have less) compared with $92,000 for white households (African American Wealth Creation Roundtable: Seattle Profile, December 2014).
· The SE Seattle unemployment rate is double to triple the citywide average, but this severely understates unemployment, as the lakefront areas of SE Seattle are low unemployment areas that pull down the average.
· 2009 State Department of Commerce data show unemployment in Rainier Beach as 16-20%. Also, this gaping need for locally accessible jobs is not captured in official unemployment rates, which omit those who are jobless but not officially "counted".
· In 2010, only 56.3% of Seattle working age African American males were employed (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Center for Economic Development Working Paper, January 2012).
· Besides pressures from the rising cost of housing, low income people (a large portion of them

immigrants and people of color) also face income pressures to leave Seattle: Small business face rising rents and workers can support the cost of living only when they have good paying jobs. Identifying places for affordable commercial space for small business is part of the answer.
· Every neighborhood or community-wide plan in SE Seattle has identified a lack of local full time living wage jobs as a need; ethnic and immigrant communities disproportionately struggle to find such jobs.
· Contrary to its image and recent economic successes, Seattle's city-wide long term job-creation performance is poor. Despite Amazon-driven (and other) growth, the Seattle 2035 Report (Jan 2015) on 20-Year Performance under the Comprehensive Plan shows that only 31.3% of 1994 20-year job creation goals were met for Hub Urban Villages and only 43% of all overall 20-year job goals have been met. This is partly due to secular changes in the global and national manufacturing economy, but failure is failure. We need to do better, Making strategic local jobs creation in living wage sectors (generally non-retail) a strategic priority is vital. (The solution is not, as the 2035 consultant unfortunately suggested, to stop measuring jobs growth in urban hubs! On the contrary we should have community supported quantitative net jobs creation targets for all urban and village hubs – and we should take those targets seriously in measuring annual and multi-year performance.)
· The SE Seattle community wants jobs and is not content with relegation to pure bedroom status. The most sustainable job is one you can walk to. This point is not at odds with TOD goals, properly understood – but it only underlines the importance of including living wage jobs creation, along with housing and amenities, around transit hubs. This is not yet the priority it should be in Seattle.
· SEED's 2013 community survey asked, "What do you see as the most pressing community needs…?" Common responses: "Living wage jobs, economic development, jobs for young people."
· Community Cornerstones 2014 tenants survey showed #1 priority is jobs.
· 2014 Affordability Commission public meeting in Rainier Beach: employment was #1 value in instant "clicker" poll.
· 2014 Rainier Beach Town Hall feedback: #1 priority was jobs.

3.Consistent with the above, I suggest more flexibility in zoning and planning frameworks to accommodate innovative and sustainable jobs creation – including urban manufacturing, makerspaces, shared work spaces, innovation zones with both educational/skills development and entrepreneurial support environments (incubators, accelerators, etc.), and a revamping of live-work zoning/permits to be more conducive to successful live-work projects (we're not there now).

4.Overall, I support the direction and approach of the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,

Lance Matteson

Lance Matteson
Executive Director
SouthEast Effective Development (SEED)

Buna Faircloth
Executive Assistant
SouthEast Effective Development

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Susan Weinstein

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Attn: Seattle 2035
To the Seattle Dept of Planning and Development:
As a constituent who has lived in Mt Baker neighborhood for 27 years and raised two daughters here, I am deeply invested in this extraordinary, historic neighborhood. As we plan development around the new Mt Baker Urban Village, I recommend two points to keep front and center.
• First, maintain focus on positive multifamily mixed use development in the existing Village boundaries, adjacent to the transit station. It would be irrational to encourage developers to chunk away at single family neighborhoods along the perimeter of the village, when vacant and surplus properties lie empty all around the station itself. This is where we and the City sensibly called for an Urban Village. This is where our development needs to be focused.
• Second, look beyond the rhetoric and political table-pounding, and recognize that Mt Baker neighborhood is an asset to be preserved. As Victor Steinbrueck noted, this neighborhood possesses important historical values that should be celebrated rather than vilified. Don't divide – complete the vibrant community vision we already defined in the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan.
Sincerely,
Susan Weinstein
Susan Weinstein, Architect

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Joe Beauregard

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I know that nothing I say will stop you from destroying what is great about Seattle. Nothing I say will prevent more unimaginative rectangular boxes forming canyons of former pleasant areas. So continue destroying the city. Clearly nothing will stop you.
However, please make these developers that are flooding the city with unwelcome buildings pay for what they bring in addition to ugly buildings ---
-- They freely close streets inconveniencing thousands. Make them pay a fee.
-- They build buildings, and do nothing to mitigate anything -- crime, traffic, parking, park usage, sewer capacity. They are required to do nothing. Charge mitigation fees. Make them mitigate their impacts. You make them do nothing!
I know the above will be completely ignore. That's too bad. You're destroying the city for current residents to accommodate future residents that may or may not stay and build a quality city.
You encourage single person units and completely discourage families from settling and staying in the city.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: John Stewart

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

Greetings,
I apologize that these responses are not necessarily organized in the same fashion as the draft. I have been procrastinating my feedback, and I no longer have time to organize my thoughts the way I had planned. I still hope they are of use.
I have lived in the Central District for almost 20 years, and in Seattle slightly longer than that. I grew up in Lake Forest Park, and went to high school at O'Dea on First Hill. I've been a regular transit user, pedestrian, cyclist, and [later in life] motorist here. I've led walks, attended seemingly endless meetings, and have two kids in Seattle Public Schools. I've watched the city change around me, and there have been some good things. There have also been some mistakes. I'm hopeful we can preserve more of the good, and fix more of the mistakes, going forward. 1) Neighborhood plans. The original Neighborhood Planning process out of DoN was a truly remarkable phenomenon. The energy and civic spirit there was amazing. The implementation of the plans, at least in the CD, has been...not as good as one might have hoped. That having been said, I am a big fan of true involvement (not box-checking presentations by City staff to community councils). I believe that NE 130th makes sense as a new urban village, but there needs to be a concurrent neighborhood planning process that involves as many citizens as possible. It's a real shame in my opinion that Portland now has a better neighborhood planning process than Seattle does.
Also along this line - downtown-sponsored phenomena like ACT here in the CD, or the new efforts being run by OED, are very frustrating from a neighborhood perspective. This is not neighborhood-driven development. This is, in essence, people who don't live here telling us what our neighborhood should look like. And that's not OK. I'm well aware that we have NIMBYs and other folks who make neighborhood planning difficult - I've been there - but that's no excuse for essentially giving up.
2) Transit. As I stated above, I have been a regular transit user in Seattle for a long time now (over 30 years). There have been a lot of improvements in that time. There are a couple issues with transit as it relates to the plan, however: A)There are too many inconsistencies around "transit corridor", "transit stop", "superior transit" and other such language in the document. I know (or at least I think I do) what is intended, and I do agree that focusing development around transit is a crucial strategy for Seattle. The devil, as often, is in the details. It is very difficult for neighborhoods (and Metro, and SDOT) to sort out what these things mean and how best to implement them when the definitions are not clear and in agreement with one another across the planning document. B) There needs to be strong language connecting transit to walking. Getting people to the stop is not enough. The walkshed from the stop to the home/school/park/business/etc. is crucial for transit to work in the real world. We not only need to prioritize our scarce sidewalk dollars for transit arterials and safe routes to school, we also need to enshrine this concept in our comprehensive plan.
3) Stairways. I urge everyone to recognize that Seattle has the 3rd-largest network of public stairways in the country. I believe this wonderful civic asset needs to be called out in the plan; we perennially underfund them, despite their importance to many of our neighborhoods. They deserve priority in the transportation planning (in terms of maintenance and upkeep) as we strive to do more for people who walk all around Seattle.
4) Trees. I know this is an old debate, but again I see us calling out goals (40% tree canopy) with no policies or measures to reach and/or enforce the goals. What I have seen time and again in the last 20 years here in the CD is the removal of trees on private property in order to maximize buildable area. I love our street trees (and just planted one just this fall!) but they are simply not enough. We need a clear, comprehensive, enforced standard around tree removal and maintenance on private property. Even if it's a fee structure that is then used to plant trees elsewhere. What we are doing right now is not working.
5) Open space. In areas not meeting targets for community open space, increase the required setbacks and landscaping requirements for new multifamily residential development like Vancouver and

Portland. Trade height if need be for FAR, but there needs to be a recognition that private land can provide open space (and not just roof decks or other private open space).
6) Finally, sustainability. This is a concept near and dear to the hearts of many in Seattle. I do not see it called out or emphasized anywhere in the planning document. If we can not figure out how to build a sustainable city, given climate change and immigration here from all parts of the world, frankly we are doomed.
Sincerely,
John Stewart

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Nick Etheredge

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

Hello,
I am writing to express my support for the changes presented in the 2035 Comp Plan. I especially support the elements that increase zoning capacity and flexibility throughout the city, not just in urban villages but in single family zones. Sadly, there are many people in Seattle, including elected officials, who do not understand the impact of housing supply on affordability. They are skeptical that making it easier to produce housing has the beneficial effect of downward pressure on rents. More supply means less competition for each unit, and less chance that existing housing will be demolished – both good for affordability.
That's why I support the elements of 2035 that increase zoning capacity, because this is the single best tool we have to make Seattle affordable and welcoming to people of all walks of life and all income levels.
I also very much support the elements geared toward walkability and bike/transit use. We should definitely be moving away from car-centric planning. Driving cars is one of the worst things we can do for the planet, and with a climate crisis, becoming less car-dependent is very much a moral obligation. So I will get behind your decision to reduce car reliance and reduce parking requirements in new developments. Seattle can very much be a model of sustainability through dense, urban living.
Thank you, and I hope you find the courage to push these changes through. I am sure you have felt plenty of heat from those most fearful of change. But we cannot fear change, and we cannot ignore the plight of the planet and everyone who currently or eventually calls Seattle home.
Nick Etheredge

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Lake City Neighborhood Alliance,Sandy Motzer

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Attached please find the Lake City Neighborhood Alliance's comments on the Parks and Open Space Goals and Policies in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Please contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.
Sandy Motzer
Chair, LCNA
--

November 19, 2015
Tom Hauger
Kristian Kofoed
Department of Planning and Development
Dear Members of the Seattle 2035 Planning Team,
I am writing on behalf of Lake City Neighborhood Alliance (LCNA), an alliance of organizations with the mission to protect and enhance the quality of life in the greater Lake City area. LCNA is comprised of 28 member groups representing neighborhood, business, faith, school, special-issue, and service-provider groups throughout Lake City. At our November 12th meeting, LCNA members expressed concerns about some proposed Parks and Open Space Goals and Policies in the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan, and strongly advocated for the following revisions:
1. P1.2-Replace the draft text with the following revised policy: "That the expansion of the City's needed park and open space sites to support proposed growth be funded through the Park District's expanded taxing authority and reevaluation of the current commercial and multifamily lot-line to lot-line development in Hub Urban Villages to allow for greater setbacks to create needed open space that could be achieved with taller building heights and/or additional density".
2. P1.7-Revise the proposed policy to delete the words "Encourage or" at the beginning of the policy "Require private developers to incorporate……"
3. P2.1-Revise this draft text to incorporate the following additional wordage after "community centers" to read as …."and provide new, full-service community centers in underserved Hub Urban Villages".
4. PG4-LCNA takes issue with this goal based upon the potential for these types of Park facilities competing unfairly with limited funding opportunities for new parks in urban and residential villages. Revise this goal to add the following conditional statement: "providing that these regional park facilities can be funded without reducing necessary funding of park needs in Hub Urban Villages due to projected growth".
Thank you for considering LCNA's recommendations.
Very sincerely,
Sandra Adams Motzer
Chair

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Robert Deeble

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Please do not expand single family zones in Crown Hill beyond their current boundaries.
Please work "with" seattle based homeowners to create additional housing through careful dpd revisions to mother in laws, ADUs and Duplexes.
please demand that multi unit developers "pay into the infrastructure of the city" through updated sewage lines, transportation funding, and mandate parking for each unit built.
Please restructure DOT to allow more creative innovation that promotes less driving THROUGH INCENTIVES not punitive actions. Consider local bus passes that allow residents that work nearby to use the buss affordably.
Please consider parking pass for residents, employees and business owners in nearby business districts like Ballard or Greenwood to add paid parking that moves along sleeper vans and campers and "without" displacing the residents that live and work there.
Please pour more money into mental health and addiction recovery for resources in our area. Please

encourage SPD to appropriately engage homeless for the purpose of getting more people safely into resources and off the streets (particularly intravenous drug users as we have had an enormous amount of open syrenges left on sidewalks and alley ways in the last year).
Please consider more land trusts to allow low income residents to purchase homes in our area and allow for more financial equality.
Please allow residents and home owners say in creating their own urban villages (like 70th St or 65th).
Please STOP CATERING TO CORPORATE DEVELOPERS.
Please rethink sidewalks planning that allow them to be built on both sides of the street in ways that allow cars and do not endanger bicyclists (the current new wide dimensions are impractical for our area)

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Jay Lazerwitz

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan comments
I am a long-term resident and homeowner in the Roosevelt neighborhood, very engaged in the neighborhood association, though these comments are solely personal and public.
Positive support
I support the concept and development of Urban Villages and transit-oriented communities; areas within easy walking distance or historical connection. Developing the Urban Village areas, as concentrated focus for future density, while retaining community character. I support increasing central density versus major re-development of Single-Family areas. Also supporting the commercial needs and variety of community services of the neighborhood, and increasing the potential is important.
I support the HALA recommendations, though would hope to see some of these adopted in incremental steps, rather than some of the sweeping changes proposed. Piloting some of the programs, especially changing “Single-Family” to “Low Density”, which I conditionally support, should be initiated in targeted areas, before opening these programs city-wide.
Comments & Questions
Retain the Urban “village” concept, though each community should retain some geographical and cultural / historical / institutional character distinct from other areas, and not sprawl.
Density capacity should be closer tied to current and future transit capacity, especially in SW and NW Seattle, where high-capacity transit is not currently in place.
Producing better target density estimates is needed, as the current figures are far from realistic, and will be needed to better guide future planning decisions.
Setting target metrics for future zoning increases, will provide some understanding toward future changes and density development. The modeling for future-unit counts is unclear and inconsistent.
Create incentives for civic amenities
Create more affordable housing (all family sizes and types). Increasing development potential increases the land value more substantially than the positive economic return, especially where there are increased building complications (greater heights, life-safety issues, and civic amenities).
Restrain land value by creating and providing incentives to developers instead of blankly increasing density limits (FAR and building height) in order to increase development density targets and better civic amenities; affordable housing, retention of neighborhood businesses, better street-level character, and abundant landscaping.
Impacts On Roosevelt Neighborhood
Why is the Roosevelt Urban Village extended into Ravenna & Cowen parks, and does not include Green

Lake or the Roosevelt Reservoir?
The 2035 draft plan lists figures for the "existing Urban Village development capacity" of 2814 housing units, and 1930 jobs. The Housing growth assumptions for the 2035 Plan, are listed at 1500 (assumed people) and 1600 jobs.
Projected growth for the Roosevelt Urban Village, is for over 2000 additional residential units, and 42,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, of recently completed (within the last year) or proposed development, that will likely be completed by 2019. These figures will greatly exceed the City metric targets for this area.
Comments regarding the Roosevelt Urban Village
Increasing the Urban Village boundary is not needed to meet current growth targets. There could be set density targets, which will trigger new Urban Village and zoning changes, though these are not needed currently. More growth is assumed within the central commercial core, and less so, at the Urban Village edge areas, so the enlargement of the Urban Village into single-family areas will only produce minimal density increases.
Does the Urban Village need to be enlarged in order to increase zoning beyond the current boundary? Changing the zoning adjacent, and east of Roosevelt High School, and also along Ravenna Blvd could be positive changes, in order to provide for Low-rise developments or Row housing along those historical arterials, though these this does not have to be part of the Urban Village.

Thank you,
Jay Lazerwitz
art and architecture
Certified Passive House Consultant

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Kassy Ellefson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

I am opposed to the Draft Plan as it currently stands because:
1. It would change the character of Crown Hill (and other neighborhoods like Whittier Heights, Loyal Heights and Olympic Manor) from single-family housing to more dense forms, such as condos, townhomes, apartments.
2. There is no requirement that in exchange for the upzone to increased density we would get infrastructure improvements (think transportation, pedestrian amenities like sidewalks and arterial crosswalks/signals, sewage, storm drainage, etc.) that our neighborhood desperately needs now.
3. There is no requirement for public involvement beyond what is happening now.
4. The preferred alternative would expand our residential urban village to include a "ten-minute walk" to frequent bus service (expanding boundaries substantially).
5. The parks and open space portion of the plan is only four pages.
Thank you for your consideration.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Karen Hardy

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

To City Planners:
One of the core values of Seattle 2035 is environmental stewardship. Preserving the function and value of Ravenna Park should be a priority. Keeping high density to the west of Ravenna/Cowen Parks seems to be a natural area to expand. Not to the East including the parks. Mayor Murray stated that we need quality of life when living in a city. We need parks, trees, paths, and some peaceful walks. To increase the density around the parks only takes away our chances of preserving this magnificient historic and natural area.
This is a neighborhood of 100 year old homes that have been maintained. The park is used by hundreds daily. We already have mother-in-law apartments and accessory dwellings. These will preserve the integrity of the neighborhood. It just takes one 4 story building to destroy the character of a this neighborhood.
The line drawn is obviously a random line. When Googled Mapped, this area was not 10 min from the station but 14 min and 0.7 of a mile. Areas south and west are closer. I ask to maintain the current west of NE 15th centerline of the Roosevelt Urban Village as the boundary. Please consider not adding Ravenna Park, Cowen Park and the streets between NE 62nd st and NE 70th to this area.
Please do not take Ravenna Park out Ravenna. Preserve it as our founders had originally set it aside. It is shocking that city planners would even consider this option. This is an important fragile natural area that needs our continued care and stewardship.
Karen Hardy

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Ken Jensen

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Request for Complete Street Improvements along Third Avenue NW

An improved sidewalk and a new protected bicycle lane will provide both safer access to Carkeek Park and complete street transportation options for an important and exclusively vehicle-dominated arterial - Third Avenue NW, between Holman Road and NW 130th Street.

According to the 2015 Seattle Bike Map, the north ends of two bicycle lanes – Eighth Avenue NW and Greenwood Avenue N, and the west end of NW 130th Street, dead-end in this part of NW Seattle. This discontinuous condition is not only dangerous for cyclists, but it also occurs at the entrance to Carkeek Park. Riding or walking along this stretch of Third Avenue NW is a very dangerous experience for bicyclists and walkers because of the narrow vehicle lanes, absence of a bike lane, and a very narrow and poorly constructed sidewalk. I'm sure you would agree that access for all to one of the most treasured Seattle parks should safely accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians as well as vehicles?

Third Avenue NW defines the west edge of NW Seattle and it is the most western continuous north-south street between Holman Road and the north Seattle limits. Therefore Third Avenue NW is a natural location for a new protected bike lane and sidewalk, to safely accommodate all forms of access to this public park, to connect these 3 bicycle lanes, and also, since this edge street has very few cross streets, the bike lane could safely become a commuter bike lane too.

The east side of this section of Third Ave NW has intermittent stretches of open storm-water drainage ditches and pot holes in gravel. This existing additional east ROW seems to have adequate width to be converted into a new dedicated bicycle lane, above a new buried storm-water culvert pipe. The new sidewalk on the west side could be separated from the roadway and widened for pedestrian safety as well.

Please consider making these Third Ave NW complete street improvements which will simultaneously accomplish all of these worthy aspirations.

Thank you,

Ken Jensen

ArchiViable

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Lance Matteson

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Land Use

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:

I would respectfully like to offer a few comments on the draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Seattle:

1. I suggest including in long term industrial capacity zones the industrial area along the southern part of Martin Luther King Jr Way South, i.e., south of the Light Rail station in Rainier Beach and including the triangle within the city limits on the west side of I-5 but not contiguous with SODO. It is zoned industrial currently, is strategically located for manufacturing and industry (as well as appropriate office and wholesale uses), and these precious jobs-intensive uses areas should be protected in our long range vision.

2. I suggest more attention to living wage jobs creation and retention, especially in vulnerable areas such as SE Seattle. A few facts regarding SE Seattle in support of this:

· 1 out of 5 residents live in poverty.
· 1 in 3 children are poor.
· Between 2000 and 2009, household income dropped between 10 and 25% in Rainier, Othello, and Rainier Beach, while citywide income remained steady (Community Cornerstones).
· 65-85% of students living in Southeast Seattle are eligible for free or reduced lunch.
· More than 50% of Seattle's African American families were considered asset poor versus only 19% of white households.
· In 2009 King County African American households were down to a median net wealth of $4,900 (half have less) compared with $92,000 for white households (African American Wealth Creation Roundtable: Seattle Profile, December 2014).
· The SE Seattle unemployment rate is double to triple the citywide average, but this severely understates unemployment, as the lakefront areas of SE Seattle are low unemployment areas that pull

down the average.
· 2009 State Department of Commerce data show unemployment in Rainier Beach as 16-20%. Also, this gaping need for locally accessible jobs is not captured in official unemployment rates, which omit those who are jobless but not officially "counted".
· In 2010, only 56.3% of Seattle working age African American males were employed (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Center for Economic Development Working Paper, January 2012).
· Besides pressures from the rising cost of housing, low income people (a large portion of them immigrants and people of color) also face income pressures to leave Seattle: Small business face rising rents and workers can support the cost of living only when they have good paying jobs. Identifying places for affordable commercial space for small business is part of the answer.
· Every neighborhood or community-wide plan in SE Seattle has identified a lack of local full time living wage jobs as a need; ethnic and immigrant communities disproportionately struggle to find such jobs.
· Contrary to its image and recent economic successes, Seattle's city-wide long term job-creation performance is poor. Despite Amazon-driven (and other) growth, the Seattle 2035 Report (Jan 2015) on 20-Year Performance under the Comprehensive Plan shows that only 31.3% of 1994 20-year job creation goals were met for Hub Urban Villages and only 43% of all overall 20-year job goals have been met. This is partly due to secular changes in the global and national manufacturing economy, but failure is failure. We need to do better, Making strategic local jobs creation in living wage sectors (generally non-retail) a strategic priority is vital. (The solution is not, as the 2035 consultant unfortunately suggested, to stop measuring jobs growth in urban hubs! On the contrary we should have community supported quantitative net jobs creation targets for all urban and village hubs – and we should take those targets seriously in measuring annual and multi-year performance.)
· The SE Seattle community wants jobs and is not content with relegation to pure bedroom status. The most sustainable job is one you can walk to. This point is not at odds with TOD goals, properly understood – but it only underlines the importance of including living wage jobs creation, along with housing and amenities, around transit hubs. This is not yet the priority it should be in Seattle.
· SEED's 2013 community survey asked, "What do you see as the most pressing community needs…?" Common responses: "Living wage jobs, economic development, jobs for young people."
· Community Cornerstones 2014 tenants survey showed #1 priority is jobs.
· 2014 Affordability Commission public meeting in Rainier Beach: employment was #1 value in instant "clicker" poll.
· 2014 Rainier Beach Town Hall feedback: #1 priority was jobs.

3. Consistent with the above, I suggest more flexibility in zoning and planning frameworks to accommodate innovative and sustainable jobs creation – including urban manufacturing, makerspaces, shared work spaces, innovation zones with both educational/skills development and entrepreneurial support environments (incubators, accelerators, etc.), and a revamping of live-work zoning/permits to be more conducive to successful live-work projects (we're not there now).

4. Overall, I support the direction and approach of the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,

Lance Matteson

Lance Matteson
Executive Director
SouthEast Effective Development (SEED)

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Mary Lou Pederson

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Transportation

Comment:

The current planning needs to respect the needs of current neighborhoods and increase density without destroying what makes Seattle a livable place for all people of all income levels. Residential areas can increase denote by simply including one triplex (not giant apodment buildings) per block, resulting in 31,480 additional housing units (based on city records of 15,740 blocks). This would allow maintaining the integrity of current housing without darling other housing, blocking sunlight or views and would still allow increased density. This would allow residential areas to remain livable, with adequate parking (yes people who take the bus still own cars and need parking!) and open spaces.

A goal of minimizing displacement of marginalized populations is not specific enough nod sets no guidelines on how to accomplish this. Seattle needs to immediately adopt policies shown to be exceptionally successful in th state of Virginia, Salt Lake City, and other areas by getting the homeless into housing now and then with them to alleviate the problems that caused their homeless. In addition, developers must include affordable housing now in each of their projects and at a higher percentage than is currently required. The income level to get this housing must also be set lower than the current one. Service workers and law enforcement officers, teachers and seniors are many of those being totally priced out of the market and being unfairly affected by the current situation. Developers are getting by with minimal requirements to contribute to mitigation of their impact on those who can no longer afford to pay the current rent or price of housing in Seattle. HALA gives developers far too much while taking away from the current residents of property now being rebuilt with outrageous increases in costs. Real, affordable housing is needed NOW, not ten years from now.

So much of the transportation rhetoric also needs too be changed to reflect the reality and not the wishful thinking of what the city hopes will happen. It is disingenuous to keep saying that everyone will be able to get around on transit of one type or another and will not own cars. Even when folks use the bus to get to work they still own cars and use them for errands and need parking for them. Planning must incorporate cars as the percentage of bikers is tiny compared to what the plans provide for them versus cars. All the bike lanes just make traffic gridlock worse instead of better. Buses do not get you to appointments in a timely manner so cars are needed. Planning MUST keep cars as a priority.

There needs to be more coordination between all sectors of development and transportation to keep Seattle with a high quality of livability.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Judith Hance

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I will turn 100 in 2035, if I live that long. Today I am 80, and really do not like much of the planning being done in Seattle.

It isn't that I do not recognize that things are changing, and the city must move along. I simply object to the way it is being done.

I see neighborhoods being destroyed by over development, exceptionally poor planning that benefits a few and makes things more difficult

for the rest of us. Developers are the winners, citizens the losers. No longer are we able to get around the city to different neighborhoods to
dine or shop - if we can get there, there is no place to park. Apartments are being built in Wedgwood with totally inadequate off street parking,
creating huge problems for churches, the library, and restaurants.Then there is the bicycle plan, which will eliminate even more parking.
I need to stay where I am. I will not be moving into a retirement home. I purchased my home as my last place, due to location and environment, which is single family properties with gardens and trees.
Housing prices may be going up, but the personal value of my home in Seattle is
decreasing as development is making the neighborhood more crowded, harder to get around in, less like "home."
I f I were to move to the Northwest now, I would not choose Seattle as a place to live. Trees are going away, ugly buildings going up, tall enough to interfere with sunlight for gardens and close enough to each other to destroy privacy. Transportation is more difficult now than it was in 1991, when I moved here. I do not like that neighborhoods are being drastically changed, and all for the sake of business and developers. The result is bound to be degraded air quality. with more development, there should be MORE trees, not apartments built up to the sidewalk. There should be more street tress eveywhere in the city, with more people and more vehicles. Perhaps SOMEDAY we will have a system that relieves us of the need to drive a car in the city, but it does not exist TODAY. And I will always need a car to travel anywhere beyond the city limits.
Street parking is a bad idea. Residents of Laurelhurst have many car breakins where they have no offstreet parking. Off street parking should be required for every apartment or condo or office in the city.
I have lived in a number of places over my lifetime. I have never before witnessed such a disaster as what is happening to Seattle now and will be in the near future.
Judith Hance
NE Seattle

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Gary Friedman

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

As a native of Seattle, I am strongly opposed to your 'Seattle 2035' draft plan as it would drive our still barely livable city toward becoming another disaster like San Francisco.
I urge you to retain the 'Toward a Sustainable Seattle' plan that was adopted in 1994.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Karen Hardy

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

To City Planners:
One of the core values of Seattle 2035 is environmental stewardship. Preserving the function and value of Ravenna Park should be a priority. Keeping high density to the west of Ravenna/Cowen Parks seems to be a natural area to expand. Not to the East including the parks. Mayor Murray stated that we need

quality of life when living in a city. We need parks, trees, paths, and some peaceful walks. To increase the density around the parks only takes away our chances of preserving this magnificient historic and natural area.
This is a neighborhood of 100 year old homes that have been maintained. The park is used by hundreds daily. We already have mother-in-law apartments and accessory dwellings. These will preserve the integrity of the neighborhood. It just takes one 4 story building to destroy the character of a this neighborhood.
The line drawn is obviously a random line. When Googled Mapped, this area was not 10 min from the station but 14 min and 0.7 of a mile. Areas south and west are closer. I ask to maintain the current west of NE 15th centerline of the Roosevelt Urban Village as the boundary. Please consider not adding Ravenna Park, Cowen Park and the streets between NE 62nd st and NE 70th to this area.
Please do not take Ravenna Park out Ravenna. Preserve it as our founders had originally set it aside. It is shocking that city planners would even consider this option. This is an important fragile natural area that needs our continued care and stewardship.
Karen Hardy

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Port of Seattle,Brenda Thomas

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

If you have any questions, please contact Joseph Gellings
--
November 20, 2015
Ms. Diane Sugimura, Director
City of Seattle
Dept. of Planning and Development
Re: Comments on the draft major update of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan
Dear Ms. Sugimura,
The Port of Seattle appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Seattle 2035 document. We applaud the City for taking the approach of overhauling the document to reduce redundancy and inconsistency. At the same time, the City must be careful to not lose important policy nuances while executing this strategy.
Overarching comments
The draft plan does not do enough to provide certainty about the future of the City's two manufacturing I industrial centers (MICs). We have previously cited the conditions that make industrial stakeholders worry about the long-term integrity of the Duwamish and Ballard-Interbay Northend MICs. These conditions include perennial Comprehensive Plan amendment requests to take land out of MICs, initiatives to blur the definition of industrial uses, and a track record of the Industrial Commercial zone of failing to attract industrial developments.
A city that wishes to have the tax base diversity and living wage jobs that come from an industrial center must instill certainty in the future ofthat center.
Accordingly, we are disheartened to see that the draft plan omits two policy statements1 that industrial leaders crafted with DPD staff through the Duwamish M/IC Policy and Land Use Study Advisory Committee. The policy known in that process as Recommendation #1 would have enacted strict criteria to be applied to any proposal to remove land from a MIC. In its place the draft plan contains G$2.20 which merely states that such criteria "should be developed." This is a big disappointment since such

criteria already were developed and enumerated in Recommendation #1.
A similar loss of integrity occurred for the policy statement known as Recommendation #4 in that study. Recommendation #4 had been crafted during the study to prohibit new application of the IC zone within
1 The exact language for the two policies is established as Recommendations #1 and #4 of DPD'S Duwamish M/IC
Policy and Land Use Study, November 2013. They are found on pages 34 and 37, respectively, of that report.
Ms. Diane Sugimura
November 20, 2015
Page 2
a MIC. instead, the draft pian contains a policy that states "Limit the future application of the IC zone ... " What those limitations might be is unstated.
The key transportation proposal for the draft plan, in the summary of the draft, reads: "Move towards transportation service standards that consider all travel modes, including pedestrians, bicycles, cars, trucks, and transit." (Seattle 2035, A Comprehensive Plan for Managing Growth, Draft Plan Summary, page 2)
The Port of Seattle endorses this vision for the future of Seattle's transportation system, because it is focused on providing transportation services for all modes, including freight. The proposal also supports Mayor Murray's vision for transportation in Seattle: a unified transportation strategy that integrates, balances and makes provisions for all travel modes.
Our comments below follow the sections of the Seattle 2035 review document.
Detailed comments
Stadium District (p. 65)
As we noted throughout the 2013 Stadium District Study, these allowances for residential and lodging uses will lead to conflicts with established industrial uses within the Duwamish MIC. The most salient example of this is Policy LUG15.1's allowance for residential uses on the WOSCA property. This site is across the street from Terminal46, one of the state's biggest marine cargo terminals. One of the most fundamental purposes of a zoning code is to buffer residential and industrial uses. This is because marine cargo terminals are dynamic operations that generate traffic, noise, and light. Our experience indicates that adding new residential uses near a large marine cargo terminal will lead to complaints and lawsuits from the new residents once they discover what it is like to live next to a thriving marine cargo terminal.
Urban Village Strategy Terms
It is difficult for the reader to follow the area designations under the urban village strategy to the extent that a manufacturing I industrial center is one such designation. We recognize that this nomenclature was established a long time ago and a great number of planning documents are built upon it. The City may wish to be more explicit in the introductions to the Seattle's Growth Strategy, Land Use, and Transportation elements that there are exactly four types of area designations under the urban village strategy and that they are urban centers, manufacturing I industrial centers, hub urban villages and residential urban villages. Please also note that the page 37 description of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) states that MICs are depicted in the FLUM but, in fact, only the other three area designations of the urban village strategy are depicted there.
To the lay reader, by context alone, "Urban Village Strategy" does not imply that MICs are a subset, (although the document does clarify this at close reading). Then, certain policies are crafted with the residential uses in mind, which conflict with industrial uses. As long as MICs remain a subset in this policy, distinctions must be included that incompatible uses do not apply to industrial zones. Such comments are included below.
Ms. Diane Sugimura

November 20, 2015
Policy LU11.25 regarding the Industrial Commercial zone
Page 3
A dominant theme in the industrial zone policies is that existing industrial waterfront areas must keep their industrial zoning because waterfront industrial land is a scarce resource. Policy LU11.25 contradicts this doctrine by suggesting that the water views and shoreline access must be used to "attract new technology businesses to the area" in the IC zone. The city has sufficient commercial zoning capacity for offices to have water views and shoreline access. This policy unnecessarily interferes with industrial zoning. Further, it appears to be inconsistent with the policies of the Shoreline Management Act and the City's new shoreline master program, which states a use preference for water dependent uses.
Other comments on Seattle's Growth Strategy and Land Use elements
• Growth Strategy Introduction (p. 20): Please add "Robust and health manufacturing I industrial centers" to the bullet list.
• Introduction, second paragraph (p. 20): At the end of the paragraph please add "Meanwhile this allows the important industrial economic sector to flourish in buffered centers."
• Planning For Growth policies (p. 21): Please add new policy "Survey the health of the MICs to ensure the industrial sector continues to thrive and provide additional investments or incentives to enhance these activities."
• Urban Village Strategy Discussion (p. 22): At the end of the second paragraph please add "MICs are an urban village strategy designation and they benefit from separation of incompatible land uses, specifically residential." This is intended to highlight that land uses in residential zones may be incompatible with industrial zones.
• Urban Village Strategy Goals (p. 24): Please add a new policy after GS2.3: "Strengthen and protect MICs from uses such as residential and pedestrian-oriented commercial uses."
• Growth Strategy Figure 1 (p. 25): Please add a note that MICs are an urban village strategy designation not addressed in this Figure. Please add a parallel table with the corresponding attributes of MICs.
• Urban Design (p. 30): Please note at the end of the first Discussion paragraph that "MICs will have their own unique and different design characteristics."
• GS4.14 (p. 32): Please add "residential" so it reads, "Design residential urban villages to be walkable, using ... "
Ms. Diane Sugimura
November 20, 2015
Summary--Transportation
Page 4
Key Proposals (p. 2): Support the proposal to: "Move towards transportation service standards that consider all travel modes, including pedestrians, bicycles, cars, trucks, and transit."
Plan Elements (p. 6): Please add "goods" to the second sentence: " ... Seattle will continue to work with regional transportation agencies to move people and goods within the city and the region."
Next Steps (p. 8)
• The transportation performance measure is currently focused on the movement of people and does not address freight mobility. (Inconsistent with the transportation key proposal on page 2 ...) Maybe use "Reliance on the personal car" as a performance measure? That would allow introducing freight mobility measures like load zone availability or a reliability measure like buffer index.
Transportation Element
Introduction (p. 72)
In order to recognize from the outset that freight mobility, in addition to moving people, is a necessary

element of the future of transportation, we recommend:
• Include "businesses" in the very first sentence: " ... to equitably serve current residents, businesses and future growth in Seattle."
• Add a freight bullet to the list-something like: "Promote efficient, reliable and safe freight movement to support a vibrant economy and bring goods to residents." This is retained from the current Transportation Element (Goal TG6), and combined with the draft vision statement from the Freight Master Plan effort.
• Third paragraph reflects transportation in 2035, with a focus on moving people. Suggest adding reference to freight mobility of the future: need examples: ITS, increasing # of trucks, drivers reliance on traffic apps &c
• Fourth paragraph speaks to Seattle's lack of room for new streets from increased streets. We suggest adding in reference to potential for new capacity gains through transi't lines in new right of way, or grade separations of existing bottlenecks/chokepoints (rail crossings).
Integrating Land Use and Transportation (p. 73}
We recommend a policy related to the City's two Manufacturing Industrial Centers-maybe one of the following:
"T1.6 Reliably connect manufacturing/industrial centers and business districts with each other and with the local, state, and international freight networks." (This is the Draft mobility goal from the Freight Master Plan effort); or
"T1.7 Enhance freight routes to ensure safe and efficient goods movement to, within and between Seattle's MICs and urban villages."
Make the Best Use of the Streets We Have to Move People and Goods (p. 74}
This purpose of this section's Zone treatment of Pedestrian, Transition and Travel Zones was not immediately apparent, we hope you could formalize that structure through formatting (e.g. capitalize
Ms. Diane Sugimura
November 20, 2015
Page 5
Transition Zone, or add headers?) and a clear description of the three zones in the ROW early on in the introductory paragraphs.
• Edit the header to include "to move people and goods" to indicate the primary function of streets.
• Think about re·organizing the policies to be clear which apply to all three zones.
• Regarding the Travel Zones, we suggest you emphasize the need for appropriate separation between incompatible modes (such as bicycles and trucks), especially in Policies 2.3 and 2.11 by adding language such as "where appropriate and safe."
• We underscore the Council's guidance with regard to the Complete Streets Ordinance, of which Section 3 reads: "Because freight is important to the basic economy of the City and has unique right-of-way needs to support that role, freight will be the major priority on streets classified as Major Truck Streets. Complete Street improvements that are consistent with freight mobility but also support other modes may be considered on these streets." (City of Seattle, Council Ordinance #122386) Please ensure that the Complete Streets Ordinance is supported in the implementation of policy T2.3. Add a bullet that reads:
o "Prioritize the movement of freight on Major Truck Streets."
• We suggest replacing the word "tactic" with "strategy", as tactics generally address short-term action items and needs, while the Comprehensive Plan would seem to call for a more strategic approach.
• In the header, we highly recommend retaining the language from the last version of the Comprehensive Plan to set the stage for a goal and set of policies focused on moving people and goods-see above.

Transportation Options (p. 77}
• This section of the Draft Element is exclusively focused on providing people with mobility choices, the section header could be sharpened to reflect that.
• We suggest adding a policy that freight mobility is necessary for people to live a less car-dependent lifestyle:
T3.19 Maintain, preserve and improve a system of truck streets and commercial loading zones to ensure that goods can be delivered efficiently and reliably to businesses and people, supporting a less car-dependent lifestyle.
• Paralleling Policy 3.2, we recommend adding "Ensure safe transportation options to MICs for employees, clients or customers."
Support a Vibrant Economy (move up from TS to T4} (wasp. 85)
The Transportation Options section provides maps of the modal plans for the movement of people. We recommend moving T5 (Vibrant Economy) to directly follow it, so that freight mobility policies immediately follow the people mobility policies.
• For goal TS (new T4), we recommend clarifying what this goal is trying to achieve by replacing "strengthen~~ with "improveu.
• Since the ability of the City to fund the projects that will implement the Transportation Element is dependent on income from a growing economy, we would encourage you to add this concept to the goal:
Ms. Diane Sugimura
November 20, 2015
Page 6
TG4 Improve mobility and access for the movement of goods and services to enhance and promote economic growth and opportunity throughout the City for all businesses and residents.
• T5.1, change 'Maintain' to 'Enhance' recognizing the support of the Mayor for the industrial sector as evidenced at the Maritime and Manufacturing Summit.
• T5.2 implies that the Freight Master Plan will not be complete before the new Transportation Element will be adopted, yet text in other sections of the draft implies that the FMP is complete. Please clarify the timing of these related efforts. Since it is likely that the FMP will be complete, or close by the time this Element is adopted, we recommend that you include the new freight network map, rather than the soon to be outdated Major Truck Street map here. As need be, you could note that the draft is in lieu of the final map.
• We suggest addition other incidents train crossings and bridge openings such as special events and construction or maintenance detours.
• Under T5.7, please delete or move ", and to minimize the impact of trucks idling and parking overnight on residential streets". While the Port agrees that these are worthy goals in themselves, there is no connection to the goal of this section, or its title.
• For T5.7, we suggest reordering to read: "Work with freight stakeholders and the Port of Seattle to improve intermodal freight connections involving industrial areas, Port terminals, rail yards, airports and highways."
• Please add a policy reflecting the recently completed Seattle Industrial Areas Freight Access Project in this section. The following combines two goals/objectives of that Project:
"T... Maintain and improve truck-freight mobility and access to accommodate expected general traffic, freight and cargo growth, and ensure connectivity for major freight intermodal and trans-load facilities in the City's two Manufacturing Industrial Centers."
Environment (move down from T4 to T5) (wasp. 84}
Diesel emissions from trucks and delivery vehicles are a major source of particulate matter and other air

pollution. Recent data provided to SOOT by Charlie's Produce show that increases in the number of deliveries, combined with increased congestion and roadway configuration changes, have forced them to more than double the number of vehicles making deliveries in Seattle. This has led to increased fuel use and emissions, an outcome that is replicated by many other firms making deliveries in the city. There is direct benefit to making provisions to counteract the need to increase delivery vehicle fleets due to roadway conditions and loading zone availability.
Please note further, the Port of Seattle has made significant efforts to reduce Diesel Particulate Matter, reducing DMP from trucks serving our terminals by more than 50% between 2005 and 2011. Congestion reduces the benefits of those reductions.
We suggest either of the following policies:
T4.6 Support efficient movement of freight to decrease truck emissions.
Or Design and operate streets in a way that minimizes the need to increase the number of delivery vehicles due to roadway congestion.
Ms. Diane Sugimura
November 20, 2015
Safety (p. 88)
Page 7
• The Port supports efforts to minimize accidents and injuries. We also support the Complete Corridor approach, which acknowledges that it is not feasible to make provisions for all users on all city streets. It provides safer routes for more vulnerable users adjacent, but not necessarily on Principal Arterials. Please include this concept under this heading. To achieve this goal, policy T6.2 may be revised to read:
T6.2 Minimize right-of-way conflicts to accommodate all travelers, using a Complete Corridor approach where necessary to maintain the functionality of the transportation system.
• In T6.3, we suggest including truckers along with motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists.
• Suggest moving current policy T5.4 to the Safety section (T6) for consistency with how safety issues on other network components are treated.
Connecting to the Region (p. 89}
The discussion and policies under this section of the Draft element are almost exclusively focused on the movement of people; freight is mentioned in only two of the eight proposed policies. Yet, the economy of the City is dependent on an efficient freight transportation system that seamlessly connects regional freeways with local port, rail and air intermodal facilities, the City's two Manufacturing-Industrial Centers and major truck freight traffic generators. Exports from Eastern Washington must be able to access Port of Seattle container terminals. Costco, Boeing, Amazon, like all manufacturers, retail businesses, and delivery services dependent on the cost-effective movement of freight, cannot function without reliable connections to the regional system.
• Please include a policy focused on freight mobility. A new, freight-focused policy may read something like:
T7.3 Coordinate with regional, state and federal agencies, other local governments. as well as major private sector freight traffic generators, to ensure an efficient freight intermodal transportation system across jurisdictional boundaries.
• We would also like to recommend inclusion of WSDOT's map of Freight Economic Corridors within the City of Seattle, it provides a good overview of the most critical city streets connecting major freight truck trip generators to the regional system.
• We are surprised by policy T7.4, which gives staff guidance to "limit freeway capacity expansions," despite the fact that the City of Seattle does not have control over these facilities. We believe this is an UNWISE strategic policy because it limits freight mobility which uses the same facilities as SOVs.
• The Discussion paragraph should not overlook other fixed guideway systems in calling out "a

regional light rail system" given Sounder heavy rail and street cars. Additionally, private sector transportation providers are important for waterways and railroad movements and could be added:
" ... including two interstate highways, several state highways, the transit network in the form of regional light and heavy rail, streetcars, buses, and the ferry network, as well as private sector providers on waterways and railroads."
Operating and Maintaining the Transportation System (p. 90)
The Port appreciates the renewed emphasis on least-cost planning and using ITS technology to maximize system efficiency for all modes.
Ms. Diane Sugimura
November 20, 2015
Page 8
• The priorities for this section of the Draft are well laid-out in the first sentence of the discussion. We recommend the same language be used in policy T8.2, which introduces concepts like social equity and place-making, that do not directly relate to the subject at hand.
• . We would also like to include a performance measure specific to the movement of freight, which are currently under development as part of the Freight Master Plan. They are also consistent with the recommendations from the Seattle Industrial Areas Freight Access Project:
T8.6 Work to reduce or eliminate freight system constraints such as weight and height restrictions, geometric deficiencies and pavement conditions preventing trucks from using the most efficient and safe freight routes.
• We suggest policy acknowledging important designation within the system such as the overdimensional
route and the Heavy Haul Network.
"T... Maintain, preserve and enhance the City's network of over-dimensional routes and the Heavy Haul Network to ensure the safe and efficient movement of specialized freight."
Measuring Level of Service (p. 91}
The discussion of Level of Service measures outlined in the discussion and policies under this section is missing freight-related components. Please include measures for both the movement of freight in major freight corridors (truck travel time and buffer index) and the availability of load zones (both the number spaces and the number of tickets written, as an indicator of a shortage of load zone capacity), based on the performance measures currently under development as part of the Freight Master Plan process, and those defined through the Seattle Industrial Areas Freight Access Project:
11T9.4 Implement freight level of service standards for truck mobility and commercial loading zone capacity to ensure that the city maintains an effective and efficient freight system that meets the needs of business and industry, supports a growing economy and enables residents to life a less car-dependent lifestyle."
Funding (p. 92}
Funding for transportation infrastructure and operations within the City is dependent on a vibrant and growing economy: Businesses pay taxes to the City, which in turn can be used to fund transportation infrastructure and operations. Yet, the discussion and policies outlined in this section , of the Draft element do not mention this vital linkage. Please add the word "economic" to the list of priorities under TGlO.
It is also surprising to us that the list of draft policies under this heading provides of a list of investment priorities (see T10.6) that does not include mobility, economic growth, or efficient freight mobility-on which a less car-dependent lifestyle is dependent. Please add "freight mobility supporting a growing economy and a less car-dependent lifestyle" to the list of priorities under this policy.
We look forward to working together with you and your staff on these issues. Please do not hesitate to call Joseph Gellings if you have any questions.

Stephanie Jones Stebbins
Director, Seaport Division Environmental and Planning

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Sarah Rose

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Comments on the "Seattle 2035, Draft Comprehensive Plan."
Regarding the Land Use portion of Seattle's Draft Comprehensive Plan 2035.
Seattle is a city of neighborhoods. The acknowledgement and appreciation of Seattle being a city of neighborhoods has been removed from the Land Use portion and no longer sets the tone.
• Re-instate neighborhood planning processes in this proposal for re-zoning and development. Why are we, both current & future residents, being excluded from the process?
• Re-instate the Land Use directive to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances our communities.
• Say no to Ultra small lot development – Seattle neighborhoods are made up of both multi-family and single family homes. The proposed language in LU8.9 not only allows for Single Family Homes to have "mother-in-laws" but also opens the door for ultra small lot development. Please close this loophole.
Single Family Neighborhoods
• Currently, existing Single Family neighborhoods are protected from multi-family development via distinct urban center and urban village boundaries. Proposed Section LU1.1 eliminates these boundaries. Rewrite Section LU1.1 to include these distinct boundaries.
• Re-instate the criteria that land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria can only be upzoned when all of the following conditions are met:
o The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary
o The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan
o The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multi-family or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas
o The rezone procedures are followed
Seattle is known for its greenness – yet Seattle 2035 does not include the basic green attributes of requiring trees or not developing in wetlands.
• Re-instate the requirement for the preservation or planting of trees as new development occurs
• Do not allow development within critical areas (LUG15 permits development "that is reasonable" within critical areas (i.e., wetlands, fish and wildlife conservation areas) as well as in areas that are prone to erosion, landslides, liquefaction or floods.)
Off-street Parking
Until Seattle is an "interconnected city where people have reliable, easy-to-use travel options that get them to their destinations," new developments need to include adequate parking.
• Eliminating parking does not eliminate cars
• Not requiring parking in new developments pushes residents of these new multi-family developments to park in the street. Once the street parking is full, then no one has a place to park. Not the residents and guests of the development nor the residents and guests of the single-family home areas that abut them.
• Without off-street parking, small, independently owned shops, cafes, restaurants and other businesses lose customers. Customers go where it is convenient. Not being able to find parking in the vicinity of

shops, services, cafes, restaurants, etc. means customers go elsewhere and businesses close or leave the urban village.
• The Parking Myth (eliminating parking eliminates cars) is inequitable and creates more burden for both the working poor and the working middle class: extra cost of parking (& parking tickets) / bus / uber / taxi associated with being at one's job adds to financial burden of both the working poor and the middle class
• Negative impact on quality of life: Extra time spent commuting due to no-place-to-park near home/ work equals less time to be with friends/ family, to work (for those working two – three jobs), to go to school (for those working and going to school), to enjoy life, to sleep, etc..
• Currently, developers are building multi-family buildings without parking; once these buildings are built, it will be too late to add parking to them. This potentially creates areas in our neighborhoods that have no convenient off-street parking options for residents, customers, patients, employees, students, friends, etc..

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Sarah Rose

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Comments on the "Seattle 2035, Draft Comprehensive Plan," regarding the Land Use portion of Seattle's Draft Comprehensive Plan 2035.
Seattle is a city of neighborhoods. The acknowledgement and appreciation of Seattle being a city of neighborhoods has been removed from the Land Use portion and no longer sets the tone.
· Re-instate neighborhood planning processes in this proposal for re-zoning and development. Why are we, both current & future residents, being excluded from the process?
· Re-instate the Land Use directive to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances our communities.
· Say no to Ultra small lot development – Seattle neighborhoods are made up of both multi-family and single family homes. The proposed language in LU8.9 not only allows for Single Family Homes to have "mother-in-laws" but also opens the door for ultra small lot development. Please close this loophole.
Single Family Neighborhoods
· Currently, existing Single Family neighborhoods are protected from multi-family development via distinct urban center and urban village boundaries. Proposed Section LU1.1 eliminates these boundaries. Rewrite Section LU1.1 to include these distinct boundaries.
· Re-instate the criteria that land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria can only be upzoned when all of the following conditions are met:
o The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary
o The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan
o The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multi-family or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas
o The rezone procedures are followed
Seattle is known for its greenness – yet Seattle 2035 does not include the basic green attributes of requiring trees or not developing in wetlands.
· Re-instate the requirement for the preservation or planting of trees as new development occurs
· Do not allow development within critical areas (LUG15 permits development "that is reasonable" within critical areas (i.e., wetlands, fish and wildlife conservation areas) as well as in areas that are prone

to erosion, landslides, liquefaction or floods.)

Off-street Parking
Until Seattle is an “interconnected city where people have reliable, easy-to-use travel options that get them to their destinations,” new developments need to include adequate parking.
· Eliminating parking does not eliminate cars
· Not requiring parking in new developments pushes residents of these new multi-family developments to park in the street. Once the street parking is full, then no one has a place to park. Not the residents and guests of the development nor the residents and guests of the single-family home areas that abut them.
· Without off-street parking, small, independently owned shops, cafes, restaurants and other businesses lose customers. Customers go where it is convenient. Not being able to find parking in the vicinity of shops, services, cafes, restaurants, etc. means customers go elsewhere and businesses close or leave the urban village.
· The Parking Myth (eliminating parking eliminates cars) is inequitable and creates more burden for both the working poor and the working middle class: extra cost of parking (& parking tickets) / bus / uber / taxi associated with being at one’s job adds to financial burden of both the working poor and the middle class
· Negative impact on quality of life: Extra time spent commuting due to no-place-to-park near home/ work equals less time to be with friends/ family, to work (for those working two – three jobs), to go to school (for those working and going to school), to enjoy life, to sleep, etc..
· Currently, developers are building multi-family buildings without parking; once these buildings are built, it will be too late to add parking to them. This potentially creates areas in our neighborhoods that have no convenient off-street parking options for residents, customers, patients, employees, students, friends, etc..
Sarah Rose
Wallingford, WA 98103
--
SARAH ROSE

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Elizabeth Sims

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

I have lived on 19th Avenue NE and 63rd St for 25 years. I am strongly opposed to the proposal to expand the urban boundary to 17th Ave NE. I have looked at the "urban progress" map showing all the proposed apartment buildings to the west of 15th. Keep them there even with inadequate allowance for parking and NO green space. One only has to look at what the University area has become, with block after block of almost identical tall, ugly apartment buildings enclosing the streets, shutting off the sky , eliminating any semblance of character or beauty in the area. I don't want my neighborhood to look the same. If it truly were low income housing, ok; I teach at a school in southeast Seattle and year after year have watched our immigrant and black/Latino/SE Asian families being priced out of the city. But this is just money-making and catering to developers. This email is intemperate, yes. I have not commented on the Roosevelt growth issue until now,but I am so fed up with the obliviousness of Seattle's planners and politicians that I cannot keep quiet.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Carol Meyers

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I endorse the position statement of the Livable U District Coalition, found at http://livableudistrict.com/
.
Let's develop measures aimed at preserving and improving both the livability and affordability of the city and that truly reflect the needs and wishes of existing residents and small businesses.
My opinion after comparing the 1994 plan with the proposed 2035 plan is that the 1994 Comp Plan is superior to the "update" because it protects elements that matter most to me: livable neighborhoods, a healthy environment, preserving existing affordable housing stock, and protection for, and enhancement of, Seattle's public open spaces and its natural, historical, and cultural resources.
Please keep me informed of any public meetings or new information that you make available.

Date: 11/19/2015

Name: Hallie Goertz

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Planners:
As a long-time Seattle resident and home owner I have some concerns about the proposed Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Please accept my feedback below.
Best regards,
Hallie Goertz
1)
ENGAGEMENT.

-- Planning for community involvement has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that community involvement applies to ALL aspects of the planning and budgeting, then this clarification has not occurred. The appearance instead is of a Comprehensive Plan that claims "community" as a theme, yet has no place for community.
Add a Community Involvement chapter that is at least as good as Portland's.

-- Employ a communications specialist to address, and report on communication shortcomings in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal.
Eliminate use of the term "storage" when the word that diverse people would understand is "parking".

-- Remove language that stereotypes, unnecessarily limits participation, and divides populations.
Replace language of "engage XXX communities"
with "engage individuals from ALL communities, including from XXX communities."

2)
HEALTH & SAFETY.

-- Because of the many benefits that street trees provide to both property owners and the general public, encourage the preservation or planting of street trees as development occurs, except in locations where it is not possible to meet City standards intended to preserve public safety and utility networks.
REF: LU41, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Pursue a comprehensive approach of prevention, transition and stabilization services to decrease potential homelessness, stop recurring homelessness and promote longterm self-sufficiency.
a. Encourage efforts to expand the supply of extremely low-income, permanent housing to meet the needs of those for whom the cost of housing is a chief cause of homelessness.
b. Strive to develop a continuum of housing opportunities, ranging from emergency shelters to transitional housing to permanent housing, in order to assist homeless households regain and maintain stable, permanent housing.
c. Strategically invest in emergency and transitional housing for specific homeless populations.
REF: H45, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- In recognition of the fact that for certain people housing support services can mean the difference between housing stability and homelessness, coordinate housing planning and funding, where appropriate, with the following types of housing support services:
a. Services that respond to emergency needs of the homeless (such as emergency shelters).
b. Services that assist clients to secure housing (such as rent and security deposit assistance, housing relocation assistance).
c. Services that help clients to maintain permanent housing (such as landlord / tenant counseling, chore services, in-home health care, outpatient mental health treatment, employment counseling and placement assistance).
REF: H46, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Work to reduce environmental threats and hazards to health in the workplace, at home and at play.
a. Make use of the City's building and fire codes, food licensing and permit processes, and hazardous materials and smoking regulations for fire and life safety protection.
b. Collaborate through joint efforts among City agencies, such as fire, police, and construction and land use to address health and safety issues in a more efficient manner.
c. Prepare land use plans in ways that support development and design that promote physical activities, use safe materials, and protect water and air quality.
REF: HD23, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Encourage connections between services that coordinate, link and integrate public, private and community-based services. Facilitate collaboration of programs through the use of City funding.
REF: HD48, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Achieve an increased sense of security and a decrease in the per capita incidence of crimes, as indicated by decreased homicides, aggravated assaults, residential burglaries, and auto theft; increased perception of police presence; and decreased perception of crime.
REF: HDG8.2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Collect data and regularly report on the sustainability measures and numeric goals in this plan to inform and enable citizens and decision-makers to consider alternative policies or programs, where outcomes differ from what was intended. Conduct an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions in Seattle at least every three years. Use data, public input, and approaches developed by other public agencies

and private organizations that address sustainability. Consider combining this monitoring activity with the one described in the Urban Village Element of this Plan.
REF: E18, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage.
REF: E24, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

3)
LAND USE

-- Do not advance a FLUM that discards current zoning. It is irresponsible for the city to so radically change the rules after people are already so invested. It would be irresponsible for such a FLUM to fuel displacement and increase inequity as those with largest resources at their disposal will be relatively advantaged in the transition.

-- Require sweeping zone-wide changes to prove equity through an analysis of local conditions. Fairness occurs when all are treated fairly, not when the benefits for population 'A' equal the losses of population B.

-- Provide policies that condition permitting of development to specific site impactsand to cumulative area impacts.

-- Raise setback and landscaping requirements in communities not meeting open space targets.

-- Provide policy support for housing preservation, including preservation of affordable rental housing stock and other functional and well-built structures which accomplish the "reuse" aspect of the common environmental policy: "reduce, reuse, recycle."

-- Provide clarity regarding how best use of surplus property is to be determined. Open space is a continual need, while for additional housing need may ebb and flow. As such, a method that involves all stakeholders will be needed in order for there to be good results in all eras.

-- Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses.
REF: LUG2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal, replaced with language that requires the city to "allow", "support", and " accommodate" for everything rather than designing something that works.

-- Preserve and protect low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited.
REF: LUG8, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing

opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics.
REF: LUG9, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- To maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan.
REF: LU11, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU59, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU60, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Reflect the character of existing low-density development through the regulation of scale, siting, structure orientation, and setbacks.
REF: LU69, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- DO NOT PROVIDE FREE ACROSS THE BOARD UPZONES VIA THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. DO NOT:
"Designate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings can provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU9.10 to replace LU75.

-- Limit the multifamily zones to areas that do not meet the single-family zone criteria, except in circumstances where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a different zone is more appropriate.
REF: LU75, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

4)
TRANSPORTATION.

-- Define transportation service performance categories (levels) not merely on the basis of frequency, but on the usability, including usability by diverse populations.

-- Establish a practice of assessing the transportation service performance category (level) of a location on the basis of the current situation, and on the basis of future housing and employment estimates.

-- If land use rules for a parcel are to deviate with proximity to transportation services,

then condition the approval of a development proposal for that parcel on proof of the transportation service performance category (level) present as of the date of the proposal application, and on independent service level projection analysis for the next 10 years.

-- Encourage off street parking in new developments where there is not a demonstrated capacity to absorb the projected additional parking demand.

-- Consider visitor parking demand when establishing parking requirements.

-- Provide consistent definitions (in the glossary) for terms like “transit corridor”, “transit stop”, “frequent transit”, "rail station", frequent rail station", “superior transit”, etc.

-- DO NOT
"Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking required."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU6.3.
This proposal would REQUIRE the city to have NO rules on what amount of parking any development must include.
MARKET FORCES are NOT a sufficient tool for city planning.

5)
ADMINISTRATION.

-- Use of the "neighborhood plans" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that the "neighborhood plans" are now to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that the neighborhood plans are to be discarded, or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to Neighborhood plans and citywide plans, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Use of "neighborhood planning" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that neighborhood planning is to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that neighborhood planning is to be replaced by full central government control or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to neighborhood planning and citywide planning, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Define clearly the role that adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies, neighborhood plan work-plan matrices, and recognized neighborhood plans play in the City’s decision-making and resource allocation.
REF: NG4, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Include (as was done in the past) growth estimates for all urban villages, not just the 6 urban centers.

-- An independent assessment should occur to determine what growth is most likely to occur if this Comprehensive Plan is adopted. (These policies seem designed to create far greater growth than that which was studied by the draft EIS).

-- Establish a vision for housing and job levels 40 and 60 years from now, and provide an analysis of

anticipated capacity distribution for those periods.

-- REMOVE ALL proposed goals/policies that in effect state that "the city shall NOT do its job". The city government and the people DO have a right to accomplish planning and to apply laws that limit land uses.
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal contains many statements that the city shall "allow", "accommodate", etc unlimited use, and these are an irresponsible abandonment of responsibility of stewardship for current and future generations.

-- Provide a Comprehensive Plan that is unbiased and invites participation, rather than one that biases and closes the conversation. For example,
“Determine the appropriate uses and densities on hospital and college campuses that are located outside an urban center or village through a master planning process that engages nearby residents and businesses”.
would be better than:
“Plan for uses and densities on hospital and college campuses that are located outside an urban center or village in ways that recognize the important contributions of these institutions and the generally low-scale development of their surroundings.”
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal is riddled with bias, and no transparent abd accountable process has been provided to correct that.

Here is another example from the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal:
“Encourage street widths and building heights that are in proportion with each other by reducing setbacks from the street and keeping reasonable sidewalk widths for lower buildings.”
"Reducing" is a bias without also proposing "increasing" for the opposite case.
"Reasonable" is a bias in that it has been listed here as applicable for "lower" buildings, implying no applicability to "higher" buildings.
There might be a suitable policy intended by this language, but that can become apparent only when the biases have been removed.

-- Incorporate the following 4 Comprehensive Plan amendments submitted in 2014, which staff was directed by the Seattle City Council to review for inclusion:
1.In order to monitor the effects of the urban village strategy: collect data, review, and report on growth and change in urban centers, urban villages, and manufacturing/ industrial centers at least every 3 years. Include in these reports factors such as: progress on implementing neighborhood plan approval and adoption matrices; changes in the numbers of jobs and hous-ing units; housing costs, including net loss or gain of low-income and very low-income housing units; housing types; crime rates; transportation systems and their use; business types; public facilities; services; and open space, to the extent information is practically available. Collect and report on similar data for typical areas outside villages for comparison. Broadly communi-cate the results of monitoring efforts. Provide a Briefing to City Council by July of the year following the review in order to be used for consideration in the annual Budget cycle. Provide the results directly to the Neighborhood Plan Stewards on record with the Department of Neighborhoods. Work with community members to identify appropriate responses to significant growth, lack of growth or changes, including: community-led activities; additional planning for, or re-prioritization of, City Programs or infrastructure improvements; partially or entirely updating a neighborhood plan; or working with other public agencies to address community goals.
2.Review situations where the rate of growth is significantly faster or slower than antici-pated in the growth targets contained in Appendix UV-A or where other measures indicate significant changes in the

center or village over an extended period of time. Evaluate the significance of the changes or the significance of lack of change with center or village residents, business owners, and other community stakeholders in light of the expectations underlying the neighborhood plan for the area, the actual level of growth, progress toward neighbor-hood plan implementation, and the relative maturity (level of mixed-use development, the pedestrian environment, infrastruc-ture, and public facilities) of the area as an urban center or village
3.To ensure compliance with [the two new polices suggested above], the Council shall receive and consider a report, compiled by DPD and DON, that documents the impacts of growth in each Urban Village when approving capital and operating budget for all departments. These growth impact reports shall be available for public review prior to the start of the annual Council budget cycle.
4.When housing or job growth exceeds 100% of targets in any urban village or center, the city shall make all affirmative efforts to re-direct job and housing growth to designated growth areas that have not yet reached their targets.
--
Hallie Goertz, MPA

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: @lekalinina94078

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

@Seattle2035 If you are looking for the Truth about Universe structure, another realms, visit: http://bit.ly/1MjnF6i

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: @UrbanistOrg

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Today is the last day to comment on the @Seattle2035 Draft Plan. http://www.theurbanist.org/2015/11/19/seattles-draft-comprehensive-plan-takes-on-the-big-issues/

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Patrick Morrison

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

I am commenting on the City of Seattle Department of Development Comprehensive Development Plan for 2035. I think there are several issues that are not considered at all in any of the four presented "plans":
1. There is no development in the Magnolia, Madison Valley, Mount Baker, Laurelhurst, and Wedgewood neighborhoods. The High-income neighborhoods are not affected at all by the runaway, unplanned growth in the other neighborhoods. I think these neighborhoods should also get the ugly, onedimensional, six-story, cheaply-built mixed-use buildings as the rest of us. If we're going to ruin the city then we should ruin the entire city, not leave pockets for the rich to be insulated from the ruin.

There are plenty of lots in Magnolia where a single-family home could be replaced with a 50 unit building with no additional parking. No worries about the Magnolia bridge not being able to handle the extra traffic. All the new residents will take the bus. 2. Bicycles are not mass-transit. Have you been on 2nd Ave downtown where they removed a lane of traffic to put in a bike lane? It is gridlock at rush hour. And at all other hours there are NO bikes to be seen but still is near gridlock for cars. It is silly and wasteful. Bikes were the passion of mayor McSchwinn but he's long gone now. Get back to reality and solve real problems. 3. Buses and streetcars are stuck in the same traffic as everyone else. There is no incentive to use them as they end up being slower than a single-occupancy vehicle. Mass transit needs to be separated from cars. We voted for the monorail expansion twice because it's a good idea. You all figure out what it takes to pay for it but GET MASS TRANSIT OFF OF THE ROADS. 4. Until you have actual mass transit options that are NOT stuck in the same traffic as everyone else then suspend allowing developers to build housing that does not have at least one parking spot for each unit. It doesn't make sense to allow this when mass transit is stuck in the 1950s. These folks have cars; they have to park somewhere and now the streets are full of the overflow cars. Have to been to Ballard? Or Capitol Hill? Or West Seattle? Or any of the non-rich neighborhoods? 5. Stop this nonsense of catering to bikes. It's just making things worse. There are much, much higher priorities. 6. Build another West Seattle bridge. This one is ful l. So are the streets. 7. Create a Department of Planning. The Department of Development is going full steam but there is no planning at all, let alone comprehensive planning. 8. My rent just went up 50%. I'm going to have to move out of Seattle. Patrick Morrison

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Neighborhood Greenways,Cathy Tuttle

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

November 20, 2015
City of Seattle
Department of Planning & Development
Attn: Tom Hauger
How we measure success matters. Measuring the success of our transportation system based on how many vehicles can pass a certain line is outdated thinking, and does not align the with Seattle's values or vision of itself for the future.
We strongly support the moving away from the vehicular "level of service" to a level of service that focuses on moving people and goods in a way that promotes the health, safety, and wellbeing of Seattle's residents.
That is why we applaud the Seattle's development of a mode share based level of service. We urge the planning staff to continue down this path, to create a measurement system that pulls us towards safe and healthy future.
Specific recommendations:
T1.3 Invest in transportation projects and programs further progress towards meeting Seattle's mode share
goals and reduce dependence on personal automobiles, particularly in urban centers.
We appreciate the table of "non-work trips" in addition to the "trip to work" table. Another table is needed to define mode share goals for walk, bike, SOV, HOV, and transit.
T2.8 Develop a decision---making framework to direct the future planning, design and optimization of street
right---of---way.

Add “and prioritize the safety of people who walk and ride bicycles.”
T4.1 Design and operate streets to promote green infrastructure, new technologies, and active transportation modes while addressing safety, accessibility and aesthetics.
T4.2 Reduce single---occupant vehicle trips, vehicle dependence, and vehicle miles traveled in order to help
meet the City’s greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.
Rather than simply “promote.. active transportation” and “reduce” VMT, please use this opportunity to call out specific mode shares needed for walk, bike, SOV, HOV, and transit to meet our GHG Climate Action Plan targets.

T6.1 Reduce collisions for all modes of transportation and work toward a transportation system that produces zero fatalities and serious injuries.
Safety is our primary objective in transportation planning with strong Mayoral support. Please specify a goal to “work toward a Vision Zero transportation system.”
T6.5 Emphasize safety as a consideration in all transportation plans and projects, including in developing project prioritization criteria.
Add “that prioritizes the safety first of people who walk and ride bicycles.”
T6.6 Consider lowering speed limits on residential streets and arterials as a way to reduce collision rates.
In the near future, we will lower speed limits on our streets. Restate as “Lower speed limits on residential streets and arterials as a way to reduce collision rates”.
T9.3 Consider establishing level---of---service standards that include non---motorized modes in order to advance this Plan’s goals of encouraging use of travel options, reduce dependence on drive---alone automobile use and accommodate growth in urban centers and urban villages.
Strike “consider”. The Seattle Comprehensive Plan will be a success if it benchmarks counting and moving people, not vehicles, as the standard to follow for our transportation future.
Thank you for your public service and for creating and implementing an innovative way to measure our transportation system’s success.
Cathy Tuttle, Ph.D., Executive Director
Seattle Neighborhood Greenways
cc: Tracy Krawczyk, Seattle Department of Transportation Kevin O’Neill, Seattle Department of Transportation Patrice Carroll, Department of Planning & Development
2035@seattle.gov

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: R. Scott Vance

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I feel like there is way too much focus on turning our neighborhoods into bedroom communities for downtown. I don't think transit is connecting the communities, it's just feeding the city. I don't feel like the process is actually inclusive. I do feel it's filled with jargon and feel-good terminology. I know it's hard to solicit feedback and apply it for so many thousands of people, but from what I see (Seattleite since 1980) the "developers" are in control.
We do not need to extend any borders of the euphemistic "urban villages" because 1) there's plenty of room to infill in Seattle with existing boundaries, and 2) these mega-structures are killing existing communities of real people who have invested their lives and who are what make there districts desirable.

For all the "growth", Ballard is dying. Please let greenwood live. Stop changing the rules of the game. Stop changing zoning and favoring "developers." They are developing nothing. It's extractive in nature.
We are not guiding the growth we have - we are accommodating big money.
Remember quality of life and what that really means.
Sorry for the late night rant, but not everyone has time to work on this and their job and take care of their kid etc. and write a decent letter. But it's painful to see this massive change without the people who actually live in a place have an honest chance at guiding it.
Please listen and do your best to make that possible.
Thanks,
-r. Scott Vance

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Susan Weinstein

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

As a constituent who has lived in the historic Mt Baker neighborhood for 27 years, I have an interest in the Mt Baker Village Center. Focus on positive multifamily mixed use development in the existing Village boundaries, adjacent to the transit station. Don't chunk away at single family neighborhoods along the perimeter of the village, when vacant and surplus properties lie empty all around the station. Mt Baker neighborhood is an asset to be preserved. As Victor Steinbrueck noted, this neighborhood possesses important historical values that should be celebrated rather than vilified. Complete the vibrant community
vision we already defined in the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Rob Fellows

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed updates to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, Seattle 2035. I've been a proponent of Seattle's urban village strategy since it was developed during the Rice administration, which envisioned focusing the city's resources into ensuring the areas slated to accept new development would be great urban places. That was the "grand bargain" for the previous generation of Seattleites, along with a commitment to work with each neighborhood to plan how to implement the plan appropriately in each urban village area to develop and express their uniqueness. City investment objectives and plans, collaboration and aspiration are largely missing from the new plan. Instead it focuses almost exclusively on how to encourage more intensive development by reducing costs and barriers to developers. Repeatedly the document suggests – but doesn't credibly support – an underlying faith that increased development and density will inherently reduce housing costs, increase diversity and equity, and be better for the environment. And instead of collaboration to tailor implementation to individual urban villages, the plan stresses one-size-fits-all policies across the city without regard to context.
Seattle has striven to encourage infill development for decades, as developers chose suburban locations where they could clear large parcels and mass-produce large houses with little required of them. But over the last few years demand has shifted for developers and high-end buyers alike. We no longer need

to beg developers to work here; they're investing at full speed. For the first time in a generation Seattle is in a good position to bargain with developers, but a generation of planners and policymakers can't seem to break free from the paradigm that has defined their careers.
The objective of urban villages was never about directing growth – the zoning map alone has done that. What's missing in the comp plan update is recommitment to collaboration and investment to make great urban places, not just denser ones. With development occurring faster than ever, we need to make sure they will be walkable, livable places with unique character, vibrant business districts, accessible parks and service and infrastructure sufficient to provide for high quality urban life.
Please consider the following comments from a steadfast supporter of Seattle's urban village strategy as originally conceived:
•Seattle's proposed growth policies are focused on the past, not the future. Planners and policy-makers have spent their careers trying to incentivize developers to build infill here instead of sprawling to the suburbs. But as the recession ends it's clear development trends have changed and development in Seattle is hot. For the first time in a generation we are in a position to bargain with developers, but Seattle's strategy is to give away the store.
• All the new housing is for singles and childless couples. If we were bargaining with developers and making it clear what we desire, we would not tolerate development that is solely focused on single people and childless couples, or that replaces affordable single family homes with pretentious luxury buyers. We should use every tool to channel development to things we need for a diverse, affordable city. Instead of giving away zoning, we should tax luxury development as Vancouver BC is considering, speed the development process for projects that collaborate with communities, and give price and zoning incentives to developers who build multifamily developments for actual families.
• The tie between equity, affordability and density is treated as a tautology. But adding supply is only effective if the demand curve stays constant, which it is not. The same supply and demand argument has powered freeway expansion throughout the world, but when demand is intense (and supply is uniformly aimed at the prosperous) equilibrium at an affordable price isn't possible. If density is the primary means to deliver the city's objectives, the plan needs to be more careful determining when and where density supports those goals, and honest about when it does not.
• Preservation needs to be given equal standing. Through most of history affordability has dependent on older housing stock, not new. In Seattle today new development can only be affordable with significant subsidies (or in the case of the "grand bargain," giveaways.) New development is deemed more important than existing affordable housing, but also than unpretentious businesses and places people love. Seattle's comp plan vision should strike a better balance between growth and preservation of things we love and can afford.
• Outreach and collaboration with neighborhoods, businesses and residents should be addressed. The comp plan seems devoid of any suggestion that placemaking and community building needs to be an ongoing process, or that community involvement is critical to livability and high quality urban neighborhoods. Community engagement and ongoing, collaborative neighborhood planning should be specifically addressed in the plan.
• After reading the plan, it is unclear what the effect will be of being in an urban village. All of the details are left for legislation and implementation. The meaning twenty years ago – that city resources and investment would be focused on urban villages to make them livable – has faded and replaced with a notion that developer barriers and costs must be reduced to encourage development. There are hints that zoning and regulations will change that remain unknown. It is not reasonable to ask people where urban village boundaries should be until the practical implications of the urban village designation are known and explained in layman's terms.
• Transportation concurrency is a serious concern. The city is imagining a city with a rapid transit system, but living in one with a bus system that has only gotten slower since the 1960's. The

transportation concurrency thresholds are set so high that they cannot be exceeded, but as roads congest and are operated inefficiently (as they are), bus service slows even more. The analysis suggests that everything is ducky and will get better, but that goes against all evidence. Seattle needs to control density for the transportation system that exists, not one that will take two generations to get here.
• Aurora/Licton Springs is getting all of the impacts of urban village status with none of the benefits. The comp plan suggests that all urban village should be treated the same, despite dramatically different contexts. The city has done nothing to make the Aurora Licton Springs urban village more walkable, livable, or safe over the life of the urban village strategy. It has become far denser, but still has a neglected business district centered on a state highway, with crime and social service issues. If Aurora-Licton Springs remains an urban village, city investment and attention must be focused on achieving the last generation's "grand bargain," which was to follow through and make urban villages great places to live.
• Parking should be based on context and evidence, not citywide policy. Again, Aurora-Licton Springs is different from Capitol Hill, and city policies and practices should recognize the differences between neighborhoods. Planning by citywide policy fiat should not replace best practices for assessing context and need. In urban villages that are not walkable, with few walk-accessible services and transit access only to downtown, it is not realistic to expect car usage to be as low as in Capitol Hill. Seattle parking requirements should be sensitive to context and based on right-sizing methodologies documented by King County Metro and other sources.
• I oppose putting urban villages next to freeway interchanges. Transit stations should serve communities, not the opposite. Communities and transit stations should be places in places where pedestrian life can thrive. It is stupid to build a high density walk-based neighborhood in a freeway interchange.
• We need a roadmap to the decision process. Over the next two years the legislation to implement both HALA and Seattle 2035 will be rolled out in small steps that will be virtually impossible to track. Yet the implementation details will likely provide 90% of what matters to understanding the comp plan impacts. If Seattle is serious about having a conversation about the topics in the comp plan, it will be critical for citizens to have a roadmap for when and how the implementation legislation will be introduced, debated and passed.
Rob Fellows

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Kathleen Dunn

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We

should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.

Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.

Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.

Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.

Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.

Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.

Thank you!
Kathleen Dunn
98116

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

The Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance community group represents the northwest quadrant of the University District. We oppose the mayor's HALA initiatives because they eviscerate the protections in today's comprehensive plan. We cite may examples in Chris Leman's document found at http://www.eastlakeseattle.org/?page=CompPlan. The University District spent the past two years thoughtfully planning density across city and neighborhood stakeholders. The University District is already well ahead of its future growth target. The University District already more development capacity in its current zoning to satisfy twice the 2035 growth targets.

A thriving neighborhood needs thoughtful, planned, constrained redevelopment in concert with adaptive reuse of existing buildings, all in concert with neighborhood influence and a market economy balanced by laws that promote making a place that people want to be by choice.

Removing the comprehensive plan's many protections on livability and unleashing unfettered development fueled by greed to maximize profit is not the way to go about reimagining the city to accommodate future growth.

City leaders need to move into our urban centers and villages and live their lives in full exposure to their

own policies. City leaders need to reconvene HALA with thoughtful progressive community leaders who understand how to mix growth and livability. City leaders need to come out into the light of day and debate comprehensive plan proposed amendments in a public forum that allows a free flow of thought and scrutiny by all.
The haste I see in this process reminds me of an adage. If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.
The city is going alone today in haste. It needn't. Neighborhoods invite the city to go together with them to envision the denser and more livable future that is ours. Together we can go far. Alone we act in haste and are ultimately misguided and wasteful.
Our built environment survives bad decisions. That's precisely the problem with haste. Haste risks building something that generates a profit but doesn't give back to the community. Developers aren't bad or evil, they simply aim to maximize profits. Government and the people who elect government officials need to influence the trend toward greed into a trend toward creating long terms assets that collectively benefit the neighborhood. Profits will still be made. And so will real working thriving neighborhoods where people choose to be in a free market of neighborhood choice.
Be responsible, Mr Mayor. Come clean and have an open debate about your comp plan proposals and what the city needs to be responsible and livable 20, 50 and 100 years from now. It will take real leadership to course correct. I'm confident you can do just that. And I'm confident that neighborhood leaders are an ally for an even broader interests than today's Seattle 2035 or HALA ever were.
Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance
RNA is the neighborhood organization serving the northwest U District

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Tony Fragada

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

The tentacles of the plan link throughout. The balance is so great that one theme can play against another. Adequate funding and budgeting will be key if not ... impossible.
Still the community must try.
GS1.xTrack affordability where investors actually live within the area.
LU2.8 establish noise criteria for building construction and give design a grade
T10.7 develop criteria for transportation impact fees so developers bear costs.
E2.x since funding always falls short compare development contribution to yearly shortfalls (take steps to eliminate special funding levys)
CW3.4 mental health tends to be under funded. Develop impact fee scale for developers.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Fremont Neighborhood Council,Toby Thaler

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

fyi
--
Toby Thaler
Fremont Neighborhood Council

http://fremontneighborhoodcouncil.org/
Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee
--
November 20, 2015
Re: Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update
Dear Seattle Comprehensive Planners:
These comments reflect my experience involved in land use planning and action and project reviews, along with opinions of hundreds of Fremont (and Seattle) residents I have worked with and listened to for over 40 years.
1. Relationship to Other Actions
The 2035 Comprehensive Plan update process is separate from environmental impact review under SEPA. In my June comments on the Draft EIS for the Plan I suggested that the affected decision making processes should be more comprehensively described. For example, the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) committee finished its work in the Spring, but the impacts of its many recommendations were not assessed in the DEIS. Neither are the HALA's numerous specific proposals called out as included elements, or not, in the draft Plan.
The table at p. 16 of the draft Plan is a good template for listing decisions that will flow from or are closely related to the EIS for the updated plan. However, the Council has taken action already on the affordable housing element, a key component of the comprehensive plan. Council Resolution 31622 (October 5) adopted a Council work plan to implement many of the recommendations of the HALA advisory committee, including reference to adoption of fiscal measures on a short time frame.
Many of the proposals in the HALA recommendations and work plan, now incorporated into the Council's future agenda by actions taken, are admirable. Nevertheless, many are controversial. The review and adoption process of these 2035 Plan elements should be as transparent as possible by describing the policy and decision process. Simply putting the Council's work plan (attached to Resolution 31622) into the Plan (or it's final EIS) would be a good start.
1 1 It would also be appropriate for the City to complete the work indicated as needed in the DEIS: "The City is currently evaluating the impacts to affordable housing through the development of a needs assessment that will inform HALA's work." 2035 DEIS (May 2015), p. 3.6-33. Cf.:
ttp://www.commerce.wa.gov/commissions/AffordableHousingAdvisoryBoard/Affordable-Housing-Needs-Study/Pages/default.aspx
2. Changes in Proposed Plan of Interest to Fremont
• Neighborhood planning has been largely eviscerated in the draft Plan. The lack of policies requiring a robust democratic decision making process including impacted communities of interest is unacceptable. Members and organizations of the Fremont community have engaged on these issues with the City far longer than I have lived here. This draft Plan is moving in the wrong direction, away from a welcoming of our community's engagement to improve our great city.
• Concurrency has yet to be done very well. After the Fremont Plan was incorporated into the City's comprehensive plan 20 years ago, some resources were allocated to address specific problems identified in a community focused planning process. However, after a few years the benefits of the urban village bargain became scarce. Instead of utilizing neighborhood planning to inform needed City actions and resource allocations, the Council abandoned the process, even after spending resources and a year on the Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee.
The Council adopted amendments to the zoning code in 2010 made things worse for Fremont and other neighborhoods. We got the development facilitated by those amendments and a booming economy, both more commercial buildings and more housing. We are experiencing many adverse impacts from these rapid changes. Many of the new housing units are small, 500 square feet or less. And transit service (bus) has not keep up; many people have been underserved for years, often watching buses go

by, or standing on the bus daily.
• Fremont is about half or less single family zoned (SF). While many residents of Fremont—including me—would like it to be easier to develop ADUs as is proposed in the draft Plan, that change should not be done without any accompanying neighborhood based planning to determine where up zones and related actions are most appropriate and necessary.
Thus, this goal from the existing Comprehensive Plan should be retained:
LUG 10: Provide for different intensities of single family areas to reflect differences in the existing and desired character of single family areas across the city. Allow development that is generally consistent with the levels of infrastructure development and environmental conditions in each area.
Include opportunities for low-cost subsidized housing in single-family areas. //
• City owned property that is no longer needed to provided City services should be held in reserve until it can be used for public benefits. Fremont is short on open space for parks, for p-patches, and for affordable housing. We have repeatedly watched as surplus City property has been sold and turned into market rate housing. Fremont wants more affordable housing, and these actions by the City are not helpful. The Plan should call for maintaining City ownership of these properties and seeking and implementing financing mechanisms to construct more such housing.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope you will take these and the many other comments you are sure to receive and craft a revised Plan for the Council that better reflects a consideration of all interested people who live in, work in, and visit Seattle.
Toby Thaler

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Mira Latoszek

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Dear DPD, Council-members and Mayor Murray,
Reading through the details of the draft Comprehensive Plan update, I noticed the following general trends that I disagree with:
An almost complete elimination of the neighborhood planning process and the neighborhood plans that were created after the adoption of the Comprehensive plan 20 years ago. As an example, the proposed language for item UVG10 changes the existing "Collaborate with the community in planning for the future" to "Have strategies that prepare the City for the challenges and opportunities of growth and that represent the needs and desires of a broad cross-section of city residents and business owners". Item UVG16 changes from "Guide public and private activities to achieve the function, character, amount of growth, intensity of activity, and scale of development of each urban village consistent with its urban village designation and adopted neighborhood plan" to "Encourage investments and activities in urban centers and urban villages that will enable those areas to flourish as compact mixed-use neighborhoods designed to accommodate the majority of the city's new jobs and housing, provide services andemployment (sic) close to housing, and pormote (sic) efficient use of public services, including trnasit (sic), with housing options for a variety of households and a range of incomes." There are many other examples throughout the draft proposal.
Instead of planning to continue the conversation with the local community to get it's input on how to accommodate growth, the draft Comprehensive Plan update proposes to effectively do away with the existing neighborhood plans and stop the conversation at the local level. Instead it proposes to open up neighborhood planning and development to the broad desires of the city at large defined in any way the current or future administration desires. If some neighborhood plans are outdated, then the City should

plan to involve the local community in updating them rather than eviscerating this important tool. Most Seattle citizens are not against accommodating future growth but they don't want uncontrolled growth with no say in the way that it affects their lives. The North Beacon Hill neighborhood plan was updated in 2010 - the City paid $800,000 in translation and liaison services to ensure the widest community input. The draft proposal throws those voices out and opens up the potential development of the North Beacon Hill urban village to developers and investors who won't have to deal with the impacts of that development.

A route to degradation of natural spaces and a de-emphasis on providing open space and breathing room for all the residents of Seattle - human and wildlife. There is a consistent emphasis on opening up of natural areas for higher intensity and structured use. As an example, item UV47 is proposed to change from "Designate and preserve important natural or ecological features in public ownership as greenspaces for low-intensity open space uses" to "Provide natural areas to preserve important natural or ecological features in public ownership and allow people access to these spaces." Low intensity open space uses means slow and limited trail usage for people of all ages and abilities to enjoy the natural beauty and fragility of Seattle's remaining wild spaces and the wildlife that resides in it. The proposed language opens up access of these fragile spaces to all kinds of uses - recently propose mountain biking and ziplines come to mind. If these are acceptable, then why not opening these spaces to further access? How about archery ranges in the woods or mountain bikes with electric motors? Proponents of these types of activities will claim that the are being denied "access" and that it is inequitable to not include them in in natural areas. There is nothing in the proposed language to limit the expansion to such extreme uses and protect our natural resources.

In addition, the language also de-emphasizes acquisition and development of park land and open space to accommodate the needs of current and future residents of the city. For example, UV48 "Identify City-owned open spaces on the Future Land Use Map" is proposed to be deleted. If we don't map the existing open spaces that the city owns, then there will be nothing to stop them from being sold off for other uses instead of preservation. Another example is the proposed change to LU122 from "Use zoning incentives and other development-related tools to provide for, or preserve, public benefits. Public benefits or other features may include housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, preservation of historic resources or provision of new public open space" to "Use development incentive programs to provide opportunities for increasing density in areas targeted for growth while addressing the impacts of the added density on the livability of urban neighborhoods, with particular emphasis on addressing the needs of those residents who are least likely to be served by higher density development provided by the private market". In the changed language, public open space is no longer mentioned as a benefit that would be a target of development incentive programs - only "opportunities for increasing density" are to be the targets of the development incentive programs. This is the language of the road to riches for developers, not a route for a livable, vibrant city.

An elimination of specific and measurable goals for City government and the departments. The language of E23 "Achieve no net loss of tree canopy coverage, and strive to increase tree canopy coverage to 40 percent, to reduce storm runoff, absorb air pollutants, reduce noise, stabilize soil, provide habitat, and mitigate the heat island effect of developed areas" is reduced to "Strive to increase citywide tree canopy coverage to 40% over time". "Achieve no net loss of tree canopy" and mitigation of "heat island effect of developed areas" are measurable, specific goals. The proposed language is not - "striving" is not measurable. Neither is "over time". What is the length of time? Is Seattle going to get 40% tree canopy in 20 years or in 100. The draft Comprehensive Plan update is specific about the growth in population and jobs that it wants to achieve in the next 10 years, yet when it comes to tree canopy it suddenly goes limp and uses the language of underachievement.

Another example of this is E8.1 with a proposed change from "Where there would be measurable benefits to people or wildlife, place priority on solving drainage problems, such as flooding and frequent

reliance on the combined sewer overflow system, with natural drainage system approaches and by restoring watershed elements such as forest, wetlands, and natural channels" to "Strive to manage 700 million gallons of stormwater runoff each year with green stormwater infrastructure by 2025". Can we check this goal off in 2025 if we only manage 1% of the 700 million gallons as long as we "strived"? Portland is way ahead of Seattle in doing this, incorporating green stormwater infrastructure in street and sidewalk upgrades - you see them all over the city. On Beacon Hill, SDOT rebuilt the intersection of 14th and Holgate and added a huge amount of concrete in the form of new sidewalks, curb-bulbs and infrastructure. It was a perfect opportunity to include swales to handle stormwater. Instead we got a few spindly street trees that are unlikely to survive the drought of last summer. Can we at least add language to achieve what Portland is already doing?
These other specific and measurable goals are simply eliminated:
•E24 - "Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage."
•E.11 - "Identify long-term goals and develop plans or strategies for improving the environmental quality of each of the city's aquatic areas, including a long-term plan to restore and sustain Seattle's creeks. Consider in these plans or strategies the use of incentives, regulations and other opportunities for action to restore and sustain the long-term health of Seattle's creeks and shorelines."
•E.16 - "In the operations of City government, strive to reduce the use of resources and toxics, prevent pollution, reuse existing resources such as historic structures, control waste, and protect natural areas and biodiversity. Repairs of City-owned buildings should employ green building practices."
•E.18 - "Collect data and regularly report on the sustainability measures and numeric goals in this plan to inform and enable citizens and decision-makers to consider alternative policies or programs, where outcomes differ from what was intended. Conduct an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions in Seattle at least every three years. Use data, public input, and approaches developed by other public agencies and private organizations that address sustainability. Consider combining this monitoring activity with the one described in the Urban Village Element of this Plan."
•E.20 - "Consider long-term environmental costs, in City planning, purchasing and operating decisions. For instance, look at all of the environmental impacts caused by materials from their production to disposal."
The notes in the associated spreadsheet claim that these are "too vague" or that it is "not the comp plan's role". Really? These are very specific and measurable, not vague. The goals to increase density by any means possible specified in other parts of the Comp Plan are written to interpretation and manipulation. Yet when it comes to specific actions that the City government can take to achieve environmental goals, the draft Comprehensive Plan update tries to get City government off the hook. These are just a few of the problems and examples of why DPD should go back to the drawing board as far as this Comprehensive Plan update is concerned. Don't ignore the work that was done in the past by so many people in neighborhoods, incorporate and build on it.
Mira Latoszek

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Matt Hoehnen

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Mayor Murray, we are appalled that your administration should dismantle the livability protections in the city's comprehensive plan as your amendments so ably do with so little public discussion. Shame on you Mr Mayor for catering so passively to the development forces that stand to benefit financially

from rebuilding today's functioning neighborhoods. We invite you to live among us as unfettered forces of here today gone tomorrow redevelopment scars our neighborhoods in the name of affordability or livability. Neighborhoods need loving nourishment and protection in the form of local and enduring investment and stewardship. Neighborhoods need lawful protections afforded by the current comprehensive plan to be strengthened, not blatantly dissolved. Neighborhoods need to influence their own destiny in concert with market forces and government policies and laws that make each development a positive influence on the whole. By removing protections in the comprehensive plan, you're saying the individual greed should prevail, and somehow our fair city will evolve into one that's more equitable and affordable and livable. A child can see that's not true. Shame on you, Mr Mayor.
Evidence for reference: http://livableudistrict.com/Leman_Comp_Plan_alert_Nov_2015.pdf
You have time to correct your path. I personally encourage you to reach out to me to hear what steps can both accomplish your goals of affordability, livability and equity, and actually gain the will of the people and neighborhoods in the process. It will require taking several steps backward, and having faith in an honest community discussion rather than the deceitful changes afoot to legalize vast overhauls of neighborhoods that simply isn't possible with today's comprehensive plan that you apparently see as an obstacle to your moneyed interests' desire.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Alex Gagnon

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

The draft comprehensive plan (Seattle 2035) redefines the boundary of the Roosevelt urban village to annex Cowen Park and Ravenna Park, as well as extending the urban village into the single family homes on the east side of 15th Ave NE. These choices seem very strange and should be changed in the comprehensive plan before it goes to the mayor.
Roosevelt is already the poster child for adding density, the number of units that are currently planned or permitted for completion in Roosevelt by the end of 2017 are close to the City's 2035 target for growth - two decades of growth in just a few years! If we are so good at meeting growth targets, then why do we need to add more growth in single-family neighborhoods where land prices will ensure that even multiplex units will be unaffordable? This huge new growth will have lots of implications, we need to see what the effects are in the current urban village before expanding this growth elsewhere.
If the goal is affordability, then just adding to the supply of expensive units cannot solve the problem (this is not just my opinion, I am quoting Steve Walker, director of the Office of Housing). I am very concerned that the new units being added to Roosevelt are primarily luxury studios and that this will reduce the diversity of our neighborhood. Our neighborhood currently has more income diversity than you would expect given the high property prices, this is because of ADUs, DADUs, and single unit rentals where many roommates share a single family home (all allowed under current rules). I am very concerned that the effective up zoning that will result from the urban village boundary change combined with other aspects of the comprehensive plan will eat up these properties or sub-lot these properties first, turning them into much more expensive units. So if affordability is the goal, it is not clear that changing the urban village boundary will get us there. (I completely support mandatory inclusionary housing and other tools that will provide affordable units because the market cannot do this on its own. It will be great to be part of the discussion on how we can enhance affordability and income diversity in our neighborhoods.)
Given these challenges I think there is a mismatch between the city's goals and what the effects of this plan will actually be. The neighborhoods have a lot of expertise and local knowledge to offer the city.

We can help find the win-win that helps us preserve what works in our neighborhoods while also helping you reach your goals if the city will work with us. This means including us in a real way in discussions about development in our neighborhoods. It also means listening to us when we say that the urban village boundary should stay at its current location along the centerline of 15th Ave NE and not be expanded east into Ravenna and that the urban village boundary should not include Cowen Park or Ravenna Park .
-Alex Gagnon

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Kevin Volkmann

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Seattle DPD:
DPD has done an excellent job of informing the public about the Seattle 2035 Plan. Thank you.
The principle of concentrating growth in urban villages located on transit corridors seems reasonable.
Remaining concerns are as follows:
1. Height restrictions in urban villages should be lifted significantly to allow for more density per unit of building footprint.
2. Specific, strong, binding plans for additional open space in urban villages should be included. The City should plan to invest in additional parkland.
3. Specific, strong, binding plans for parking and low-income residential units should be included.
4. Plans for additional sidewalks, trails and bikeways should be included and may include parks made from closed streets.
These four objectives seem to be partly addressed by the draft plan, but ought to take priority in actual development plans.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Respectfully,
Kevin
--
Kevin Volkmann, Executive Director, A.R.T.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Sylvie

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Hello,
I am a Greenwood resident and after reviewing the comprehensive lan I would lke to express my concerns about the following items:
I don't see a clear communicating plan with the input of the community.
Please include a community chapter in he decision making process. We have a nice neighborhood community that needs to represented.
I am concerned about the upzoning changes, those need to clearly defined and approved by the community chapter before being implemented.
It is unclear why development of apartment building would happen in a single gamily zone.

Below are other points, i would like to make on the subject
-- Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU59, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU60, deleted by 07-2015 DPD
Thanks for your attention
Sylvie
Sent from my iPad

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Blake Trask

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035,
Thanks for the opportunity comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities:
Make Seattle more affordable for everyone. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability - particularly by removing the onerous single-family home designation citywide. The Comprehensive Plan should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Move forward on innovative, bold multi-modal strategies to make our transport system more affordable, safe and sustainable. The Comprehensive Plan should adopt a Vision Zero strategy to prioritize safety, specifically those biking and walking. We need stronger investments in protected bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle's transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to respond to environmental change. We need to grow our resiliency for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Make Seattle more equitable for everyone. Not all of Seattle's residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Improve accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific

populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you,
Blake Trask
98103

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: South Seattle Crime Prevention Council,Pat Murakami

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Attached is a letter from the South Seattle Crime Prevention Council.

Pat Murakami, SSCPC President
--
November 6, 2015
At the November 4, 2015 meeting of the South Seattle Crime Prevention Council (SSCPC), community members in attendance voted unanimously and vehemently to oppose the City's Growth Alternatives 3 and 4.
The City's own Displacement Risk Index and Access to Opportunity Index maps indicate that South Seattle has the HIGHEST risk of displacement of our vulnerable population and the LOWEST access to opportunity for that same population. It appears the City's "Race and Social Justice Initiative" is meaningless lip service and that Alternatives 3 and 4 were drawn up by planners who lack all human compassion and have no respect for the most ethnically diverse community in Seattle.
Obviously, we are extremely concerned about public safety issues in South Seattle. Those of us with decades of volunteer dedication to our community know that only 15-25% of all crimes are actually reported in South Seattle. Yet our reported crimes are disproportionately high for our percentage of the City's population. Low income people are, unfortunately, most often the victims of crime.
We also know that even in the much more affluent neighborhoods of Seattle, recent increases in density have resulted in increases in crime. "More feet and eyes on the street" do not ensure more safety; rather the opposite. The assumption of density improving safety has proved to be nothing but a fallacy. If density of people guarantees public safety there wouldn't be a single crime or drug transaction taking place in downtown Seattle. Instead SPD constantly struggles with criminal activity precisely where the most "feet and eyes" congregate.
It has been our tragic experience that Light Rail and the increased pedestrian foot traffic around major transportation stops in South Seattle have resulted in increased street robberies, assaults and injuries.
The City has historically forced whatever program or challenging social issue, not wanted in other neighborhoods, on the backs of our susceptible population. Please reverse that trend. Focus on jobs and economic opportunities for our community members; housing growth and density will organically follow. Genuine economic development for our EXISTING population is what is needed by our community.
Sincerely,

Pat Murakami
President, SSCPC

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Downtown Residents,Albert Chang

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Director Sugimura:
We are downtown residents writing to comment on “Seattle 2035: Comprehensive Plan for Managing Growth 2015-2035” published on July 8, 2015.
The plan makes clear that “the largest amount of residential growth is expected to occur in [the] urban center,” with downtown expected to adsorb 10,000 new residential units.
As downtown residents, we appreciate the appeal of downtown living and look forward to welcoming new neighbors. We understand that additional residential development in the downtown core can bring a multitude of public benefits. We know that mixing residential use into an area dominated by office spaces will increase night time street safety and vibrancy.
However, we are concerned that the City’s current design guidelines and development regulations have not kept up with the change of land use. Many areas of downtown currently being contemplated for mixed residential developments are zoned as Downtown Office Core and therefore lack “development standards that promote privacy and livability, such as appropriately scaled landscaping [and] street amenities.” (GS4.15) In fact, of the 33,512 future residential units possible in downtown (Development Capacity Report, pg. 11), nearly 2/3rds of that growth can occur in areas which lack meaningful residential design standards, such as DOC 1 & DOC 2.
The residents of the Cosmopolitan Condominium and the Olive 8 Condominium can attest to the lack of tower separation requirements in most areas of downtown Seattle. The communities at the Cristalla Condominium and Escala Condominium are facing the same fate. Other sites in the immediate area and beyond could produce similar results under current zoning regulations.
In order to “promote Downtown Seattle as… a vital and attractive environment that supports employment and residential activities and is inviting to visitors,” (LUG12) the City must take this opportunity to reconsider the development standards that apply in the downtown core. While the lack of height restrictions and tower separation requirements in the downtown commercial core may have been adequate for office towers; it is clearly insufficient for a residential community.
As downtown residents, we chose to live here because we value living in the city center. The livability of downtown and the health of our community are at risk so long as the planned land use and development standards for our neighborhood remain at odds. As Brent Toderian, former Chief Planner in Vancouver would put it; we want "density done well." To achieve that, the City must embrace urban design standards that match the planned land use.
Sincerely,
Downtown Residents
(Signatures on Attachment)

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Tom Hardy

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern;
I understand the need for increased density in Seattle as the city and the region grow. In the process of increasing density though, please consider maintaining the character of neighborhoods like Ravenna and Ravenna park. Arbitrarily drawing a line on a map to include parts of NE 62nd Street, NE Naomi Place

and east to 20th Ave NE in a rezone would be harmful to the form, function and feel of this great neighborhood. The Roosevelt urban village east boundary should be 15th Ave NE and should not include the heart of Ravenna, east of 15th Ave NE.
The ability of mother-in-law housing is already included in the neighborhood and fits well with the character east of 15th Ave NE. Please do not include the ability to build multi-story apartments or duplexes east of 15th Ave NE , within the "10-min walk" line shown on the draft maps.
The 10-min walk line is, as drawn on the map, not accurate. The far east line was drawn only to include Ravenna Park and is misleading. As Seattle increases density and the population grows, neighborhoods like Ravenna and Ravenna Park will be quiet, classic places to enjoy on the edge of all the frenzied urban villages.
Thanks for considering my comments,
Tom Hardy

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Mark Holland

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Seattle 2035 COMPLAN
I am very concerned about the shocking and false stements made by the Parks Department regarding open space acquisition, or lack thereof. in Seattle's future.
The Parks Department thinks citizens want them to STOP acquiring land for new Parks and Green Spaces?
Look closely at number eight for Parks and Open Spaces.
The only quotes listed in the graphic support what the Parks Department already wants to do, which is stop building new parks. If the upper level managers of the Seattle Parks Department want to stop building Parks, let them quit the Parks Department and go get jobs more suited to their skill set, like flipping burgers at a fast food restaurant.
Can somebody please go into the Parks Department and fire all the incompetent managers who came up with this hare-brained scheme?
This is unbelievable!
Here is the introduction to number eight:
"The existing Comprehensive Plan includes a goal of one acre of parkland per 100 residents. Over the coming twenty years, meeting this goal would require an additional 1,400 acres of parks, and the city has very little vacant land. Since 2000, the City has added 261 acres to the park system. Public feedback for the Parks Legacy Plan prioritizes improving existing parks with less emphasis on acquiring new park land. This Plan encourages the development of new goals that reflect today’s priorities and challenges."
Get that? No more new acquisition of public open space. No new Parks. No more acquisition of greenbelts.
Instead they will paint the asphalt green in a parking space, put a fence around it, and call it "greenspace". They call it a "parklet".
So the Parks Department's response to the coming density wave is to stop building new parks, because they are suddenly land poor now that they have the Municipal Parks District.
I remember the the Parks Department hawked the District funding mechanism by dangling "Fourteen new Parks" in front of voters. Now that they have a self regulated tax base they can raise at will, they suddenly want to stop building new Parks.
If the existing Comprehensive Plan had a goal of 1 acre per 100 residents, then there must be land

currently available to meet that goal. So why does the Parks Department now claim they have "very little vacant land."?
What they are really talking about is a time in the near future AFTER they are done selling off our public lands at breakneck speed.
THE SELLING OF SEATTLE PUBLIC LANDS
The city has land all over the place that could easily be converted to uses like pocket parks and playgrounds. Seattle has had pocket parks planned and never built since the Olmsted's plan for Seattle in 1911.
The problem is Parks Department policy that says they will not consider any parcel under 10,000 square feet. Many of the parcels owned by City Light are single family house lots of five to six thousand feet. These are the perfect size for pocket parks, p-patches and playgrounds. Because of the 10,000 square foot threshold policy, the Parks Department does not even bother to look at these smaller parcels, and City Light is selling them off like hotcakes.
There is a former City Light substation on 14th Ave. just south of Hill St. that sold for $550,000 one week after I wrote to the City Council asking them to save this property. That was the first sub station sold, and there are many more to come.
SEATTLE GREEN SPACES COALITION
Here is a link to the Seattle Green Spaces Coalition (SGSC), a citizen led group that is working to "Keep Public Land in Public Hands" including all the City Light Sub-stations.
http://www.seattlegreenspacescoalition.org/
SGSC is making progress with the City Council, but the message does not seem to be getting through to the Mayor or Parks Department.
Here is a quote from their website:
"Over 800 signatures in the forms of petitions, letter and emails to City Council resulted in the unanimous adoption by the City Council of a “Statement of Legislative Intent” creating an Interdepartmental Team to re-examine how the City disposes of surplus properties and how the lands could be better used to meet the needs of the people."
HELP FOR DEVELOPERS
The Mayor just promised to spend an additional five million dollars for emergency shelter services and he is going to pay for it how? By selling off city owned land to developers! Land the Parks Department claims does not exist. Even when Murray helps the homeless, he helps developers more, and hurts Seattle's future access to open space.
That is just the start. The city owns property all over the place owned by various city owned utilities. They will claim the Parks Department cannot afford to purchase the property from the other utilities. What they do not talk about is the fact that all they need is an agreement called a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the other departments.
This is how Jefferson Park works. The Parks Department has an MOU with SPU for the former reservoir sites on the upper plateau. SPU still owns the property, not the Parks Department.
The Parks Department could do the same with the fifteen acres west of Jefferson Park, but they refuse.
15 ACRES OF VACANT SPU LAND AT JEFFERSON PARK
Beacon Hill has 15 acres of unused SPU land west of Jefferson Park that the Parks Department was supposed to take over and turn into a huge arboretum, according to the Jefferson Park Master Plan. When the Food Forest idea came up, the Parks Department claimed they do not do P-patches. They used that as an excuse to write themselves out of their obligation to follow our Neighborhood Plan, which specified an arboretum of native trees on this site. Jefferson Park should have an arboretum just like Woodland Park, instead we get unused space that we still have to pay SPU to mow. Because of the Parks Departments' abandonment of the Jefferson Park Master Plan, SPU maintains the lower 15 acres of Jefferson Park, and the Parks Department maintains the upper portion. How inefficient is that?

Then there is the historic gatehouse, nominated for landmark status by the Landmarks Board, sitting empty and unused behind barbed wire fence for the same reason. The Parks Department refused to put this free building to use, and then SPU tried to demolish the building. As part of the demolition process, SPU had to go to the landmarks board for approval. Beacon Hill fought back against the demolition and saved the building. That is how the landmarks board nominated the gatehouse for landmark status.
After the Jefferson Park battle, SPU cancelled demolition plans for all the other historic gatehouses at converted reservoirs in Seattle, such as at Maple Leaf reservoir.
Despite the landmarks board clear message that the Gatehouse be preserved and re-purposed for community uses, the Parks Department still refuses to do take over the building from SPU.
Worse yet, SPU has no use for the gatehouse, and they cannot demolish the building due to the landmark nomination. So the building just sits there, costing SPU money it should not have to spend, while doing nothing for Jefferson Park, the community center, or Beacon Hill.
HOW TO KEEP SEATTLE PUBLIC LANDS IN PUBLIC HANDS
Here is what I recommend to the City regarding the Parks Department and open space.
1. A moratorium on the sale of public lands until the City Council completes their interdepartmental review of how the city disposes of surplus property.
2. The Parks Department must develop the public lands we already have, like the unused 15 acres of Seattle Public Utilities land west of Jefferson Park.
3. The Parks Department must reverse course and commit to continue with the current COMPLAN goal of providing 1 acre of land for every 100 residents.
4. The Parks Department must change the policy of only looking at parcels of 10,000 square feet or more, and consider smaller parcels for pocket parks, p-patches and playgrounds.
5. The Parks Department must write a new policy that commits to a building of smaller pocket parks throughout Seattle, just as the Olmsted's recommended in their Plan for Seattle over 100 years ago.
FIRE THE PARK DEPARTMENT ARCHITECTS OF THIS WRETCHED PROPOSAL!
This is the last straw! The upper level Parks Department managers who proposed this idea should be fired and replaced with people who like building parks and serving people.
I have been involved with Neighborhood Parks issues for twenty years in Seattle, and the Parks Department is more abusive and cynical towards the public than I have ever seen.
The reason for their arrogance and abuse is obvious.
Mayor Murray will not discipline his husband, Michael Shiosaki, who controls ALL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE in the Parks Department.
Previous Mayors cracked down on the Parks Department when they became abusive toward the public. But not Ed Murray. No, he encourages abuse of the public, and that is a road that leads to corruption.
Sincerely,
Mark Holland

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Kathy Kundert

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

To whom it may concern :
I have lived in the south end on Mt baker Blvd and Beacon Hill for 30 years. I have watched the area grow , diversity wane and property values rise but the Rainer Ave/ Mclellan area near the light rail is really not much different as well as much of Rainier Ave south of Mass St.
This is the area that needs development. Do not push multi family units into a stable neighbor hood like

Mt Baker. I have lived thru crack houses down the street, break ins, people being murdered and yet my services are woefully poor compared to the north end. We have so few amenities and now the city wants to foist more people and assume the Rainier corridor will naturally develop. I don't think so. If effort is not put into the Rainier area so that it is pedestrian friendly business will continue to flounder such as what is currently happening in the new building by the light rail station. Those business cannot thrive with out foot traffic.

Give people services such as shops and restaurants they can walk to before you create a Capital Hill density. Mt Baker is a very historic neighborhood not only for design and architecture but also in diversity. This should be the highest priority preserving the community that is working here. We have flourished in relationships despite poor services for years.

Cheasty green belt must be preserved. There is plenty of room for development along the light rail corridor that if developed would be an asset. You will meet resistance with this proposed expansion. Beacon Hill is the noisiest neighborhood in the city. We live with the sirens off Rainier, incredible jet noise that no one wants to even monitor and I am concerned that the community will have no say what so ever in city planning because historically it has been so quiet. I do not agree that multi family housing is the best answer to our housing situation. It should not replace single family dwelling when suitable space is undeveloped nearer the current light rail station. Carry out the original plan first and then address expansion or you run the risk of destroying the character of what makes a community in the first place.

Sincerely
Kathy Kundert
Sent from my iPhone

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Crown Hill Business Association

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Dear Council Members, Patrice Carrol, Tom Hauger, Seattle 2035 Team, Seattle Planning Commission:
The Seattle 2035 Planning Process is a complex and far reaching effort, with long term implications for business, community, livability, transportation, housing, and the environment.
We, the Crown Hill Business Association, have long talked with our surrounding communities about the challenges of our location and how we would guide future changes. We've repeatedly work with SDOT, DPD, EOD, and DON on projects in our community and have always been assured that we would have a seat at the table in future planning in our community. In fact, on the campaign trail, our now elected Councilman Mike O'Brien said that absolutely communities would have a seat at the table to guide the process and allow different communities to have a different feel and approach. But nowhere does the 2035 document reflect those assurances. It must.
Portland's Comprehensive Plan, has a chapter entitled "Community Involvement" (http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/532776), while Seattle's plan has removed virtually all reference to neighborhood planning and community guided development, simply listing "community" as a "theme" with no outline, no metrics, and no mention of developing standards.

It lacks a definition of how the plan will be administered, and provides no role for the public in its administration.

For proper risk management, it is a necessity that the Comprehensive Plan include a comprehensive

accountability process, with safeguards to assure that diverse opinions will have a place in the city's most widely impacting policy during its application.
We offer the following specific comments:
•There must be specific minimum standards in the 2035 plan for community involvement.
•There must be specific mention that, and how, different communities will be able to have different approaches as well as look, feel and solutions. The Crown Hill Residential Urban Village (RUV) has almost no sidewalks now, and any expansion will increase the number of areas with no sidewalks to the village. It's time for a new look at sidewalks as we build out our area.
•With an approximately 400% increase in Crown Hill RUV area, and even more density on deck with planned up-zones, Crown Hill is becoming close to the size of Ballard. As the Ballard Growth boom is daily moving to Crown Hill, the plan for light rail needs to address the needs north of Market Street. The potential stop at 65th needs to be moved 25 blocks north.
•Removing metrics from parks, transportation, and other quality of life measures, removes any objective way to rate the progress and quality of the density. Metrics must be added into the plan for parks, libraries, community centers, transportation services, and business vitality.
Changing any boundaries without understanding the challenges and success in what was done previously is a mistake. Why repeat the mistakes of the past? And why not capitalize on successes? We've learned that vastly adding density without meaningful follow-through for transportation is a nightmare. We must not do to any other community what was done to and is still being done to Ballard regarding transportation. Since most Crown Hill residents have to pass through Ballard to get to their jobs, we need to be careful about timing.
Thank you to the team for their efforts to date in this substantial project. We appreciate your thoughtful consideration of these issues that are very important to our community. We are ready to provide any additional information you may need, and we look forward to your response regarding how these issues may be addressed.
Sincerely,
Loy Suderman
President, Crown Hill Business Association
.
CC: CHBA Board Members

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Amy Kaminishi

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hello. I appreciate the outreach including the open houses that were done to discuss the Seattle 2035. I have the following concerns with Seattle 2035.
-Increase of building (new construction) especially in the residential area. I currently live in the urban village and there is so much new construction that there is no available street parking at times. Also, the traffic has significantly increased and it takes longer to travel within your neighborhood. There should be a strong emphasis in having more parking available on the properties rather than street parking. Also, this can make it difficult to walk especially crossing the streets.
-With the prediction of increase of jobs in Seattle, what is the chance that employers such as Amazon, etc.. may move jobs outside of Seattle or even Washington State. We have seen companies such as Boeing in moving jobs out of state. As a result, this can lead to property values decrease and overbuilding of homes.

Thank you.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Eric Fosburgh

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
Eric Fosburgh
98112

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Frank Gonzalez

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear Seattle Council Members,
I've been an Eastlake resident for 15 years. I strongly object to Seattle 2035 plans to rezone for increased heights in neighborhoods such as mine.
Eastlake is a relatively small neighborhood with precious little room for growth; it is bounded by water to the west and north, the I5 freeway to the east and large buildings to the south. Current code height restrictions are in place to mitigate traffic congestion, and enhance livability.
Thus, Eastlake is currently a very desirable neighborhood. But increased height allowances will inevitably have very negative impacts, including
- Further traffic congestion and an associated rise in the occurrence of accidents.
- Increased "commercialization" and disruption of a currently well-balanced blend of residential and commercial real estate
- Loss of views of the city. These are highly desired, amenities whose value is reflected in the prices that homeowners paid to purchase their homes.
- Decreases in property values due to lost views, traffic, etc.
- Increase in crime rates due to increased density and urbanization.

As clearly outlined in design for Seattle's Residential Urban Villages, "The Plan designates 18 residential urban villages, including places like Columbia City, Admiral, Upper Queen Anne and Wallingford. These are places expected to experience primarily residential growth." The purpose of this design philosophy was to ensure that the "village" communities were specifically planned to continue promoting residential community living areas; higher density, multifamily dwelling are in direct conflict with this philosophy.
For these reasons, please oppose the proposed increase in height restrictions.
Sincerely,
—Frank Gonzalez

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Bob Fleming

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

I believe that monorail would be much better than light way in the corridor from West Seattle - Downtown - Ballard/Crown Hill. The route would be similar to the cancelled Green Line, but would not go through Seattle Center, but rather south from Key Arena and down Second Avenue. The cost should be less than underground light rail, would require a narrow corridor, mostly in the center of public streets, could be built faster, and safer and less disruptive than surface light rail. The route would include Key Arena/Seattle Center, Safeco Field, CenturyLink Field, and the proposed Sodo arena for basketball and hockey. The elevated structure would leave surface streets open for port and commercial traffic. Outlying parking lots along the route would eliminate the need for additional parking for the Sodo (Hansen) arena, and in fact should permit reduction of existing parking around Safeco and CenturyLink fields, thereby reducing existing interference with port
and industrial trucking. Another possibility would be to build a high-level bridge across Salmon Bay for

both the monorail and most vehicular traffic now using the Ballard Bridge, substantially speeding both auto and bus traffic with no delays for bridge openings. The Ballard Bridge could be retained for traffic originating or terminating near both sides of the ship canal, because approaches for the high-level bridge would need to be back several hundred feet from the waterfront, maybe from a few blocks north of W. Dravus Street to just south of N.W. Market Street.
Bob Fleming,
Seattle

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Michael Lanthier

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

To City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development:

As a board member for the Squire Park Community Council, I support the City Neighborhood Council comments to the Seattle 2035 draft comprehensive plan.

I agree that the draft Comprehensive Plan must restore more robust Neighborhood Planning, adding more transparency and community engagement, in order to support more rational and credible plans that strengthen neighborhood sustainability, affordability and social wellbeing.
Displacement is for real. We need you to support community / neighborhood empowerment through real community-led planning. HALA is not enough if you truly care about the inequities within our neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Michael Lanthier

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Catherine Adams

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and

businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
Catherine Adams
98108

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Leanne Olson

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space, Transportation, Utilities

Comment:

I feel that the City of Seattle is approaching its Comprehensive Plan from a provincial view. The focus should be on the entire region rather than Seattle centric.
Following is a summary of the points I consider most important to be included in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan:
Growth Strategy
Cooperate with rather than compete with smaller Puget Sound area cities to absorb growth. Seattle doesn't need more tax revenue from added jobs and housing, it already has more than it can keep up with. Smaller cities such as Olympia, Tacoma, Everett and Bremerton need more tax revenue to remain vital. These should not be bedroom communities for Seattle workers priced out of housing close to where they work. Seattle should partner with these municipalities to optimize growth in the region.
Land Use
Similar to growth strategy, Seattle does not need to absorb all the density. EG, It does not need more sports stadiums. Placing such growth in outlying areas helps the entire region by distributing tax revenue and relieving transportation pressures.
Utilities and Infrastructure

Developers should bear the full cost of infrastructure improvement required by their projects. This includes street repair, sewer, water, electricity, schools, open space and public safety.
Transportation
Work toward seamless home to destination transportation, whether by foot, bicycle, bus, streetcar, light rail, train or auto. Focus on safety for all modes. Enforce laws for all modes.
I currently am more intimidated by other bikers who speed and ignore traffic laws when I am riding my bicycle than I am by autos. Likewise, I am currently reluctant to use public transit to travel across town for evening events because I must transfer in downtown Seattle where bus stops are few, far between and populated by criminal activity.
Housing
Incentivize developers to retain and improve existing housing stock rather than demolish and replace. This will ensure diversity of housing styles, type, and affordability. It also reduces the huge amount of wasted material caused by demolition. It is alarming that a city that encourages recycling of other materials ad infinitum actively promotes destruction of reusable housing stock.
Create incentives to encourage private property owners to retain existing buildings. The current landmark legislation does not go far enough to protect the culturally important historic fabric of the city and should be amended to promote preservation.
The city should purchase sound historic apartment buildings and hire local tradespeople to restore and adapt them as low income housing rather than relying solely on use of developer fees to build new. This would promote economic, racial and age diversity in communities facing gentrification pressures.
Parks and Open Space
Incentivize retention of open space and view corridors by developers of commercial and private properties. Views of the iconic Space Needle from the street level are fast becoming extinct. Light and air are disappearing in canyons of mid-rise, high-rise and single family "box" style architecture.
Regulate use of gasoline powered leaf blowers and lawn mowers. These tools are noise and air polluters.
Move toward Xeriscaping of all public parks.
Neighborhood Planning
Work towards the ability to enforce neighborhood plans rather than continue to allow them to be merely advisory.
Economic Viability
Encourage retention of historic buildings to house small independent businesses.
Incentivize larger employers with multiple locations to place workers near where they live. Why should a bank employee who works in Northgate have to commute from Federal Way, when she or he could work at a branch near their home?
Sincerely,
Leanne Olson

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Emma Connell

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I know you work hard to keep Seattle green so I want to draw your attention to the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan's Parks and Open Space element. They endanger our environmental sustainability. Please investigate and consider revising the proposed Comprehensive Plan such that:
The referenced 2006 Seattle Parks and Recreation Development Plan's quantitative metric/goal (1 acre

of open space per 100 people) is retained as policy, and increase in the amount of open space required in all land use zones except single family.
For the single family zone, please remove reference to 'acceptable goals' (acceptable goals are 1/3 that of desirable goals).
Remove the proposed new goal of being 'reasonable' about open space land acquisition. (P1.2)
We are losing record amounts of 'private' open space to development. Acquisition of new 'public' open space should be making up for those losses. Without sufficient green space to mitigate the ill-effects of urbanization, Seattle will become denser but it will no longer be sustainable, livable, ecologically responsible or environmentally just.
Thank you for your attention to this and for your commitment Seattle's future.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Grace Connell

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I know you work hard to keep Seattle green so I want to draw your attention to the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan's Parks and Open Space element. They endanger our environmental sustainability. Please investigate and consider revising the proposed Comprehensive Plan such that:
The referenced 2006 Seattle Parks and Recreation Development Plan's quantitative metric/goal (1 acre of open space per 100 people) is retained as policy, and increase in the amount of open space required in all land use zones except single family.
For the single family zone, please remove reference to 'acceptable goals' (acceptable goals are 1/3 that of desirable goals).
Remove the proposed new goal of being 'reasonable' about open space land acquisition. (P1.2)
We are losing record amounts of 'private' open space to development. Acquisition of new 'public' open space should be making up for those losses. Without sufficient green space to mitigate the ill-effects of urbanization, Seattle will become denser but it will no longer be sustainable, livable, ecologically responsible or environmentally just.
Thank you for your attention to this and for your commitment Seattle's future.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Timothy Connell

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I know you work hard to keep Seattle green so I want to draw your attention to the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan's Parks and Open Space element. They endanger our environmental sustainability. Please investigate and consider revising the proposed Comprehensive Plan such that:
The referenced 2006 Seattle Parks and Recreation Development Plan's quantitative metric/goal (1 acre of open space per 100 people) is retained as policy, and increase in the amount of open space required in all land use zones except single family.
For the single family zone, please remove reference to 'acceptable goals' (acceptable goals are 1/3 that of desirable goals).
Remove the proposed new goal of being 'reasonable' about open space land acquisition. (P1.2)
We are losing record amounts of 'private' open space to development. Acquisition of new 'public' open

space should be making up for those losses. Without sufficient green space to mitigate the ill-effects of urbanization, Seattle will become denser but it will no longer be sustainable, livable, ecologically responsible or environmentally just.
Thank you for your attention to this and for your commitment Seattle's future.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Anne Connell

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I know you work hard to keep Seattle green so I want to draw your attention to the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan's Parks and Open Space element. They endanger our environmental sustainability. Please investigate and consider revising the proposed Comprehensive Plan such that:
The referenced 2006 Seattle Parks and Recreation Development Plan's quantitative metric/goal (1 acre of open space per 100 people) is retained as policy, and increase in the amount of open space required in all land use zones except single family.
For the single family zone, please remove reference to 'acceptable goals' (acceptable goals are 1/3 that of desirable goals).
Remove the proposed new goal of being 'reasonable' about open space land acquisition. (P1.2)
We are losing record amounts of 'private' open space to development. Acquisition of new 'public' open space should be making up for those losses. Without sufficient green space to mitigate the ill-effects of urbanization, Seattle will become denser but it will no longer be sustainable, livable, ecologically responsible or environmentally just.
Thank you for your attention to this and for your commitment Seattle's future.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Liza Stacishin

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Dear City of Seattle and King County,
My name is Liza Stacishin. My professional life began as a registered architect in Brazil. I have been a resident in the Othello neighborhood in South Seattle for fifteen years, seven of those also an activist.
The region, City and our neighborhoods of South Seattle, have arrived at a dysfunctional, inequitable, unjust, and unsustainable urban solution of segregated districts that thrive in bringing crime, instability, apartheid, to our metropolitan areas, while at the same time promoting ever increasing areas of sprawl and congestion outside city limits.
Very similar to what we have seen and experienced in the poor neighborhoods of L.A., Baltimore, Ferguson, Chicago throughout most all of the United States and even throughout some cities in Europe and the world.
It was in a poor neighborhood of South Seattle, that Jimmy Hendrix (highest paid musician in Woodstock), Quincy Jones, and many others developed their cultural talents as musicians, writers, painters or craftspeople. However the lack of opportunity venues are furthermore promoting the death of the community. Our poor neighborhoods have no functional cultural town centers, no bazaar, no popular venues, no physical planned open market, no opportunity space in witch to perform interact and innovate. As Jane Jacobs would say no clustering force can be achieved without the appropriate

spaces. At this time here, we feel our culture is dying.
Like many other poor neighborhoods, around the U.S. our current layout structure is out dated. They are the result of late 19th century and 20th century planning. Our arterials are dotted with black top parking lots, where driving is a must, specially if you have elderly or special family members at home, or work on your own, in landscaping, baby sitting, massage, house cleaning, teaching, being a student, teaching a musical instrument, catering, or have your own business. As an artist or a musician, besides needing adequate space to practice, and finding gigs, you will need a vehicle, a van, pick up truck or automobile, necessary to load and unload the stuff. Currently our less famous musicians have performed in Bothell, Kenmore, Redmond, Kirkland and others. Unsustainable situation.
Parallel with the above mentioned situation, connected developers only see the opportunity for affordable and low income housing. Locating housing at prime nodes and precluding 21st century cultural, retail centers with structured parking from developing. Also precluding opportunities for our residents, small business and professionals for decades to come.
Recognizing the necessity of more affordable and low income housing, I agree with Prof. Sharon Egretta Sutton who in the "Urban Paradox", alerted to the mistake of locating housing where there was no commerce or industry.
First, we need to get rid of overgrown mirths and even dogmas. The mirth that structured parking is too expensive. Donald Shoup in his the "High Cost of Free Parking". Advocates
yes. However, there are many ways that we can come to larger costs. Such as; what comes with inequality, instability after uprisings, attacks, continuous criminal activities, suburban sprawl, unsafe and unhealthy neighborhoods. All of these problems are more expensive, more costly, than some well located structured parking.
Lucky for us, old poor neighborhoods still have many possibilities through their artists and craftspeople residents if met with functional planning. These residents are the ones that can promote our neighborhoods if given the adequate functional infrastructure and spaces. Spaces that if well planned, many developers will be willing to produce and profit.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_musicians_from_Seattle

Integrating Transportation and Transitioning to a Less Automobile Oriented Transportation System.
Key Proposal # 1. Prioritize and facilitate our culture, with neighborhood centers and managed long term parking.
Managing parking, does not mean parking every where or free parking, but having the quantity of stalls necessary to attract all customers, professionals, to their needs and lively hood.
Strategic location is paramount to any real estate development, furthermore for a neighborhood cultural center with long term paid parking. Crossroads nodes are the best.

In planning for a neighborhood cultural town center, special importance needs to be give to the design of accesses (pedestrian, bicycle, transit, cars and others) as well as the architecture and gathering spaces. In a development catered to art and culture, eateries and restaurants should offer live music, have a small structure for a stage and PA system. Paintings are stagged in business, markets, banks, bookstores,where music dancing and singing classes can be taken, gyms, daycare, salons can strive, The center of the neighborhood needs to be a place where everyone needs to go not only for human entertainment, but also for everyday supplies. The center is for us all.
Key Proposal # 2. Search, research plot and protect paramount locations for future neighborhood centers developments.
Because it is much easier to buy property from government agencies for affordable housing, developers have been erecting large soviet looking blocks of apartment buildings, with no adequate parking, that will preclude the development of more community supported projects. This has happened close to the

light rail Othello station, close to the Beacon Hill Station, and close to Mount Baker. Once these projects are done it will condemn the neighborhood to live in a poor planned, supplied, and more dangerous neighborhood.
The vacant SHA site located at the SW corner of the MLK way and South Othello street, needs protection. This site of almost four acres, has the potential to begin the process of Othello becoming a destination, bringing culture, economic opportunities and healthier lively hood to the entire South Seattle.
Maybe, this is an opportunity to underline the important characteristics and advantages of this location a regional node for the neighborhoods of South Seattle.
Advantage 1. Location. The South Seattle neighborhoods of Othello, Columbia City, George Town , Ranier Beach, Hillman city, South Park, some of West Seattle are located half way between Downtown and the airport.
Advantage 2. Existing community of artists, musicians,painters, writers, poets, bohemians, continue to reside here for it's community, proximity to the Down town, source of inspiration and culture, and afford ability.
Advantage 3. The node at Othello station, provides North South, mobility by road ways as well as light rail and East West by roadway. Easy access to Seward Park and, George Town South Park as well as to the airport and Downtown.
Advantage 4. Rundown areas on MLK, Ranier Valley and others, offer infill and restructuring opportunities for the future.
Key Proposal # 3. Consider minimizing displacement by capping property tax for those living in the neighborhood for over 5 years. Until sale date.
More study is needed.
Key Proposal # 4. Some parks are dangerous and small kids are not allowed to use them. For more effective park use, and help police, create an educated a guard force to be stationed in some parks. Maybe in a booth.
Key Proposal # 5. Save our downtown from excessive shadows and too many high rises. Increase separation of towers.
Key Proposal # 6. Integrated transportation needs to be ubiquitous and benefit all modes of transportation in all urban neighborhoods. Only in this way we can curb suburban sprawl, that is the real unaffordable way of planning. For that to happen we need to lift the ban in long term parking by special nodes next to the light rail.
I thank you for the opportunity.
Liza Stacishin, Bach. Arch., MLA.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Robert DeLuca

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

As a Seattle homeowner I have serious concerns about the proposed Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Please see my feedback below.

Robert DeLuca

1)

ENGAGEMENT.

-- Planning for community involvement has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that community involvement applies to ALL aspects of the planning and budgeting, then this clarification has not occurred. The appearance instead is of a Comprehensive Plan that claims "community" as a theme, yet has no place for community.
Add a Community Involvement chapter that is at least as good as Portland's.

-- Employ a communications specialist to address, and report on communication shortcomings in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal.
Eliminate use of the term "storage" when the word that diverse people would understand is "parking".

-- Remove language that stereotypes, unnecessarily limits participation, and divides populations.
Replace language of "engage XXX communities"
with "engage individuals from ALL communities, including from XXX communities."

2)
HEALTH & SAFETY.

-- Because of the many benefits that street trees provide to both property owners and the general public, encourage the preservation or planting of street trees as development occurs, except in locations where it is not possible to meet City standards intended to preserve public safety and utility networks.
REF: LU41, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Pursue a comprehensive approach of prevention, transition and stabilization services to decrease potential homelessness, stop recurring homelessness and promote longterm self-sufficiency.
a. Encourage efforts to expand the supply of extremely low-income, permanent housing to meet the needs of those for whom the cost of housing is a chief cause of homelessness.
b. Strive to develop a continuum of housing opportunities, ranging from emergency shelters to transitional housing to permanent housing, in order to assist homeless households regain and maintain stable, permanent housing.
c. Strategically invest in emergency and transitional housing for specific homeless populations.
REF: H45, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- In recognition of the fact that for certain people housing support services can mean the difference between housing stability and homelessness, coordinate housing planning and funding, where appropriate, with the following types of housing support services:
a. Services that respond to emergency needs of the homeless (such as emergency shelters).
b. Services that assist clients to secure housing (such as rent and security deposit assistance, housing relocation assistance).
c. Services that help clients to maintain permanent housing (such as landlord / tenant counseling, chore services, in-home health care, outpatient mental health treatment, employment counseling and placement assistance).
REF: H46, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Work to reduce environmental threats and hazards to health in the workplace, at home and at play.
a. Make use of the City’s building and fire codes, food licensing and permit processes, and hazardous materials and smoking regulations for fire and life safety protection.

b. Collaborate through joint efforts among City agencies, such as fire, police, and construction and land use to address health and safety issues in a more efficient manner.
c. Prepare land use plans in ways that support development and design that promote physical activities, use safe materials, and protect water and air quality.
REF: HD23, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Encourage connections between services that coordinate, link and integrate public, private and community-based services. Facilitate collaboration of programs through the use of City funding.
REF: HD48, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Achieve an increased sense of security and a decrease in the per capita incidence of crimes, as indicated by decreased homicides, aggravated assaults, residential burglaries, and auto theft; increased perception of police presence; and decreased perception of crime.
REF: HDG8.2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Collect data and regularly report on the sustainability measures and numeric goals in this plan to inform and enable citizens and decision-makers to consider alternative policies or programs, where outcomes differ from what was intended. Conduct an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions in Seattle at least every three years. Use data, public input, and approaches developed by other public agencies and private organizations that address sustainability. Consider combining this monitoring activity with the one described in the Urban Village Element of this Plan.
REF: E18, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage.
REF: E24, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

3)
LAND USE

-- Do not advance a FLUM that discards current zoning. It is irresponsible for the city to so radically change the rules after people are already so invested. It would be irresponsible for such a FLUM to fuel displacement and increase inequity as those with largest resources at their disposal will be relatively advantaged in the transition.

-- Require sweeping zone-wide changes to prove equity through an analysis of local conditions. Fairness occurs when all are treated fairly, not when the benefits for population 'A' equal the losses of population B.

-- Provide policies that condition permitting of development to specific site impactsand to cumulative area impacts.

-- Raise setback and landscaping requirements in communities not meeting open space targets.

-- Provide policy support for housing preservation, including preservation of affordable rental housing stock and other functional and well-built structures which accomplish the "reuse" aspect of the common environmental policy: "reduce, reuse, recycle."

-- Provide clarity regarding how best use of surplus property is to be determined. Open space is a continual need, while for additional housing need may ebb and flow. As such, a method that involves all stakeholders will be needed in order for there to be good results in all eras.

-- Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses.
REF: LUG2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal, replaced with language that requires the city to "allow", "support", and " accommodate" for everything rather than designing something that works.

-- Preserve and protect low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited.
REF: LUG8, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics.
REF: LUG9, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- To maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan.
REF: LU11, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU59, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU60, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Reflect the character of existing low-density development through the regulation of scale, siting, structure orientation, and setbacks.
REF: LU69, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- DO NOT PROVIDE FREE ACROSS THE BOARD UPZONES VIA THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. DO NOT:
"Designate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings can provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU9.10 to replace LU75.

-- Limit the multifamily zones to areas that do not meet the single-family zone criteria, except in circumstances where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a different zone is more appropriate.
REF: LU75, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

4)
TRANSPORTATION.

-- Define transportation service performance categories (levels) not merely on the basis of frequency, but on the usability, including usability by diverse populations.

-- Establish a practice of assessing the transportation service performance category (level) of a location on the basis of the current situation, and on the basis of future housing and employment estimates.

-- If land use rules for a parcel are to deviate with proximity to transportation services,
then condition the approval of a development proposal for that parcel on proof of the transportation service performance category (level) present as of the date of the proposal application, and on independent service level projection analysis for the next 10 years.

-- Encourage off street parking in new developments where there is not a demonstrated capacity to absorb the projected additional parking demand.

-- Consider visitor parking demand when establishing parking requirements.

-- Provide consistent definitions (in the glossary) for terms like “transit corridor”, “transit stop”, “frequent transit”, "rail station", frequent rail station", “superior transit”, etc.

-- DO NOT
"Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking required."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU6.3.
This proposal would REQUIRE the city to have NO rules on what amount of parking any development must include.
MARKET FORCES are NOT a sufficient tool for city planning.

5)
ADMINISTRATION.

-- Use of the "neighborhood plans" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that the "neighborhood plans" are now to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that the neighborhood plans are to be discarded, or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to Neighborhood plans and citywide plans, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Use of "neighborhood planning" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that neighborhood planning is to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that neighborhood planning is to be replaced by full central government control or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to neighborhood planning and citywide planning, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Define clearly the role that adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies, neighborhood plan work-plan matrices, and recognized neighborhood plans play in the City's decision-making and resource allocation.
REF: NG4, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Include (as was done in the past) growth estimates for all urban villages, not just the 6 urban centers.

-- An independent assessment should occur to determine what growth is most likely to occur if this Comprehensive Plan is adopted. (These policies seem designed to create far greater growth than that which was studied by the draft EIS).

-- Establish a vision for housing and job levels 40 and 60 years from now, and provide an analysis of anticipated capacity distribution for those periods.

-- REMOVE ALL proposed goals/policies that in effect state that "the city shall NOT do its job". The city government and the people DO have a right to accomplish planning and to apply laws that limit land uses.
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal contains many statements that the city shall "allow", "accommodate", etc unlimited use, and these are an irresponsible abandonment of responsibility of stewardship for current and future generations.

-- Provide a Comprehensive Plan that is unbiased and invites participation, rather than one that biases and closes the conversation. For example,
"Determine the appropriate uses and densities on hospital and college campuses that are located outside an urban center or village through a master planning process that engages nearby residents and businesses".
would be better than:
"Plan for uses and densities on hospital and college campuses that are located outside an urban center or village in ways that recognize the important contributions of these institutions and the generally low-scale development of their surroundings."
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal is riddled with bias, and no transparent abd accountable process has been provided to correct that.

Here is another example from the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal:
"Encourage street widths and building heights that are in proportion with each other by reducing setbacks from the street and keeping reasonable sidewalk widths for lower buildings."
"Reducing" is a bias without also proposing "increasing" for the opposite case.
"Reasonable" is a bias in that it has been listed here as applicable for "lower" buildings, implying no applicability to "higher" buildings.
There might be a suitable policy intended by this language, but that can become apparent only when the biases have been removed.

-- Incorporate the following 4 Comprehensive Plan amendments submitted in 2014, which staff was directed by the Seattle City Council to review for inclusion:
1. In order to monitor the effects of the urban village strategy: collect data, review, and report on growth and change in urban centers, urban villages, and manufacturing/ industrial centers at least every 3 years. Include in these reports factors such as: progress on implementing neighborhood plan approval and adoption matrices; changes in the numbers of jobs and hous-ing units; housing costs, including net loss or gain of low-income and very low-income housing units; housing types; crime rates; transportation systems and their use; business types; public facilities; services; and open space, to the extent information is practically available. Collect and report on similar data for typical areas outside villages for comparison. Broadly communi-cate the results of monitoring efforts. Provide a Briefing to City Council by July of the year following the review in order to be used for consideration in the annual Budget cycle. Provide the results directly to the Neighborhood Plan Stewards on record with the Department of Neighborhoods. Work with community members to identify appropriate responses to significant growth, lack of growth or changes, including: community-led activities; additional planning for, or re-prioritization of, City Programs or infrastructure improvements; partially or entirely updating a neighborhood plan; or working with other public agencies to address community goals.
2. Review situations where the rate of growth is significantly faster or slower than antici-pated in the growth targets contained in Appendix UV-A or where other measures indicate significant changes in the center or village over an extended period of time. Evaluate the significance of the changes or the significance of lack of change with center or village residents, business owners, and other community stakeholders in light of the expectations underlying the neighborhood plan for the area, the actual level of growth, progress toward neighbor-hood plan implementation, and the relative maturity (level of mixed-use development, the pedestrian environment, infrastruc-ture, and public facilities) of the area as an urban center or village
3. To ensure compliance with [the two new polices suggested above], the Council shall receive and consider a report, compiled by DPD and DON, that documents the impacts of growth in each Urban Village when approving capital and operating budget for all departments. These growth impact reports shall be available for public review prior to the start of the annual Council budget cycle.
4. When housing or job growth exceeds 100% of targets in any urban village or center, the city shall make all affirmative efforts to re-direct job and housing growth to designated growth areas that have not yet reached their targets.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Howard McCay

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Has there been sufficient discussion on balancing growth to surrounding areas so that Seattle can preserve its traditional character, open space, tree canopy, single-family owner-occupied houses, and restore its minority-community displaced-families to home ownership in central Seattle?

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Liza Sheehan

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

While I support the increased density around the new light rail station, I am vehemently opposed to taking solidly single family home neighborhoods 5 blocks or more east of the station and rezoning them to Low Rise based on a 10 minute walking profile from the station. This will dramatically alter the character of the street I am most opposed to, 17th Ave NE. And the map shows only a random portion of this street will change based on walking speed and elevation. Change the whole street or change none of it. I say none of it.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Jake London

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I live on the top of Beacon Hill.
I wanted to make some quick comments on the proposed upzones of SF areas contiguous to the Mt Baker Link Station (aka urban village expansions).
While it likely makes sense to upzone these areas eventually, I don't think that it makes sense to do that in the near-term, given the amount of undeveloped land that already exists right next to the Mt. Baker station. Indeed, I favor tying these kinds of upzone to substantial completion of the urban village core. Adding more diversity of housing stock is an important and noble long-term goal for our neighborhood. But in the near-term, our priority should be on fleshing out the existing Mt. Baker urban village area (and frankly doing the same thing at every light rail station urban village in south Seattle). Once this is done, we can move on to the areas further removed from the station.
Here is why I believe that is the mos sensible approach:
*Large apartments and condos near the station are our fastest path to increasing density.
*A rapid increase in density is our only realistic path to increasing demand for transit.
*Increasing demand for transit is our only path to increasing transit frequency.
*Increasing transit frequency is our only chance at encouraging even more people to ride transit and give up their cars.
*Less people driving cars is the only way to reduce our parking requirements.
* Reducing the amount of parking we need is the only way that we can add more density to SF zones without either compromising the quality of life of current and new residents of that zone or adding significant additional parking to the zone in question (something we are trying to move away from).
If we upzone these SF areas now, I'm concerned that it will dilute our focus on completing the existing urban village core, by diverting development dollars from the existing urban village to this new area.
The sort of the development that will happen in SF zones is smaller scale, less risky, faster to complete, and I suspect that the profit margins are better too. So if those areas are open for development, where do you think the money is going to go? To the existing lots that have been sitting empty for the last 7 years since the Mt/ Baker Link station opened? Or into these newly upzoned areas?
That's why this proposed upzone is bad idea. It's exactly the opposite of what the incentives ought to look like at this time.
God forbid that the economy takes a bad turn before we finish the urban village cores in South Seattle.
I'm sure the 20 year plan for Detroit in 1961 seemed pretty bullish on the future. I mean come on, it was the 5th largest city in America and the home of one of American's cornerstone industries. But by the time I entered college at the University of Michigan in the fall of 1981, things were looking a whole lot different.

I took a seminar on the history of Detroit during that first fall. We took 3 field trips to Detroit and went all over the city. It wasn't' looking good. Its population had shrunk by almost 400,000 people, and it's just gotten worse since then. By 2012, Detroit would be around half the size it was in 1960.

A plan needs to account for that possibility as well. The pie doesn't already keep growing forever. Sometimes is stalls or starts going backward.

Currently, Seattle has a population density of 7700 people per sq mile. The 2035 plan predicts that we'll get to a population density of around 10,000 people per sq mile by 2035 (i.e., add around 125,000 people).

This is about the minimum population density we need to support the sort of frequent public transit that might really entice people out of their cars (just take an inventory of all the cities in North America that have the sort of transit that we want here. They all have population densities over 10,000 people per sq mile).

What if we get to 8750 people per sq mile in the next 10 years, but we don't make it 10,000 people per sq mile by 2035? So we're not really dense enough to support great, car replacing transit, but we messed up all the parking in our SF zones by overbuilding townhomes and aPodments. Now we're in a horrible in between place where the economy is not so good, and we're not really in a good position to fix what's broken about or transportation system. We can't afford to improve transit, but it's even worse driving and parking than it is now.

Think of this as the 2015 experience but even worse.

Maybe driverless cars will save us and we'll get the convenience of the car availability without the same parking demands required by individual car ownership. But I don't want to count on that.

That's why I want to make sure we get those urban village cores built asap. 8750 people per square mile with fleshed out urban village TOD transit hubs feels like a better potential outcome to me than 8750 people per square mile with vacant lots in the urban village core and townhomes/microhousing surrounding it.

Microhousing and townhomes in those proposed areas can wait, not forever, but or a while longer. If the predictions come true and we do add 125k people by 2035, there should be plenty of time to fill in those areas with townhomes and microhousing after the town center build-out is complete.

After all, one of their strengths is that they are faster to build than the sort of larger building that will go in nearer to the stations. Indeed, a completed urban village center should make these units more lucrative and even less risky to build. So they're even more likely to get built at that point.

I'm not sure the reverse is true. Microhousing and townhomes adjacent to the station do not necessarily increase the odds that the center will be completed, especically if the economy goes south. So the question is this: If the economy goes south, which would you rather be left with? Completed urban village TOD cores and and existing SF zones? Or barren, incomplete urban village TOD zones ringed by denser SF zones that lack the contiguous infrastructure needed to allow them to fully realize their potential (e.g., enough parking to serve all the car-owners living there who have no choice but to keep driving, because the transit still isn't good enough to allow them to give up their cars).

Our window of opportunity to get these larger projects finished in the south end is likely not be infinite. Before too long, the Northgate link extension will open, even more TOD investment money will head up that direction, and South Seattle's TOD hubs could be left behind, sad remnants of a promise made back in the 1990s that was ultimately left unfulfilled, because we couldn't keep our priorities straight.

Please, let's not do that. Let's keep our eyes focused on the most important prizes.

Best,

JL

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Jan Brucker

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Housing

Comment:

OVERALL
This document, in many places, appears to be a simple inventory of existing facilities and programs, and offers little/no insight or information to the public regarding any future plan(s). Thus, this does not appear to address either the spirit or the letter of the requirements of the Growth Management Act [GMA].
HOUSING
The Appendix documents fail to acknowledge the existence of the Aurora-Licton Urban Village, and thus fail to account for either existing housing [all categories] as well as capacity for future housing [all categories]. To the extent the ALUV was intended to be covered in the "Aggregate" category, this is insufficient and inadequate to inform citizens or others as to actual housing by category or future projections. This does not meet or satisfy GMA requirements. This document fails as support for the housing and zoning modifications included in the HALA ordinance passed by the City Council on Monday, November 16, 2015.
FACILITIES
The document lists City facilities, and notes as to functions. However, only the section submitted by Seattle Public Schools, which is not an arm or City Government, included a Forecast of Future needs. There is insufficient information in this draft comprehensive plan upon which to support any findings in the Draft EIS as to impacts based upon existing City Facilities, let alone any modification or expansion of facilities. The flat conclusion/statement "[o]verall, fire, police, library facilities, parks and schools are sufficient to accommodate expected 20 year growth" lacks any analysis or explanation. In the sections where some changes are apparently contemplated, simple words such as "development," "relocation," "replacement," and "expansion" are vague and are not supported by any explanation whatsoever as to why any "relocation" etc, is appropriate or when such is expected to occur. [Section J Potential Future Discretionary Projects]. While the appendix documents contain forecasts for an
----- Message truncated -----

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Frank Fay

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I am opposed to the changes in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The current proposals will greatly reduce the livability of Seattle neighborhoods and will increase the cost of living in Seattle. The proposed changes to zoning and zoning rules are unnecessary as the existing zoning has plenty of capacity to accommodate the projected population increase of 120,000.

I oppose the misuse of the urban village and residential urban village boundaries. These boundaries were for providing amenities within urban villages to compensate for increased density of development. There should not be a single zoning category or single set of special up-zoning rules for urban centers, urban villages, and residential urban villages. These changes would replace neighborhood commercial districts with massive multi-family residential development. The current zoning established by the present neighborhood plans should be retained.

I oppose removing neighborhood involvement in the Comprehensive Plan. We should be building strong neighborhoods in Seattle with neighbors that know each other and work together to build better places to live. The proposed changes would sever these relationships by allowing absentee owners for in-fill single-family development and by allowing for massive multi-family residential rental developments with out-of-state landlords. It is neighbors who know how best to accommodate development in the neighborhood. The present neighborhood involvement with integrating development to their neighborhoods should be retained.

I oppose removing parking requirements for automobiles from new development. Automobiles represent over 50% of transportation in Seattle and that mode share has only slightly declined. Residents still need places to store cars and requirements on new development are the cheapest way to meet that need. The subsidy cost for Metro is on the order of $800/rider/month which must be paid by all residents. Shifting residents from automobiles to transit thus increases the cost of living in Seattle. Furthermore, it has been repeatedly shown that transit is not more efficient and does not have fewer emissions than automobiles. All new development should be required to provide parking, perhaps with some focus for car-sharing (and eventually robo-taxis).

I oppose removing Comprehensive Plan environmental requirements. The current requirements for ecological habitats and steep slopes should be retained. The current requirements for preservation of trees and street trees should be retained.

I oppose allowing exceptions to minimum lot size requirements. The current restrictions on small lot development should be retained.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan revisions should be combined into a single process with the HALA proposals. Any combined revisions should be submitted to a substantial process of neighborhood involvement. The current Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan proposals are unnecessary, will increase the cost of living in Seattle, will not decrease the cost of living due to new development, and will reduce the livability of Seattle for all residents.

Regards,
Frank Fay

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: WSDOT SnoKing Planning Office,Leah Bolotin

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Kristian,
Attached please find an electronic version of WSDOT's finalized comments.
A hard copy will be forwarded next week.
Thank you again for your hard work with us, Leah

_____
Leah Bolotin, AICP
Senior Planner
WSDOT Sno-King Planning Office
Comprehensive Planning Resources-http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/community/GMA.htm-

--
November 20, 2015
Kristian Kofoed
Seattle Department of Planning and Development
PO Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Kristian,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the periodic update of Seattle's Transportation Element and (TE) Transportation Appendix. The TE and Appendix address many issues of importance to WSDOT and other agencies. We particularly appreciate the walkability and intermodal focus (TG 3), integration of land use and transportation issues in the urban village and manufacturing/industrial center strategy (TG 1), focus on equitable access (TG 3), use of complete streets standards (TG 6), focus on safety (TG 6), adherence to the Governor's Executive Order on vehicle-miles traveled and greenhouse gas reduction (TG4), and the close implementation of Vision 2040 shown throughout.
In addition to the specific comments below the City may wish to give further attention to the requirement in RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(iii)(F) regarding the improvements to state and local systems needed to meet current and future demand. This letter includes some additional recommendations along that line for your consideration during the next update.
The letter is divided into comments on the draft TE and the draft Transportation Appendix. We have also included comments on the Container Port Element and a few miscellaneous comments.
Draft Transportation Element
General Comment: Since it is unusual for a TE to be composed solely of goals and policies, we recommend that you direct readers to the Transportation Appendix where the majority of the statutory TE requirements are met.
- TG 1: Transportation investments based on land use

T1.3: "Invest in transportation projects and programs [that] further progress towards meeting Seattle's mode share goals and reduce dependence on personal automobiles, particularly in urban centers." WSDOT recommends that reference be made here, or in the Appendix, to TDM, CTR, GTEC/Commute Seattle, and other multimodal programs. See requirements in RCW 36.70A.070, RCW 70.94.527, and RCW 70.94.528. Please either provide more information on the Commute Seattle program, or refer to another document that does, during the next annual amendment.
- TG 2: Allocating space between modes

Discussion: "The City has adopted master plans to address non-automobile modes of travel – pedestrian, bicycle, transit and freight movement – drawing on extensive community input." Inventory and plans for improvement of pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and freight facilities are all requirements of the TE. If Seattle has separate modal plans, the reader should be referred to the plan titles, and provided links if available.
Additionally, the Freight Master Plan (FMP) is still under development as of this review. A draft FMP is expected to be released this fall, and adopted by the City Council in early 2016. The final FMP should either be referred to in the TE, or incorporated into the TE by citing relevant policy and program recommendations once complete.
It may be helpful to include rail and marine systems as alternates to truck freight during the next amendment.
T2.7: "Prioritize mobility needs in the street right-of-way based on the recommended networks and facilities identified in the respective modal plans. Within the travelway, prioritize space to address safety concerns, network connectivity of modal plans and general purpose travel." This is a unique and constructive policy. As discussed, it would be helpful to define the term "activation" when discussing prioritization categories.

- TG 3: "Equitable access; ensuring that people who are dependent on transit or vehicle use because of age, disability, or financial considerations are well served."

General comments:

– Seniors tend to span all three of the focus issues mentioned in TG 3. Consider mentioning the bulge in the senior population cohort, and explicitly incorporate planning for that into long-range transportation plans in the next update.

– The comment that "availability of free parking is also a key determinant in mode choice" could be more directly addressed in the parking section of the Appendix during the next amendment.

– Please be advised of the following requirements under Title II of the ADA regulations and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act:

? New construction and altered facilities must be "accessible to and usable by" people with disabilities.

? Individual pedestrians must be reasonably accommodated, where necessary.

? Transportation providers must evaluate existing facilities, policies, and programs for discrimination and develop a modification or transition plan that includes methods, a schedule for correction/retrofit, and a curb ramp installation schedule. Transition plans were required to be developed within six months of the effective date of the 1992 regulation, and structural changes were required to have been in place by 1995 (28 CFR Parts 35.149 and 35.150). It is therefore strongly recommended that the city develop and implement a transition plan as soon as possible.

The WSDOT ADA website is a good resource for ADA information, including a sample ADA checklist and links to state and federal guidance and resources.

T3.2: "Improve transportation options to and within the urban centers and urban villages, where most of Seattle's job and population growth will occur." This is another place where TDM, CTR, and other multimodal programs could be referenced.

T3.5: "Prioritize transit investments on the basis of ridership demand, service to populations heavily reliant on transit, and opportunities to leverage funding." It may be useful to specify whether this policy would apply only to the service Seattle purchases from Metro or whether it is intended as policy input to Metro for their service guidelines. Also, consider including a specific mention of the work being done with zoning and planning for transit/TOD/Growing Transit Communities.

T3.15 "Create vibrant public spaces in and near the right-of-way that foster social interaction, promote access to walking, bicycling and transit options, and enhance the public realm." This policy could be in conflict with several other policies in the TE, such as T2.4 which discusses the importance of employing the standards and safety requirements in the city's Right-of-Way Improvement Manual, as well as policies from other modal master plans. WSDOT recommends that careful consideration be given to implementation of this policy relative to other essential policies that address transportation policy priorities.

- TG 5: Strengthen the economy

General Comment: The policies under this goal are a good summary of efforts the city should support to ensure ongoing support and promotion of freight and freight maritime (Port of Seattle) activities in Seattle. WSDOT recommends that these policies be revised as necessary to incorporate key findings and policies from the aforementioned FMP and Seattle Industrial Area Freight Access Project when these studies are adopted by the city.

Figure 8, Major Truck Streets map: The street identification on this map is illegible; suggest the street labeling be enlarged, or that it be put onto an 11x17 sheet with improved resolution. Another alternative would be to list the truck streets in a table, or referenced in another document such as a freight master plan, where the streets are clearly identified. WSDOT recommends this comment be applied to all maps, particularly where identification of routes or inventorying is required by statute.

- TG 6: Safety

General comments:

– Thank you for including the goals (zero fatalities and serious injuries) and three of the "4-Es" implementation approach (engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services) of the state's safety Plan, Target Zero. Consider explicitly aligning Seattle's transportation safety goals with the State's, including participation in Community Task Forces and inclusion of emergency medical services as well as a target date of 2030 rather than 2035. Target Zero Community Task Forces have been shown to be extraordinarily effective at reducing fatal collisions.

– Consider including Community Protection through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

- TG 7: Coordination with other agencies and governments

T7.2 "Coordinate with regional, state and federal agencies, other local governments, and transit providers when planning and operating transportation facilities and services that reach beyond the City's borders in order to promote regional mobility for people and goods and support the regional growth strategy." Broadly applied this policy would facilitate implementation of the requirement in RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(iii)(F) regarding improvements needed to meet future demand on state highways.

T7.3 "Support completion of the freeway high-occupancy-vehicle lane system throughout the central Puget Sound region and continued use of that system for promoting more efficient travel." Note that parts of the freeway HOV system are being converted to high occupancy/toll (HOT) lanes which should help ensure efficient operation as demand increases.

T7.4 "Limit freeway capacity expansions intended primarily to accommodate drive-alone users to allow only spot improvements that enhance safety or remove operational constraints in specific locations." However, a local policy that attempts to limit potential freeway capacity improvements that would primarily benefit drive-alone users would prove problematic in practice. Not only does alleviating freeway congestion benefit all modes including freight and transit, it also helps reduce pressure on congested city streets. RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a): (ii), (iii)(C), and (iii)(F); and WAC 365-196-430 (2): (a)(ii), (a)(iii), (b), and (c) specifically require cities to estimate traffic impacts to state facilities in order to help monitor and plan improvements, and to utilize established LOS standards in order to meet current and future demands and to be consistent with state and regional plans. WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b) specifically recommends "The goals and policies [of a city TE] should be consistent with statewide goals and policies." We therefore suggest re-wording of policy T7.4 to more clearly reflect statutory guidance.

- TG 10: Funding

T10.10: "Identify and evaluate possible additional funding resources and/or alternative land use and transportation scenarios if the level of transportation funding anticipated in the six-year financial analysis, below, falls short of the estimated amount." RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(iv)(C) requires that the TE include a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed, to maintain LOS standards.

Draft Transportation Appendix

General comments:

- Please see comment regarding maps provided for the TE.
- Utilization of WACs

Although the statutory requirements for TEs are identified in RCW 36.70A.070 (6), TE requirements and recommendations are described in more detail in WAC 365-196-430. Note that the first part (1) of the WAC is nearly identical to the RCW and includes only requirements. The second part of the WAC (2) contains recommendations which are not part of the RCW. With the exception of implementation measures in section (m), section (2) does not contain a lot of new material; instead, it goes into suggestions and details of how the requirements may be filled. Requirements and recommendations by topic along with links to numerous resources may be accessed through the Local Planning Resources document located on the WSDOT Comp Plan Resources website. This document is frequently updated, so it should be newly downloaded each time prior to use.

- RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(iii)(A) requires an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments and general aviation airport facilities, to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning. Transportation Figures A-2 (Transit/HOV Lanes), A-3 (Bus Routes), A-4 (Rail & Ferry Routes), A-5 (P&R Facilities), A-6 (Bicycle Facilities), A-7 (Pedestrian Facilities), A-8 (Marine Properties), and A-9 (Airports), all show excellent overviews, but none could be considered an "inventory." Please include tables or more detailed maps during your next annual update, or refer to separate modal documents or master plans if such contain more detailed inventories. For recommendations on how to comply with this requirement, please refer to WAC 365-196-430 (2)(c).

A. Land Use Assumptions Used in Estimating Travel

Regional Land Use Assumptions: PSRC lists six designated Regional Growth Centers and two Manufacturing/Industrial Centers in the city of Seattle. Seattle's updated Urban Village Map lists 22 Urban Villages, and the Land Use Appendix lists dozens of Urban Centers. WSDOT recommends that the TE or Appendix provide a short explanation of how the designations differ (or refer to the Land Use or another element in which an explanation is provided), and clarify whether there were differences in the assumptions or methodology used for traffic analysis and forecasting between them.

B. Facilities and Services Needs

- Rail

The description of the freight rail (Class I freight railroads) is reasonable and accurate. However there is one other freight rail (shortline) operator in Seattle that warrants mention, namely the Ballard Terminal Railroad. The Ballard Terminal connects with the BNSF Railway north-south mainline just north of the BNSF Railway bridge crossing of the ship canal. Although it is a small freight rail operation in comparison to the two Class I railroads in Seattle (BNSF and UP), the Ballard Terminal is an important freight rail operation for local freight. This should be included to comply with the inventory requirement in RCW 36.70A.040 (6)(a)(iii)(A).

WSDOT additionally recommends that at-grade rail crossings be identified and that issues pertaining to safety and mobility on the railroad and roadway system be documented. Consider referencing rail crossing projects undertaken by PSRC and FMSIB.

- Other Intermodal Facilities

Identify intermodal connector routes. Identify freight facilities, intermodal terminals, and transportation routes (i.e., roadway, railway, and waterway) that are on key statewide supply chains; some supply chains extend far beyond Seattle city limits and some routes are therefore of statewide significance. This should be included to comply with the inventory requirement in RCW 36.70A.040 (6)(a)(iii)(A).

- Water Transportation

WSDOT recommends that the classifications for Waterway Freight Economic Corridors be identified.

- Freight

Consider adding a Freight section to the Appendix that identifies the Freight Economic Corridor classifications as the backbone of the freight system. Referencing Freight Economic Corridors will show how multimodal freight transportation systems fit within the state's overall system. Also, consider including here, or in the Freight Master Plan, routes for oversize/overweight truck loads, routes for hazardous materials, and identifying truck bottlenecks, weight-restricted pavements, and bridges. Identify major truck parking locations, both public and private, and areas in need of truck parking.

C. Local Level of Service Standards for Arterials and Transit Routes

- Traffic Forecasts

Utilizing travelsheds based on screenline V/Cs of "groups of arterials among which drivers logically can choose to travel" is a helpful methodology for a large urban center with numerous principal arterials, and makes sense in a city with six designated regional growth centers and two designated manufacturing/industrial centers, to quote from the Appendix, because it helps to address the broad

geographic impacts of development and travel patterns.
RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(iii)(B) requires a TE to include level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge of performance. Transportation Figure A-10 (Transportation LOS Screenlines) shows the location of travelshed screenlines, and Figure A-11 (LOS: Screenline V/C Ratios) provides corresponding V/C values for existing and horizon years. V/C provides a good operational level of service calculation, and is required in order to determine future needs. However, no LOS standards for local arterials or transit routes are given against which to measure the forecasted operational levels. Please either provide these standards in the figures, or direct readers to the document in which they are provided.
WAC 365-196-430 (2)(e)(iv) recommends that "to identify level of service standards for public transit services, counties and cities should include the established level of service or performance standards from the transit provider and should reference any relevant planning documents." Seattle currently assumes the transit standard and operating LOS to be the same as the associated arterial. WSDOT recommends that Seattle additionally include the transit providers' own LOS standards and LOS performance analysis for comparative purposes as suggested in the WAC. For ferries, descriptions of existing and proposed ferry route LOS standards are available in the Washington State Ferries Final Long-Range Plan. Once LOS standards are included for state facilities, it would also be helpful to provide a crosswalk between operational V/C ratios and said adopted LOS standards.

- State Highway Level of Service Standards

On p 26 please make the following correction: "Including LOS standards for HSS is a communication and coordination tool in local plans, so that the State of Washington has a current understanding of performance on their facilities. Accordingly, the State legislation that designates HSS also directs the State Transportation Commission to give higher priority for correcting identified deficiencies on highways of statewide significance." This section of the statute was repealed in 2007 (SSB 5412).

- State-Funded Highway Improvements and Local Improvements to State Highways

On page 26, Table A-12, State Highway Project List, did you add any projects to this list as a result of the PSRC Capacity Project List in Appendix N of Transportation 2040, or discussion with the Traffic Office at Northwest Region? You may also want to check projects in the Connecting Washington package recently funded by the state legislature. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F) requires that identified needs on state-owned transportation facilities be consistent with the statewide multimodal transportation plan, and (6)(c) requires that the TE be consistent with the ten-year investment program required for the state.

D. Estimated Traffic Impacts to State-Owned Transportation Facilities

- Although a range of 33-39% AWDT growth is shown in the table for SR 509, it is not included in the text discussion that follows. The northern-most segment of SR 509 that lies within the city's border is roughly five miles long. Please include that segment in the discussion on pp 29-30.
- Table A-13, State Highway Traffic Volumes, 2013 thru 2035, breaks state facilities into travelshed segments for existing (2013) and horizon (2035) AADT and AWDT by direction, and then shows percent change in AWDT between. This is a useful way to comply with RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(a)(ii).
- For more information, please see the Concurrency and State Transportation Facilities section of Commerce's Your Community's Transportation System - A Guide to Reviewing, Updating and Implementing Your Transportation Element, states: "Your community is required to include level-of-service standards for state-owned facilities in your community. These level-of-service standards can then be used to monitor system performance, evaluate improvements and improve coordination with WSDOT and your local RTPO. The concurrency exemption means that your community is not required to deny development if the adopted level of service on a state highway cannot be achieved. However, the exemption is not a license to ignore traffic impacts on state facilities."

For the next periodic update, please consider including actions the City could take that would help address performance problems on the segments of locally operated state facilities forecast to operate

below their adopted LOS standard. WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b) includes recommendations for bringing locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below established LOS standards into compliance. WAC 365-196-430 (2)(g) also contains a series of local network suggestions that may be helpful.

Container Port Element

It appears the most recent version of the Container Port Element (June 2013) will not be revised in concert with the Seattle Comprehensive Plan update. When the Container Port Element is next updated, WSDOT recommends that it incorporate the following:

- Seattle Freight Master Plan: All key findings related to Seattle's port and maritime industries as noted in the upcoming Seattle Freight Master Plan (early 2016) be included in the Container Port Element update. This should include identification of key freight corridors connecting the Port of Seattle terminals with intermodal facilities, local/regional distribution centers; first and last-mile port connections as well as city of Seattle/SDOT identified overweight routes to serve the port facilities.
- Marine Cargo Forecast: In scoping now, this effort will project current volumes of marine cargo in Seattle and landside impacts to the freight system. It will be complete in 2016. FMSIB, WPPA, and WSDOT are jointly developing this effort.
- Seattle Industrial Areas Freight Access Project: WSDOT recommends the Container Port Element update also address and incorporate key findings and recommendations from the city of Seattle's (SDOT) 2015 Seattle Industrial Area Freight Access Project as appropriate. Although the focus of this study is on the identification of truck-freight infrastructure improvements needed over the next 20 years to keep the Seattle manufacturing/industrial centers of the Greater Duwamish and the Ballard/Interbay area vibrant and relevant for freight, a number of projects from this effort will also support future Port of Seattle operations.
- Policies: WSDOT recommends the various policies included in the current (June 2013) Container Port Element be revised as necessary to reflect key findings and policy direction from the Seattle Freight Master Plan and the Seattle FAP plans when they are adopted by the city. The Container Port Element Transportation policy CP 8 discusses the importance of maintaining the city's "Major Truck Streets" while also ensuring "support other modes maybe considered in these streets." It might be beneficial to clarify how the operational and safety needs of these modes can be accommodated.

Other Elements

Although these comments are not on the Transportation Element or Appendix per se, they do feed into the overall transportation planning effort. Please forward these to other offices as appropriate.

- Seattle Growth Strategy: Consider referencing PSRC's Industrial Lands Analysis. This will show how the City's industrial lands fit within the region's overall land use vision.
- Industrial Areas: Consider adding language that explains the importance of protecting land used for freight that is adjacent to rail and waterway transportation facilities. This is discussed in the PSRC document mentioned above.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on Seattle's Periodic update. Please contact me or Leah Bolotin if you wish to discuss any of these comments.

Sincerely,

Charles Prestrud
Manager, Sno-King Planning Office

cc: Tom Hauger, Seattle DPD
Kevin O'Neill, SDOT
Paul Inghram, PSRC
Yorik Stevens-Wajda, PSRC
Commerce Review Team

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Thomas Wasserman

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

To Whom it may concern,
As a home homeowner on McClellan, I am very much opposed to the proposed expansion of the North Rainier Urban Village into the Mount Baker residential neighborhood, and into the hillside adjacent to Cheasty Greenspace.
There is plenty of existing empty space inside the existing urban village area without expanding into the historic neighborhood. Do not give any more of our city over to developers at the expense of families and family home.
Thank you for your consideration.
Thomas Wasserman

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Bryan Kirschner

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

We are writing to provide our comments on the draft comprehensive plan.
First, we strongly endorse the making a variety of housing options possible within single-family zones. Many of Seattle's older neighborhoods were built with a mixture of duplexes, triplexes, and row houses mixed among single family detached homes.
Allowing this city-wide is pro-affordability and pro-environment.
Second, we strongly endorse taking a holistic rather than narrow view of "displacement." To focus "displacement" solely on where disadvantaged or minority citizens are concentrated now will simply reinforce the legacy of exclusionary zoning, redlining, and racial convenants that still largely define where people live within the city today. The city's policy should be about enabling a diverse population to live throughout the city.
Goals for "non-displacement" from the city should encompass reducing the concentration of poor and minority residents in some neighborhoods and their near total exclusion from other, both of which are a direct legacy of racial and class animus.
Best regards
Bryan Kirschner
Holly Ferguson

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Pat Bliquez

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I moved into my modest bungalow in Wallingford 45 years ago from San Francisco. It has met my family's needs well when we were parents of small children, and now its location next to busses and services is serving me well as a senior. I am concerned that I and my neighbors (all of whom live in small

houses on small lots) will lose their precious share of sunlight and green space to development. I am opposed to the diminishment of single family zoning. "Single family" has made my neighborhood a great place for families and mixed ages and incomes for decades. It works!

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Holly Krejci

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Dear Mayor Murray:

As a resident of Georgetown, I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed Industrial Land Amendments to the City of Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

I strongly oppose the unwarranted removal of the IC zone and am equally concerned about the lack of dialogue, outreach and engagement with a broad range of affected stakeholders prior to this recommendation, including Georgetown residents.

Industrial Commercial (IC) land exists as a natural buffer between IG-zoned land and other less restrictive zones. In the case of our neighborhood, the IC zoned land provides a critical buffer between industry and residents. As such, maintaining this flexibility is essential to the health and well-being of people who live in Georgetown.

The complete removal of the IC zone from the city's land use code is extreme and not warranted. IG zoned land is robustly protected from encroachment by non-industrial uses and IC zoned land is not being inconsistent with the current code.

I am also concerned about the lack of outreach associated with the Department of Planning and Development studies that lead up to this recommendation. The November 2013 Duwamish M/IC Policy and Land Use Study did not include outreach to Georgetown residents. Recommendations from these plans were then advanced by staff into the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendment process as a fait accompli.

Some have argued that this work was predicated as part of the Arena Co. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Seattle and King County. I feel it is unfair to consider trading the health of our residents and the vitality of our neighborhood in exchange for an arena in SODO.

Before sweeping recommendations are advanced, let's bring balance and fair representation to industrial land policy direction. Please provide opportunity to truly examine the uniqueness of Georgetown as a whole, and other industrial areas such as Ballard and InterBay.
I ask you to not move ahead with the proposed restrictions on industrial development from the Comprehensive Plan. Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Holly Krejci
Georgetown resident since 2003

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Georgetown Community Council Board of Directors,Holly Krejci

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Economic Development, Environment, Land Use

Comment:

Please see the attached letter from the Georgetown Community Council Board of Directors regarding the proposed industrial land amendments to the 2035 Comp Plan.
Thank you.
--
November 20, 2015
Hon. Edward Murray
Seattle City Hall
Dear Mayor Murray:
We're writing to once again express our great concern about the proposed Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendments that impact Seattle's industrial land.
As residents who live in a sea of industry, any change in industrial zoning affects our quality of life. In addition to the concerns we shared with you in our June 18, 2015 letter, we'd like to address the core values of the Comprehensive Plan and how they relate to our neighborhood.
Community - developing strong connections between a diverse range of people and places. Georgetown is a neighborhood that is home to a diverse community of people and businesses. The broad stroke, one-size-fits-all approach to industrial lands fails to take into account the aspects that make our neighborhood unique. The residential community was shut-out of the stakeholder process for the industrial land study that helped shape the staff recommendations for the Comp Plan. As a result, this perspective is not represented in the current comp plan amendments.
Environmental Stewardship - protect and improve the quality of our global and local natural environment. Improving our environmental surroundings has been a priority for years. We combat air, water and noise pollution every day. The Comp Plan provides us an opportunity to have different conversation about environments, to re-examine our green policies and the ban of open space in our industrial areas. Let's revisit urban canopy goals. Georgetown has the smallest canopy and the most need, yet current city policies prevent us from making noticeable increases. Include 1:1 tree replacement and require landscaping requirements for all businesses, even industry.
Economic Opportunity and Security - a strong economy and a pathway to employment is fundamental to maintaining our quality of life. We support a strong economy, and living wage jobs. However, profits to industry should not come at the expense of quality of life for residents and workers. Georgetown is an excellent example of a mixed-use community. We have an opportunity to be a national model. However, the success of the relationship between industry and residents depends on a stakeholder process that involves a broad range of voices.
Social Equity - limited resources and opportunities must be shared; and the inclusion of under-represented communities in decision-making processes is necessary. Clean air and water should be a right no matter where you can afford to make your home. Residents of Georgetown have a life expectancy that is 10 years shorter than our neighbors just two miles away. Industrial Commercial (IC) zoning provides opportunity to create meaningful buffers between industry and residents. Eliminating this designation, as proposed in the current draft Comp Plan, would preclude future land uses in Seattle's industrial border areas and thus eliminate flexibility in providing means to address health disparity and social equity issues.
We ask that you consider the long term affect the Comp Plan will have on the health and vitality of our community. We ask that you not trade the character of our neighborhood in exchange for an arena in

SODO. And finally, we ask that you consider excluding all of Georgetown from the proposed industrial comp plan amendments.
Sincerely,
The Georgetown Community Council Board of Directors
cc: 2035@seattle.gov Kate Joncas, Deputy Mayor, City of Seattle Diane Sugimura, Director, Seattle Department of Planning & Development Bruce Harrell, Seattle City Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Seattle City Councilmember Sally Bagshaw, Seattle City Councilmember Tim Burgess, Seattle City Councilmember Kshama Sawant, Seattle City Councilmember Sara Belz, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Mayor Steve Lee, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Mayor

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Talis Abolins

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Hello,
I'd like to add some additional information for your request for comments on the possibility of an expanded North Rainier Urban Village. The original plan was developed with broad community input, and remains a powerful but unfulfilled vision for focused development within the existing village boundaries, plus preservation of the supportive historic neighborhoods and the ring of green.
Page one of the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan remains true today:
"[T]he community sits at the crossroads of the future regional light rail system, and must grapple with how to ensure its sensitive and compatible interface with the North Rainier Community. The recommended actions, goals and policies of this plan seek to provide the framework for tackling these issues.
Through the hard work and partnerships of the North Rainier Planning Committee, its project staff and consultants, the Seattle Neighborhood Planning Office, AND MOST IMPORTANTLY THE MEMBERS OF THE NORTH RAINIER RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNITIES, this plan has been developed to serve as North Rainier's blue print for a viable and vibrant future." (emphasis supplied)
Urban village expansion should certainly be considered, but it should be considered in light of local needs and conditions, and the potential for disruption to the local community. Rezones of stable neighborhoods can be divisive and counter-productive to the fabric of our community. There are places where the benefits outweigh the cons, but there are also villages where the cons outweigh the needs / benefits for expansion.
The existing North Rainier Urban Village is among the most underdeveloped villages on the Light Link line. The adjacent areas proposed for rezone are recognized nationally as historic in nature, and recognized in neighborhood planning documents as in need of preservation. The City actually loaned money to residents for that purpose, and Victor Steinbrueck documented the unique and important values of the residential design adjacent to the Olmsted Boulevards.
The solution is not to expand villages everywhere, without consideration of local conditions. A healthy and balanced approach is to focus expansion of upzones and density in a thoughtful way, consistent with our community's original plan. Our North Rainier Neighborhood Plan was a vehicle for our community to express their voice, collectively. They did so, loudly and clearly, after a major outreach effort by the City.
The first attached picture shows what the residents wanted, after a massive public process that involved lots of intelligent citizens from all walks of life. They wanted affordable housing, and they wanted to retain the valuable asset that is described in my original notes on this subject. Today, as yesterday, the

undeveloped valley floor is a grand opportunity for developers and for affordable housing -- the Neighborhood Plan seeks to fill that floor with affordability, density and equity. Then and now, our community wants the focus to be within the existing North Rainier urban village boundaries -- a blank slate of undeveloped land when compared to other villages.
So a sensible solution is not to focus on a mantra of expansion everywhere, but to actually look before we leap. To actually consider the vision that the City worked so hard to develop through an inclusive process.
The "Grand Bargain" between real estate developers and affordable housing advocates has achieved many excellent ideas that can and are being implemented throughout the City. But one of the most apt criticisms of this grand bargain is that it was negotiated largely behind closed doors, and left out a major and important group of citizens -- the vast number of caring and intelligent residents who care about their single family neighborhoods. Should there be compromise? Certainly. But unlike our neighborhood planning process that the City provided outreach for, the Grand Bargain left many stakeholders and village voices out of the room. The real estate industry was very well represented. But there was a reason the Mayor drew the line on the approach to single family zones -- because the HALA group lost its way with a divisive tone, and some proposals which lacked a true balance of important values shared by a vast segment of our residential population. The tone of this "Grand Bargain" was not as inclusive as it should have been in certain areas. The Mayor saw what happened -- preserving most of the good work, but recognizing this is a City where neighborhoods matter more than bargains between well funded real estate interests in closed rooms.
So now many of the residents of North Rainier are suddenly aware of a new expanded rezone -- just when they thought the trauma of the last rezone was over. Some old wounds are being opened, in a community that was truly starting to gel and develop stakeholder consensus. This divisive proposal is a bad idea. This is a democratic process, and ALL voices of the community should be heard on the subject. Does our community really want and need expansion of an existing Village that is still full of areas that lack any housing at all? No.
Please keep the focus on the spaces within our underdeveloped Village -- the spaces around the Link station. There is no justification to chunk away at the neighborhood this community specifically said to preserve. There is plenty of room down there for the developers, and that is where we all want the affordability to go. In North Rainier, I think it is an unnecessarily extreme and divisive position to reject the community's balanced vision.
Thank you for your consideration of a balance approach, that respects the original plan developed through the City's more inclusive outreach process.
Talis Abolins

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Ken Mostow

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

See attached comments. Please acknowledge receipt and inclusion.
--
Kenneth L. Mostow
Seattle Department of Planning and Development December 20, 2015
Attn: Seattle 2035
Transmitted by electronic mail to 2035@seattle.gov
Re: Proposed Inclusion of part of Mount Baker into the North Rainier Urban Village

Dear Department of Planning and Development:
I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed inclusion of a substantial part of Mount Baker into the North Rainier Hub Urban Village. In fact, as the elected representative of a substantial number of folks in that portion, I am deeply offended by the proposal.
As the Democratic Precinct Officer of Precinct 37-1934, I represent some 676 voters who live in the expansion area. From MLK to 33rd S, from Bayview to Walden, plus the Gale Street Apartments. These are the folks who would be most impacted by the change.
I know my neighbors. I have walked my precinct each election cycle for well over 20 years. We're mostly middle class working folks, not the at all the wealthy part of Mount Baker further east. We are mostly the kind of folks who are too busy to attend government meetings and turned off by them anyhow. But that does not mean that we are not politically and civically active. We have the highest voter turnout of any precinct in the 37th District. We raise our kids and are involved in the schools, the Mount Baker Community Club, local charities.
We are mostly the middle class working folks of Seattle, living in apartments, townhomes, and single family homes. We are precisely the folks that we need to keep in Seattle as it expands. And we are the folks most impacted by the change.
We have not been contacted about this proposed change. I'll bet most are unaware of it. We learn about it from a neighbor's posting on the web, not from the City government itself. We are deeply offended and demand that there be individual notification, distribution of information, and solicitation of input of us before any change is even considered. You must consider the impact upon us and our adjacent neighbors before acting.
There has been talk of fancy plans for the QFC/Rite Aid site and the Lowe's/Amazon site, and even of some transportation tweaks to the Rainier/MLK/McClelland intersection. But I'll bet that when you get out here, you'll find out that not even 5 percent of the residents know of this future rezoning proposal. Because there hasn't been a full neighborhood discussion of this change, I can't speak for all of my neighbors at this time.
But I can express what I think. To adopt it would be a big, fat, mistake. To put this section of Mount Baker into the North Rainier Hub Urban Village would be to consider more dense uses for this residential housing community. Rezoning would mean that our homes could be aggregated, could be bulldozed, could be changed into something different than what it is now. This little bit of an economically and socially diverse community would be changed into an upper middle class and upper class professional community. A community of new residents and new workers that would be comfortable living tucked under the more affluent community up the hill.

To me, this is a machination of developers and city planners to grab up land adjacent to affluent professionals higher up the hill in Mount Baker, eliminate the less affluent diverse folks now living there, and develop it for many more affluent "professionals". I don't think that it is any secret that many of the affluent class living in this region, and moving into this region, are not comfortable, have not been raised in the diverse multicultural, and, excuse me for saying it, multicolored rainbow that we in this area are so proud of.
There are reasons that the North Rainier Comprehensive Plan of the 1990s and the coming of a light rail station connected to downtown has not resulted in an economic boom for our area. In fact, very little nongovernment development has occurred in the past 20 years.
The community of North Rainier has plenty, plenty of available, developable space within a 10 minute walk of the light rail station. And much, much more within say 15-20 minutes. As examples, Chubby and Tubby, the side car factory, the other gas station at MLK and McClelland, now the bowling alley, all sit vacant. In addition, there is plenty of property nearby not being put to anywhere near a decent use.
I say that the City of Seattle should first tackle the development of the vacant and underused property

within the existing North Rainier Hub. When it is successfully renewed, and economically vibrant, then come to us looking for more dense uses of our proud diverse community.
I have run out of time to write these comments, so please excuse the lack of editing and errors.
Sincerely,
Kenneth L. Mostow

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Nature Alliance

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

Dear Seattle City Councilmembers, Mayor Ed Murray, Patrice Carroll, Tom Hauger, Seattle 2035 Group:

As advocates for preserving our city's precious wild natural areas to improve the quality of life for future generations of all Seattle citizens, we appreciate the incredibly thoughtful insights the Seattle Green Spaces Coalition has offered on the 2035 Plan. The Seattle Nature Alliance Alliance enthusiastically supports their commentary, suggestions, and their recommendations.

Sincerely,
Seattle Nature Alliance
Directors: Denise Dahn, Mark Ahlness, and Rebecca Watson
On Fri, Nov 20, 2015 at 12:00 PM, Elaine Ike wrote:

Dear Seattle City Councilmembers, Mayor Ed Murray, Patrice Carroll, Tom Hauger, Seattle 2035 Group:

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition thanks the 2035 group for extending the comment period through November 20, 2015, allowing us to have a more comprehensive and specific response to 2035. For the past 3 years our coalition has been focused on concerns of areas that should be covered by the proposed plan, particularly in the valuing, preservation and incorporation of green infrastructure for the health of Seattle's residents and the continued livability of our home.

We thank you for your consideration of the SGSC's comments and hope you will include them in the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan update.

Sincerely,

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Judy Bendich

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Dear Person:

Although I had previously submitted a comment, it was without the benefit of oral presentations from

City staff. I have now attended two presentations, one at the Ravenna Bryant Community Association (RCBA) and the second at North Seattle Community College. At the RCBA the City presenter said that (1) the "draft" was really a "draft," that citizen and community input could cause the Department to change the "draft;" (2) inclusion of the dashed line parts of the Ravenna community was due exclusively to an algorithm that allegedly factored in topology to determine a 10-minute walk to the pending light-rail station, and that algorithm would be tested by real people on the ground walking from the various points on the map to verify whether it was really 10 minutes from even the furthest point; and (3) Ravenna/Cowen Parks were included to count as "green space" for the "urban village," and when it was pointed out that the "green space" is intended to be within the densest core in order to make the core of the urban village livable and people-friendly (such as mini parks, small play grounds, open street spaces for pedestrians and public events, etc.), the City presenter said that there was too little money and much competition for "green space" dollars and that is why the 100-year-old parks are included – to meet the acreage requirement for "green space."

I have now been informed that the first two of these statements are false or misleading. The third, the inclusion of the parks, does not comply with the comprehensive plan goals for "green space" within the dense urban village, but is a ruse to get around the plan's stated objective. Including Ravenna/Cowen Park acreage has no other purpose than to meet the "green space" acreage requirement, and absolve the City from mandating "green space" where the densest housing is. This is duplicitous, and our public servants have at least been honest enough to acknowledge that in their oral presentations.

Apparently, the City department personnel now say they cannot change the "draft" – despite citizen and community opposition – and any changes must be made by the Mayor or City Council. Why tell us that our voices make a difference to the "draft" when that is not true? The RCBA voted to oppose the dashed lines, and 100 or more homeowners within the dashed lines, who signed a petition, opposed the dashed lines. Now, we are told we and RCBA make no difference. This is precisely what breeds cynicism when dealing with the City. Second, is it really true that real people will/have actually walked (at a normal pace) to test the algorithm? Please provide the data and the results.

More fundamentally, the premises are incorrect, and whether an area is within or without a 10-minute walk is really not the point. The point is the housing density and livable housing for families. The Roosevelt/Green Lake/Ravenna neighborhoods have or will soon exceed the 2035 density levels for an urban village – well before 2035. Therefore, why should an additional area in Ravenna be included at all in the "urban village"? This is a fundamental question that underlies all the assumptions, and it is one the City has totally ignored.

Second, why displace and tear down original residences that have historical character? The oldest home on my block dates from 1906 or 1908 and the youngest from 1927. Every home is different. Why does it matter? What matters is that those who live here truly care about their neighborhood. I previously wrote about a few of the neighborhood activities that make this area unique. The second reason it really matters is to avoid land speculation - that in no way fosters additional affordable homes. Homes on my block are now in the million dollar sale range. (These used to be working class homes for families. Now these are limited to families with high incomes or re-investment from sales of other homes.) There is no way any builder could turn these properties into any affordable housing except with huge apartment buildings. What a speculator dreams of is to buy a lot or double lot, ignore the historical value (plaster and lath construction, leaded windows, etc.), let the building decay (just look at Sisley, our neighborhood slum landlord), and convert it into two or three condo units and sell each for at one million or more dollars. Or maybe, following the Sisley model, let the houses decay to force the

neighbors to leave. None of these scenarios – which are real probabilities if the dashed lines go into effect – in any way advances the City's goal to have livable and affordable neighborhoods.

What has worked in this neighborhood is to have mother-in-law apartments and garage conversions. There are quite a few of them. These permit affordable spaces and good neighbors.

I hope I am proven wrong and the City department actually removes the dashed lines from the "draft."

Sincerely,

Judith E. Bendich

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Marc Singer

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Greetings,
We are residents of the University District. We understand that there is a proposal to expand the urban village zone around the 65th street / Roosevelt station of the Link Light Rail. Based on the proposed expansion, our home will not be in the enlarged zone. Even so, we do not agree with the proposal.
Imagine that you were told that the highway needs to be widened to accommodate more traffic and imagine that, in principle, you agree that this is necessary for the growth of the region. Yet, when you see the result you find that the road has been widened, but there are no longer lanes on the highway, the guardrails have all been removed, and the signs are now written in Latin. So, while you agree that the idea of highway expansion is a good idea, the execution is giving you reason to doubt the integrity of the people managing the process. This is how we feel about the growth management in Seattle. We understand that the region is growing. Yet we are finding that the results are inconsistent with the way the plan is sold. For example, look at page 17 of the 2035 Draft Plan Open House presentation. The picture shows about a dozen or so people at 'Event time'. I'm sure that the authors were sincere in their intention, but to anyone who has attended an event at one of the stadiums knows 'Event time' is usually a thick crowd of people that fills the street and sidewalks. Or more pointedly, there is the picture on page 14 showing what is supposed to be the outcome of increasing density in our neighborhoods. This image is, to be blunt, a fatuous fabrication. The distance between homes, the width of the parking strip and sidewalks, and even the heights of the new buildings bears no resemblance to what we're seeing in neighborhoods that have been upzoned.
The development we're getting in our neighborhoods isn't smart. New projects are dominated by what makes developers the most money and the highest 'yield'. In neighborhoods like the U District, some projects actually reduce density by replacing homes of eight bedrooms with four or five individual town-homes. There is a building that was built in Ballard that is fewer than five feet from the neighbors house--how can we ignore fire-safety rules? And, how can anyone trust that the development is being managed when we see these kinds of results? Don't expand the Urban Village zones until the zoning and development rules are updated to prevent more development disasters like the ones we've already seen.
Marc Singer and Family.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Jan Brucker

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Housing

Comment:

OVERALL
This document, in many places, appears to be a simple inventory of existing facilities and programs, and offers little/no insight or information to the public regarding any future plan(s). Thus, this does not appear to address either the spirit or the letter of the requirements of the Growth Management Act [GMA].
HOUSING
The Appendix documents fail to acknowledge the existence of the Aurora-Licton Urban Village, and thus fail to account for either existing housing [all categories] as well as capacity for future housing [all categories]. To the extent the ALUV was intended to be covered in the "Aggregate" category, this is insufficient and inadequate to inform citizens or others as to actual housing by category or future projections. This does not meet or satisfy GMA requirements.
This document fails as support for the housing and zoning modifications included in the HALA ordinance passed by the City Council on Monday, November 16, 2015.
FACILITIES
The document lists City facilities, and notes as to functions. However, only the section submitted by Seattle Public Schools, which is not an arm or City Government, included a Forecast of Future needs. There is insufficient information in this draft comprehensive plan upon which to support any findings in the Draft EIS as to impacts based upon existing City Facilities, let alone any modification or expansion of facilities.
The flat conclusion/statement "[o]verall, fire, police, library facilities, parks and schools are sufficient to accommodate expected 20 year growth" lacks any analysis or explanation. In the sections where some changes are apparently contemplated, simple words such as "development," "relocation," "replacement," and "expansion" are vague and are not supported by any explanation whatsoever as to why any "relocation" etc, is appropriate or when such is expected to occur. [Section J Potential Future Discretionary Projects].
While the appendix documents contain forecasts for an increase in residential housing units, there is no corresponding assessment to the adequacy of parks, community centers, libraries, etc. in the current urban villages nor is there any credible forecast or plan to meet the needs in urban villages for additional facilities to meet the growth forecasts.
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ELEMENT
I endorse the citizen initiated Community Involvement Element and urge its inclusion in the final 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Laurelhurst Community Club,Jeannie Hale

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Hi DPD and Councilmembers,
Attached and pasted below are comments from Laurelhurst on the proposed Comp Plan changes. We hope you will consider our views.

Colleen and Jeannie
--
Laurelhurst Community Club
Serving Seattle's Laurelhurst Community since 1920
November 20, 2015
Seattle Department of Planning and Development
Attention: Seattle 2035
Re: Comments on Seattle 2035

The Laurelhurst Community Club (LCC) commends the efforts of the City of Seattle to plan for the accelerated growth in population anticipated over the next 20 years. Preparing for good solutions for housing, schools, commercial services, open and park greenspace, and the supporting transportation infrastructure will require active collaboration of citizens from all affected types of residents and governmental agencies to make it successful.

LCC has attended the Seattle 2035 Open House, and reviewed the proposals. The future land use map (FLUM) has many proposed goals and also underlying changes that support the goals, yet many the actually undermine the stated goals.

In order to balance city growth, and retain what makes Seattle such a desirable place to live and work, some of the proposed changes are too damaging to the liveability and quality of life of the city and should be struck from the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Laurelhurst Community Club agrees with many of the stated goals in the 2035 growth plan, yet many of the codes are then followed by loopholes which will undermine such goals.

LCC recommends the following changes and comments:

1. In section on "Uses", page 39, it states, "regulating land uses provides predictability about how an area will evolve over time, which is necessary to support neighborhood stability." LCC agrees, and yet the "policies" state: LU2.1 "Generally allow for a broad mix of compatible uses in those zones that allow the greatest densities of development." This can leave a loophole, or catch all for exceptions. This sentence should be stricken.

2. Under "Special Uses: Public Facilities and Small Institutions" (pages 40-41): The "goal" is to allow public facilities and small institutions to locate where they are generally compatible with the function, character and scale of the area, even if some deviation from certain regulations is necessary"

- Under "policies", LCC applauds LU3.1, LU3.3, LU3.4, LU3.5, and LU3.6 in requiring these types of buildings to be well integrated into local communities.
- LCC objects to LU3.2 which gives wide latitude and a "free pass" that development can use to waive away compatibility requirements. We request that LU3.2 be stricken, or changed.
- In regard to LU3.7, the repurposing of surplus schools, LCC recommends the formation of a citizen's advisory committee be required as a formal process to allow any use change.

3. LCC agrees with the goals and policies on the Telecommunication Facilities, and applauds the firm stance to keep them out of residential areas. (LU4.5).

4. Land Use "General Development Standards" (Page 43): LCC supports the Seattle 2035's statement "The City uses development standards to ensure that new development is in keeping with the existing and planned character of a neighborhood, and that it accounts for physical and environmental constraints."

LCC also supports the stated goal: "Maintain development standards that guide building design to serve each zone's function and produce the scale and character desired." However, LU5.1 "Allow for flexibility in developmental standards"....provides for development that undermines the above worthy goals, and should be stricken from the Seattle 2035 comp plan.

The other codes do support the overarching goal, such as LU5. 2, through LU 5.16, and are excellent inclusions in the land use code which maintain and enhance the quality of life in the city.

Proposed code LU5.17 (page 45) is not clear in its implementation, and leaves open loopholes too large for developers. The policy is too vague as written, and can allow a wide variation of underlying code or zoning to be wiped away for a non-specific incentive.
LCC supports landmark preservation, and mitigating increased density, but this policy should be separate for both issues, and written with specific allowances.
Policy LU5.19 is definitely on target to help prevent some poor quality of development that Seattle has experienced in the past 15 years. The policy does not state the mechanics of how a design review process will be part of the land use process. LCC is very supportive of this policy, and would like to see it imbedded as a process more clearly in this policy.
5. Off Street Parking: The Laurelhurst Community Club supports the use of transit and other transportation modes, but also recognizes that transport for some businesses, outlying job locations, job mobility requirements, parents' trips for children to/from daycare or schools, runs for heavy groceries, access to non-transit served (or if you are actively ill) healthcare appointments, etc., also require that the City plan to accommodate the use of and some parking and use of personal vehicles.
The goals of LUG6 to reduce the reliance on automobiles are lofty, and LCC generally supports it.

- With respect to Seattle 2035, and the concurrent social justice goal of having Seattle grow to accommodate a wide range diversity of income levels, family types, etc., some of the policies to squeeze out parking actually will create an unfair burden on lower income families.
- Many small business owners and employees, the backbone of our City, rely on use of their personal vehicle to deliver services. For example, tools for builders, housecleaners, dog walkers, etc. need to be transported by vehicles and to various daily locations.
- Seattle 2035 need to provide for more growth in all transportation modes policies to be consistent with it’s strive to provide housing and jobs for a diverse economy. More residents will bring in more vehicles, and we are short sighted not to plan for that as well as transit and bikes.
- Specifically, LU6.1 is not balanced for a very large and diverse city. Promoting economic development and also reducing parking may not work. In policy sections LU6.2, LU6.3, LU6.4, LU6.5, LU6.6, LU6.7, LU6.8, LU6.9., LCC requests that the policy be re-written to include both citizen and business community involvement for imposing changes on existing parking requirements. The impacts on the elderly, lower income families, and the local small businesses must be considered, such as in LU6.10, but with more specifics.
- The other policies LU6.10, LU6.11 coop spaces do not work well, and one business will benefit while the other loses customers who drive past seeing no parking.
- For businesses, especially restaurants, they operate when transit stops running. It is important that they have some parking available for potential customers of other Seattle neighborhoods. (e.g. it is nearly impossible to dine now on Capital Hill-no bus, and no parking)
- The policy LU6.13 the concept of retaining open space maximum is a good one. However, transit does not serve parks well, and has limited operating hours, especially on weekends, holidays and evening hours. Thus, this policy must be mindful that some sports fields for our youth are located in the parks, and parking for families is very important. We want to encourage citizens to use parks, not penalize people by not allocating adequate parking for all ages of walkers, families using the playgrounds, youth and adults using fields, dog walkers, and nature wanderers. Seniors will not use the parks if some parking is not available, and that is discriminatory, so Seattle2035 must maintain access to parklands for all.
- Policy LU6.15 Stand alone park n ride should be explored to multi use with other entities. Having some parking will encourage transit use, and the city should encourage businesses, or institutions nearby transit hubs to allocate some parking for this purpose. The city might grant a tax reduction (like developers of low income housimng) for providing this for transit users, parking is a bonus underground for the city as well.

- LCC opposes the deletion of goals LUG6, LUG6.1, and TG17 and policies LU20, LU49, LU, LU50, T-39, T-40, and T-46 that currently direct that parking policies “account for local objectives,” recognize parking as a part of “moving people and goods,” consider “access to local businesses,” “parking spillover into residential areas,” and “truck access and loading,” and not “introduce serious safety problems or blighting influences” but rather “achieve vitality of urban centers and urban villages” and “preserve Seattle’s competitive position in the region.” While deleting those goals and policies, the Comp Plan “update” would introduce two new policies: LU63 to “rely on market forces” for onsite parking and T40 to give higher priority to “greening” over “storage” (the City’s new negative term for parking) in the allocation of street space. LCC asks that you restore the deletions.

6. Incentives: The goal of LUG7 reflects the emphasis on providing new housing at the expense of impacts on existing urban neighborhoods. Many urban villages and centers have already achieved targeted growth. In adding to that density unless the measures such as providing open space or "other community resources" is spelled out, it will not happen.

For proposed LU7.2., LCC would ask that the comp plan add specific language to ensure that open space component is actually built out with each project, and that cumulative effects be allocated to each development, so they all do not go "under the radar" to provide such amenity.

7. Land Use Areas: The definitions include "single family areas in different parts of the city developed at different times with distinct character that may be defined by a particular architectural style or a unique relationship to their surroundings"

In the goals (page50) for detached single family, it adds "Provide single family and other compatible housing options"... This language should be struck as this wording automatically undermines the "single family" character. Single family residential is just that, not any given "mix" of types of housing. Seattle is well known across the country for those neighborhoods where residents of any economic or social background can actually live in a single family home, and not share walls, with the savings that have accumulated.

Restore land use codes LU59 and LU60 which define and protect single family zoning. At the Open House in the Rainier Valley on November 7, 2015, several local residents expressed opposition to the changes of their single family zones. Their homes were something that they aspired to with financial and sweat equity. Further, the point was made that sf homes often house adults, young adults in transition (broke from being students), seniors who cannot live alone, and/or perhaps another family friend or student renter. Thus, in fact within the single family structure, one single family structure provides housing for three households. Retaining the set backs, yards and character of such sf zones make it workable with extra breathing room for those residents, and perhaps an attic room, and kitchen garden, and a place for their children to exercise in their yard.

8. The same reasoning follows that the City must restore LU 1, LU5, LU 76 and LU 164 that direct any conditional use changes, reflecting community preference, and require any change to be consistent with neighborhood plans. Use changes to properties adjacent sf zones will only be in character and successful with a collaborative neighborhood public process, and not "back door" deals with developers who have no stake in its outcome, except profitability, and such changes cannot be reversed.

LU.8.1 Designate as single family residential areas those portions of the city that are predominantly developed with single family houses that are large enough to maintain a consistent residential character of low height, bulk and scale over several blocks." However, LU8.2 includes the working "respond to neighborhood plans for redevelopment or infill. but allows for a greater range of housing types". Laurelhurst Community Club requests that this be deleted, as it essentially is a free pass key for developers to add non- single family residents or undersized lot development which is opposite of LU8.1 designed to establish the single family residential zone.

LU8.4 Recognizes the single family zone as the principal use, and LCC agrees with that statement, but opposes policies such as LU8.5, LU8.9 and LU8. 11 which undermine that type of land use zone.

Policy LU8.9 is especially disturbing as it allows below standard lot sizes to be inserted into existing single family neighborhoods based on outdated historic lots that are no longer used. Developers troll these records to find a way to wedge in a "tall skinny house", opposed by all Seattle neighborhoods, which actually destroy the intent of LU8.1. Thus, LU8.9 cannot be included in the comprehensive plan as it does not support the stated land use goal.
LU8.11 Permitting of non conforming developments by City Council or "conditional use" approval gives another loophole that can destroy the intent of the land use code stated in LU8.4. This policy should be eliminated from the proposed plan.
LU8.5 Allowing developments of any residential structure should be struck as well. It can destroy well planned set back requirements and protections for open and green spaces that necessarily make the single family zones livable.
9. In order to retain some liveability with relationship of the built environment to the relief of open space, view corridors and fresh air, LCC requests that LU81 be retained to maintain that balance, and enforces the respectful adjacencies of building heights. Without this regulation, a domino effect occurs, and creates an unfair burden on the code compliant height dwellings to continue to "top off", when most cannot afford to do so.
10. Seattle's tree canopy preservation and enhancement seems to be abandoned in the 2035 goals for the City. The Urban Forest Management Plan's 5 year Implemention Strategy parallels Seattle 2035 growth plan, and targets a comprehensive strategy for increasing the urban canopy to 30% coverage in 30 years. Seattle's trees provide environmental and social benefits and enhance the liveability of the city. Trees and plants absorb global warming pollution, provide habitat for wildlife, clean the air and waters, lessen impacts of storms by absorbing rainwater, calm traffic and improve the walkability of our neighborhoods.
The priorities stated include the following in regard to the critical tree canopy on private property, which now holds the majority of the City's trees. Page 12 of the report states:
"The urban forest occurs primarily on private property and therefore is sutainable when the community values trees and is engaged in planning, preserving planting and caring for them"
Priorities include:
"Improve regulations to encourage tree preservation and protection on private property, and on the right of way.
"Provide additional incentives for tree planting focusing on single family residential zones especially in neighborhoods with lower tree canopy cover."
The Laurelhurst Community Club asks that the 2035 Comprehensive Plan look to add back the zoning and tree policies which will strengthen the Urban Canopy as the city grows into 2035 with concurrent health and liveablity.
11. Urban boundaries: LCC opposes expanding the existing boundaries of the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village. We believe that the current boundaries are most appropriate as the neighborhoods in the area grow and continue to absorb increased density.
12. Multi family Residential: The policies and goals appear to be compatible and LCC agrees with those provisions.
13. Commercial/Mixed Use: LCC generally agrees with most of these goals and policies.
14. Industrial Areas: LCC supports the goal, and especially LU11.11 which proposes landscaping and installing street trees for screening to offset visual impacts. LCC also supports height restrictions of LU11.20 for a reasonable transition to neighboring zones.
15. Downtown areas: LCC supports the goals and plan to establish a Master Plan Community. Retaining open space and view corridors should be considered in the Master Plan.
16. Major Institutions: The stated goal "Encourage the benefits that major institutions offer the city..., while minimizing the adverse impacts associated with development and geographic expansion". -The

policy LU14.3 which establishes using only the institution's master plan instead of underlying zoning is a one-sided policy, and LCC requests that this be stricken, and zoning should be also shown. Using both overlays demonstrates the impacts on neighboring areas to be shown accurately.

- LU14.14 LCC suggests that community involvement to be "required" and not "encouraged" as it currently states. If "encouraged" only, the major institution will not do it.
- LU14.6 undermines the goal of compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and should be stricken. "Allow the MIO to modify underlying zoning provisions and development standards are a gift to any major institution, and allow them to basically do whatever they want.
- LCC strongly requests that LU14.6 be eliminated from the Comprehensive 2035 Plan.
- LU14.15 This policy should be stronger, perhaps stating that demolition of existing housing will not be allowed. The affordable housing stock is so limited, and major institutions have no right to demolish it. Major Institutions can always find another way to expand.
- LU14.16 This is the real requirement for community involvement so LU15.14 should be stricken (see above note).

17. Stadium District: LCC generally concurs with the goal and policies.
18. Unwarranted deletions that protect sustainability and livability are either weakened or entirely deleted. Please restore the proposed deletions below:

- Deletes policy LU11: “In order to maintain the character of Seattle’s neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of the Plan.”
- Deletes policy LU34: “Limit the maximum amount of lot area covered by a structure to maintain compatibility with the scale and character of an area, to provide an adequate proportion of open area on a site relative to the area occupied by structures, and to provide occupants with sufficient access to light and air, as appropriate to the intended character and use of an area.”
- Deletes policy LU39 to “preserve and enhance the City’s physical and aesthetic character and environment by preventing untimely and indiscriminate removal or destruction of trees” and to provide incentives to property owners for tree retention; and deletes policy UV39 to enhance the tree canopy and understory in urban villages.
- Deletes policy LU81: “Limit building heights to establish maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent buildings, and limit view blockage.”
- Deletes policies LU1, LU5, LU76, LU164 that currently direct that zoning, rezoning, and conditional use changes reflect community preferences, and be consistent with neighborhood plans.

18: Environmentally Critical Areas: LCC agrees with the goal to protect the environment, especially wetlands and public health. The policies are excellent, but LCC notes that LU17.3 to "Allow adjustments of development standards..." is not consistent with the goal, allows a "back door" for potentially harmful impacts on these environmentally fragile areas and should be stricken.

Thank you for your attention in integrating the comments of the Laurelhurst Community Club, and we offer to work with you in any of our proposed changes to the 2035 comprehensive plan.

Sincerely,

Colleen McAleer Jeannie Hale
Vice President and Land Use Committee President

cc: City Councilmembers; Diane Sugimura

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Bonnie Williams

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

2035 plan needs more neighborhood involvement from wallingford residents as changing away from single family zoning is a mistake to allow rentals to dominate. Current permits issued to current construction, businesses are underestimatiare allowing them to build with inadequate parking forcing homeownners to pay thru rpzones.
This plan for apodments,apts. businesses without on site parking is failing. we need to retain single family zones.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: David Kopacz

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

My specific comments are about 1) community engagement, 2) health and safety, 3) land use, 4) transportation and 5) administration:
1)
ENGAGEMENT.

-- Planning for community involvement has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that community involvement applies to ALL aspects of the planning and budgeting, then this clarification has not occurred. The appearance instead is of a Comprehensive Plan that claims "community" as a theme, yet has no place for community.
Add a Community Involvement chapter that is at least as good as Portland's.

-- Employ a communications specialist to address, and report on communication shortcomings in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal.
Eliminate use of the term "storage" when the word that diverse people would understand is "parking".

2)
HEALTH & SAFETY.

-- Because of the many benefits that street trees provide to both property owners and the general public, encourage the preservation or planting of street trees as development occurs, except in locations where it is not possible to meet City standards intended to preserve public safety and utility networks.
REF: LU41, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage.
REF: E24, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.
3)
LAND USE

-- Do not advance a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) that discards current zoning. It is irresponsible for the city to so radically change the rules after people are already so invested. It would be irresponsible for such a FLUM to fuel displacement and increase inequity as those with largest resources at their disposal

will be relatively advantaged in the transition.

-- Require sweeping zone-wide changes to prove equity through an analysis of local conditions. Fairness occurs when all are treated fairly, not when the benefits for population 'A' equal the losses of population B.

-- Provide policies that condition permitting of development to specific site impacts and to cumulative area impacts.

-- Raise setback and landscaping requirements in communities not meeting open space targets.

-- Provide policy support for housing preservation, including preservation of affordable rental housing stock and other functional and well-built structures which accomplish the "reuse" aspect of the common environmental policy: "reduce, reuse, recycle."

-- Provide clarity regarding how best use of surplus property is to be determined. Open space is a continual need, while for additional housing need may ebb and flow. As such, a method that involves all stakeholders will be needed in order for there to be good results in all eras.

-- Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses.
REF: LUG2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal, replaced with language that requires the city to "allow", "support", and " accommodate" for everything rather than designing something that works.

-- Preserve and protect low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited.
REF: LUG8, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics.
REF: LUG9, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- To maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan.
REF: LU11, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-

family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU59, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU60, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Reflect the character of existing low-density development through the regulation of scale, siting, structure orientation, and setbacks.
REF: LU69, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- DO NOT PROVIDE FREE ACROSS THE BOARD UPZONES VIA THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. DO NOT:
"Designate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings can provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU9.10 to replace LU75.

-- Limit the multifamily zones to areas that do not meet the single-family zone criteria, except in circumstances where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a different zone is more appropriate.
REF: LU75, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

4)
TRANSPORTATION.

-- Define transportation service performance categories (levels) not merely on the basis of frequency, but on the usability, including usability by diverse populations.

-- Establish a practice of assessing the transportation service performance category (level) of a location on the basis of the current situation, and on the basis of future housing and employment estimates.

-- If land use rules for a parcel are to deviate with proximity to transportation services,
then condition the approval of a development proposal for that parcel on proof of the transportation service performance category (level) present as of the date of the proposal application, and on independent service level projection analysis for the next 10 years.

-- Encourage off street parking in new developments where there is not a demonstrated capacity to absorb the projected additional parking demand.

-- Consider visitor parking demand when establishing parking requirements.

-- Provide consistent definitions (in the glossary) for terms like “transit corridor”, “transit stop”, “frequent transit”, "rail station", frequent rail station", “superior transit”, etc.

-- DO NOT
"Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking required."

...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU6.3.
This proposal would REQUIRE the city to have NO rules on what amount of parking any development must include.
MARKET FORCES are NOT a sufficient tool for city planning.

5)
ADMINISTRATION.

-- Use of "neighborhood planning" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that neighborhood planning is to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that neighborhood planning is to be replaced by full central government control or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to neighborhood planning and citywide planning, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Define clearly the role that adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies, neighborhood plan work-plan matrices, and recognized neighborhood plans play in the City's decision-making and resource allocation.
REF: NG4, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Include (as was done in the past) growth estimates for all urban villages, not just the 6 urban centers.

-- An independent assessment should occur to determine what growth is most likely to occur if this Comprehensive Plan is adopted. (These policies seem designed to create far greater growth than that which was studied by the draft EIS).

-- Establish a vision for housing and job levels 40 and 60 years from now, and provide an analysis of anticipated capacity distribution for those periods.

-- REMOVE ALL proposed goals/policies that in effect state that "the city shall NOT do its job". The city government and the people DO have a right to accomplish planning and to apply laws that limit land uses.
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal contains many statements that the city shall "allow", "accommodate", etc unlimited use, and these are an irresponsible abandonment of responsibility of stewardship for current and future generations.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Ken Thompson

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Comments on Seattle 2035 Draft Plan
Ken Thompson, N. Beacon Hill, Seattle,
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS.
My comments mainly relate to the expanded Urban Villages (UVs). I live in one of the currently non-UV areas that would appear to get included in the revised N. Beacon Hill UV.

I'm not inherently opposed to the expanded UVs in general or on Beacon Hill in particular. I think it's a good idea to put growth near the transit hubs. I think it's likely that my single family zone property will be rezoned, and while not excited about that, am not entirely against it, but I think a lot whether that is a good thing for my neighborhood lies in HOW it is done.
I do think that an undue amount of the population growth is to be put into these areas of the city, and would prefer to see a more equitable distribution of new population put into the UVs (perhaps 40%, rather than 85%) AS WELL AS OTHER AREAS of the city, utilizing techniques such as:
•Convert a small amount of industrial land around the SODO and Stadium Light Rail Stations to be used for very high rise residential developments. The overall land loss would be small, but the number of new residences added could be quite large using this approach. Vast amounts of industrial space in this city appears to be empty/underutilized, and we should convert it to the needed use: housing. In the future, we will just need less and less industrial space it seems to me. Converting 5% of it to high rise (20+ stories, think Vancouver BC) could be great for this city.
•Allow, and even incent, single family zones all across the city to add heigh-limited accessory dwelling units or add mother in law –type units in existing housing.
Looking at the racial equity analysis maps/options, it appears that the city has chosen the least racially equitable route possible in regards to putting so much growth into the UVs. With whatever growth gets allocated to the new UVs, I would suggest the city make the following choices:
• To decrease displacement and gentrification, the city should make sure that current low income homeowners living in their property in UV areas that are upzoned and hence incur increased property taxes do not have to pay more for their property taxes (specifically due to increased land value due to upzoning the property). If the city can not broker a deal with the county to allow for this, the city should provide rebates to homeowners in this situation.
• Preserve (or replace) nearly all (90% plus) of the truly low-income rental units, though whatever means possible.
• Whatever rezoning is done in the UVs should be with limited height increases in areas that are currently single family zoned. So yes, rezone to multi-family, but do not allow for large increases in height that do not match the current area heights.
• Emphasize filling in unused land, at the current height limits, rather than building up. Building up seems to be the number one thing that destroys the character of existing neighborhoods. Incent accessory dwelling units.
• For larger buildings going into new NC-zoned areas, or higher height limit multi-family areas, do more design review. Part of what is so discouraging about growth in Seattle is that the buildings are just ugly.
• For commercial strips in the UV's, consider what Tokyo I think utilizes in some of its building design considerations for new buildings, which is to look at how much light gets blocked by any new buildings. I believe each person/property in Tokyo is guaranteed some amount of direct sunlight, and it leads to mixed heights of building within each block that is developed.
• You probably can't do this, but in our neighborhood, there is prime undeveloped land which apparently the owners won't sell. [On other lots, existing housing sits vacant, a different but related issue it'd be great to be able to do something about.] It would seem preferable to develop this land first, vs. tear down existing housing. Can the city not do something to incent these land owners to sell? What about adding city $ to increase the offering price to the point owners would sell? This would also decrease displacement.
I grew up in the Seattle area, and have lived inside the City for almost all of the last 31 years. I moved to North Beacon because I like the diversity of the neighborhood, both in terms of income levels, ethnicities/races, housing stock, and eclectic assortment of neighborhood services. I welcome more people to move to this area, but it needs to happen without robbing the neighborhood of it's character or displacing its current residents (especially low income residents). I don't think the City currently has

the tools in its tool kit to accomplish this, so I strongly urge you to consider more creative solutions – and yes, some solutions that might be more expensive than the cheapest path forward to adding more people to the entire city. And as I stated, more of the population growth of the city needs to be shared city-wide rather than in the tiny percentage of the city that makes up the UVs. Pushing all the growth into the UVs is going to make for the worst possible development choices in the UVs in order to cram everyone in here.
Ken Thompson

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Futurewise,El Centro de la Raza,Jeanette Ordonez

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035,

See the attached comments regarding the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. On behalf of Futurewise and the community at El Centro de la Raza, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Best,
Jeanette
--
November 20, 2015
City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development
Sent via email to 2035@seattle.gov
RE: Comments on Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft
Dear Seattle 2035,
On behalf on Futurewise and the community at El Centro de la Raza we thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
In 2014, Futurewise and El Centro worked together to engage the community in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan process, particularly focused on the Spanish-speaking residents of Seattle and South King County. We designed and deployed a variety of engagement activities including surveys, SpeakOuts, a Youth Summit. From this outreach, several clear priorities emerged from the community:
• Better, more user friendly transit that is safe, affordable and comfortable for all, including families with children.
• Affordable housing in safe neighborhoods that have quality schools, accessible stores parks, libraries, cafes and restaurants, churches and community centers.
• More safety for people who are walking or biking.
• Better jobs and wages for all, including immigrants
• A city where all are welcome and people do not feel discriminated against.
More recently, we translated the ten key proposals from the Comp Plan engagement materials and took them to El Centro to discuss with residents in their Beacon Hill center. Below are the comments we received. We hope that you will add these to the comments which you have gathered from the seattle2035.consider.it forum and the community open houses which were not accessible to persons who do not speak English.
Proposal 1: Guide more growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of frequent transit.
• Yes, traffic is terrible.

• Transit that goes out of the city and to other parts of the state. They should connect local transit to other cities.
• Yes, but better transportation to connect the east side to Seattle.
• Better transit and better service.
• We don't live close to transit stations. We live in Everett and Federal Way due to increasing rents. More Park & Rides.
Proposal 2: Create a Future Land Use Map that communicates future development in urban villages.
• Plan for better use of space within urban villages.
Proposal 3: Move towards transportation service standards that consider all travel modes, including pedestrians, bicycles, cars, trucks and transit.
• Yes, bicycles are important.
• Yes, but extend the Link light rail further.
• Yes.
Proposal 4: Plan for and locate schools to serve Seattle's growing population.
• Teachers need more respect.
• Transit to schools.
• More intervention services for communities in north Seattle.
• Create programs that benefit schools that do not have many resources.
Proposal 5: Minimize displacement of marginalized populations and small businesses as Seattle grows.
• More communication in other languages, especially in public and health services.
• Less discrimination in affordable housing.
• Have good communication with the community and if they are relocated give them just compensation.
• Standards for affordable housing units.
• Propose a plan that takes into account small businesses. Create an atmosphere that benefits small businesses.
Proposal 6: Increase the diversity of housing types in lower density residential zones, including single-family zones.
• Consider environmental impacts from new development. Accountability for environmental impacts.
• Yes, it is more difficult to live in the city because of this reason.
• Yes, everyone has needs. People can help one another.
• Incentives for homeowners to provide solutions for affordable housing.
Proposal 7: Designate a Stadium District on the Future Land Use Map around the professional sports stadiums.
• Yes, the space is often underused.
• More security.
• This space can be used for other things.
Proposal 8: Update citywide neighborhood planning policies to reflect current practices.
• Yes, this is good.
Proposal 9: Estimate, monitor and report on growth and change citywide and in urban villages.
• Measure levels of service and treatment of residents at affordable housing units, homeless shelters and from service providers.
• Measure levels of educational attainment. Include college-entrance, exiting in measure as well (per ethnic group).
• Yes, measure by neighborhood. More monitoring.
• Measure delinquency and community tranquility.
Proposal 10: Set goals for parks and open space that focus on quality, equity, and proximity to jobs and residences.
• Yes, care for and maintain parks.

• More free programming at parks.
• Yes, parks are super important to sustaining a community space and sense of belonging.
• They rent to people outside of the city with more money while those who pay taxes can no longer use the parks. This is not fair!
• Public spaces are not for making profit.
• Focus on walkability, impact, accessibility as well.
Again, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to participate in the development of the Comprehensive Plan and hope you will take into consideration the comments provided by the community at El Centro de la Raza. Throughout our engagement the El Centro community has been enthusiastic about participating in these discussions and contributing to the future of Seattle. We hope that future Seattle 2035 materials will be translated to include non-English speaking residents in this important planning process.
Sincerely,
Jeanette Ordonez
Futurewise
Community Outreach and Education Coordinator
Denise Pérez Lally
El Centro de la Raza
Human Services Director

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Kirk Robbins

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

I have two areas of comment, which are related to each other and to my personal situation.
First is the WALKSHED topic, of which you have heard much. I dislike the idea, especially as applied to areas with which I am familiar. I live east of the industrial area which is east of the Ballard Hub Urban Village. DPD maps show my area as within a 10-minute walkshed of the intersection of 15th NW & NW Market Street. This is faulty for many reasons:
The line is drawn for theoretically mobility, thought to be of the median population. Thus it is too optimistic for half the population (including me, and other seniors)
The line assumes easy crossing of uncontrolled intersections. In this area, many of those are in industrial areas which are challenging for many pedestrians and rather unsafe during non-working hours. There are no "eyes on the street" in uninhabited industrial areas, and some of the unlawful inhabitants in camper vans are unsavory or worse, as police will confirm IF ASKED. Sidewalk quality in industrial areas is not a high priority -- no problem for that use, but for walksheds?
The line assumes easy crossing of commercial curb-cuts, or (as one DPD employee explain) that those curb-cuts will disappear. Both are unwarranted. "In the long run" curb cuts in not-yet-designated Pedestrian Overlay zones may disappear, but probably not soon (I refer to the recently redeveloped Safeway at 15th & Market).
The second related topic is the elimination of all parking requirements in our area, should we become part of the Ballard H.U.V. There isn't much within walking distance of here, other than breweries. Older and less-mobile residents will not walk back from supermarkets laden with groceries, even if younger planners don't think of this. On-street parking is fully utilized here. New developments here require off-street parking which is matching growth with impact. An abstract policy would mess with life here in a manner which would make "aging in place" (more than lip service?) problematic for many. Also there

are many young children here, close to Gilman Playfield. Other than the Playfield, most kid-friendly amenities are not within the mapped 10-minute walking distance. (Are children, and those who accompany them, part of the "ten-minute" 50%?.
Please drop the unrealistic formulaic "ten minute walkshed". My understanding is that opposition to the notion is widespread, probably because in the hands of unduly pro-developer Planners (the norm, alas) it will be used to degrade the quality of life for many at the expense of the well-heeled and well-connected few. Haven't we had enough of that lately?
Kirk Robbins

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: University District Advocates & U District Square,Chase Landrey

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development
Attn: Seattle 2035
Dear City Officials,

On behalf of the University District neighborhood and Seattle public spaces, University District Advocates and U District Square has put together the following comments of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
First off, we would like to thank Seattle 2035 for considering parks and open spaces as a priority when looking at the future of Seattle. You stated in your introduction to the Parks and Open Space section that, “Seattle’s parks and open spaces help make this city a great place to live, play, and raise families”, and are necessary in guaranteeing that the future growth of Seattle is sustainable and livable. In the University District there is a need for centrally located parks and open spaces, included in the recently approved U District Parks & Open Spaces Plan. With the incoming Light Rail station to 43rd & Brooklyn and the potential for increased development in the neighborhood it is an opportune time, taking advantage of this limited opportunity, to bring a central plaza and public spaces to the University District.
Looking over the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan, we have drafted the following recommendations. We believe that the adoption of these suggestions would work to better support Seattle public spaces and the University District.

- Using a clearer definition of Urban Centers in comparison to other Urban Villages. Also explanations to how the implementation of the plan will affect the University District compared with other Urban Centers (Downtown, South Lake Union, Uptown, and Capitol Hill/First Hill).

The land use appendix shows that the University district is way behind other Urban Center areas when it comes to public space. We have only 8 acres, compared to 20 for downtown and 23 for First and Capitol Hill.

- Better explaining the difference in the document between parks and open spaces, to show the division between privately owned spaces (building plazas, institutions, etc) and public spaces (City Parks, intended for the general public, etc).

P1.1 “Continue to expand the City’s park holdings, with special emphasis on serving urban centers and urban villages and areas that have been traditionally under-served”

- Incorporating parks and open spaces into CW1.1, showing their use as facilitators for community building and forming connections.

“Promote opportunities for people to build connections with their peers, neighbors, and the greater community by supporting intergenerational and inter-cultural programs, activities and events.”

- Changing the language of NP1.3 to be more cooperative to the needs and ideas of Seattle Neighborhoods. The city should adapt its plans in accordance with the neighborhood plans, like the recently updated U District Parks & Open Spaces Plan, to remain consistent with other components of the Seattle 2035 Plan’s focus on neighborhood interests.

“Develop neighborhood plans to be consistent with this Plan’s vision and allow neighborhood plans to focus on issues that are unique to their areas.”

- We support LU14.16, requiring a master plan whenever a Major Institution proposes development that could affect the livability of an adjacent neighborhood. We encourage the use of stronger language like this in regards to Major Institutions and developers. Using stronger language around developer incentives and requirements in the development of urban centers, like changing “may/might” to wording that enforced more certain policies, can help communities to keep these groups held to agreed standards.

“Require a master plan whenever a Major Institution proposes development that could affect the livability of adjacent neighborhoods or has the potential for significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas.”

Thank you for allowing University District Advocates and U District Square to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan and being transparent during this drafting process. We support the City’s commitment to parks and open spaces, and we hope our recommendations can be used to strengthen the Comprehensive Plans’ long term impact on Seattle.

Thank You,

University District Advocates & U District Square

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Groundswell NW,Dawn Hemminger

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Thank-you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan. Attached is a response from Groundswell NW on the Parks and Open Space Element of the Draft Plan. Please share with your team and please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns with our comments and recommendations.

Regards,
Dawn Hemminger
Groundswell NW, President
--
11.20.2015
addressees: Seattle DPD, Seattle Planning Commission, Seattle Parks and Recreation
Re: Comments for 2035 Seattle Draft Comprehensive Plan
Dear: Seattle 2035 Planning Team
I am writing to you on behalf of Groundswell NW in reference to and in support of the Parks and Open Space Element of the Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan. We are encouraged to see the introduction of a standalone Parks and Open Space element in this draft plan which demonstrates that Seattle values the importance parks, open space and habitat plays in the health and well being of a thriving city.
Upon review of the Parks and Open Space Element, we believe that overall goals and policies presented meet the goals and mission of the NW Seattle community which Groundswell NW represents, and we request that you take into consideration the following recommendations and revisions in order to make this document stronger.
1. P1.1 – "Continue to expand the City's park holdings, with special emphasis on serving urban centers and urban villages and areas that have been traditionally under-served." We recommend including language that reduces the 10,000 sq. ft. threshold for purchasing park property in order to better serve the limited space available for parks and open space within the Urban Villages and in other fully developed neighborhoods.
2. P1.2 – "Identify goals for the City's future open space system that are realistic about the quantity of land that could be acquired, consider land managed by other agencies, and that drive improvements in the quality and usability, as well as quantity, of those spaces." While it is important to be realistic about open space acquisition, the Comprehensive Plan should also be an aspirational document, and in many areas there is still a need to acquire new open space.
3. P1.5 "Provide natural areas to preserve important natural or ecological features in public ownership and allow people access to these spaces to the degree consistent with habitat objectives." ?
4. P1.6 "Provide public access and, where possible, habitat enhancement, to shorelines by using street ends, regulation, or acquisition." We would like to see some language about working with neighborhoods and owners to add public access to currently private waterfront/shoreline where appropriate.
5. P1.7 – "Encourage or require private developers to incorporate on-site publicly accessible open space or contribute financially to new or enhanced local parks, and to provide appropriate recreation opportunities for building tenants within new developments." It is important for new development to contribute to public open space as well as provide private recreation space. This policy should also include language that open space should be beautiful and sustainable. We encourage you to not provide developers the opportunity to provide private-only open space. This approach is not welcoming to the surrounding community and encourages the continuation of zero lot line development with minimal landscaping along the edges of the property that is incompatible with the neighborhood character.
6. P1.8 – "Use cooperative agreements with the Seattle School District and other public agencies to provide access during non-school hours to open spaces they control."
7. We would like to see some language about expanding partnerships among open space agencies, transit agencies, private sector and nonprofit institutions to acquire, develop and/or manage existing open spaces.
8. We would like to see language that addresses the consideration of equity in the location,

development and acquisition of open space to help in the reduction of health disparities and in the promotion of social and environmental justice.
9. We encourage the city to be more specific in setting goals for public open space accessibility, e.g., “In order to meet increased population needs, all users should be able to access public open space within a 10 minute walk without obstacles (e.g. geography, arterial crossings, etc.).”
10. Consider adding a new policy under Goal 3 – “Engage the community in volunteer maintenance and stewardship of parks and natural areas to stretch maintenance resources and expand neighborhood “ownership” of parks properties and facilities.”
11. Consider adding a new goal or new policy under Goal 1 to, "Facilitate the development of community-initiated or supported open space.s" This is something Parks does today and should be made more visible.
In closing, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the draft comprehensive plan. Please contact me if you would like any further clarifications. In addition, we understand that a more detailed Parks Development Plan will be written in 2016 in order to implement the polices from this draft plan. We ask that Groundswell NW have the opportunity to participate in the development of this plan.
Sincerely,

Dawn Hemminger
Board President, Groundswell NW
On behalf of fellow Groundswell NW Board Members
Dave Boyd, Renee Dagseth, David Folweiler, Dennis Galvin, Frana Milan, Jan Satterthwaite

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Central Area Land Use Review Committee,Jeffrey Floor

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Greetings:
Attached please find "Seattle 2035 LURC Comment Letter 2015.11.20.pdf", which summarizes the response of the Central Area Land Use Review Committee to the draft of Seattle 2035.
We look forward to further involvement in the process.
Sincerely,
Jeffrey Floor & Christina Ghan
LURC Co-chairs
--
November 20, 2015

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development Transmitted via email

Re: Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update – Comments on Draft Plan

The Central Area Land Use Review Committee (LURC) is pleased to be given an opportunity to participate in the public process for the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan.

The LURC is a volunteer committee composed of residents, business owners and property owners in the Central Area, many of whom work in the planning and design industry. The mission of the LURC is to

advocate for and support development that contributes to the vitality of our neighborhoods. Our group facilitates community conversations around land use issues to constructively shape land use and development in the Central Area.

The LURC has reviewed the draft plan for "Seattle 2035," particularly the proposal to expand the boundaries of the 23rd & Union---Jackson Residential Urban Village to include the residential areas to the south towards I---90. Given the proximity to the proposed Rainier Ave light rail station and the overall trend in the environs towards low---intensity multi---family zoning, the expansion of the Urban Village
boundary seems to be an appropriate direction that we generally support.

The LURC recognizes that the inclusion of this area in the Urban Village boundary is an important first step to directing residential development into areas that are, or in this case, will soon be, served by high---capacity transit. Increasing the density of residential development within walking distance of the planned light rail station will provide more Central Area residents with meaningful access to public transportation, increasing the mobility of those residents and helping further the city's environmental sustainability goals. Additionally, improvements to the pedestrian environment in the areas north of the station, as a result from further planning and investment into the area, will strengthen the connection of the station area with the Jackson core.

There are of course, further details to be determined, especially the exact alignment of the boundary. We look forward to working with DPD as the plan is finalized over the next several months, and as the city engages with the neighborhood to conduct more localized planning within that area.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Floor & Christina Ghan, Co---Chairs
Central Area Land Use Review Committee
www.centralarealurc.org

LURC Members:
Jeffrey Floor (Co---Chair) Christina Ghan (Co---Chair) Tova Cubert Dennis Comer Bill Zosel Paul Crane
Jonathan Konkol (Vice---Chair) Mike Moedritzer
Amanda Bryan Bill Bradburd

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Futurewise,Amy Gore

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

Good afternoon,

Attached please find comments from Futurewise on the Comprehensive Plan Draft. We appreciate the opportunity to share our thoughts. If we can provide clarity or further explanation, please feel free to let me know.

Sincerely,

Amy Gore
Futurewise ¦Sustainable Communities Director
--
November 20, 2015
City of Seattle
Department of Planning & Development
Sent via email to 2035@seattle.gov
RE: Comments on Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft
To Whom It May Concern:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Working with City staff over the past several years, it is obvious that a tremendous amount of work and thoughtfulness has gone into the draft.
Futurewise is a non-profit organization that works throughout Washington State to create livable communities, protect our working farmlands, forests, and waterways, and ensure a better quality of life for present and future generations. We work with communities to implement effective land use planning and policies that prevent waste and stop sprawl, provide efficient transportation choices, create affordable housing and strong local businesses, and ensure healthy natural systems. We have supporters across Washington State, including the City of Seattle, and together we are creating a better quality of life in Washington State. In 2014 and 2015, Futurewise and its partners conducted an extensive community engagement program throughout the city to ensure that the voices of Seattle residents are heard in the Comprehensive Planning process. The engagement included "SpeakOuts", surveys, workshops and focus groups for persons of color, residents with limited English proficiency, youth and other groups not normally reached through traditional outreach methods. The results of this engagement have been summarized and highlighted in the City of Seattle Health and Equity Assessment found at www.futurewise.org and were shared with City staff.
We would like to offer comments on the policies and goals related to eight priorities:
(1) Modify the growth strategy and associated land use to provide greater flexibility, more affordability and less displacement. How we plan to grow is one of the most important questions answered by the Comprehensive Plan. The Urban Village strategy set forth in 1994 has been largely successful in directing new residential units and jobs into villages and has allowed the City to target public investment efficiently. We support this strategy as a way to combine more intense land uses with transit and other amenities into compact, multimodal communities. However, the urban village strategy needs to be modified to provide an increased, more flexible supply of land for development which will produce a greater variety of housing types, increase affordability in the city and reduce the risk of displacement for low-income residents and businesses.
(2) Support housing affordability through aggressive, bold action. Housing affordability is a critical issue facing Seattle. We believe that a lack of affordable housing is increasingly becoming a threat to the economic vitality and environmental sustainability of our city and that all possible policies and resources should be used to address housing affordability. We support those goals and policies which are needed to implement the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) recommendations through increasing the number of

affordable and market-rate units, providing more resources for affordable housing, offering more support for communities and using innovation to meet our goals.
(3) Implement increased environmental protection, climate change adaptation and mitigation. The Pacific Northwest's extraordinary natural environment is one of its most important assets. We have an obligation to protect natural systems for ourselves and future generations. A key part of this is the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions as well as support for our communities to be resilient in the face of climate change impacts. To continue to reduce our impacts on air, water and natural habitats as we add 120,000 new residents and 115,000 new jobs, we will need to plan carefully, increase our public engagement (with the entire community), and implement innovative solutions in transportation, building codes and regulations, industry, utilities and community development.
(4) Employ land use, transportation and other city policies and investments to support health and wellbeing. Cities can improve health and well-being through access to opportunity, jobs, healthcare, social connections, healthy food access, positive attachment to place. However, cities can also negatively impact health due to air quality problems from transportation and industrial uses, threats to bodily safety from traffic collisions, and mental and emotional stress from noisier, more intrusive environments. Therefore, the City must use its policies and investments to mitigate these negative impacts by ensuring affordable, healthy food access, safe and efficient transportation, personal safety and protection from violence and crime, and by ensuring healthcare and healthy environments are affordable and accessible regardless of income, race, English proficiency, age, gender identity, sexual orientation or religion.
(5) Focus on equity and opportunity throughout the Plan. The City of Seattle has significant disparities by race, ethnicity, income and geography in many critical determinants of opportunity, including health, incomes, education, housing cost burden, homeownership and many other critical measures. The policies in the Plan can and should be focused on reducing these disparities in accordance with the City's Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI). Furthermore, the City should set specific, measurable goals for reducing disparities that can be tracked for progress on an annual basis.
(6) Articulate neighborhood livability and support. Neighborhoods, whether they are a dense urban village or single family areas, are the primary way that Seattle residents experience the city. Neighborhoods are extraordinarily important to people and they have a fierce sense of ownership and are protective of the characteristics which drew them there in the first place, whether it is affordability, cultural diversity, historic character, valued assets, natural amenities or connections to neighbors, businesses and institutions. We believe that the City can support neighborhood growth and change while protecting these elements of neighborhood livability by working with residents to identify their priorities, planning for change and using policies and investment to guide growth responsively and responsibly.
(7) Increase meaningful community engagement and partnership. The City has committed to broader participation by under-represented communities throughout this planning process. Holding open houses in multiple neighborhoods and at different times of day is an improvement on traditional engagement methods which can be exclusionary. We encourage the City to continue to expand their engagement activities which allow in-depth discussions about policies in accessible, relatable language in comfortable community spaces. Using community leaders and community-based organizations as trusted intermediaries should be utilized more fully and there should be more resources dedicated to translation and interpretation for non-English speakers. Clearly demonstrating how city decisions have been responsive to the engagement process is critical to building trust and demonstrating the value of engagement for stakeholders. These methods should not be limited to only the Comprehensive Plan, but broadly in all planning initiatives taken by the City.

Comments on Seattle 2035

Comprehensive Plan Draft
Page 3

(8) Emphasize quantifiable goals and commit resources to tracking progress towards these goals. The Plan sets forth a vision for a Seattle that is equitable, affordable and sustainable. However, without specific, actionable and quantifiable goals, we will be unable to determine if we are fulfilling this vision or not and we will be unable to change our programs and investments to better fulfill this vision. Where possible, the City should set specific goals and develop a process for tracking and reporting on progress in a timely and transparent manner.
These eight priorities are influenced by goals and policies found throughout the Plan. For simplicity and clarity, we have organized our comments by element to reflect the order of the Plan:
Growth Strategy Element
We support the continuation of the Urban Village strategy which has been successful in efficiently accommodating a significant portion of Seattle's growth in the past 20 years. We support the creation of urban villages which use dense land use in conjunction with complete multimodal transportation networks to create compact neighborhoods which support healthy active transportation choices, reduce the environmental impacts of growth and enhance community connectivity.

- Because the majority of our growth will go in urban villages, it is critical that villages accommodate our goals for affordable housing. Therefore, the number of affordable units created and demolished in each village should be tracked as part of policy GS1.5 and GS1.6. This will enable the City to refine policies, programs and investments as needed to ensure that there are affordable units in each village.
- The Plan's policies should go further in explicitly stating the need for affordable housing in urban villages. This could occur in policies GS2.6 (in addition to or rather than "broad cross-section") and GS2.15 (which currently states "promote meaningful choice for marginalized populations to live and work in urban centers…") and GS3.5.
- We support policy GS2.7 and encourage the City to specify "safe walking, biking, and public transportation" in accordance with the adopted Vision Zero policy.
- We support policy GS2.12 which will expand urban village boundaries and recommend that "a ten-minute walk of frequent light rail stations" be changed to "a ten-minute walk of frequent transit service" to be more flexible with regard to mode and more consistent with the HALA recommendations.
- We support policy GS2.22, which will allow limited multifamily commercial, and industrial uses outside of urban villages. Because increasing land supply for multifamily housing is a critical component of addressing our affordable housing crisis, we recommend that "promote housing supply, mix and affordability" be included as a condition for land use changes under this policy.
- We support goal GSG5 and its associated policies identifying potential annexation areas and annexation policies. Annexing these areas would provide efficiencies in service delivery, improve level of service for residents and businesses, and lead to more cohesive land use and transportation integration with the adjacent city.

Comments on Seattle 2035
Comprehensive Plan Draft
Page 4

- While we support directing growth to urban villages, many of the existing urban villages are in areas with high displacement risk for marginalized populations, as noted in the City's Growth

and Equity Analysis. This may result in a disproportionate burden of accommodating growth and redevelopment on those people are most vulnerable to displacement and who would most benefit from remaining in urban villages which have superior transit service, culturally appropriate institutions and other supportive amenities. For this reason, we support directing a larger proportion of growth into existing urban villages in "high opportunity/low displacement risk" areas as well as the creation of new urban villages in areas identified as "high opportunity/low displacement risk". Additionally, we support policies which protect both residents and businesses from displacement to mitigate this risk equitably and fairly, as noted in policy GS2.9.

Land Use Element

- We suggest that LUG2 include "providing adequate supply to meet demand and growth targets" in the goals of the City's zoning and land use regulations.
- We support the policies which recognize disproportionate adverse impacts and aim to minimize and mitigate inequitable outcomes (LU2.8).
- We strongly support policy LU5.17, which recognizes that higher-density development will require additional conditions related to preservation, open space and affordable housing.
- We support policy LU9.4, which establish evaluation criteria for rezoning land to multifamily and recommend that "promote housing affordability" be included as a condition for land use changes under this policy.
- We support the policies which recognize the impact of land use on health and well-being, and that promote healthy residents and communities through noise control (LU5.12 and LU5.13), air quality (LU5.14), food access (LU5.18), recreation space (LU5.5), as well as policies which encourage safe and convenient active transportation modes (LU6.5, LU6.6 and LU6.7).
- We support policies which use land use regulations to protect the natural environment and support climate change mitigation and adaptation (LU5.8)
- While off-street parking can reduce the need for on-street parking which allows for mobility uses in the City's limited Right of Way (ROW), off-street parking reduces site capacity and increases the cost of construction, leading to more expensive housing and commercial costs. Currently, the Plan has goals and policies which both encourage off-street parking (T2.3) and ones which aim to minimize off-street parking (LUG6 and related policies). The Plan should have better consistency related to parking, ideally focusing on the goal of reducing overall parking demand rather than accommodating parking demand at the expense of either mobility or affordability through policies such as LU6.5, LU6.8, LU6.10 and LU6.13.
- We strongly support the use of development incentives to increase density and, in particular, provide housing options not met by the market (LUG7). We suggest that some examples of housing market deficiencies where

these incentives could be used be included in the Plan, particularly "affordable housing" and "family-sized housing".
- We strongly support policies which allow additional compatible housing types in single family neighborhoods (LUG8, LU8.3, LU8.5, LU8.11 and LU8.12). We suggest that neighborhood character be promoted through consistent and compatible design standards like height, scale and bulk, but discourage the use of "single family" as a descriptor of character, such as in LU8.2,

because it is inconsistent with other policies. We support the inclusion of housing choice as a consideration in changing the development standards in single-family areas (LU8.12).

- We support goal LUG9, and its policies, which sets forth a vision of multifamily zones which includes a variety of housing types and densities, mixed-incomes, and promotes walking and transit use.
- We suggest the inclusion of "minimizing or mitigating loss of tree canopy and vegetation" as a need to be considered in midrise and highrise areas in LU9.14.
- We support LU10.1, the prioritization of existing commercial/mixed use areas over the creation of new business districts, particularly in areas with established districts with locally-owned and neighborhoodsupporting businesses.
- We support the use of land use regulations that protect and encourage locally-owned, neighborhood serving businesses, such as LU10.7 and LU10.22. These policies are particularly important in those areas identified as high displacement risk in the Equity and Growth Analysis where businesses that serve persons of color, immigrant and refugees, persons with limited English proficiency and other needs may be under significant displacement pressure due to rising rents or displacement of their customer base.
- We support the use of land use policies which improve the safety, accessibility and comfort of people walking, people on bikes and people taking transit (LU10.7. LU10.9, LU10.11, LU10.16, LU10.18 and LU10.20).
- We support the protection and expansion of safe industrial land uses that support equitable employment opportunity in Seattle (LU11.2, LU11.4, LU11.5, LU11.6, LU11.10).
- While it is reasonable not to impede industrial land uses with unnecessary landscaping and streetscaping regulations for aesthetic purposes (LU11.11), there should be minimum utilitarian requirements which will support a healthy environment through stormwater management and vegetation to improve air quality and mitigate heat impacts of climate change.
- We support the use of overlay districts to achieve support transit communities and large master planned communities where appropriate (LU13.2, LU13.3 and LU13.4).
- While recognizing the benefits of an expanded, mixed-use Stadium District, we have serious concerns about the impact this might have on the surrounding industrial lands and related businesses and jobs. Therefore, we recommend that LU15.2 be modified from "minimize negative impacts on nearby activities" to "avoid negative impacts…" or "without impacting" and that the Plan include additional language about potential conflicts and a framework for prioritizing business-supporting industrial lands when conflicts arise. ? We support the use of historic and landmark designation to protect those sites, buildings and districts which contribute to the character of our city and provide a visible link to the shared history of our city, our neighborhoods and our people. (LUG16) We support the following comments from Historic Seattle:

Comments on Seattle 2035
Comprehensive Plan Draft
Page 6

- Foster stewardship of neighborhood, place, and landscape as contributors to the city's viability and vitality
- Celebrate the diverse physical form and fabric of the city
- Promote the city's historic and cultural resources as an economic asset
- Promote the environmental benefits and opportunities of preserving and adaptively reusing

historic buildings

- Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive use of buildings to conserve resources, reduce waste, and demonstrate stewardship of the built environment
- Promote seismic and energy efficiency retrofits of historic buildings to reduce carbon emissions, save money, and improve public safety
- Identify and establish alternative means to protect the historic character of neighborhoods selected as urban centers and villages
- Encourage adaptive use of historic community structures, such as meeting halls, schools, and religious buildings, for uses that continue their role as neighborhood anchors
- While we appreciate that Goal LUG17 includes the correct standard of protecting the functions and values of critical areas,i we encourage the expansion of the land use policies designed to protect the ecological functions and values of our environmentally critical areas. The development of wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas will result in their destruction. We urge more specific language in LU17.3 to reflect that "reasonable development" in environmentally critical areas may not only be destructive to the environment, but also may endanger human health and safety. So we recommend that LU17.3 be modified to read as following, with our additions underlined and our deletions struck through: LUG17 Protect the ecological functions and values of environmentally critical areas, including wetlands and fish and wildlife conservation areas; prevent erosion caused by development on steep slopes; and protect public health, safety and welfare in hazard-prone areas, including areas subject to landslides, liquefaction or floods, while allowing permitting development in areas subject to erosion, liquefaction, or floods where the safety of occupants can be assuredthat is reasonable in light of these constraints.
- Policy LU17.1 does not address conservation of wetlands which are often, but not always, fish and wildlife habitats. So we recommend addition a new bullet "Conserve wetlands" to Policy LU17.
- Policy LU17.3 should reflect the standard of no net loss of functions and values for critical areas.ii So we recommend that Policy LU17.3 reads as follows: "Allow adjustments of development standards in environmentally critical areas to help protect those places and their functions and values while enabling reasonable development."
- While we support Policy LU17.5, instability has many causes beyond development, including precipitation, ground water, geology, and slope.iii So we recommend that Policy LU17.5 should be modified to consider instability due to causes other than development. Natural slope failure can be as damaging, or even as deadly, as development induced slope failure. In addition, both relative and absolute risk should be considered. So we that Policy LU17.5 be modified to read as follows: "Identify landslide-prone areas by examining the geologic, hydrologic and topographic factors that contribute to landslides and regulate development to protect against future damage due to instability, including instability that might be created or exacerbated by development, including potential damage to public facilities. Consider the relative risk to life or property when reviewing development proposals for landslide-prone areas."
- We are concerned that Policy LU17.6 maybe read as implying that construction on landslide-prone slopes is safe if properly engineered. The science shows this is not the case. For example, the USGS report Shallow- Landslide Hazard Map of Seattle, Washington states:

Although most of the source areas for debris flows are located near the tops of slopes in the Seattle area, debris-flow sources are scattered among lower parts of the slopes as well. There are enough of these that a runout zone established below susceptible cells based on the mean or maximum runout length from this data set would cover most of the existing slopes. For this reason, we conclude that the runout data indicate that all areas of steep slopes forming bluffs of Puget Sound and along other bluffs in the Seattle area should be considered hazardous. Furthermore, where flat-lying areas exist in Seattle below steep slopes that are above water and can be occupied, a runout zone based on the mean (60.2 m) or maximum (235 m) runout length would provide a degree of protection for the runout areas of most of the existing slopes of concern.iv

So we recommend that Policy LU17.6 be modified to read as follows; "LU17.6 Avoid development on

landslide-prone areas, landslide runout areas, and their buffers. Where scientific and engineering analysis shows construction may be safely allowed, rRequire engineering solutions for development on landslideprone sites in order to prevent slides during high-stress periods and if there has been poor maintenance of the hillside.

- We strongly support policy LU17.11 which seeks a "net gain in wetland function by enhancing and restoring wetland function across the city." Wetlands have many functions that benefit the community such as flood storage. This policy wisely encourages a net gain in these important functions.

Transportation Element

- We support TG.1 and its policies, which recognize that transportation investments supporting land use policies are critical to the success of the Urban Village strategy and are needed to create compact, accessible and walkable neighborhoods while reducing dependence on personal automobiles. We support policy T1.5 which recognizes that vulnerable and historically marginalized populations may have special transportation needs to be considered.
- We support accommodating multiple travel modes and placemaking functions in public right of way (TG2).
- This section should also acknowledge the need to use right-of-way to house landscaping and incorporate other design standards which support critical environmental and natural systems.
- We suppot the development of a decision-making framework (T2.8), which should include safety, mobility, access, greening and environmental uses, placemaking and activation as well as community and personal health.
- We support TG3 and its policies which expand transportation options for those most in need (T3.3) and focuses on the expansion of interconnected, accessible bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities.
- We support TG4 and its policies which incorporate the recommendations from the Climate Action Plan and will help the City achieve its environmental and greenhouse gas reduction goals.
- Goal TG6, which addresses system safety, should acknowledge the need to improve personal safety around transit facilities (like light rail and bus stops) so that people are safe while waiting for or using transit, through methods like better design or through coordination with public safety departments.
- We support policy T9.3, which would establish an alternative, multimodal approach for Level of Service (LOS) standards which will be more useful in meeting the City's GHG emissions reduction targets.

Comments on Seattle 2035

Comprehensive Plan Draft
Page 8

Housing Element

- The City's housing element should include housing policies and goals which are consistent with and supportive of the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) strategies, particularly H2.1, H2.3, H2.5, H2.7, H3.1, H3.5 and HG5 and its policies.
- The policies under HG1 should include testing, monitoring and enforcement of fair housing compliance for all protected classes in the City of Seattle to identify those groups which are still experiencing discrimination. It should also include coordinating with non-profit groups and quasi-governmental agencies to achieve fair housing goals through coordinated education and protection programs.
- We agree with policy H2.6, in which local communities should be part of the affordable housing conversation to ensure that programmatic and policy solutions are addressing their specific needs.
- We support the goal HG3 and policies related to expanding the mix of housing found in Seattle through design standards, zoning, and land use policies to better meet the diverse needs of Seattle households. ? We suggest that goal HG4 include a policy which considers providing assistance to low-income homeowners, landlords or building owners/managers for renovations and upgrades to improve energy efficiency of housing units. We suggest the City explore innovative financing techniques and improved incentives to encourage and support the use of innovative, sustainable building methods.

Capital Facilities Element

- We appreciate the commitment to using the development and management of capital facilities in anequitable way which incorporates the environmental, economic, social and health benefits of capital facilities (CFG1), in particular the structuring of user fees to mitigate cost burdens for low-income households (CF1.7), supporting job creation and training (CF1.8), locating new capital facilities to support equitable distribution of services for underrepresented communities (CF3.2) and encouraging accessibility of capital facilities for people of all abilities, socioeconomic backgrounds, ages and cultures. (CF4.1)
- We support the inclusion of capital facilities as a part of the City's strategies in restoring the natural environment and preparing for the impacts of climate change through a commitment to resilient capital facilities (CF1.6), improved resource conservation (CF2.2, CF2.3) and in the design and construction of new capital facilities (CFG4) .
- In addition to considering climate conditions (such as flooding) during facilities siting, we recommend that the City also take into consideration the need for capital facilities to provide a resource for communities during adverse impacts (CF3.6) as part of siting, design and construction of facilities.
- We recommend that the City include a policy which states that it will develop specific goals and metrics to monitor the progress towards the equitable distribution of capital facilities through the Race and Social Justice Initiative.

Comments on Seattle 2035
Comprehensive Plan Draft
Page 9

Utilities Element

- We support the commitment to using the utilities services to further environmental stewardship, race and social equity, economic opportunity and the protection of public health (UG1).
- We support embedding equitable access into decision making criteria (U1.1). We support the policy to discourage siting and design alternatives that may increase negative impacts, particularly on communities which already bear a disproportionate amount of these impacts (U3.2).
- We support the incorporation of climate change considerations in the development of a resilient utility system (U1.3). We encourage the inclusion of a policy which recognizes that the City's utility system will not only be responding to climate change, but can play an important role in the achievement of the City's climate change mitigation through policies, particularly related to conservation as included under goal UG2.

Economic Development Element

- We support the policy to strengthen neighborhood districts (ED1.2), particularly those neighborhood business districts identified as areas with high displacement risk in the Equity and Growth Analysis.
- We support the prioritization of assistance to commercial districts in areas of lower economic opportunity (ED1.3) and encourage that assistance to be community-driven and culturally-competent.
- We support the policy to increase job training, internship and placement to overcome high barriers to employment and achieve greater racial and social inclusion in the workforce (ED4.2). This policy should also include programs to educate and work with businesses to understand how they can improve their hiring and retention of more diverse employees, women, and other groups which face higher barriers to employment.
- We support the goal of strengthening the entrepreneurial environment for start-ups and small businesses (EDG5) and encourage the inclusion of a policy which recognizes the particular need for entrepreneurial support for businesses owned by persons of color, immigrants and non-native English speakers.

Environment Element

- The Plan's Environment Element should include policies and goals which are consistent with and supportive of the strategies and outcomes outlined in the Seattle Climate Action Plan, particularly EG3, and policies E3.1 through E3.7. Climate change, as well as the city's adaptation and mitigation measures, will have disparate impacts on certain populations, particularly low-income households, persons of color, transit-dependent households, recent immigrants or non-English speaking residents, the elderly and persons living in more vulnerable neighborhoods. The City should study and address these disparate impact with responsive, equitable mitigation actions.
- We support the goal of fostering healthy trees, vegetation and soils to promote both environmental and human health (EG1) and suggest including a policy recognizing that there will need to be diverse strategies to achieve these goals which are responsive to different land use patterns and that our high density areas can and should support this goal.
- The need to protect waterways and healthy fish and wildlife should include a policy of respecting the needs of subsistence and cultural fishing within the City.

- Pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods as outlined in E3.2 to reduce emissions are critical to Seattle's emissions reduction strategy, and therefore the Comprehensive Plan should change the language from "aspire" to "will."
- We strongly support the goal in E3.3 to implement these policies "while employing strategies which mitigate impacts on low income residents," though we would advise broadening to "low income residents and other impacted communities."
- Sea level is rising and floods and erosion are increasing. In 2012 the National Research Council concluded that global sea level had risen by about seven inches in the 20th Century and would likely rise by 24.3 inches in Seattle by 2100.v The general extent of the two feet of sea level rise currently projected for coast can be seen on the NOAA Coastal Services Center Sea Level Rise

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Chamber of Commerce,Markham McIntyre

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Hi Director Sugimura and Seattle 2035 team,

The Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce's comments on the Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan update are attached. Please let me know if you have any questions.
Best,
Markham

Markham McIntyre | Senior Director of Government Relations
Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
--
December 3, 2015
Director Diane Sugimura
Department of Planning and Development
Dear Director Sugimura:
On behalf of our 2,200 members, the Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce offers the following comments as you consider public input to the Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan (Seattle 2035).
Seattle is one of the fastest growing cities in the nation. Based on King County's projections, over the next 20 years, Seattle will add 70,000 new residents and 115,000 new jobs. Rapid growth is already straining our current infrastructure as our city faces a shortage of affordable housing and an increasingly congested transportation system.
As our city and region grow at an unprecedented rate, we must have bold goals and specific targets for an equitable, prosperous and sustainable Seattle where everyone shares in the benefits of the city's growth. We have an opportunity to get it right with this update to our comprehensive plan and we must seize it.
Broadly, the Chamber supports goals and policies in the draft plan that will help:
- Increase housing supply, diversity, and affordability in ways that are consistent with the city's Housing Livability and Affordability Agenda (HALA) recommendations;
- Move people and goods faster and more efficiently through the city by improving mobility, accessibility, and reliability in our multimodal transportation system
- Retain and grow existing businesses, as well as spur entrepreneurship.

In particular, the Chamber supports the following key proposals:

- Guide more growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of frequent transit
- Estimate, monitor, and report on growth and change citywide and in urban villages
- Increase the diversity of housing types in lower density residential zones, including single family zones.
- Move toward transportation service standards that consider all travel modes, including pedestrians, bicycles, cars, freight, and transit.
- Plan for and locate schools to better serve Seattle's growing population.

As a footnote to the proposal to guide growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of transit, consider where the next wave of jobs will be located and make sure to prioritize adding density capacity near all light rail stops, including those south of downtown.

The Chamber strongly encourages your support for these key proposals. We also recommend including a progress indicator that examines the impacts of growth on neighborhood business districts.

We welcome any questions about our comments or any opportunity to engage further on Seattle 2035. Please direct your questions to Markham McIntyre.

Sincerely,

Maud Daudon
President & CEO

CC: Seattle City Councilmembers Bagshaw, Burgess, Godden, Harrell, Licata, O'Brien, Okamoto, Rasmussen, Sawant
Chris Gregorich, Director of Strategic Initiatives, Office of Mayor Ed Murray

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Kim Quon

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I am writing to comment upon the proposed revisions to the Roosevelt Urban Village boundaries, particularly on the eastern side. I believe that this revision is arbitrary and does not reflect the realities on the ground, and may cause irreparable harm to exactly the type of neighborhood that makes Seattle so special. I strongly urge that the boundary be kept as in the original plan, at 15th Ave NE.

The proposed expansion extends the urban village eastern boundary eastward to include residential blocks as far east as 18th Ave NE and includes much of Ravenna Park, as indicated in the following map: http://2035.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/green-lake-roosevelt-sf-zones-and-expanded-UCUV.pdf.

As is immediately apparent upon inspection, this proposed boundary makes little sense, in some places following an apparent random walk that splits properties and houses in two, while in other places deliberately including features such as Ravenna Park or omitting others like the Roosevelt reservoir. My understanding, based on a presentation by the DPD to the Ravenna-Bryan Community Association (RBCA) and subsequent correspondence, is that the apparent randomness was a result of the boundary being generated by a computer algorithm that drew the line to include all areas within a calculated 10 minute walk of the nearby light rail station currently under construction.

While I fully support the goal of increasing housing density around light rail stations, particularly when done properly to maintain affordability and livability, I also believe that development done wisely must also preserve irreplaceable natural and historical features, and sheer beauty where it exists. To do otherwise would be incredibly short-sighted, destroying some of the character and beauty that makes

Seattle such a desirable place to live. With this in mind, I urge you to take a walk through the neighborhood between 15th and 20th Aves NE, south of 65th St, rather than relying on computer-drawn boundaries. This little pocket borders the park (which, it goes without saying, should be kept free of housing development) and is a well preserved architecturally cohesive neighborhood of historic bungalows and craftsman homes from the early 1900s. It has been the subject of historic walking tours highlighting notable homes of the arts and crafts movement (e.g. Bungalow Fair organized by Historic Seattle). Its streets are well maintained, beautifully landscaped, and a pleasure to walk through and live in. Its character has fostered the type of multi-generational community that has come together to hold block parties with its own live neighborhood band, Easter egg hunts for kids, and to maintain a beautiful environment, such as by landscaping the mini-park traffic circle at 17th Ave NE and Naomi Pl, and candle-lighting the entire neighborhood with luminaries during the December holidays.

It would be a shame to jeopardize the beauty and character of this unique neighborhood and subject its unified character to haphazard densification, not just for its current residents, but also the overall beauty of the city, and for posterity. This is not just my lone opinion. The neighborhood has voiced its opinion in near unanimity that it should not be included in the Roosevelt urban village, in a signed petition submitted to DPD by the RBCA. This is not simply a case of NIMBYism or not wanting change. The neighborhood as a whole welcomes light rail. It welcomes smart growth, increased density that maintains the unique neighborhood character and livability, bike paths through the neighborhood that make sense. It doesn't welcome policies that are poorly thought out (or in this case, boundaries that are not thought out at all except by a computer algorithm), that will potentially destroy the type of beautiful, livable 100 year old neighborhood that makes Seattle so special. I urge you to take a look at this unique neighborhood, and keep the urban village boundary as originally proposed, at 15th Ave NE.

On a related note, the inclusion of Ravenna Park, and the exclusion of the Roosevelt reservoir make it clear that the boundaries were not solely drawn by a computer, but with some human intervention. I am assuming that the park itself is not being considered for development, but is instead being included within the boundaries to excuse developers from having to set aside greenspace in their development. It hardly seems fair to gerrymander the borders for this purpose, while at the same time relying on a computer algorithm to set the boundaries for the rest of the eastern boundary. The boundaries should be drawn by people who know the neighborhood (such as the RBCA, with input from the residents), to reflect the realities on the ground and to balance the needs of increased housing density with livability. In the case of the neighborhood, the border should be at 15th Ave NE.

Sincerely,
Kim Quon

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Doug Trumm

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I don't think any of the four major alternatives discussed go far enough and I support The Urbanist's Alternative 5 that increased the number and size of urban villages. It's also crucial the plan reflects the best of HALA. Particularly urban villages should max out wood construction to at least 7 stories. There is strong evidence that cross laminated wood can go higher (easily 10 stories). Encouraging wood construction would also help Seattle meet its climate change goals (concrete is very carbon intensive). http://www.theurbanist.org/2015/06/16/support-alternative-5-for-seattle-2035/

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Puget Sound Sage,Ubax Gardheere

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Environment, Growth Strategy, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

Good Afternoon.
Please find our attached comments on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft.
If you have any trouble reading the document or need clarification on content, please reach out to us.
Sincerely,
Ubax Gardheere, MPA
Program Director
Puget Sound Sage
--
November 20, 2015
City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development
Attn: Seattle 2035
Dear Mr. Hauger,
We respectfully submit our comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan Update (the Plan). Puget Sound Sage values the tremendous work done by DPD and City of Seattle staff to write the Plan. In particular, we deeply appreciate the extension of the City's race and social justice framework throughout.
Puget Sound Sage improves the lives of all families by creating shared prosperity in our regional economy. We bring together community, labor, faith, and environmental leaders to advance a common agenda for racial and social equity, a stronger democracy, better jobs, a clean environment, and thriving communities.
The Plan is the single most important policy document for the future of Seattle. To achieve the City's 20-year vision to accommodate growth the Plan must include a) a strong race and social justice framework with clear implementation and evaluation strategies b) goals and policies that improve outcomes and narrow disparities for all Seattle residents and c) concrete mitigation strategies to prevent displacement of residents and businesses that also help communities of color, low-income households, immigrant and refugee communities, and youth realize the benefits of growth. We believe that these elements are consistent with the City's equity values as stated in the Plan.
However, the Plan as proposed falls short of embodying both a vision and set of strategies for growth that benefits all Seattle residents. The comments and suggestions below are intended to make the Plan more clear on equity outcomes, accountability, and concrete strategies.
In addition to stronger equity goals and policies, the draft Plan should indicate how the City will implement it and make decisions moving forward. We suggest that the City state as a clear goal that future planning and decision-making around the Plan be rooted in a community participation and prioritize community leadership. While the City will play a critical role in creating resources for affordable housing, community leadership will the key to helping communities of color and low-income households prosper in place as the City grows. The Plan needs to live not just on paper and in government action but through ongoing community determination of their future.
Overarching Comments

- ? The racial and social equity framework, which is key pillar of the Plan, is incorporated inconsistently throughout the document. As the City moves into an implementation phase of its Race and Social Justice Initiative, we urge DPD to develop statements for all plan elements that assert the desired outcomes with regards to racial and social equity. The Growth Strategy, Land Use, and Transportation Elements need a stronger overarching equity lens and additional goals

and policies to work towards increasing opportunities and reducing disparities for low income communities and people of color. Additionally, City staff should ensure that Plan goals and

Puget Sound Sage: Draft Comprehensive Plan Letter Page 2

policies reflect the mitigation strategies identified in the DEIS and Equity Assessment that are critical to preventing displacement. As written, the Plan seems to be disconnected from those analyses.

- Policies in the Plan should indicate a clear path for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Throughout the plan, lack of specificity in goal and policy language will likely result in the plan being unenforceable, unmonitorable, and undermine the effectiveness of the City's vision to accommodate growth. Specific, quantifiable equity measures should be identified and monitored throughout the life of the plan.
- The City of Seattle has recently established a broad plan to address housing affordability and displacement through the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) process. From HALA has emerged the most clear and comprehensive strategy to date that will address our affordability crisis. With wide support from elected officials, private sector partners, and community, the HALA recommendations should be included in the Plan. Specifically, the Plan should reflect the clear numeric goals for affordable and market rate housing production, strategies to achieve these goals, and timelines for implementation included in the HALA report. There are several instances where the Plan goals and policies directly contradict the strategies agreed upon through HALA. These conflicts should be resolved.

Growth Strategy

Historically, marginalized communities have been left out of the planning process and most often are disproportionately burdened by strategies to accommodate housing and employment growth. The best way for the City to undo these historic outcomes is to put marginalized communities at the center of the planning process. Policies under GS1 must be amended to prioritize participation and leadership from marginalized communities. The City should also amend policies GS1.5 and GS1.6, which propose monitoring strategies to assess how the City is growing, to include collection and publication of baseline affordability data and the number of housing and commercial units in urban centers and villages. Without baselines data, the City will be ill-equipped to show whether the growth strategy displaces existing households or deepens inclusiveness and equity.

Growth Strategy Goal 2, which aims to accommodate most of the City's housing and employment growth in designated centers and urban villages, does not adequately address housing affordability and choice or residential and commercial displacement. In this section, the City must explicitly state its goals to 1) increase affordable, family sized housing choice in areas with high opportunity, and 2) invest in low-opportunity neighborhoods to guarantee that existing residents benefit from those investments. Additional policies must be added to ensure that anti-displacement strategies are put in place before major growth or redevelopment occurs.

Urban centers and urban villages play an important role in growth management, but unless these central places accommodate, and preserve cultural institutions like culturally relevant businesses and religious centers, social cohesion for our communities will be lost and displacement exacerbated. Policy GS2.2 should include language for the creation and preservation of cultural institutions and businesses.

The List of Hub Urban Villages should include a list of potential new locations to accommodate recently dedicated funding for additional transit stations along the LINK light rail, namely Graham Street Station and 130th St Station. The list of potential new Villages should also reference locations included in GS2.12 – the area that is generally within a ten-minute walk of frequent light rail stations in urban village boundaries—and other areas served by high-capacity transit. Both of these locations have a financial commitment from the City through the passage of the Move Seattle Funding Levy.

Puget Sound Sage: Draft Comprehensive Plan Letter Page 3

Land Use
All of the alternatives explored in the DEIS and accompanying equity assessment plainly state that any growth strategy will place disproportionate displacement risk on lower and middle-income communities and people of color in Central and South Seattle. As the City has well documented, displacement of marginalized people from their communities threatens the existing social fabric, disintegrates community support systems, and weakens political inclusion. The City must reference these expected outcomes in the policies and goals, as well as include new policies to prevent and effectively mitigate displacement.
Incentives for increasing density that require community benefits are an important strategy to accommodate growth in Seattle. However, new density with or without affordability should not come at the expense of existing affordable housing and commercial space. For example, if a new 100 unit building with 5 affordable units replaces an older building with 25 affordable units of naturally occurring affordability, it will be a loss for that neighborhood. A new policy under LUG7, should encourage plans to replace affordable units demolished through redevelopment and consider alternatives such as preservation of the original building by a non-profit or public agency.
The City of Seattle has a goal to increase housing choices in high opportunity areas for low-income households. As noted in the DEIS Equity Assessment, many of the City's high opportunity areas overlap with areas zoned for single-family homes. While the City is mandated to make policy accommodations for single-family uses through GMA, Land Use Goal 8 and accompanying polices should include strategies that increase affordable family sized housing choices in single-family neighborhoods to ensure access to services, high-quality jobs, quality education, etc.
The displacement risk documented in the equity assessment of the DEIS includes risk for residents of affordable housing, renters of affordable commercial space, and community spaces that house cultural institutions. LU 10.16 should be amended to include language regarding the preservation of affordable commercial space. While LU 10.22 should be amended to include cultural institutions and businesses. We also recommend referencing successful tools and programs like Community Cornerstones, which worked to help cultural businesses adapt to new TOD conditions and benefit from major community investments.
Transportation
Affordable and accessible transit is crucial to ensure the City of Seattle grows equitably. An affordably connected city opens up opportunities for housing choice, access to high-paying jobs, broader education choices, and other essential supports like healthcare, childcare, and community gathering spaces. Transportation-related policies and goals in the Plan should account for and address historic disinvestment and disparities in service for low-income communities and people of color.
Transportation Goal 3, which aims to meet the mobility needs of Seattle residents, does not include adequate provisions for affordability and accessibility of transportation service.
Investing in transportation in our City is also a significant investment in the local and regional economy. It is vitally important that the Plan ensures that any major investments in the transportation system benefit all sectors and participants of our economy. The City of Seattle has implemented successful tools and strategies (such as Community Cornerstones) to ensure that businesses in South Seattle adapt to changes created by light rail investment and remain stable in the face of rising land costs and rents. These best practices should be reflected in Transportation Goal 5 and subsequent policies.
Puget Sound Sage: Draft Comprehensive Plan Letter Page 4
Major public investments in our City should undergo rigorous tests to evaluate their impact on marginalized communities. In T10.6, please clarify how race and social equity factors will be considered in selecting transportation investments.
Housing
To encourage mixed-income and racially diverse communities, the City of Seattle has made a public

commitment to 1) housing choices in high-opportunity areas and 2) preserving affordability and enhancing low-opportunity areas with strategies to ensure the benefits of growth flow to existing marginalized populations. The City should articulate these goals more clearly throughout the Housing Element.

The Plan makes no reference to the agreed upon housing strategies from HALA. Puget Sound Sage urges the City to reference:

- Affordability goals outlines by Mayor Murray and show how these goals meet or exceed the King County Countywide Planning Policies requirement to plan for affordability for 0-30%, 30-50%, and 50-80% AMI.
- Specific strategies to achieve housing affordability, such as recently adopted Mandatory Housing Affordability policies, among a list of other potential tools under Housing Goal 5 and subsequent policies.
- Provisions and timelines for implementing affordable housing preservation and displacement prevention strategies.

Housing Goal 2 and subsequent policies do not reference any DEIS or Equity Assessment findings that show increased growth near urban centers and hub urban villages will disproportionately impact low-income communities and people of color in Central and South Seattle. A new policy should be added under Housing Goal 2 that develops provisions and timelines for implementing displacement mitigation measures ahead of planned upzones. A similar policy should be included under Housing Goal 5.

While the development and enforcement of healthy housing programs will ensure safe housing for many Seattle residents, related housing policies and programs should include provisions to ensure that enforcement does not result in the loss of affordable housing.

There are currently no provisions in the housing element to monitor the success, failure, or impacts of the proposed policies. We strongly encourage the City to adopt goals and policies to monitor and evaluate outcomes of the Plan, especially those that may disproportionately impact communities of color, low-income households, immigrant and refugee communities, youth, etc.

Economic Development

In reality most of the topics covered in the Plan are strongly tied to economic development outcomes. As Seattle grows as a hub for high-paying jobs in technology, aerospace, manufacturing, and healthcare, the City must ensure that the benefits from growth are distributed equitably. Policies in the Land Use, Transportation, and Housing Elements that relate to economic development outcomes should all clearly articulate strategies that provide pathways to high quality employment for communities that have been historically excluded from opportunity. This includes both strategies to access high-paying jobs and make low-wage, dead end career jobs better. One clear example of encouraging better jobs are grocery stores in Seattle. Over 80% of all grocery chain jobs in the City are under collective bargaining agreements that provide good wages, high-quality health care and long-term career opportunity. Without collective bargaining, those jobs would reflect much poorer quality working conditions found in many suburban stores.

Puget Sound Sage: Draft Comprehensive Plan Letter Page 5

Goal EDG2 and subsequent policies should include strategies to encourage that high paying, high skill jobs in the industry clusters listed are accessible to and representative of all residents, specifically marginalized communities, throughout Seattle.

Strategies to improve workforce development for marginalized communities in EDG4 should be aligned with strategies to invest in places with low-access to opportunity and high-displacement risk, especially near high-capacity transit in Central and South Seattle. Examples include culturally-relevant early learning training, community college centers and food industry programs.

Goal EDG5 aspires to strengthen the entrepreneurial environment for small businesses, but does not acknowledge or plan to eliminate barriers for immigrant and refugee business owners. The City should

add a policy under EDG5 that specifically addresses the needs of these vital community institutions.
Environment
Many of the goals and policies do not work directly to address historic environmental degradation and disinvestment in communities of color and low-income households. Policies should more explicitly address historic inequities and gaps in environmental quality between neighborhoods in Seattle. The City should develop a new policy to ensure that those most impacted by environmental injustice and climate change lead the policy conversation and develop the solutions moving forward.
Conclusion
We view the Plan as a significant tool for economic prosperity for all current and future Seattle residents. We believe that growth is possible without displacement and that increasing density can go hand in hand with race and social justice. But the Plan must prioritize specificity and scale of strategies, evaluation, community leadership in developing and implementing solutions, and consistency with existing policy direction to promote an equitable future for the City. We hope that you accept these comments in this spirit and look forward to working with you to finalize the Comprehensive Plan.
Sincerely,
Ubax Gardheere, MPA
Program Director, Puget Sound Sage
Cosigners:
One America
InterIm Community Development Association
Vietnamese Friendship Association
Homesight
Rainier Beach Action Coalition
Eritrean Association in Greater Seattle
Filipino Community of Seattle
East African Community Services

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: The Urbanist,Owen Pickford

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

Hello Seattle 2035 Team,
The Urbanist comment on the Seattle 2035 draft plan is attached here. Thank you for all the work you did on this. Please don't hesitate to contact us with any questions.
Regards,
Owen
Owen Pickford, Executive Director
The Urbanist |
--
November 20, 2015
Diane Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning and Development
City of Seattle
Director Sugimura,
We appreciate the dedicated and thoughtful work the the City and your department has invested in planning for Seattle’s future. This city has been at the forefront of visionary, progressive policies that

have improved the quality of people's live and their built and natural environment. In that vein, the work of Seattle 2035 is an invaluable community exercise to vet a comprehensive plan that embodies the city's hopes and dreams for today and future generations. It's for this reason that getting policy decisions right now is critical.

During the comment period for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, we urged the City to consider four key policy themes: diversity, equity, opportunity, and accessibility for all. Specifically, we offered the following policy goals for the City to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan:

1. All areas of the city have an obligation to support growth, and the right to access the urban benefits that come with it. Regardless of wealth, race, class, or zoning, each portion of the city must support its share of the city's growth. As an example, single-family residential zones are appropriate for many of the common M issing Middle housing types, such as cottage housing, detached accessory dwelling units, duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, and even rowhouses. These housing options should be broadly allowed with minimal interference from neighbors. These building types are equitable, desirable, and compatible with the character of residential neighborhoods. While this type of growth may seem painful to some, it presents a wide range of opportunities and benefits: proximity to jobs, access to high-quality transit, grocery stores and restaurants, parks, schools, and more. All these benefits come from growth and density, not the other way around. All residents, whether new or old, deserve to partake in these urban benefits, regardless of where they live.
2. Expand the number and size of urban villages to accommodate growth throughout the city. There are ample commercial and medium-density residential areas in the city that have no urban center or urban village designation, such as Aurora Avenue (north of N 36th St to N 85th St), Upper Fremont, "Frelard", Westlake, Nickerson, M adison Park, Wedgwood, South Magnolia, Interbay, Graham, and many more. Each of these areas presents an opportunity to absorb growth while providing tremendous urban benefits. The city should also consider extending boundaries in these areas beyond just the immediate medium-density residential and commercial core properties. Transit walksheds extend beyond the core, and bikesheds extend even farther. Connecting bike rides with transit, something that will become even easier with Pronto's expansion, shows that the urban villages can be much larger. Overconcentration of growth leads to targeted displacement and disruption. Only by spreading growth throughout the city can we ensure that no single area experiences an unreasonable share.
3. Expand urban zoning in urban villages and urban centers. Designating areas as urban villages isn't enough. The city needs to go further and expand the areas of urban development in urban villages and high-intensity zoning in urban centers, especially where there is extraordinary demand for housing (e.g. Ballard, Wallingford, South Lake Union, and the University District). This will reduce the number of people that are displaced due to demolitions.
4. Actively mitigate the impacts of growth in areas where displacement risk is high. We support adopting policies that will alleviate or prevent actual displacement. This might include mandatory participation in the multifamily tax exemption (or a similar program), mandatory inclusionary zoning or linkage fees, one-to-one replacement of affordable units in perpetuity, focusing housing levy dollars in these areas, using the city's bonding authority for sustainable affordable housing options, and other socially progressive housing strategies through the land use code or city actions in the form of programs and partnerships.

The Draft Plan suggests that the City is pursuing many of these policies in the spirit of the long-established Urban Village Strategy, and we find that incredibly encouraging. Here are just a few of the policy changes that we applaud:

- Targeting policies that will deliver affordable housing options and create racial and social equity;
- Creating higher standards for buildings to achieve for health, safety, and the environment;
- Acknowledging that the proliferation of off-street parking iscounterproductive to a growing, innovative, and multi-modal city;
- Enhancing policies for industrial areas, which are integral to the localeconomy;
- Establishing a Stadium District to recognize the unique attributes of sporting entertainment and complimentary amenities they bring;
- Recognizing that additional housing typologies are compatible within low density residential areas;
- Setting goals for parks and open space that focus on quality instead of quantity;
- Focusing growth where transit is highly accessible;
- Developing superior metrics for mobility and transportation planning of all users in lieu of Level of Service; and
- Establishing high targets for non-driving modes across the city.

Additionally, we recognize that land use discussions are always a challenge for policymakers, but we strongly support the bold proposals envisioned to expand urban villages and even add a new one near NE 130th St and I-5. This is a necessary step to accommodate growth over the next 20 years. But we still believe that the City should evaluate other locations for additional designation as urban village, as suggested above.
Cordially yours,
The Urbanist Board of Directors (Owen Pickford, Stephen Fesler, Ben Crowther, Sarah Oberklaid, and Scott Bonjukian)

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Freight Advisory Board,Warren Aakervik

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

[forwarded by Kevin O'Neill]
Here's the Freight Board's letter. As Chris noted, the other boards are slackers. We never expected a letter from the Transit Board. I suspect we might hear more from at least the Bike Board later in the adoption process.
Bill
Bill LaBorde
--
November 20, 2015
Ms. Diane Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning & Development
City of Seattle
Subject:Seattle 2035: Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan
Dear Ms. Sugimura:
The purpose of the Freight Advisory Board is to "advise the City Council, Mayor, and all departments and offices of the City in development of a functional and efficient freight system and on all matters related to freight and the impact that actions by the City may have upon the freight environment." (Resolution 31243)
The purpose of this letter is to provide comments from the Seattle Freight Advisory Board on the Seattle

2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan. As you may know, Seattle DOT is preparing the first Freight Master Plan (FMP) for the City and it is planned for completion in 2016. This is the fourth modal master plan for the City and must be reflected in this update to the Comprehensive Plan to fully reflect both the planned network as well as the expected changes in freight mobility and good deliveries – in concert with the planned growth and changes to person mobility in the City. Please do not finalize Seattle 2035 and the Seattle Comprehensive Plan until it can fully reflect an adopted Freight Master Plan, endorsed by both Mayor and Council. We strongly urge that the Seattle Comprehensive Plan not be finalized or adopted without incorporating and reflecting the adopted FMP. The current schedule for a Draft FMP for public comment is in February 2016. The Seattle 2035, Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan is not a comprehensive plan for transportation and mobility in Seattle without reflecting the FMP which is still in development.

Seattle Municipal Tower

SFAB Comment Letter Seattle 2035 11-20-15
Below are Freight Advisory Board comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan based on our review, for you to incorporate into the Final Plan.

- The Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan must reflect the Freight Master Plan as a critical travel mode for Seattle. Do not adopt the Comprehensive Plan without incorporating the Freight Master Plan.
- Where is freight in the Plan? Freight must be included in the plan for property access and in the streets design standards for trucks, loading and site access. The current draft focuses on movement of people. Freight movement to the distribution centers with large trucks (WB67) for those same people should receive commensurate emphasis.
- Protect the manufacturing and industrial centers in Seattle – the MIC and the Ballard Interbay MIC
- Sustain the freight network – major truck streets, minor truck streets – as redefined in the Freight Master Plan in development
- Seattle growth envisions people mobility with emphasis on transit and non- motorized travel, however, reduced reliance on the private auto will increase reliance on freight and freight mobility to deliver goods throughout the City. This means that freight mobility is a key to a vibrant economy in Seattle. Level of service of transit and freight must be a benchmark of any further growth in the Seattle area.

The Freight Advisory Board looks forward to the Seattle 2035 – Comprehensive Plan that helps to set the stage for overall growth and livability in Seattle. Freight is a key element of Transportation for the City and we urge you to ensure that freight is fairly reflected in the updated Comprehensive Plan, including the Freight Master Plan in development.
Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or issues. Sincerely,
Warren R. Aakervik, Jr.
Chairman, Seattle Freight Advisory Board

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Natalie Quick

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

Dear Mayor Murray:

As part of the City of Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan DEIS, attached is a comment letter from several industrial stakeholders Thank you for the opportunity to share feedback – we look forward to ongoing dialogue with you and your team on this topic.
Sincerely,
Natalie Quick
Natalie Quick | President & CEO
Natalie Quick Consulting
--
November 20, 2015
Hon. Edward Murray
Seattle City Hall
Dear Mayor Murray:
As industrial property owners, owner/operators, business owners, real estate brokers, business leaders and concerned neighbors, we have deep concerns about the proposed removal of all future Industrial Commercial (IC) zoning as part of the City of Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
We strongly oppose the unwarranted removal of the IC zone and are equally concerned about the lack of dialogue, outreach and engagement with industrial owners, owner/operators and other affected stakeholders prior to this recommendation.
Land zoned Industrial Commercial (IC) represents less than 1% of the city's total land base and less than 10% of the city's roughly 4,670 acres of industrial land.1 Roughly 87% of the city's industrial land – or 4,133 acres – is zoned Industrial General-1 or Industrial General- 22. As such, this land is expressly protected from non-industrial uses (specifically office and retail uses) via the city's 2007 industrial lands downzone.
Industrial Commercial land exists as a natural buffer between IG-zoned land and other less restrictive zones – such as Commercial (C) or Neighborhood Commercial (NC). Both of these less-restrictive zones encourage residential uses and other neighborhood-focuses amenities, pedestrian elements and are often in or near Urban Villages or Urban Centers. As supporters of Seattle's maritime, manufacturing and industrial heritage, we recognize that the working waterfront in South Seattle and Ballard, or the Duwamish waterways, are clear examples of industrial/maritime use and should remain that way. But along the edges, which is where Industrial Commercial land exists, there should be flexibility and a mix of non-residential uses.
The complete removal of the IC zone from the city's land use code is extreme and unwarranted. IG-zoned land is robustly protected from encroachment by non-industrial uses and uses advanced in IC-zoned land is consistent with the current code. Eliminating this zoning designation would remove that flexibility and preclude future land uses in Seattle's industrial border areas, areas that serve as buffers between residential urban areas and industrial and manufacturing centers.
We are also concerned about the lack of outreach associated with the Department of Planning and Development Studies that lead up to this recommendation. The November 2013 Duwamish M/IC Policy and Land Use Study did not include outreach to property 1 City of Seattle land use zoning and GIS layers; King County GIS parcel layer 2 DPD Duwamish M/IC Policy and Land Use Study, 2013
2
owners or neighborhood developers, nor did the January 2015 Local Production Study. Recommendations from these plans were then advanced without discussion from these stakeholder groups into the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendment process as a fait accompli.
We have been equally concerned about the remarkably vague language previously advanced in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan that sets an unattainably high bar for removing any land from Seattle's massive Manufacturing / Industrial Centers (M/IC). Should the city adopt this language, it would significantly limit future retail and commercial uses in SODO and other areas bordering heavy

industrial/manufacturing uses for the foreseeable future. We are pleased this language is no longer in the current Draft EIS and strongly support its removal.
Some have argued that this work was predicated as part of the Arena Co. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Seattle and King County. This is not the case. That directive was limited to the Duwamish area and that study was completed. It in no way set the stage for sweeping legislation that impacts Ballard, Interbay, Fremont, SODO, and Georgetown.
As neighborhood property owners, owner/operators, developers and industry leaders, we are consistently left out of the discussion when it comes to the direction of industrial land in our communities. As such, the direction advanced in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan doesn't include on-the-ground economics from owners, owner/operators and landholders – and instead only reflects the perspective of industrial/manufacturing tenants (existing and those who have left town), industrial lobbying groups, pro-industrial associations, labor groups and public entities, such as the Port of Seattle. While these are important perspectives, they are one side of the discussion.
Before sweeping recommendations are advanced, it's time to bring balance and fair representation to industrial land policy direction. As such, we urge you to not move ahead with the proposed restrictions on industrial development from the Comprehensive Plan.
Sincerely,
Johannes Ariens
Constructive Element
Jimmy Blais
Merlino Properties, LLC
John Bredvik
Deanne Ederer Emmons
Ederer Investment
Dan Ederer
Ederer Investment
3
Jay Fisher
Principal Real Estate Investors
Wendy Glant
Glant Pacific Companies
Mikel Hansen
Sabey Corporation
John Hempelmann
Cairncross & Hempelmann
Jeffrey Hummel
Hummel Architects
AP Hurd
Touchstone
Chad Johnstun
Dick's Restaurant Supply
Don Merlino
Stoneway Concrete
Gary Merlino
Gary Merlino Construction Company, Inc.
Kent Mueller
Marcus & Millichap
John Pietromonaco

HRP Properties
Jack Rader
Pacific Realty Advisors LLC
Craig Ramey
Regency Centers
Douglas Rosen
Alaskan Copper & Brass Company
Adam Rosen
Alco Investment Company
Robb Stack
Pacific Investment Co.
4
Greg Steinhauer
American Life, Inc.
John Teutsch
Teutsch Partners, LLC
Charles Wathun
Interbay Investors, LLC
cc:
2035@seattle.gov
Kate Joncas, Deputy Mayor, City of Seattle
Robert Feldstein, Director, Office of Policy and Innovation, Mayor's Office
Chris Gregorich, Special Advisor for Strategic Initiatives, Mayor's Office
Sara Belz, Office of Policy and Innovation, Mayor's Office
Diane Sugimura, Director, Seattle Department of Planning & Development
Kathy Nyland, Director, Department of Neighborhoods

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Matt Thullbery

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Hello,
I am concerned about the urban villages and land use immediately surrounding the borders of the urban villages. I currently live at N 84th St, and I am worried the comprehensive plan will permit across the board upzoning which will radically alter the landscape of the wonderful neighborhoods of Seattle. I am in favor of preserving and protecting low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited. I would like to preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics. If upzoning is to occur, I would be in favor if ALL of the following criteria are met: The land is within a current urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-

family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed. In summary, I would like to foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Thank you.
Matt Thullbery

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Washington State Public Stadium Authority,Ann Kawasaki Romero

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

November 20,2015
WASH I NGTON STATE
PUBLIC STAD IUM AUTHORITY
City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development
Attention: Tom Hauger and Kristian Kofoed
Via email: 2035@Seattle.gov
Re: WSPSA Comments on Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan
Dear Mr. Hauger and Mr. Kofoed:
The Washington State Public Stadium Authority (PSA) appreciates the opportunity to submit this comment letter in support of Seattle's Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The PSA is the public agency that owns CenturyLink Field and Event Center (CenturyLink) and is charged with protecting the citizens' $430 million facility.
1. The PSA Strongly Supports Creating the Stadium District.
First and foremost, the PSA wants to express it strong suppot1 for the inclusion of the Stadium District in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, and its excitement at seeing the Stadium District identified as amongst DPD' s "1 0 Key Proposals" for the Comprehensive Plan. It has been more than ten years since Century Link opened, and more than fifteen years since Safeco Field opened. The PSA believes that it is critical to recognize and protect the substantial public investment reflected in the two event facilities. Toward that end, the PSA and the Washington State Major League Baseball Stadium Public Facilities District (PFD) began a planning effort in 2010 to develop common goals and objectives to protect the public investment and viability of the two facilities. That effmt culminated in issuance of the Stadium District Concept Plan in 2012. Thereafter, the PSA participated in the Stadium District Advisory Committee empaneled by the City in 20 13, which generated many of the goals and policies proposed in the Draft 203 5 Comprehensive Plan.
We supp01i the creation of an independent land use district. The time is ripe to acknowledge how this area has developed over the past decade and to move from a zoning overlay to an independent district that better supports and capitalizes on the spmts and events facilities that make up its largest uses.
2. The Stadium District Should Include All PSA-Owned Property. The PSA owns all ofthe property north ofCenturyLink up to Stadium Place, the Nolo Building, and the planned hotel/office building to the east on King Street. The draft Future Land Map appears not to include all ofthe PSA-owned property, leaving a pmiion of the PSA-owned .
- 2-
property (the portion known as the south half of the north lot) in the Pioneer Square Mixed ("PMS") zone. We can see no reason or benefit to bifurcating the PSA's property into two zones. Instead, all of the PSA-owned property should be part of the new Stadium District and subject to the zoning regulations that will be applicable to the Stadium District.

The PSA was created by Referendum in 1997. Pursuant to that Referendum, the PSA is strictly limited in how it can use its property. The PSA may only use this propetty for a "stadium and exhibition center," defined as "an open-air stadium suitable for national football league football and for Olympic and World Cup soccer, with adjacent exhibition facilities, together with associated parking facilities and other ancillary facilities." RCW 36.102.050(1), RCW 36.102.01 0(9).

The PSA has no immediate plans to redevelop the south half of the north lot, but when it does, that property will have to be part of the authorized stadium and exhibition center use. Although a "stadium and exhibition center use" is not prohibited outright under the City Code, the development regulations applicable to the PSM zone and Pioneer Square Preservation District (PSPD) limit development pursuant to that use. See e.g., SMC 23 .66.130(C) (discouraging any general sales or services uses or eating and drinking establishments over 3,000 square feet, and any use over 10,000 square feet); SMC 23.66.130(D) (prohibiting any use from occupying more than 50% of the street-level frontage of a block that is 20,000 square feet or more); SMC 23 .66.130(B) (encouraging smaller retail and restaurant uses). By retaining the south half of the north lot in the PSM zone, the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan inadvertently, but significantly, restricts the development potential ofthis valuable property. Moreover, with the recent development of Stadium Place, the Nolo Building and the pending development of the hotel/office building to the east on King Street, the south half of the no1th lot is effectively buffered from Pioneer Square (and vice versa). 1 When the Pioneer Square Special Review District was first created in 1973, one ofthe City's concerns was that autooriented development in the nmth lot of the newly developed Kingdome would adversely affect the character of Pioneer Square. See Ordinance 102455 (1973). When the Council next revised the Pioneer Square District in 1985, the Council expressly mapped the north lot as a "buffer" between Pioneer Square and the Kingdome, designated the north lot for parking use to support the Kingdome, and did not apply the street level use requirements to the nmth lot. See Ordinance 104 709 (1985). Thereafter in 1999, concurrent with plans to replace the Kingdome with CenturyLink, the Council eliminated the parking designation on the nmth lot, and recognized its likely development with "a mix of uses, including a substantial amount of housing." Ordinance 119484, Section 34 (SMC 23.66.l l (C)(4)) (1999).

That mixed-use/residential development is now complete, and provides the transition between the Stadium District to the south and Pioneer Square to the north and west. There is no need for additional buffer between the Pioneer Square and Century Link. The north sides of the new mixed use developments minor many of the historical features of Pioneer Square, while the south sides of those developments match the relative modernity of Century Link Field. In light of 1 Development permitted for the east parcel of the north half of the North Lot includes: 298.974 sqft of hotel (297 rooms), 174,271 sq ft of office, and 36,673 sqft of retail/restaurant uses.

- 3-

this historical evolution of the PSPD and the recent development of the nmth half of the north lot, we can see no reason to retain the south half of the north lot in the PSM. Finally, the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan contains no explanation for why it is appropriate or necessary to retain the south half of the nmth lot in the PSM zone. The only explanation provided to date (which is not stated in the Draft Camp Plan) has been that the north half of the north lot was able to develop relatively smoothly under the PSM and PSHD. The north half of the north lot is now owned by a private developer interested in and able to pursue a diverse array of uses. That is not the case with the south half of the north lot, which is owned by a public entity and subject to pre-existing statutory use restrictions.

Now is the time, as the City is first creating the District, to establish the appropriate boundary. That boundary would place all of the PSA-owned property in the Stadium District with other event facilities.

3. The Stadium District Policies Should More Fully Implement the Stadium District Concept Plan.

The Stadium District Concept Plan, created by the PSA and the PFD, was a foundational document for the City's Stadium District Study and the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. As such, DPD should more fully

integrate the key components from that Concept Plan into the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, particularly the provisions calling for additional parking, more public open space, and view preservation.
With regard to parking, the PSA appreciates the steps made in Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan "to address unique event-related parking needs." Draft Policy LU 15.9. Additional affirmative measures are needed to replace the thousands of parking spaces that have been eliminated in the District over the past 10 years by the Viaduct replacement/tunnel construction and other developments, and to ensure adequate parking to meet current and future parking demand in the District. The Concept Plan calls for the creation of2000 new parking spaces over a ten year period. To enable that goal, the PSA suggests adding the following language to Draft Policy 15.9:
If new parking facilities are added, they should be co-located with or adjacent to existing parking or accessory to a spmts or event venue or other public use and designed to be compatible with the pedestrian-friendly character intended for the district.
This minor revision will provide more opportunities in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan to ensure adequate parking supply in the Stadium District. Second, the PSA believes that the City can and should do more to create public open space in the District. Toward that end- and in suppmt of the draft Stadium District Goal of supporting the continued viability of the industrial area west of the WOSCA site- the PSA encourages the City to begin master planning the WOSCA site now. As the PSA said throughout the City's Stadium District Advisory Committee process, the WOSCA site represents a "once in a century" opportunity for the City and the Stadium District. - 4-
DPD undertook master planning for Yesler Terrace. The PSA recommends and requests that the City adopt a master planning process for the WOSCA site as part of implementing the Stadium District. This would give the future owner/developer of the WOSCA prope1ty greater ce1tainty about the intention behind proposed policy LU 15.7 ("Encourage new development to contribute to the creation of a network of public spaces and streetscapes .... "), and ensure this valuable propetty is redeveloped· in a way that benefits the public and is acceptable to all of its neighbors.
Finally, on the issue of view preservation, the PSA appreciates the efforts reflected in the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan to protect important view corridors within the City. See Draft Policy LU 15.4, 15.6. The PSA believes that the 2035 Comprehensive Plan can and should do more to protect the valuable view corridors both to and from CenturyLink and Safeco Field in the Stadium District. This could be accomplished by master planning WOSCA and creating development standards on massing and location to avoid higher heights in areas that will cause adverse impacts to views to/frof!l Century Link, or otherwise limiting the height of buildings to the west of Century Link to 65 fed.
4. The Stadium District Policies Should Recognize the Need for Large Signage to Supp01t Sp01t Venues. The Stadium District Study included an additional policy that is not reflected in the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan related to signage. Specifically, the Study provided: Recognize that major spcnts and entettainment uses have unique needs for oversized signage or displays associated within venues, and accommodate such needs in sign code regulations.
Stadium District Plan (November 2013), p. 53. The PSA requests that DPD include this policy in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan for the Stadium District. Thank you very much for your consideration ofthe PSA's comments regarding the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. We strongly supp01t the City's decision to create a Stadium District, and hope that our comments will improve that vision. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me.
cc: Gary Johnson, City of Seattle
Very truly yours,
Ann Kawasaki Romero
Executive Director
Ed Goines, Vice President/General Counsel, First & Goal Inc.
Molly Lawrence, Van Ness Feldman GordonDerr

PSA Board Members

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Art Garcia

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

I oppose the proposed urban village expansions in the south end. We have current zoned areas with capacity that are unused at this time. I do not see a reason to expand the urban village areas at this time. In addition the scope of the proposed expansion is excessive since between the Beacon Hill and the North Rainier (Mount Baker) areas almost the entire neighborhood is being taken as an urban village. This is excessive and will have a devastating impact on a racially diverse and economically low income area. It is in direct opposition to race and social justice lens of the city and in conflict with affordable housing in that it will result in affordable housing being replaced by 100% high costs new construction market rate housing. There is no requirement for affordable housing for construction less than 20 units which this will be. Secondly it is challenging to be able to comment on a process with a dotted line blob as the "proposal" this is the first street level maps I have seen since other maps have been pixelated city maps that were purposefully unclear on what and where the changes were. I am concerned that the expansion of the Rainier area appears to be focused on including the "green spaces" in the urban village area. this appears to show that the city's intent is to allow clear cutting and development in these areas (all new construction clear cuts all trees before building to the fullest extent zoning lot lines allow). This process is on a fast track while other statements have been that there will be community meetings and outreach etc on changes to be rolled out over the next few years but those processes aren't set until 2016 or 2017 in the HALA documents? I am not sure what will be left to comment on. Also this process is extremely unclear how the urban village expansion process will happen and how subsequently the process to rezone/upzone/change the urban village areas will occur. I support and have worked for low income housing and social services and know that the only way true affordable housing is created is by designating and funding it. the market does not create it if it is not required. I am gravely concerned that this proposal will undermine and destroy our diverse neighborhood for gentrifying landlords - destroying affordable housing and driving low income families, seniors, people of color and limited English speakers out of the city. Since we are planning for 2035, it appears we could take more time to do that in a thoughtful way for all. Smaller changes to zoning for both an ADU and DADU (please please please keep owner occupied requirement for one of the 3 units) will create more affordbale housing, allow folks to stay in their homes, support multigenerational living, but maintain a neighborhood. Lack of owner occupied has lead to more absentee or airbnb or purely investment property which drives housing inflation prices. Thank you for your consideration of the comments or all citizens who live in neighborhoods. we rented for years saved money, and bought into an affordable Neighborhood.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Steve Nielsen

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

First of all I'd like to affirm the efforts of the City staff, citizen members of the advisory committees, members of the Seattle City Council and the Mayor's office for their diligent work ethic shown in

addressing the myriad of issues that arise in organizing, processing and preparing recommendations for a city-wide plan that will have far-reaching impacts on many facets of life in Seattle. Of particular interest to me is the impact the HALA plan will have on the implementation of residential development policies in the Seattle 2035 Plan and, more specifically, the Ballard Hub Urban Village.

The BHUV plan shows an area outside the Eastern boundary that is designated as "Potential village expansion area". I understand that there are on-going studies directed toward a change from a designation of "Potential" to "Proposed" Urban Village Boundary, indicating that, with the adoption of the Seattle 2035 Plan, the boundary of the BHUV will be expanded to include the areas bordering Market Street and within the 10-minute walk to frequent transit service. Such an expansion of the BHUV boundary would be precisely consistent with a number of emerging land use policies regarding such elements as walkability, transit service, proximity to employment areas, core community services and, perhaps most importantly, an optimum location for affordable housing as outlined in the HALA report and emerging implementation mandates.....to name only a few.

My primary interest may be that the impact of the HALA effort not be delayed by a protracted Seattle 2035 review cycle that would have a negative impact in on-going project planning by private developers interested in participation in the framework of the HALA model. There will be large development companies as well as smaller builders that will be able play a positive role in the implementation of the emerging residential land use policies. A great encouragement to us all will be, in the near term, the completion of an already extensive public review process and a timely publication of the updated Land Use Code that tells us what to do.

This is an optimum time for the Seattle 2035 plan to formally change the BHUV boundary to include the "Potential Expansion Area" East of the current boundary in the area of Market Street. The plan map can affirm the emerging residential land use policies by designating this area for LR-3 low density multi-family housing. It'll work.

Let's get some HALA projects under construction in 2016!

Steve Nielsen
Fairwinds Development

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Daniel Gamelin

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I write to voice my strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the Green Lake/Roosevelt Residential Urban Village into the Ravenna neighborhood as indicated in the proposed urban village expansion map of August 10, 2015.
The proposed expansion, indicated by a computer-generated dashed line on the City's map supplied to its citizens for comment, is irrational, unnecessary, and does not advance the City's objective of creating a walkable, livable urban village around public transit with affordable housing for its residents.
There are several reasons to reject this proposal:
1. The need for such a boundary expansion at this time is not adequately justified. Walking through the existing Green Lake/Roosevelt urban village, it is evident that there is still a great deal of underused

space remaining in areas that are presently already zoned for commercial or high-density housing use, in the form of one-story businesses, asphalt parking lots, or empty lots. Is the City really sure that additional up-development will be needed outside the present urban village boundaries even after these areas are developed? Or is the City in fact delaying development within the present boundaries by authorizing development in a new neighborhood? Once such a re-classification is permitted, it will never be reversed and the historic Ravenna neighborhood will be changed forever. Well-kept craftsman houses, a pride of Seattle's architectural history, will be slowly demolished, transformed into multiplexes, engulfed by incommensurate neighboring development, etc. This means that the City must have a legitimate and pressing need for expansion of this boarder into this neighborhood before it authorizes those irreversible changes. The evidence suggests that such a need do not yet exist, prompting the question of why the city is choosing to take such an irreversible action now before knowing whether it is really necessary?

2. The new proposed boundary is computer-generated and appears to be essentially arbitrary, meaning the City has not actually thought it through. The City should not treat its residents in such an impersonal way under the auspices of serving their interests. This computer-generated boundary slices arbitrarily through the Ravenna neighborhood, even through existing houses, with absolutely no regard for the existing structures or their residents. By providing citizens only a vague and poorly defined proposal for comment, the City is not providing residents sufficient opportunity to comment on the actual intended expansion plans.

3. Ravenna is not part of Green Lake or Roosevelt. The proposed expansion engulfs portions of single-family Ravenna neighborhoods that presently have historic turn-of-the-century housing maintained in fine condition, occupied by working families, and situated on narrow residential streets. The proposal to reclassify an arbitrary portion of this neighborhood for up-development by slicing through its middle with the re-zoning designation will have severe negative impact on both sides of this arbitrary boundary by causing demolition of historic housing and incommensurate development among single-family residences, increased automobile traffic at speeds that make it dangerous for neighborhood children to ride bicycles in front of their own houses, etc.

4. The City's proposed boundary clearly involves gerrymandering for book-keeping purposes. The boundary has been extended artificially deep into the Ravenna neighborhood so that it can include a portion of Ravenna Park and Cowen Park to satisfy the City's desired balance between urban development and open space in the urban villages. This boundary allows the City to proceed with high-density development in this neighborhood but circumvent the intended objective of balancing such development by also introducing green space for the many new occupants. From a citizen's perspective, it appears to be a very cynical move that is intended to allow greater development without any additional effort to improve the quality of life of the new high-density residents.

5. As a consequence of the above gerrymandering, the proposed boundary extends all the way to 20th Ave NE, arbitrarily slicing through houses along the way. The extension of a Green Lake/Roosevelt urban village all the way to 20th Ave NE, in the heart of Ravenna, is completely unjustifiable. This portion of Ravenna has should definitely not be subject to up-development associated with densification of Green Lake and Roosevelt.

5. Finally, it was very disconcerting for citizens to hear from the city planner at a recent Ravenna Bryant Neighborhood Association Meeting who was asked about lack of development around urban villages along light rail line south of downtown, that "There is not market value in developing south of Seattle." Is this development really being prioritized because it will lead to greater profits for developers, rather than best serving Seattle's residents? This is the clear impression given by the city planners.

I would welcome a response from your offices on any of these concerns.

Sincerely,

Daniel Gamelin

Ravenna resident

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Kelly Welker

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Dear Mayor Murray and Council members,
I'm writing to express my concern about the proposed Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendments that impact Seattle's 6000 acres of industrial land. These amendments form the Department of Planning and Development (DPD), new Office of Planning and Community Development, place unnecessary limitations on land use in the city's industrial areas, where non industrial uses were dramatically limited in 2007 down zoning. This is a one size fits all approach and should not be used for a divers area such as Georgetown.
There are areas of Georgetown that are vacant,when they could be extraordinary. We need more use of Industrial Commercial zoning. The city has to let land evolve. IC zones make up 6% of Seattle's industrial land base and are located precisely where we need MORE zoning flexibility. We need this zoning for flexible land use that acts as a buffer between residential areas and industrial and manufacturing centers. It's not a new cry. Georgetown residents have very little if any industrial buffers that protect us from industrial freight and hazardous pollution. There appears to be no health and equity built in to your planning factors in Georgetown. Residents deserve protection.
I'm equally concerned about the language in the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment that sets a high bar for removing any land form Seattle's massive Manufacturing and Industrial Centers (MIC). This would significantly limit future retail and commercial uses in Georgetown for the foreseeable future. It makes no sense to restrict the ability to convert Manufacturing /Industrial land to other uses. We don't know what the future holds. This is the M/IC 's bargaining chip because they are upset with the proposed Basketball stadium in SODO. It's manipulative. Georgetown residents don't have the money to hire lobbyist like the M/IC. Stop using Georgetown as a bargaining chip. Start treating the residents like they belong to the City of Seattle. If I wouldn't have access to a map, I wouldn't think that we belonged to the city of Seattle or District 2. We lack the green environment and walkablity that most Seattleite's enjoy. For years, our representation has only listened to and followed the instructions of the M/IC. That is why Georgetown is a polluted, treeless, transportation lacking, pedestrian unfriendly, food desert. Please, we just don't deserve to be treated like a M/IC pawn because it is one of the most affordable areas for families to live in. It feels like middle to lower economic class earns are being punished for having families. We aren't pawns.
The lack of outreach in Georgetown is historic. DPD is no exception. The November 2013 Duwamish M/IC Policy and Land Use Study did NOT include outreach to residents of Georgetown. Recommendations from this plan were then advanced without discussion from the residents and other stakeholders into the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Georgetown residents are consistently left out of discussion when it comes to direction of industrial land in our community. It is by DESIGN. Stop treating residents like it is acceptable for multi million dollar industries to make money off of my health and well being. We can share this portion of the city. Georgetown residents shouldn't give years of our lives for the City an the Manufacturing/Industrial communities benefit. We count!
Before sweeping recommendations are advanced, it's time to bring balance and fair representation to industrial land policy. Humans before profit would be an excellent start. We can share the land in Georgetown. Jobs are important, as long as your aren't paying your employer years of your life to have that job. Industry is important, as long as it's not polluting the land and taking years off of residents

lives. Without residents, who would buy the product.
Sincerely,
Kelly Welker
Georgetown resident for 10 years

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: James French

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
James French

98103

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Talis Abolins

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hello,
Please consider the attached analysis and statement in opposition to the "possible" expansion of the North Rainier Urban Village.
For the reasons stated, this Village is unique in that there is too much undeveloped land within the recently upzoned transit area. Conversely, the expansion areas are unique and stable assets that the Neighborhood specifically wanted to preserve, per the Neighborhood Plan.
Many other villages lack capacity, but North Rainier is an area where another divisive upzone should be avoided. The community has consensus on completing positive transit oriented development where it is needed most -- in the many vacant, surplus, and underdeveloped spaces of the existing Village.
The original plan needs to be fulfilled, before we target disruptive and divisive rezones in the historic, supportive and green areas around Cheasty and Mount Baker Boulevards.
Thank you
Talis Abolins
--
Hello Neighbors,
Did you know the City has proposed expanding the North Rainier Urban Village into the Mount Baker residential neighborhood, and into the hillside adjacent to Cheasty Greenspace? The comment period for this proposal expires this Friday, November 20.
You can submit your comments on the Draft Plan through November 20. Here's how:
1. Join the Seattle 2035 Online Community Conversation at seattle2035.consider.it and discuss the potential pros and cons of Key Proposals with your fellow Seattleites
2. Follow us on Facebook and Twitter
3. Send us your comments by November 20, 2015:
1. Email: 2035@seattle.gov
2. Mail comments to the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development, Attn: Seattle 2035Here's a map showing the proposed expansion into Baker and Cheasty:
http://2035.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/north-rainier-sf-zones-and-expanded-UCUV.pdf
This proposal raises some important questions about the future vision of our neighborhood, and where we should concentrate the badly needed density.
- On one hand, the current Urban Village footprint is full of vacant, surplus, and underdeveloped properties.
- On the other hand, the stable Mount Baker Neighborhood is nationally recognized for its Olmsted-influenced design and architectural strengths.

Should the City replace stable Mount Baker neighborhood streets near Mount Baker Boulevard and Franklin High School with an Urban Village expansion?
Or should the City first complete the Town Center investments needed for new development in the empty spaces surrounding our Mount Baker Light Link Station? I think this is a question worthy of discussion, and the City needs to hear your views before Friday.
Here's some more background that should not be forgotten.
North Rainier Neighborhood Plan: In the early 1990's, Seattle began a neighborhood planning effort that

spanned 38 Seattle neighborhoods. The plans provided the City with direction on a broad range of subjects important to the neighborhoods, which would be incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan. The North Rainier Neighborhood Plan was completed in 1999:
https://towncenterfriends.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/56g-north-rainier-neighborhood-plan-12-1-99.pdf
This Plan was based on extensive outreach into and input from our economically and ethnically diverse neighborhood. The City recognized the North Rainier Neighborhood, which includes Mount Baker, as one of the most diverse neighborhoods in the City. See City Resolution 31204; North Rainier Demographic Summary.
Take a look at Figure 3, page 35 of the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan:
https://towncenterfriends.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/56g-north-rainier-neighborhood-plan-12-1-99.pdf
This drawing illustrates a recommended "Vision of the Future North Rainier Neighborhood". The Neighborhood Vision's explanatory arrows balance new high density with stable family neighborhoods:

- Right side arrow: "Preserve and maintain quality of single family areas". This arrow points at the very same residential area the City now proposes to open up to high density urban village development!
- Left side arrow: "Town Center -- focal point for new high density and transit oriented development". The arrow points to the areas surrounding the Light Link that remain essentially vacant, surplus, and underdeveloped.

Does our neighborhood planning process matter? Is it OK for the City destabilize a historic neighborhood asset, before we have even started development in the areas where it is needed – in the struggling Town Center?
Victor Steinbrueck Study: Was our North Rainier Neighborhood Plan wrong to recognize a historic neighborhood as an asset? Perhaps we should listen to one of Seattle's most important and defining visionaries. Victor Steinbrueck. In addition to preserving Pike Place Market and Pioneer Square, Mr. Steinbrueck (like our community) advocated for the preservation of the Mount Baker neighborhood. "MOUNT BAKER: An Inventory Of Buildings And Urban Design Resources"; see also Mount Baker Historic Context Statement, City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (May, 2004):
"GENERAL DESCRIPTION: The Mount Baker district is unique in Seattle because of early planning which successfully integrated street and residential developments into the natural amenities of the area. It is one of the best local examples of the English or "picturesque" type of landscape planning. Platting restrictions limiting use to single-family residences with one location for commercial development have further established the special quality of the neighborhood. .... Mount Baker remains an exclusively single family residential community of consistently substantial homes with rigid lot set-backs and sideyards. Some street layouts by the Olmsted Brothers have added an additional environmental quality."
The report goes on to discuss the City's support of low interest home improvement loans that were used by those who could not otherwise afford to restore "the community's strength as a neighborhood along with the improvement of its physical quality."
The Steinbrueck report continues:
"HISTORY: Mt. Baker is one of Seattle's earliest planned residential communities, and as such, was an experiment in residential development. Its present physical character is largely a result of that effort. The area's early real estate development is of historic interest. .... They [the Hunter Company] hired the Olmsted Brothers (who were also responsible for much of Seattle's parks and boulevards system) to lay out streets and lots fitting the topography in order to provide views, privacy, and pleasant streets for each residence. The area was restricted to single-family dwellings, with strict property requirements for side and front yard setbacks." The developers donated land for amenities and other projects to increase

the area's desirability, establishing a unique residential district with character.
George Cotterill (who became a Seattle Mayor) based the Hunter Company's plan on early bicycle trails he had designed, and in 1906 John Charles Olmsted provided comments designed to assure the quality of the single family residential development. The Mount Baker Park Addition was recorded on July 15, 1907, the same year that Mount Baker Boulevard was completed.
The City's Historic Context Statement notes that
"Mount Baker was restricted to single family residences only, with the one exception being a single commercial building at 35th Avenue South and South McClellan Street. This commercial building included stores on the street level and a clubhouse above and has been replaced by the Mount Baker Center building (1930). Mount Baker Park was one of the largest planned communities in Seattle at the time of its platting. .... The Olmsted Brothers incorporated the Mount Baker Park Addition into their city-wide plan [for a connected series of parks and parkways]. .... The majority of the older houses in the neighborhood were built in two general time periods: an early phase from 1905 to about 1915 or 1920, and a second phase from 1920 to 1929."
Creating a just and affordable continuum of housing in our City is extremely important. But the Mount Baker neighborhood that borders the North Rainier Urban Village is an asset to be preserved – not a relic to be ridiculed. Certainly, there are some developers and short-sighted but well intentioned idealists who would target the Mount Baker neighborhood streets as an ugly legacy – as an "opportunity" to pursue an agenda. However, before a City divisively ignores its respected leaders and the voices of its local residents, it should first do the real work of creating the new Town Center community where everyone agrees it is needed.
North Rainier Urban Village Assessment. Should we focus growth in the existing urban village? Yes – we must. In April 2015, the Seattle Economic Development Commission issued a follow up report on the lack of development in North Rainier: North Rainier Urban Village Assessment (Berk 2015)
https://towncenterfriends.files.wordpress.com/2015/05/north-rainier-urban-village-asssessment-final.pdf
The Berk Report was highly critical of the City's failure to provide infrastructure and amenities badly needed for the vibrant multi-family community that was supposed to spring up on the station area's vacant, surplus and run down parcels. The potential is huge, but the area screams for City investment to make the theoretical "Town Center" a develop-able reality. Following this report, Council Member Bruce Harrell's office issued an important call on the Mayor and others to form a special team, and help us complete the station area. Bruce Harrell Letter (July 9, 2015):
https://towncenterfriends.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/2015-07-09-bruce-harrell-letter.pdf
Bruce Harrell's compelling letter will hopefully keep the City focusing on development where it is needed. To the extent we need "eyes on the street", it is not on the historic streets of hundred year old homes several blocks away from our empty station area.
Now is not the time to divide our North Rainier Urban Village with yet another politically charged study, when we are just now focusing on completing the unfinished business that our North Rainier Neighborhood Plan called for over a decade ago.
Sadly, there are some who suggest single family residential is evil. Some Seattle bloggers ridicule those who advocate for preservation of single family residential as heartless NIMBY's who are uninformed about history. Five minutes of objective research would bring some civility to this important, nuanced debate. Single family residential is not an evil relic of Seattle's uncivil racist past.
Help Our City Show Leadership Under Pressure. As the Mayor and Council approach these important issues, please share your views. Hopefully they will not bow to pressure or "grand bargains" with developers and hard liners who have alienated well intentioned neighbors with easy insults and labels. Help our leaders appreciate the need for a nuanced approach, that properly balances the values, ideas and hard work of residents dedicated to the common goal of an equitable and diverse City where all are

respected.
Certainly, other urban villages should be expanded. They are crowded, and need room. But for the reasons stated above, the proposed expansion of the North Rainier Urban Village would be a ridiculous mistake. Let's focus on areas in desperate need of development before alienating and dividing a community by putting one of Seattle's oldest historic residential neighborhoods on the political chopping block.
In summary, I recommend two points to consider as we comment to the City:
• First, the City must not lose focus on encouraging positive multifamily mixed use development immediately adjacent to the transit station. It is irrational to encourage developers to chunk away at single family neighborhoods along the perimeter of the village, when vacant and surplus properties lie empty all around the station itself. This is where the City sensibly called for an Urban Village. This is where our development needs to be focused. Don't let the City off the hook.
• Second, the City must look beyond the rhetoric and political table-pounding. The single family neighborhoods adjacent to the Urban Village possess important historical values that should be celebrated rather than vilified. Don't divide – complete the vibrant community vision we already defined in the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan
Thank you! These views are my own.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: WA MLB Stadium Public Facilities District,Tom Backer

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Please find attached comments from the Washington State Major League Baseball Stadium Public Facilities District (PFD) regarding Seattle's draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Thank you for considering our comments.

Thomas Eli Backer
Attorney-at-Law, PLLC
Legal Counsel to the Ballpark PFD
--
November 20, 2015
City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development
Attention: Tom Hauger and Kristian Kofoed
Via email:
Re: PFD Comments on Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan
Dear Mr. Hauger and Mr. Kofoed:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Seattle's proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The Washington State Major League Baseball Stadium Public Facilities District (PFD) strongly supports the designation of a new Stadium District in the area around Safeco Field and CenturyLink Field & Exhibition Center. We also strongly support the Future Land Use Map and the Land Use Goals and Policies associated with the Stadium District (see below). We firmly believe that the Stadium District can be recognized as a unique sports and entertainment district while at the same time protecting freight mobility and industrial activity in the Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center to the south and west. We urge the City to adopt the Stadium District elements of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
The PFD is the public entity that developed and owns Safeco Field. The PFD is responsible for overseeing this public asset and it works to maximize the benefits from the public's $335 million investment in the

ballpark.
Since 2010, the PFD has been working with our neighbor entity—the Washington State Public Stadium Authority (PSA), the public owner of CenturyLink Field—on ways to enliven the area surrounding the stadiums. The work of these two public entities produced a Stadium District Concept Plan in December 2012 (www.stadiumdistrict.org).
PFD Comment Letter on Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan
November 20, 2015
Page 2 of 3
The purpose of the Concept Plan was to identify the essential elements of a thriving stadium district—one that is economically successful, safe, desirable, innovative, inviting and irresistibly fun to live in and visit. The Concept Plan included a number of guiding principles and key findings. The Plan recommended developing public and private strategic partnerships to achieve the following 10-year targets for development within a 15-minute walk radius of the stadiums:

- threshold increase of 2,000 new market rate housing units
- minimum of 2,000 new parking spaces
- enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and connections, and
- a major new destination open space

In 2013, we participated actively in the City's broadly diverse 20+ member working group for the Stadium District, which developed a formal set of proposed Comprehensive Plan changes. In short, those changes were designed to enrich and enliven the area around Safeco Field and CenturyLink Field for more than just events, and they are generally consistent with the guiding principles of the Concept Plan.
The comprehensive plan changes recommended by the working group for the Stadium District have largely been incorporated into the City's proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan. We believe that the goals and policies for the Stadium District contained in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan are both consistent with our hopes for the district and are respectful of the concerns expressed by the proponents of the industrial lands to the south of the district. We have always believed that a vibrant Stadium District can be developed while supporting the continued viability of industrial operations in the Duwamish manufacturing and industrial center.
Accordingly, we strongly support the City's adoption of the following elements of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan:

- Designate a new Stadium District on the Future Land Use Map as an independent land use category (including the boundary modification proposed by the PSA).
- Adopt the Land Use Goals and Policies identified for the Stadium District in the land use element of the comprehensive plan (including the changes suggested by the Seattle Mariners and the PSA).
- Allow the complementary uses identified for the Stadium District (e.g., housing and lodging), subject to the location restrictions contained in the plan.

PFD Comment Letter on Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan
November 20, 2015
Page 3 of 3
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Seattle's 2035 Comprehensive Plan. If you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to discuss, please call our Executive Director, Kevin Callan or our Legal Counsel, Tom Backer.
Sincerely,
Charles Royer
Board Chair

Cc: Via Email
PFD Board Members
Kevin Callan, Executive Director
Tom Backer, Legal Counsel
Bart Waldman, Seattle Mariners
Susan Ranf, Seattle Mariners
Melody McCutcheon, HCMP Law Offices
Gary Johnson, City of Seattle DPD
Geoff Wentlandt, City of Seattle DPD
Ann Kawasaki Romero, PSA

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Rob Harrison

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Housing, Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2050.
•We need more integration between OSE, DON and OPCD. Jessica Finn Coven, Kathy Nyland (both awesome!) and whoever succeeds Diane Sugimura ought to be having regular weekly meetings, and coordinating their efforts to this end.
•We need a much better way of incentivizing ultra-low energy building than the current Deep Green Pilot program, which has produced exactly no new deep green buildings in the two years it has been in place (zero!), in the midst of one of the most dramatic building booms the city has seen. I believe that program has failed because it is putative and restrictive in nature rather than helpful and expansive in embracing innovation. I have proposed a program similar to Brussels' Exemplary Buildings program, where the city provides awards and technical assistance rather than, as the Deep Green Pilot program does, restrictive gatekeeping and penalties for missing targets.
•We need (and I think Kathy Nyland and Diane Sugimura agree) an executive means of allowing innovative projects to proceed even if they stretch the bounds of existing zoning. We have mechanisms in place for buildings that push technical boundaries, but not social ones. I'm speaking of my own experience with a multigenerational house that was squashed by DPD, but it could apply to other situations no one has thought of yet.
•In conjunction with other transportation policies below, VMT can be reduced if we allow corner stores in single family zones. I have proposed a Corner Store Gap Analysis. (Similar to the Parks and Open Space Gaps Analysis, but looking at areas that don't have walkable access to essential goods.)
•Passive House should be written in to all future incentive programs. It's not perfect (like Living Building Challenge is) but Passive House can be done for very reasonable premium now, and will get even less expensive as more in the building community become familiar with the technique.
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability.
•The plan should include more support for more creative ways of making housing less expensive

without permanent subsidy like: land trusts, baugruppen (self-developed housing), building on city-owned land, and a city or state bank like Rep. Bob Hasagawa suggests that could provide loan interest loans for all of these kinds of projects.
•By all means the plan should include policies that increase the supply of market rate units, not just affordable units.
•Increasing the density of all single-family zones (not just the single-family zones within Urban Villages) should be put back on the table. The HALA recommendations were spot on in this.
•All Urban Villages should definitely be expanded to cover the ten-minute walkshed. I support the new Urban Village around the 130th Street Station as well.
Prioritize investments in road and bridge maintenance, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years.
•We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
•Don't build new highways!
•Consider abandoning the Deep Bore Tunnel.
Thank you!
Cheers,
Rob
Rob Harrison cPHc
Certified Passive House Consultant
HARRISON architects

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Pat Naumann

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space, Transportation

Comment:

COMMENT ON SEATTLE 2035
Hello,
Not able to comment as thoroughly as I'd like, I offer these limited remarks:
REGARDING OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION --
I viewed not that long ago a video of Mayor Murray introducing the new Parks Superintedent, Jesus Aguirre, and commenting on the road forward with the passage of the Parks Legacy Plan. Murray said there would be $$$ for acquisition.

I am also aware that the City is selling to developers empty land previously hosting substations.

Seattle 2035 says it wants to identify "realistic" goals about the "quantity of land that could be acquired" so why is it selling off the substation land? It does not make sense.

I participated in the North Rainier Neighborhood Planning Process precisely to convert the non-used York Substation into a small neighborhood park, which is used a lot by nearby apartment dwellers and a convalescent center.

The City (Murray) says from one side of its mouth it will now have money for acquisitions; then in Seattle 2035 says to be "realistic"; and then goes forward with selling off to developers open land it possesses. Go figure!
NATURAL AREAS
Our Natural Areas are at a premium value as, well, natural areas. I do not buy that because 120,000 people are anticipated to arrive by 2035 that we have to carve into our NA's now, or ever. The City of Houston absorbed anywhere from 120,000 - 160,000 people in a matter of a month or so following Katrina when it opened its arms to refugees--- many of whom had lost so much -- and it did not deem it necessary then, nor since, to carve into its natural areas because of the influx.

Besides, if incursion into our, or more precisely wildlife's, natural areas is essential because of population increase, then wait until the newcomers actually arrive so they may have some say in what happens. They may in fact be drawn to Seattle BECAUSE of the Natural Areas and harbor no desire to see them opened uncontrollably.
Much of our Natural Areas are environmentally critical areas.....on steep slopes, or slide prone, or with a history of slides. Prudence merits caution in disturbing those hazards in any way. Keep Natural Areas natural and for the wildlife. If incursion must occur, it should be controlled. It is not wise to open them to just the public at large, just as it is not wise to start allowing mountain bikes into them even if controlled, because any reading of the literature and news about mountain biking reveals they more that is given over, the more will be taken, often illegally.
Someone, speak up for Wildlife please!
FINALLY, the SQUEEZE, the GASP FOR BREATH
Anyone on I-5 or our major arterials at almost any time of day can deduct that this City is strangling itself on traffic. People will NOT want to move here, and I believe population projections will revise downward. Growth provides the limit to growth, but after some years of gasping frustration sitting in lanes or not venturing out in the town because it will just take too long to travel, people give up. Traffic is not glamorous though some like to think of it as the Sign of Success; of Growth. In fact, it is awful. Some planners made mistakes: they allowed and encouraged growth when the infrastructure was not there to support it. Talk about limitations: don't the planners see well enough the constraints of our geography? Doesn't anyone in City Hall speak truthfully to the $$$ developers to limit their ambition or greed and see reality instead of fancying a sparkling future?Doesn't anyone have the courage to say "No" or "Whoa" or "I can't go for that"? Stop attracting Growth. Let all the suspended particles whirl in the water until they subside; then take a clear look at what's what. Because I get the feeling this City now doesn't know one of its ends from the other. It's all messed up. The experiment has gone awry. Seattle will take a fall because of the strangulation and I don't see you offering a solution. It is not important to be a world-class city; it is important to be a city that is livable and values its citizens and maintains the values of its citizens. It doesn't matter to me if hoards of the fabled "120,000" people decide to go elsewhere. What's it to anyone?
Sincerely,
Patricica Naumann

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Gema Mae Apartments, LLC,Katie Kendall

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Hello,

Attached please find comments on the draft Future Land Use Map ("FLUM") for the Comprehensive Plan. We submit these comments on behalf of Gema Mae Apartments, LLC, the owners of three parcels located ___ 40th Avenue NE (the "Property") and the applicant for proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan FLUM to change the designation of the Property from Multifamily to Mixed Use/Commercial.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Katie Kendall
Attorney-at-Law
McCullough Hill Leary, ps
--
November 20,2015
Kristian Kofoed
Senior Urban Planner
City of Seatde Department of Planning and Development
RE: Comments regarding proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan
Future Land Use Map
Dear Kristian,
Thank you for the opportunity to provide written comments on the proposed Seatde Comprehensive Plan and proposed Future Land Use Map ("FLUM"). We submit these comments on behalf of Gema Mae Apartments, LLC, the owners of three parcels located at ___ 40'h Avenue NE (the "Property"), and the applicant for the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan FLUM.
The applicant proposes a change in the FLUM designation of the Property from Multifamily to Mixed Use/Commercial. On July 29, 2015, the Seatde City Council identified this proposed FLUM amendment to be included on the docket for consideration for possible adoption in 2016. See Resolution 31599.
The draft proposed FLUM map continues to show the Property with a Multifamily designation. For the reasons set forth below, we respectfully request that DPD amend its draft FLUM to change the designation of the Property from multifamily to Mixed Use/Commercial.
The Property is located in a triangular block that is bordered by 40'h Avenue NE to the east, Sand Point WayNE to the west, and NE 45'h Street to the South. The in-block uses surrounding the parcels include a Wells Fargo bank to the north, two commercial medical office buildings to the west and southwest, and newer townhomes on a comer lot to the south of the parcels. Across the street from 40'h A venue NE is the new Seatde Children's Hospital expansion.
The uses of the block in which the Property is located are shown in the attached map. Because the block is triangular, the Property essentially serves as a wedge between the commercial use to the north, the Wells Fargo Bank, and the medical office parcel to the west, near Sand Point WayNE. Based on the location of the parcels within its triangular block, the Property is more or less located in the backyard of the medical office building, making the NC-2 designation on the block incomplete and the uses at the Property incompatible with the uses next door. The mixed-use designation should accordingly carry through to the Property based on the unique block configuration and surrounding uses. South of the property is a corner lot with townhomes, designated as multifamily in the FLUM and zoned LR3. While these lots abut the Property, the townhomes are located on the corner of the block and are accordingly not surrounded by incompatible uses. Due to its corner location, the corner lot also serves as a good transition to the neighboring LR3 and SF zones south of NE 45'h Street. The Property serves no purpose in this transition. The area along Sand Point WayNE is zoned NC2-30 and primarily consists of a number of commercial uses, including pharmacies and doctor's offices and a number of restaurants near

NE 45'h Street.
The designation of this property from multifamily to mixed-use/ commercial will best fit into the existing fabric of the immediate neighborhood. The unique block configuration creates a situation where incompatible uses envelop the parcels, and it is accordingly no longer appropriate continue the roperty's Multifamily designation in the Comprehensive Plan. We accordingly request that DPD support the proposed FLUM amendment to change the designation of the Property from Multifamily to :Nlixed Use/Commercial.
Thank you very much, and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.
Sincerely,
Katie Kendall

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Serena Larkin

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.

Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
Serena Larkin
98102

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Matt Maria

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Greetings,
I support the expansion of the Urban Village boundary in the Rainier Valley to increase housing options and improve housing affordability. I personally would be more inclined to live several blocks away from the busy Rainier Avenue, but this stagnant single family housing sees little turnover or opportunity for someone at my income level. Furthermore, the core of the light rail development should see more rapid commercial development with the addition of new residents to the expanded Urban Village.
Thank you for your work,
Matt Maria

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Patricia Parker

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while

protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
Patricia Parker
98166

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: JoElla Weybright

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hello,
I am offering my comments regarding the proposal named above, particularly the boundary across 15th Ave. NE into west Ravenna. I sincerely hope that my opinion will be heard and valued. This hope is not expressed in sarcasm, but in an earnest desire that you be aware of the despair some feel in this process of neighborhood input. Many of us feel that the city is listening mostly to developers these days over citizens.
I concur with my neighbors that we welcome density, light rail, bicycle lanes for safety and the excitement of a growing city. We also treasure our neighborhoods, full of people who are singles, families, have diverse backgrounds and ethnicities, and join to make Seattle a great place to live. We have volunteered many hours to beautifying the area (see: Circle Park, Ravenna Park), have organized successful neighborhood gatherings (see: Easter Egg Hunt; Seattle Night Out) and come together to support friends and neighbors who are ill or hurting. Isn't that what we want a city to be, neighborhood by neighborhood?
We are open to adding mother-in-law units, backyard cottages or above-garage living space, all of which can increase density very nicely without destroying the existing character of streets with historic bungalows and small to medium-sized houses. Won't this type of growth offer more affordable housing than building new "x-plexes" and stacked townhomes?
Our experience over the past 5-6 years with the Roosevelt zoning and struggles with the Sisley properties make us wary of the relationship the city has with developers. Why is this change needed? If you need the parks for green space (and why is it just now that such a need has been realized), simply run the line southdown 15th NE, east on 62nd to 20th NE, then back west to Cowen Place and the existing NE Ravenna Blvd southern boundary.

Please think carefully about how your decisions that are made at a desk in a city office can impact an entire group of people in a real life situation. I ask that the city NOT expand the Urban Village into west Ravenna.
Thank you for your time and consideration,
JoElla Weybright

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Sybil Kohl

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!

Steve and Sybil Kohl
98606

Date: 11/20/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
Lloyd Johnston
98125

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Mary Pat Traxler

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

I have a few comments and recommendations about the city's Comprehensive Plan. As a homeowner who has lived in Seattle for only a few years and has experienced transition, planning and changes in other American cities as well as cities in other parts of the world (New Zealand and Germany), a general comment is that someone other than the community seems to be driving what seems like chaotic and poorly planned development here in Seattle. The infra-structure does not support the city's current needs, and this mis-match will only become more intense in years to come based upon my research into the city's approach. As a recent observer to the way things are unfolding here, I assume moneyed interests are driving the development, as it is not being driven by the community, the people who are living in Seattle (or will live in Seattle in the years to come). Generally speaking, I recommend the city pay better attention to established communities within Seattle, and into the culture and values of the community.

My specific comments are about 1) community engagement, 2) health and safety, 3) land use, 4) transportation and 5) administration:

1)
ENGAGEMENT.

-- Planning for community involvement has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that community involvement applies to ALL aspects of the planning and budgeting, then this clarification has not occurred. The appearance instead is of a Comprehensive Plan that claims "community" as a theme, yet has no place for community.

Add a Community Involvement chapter that is at least as good as Portland's.

-- Employ a communications specialist to address, and report on communication shortcomings in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal.

Eliminate use of the term "storage" when the word that diverse people would understand is "parking".

2)
HEALTH & SAFETY.

-- Because of the many benefits that street trees provide to both property owners and the general public, encourage the preservation or planting of street trees as development occurs, except in locations where it is not possible to meet City standards intended to preserve public safety and utility networks.

REF: LU41, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage.

REF: E24, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

3)
LAND USE

-- Do not advance a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) that discards current zoning. It is irresponsible for the city to so radically change the rules after people are already so invested. It would be irresponsible for

such a FLUM to fuel displacement and increase inequity as those with largest resources at their disposal will be relatively advantaged in the transition.

-- Require sweeping zone-wide changes to prove equity through an analysis of local conditions. Fairness occurs when all are treated fairly, not when the benefits for population 'A' equal the losses of population B.

-- Provide policies that condition permitting of development to specific site impacts and to cumulative area impacts.

-- Raise setback and landscaping requirements in communities not meeting open space targets.

-- Provide policy support for housing preservation, including preservation of affordable rental housing stock and other functional and well-built structures which accomplish the "reuse" aspect of the common environmental policy: "reduce, reuse, recycle."

-- Provide clarity regarding how best use of surplus property is to be determined. Open space is a continual need, while for additional housing need may ebb and flow. As such, a method that involves all stakeholders will be needed in order for there to be good results in all eras.

-- Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses.
REF: LUG2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal, replaced with language that requires the city to "allow", "support", and " accommodate" for everything rather than designing something that works.

-- Preserve and protect low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious surface can be limited.
REF: LUG8, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics.
REF: LUG9, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- To maintain the character of Seattle’s neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan.
REF: LU11, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.

+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU59, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU60, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Reflect the character of existing low-density development through the regulation of scale, siting, structure orientation, and setbacks.
REF: LU69, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- DO NOT PROVIDE FREE ACROSS THE BOARD UPZONES VIA THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. DO NOT:
"Designate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings can provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU9.10 to replace LU75.

-- Limit the multifamily zones to areas that do not meet the single-family zone criteria, except in circumstances where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a different zone is more appropriate.
REF: LU75, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

4)
TRANSPORTATION.

-- Define transportation service performance categories (levels) not merely on the basis of frequency, but on the usability, including usability by diverse populations.

-- Establish a practice of assessing the transportation service performance category (level) of a location on the basis of the current situation, and on the basis of future housing and employment estimates.

-- If land use rules for a parcel are to deviate with proximity to transportation services,
then condition the approval of a development proposal for that parcel on proof of the transportation service performance category (level) present as of the date of the proposal application, and on independent service level projection analysis for the next 10 years.

-- Encourage off street parking in new developments where there is not a demonstrated capacity to absorb the projected additional parking demand.

-- Consider visitor parking demand when establishing parking requirements.

-- Provide consistent definitions (in the glossary) for terms like “transit corridor”, “transit stop”, “frequent transit”, "rail station", frequent rail station", “superior transit”, etc.

-- DO NOT

"Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking required."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU6.3.
This proposal would REQUIRE the city to have NO rules on what amount of parking any development must include.
MARKET FORCES are NOT a sufficient tool for city planning.

5)
ADMINISTRATION.

-- Use of "neighborhood planning" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that neighborhood planning is to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that neighborhood planning is to be replaced by full central government control or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to neighborhood planning and citywide planning, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Define clearly the role that adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies, neighborhood plan work-plan matrices, and recognized neighborhood plans play in the City's decision-making and resource allocation.
REF: NG4, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Include (as was done in the past) growth estimates for all urban villages, not just the 6 urban centers.

-- An independent assessment should occur to determine what growth is most likely to occur if this Comprehensive Plan is adopted. (These policies seem designed to create far greater growth than that which was studied by the draft EIS).

-- Establish a vision for housing and job levels 40 and 60 years from now, and provide an analysis of anticipated capacity distribution for those periods.

-- REMOVE ALL proposed goals/policies that in effect state that "the city shall NOT do its job". The city government and the people DO have a right to accomplish planning and to apply laws that limit land uses.
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal contains many statements that the city shall "allow", "accommodate", etc unlimited use, and these are an irresponsible abandonment of responsibility of stewardship for current and future generations.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Lee Raaen

Draft Plan Element: Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I strongly disagree with the elimination of Neighborhood Planning as criteria to guide goals and policies. They provide local flexibility to city-wide rules. Without them, developers will make decisions, not neighborhoods or the city. (Once approved, the City won't be able to deny permits if general requirements are met, even if it doesn't fit in the neighborhood.)

I also object to the replacement of "lower housing costs" and "affordable housing" as objectives with "density." Density doesn't mean lower housing costs. If Seattle really is interested in affordable housing, that should be the criteria, not density. The two don't necessarily go hand in hand. Changing existing goals and policies supporting affordability is hypocritical given all of the lip-service given to our housing crisis.
Lee Raaen

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: David Osaki

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

November 20, 2015

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development
SUBJECT: City of Seattle - Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan

City of Seattle:
The Aurora Licton Residential Urban Village ("ALUV") appreciates the opportunity to comment on the City of Seattle - Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. We appreciate the work that has gone into the draft Plan's preparation and associated public outreach.
As background, ALUV consists of interested neighbors, community groups and business owners who reside or work in and near the Aurora Licton Residential Urban Village. Our goal is to actively coordinate with community members, organizations and the City to successfully implement the vision of the City of Seattle's adopted 1999 Aurora Licton Neighborhood Plan (City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan Ordinance #119538).

We have, unfortunately, found that a considerable number of policies and recommended actions in the Aurora-Licton Neighborhood Plan have never been implemented. This includes, as examples, recommendations related to capital improvements, enhancing public safety, adopting design guidelines, developing a community center and creating vibrant commercial areas that provide neighborhood serving goods and services.

To further the goal of promoting the Aurora-Licton Neighborhood Plan vision, ALUV has adopted the following Mission Statement,

"Mission

Build a pedestrian-safe, visually vibrant, economically sound, livable and welcoming neighborhood using sustainable-growth principles."

ALUV's mission is therefore closely aligned with the four core values of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan which are:
•Community - developing strong connections between a diverse range of people and places
•Environmental Stewardship - protect and improve the quality of our global and local natural environment

•Economic Opportunity and Security - a strong economy and a pathway to employment is fundamental to maintaining our quality of life
•Social Equity - limited resources and opportunities must be shared; and the inclusion of underrepresented communities in decision-making processes is necessary.

ALUV looks forward to working with the City to further both our Mission and the Comprehensive Plan's core values.

In preparing these comments, ALUV took note of the draft Comprehensive Plan comments provided by other groups, including community councils. It is not our intent to repeat comments prepared by these other groups, other than to say that we too are concerned with any revisions to the existing Comprehensive Plan that could be taken to weaken policy and regulations that protect the sanctity of residential areas or revise processes that lessen the public's role in influencing the outcome of land use decisions.

The following comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan are generally organized by topic.

Land Use

The City of Seattle's Development Capacity Report (Updated September 2014) indicates that the City of Seattle is projected to grow by 70,000 housing units through 2035. The same report indicates that development capacity under existing zoning is about 224,000 housing units, a sufficient amount to accommodate the 70,000 households King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPP's) assign to Seattle for the next 20 years.

With so much excess capacity we question the need to expand urban village boundaries. Focus should be on directing public investment on public facilities and services within existing urban village boundaries to make them livable and provide a safe and quality urban environment.

If there is a need to expand an urban village boundary for any reason, it should only be done in conjunction with a neighborhood plan update to ensure adequate notice and involvement by the neighborhood. This should be included as a policy in the land use and/or neighborhood planning element.

Economic Development Element

Proposed Policy ED1.3 states,

"ED.1.3 Prioritize commercial districts for assistance in areas of lower economic opportunity."

Areas characterized by lower economic opportunity should not be the only criteria to prioritize assistance to commercial areas. Economic opportunity should also be prioritized in urban villages that require targeted economic development to successfully implement the Urban Village strategy.

In the case of the Aurora-Licton Residential Urban Village, there is an absence of pedestrian oriented neighborhood serving goods and services to support residential development in the Residential Urban Village. Recent development along Aurora Avenue, such as mini-warehouses and contractor storage yards, do not support a pedestrian oriented neighborhood serving goods and services. Economic

assistance in attracting appropriate uses to the Residential Urban Village is needed.

We would ask that proposed Policy ED1.3 be revised to state,

"Prioritize commercial districts for assistance in areas of lower economic opportunity and in urban villages lacking the appropriate mix of neighborhood oriented commercial goods and services."

Neighborhood Planning Element

We appreciate that Neighborhood Planning Element makes many positive statements about neighborhood planning, provided that they can be implemented. This includes providing neighborhoods with appropriate tools to refine their current vision.

In terms of policies, proposed Policy NP1.1 states,

"NP1.1 Prioritize neighborhood planning in areas expecting or experiencing significant change, primarily in urban centers and urban villages."

While change is an appropriate criteria for prioritizing neighborhood planning, so too should be the length of time since the last neighborhood plan update. The Aurora Licton Neighborhood Plan was adopted in 1999.

We would ask that this policy be revised to state,

"NP1.1 Prioritize neighborhood planning in areas expecting or experiencing significant change, primarily in urban centers and urban villages, and in those neighborhoods where neighborhood plans are the most outdated."

We would also request that an update to the Aurora-Licton Neighborhood Plan be initiated promptly.

Conclusion

ALUV appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to the Mayor's recommended Comprehensive Plan and future opportunities to comment before the City Council on 2016.

Sincerely,

David Osaki

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: University District Community Council,Matt Fox

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

UNIVERSITY DISTRICT COMMUNITY COUNCIL
C/O 4534 UNIVERSITY WAY NE

November 20, 2015

Department of Planning and Development
Via email to 2035@seattle.gov

RE: 2035 Comprehensive Plan Proposed Changes

When the Comprehensive Plan was first adopted twenty years ago, DPD's predecessor DCLU promised that increased growth would be focused into so-called "Urban Villages" where transportation and other infrastructure either existed or would be easier to provide. Neighborhoods (including urban villages and centers) were also promised that parking requirements would be retained, landscaping and setbacks would be provided to ensure quality development, and that growth would pay for growth and not unduly burden existing residents. None of this has come to pass. Instead, DCLU/DPD has spent the last 20 years actively working to undermine and/or abrogate any and every compromise it made in order to pass the Comprehensive Plan (and subsequent updates), and nearly all of the costs of accommodating growth have been passed on to taxpayers in the form of increased levies and utility rates, not to mention the value of their time wasted in traffic.

Central to the original "grand compromise" that many thought the original 1994 Plan represented was that single family zoning would be protected, including in the areas around Urban Centers and Urban Villages. The UDCC opposes the following specific proposed changes to the Plan that would undermine this promise:

· LU8.2 'redevelopment or infill development that maintains the single-family character of the area but also allows for a greater range of housing types'

· LU8.3 'redevelopment or infill development near urban centers and villages, where that new development would maintain the low height and bulk that characterize the single-family area, while allowing a wider range of housing types.'

· LU9.10 'designate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings can provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas.'

These are simply bureaucratic ways of saying DPD wants to undermine the promises it made to the community.

DPD should also drop all proposals for extending the Roosevelt Urban Village boundaries south of Cowan and Ravenna Parks. This goes beyond the half-mile "walkshed" for a light rail station and pays no respect to economic, community or geographic relationships on the ground. Residents in the broadened area are strongly opposed to the extension.

When the Comp Plan was amended over 10 years ago DPD – in a rather telling move – decided to stop tracking individual mode split goals by travel mode. So instead of acknowledging the fact that commuters were not taking up walking, biking, or transit at the rate that all of the original transportation projections of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan were predicated on, DPD instead lumped all of these modes into one "Non SOV" category to paper over the fact that a fundamental tenet of the

1994 Plan simply wasn't working. Most notably, the 1994 goal for 2000 bike mode share was for it to increase from 3 to 5% by 2000, and to 9% in 2010. Needless to say, this has not and will not occur - Seattle is simply too hilly and rainy for bicycles to ever account for more than a tiny fraction of work commute trips no matter how many vehicle lanes are removed in a vain attempt to attract new riders. Public transit use was 16% in 1990, and the goal was for it to rise to 20% in 2000 and to 27% in 2010. This, too, hasn't occurred – and a north/south light rail starter line (over 16 years late in the U-District) and isn't going to change this reality for a long, long time to come.

DPD (and SDOT's) desire to wish away the personal automobile has failed and is failing, and the level of gridlock on our streets is the direct result of the arrogance of city planners who insist on planning for how they want people to behave rather than dealing with how things occur in the real world. If the GMA and concurrency principles were being adhered to, DPD would stop (or at least radically slow down) handing out building permits and upzones, acknowledge that these new projects create more vehicle trips than the street grid can accommodate, and deal with the fact that bikes and transit simply aren't making up the difference.

Members of the UDCC were appalled but not surprised to hear DPD Director Diane Sugimura pooh-pooh legitimate concerns about the pace and scale of current and proposed upzones, tax breaks, and other developer subsidies by dismissing those who raised these issues as simply "fearing change." What citizens fear far more than change is an enormously powerful, unaccountable, and unelected agency whose stated clients are developers rather than the citizens who have to live with (and subsidize) development, both with the time they spend in traffic (during and after construction) and the tax dollars they spend on the infrastructure that is required to keep pace with the unprecedented levels of growth DPD has actively encouraged (all too often by stretching or ignoring the Land Use Code). We also note that DPD has allowed numerous interminable long-term street closures in the U-District to make things easier for developers that would never be allowed in most other cities.

DPD promised to preserve existing unsubsidized affordable housing in the original 1994 Comprehensive Plan and the 2004 update, but have since actively undermined any meaningful attempts to do so. Instead, DPD pushes MFTE tax breaks for developers who are providing housing that is barely cheaper than comparable rental units, and that literally raise the property taxes that the rest of us pay. Actions speak louder than words, and DPD acts at every turn like hypothetical future residents are far more important than the proles who live and work here now. This must change.

DPD has acknowledged the need for more open space in the University District even at existing levels of growth, let alone with the massive new upzones that DPD and the University of Washington are pushing on the neighborhood. DPD's attempt to adopt Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan changes before firm and binding commitments to ensure that developers provide open space in exchange for the massive public gift of value that upzones provide must be in place before the any Comprehensive Plan and/or zoning or land use map changes are made. It is also premature to adopt the HALA recommendations and/or make other changes to the land use code and Comp Plan until there is some mechanism to ensure that promises of a long-needed central plaza in the University District (which the UDCC has strongly supported since the adoption of the original University Community Urban Center Plan) are not left by the wayside after the UW and its private "partners" start building skyscrapers. The time to ensure that growth actually pays for growth is before these changes are made – not after.

Twenty years ago, as today, the stated goal of DPD in working to capture a greater share of regional development in the city limits than regional bodies were/are requesting is that Seattle is going to

somehow save the region from “sprawl.” Planners need to drive out to Newcastle, the Issaquah Highlands, Maple Valley, and a dozen other suburban and exurban locations to see for themselves how that has worked out – it hasn’t and won’t. Instead, DPD’s approach of adding density for its own sake without adequate mitigation will likely drive what is left of the working and lower-middle class residents who are barely holding on in Seattle out to the very suburbs and exurbs it purports to save. For those who grew up in and/or built lives in Seattle, there is nothing at all “sustainable” about that (but that being said, the UDCC supports other citizens who hope to see that word remain in the name of the Comprehensive Plan).

It seems odd to have to remind DPD that much of our neighborhood (and many others) was already upzoned in anticipation of the arrival of light rail. The buildings came, and the fact that rail is 16 years late does not justify further wholesale upzoning of our community or making amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to prematurely set the stage for it. We urge DPD to keep the promises it made when the Comprehensive Plan was originally adopted, and to start treating new development as a phenomenon that needs to be mitigated rather than as an intrinsically beneficial divine force of nature that must be facilitated and publicly subsidized. As it stands now, DPD’s approach to the Growth Management Act has been and remains all growth - no management. This too must change, and the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan update needs to keep the promises made to citizens that growth would pay for growth and that it would not unduly impact those who already live and work here.

We appreciate your attention to these comments.

Sincerely,
matthewfox
Matt Fox,
UDCC President

CC: Mayor Ed Murray
Seattle City Councilmembers

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Shirley Nixon

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

The "updates"proposed to the Seattle Comprehensive Plan via Seattle 2035 are disappointing, as have been the gradual weakenings over the years of the principles set forth in the existing 1994 Comp Plan. Seattle has been gradually losing its soul and becoming more and more unlivable. Seattle 2035 sets the stage for perpetuating this trend.

It is too late (and it probably always was too late) for citizen comments on Seattle 2035 to translate into meaningful DPD improvements in the document. DPD's indifference and in some cases disdain for public input was made clear at the November 14, 2015 Open House that was organized in a manner to deflect collective questions and answers, and avoid DPD accountability.

The following principles representing my vision for a more livable Seattle are better supported in the language of the 1994 Comp Pan, and I ask that the City delay action on adopting the draft Seattle 2035 plan until its many flaws can be fixed. A truly interactive and more publicly collaborative comp plan adoption process should be undertaken.

Vision for a Livable Seattle:
Built environments that respect local history and neighborhood character, and that preserve natural resources including urban forests and green natural spaces.
Extensive public services and concurrent infrastructure improvements sufficient to accommodate growth.
Communities that foster inter-generational, cultural and economic diversity in a warm and inviting social climate.
A beautiful and healthful physical environment, including views of skies, water bodies, and mountains; clean air; peaceful places; and a built environment that nourishes the human spirit through enhancing residents' rights to daylight and sunshine.
A City government that promotes a superior quality of life by fostering open and full public discussion and participation, that responds to residents in a fair and prompt manner, and that provides for outstanding public safety, high quality recreational amenities, and superb infrastructure.
See also the position statement of Livable U District, which I endorse:
http://livableudistrict.com

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Joanna Cullen

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Dear DPD, I want to see more planning to add housing for families that can accommodate children and adults in general. In addition affordability of that housing, rents and homeownership. Do not approve adding density unless there is a plan for providing for increase in traffic and transit, schools and open space to accommodate it. Trees and the overall canopy for Seattle needs to be improved and maintained.
In addition these points are very important.
1. The role of Neighborhood Planning needs to be enhanced. Planning is a constant, while it might be quiescent in many areas, the local plan needs to be referenced, stewarded and refined when conditions change. Instead we have seen the plans shelved and new terms like Transit Area Planning or Action Plans. While some of the methods seem very useful, those processes have often created chaos, disengagement and polarization. We need a civic infrastructure that supports the local oversight and involvement in planning for local areas that is integrated with the local Neighborhood Plan as a living document.
2. Transparency and community engagement. A model such as Portland has would be critical for Seattle to effect rational plans that are credible.
3. Measures that lead to reprioritization and action are needed. Not every area starts in the same level of concurrency, those inequities should drive priorities. Measures can also show where we are out of whack, and there should be mandated actions to respond.
4. Mitigation or exceptions to general policies if consequences cannot be mitigated. The Draft EIS was very clear about certain consequences that appeared to have no legal basis for the city to mitigate. A general policy is one thing, but citywide whole sale land use changes that ignore predicted displacement or ignore the realities of landslide risks, along with no exception for local conditions and no consideration by local residents, can have far reaching damaging consequences.
5. The environment. I don’t see ’sustainable’ in the title of this plan and I do not see enough respect for the fact that we are living on this earth, polluting the waters, and driving out the birds and the bees.
I am active in the Squire Park Community Council, EastPac and the League of Women Voters. Seattle as a

city and the Central Area are both very important to me. Let us make sure that we respect the natural beauty of this area and maintain a healthful environment for the residents.
Sincerely, Joanna Cullen
--
Joanna Cullen

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: NANCY K HARRIS

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

I'm writing to express my following concerns with the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

1. The decrease in neighborhood emphasis and involvement:
For example, "foster neighborhoods" is removed from the LUG2 which overlays zoning regulations. LU5 is deleted which would consider neighborhood recommendations when revising zoning codes to reflect community preferences. In addition, some single family rezoning conditions are removed with the deletion of LU59 and LU60. Allowing rezoning in urban center or village boundaries as adopted in neighborhood plans should be maintained.

Broad goals, by neighborhood, are not included in the 2035 plan, as they are in the prior plan. Will they be developed, after? the 2035 plan is approved?

The replacement of LU67 with LU8.9 allows minimum lot exceptions, which were just recently addressed with land use code amendments. I do not support allowing exceptions to the minimum lot size worked out by PLUS committee and DPD.

2. Parking: LUG6.3 "Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking required." Building parking adds to overall construction costs. Minimum parking space requirements should continue to be included in residential and commercial projects. Without them, gridlock intensifies, reducing the livability of all areas of our city. We cannot remove traffic from our city by reducing parking. For many people and for specific errands (grocery shopping, medical appointments, etc.), cars are still a necessity. Our lack of infrastructure precludes many transit trips. Move Seattle levy will over time help with some congestion, but not quickly enough for the anticipated growth.

I urge the Council to maintain the variety of zones in our city and continue the previous Comp Plan's emphasis on growth in urban villages and centers. Seattle's neighborhoods give vibrancy to our city and allow housing alternatives.
Let's keep livability as a key goal for Seattle in the next 20 years.

Thank you for considering my views as you review the 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan.

Nancy K. Harris, Ballard resident

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: William Donnelly

Draft Plan Element: Economic Development, Environment, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
William Donnelly
98102

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Ron Momoda

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

11/20/15 Comments to the DRAFT Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update
Displacement is a Civil Rights issue:
Alternatives 3 & 4 of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update is a Civil Rights issue because many people of different colors in SE Seattle will be displaced by these options.
Displacement/ Opportunity Risk Maps/4 Growth Alternatives. Source Seattle 2035 Equity Analysis Summary (see Attachment) Areas in "Red" High Displacement versus "Blue" Low displacement risk. "Low" access to opportunities are shaded in brown on the second map. Alternatives/ residential growth relative to existing housing units: "Pink" 0>50%, "Red" 51-100%, "Black" >100%.
SE Seattle is the most diverse community in the United States, and Japanese Americans are part of that diversity. I know the worst day of my mother's life came during WWII when this government ordered 120,000 of Japanese descent, many who were American citizens, to leave their homes to be detained into so called internment camps behind barb wire and armed guards. The fear was unfounded. This was a flagrant violation of their Civil Rights. German Americans, in contrast, did not receive the same kind of unfair treatment. To show their loyalty to this country, 14,000 Japanese Americans volunteered for combat duty to form the all Japanese American 442nd Infantry Regiment. For their sacrifices"The 442nd became the most decorated unit of its size in U.S. military history."www.history.com
The City of Seattle must place the importance of Civil Rights first. If the City moves forward with Alternatives 3 &4, the Othello Urban Village boundary expansions will mean up rezones, higher taxes, disruption, pressure to sell and a wave of displacements will follow. My mother will be involuntarily displaced a second time from her home. I am extremely fearful that the City of Seattle will pursue eminent domain if change is not fast enough.This will put into jeopardy her 4th Amendment right's as provided by the Constitution which states "the right of the people to be secure in their homes against unreasonable seizure should not be violated".
I hope when the Final EIS is released it does contain a 5th Alternative that protects our Civil Rights that many have sacrificed so much to preserve. Seattle's growth must be encouraged where the displacement risks are lower and opportunities are higher.
Sincerely,
Ron Momoda

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: John Perkins

Draft Plan Element: Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

This plan as drafted lacks adequate provisions for citizens who currently live and pay taxes in Seattle to monitor proposed changes during the design review process before permits are issued. One way to fix this is to make it policy that citizens—including journalists, bloggers, etc.—can observe any time during the permitting process at which the developer and city staff meet to discuss the design. Planned meetings should be publicly posted on the project's page with at least 5 working days' notice. Make it clear that the public and press are welcome not only at design review board meetings, as currently is the practice, but at _any_ meeting between staff and developers. The principle is to strive for transparent and participative self-rule, so there should not be any threshold based on size of project for when the public will be barred from observing the meeting.
cc: City Council

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Port of Seattle,Washington Maritime Federation,Ballard Oil,Manufacturing Industrial Council,International Longshore and Warehouse Union Local 19,Seattle Freight Advisory Board,BNSF Railway Company,United Transportation Union,Seattle Marine Business Coalit

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Please find attached our shared comment letter on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Updates.
--
November 20, 2015
Director Diane Sugimura Seattle Department of Planning and Development
Re: Concerns with Seattle's Draft Comprehensive Plan
Dear Ms. Sugimura,
We are a coalition of maritime and industry stakeholders that share significant concerns about the current draft Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan (Seattle 2035). Over the last several years, we invested significant efforts working with the City to share our collective perspectives on the land use policies for industrial lands and given the current draft Seattle 2035, we feel that those viewpoints have been largely ignored.
Providing certainty to manufacturing, industrial and maritime businesses in industrial zones is critical in fostering the City of Seattle's previously stated position of maintaining and growing solid, family-wage jobs closely tied to our sectors. As you know, several years ago, the City began an extensive effort "considering land use policies for designated Manufacturing and Industrial Centers (M/IC) that will help preserve these areas for ongoing industrial use. The proposed policies would also discourage the conversion of property to non-industrial uses."1
Through collaboration with City staff, these efforts resulted in two carefully crafted industrial protection policies – they were not included in the version of Seattle 2035 currently being considered. While we appreciate the policies that were added, they fall incredibly short of the necessary steps to ensure the protection of industrial lands key to the future of Seattle's maritime and manufacturing sectors.
Of further note, the City's December 3, 2012 Seattle Sports and Entertainment Facility Memorandum of Understanding commits the City to "evaluate the necessary policies, land uses, and zoning mechanisms, such as a Port Overlay District, to protect maritime and industrial uses and reinforce the role of the MIC as a manufacturing and industrial sanctuary."2 The agreement goes on to state "the objectives of this planning effort are to strengthen the long-term viability of the MIC, protect industrial uses and Port operations."3 Draft Seattle 2035 fails to do this.
In addition, the creation of a new stadium district, including the allowance of multifamily housing across the street from a busy marine cargo terminal, directly conflicts with other Seattle 2035 proposed policies about buffering industrial uses from residential uses and the long standing zoning principles of
1 http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/completeprojectslist/industriallands/whatwhy/default.htm
2 http://www.seattle.gov/council/attachments/2012arena/20121008mou.pdf (p. 29)
3 Ibid.
separating incompatible uses. Such adjacencies inevitably lead to complaints and lawsuits from the residents once they discover the realities of living next to a marine cargo terminal. This component also does little to strengthen the long-term viability of the MIC.
Mayor Murray, in his opening comments of his May 2014 Maritime and Manufacturing Summit, stated, "I believe it will be a future in which we first protect the manufacturing and maritime jobs that we already have, and then find ways to build on the strengths and advantages your companies provide to create more jobs in these industries." DPD's addressing the policy concerns outlined in this letter would support that vision.

Thank you for your attention on this matter, critical to the future of our industries, the economic activity we generate and thousands of family-wage jobs associated. We welcome the opportunity to discuss these details further.
Sincerely,
Washington Maritime Federation
Warren Aakervik Jr Chair, Seattle Freight Advisory Board Vice President, Ballard Oil
David Gering Executive Director Manufacturing Industrial Council
Jason Gross Vice President ILWU Local 19
Johan Hellman Executive Director of State Government Affairs BNSF Railway Company
Herb Krohn Washington State Legislative Director SMART-Transportation Division/ United Transportation Union
John W. Lockwood Rear Admiral, USCG, ret. President Seattle Marine Business Coalition
Jill Mackie Senior Vice President, Public Affairs Vigor Industrial
Dan McKisson President ILWU Puget Sound District Council
Captain Mike Moore Vice President Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
John Odland Vice President MacMillan-Piper
Vince O'Halloran Seattle Branch Agent Sailors' Union of the Pacific
Geraldine Poor Regional Transportation Manager Port of Seattle
Cc: Planning, Land Use and Sustainability Chair Mike O'Brien Planning Land Use and Sustainability Vice-Chair Tim Burgess Chris Gregorich, Special Advisor for Strategic Initiatives, Office of Mayor Murray Nathan Torgelson, Deputy Director, Seattle Department of Planning and Development Roque Deherrera, Maritime and Manufacturing Advocate, Seattle Office of Economic Development

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Freight Advisory Board,Warren Aakervik,Chris Eaves

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Dear Ms. Sugimura

Please find attached a comment letter from the Seattle Freight Advisory Board (SFAB). I am forwarding this to you for Warren Akervick, Chair of the SFAB and copying the Seattle 2035 email.

Thank you,

Chris Eaves
SFAB Liaison
Christopher Eaves, P.E.
Senior Civil Engineering Specialist
City of Seattle Department of Transportation
--
November 20, 2015
Ms. Diane Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning & Development
City of Seattle
Subject:Seattle 2035: Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan
Dear Ms. Sugimura:

The purpose of the Freight Advisory Board is to "advise the City Council, Mayor, and all departments and offices of the City in development of a functional and efficient freight system and on all matters related to freight and the impact that actions by the City may have upon the freight environment." (Resolution 31243)

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments from the Seattle Freight Advisory Board on the Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan. As you may know, Seattle DOT is preparing the first Freight Master Plan (FMP) for the City and it is planned for completion in 2016. This is the fourth modal master plan for the City and must be reflected in this update to the Comprehensive Plan to fully reflect both the planned network as well as the expected changes in freight mobility and good deliveries – in concert with the planned growth and changes to person mobility in the City. Please do not finalize Seattle 2035 and the Seattle Comprehensive Plan until it can fully reflect an adopted Freight Master Plan, endorsed by both Mayor and Council. We strongly urge that the Seattle Comprehensive Plan not be finalized or adopted without incorporating and reflecting the adopted FMP. The current schedule for a Draft FMP for public comment is in February 2016. The Seattle 2035, Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan is not a comprehensive plan for transportation and mobility in Seattle without reflecting the FMP which is still in development.

Seattle Municipal Tower,
Web: www.seattle.gov/sfab/
An equal opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided on request.

SFAB Comment Letter Seattle 2035 11-20-15

Below are Freight Advisory Board comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan based on our review, for you to incorporate into the Final Plan.

- The Seattle 2035 Draft Comprehensive Plan must reflect the Freight Master Plan as a critical travel mode for Seattle. Do not adopt the Comprehensive Plan without incorporating the Freight Master Plan.
- Where is freight in the Plan? Freight must be included in the plan for property access and in the streets design standards for trucks, loading and site access. The current draft focuses on movement of people. Freight movement to the distribution centers with large trucks (WB67) for those same people should receive commensurate emphasis.
- Protect the manufacturing and industrial centers in Seattle – the MIC and the Ballard Interbay MIC
- Sustain the freight network – major truck streets, minor truck streets – as redefined in the Freight Master Plan in development
- Seattle growth envisions people mobility with emphasis on transit and non- motorized travel, however, reduced reliance on the private auto will increase reliance on freight and freight mobility to deliver goods throughout the City. This means that freight mobility is a key to a vibrant economy in Seattle. Level of service of transit and freight must be a benchmark of any further growth in the Seattle area.

The Freight Advisory Board looks forward to the Seattle 2035 – Comprehensive Plan that helps to set the stage for overall growth and livability in Seattle. Freight is a key element of Transportation for the City and we urge you to ensure that freight is fairly reflected in the updated Comprehensive Plan, including the Freight Master Plan in development.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or issues. Sincerely,
Warren R. Aakervik, Jr.
Chairman, Seattle Freight Advisory Board

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Marilyn Cope

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

Dear Mayor Murray and members of the Seattle City Council,
The Seattle 2035 proposal is grotesquely untenable.
- It gives developers exceptional power to buy up, carve up and desecrate Seattle's historic and iconic neighborhoods under the false pretense of building additional affordable housing.
- The most affordable housing in Seattle is EXISTING HOUSING! Developer driven housing is not affordable at market rates and wouldn't be affordable for average individuals and families, even if developers used LIHC affordable housing tax credits. Affordable housing will only exist if the City of Seattle actually chose to build and sustain it.
- According to your own city studies, there are already enough lots zoned for higher density housing available to meet the demand for increased housing. Upzoning existing single family neighborhoods is done out of greed, not altruism.
- Neighborhoods are no longer "fostered" and neighborhood planning no longer exists. Residents no longer have a say and decisions will all be made downtown with the influence of developers who have no interest in preserving the cultural of existing neighborhoods.
- There are no clear lines or boundaries contained in LU1.1. Without clear lines or boundaries growth won't be done thoughtfully. It will follow the path of greatest profits for developers and political campaign coffers.
- Last but not least, Seattle 2035 removes any requirement for street trees. No street tree requirement IN SEATTLE! And development in critical environmental areas is encouraged. Unbelievable.
Everywhere I go in Seattle, I see the new higher density housing units, some of it less than five years old. With few exceptions, these large units of apartments and condos are already dilapidated. Seattle needs more regulations to increase the quality of construction, not less.
The outrage of the original HALA proposal is real and won't go away. Seattle 2035 is an abomination for a progressive city like Seattle. Shame on this proposal.
Sincerely,
Marilyn Cope

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: John Perkins

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

Note: You can seem more about this concern in our summer comments. Background note about the SEPA Checklist: “The environmental checklist is a standard form used by all agencies to obtain information about a proposal, its location, possible future activities, and questions about potential impacts of the proposal on each element of the environment (such as earth, water, land use, etc.). …
“The lead agency may choose to fill out the checklist or may require the applicant to fill it out.” [Emphasis added.]
During our review of the documents for Project #3020374 we realized that allowing developers to submit the SEPA checklist is a blatant conflict of interest.
Recommendations:

So ,then, who should fill out this form? For other parts of the approval process a city department or third party makes an assessment. For example, will the construction or finished building be too close to power lines?—City Light makes a review and files a response. How will the building connect to water and sewage pipes?—Public Utilities reviews the plans and files a response. Following this pattern, the Department of Neighborhoods could file the SEPA Checklist.

For citizens to keep our trust in elected officials and public processes and laws they are elected to enforce, we feel it is your urgent duty to

1. Call attention to the conflict of interest and work with the Mayor and Council to clarify who qualifies to complete a legitimate, truthful, and conscientious SEPA Checklist.
2. Institute a moratorium on projects in the application queue which have SEPA Checklists submitted by the applicants until new independent Checklists can be submitted.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Cicily Nordness

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

One of the things I hear often about why people don't use public transportation is that they have to take a bus to the light rail, or they have to transfer. I think finding out what the thing is about that transfer that is so difficult is essential as you are planning - is it that someone it seems hard? Is it the rain? The walking? That is seems confusing? Somehow people don't mind if they have to do from one subway to another in other cities, but the transfering from one type of transit to another seems particularly irritaing to people. I suggest trying to streamline and have fewer, rather than more types of transit makes more sense. It is feels like it is a lack of coordianted planning that led to all the different systems. (I don't know the reality, I'm just saying what it looks like when I see all these different public transit systems many of which don't connect with one another.

Another suggestion, and I'm sure you get this plenty, is to reduce the shared road space with the rails. The roads are more confusing when the rails follow different pattern than the roads, the rails are slippery when wet, but most important, it is hard to understand how a rail in the middle of the road will not be subject to the exact same traffic as a bus. Why spend all of the money on a system that's pros and cons mimic a bus system?

Thanks, Cicily

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Catherine LaDuke

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

-First, encourage the City to maintain focus on positive multifamily mixed use development in the existing Village boundaries, adjacent to the transit station. It would be irrational to encourage developers to chunk away at single family neighborhoods along the perimeter of the village, when vacant and surplus properties lie empty all around the station itself. This is where we and the City sensibly called for an Urban Village. This is where our development needs to be focused.

-Second, help the City look beyond the rhetoric and political table-pounding, and recognize that Mt Baker neighborhood is an asset to be preserved. As Victor Steinbrueck noted, this neighborhood possesses

important historical values that should be celebrated rather than vilified. Don't divide – complete the vibrant community vision we already defined in the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan.
Thank you for recording my opinion.
Catherine M. LaDuke

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Cicily Nordness

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

I am concerned about how changing the ability to build different things in the urban villages will negatively impact hisory of space. I am not someone who hates the new construction (I love many of the new modern homes and have considered buying one), nor do I think that things need to remain how they were when I arrived, or based on my "fond memories". That said, much of the Ballard area is nearly 100 years old (or more), and I do feel worried that if we continue what sometimes can feel like a "slash and burn" system of growth, we will lose too much of our heritage and find ourselves in 20 years bemoaning our over-focus on new contruction.
I like the opporunity for higher buildings in some of the real centers of the urban villages to allow increased housing, and to also find ways to encourage growth while leaving existing structures such as encouraging AUDs, backyard cottages, additions, duplex conversion and even some gut-and re-build the inside of the house while leaving some of the orginal housing in place. I know that this can't be all of the increase, but including it as a priority will allow us to keep our heritage. There is reason that people love to go visit Europe and see centuries-old villages, even a reason that people love much of the charm of many east-coast cities that have plenty of new, but don't throw away entire neighborhoods when adding more housing.
I think included in this plan should be ways to incentivize other means of adding housing other than tear down. Some houses do need to be torn down. Some people do just want to rebuild their home. More power to them. That will happen and it is part of the way things go. Right now, however, in a collective rush for new, we are forgeting to honor the past and remember that these old houses have stood the test of time and there should be just as much (or more) encouragement to keep them as to tear them down. This might include incentive programs, helping get houses on historical registries, easier support to maintain old houses that need repairs, loan programs to help, easy to access designers to help make places meet historical and new/more housing goals, less wait time for remodels and adding new dewelling space in existing buildings than for those looking to build entirely new.
There are ways to balance both, and we have a lot of fearful people who are worried that the whole neighorhood will be torn down and become cookie-cutter modern homes, many of which will likely not be built with the same level of craftsmanship as home that we built a century ago. We can increase growth and still meet people's needs to keep their neighborhood feel. Higher high buildings close to the center, incentivize extra new units within existing homes, and also continuing to increase the housing in the city center.
Thank you.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Wendy Kliment

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. I am a little confused why Ballard is not a planned area for future lightrail. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should ensure that people are not put on on the street when developers take over the location for their newest high-rise project. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk. We must ensure that we save our canopy - it is being destroyed at record pace as we plow over small buildings to make way for larger complexes. Trees are a critical source of oxygen and important in removing carbon from our environment.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!
Wendy Kliment
98117

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Heidi Siegelbaum

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Attached please find our comments on the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan. Kristian, you have shared the Dropbox entitled Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. All the documents in that Dropbox are intended to be incorporated into the public record for the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Please confirm that is your understanding and good luck with the process. Much coffee ahead!
Best,
Heidi Siegelbaum and Rob Hyman

Heidi Siegelbaum
Calyx
--
1
Comments on 2035 Proposed Changes to Seattle' Comprehensive Plan
Dear DPD, Mayor and City Council Members:
We offer our comments on the proposed 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendments below. We understand that the city feels it needs to accommodate every single person who would like to move to Seattle and that these are very difficult issues. However, your current approach, if passed, would do the following:
1. Destroy Culture, Design, Neighborhood Artifacts and Buildings: Destroy cultural artifacts and historic architecture that is not protected under Historic Preservation Laws
2. Violates Concurrency requirements: The proposed plan elements and current practice violates the concurrency requirements as the current pace and density of building far outstrips our capacity to accommodate people in all forms of transit outside the car. Last year's letter from the feds to the Puget Sound Regional Council about our ability to finance growth related transportation is emblematic of the City's issues around transportation (not to mention sanitation, recycling/litter etc). That 2014 letter is located in the Dropbox shared with Kristian Kofoed of DPD. Those documents are hereby incorporated into the Public Record for our comments related to the 2035 Comprehensive Plan proposed amendments.
3. Destroy Environmental Assets: The city's current and proposed policies and laws are systematically destroying all forms of biota (trees, shrubs, vegetation, flowers- anything that lives) due to density development and our failed 2010 Code amendments which still have enough loop holes to drive a Bertha sized truck through. This contravenes the City's policies and laws which relate to stormwater, Restoring Puget Sound, restoring Our waters, and climate change agreements. Our tree policies are laughably weak and do not protect trees, including Old Growth and mature conifers, particularly on private property. While credits for bioretention are generally a good idea, the incentives are not enough to save trees. From a drive around the city, NOT ONE TREE is saved during development or redevelopment and the DPD does not track trees removed during construction in contrast to City Light and SDOT which do (and replace trees to boot).
CW3.9: You should also consider the City's surplus property for open space (eg. Myer parcel in West Seattle) in addition to gardens.
4. Leads to Lack of Gathering Space and Open Space: Your definitions of open space, current zoning and the total failure of our tree regulations means that we are rapidly losing every inch of "open" PUBLIC space in which people can relax, children play, plant gardens and read. Private porticos and balconies which are PRIVATE cannot be counted as open space because THEY ARE NOT ACCESSIBLE. CW1.1: Building connections between people requires SPACE. People don't connect in the confines of crowded

hallways and concretized alleys between 6-pack condos. Gathering means space, not concrete.
5. Design and Aesthetic Failure: There is completely insufficient design review in the neighborhoods and current trends contravene your economic development goals and policies. The city's neighborhoods and its urban villages are starting to look like a post Romanesque meal in which ultra modern and Gulag superstructures were vomited across the landscape with no regard for history, design, adjacency or scale. You do not see this in the great cities of the United States and elsewhere. Well to do residents and businesses DO pay attention to design, scale and
2
aesthetics. Our willy nilly, "anything goes" "destroy all nature" approaches to the City's density development do not support business recruitment and design. Take a page from Bellevue's active focus on livability. Your policies are creating a totally unlivable Seattle.
6. Destroys Community Well Being, Character and Neighbor Affinity: Our rush to develop without sufficient input from a wide variety of practitioners (landscape architects, arborists, other cities, designers, open space planners) is creating an environment of hostility and despair between neighbors. You are fomenting a "take the money and run" ethos in which developers pay homeowners ridiculous amounts of money to redevelop their property, build lot line to lot line, remove every shred of trees and vegetation, leaving the next door neighbor without privacy, light and reasonable space. This is not New York City folks. And if you plan to create one, you need more money and people at the table.
Environmental Plan Element
While you acknowledge that trees, vegetation and soil are vitally important, all of your plans to hyperdensify the city and the urban villages (thereby further fragmenting the small amount of pervious surfaces left) while failing to protect trees on private property (60% of our land mass) actively destroy those assets. Your assumptions that densifying Seattle in the manner in which are densifying --in isolation—reduceds GHG emissions requires a more nuanced analysis. Impervious surface increases actually exacerbate GHG and lead to Heat Island Effect. Seattle ranks 10th in the nation for heat island effect. If you make this city unlivable, it will lead to sprawl. You should track who is leaving and why because we know scores of people that have migrated north to remove themselves from the ongoing assault on neighborhoods.
http://www2.epa.gov/heat-islands/heat-island-impacts
You also appear in your introduction to introduce a linkage between race, social equity and environment. Be careful here. Making housing affordable should not mean destroying natural assets. As you know, people in lower income brackets tend to be disproportionately impacted by poor environmental quality and conditions. This includes lack of trees, lack of access to parks and open space and poor air quality from fine particulate matter associated with living near traffic and highways.
E1.2: You need a time frame to reach the tree canopy goal. "over time" is not an actionable performance target.
E.1.4: If you want to reduce hardscape surfaces the Council needs to go back and change our zoning amendments, remove the tree regulations from DPD, strengthen them and impose an impervious surface tax. Permeable pavements are a great tool BUT they don't support habitat, trees, birds, and other forms of biophilia that will make the city livable. If the city is not livable, people will move outside the city, contributing to sprawl. The priority should be to build in height in tightly confined areas on major arterials, not invade little neighborhoods with out of scale buildings. Nothing spurs sprawl more than lack of affordability AND livability.
E1.6 and E.1.7: : Green Stormwater Infrastructure needs to include tree retention and protection strategies and remove the tree regulations from DPD and give them to OSE or another stewardship oriented city agency. Our tree regulations for private property must change. No one with property understands the tree regulations (which permit removal of 3 trees a year) and you don't get a letter saying you have a heritage or exceptional tree. Hire Plant Amnesty to help you and give greater

authority to the Urban Forestry Commission.
3
EG2: Fostering healthy aquatic systems rests on open space, pervious surfaces and tree retention. Once you build, pave and remove trees it's all over. Refer to Jen McIntyre/WSU's recent report on the fact that salmon die almost immediately upon entering Seattle's waters.
Overarching Issues
1. Develop and adopt legislation that requires developers to pay impact fees to ensure that developers pay their fair share of the costs of growth on our transportation network, utilities, parks and public schools. We are the ONLY city even close to our size that taxes its citizens to pay for the infrastructure associated with developer benefitted development. This must change in 2016.
2. Develop and adopt a comprehensive traffic and parking mitigation plan drawing from the expertise of residents to mitigate enormous levels of congestion already affecting the neighborhoods. Again, there should be a pause in building until affordability, homelessness, traffic and displacement issues are addressed.
3. Develop an effective anti-displacement strategy for the city which includes adoption of legislation that helps preserve the city's small business character, that requires developers to replace 1 for 1 at comparable price any existing low cost housing they remove and includes a right of first notice law requiring owners who put their low income apartments up for sale to first consider offers from nonprofits interested in preserving them
4. Develop and adopt a comprehensive plan to increase, improve and maintain parks and open space in the neighborhood accompanied by a real commitment of city funds to make this plan a reality
5. Develop and adopt a comprehensive historic preservation plan with real teeth needed to preserve dozens of identified historic structures now at risk of being lost to redevelopment
6. Adopt strong regulations protecting our declining older growth tree canopy in our community and city-wide.
7. Provide effective social services to address the ever-growing homeless population The comments below are adopted in full by another citizen and are hereby incorporated by reference into our comments:
The Mayor is proposing that Seattle and particularly its urban villages take far more growth than County targets currently require. And the current targets already have Seattle accepting as its share of growth more new construction per acre and per capita than any other city in the state. Further increasing these already unsustainable growth targets is a decision that would have huge consequences for Seattle's size and livability, and it must not be made without full public awareness and involvement.
Officially terming these neighborhoods as "urban villages," as the Comprehensive Plan has done since 1994, embodied a promise to them that while growth would come, it would be no more than is consistent with the intimacy and charm of a village. The commitment was that growth would only be such that the qualities of a village would be maintained; that it would be accompanied by public investments in amenities like parks, sidewalks, and other public facilities; and that the growth expectations for urban villages would be scaled back if livability would otherwise be sacrificed.
4
Since its adoption in 1994, the Comprehensive Plan has committed the City to balancing growth with livability. With the revolutionary "update" now proposed, the Comprehensive Plan would be transformed into an engine of growth at any cost that would likely leave Seattle unrecognizable as the city of neighborhoods it has been for more than a century.
In the proposed "update," many if not most items in the current Comprehensive Plan that protect sustainability, livability, and public participation are either weakened or entirely deleted. Emblematic of the loss of balance in this "update" is that the plan would no longer even be titled "Toward a Sustainable Seattle," as it has been since being adopted in 1994. 2

5
This reversal in priorities can also be seen in how the term “urban village” is used in the proposed new Comprehensive Plan. It no longer connotes a balance between growth and livability, but simply a means to push more growth into the urban villages. In an Orwellian reversal of meaning, the “updated” Comprehensive Plan’s notion of “urban village strategy” (newly envisaged as huge growth increases in those neighborhoods) would now trump the balancing protections that urban villages now enjoy in the current Plan--rendering absurd the claim of village-like qualities in the result. The “urban village strategy” thus would become an all-purpose excuse for density without limits, in contrast to the urban village strategy being originally defined in the Comprehensive Plan as balancing growth with livability.
Following is a summary of the differences that the DPD “crosswalk” document reveals between the current Comprehensive Plan and the proposed “update.” Note that the preparer of the current document has not had a chance to double-check the changes identified in the crosswalk document by comparing each important goal and policy in the current plan that is listed below to confirm what its fate is in the proposed “update.”
Following is a grouping of the changes into the following four categories:
Growth is no longer to be balanced with livability
Open space and trees and their benefits are greatly de-emphasized 3
6
Participation by the public and consideration of its wishes are greatly diminished
Parking is no longer recognized as of value but now is cast as a problem (which it can be but you would need to vastly increase transportation options to remove people’s current reliance on cars).
GROWTH IS NO LONGER TO BE BALANCED WITH LIVABILITY Deletes LU11: “In order to maintain the character of Seattle’s neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of the Plan.”
Substantially deletes LU48: “Seek to preserve views through: (1) land use regulations that address view impacts with height, bulk, scale, view corridor, and design review provisions; (2) zoning policy that considers the effect of zone designations on views, with special emphasis on protection of views related to shoreline areas; and (3) application of adopted environmental policy to protect public views, including views of mountains, major bodies of water, designated landmarks and the downtown skyline, in review of development projects.” [The replacement language is as only as follows: Address view protection through (1) Zoning that takes into account views, with special emphasis on protection of shoreline views; (2) Development standards that help to reduce impacts on views, including height, bulk, scale and view corridor provisions, as well as design review guidelines; (3) Environmental policies that protect specific public views, including views of mountains, major bodies of water, designated landmarks and the downtown skyline, during review of development projects.] Deletes LU80: “Provide for predictability about the allowed intensity of development with appropriate development standards and density limits for each zone to accommodate a range of housing types and achieve development that meets the policy intent for each zone.” Deletes LU81: “Limit building heights to establish maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent buildings, and limit view block age. Allow for a variety of roof forms, and allow additional height to encourage pitched roofs, where appropriate.” Deletes LU82: “Determine the appropriate height for an area according to the policy intent for each multifamily classification.” Deletes LU94: “In order to maintain a consistent and appealing character in low-density multifamily areas, adopt development standards that help ensure new development and converted structures contribute positively to the character of multifamily neighborhoods and are compatible with abutting single-family zoned areas in terms of scale, open space and setbacks, siting, and unit orientation.” 4
7

Deletes UV14: “Encourage development of ground-related housing, which is attractive to many residents including families with children, including townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, ground-related apartments, small cottages, accessory units, and single-family homes.”
Adds LU9.11 “Use midrise multifamily zones to provide additional housing opportunities in urban villages and centers.”
Deletes UV30: Balance objectives for accommodating growth supporting transit use and walking maintaining compatibility with existing development conditions, maintaining affordable housing, and responding to market preferences for certain types of housing, through the density and scale of development permitted. Deletes UVG33: “Plan for a distribution of growth to each urban village that accomplishes the goals of the urban village strategy, and recognizes local circumstances, community preferences as expressed in neighborhood plans, and the need for an equitable distribution of growth across the city.” [Various new policies or goals would force most growth into urban villages regardless of the impacts and regardless of the capacity for growth to be accommodated outside urban villages. For example, an addition is GSG2: “Accommodate most of the city’s housing and employment growth in designated urban centers and urban villages in ways that will lead to equitable outcomes for all of the city’s residents.” Another addition is GS2.8: “Direct the majority of future development to centers and urban villages, and limit the possibility of scattered growth along arterials and other areas not conducive to walking, transit use, and cohesive community development.”]
Deletes UVG35 “Achieve development within urban villages at a pace appropriate to current conditions in the area.” Deletes CF8 (concurrency): “Explore tools that encourage sufficient capital facilities and amenities to meet baseline goals for neighborhoods and to address needs resulting from growth.” [This is a pathway to litigation against the City] Substantially deletes H37 (good neighborhood guidelines): “Require sponsors of City-funded subsidized rental housing projects and encourage sponsors of non-City-funded subsidized rental housing projects to use the City’s good neighbor guidelines. This should encourage cooperative problem solving as early as possible in the process of developing subsidized rental housing, in order to identify, and where appropriate, respond to neighborhood concerns.” [The replacement language is as only as follows: “Require neighborhood notification when agencies apply for City funding for rental housing preservation and projection projects and provide guidelines for effective communication between housing owners and neighbors. ”]
Adds GS2.9/2.10: Use zoning and other planning tools in urban centers and urban villages to address displacement of low-income, special needs residents, and immigrant and refugee populations, along with community services and institutions.” [Note: this is an ironic addition, 5
8
given that upzoning and the overdevelopment that it promotes have caused much of the recent displacement by causing demolition of the older buildings in which many low-income, special needs, and immigrant and refugee populations were living.]
OPEN SPACE AND TREES AND THEIR BENEFITS ARE GREATLY DE-EMPHASIZED Deletes LU-34: “Limit the maximum amount of lot area covered by a structure to maintain compatibility with the scale and character of an area, to provide an adequate proportion of open area on a site relative to the area occupied by structures, and to provide occupants with sufficient access to light and air, as appropriate to the intended character and use of an area.” [The replacement language, LU5.3, is only as follows: “Control the massing of structures to make them compatible with the area’s planned scale, provide a reasonable ration of open to occupied space on a site, and allow the building to receive adequate natural light. ” Deletes LU36: “Outside of Urban Centers, use requirements for onsite open space or required yards to help ensure that new development maintains existing patterns of landscaped front yards, to encourage permeable surfaces and vegetation, and to mitigate the cumulative effects of development.” Deletes LU39: “Preserve and enhance the City’s physical and aesthetic character and environment by (1) Preventing untimely and indiscriminate removal or destruction of trees; (2)

Providing incentives to property owners for tree retention; (3) Providing protection to large trees; (4) Providing special protection to exceptional trees that, because of the unique historical, ecological, or aesthetic value, constitute an important community resource. Deletes UVG37: ["Provide safe and welcoming places for the people of Seattle to play, learn, contemplate, and build community. Provide healthy spaces for children and their families to play; for more passive activities such as strolling, sitting, viewing, picnicking, public gatherings, and enjoying the natural environment; and for active uses such as community gardening, competitive sports, and running."] Deletes UV39: ["Enhance the urban village strategy through the provision of: 1. Amenities in more densely populated areas; 2. Recreational opportunities for daytime populations in urban centers; 3. Mitigation of the impacts of large scale development; 4. Increased opportunities to walk regularly to open spaces by providing them close by; 5. Connections linking urban centers and villages, through a system of parks, boulevards, community gardens, urban trails, and natural areas; 6. A network of connections to the regional open space system; 7. Protected environmentally critical areas; 8. Enhanced tree canopy and understory throughout the city."]
Deletes UV53: Direct efforts to expand the open space network according to the following considerations: (1) Locations for new facilities: a. Urban centers and villages targeted for largest 6
9
share of residential growth; especially those existing high density residential areas presently not served according to the population-based or distribution goals for urban village open space; b. Other urban village locations where an adopted subarea plan or recognized neighborhood plan includes open space recommendations consistent with these policies; and c. Specific locations enumerated in the Parks functional plan outside urban centers or villages. (2) types of open space acquisitions and facility development: a. Village open space sites, urban center indoor recreation facilities, village commons sites, and community gardens; b. Critical open space linkages, connectors, and corridors that are highly accessible for active use within or directly serving urban villages, high density and/or high pedestrian, bicycle, or transit use areas; c. Open space linkages, connectors, and corridors that are highly accessible for active use serving other high pedestrian, bicycle, or transit use areas; and d. Other types of open space within or adjacent to urban villages that is accessible from adjacent urban village. [The replacement language, P1.1, is only as follows: "Continue to expand the City's park holdings, with special emphasis on serving urban centers and urban villages and areas that have been traditionally under-served."]
Deletes UV55: "Seek to provide public open space in conjunction with major public projects such as utility and transportation projects, with the amount of open space based on the size of the project, open space needs of the adjacent areas, and the opportunities provided by the particular project."
PARTICIPATION BY THE PUBLIC AND CONSIDERATION OF ITS WISHES ARE GREATLY DIMINISHED Deletes LU5: ["Consider, through neighborhood planning processes, recommendations for the revision of zoning to better reflect community preferences for the development of an area, provided that consistency between the zoning and this Plan is maintained. Consider relevant goals and policies in adopted neighborhood plans when evaluating a rezone proposal."
Deletes UVG10: "Collaborate with the community in planning for the future."
Deletes LU5: "Consider, through neighborhood planning processes, recommendations for the revision of zoning to better reflect community preferences for the development of an area, provided that consistency between the zoning and this Plan is maintained. Consider relevant goals and policies in adopted neighborhood plans when evaluating a rezone proposal."
Deletes LU75: "Limit the multifamily zones to areas that do not meet the single-family zone criteria, except in circumstances where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a different zone is more appropriate."
Deletes LU164: "Require conditional use review for certain uses to ensure compatibility with uses

located in abutting, less intensive zones, to ensure consistency with adopted neighborhood plans, or to evaluate certain uses that could have significant impacts on other nearby uses." 7
10
11
PARKING IS NO LONGER RECOGNIZED AS OF VALUE BUT NOW IS CAST AS A PROBLEM
Deletes LUG4: "Establish off-street parking requirements for new development to provide parking for the occupants of the structure. Set off-street parking requirements to reduce reliance on automobiles, promote economic development, and reduce housing costs."
Substantially deletes LU49: "Seek to further this Plan's goals of encouraging the use of public transit, carpools, walking, and bicycles as alternatives to the use of single-occupancy vehicles when setting parking requirements for both single-occupant vehicles and their alternatives. When setting new requirements for off-street parking balance the goals of accommodating the parking demand generated by new development and avoiding on-street congestion of parked cars with the goals of lowering construction costs and discouraging single-occupant vehicles."
Deletes LU20: "Allow small institutions and public facilities to not satisfy all parking demands they generate, if they demonstrate how they will reduce traffic impacts. Do not permit the creation of a serious safety problem or blighting influence on the surrounding neighborhood."
Deletes LU50: In urban centers and urban villages, consider removing minimum parking requirements and setting parking maximums in recognition of the increased pedestrian, bicycle and transit accessibility these areas already provide or have planned. Parking requirements for urban centers and villages should account for local conditions and planning objectives. "
Adds LU63: "Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking provided in areas of the city that are well-served by transit, such as urban centers and those urban villages that contain frequent transit service, without requiring a minimum parking requirement in these areas."
Deletes T-39: "Restrict on-street parking when necessary to address safety, operational, or mobility problems. In urban centers and urban villages where such restriction is being considered, the pedestrian environment and transit operations are of primary concern, but decisions should also balance the use of the street by high-occupancy vehicles, bicycles and motor vehicles, access to local businesses; control of parking spillover into residential areas; and truck access and loading."
Deletes T-40: "in commercial districts prioritize curb space in following order: 1. transit stops and layover; 2. passenger and commercial vehicle loading; 3. short term parking (time limit signs and paid parking); 4. parking for shared vehicles; and 5. vehicular capacity.
Adds T2.6: "Assign functions in the transition zone to support nearby land uses, provide support for modal plan priorities, and to accommodate multiple functions.
Transportation Figure 3--Priorities for Right of Way Transition Zone" by Predominant Use of Area 8
12
Commercial/mixed use areas: 1. Access for commerce; 2. Access for people; 3. Activation; 4. Greening; 5. Storage.
Industrial areas: 1. Access for commerce; 2. Access for people; 3. Storage; 4. Activation; 5. Greening
Residential areas: 1. Access for people; 2. Access for commerce; 3. Greening; 4. Storage."
Deletes T-46: Coordinate Seattle's parking policies with regional parking policies to preserve Seattle's competitive position in the region."
Deletes TG17: "Manage parking supply to achieve vitality of urban centers and urban villages, auto trip reduction, and improved air quality."

If you have any questions feel free to contact
Heidi Siegelbaum and Rob Hyman
Ballard

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Britten Clark

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

I strongly believe that urban village expansion is a good idea near transit like lightrail. The current proposed expansion line in Roosevelt (10 min walk) is a good rough start but seems lacking in trying to work with existing building quality and more likely zones of development like along arterials. It seems it would be useful to add additional expansion of boundary along arterials for a 15-20 minute walk. Arterials and parks could be good oportunities to increase urban density. Arterials in particular are less desireable for single family but better opportunity for higherdensity that could transition and connect to quieter streets of adjacent residential. Though property values could rise for residental neighborhoods on quiet streets that are upzoned the reality is that only a few rougher homes will be rebuilt into higher density and neighborhood will look a little odd and crazy. Many of the homes on quieter streets have been heavily invested in to improve them. The higher density new construction can be designed to work with the noise and activity along the arterial streets. I think in general there is a fear of change and higher density. However with architectural review boards and better design requirements in mixed areas of single family and low rise, high density can fit in with single family style well and look like a large house but actually have 4 or more units. people will need more positive examples of what could fit in with a neighborhood of classic craftsman and other styles of homes in a given neighborhood.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Green Spaces Coalition,Elaine Ike

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Dear Seattle City Councilmembers, Mayor Ed Murray, Patrice Carroll, Tom Hauger, Seattle 2035 Group:

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition thanks the 2035 group for extending the comment period through November 20, 2015, allowing us to have a more comprehensive and specific response to 2035. For the past 3 years our coalition has been focused on concerns of areas that should be covered by the proposed plan, particularly in the valuing, preservation and incorporation of green infrastructure for the health of Seattle's residents and the continued livability of our home.

We thank you for your consideration of the SGSC's comments and hope you will include them in the Seattle 2035 Draft Plan update.

Sincerely,

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition
Comments to Draft Comprehensive Plan
November 20, 2015

Comments of Seattle Green Spaces Coalition to Draft Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan
Understanding The Value of Our Green Infrastructure to Our Ecosystem is Critical to Formulating a New

Comprehensive Plan
Seattle Green Spaces Coalition strongly urges the City of Seattle to:
1. Incorporate more than a billion dollars a year worth of green infrastructure assets onto its balance sheet in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan -- enabling the city to preserve and steward its natural capital going forward, and to save tens to hundreds of millions of dollars in costs every year on financial borrowing, infrastructure development and maintenance, and public health,
2. Understand that publicly-held open and green spaces provide value in perpetuity to Seattle residents vs. selling that land for real estate development, which only provides short-term gains during each owner's amortization period,
3. Replace piecemeal evaluations of individual green and open space properties in the city surplus lands portfolio with an overall, holistic assessment of Seattle's green infrastructure.
4. Fulfill requirements in the Growth Management Act to concurrently develop infrastructure, including green and open spaces.
An Inter-Departmental Team (IDT) reviewed Statement of Legislative Intent 47-2-A-2 (Open Space Opportunity Fund), and reported that, "There may be real value to contemplating value of green infrastructure …in cost-benefit analysis."
A. Comprehensive Plan 2035 must recognize that public open and green space assets provide monetary value.
While standard economic practice assigns more value to present than future assets, we know the reverse is true. As the city builds out through residential and commercial development, open space becomes proportionately scarcer, and therefore more valuable.
Four years ago (2011), the Trust for Public Lands reported that Seattle parklands and natural areas deliver nearly $500 million a year in benefits and savings to the city – beyond the $20 million they generate in revenue. These included oxygen production and carbon sink, drainage, storm water and erosion control, habitat provision, heat island mitigation, aesthetics and property value enhancement, and recreation, public health and community engagement benefits. Two years ago (2013), the Urban Forest Stewardship Plan (UFSP) found that urban forests provide $23.4 million annually in air quality benefits and savings alone. Estimated today, the total benefits and savings provided by our public and private green infrastructure would exceed a billion dollars a year.
B. Publicly held open and green spaces provide value in perpetuity.
Our growing population requires more open space to make urban neighborhoods livable. Contrarily, privately owned land provides increasing value to its owner, and decreasing value to the city over its amortization period.

When the 1899 Seattle City Council acquired the Cedar River watershed area – for the benefit of Seattle citizens in perpetuity – council members acted with rare vision. A real estate appraisal of the watershed's 90,638 acres today, however, would go no further than valuing it as raw land, dotted with some valuable infrastructure. The real value of this area, which provides clean drinking water to 1.4 million people in the greater Seattle area, is almost incalculable. Little of that value would be realized if the City of Seattle sold this land at "fair market value." Further, the comparatively paltry sum would not come close to covering the cost of developing new city water sources. On the other hand, if Seattle wished to purchase a resource on this scale today, the cost would be astronomical, therefore prohibitive and fiscally irresponsible. Once these lands are lost, it requires great expense to repurchase them, or to replace them with human built capital.
Seattle Green Spaces Coalition urges the public sector to view its green infrastructure as an asset of continuously appreciating value. While the city currently tracks, tallies and depreciates built infrastructure over time, it does not tally or track green infrastructure, even though its value increases over time. This presents a fresh opportunity for the City of Seattle to explore. Precedents have been set,

and new ones are being developed at federal, state, county and local levels, and in both the public and private sectors.

C. A Comprehensive Plan Must Take a Holistic Approach To The Built and Green Environment

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition urges the city to complete an aggregated, holistic assessment of Seattle's green infrastructure, a valuation of benefits and savings it provides the city, and then incorporate those values into the city's asset portfolio, for management, cost-benefit analyses and reporting. Briefly, we recommend creating an Integrated Master Plan for Open Space. We propose that the City identify its open space goals, not just "aspirations," and create a targeted work plan to implement these goals into realities.

Presently, piecemeal evaluations of individual open and green space properties in the city's surplus land portfolio set up a criteria competition between evaluating entities – e.g., the Parks & Recreation Gap Analysis vs. city department analyses vs. the Urban Forestry Commission vs. Seattle Parks Foundation vs. the Trust for Public Lands, etc. The surplus property process also sets up a rejection cycle starting with offering the land to other departments and agencies at "fair market value," which is often prohibitively expensive – and which they often reject, followed by asking for interest from citizens or citizen groups – who also in most cases cannot afford the price (see A. above).

This pricing system neglects the land's ecosystem services benefits, and the added value of neighborhood participation in activating and stewarding it. The city owns approximately 414 acres "excess" or "surplus" land, much of it wooded and/or planted open space that has provided benefits as part of Seattle's living ecosystem for generations. Without a comprehensive assessment of the city's open and green spaces, city leaders have no idea how these acres contribute to Seattle's green infrastructure, nor what value they provide. It makes no sense to dispose of these properties without knowing their value.

D. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires Seattle to develop concurrently its infrastructure, including green and open spaces, as it builds out its hardscape.

The city has a responsibility to maintain and increase open and green space as it develops. This must be done in concert and compliance with city environmental goals, such as increasing forest canopy, reducing pollution and carbon footprint, and improving equity in city-wide distribution of and access to green assets. One of the key principles of environmental justice is that those most affected by environmental inequities are able to participate in the process and develop solutions. This would offer an ideal opportunity to satisfy GMA requirements, where the City examines how surplus properties can be re-purposed in ways that contribute to race and social justice and environmental equity.

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition urges the city to act on opportunities for repurposing city owned surplus land, by retaining it for interim or partial uses as temporary encampments for the homeless, and for permanent uses as land conservancies, tree banks, P-Patches, parks, environmental, climate mitigation or educational sites, and other uses. While city departments have identified possible uses or pilot projects for surplus property, there is no integrated approach to re-purposing the land for public benefit.

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition encourages the city to find new, innovative funding, ownership and management strategies for retaining and expanding its open and green space assets. The city currently allows developments to trade technologies -- e.g. green roofs, green walls, bio swales, and permeable pavement — for reduced open space. None is proven sufficient to meet the serious environmental challenges facing Seattle. We urge the city to retain City owned green space to mitigate negative environmental effects.

Seattle has a laudable and extensive history of re-purposing sites of historical, cultural and environmental significance, such as Gas Works Park, the Burke-Gilman trail and MOHAI, to name just a few. These make our city unique, celebrate our heritage and add dimension to the fabric of our lives.

People love to visit and spend time in places that have something to them. This experience can be brought to re-purposing our surplus land. Seattle's history also includes numerous, successful public/private partnerships, such as the Pike Place Market and Green Cities Partnership. City Fruit and Seattle Tilth have expressed interest in expanding their urban agriculture programs on City-owned surplus property – just two of many potential partners the city can with in the private and non-profit sectors

Since 2013, Seattle Green Spaces Coalition has been working with neighborhoods to identify their needs and desires, and how our surplus land can be re-purposed to meet them. We urge the city to encourage and grow these neighborhood efforts to capitalize on healthy green space.

It does not make sense to sell property, and to create a "draft" Comprehensive Plan without quantifying our green infrastructure needs and making a determination of how we will meet those needs. Green infrastructure is as critical to the future of the City as the build environment. Yet while the Draft Plan contains myriad details about future built environment without a framework of our green infrastructure balance sheet, and what our open space means for that balance sheet.

Key Metrics Have Been Omitted from the Draft Plan

The Draft Plan has deleted portions of the current Comprehensive plan that are very important for the livability of Seattle, and critically important for our ecosystem. We request that these be retained in the new plan:

- UVG15 (page30): Provide parks and open spaces that are accessible to urban villages to enhance the livability of urban villages, to help shape the overall development pattern, and to enrich the character of each village.

- UV46 (page 40) Strive to accomplish goals in the Urban Village Appendix B for the amount, type and distribution of open space. This Appendix identifies the open space requirement to be one acre per 1,000 households and all areas in either urban center or village being within 1/8 if nuke from open space or ¼ of a mile for residential villages. The proposed plan has no statement.
- UV47 (page 40) Designate and preserve important natural or ecological features in public ownership as green space for low intensity uses.

Specific Comments

Seattle Green Spaces Coalition provides the following specific comments to the Draft Comprehensive Plan. Proposed changes and additions are underlined.

Growth Strategy/Planning for Growth

The Draft Plan states that it envisions a city where growth heightens our stewardship of the environment, yet the Growth Strategy Goals and Policies fail to include environmental stewardship.

Proposed Change:

Revise GSG1: Have strategies that prepare the City for the challenges and opportunities of growth and that represent the needs and desires of a broad cross-section of city residents and business owners and that enhance our environmental stewardship.

Add to Policies:

GS1.5: Monitor urban centers and villages to track changes over time in number of housing units and jobs, population and public investments, parks and open space, and use this information to make decisions about conducting further planning or providing additional investments to help meet the needs of residents in these locations.

GS1.7 [new]: Engage in on-going evaluation of how growth shall heighten our stewardship of the environment, enhance public health and further our climate action goals.

Growth Strategy/Urban Village Strategy

The Urban Village Strategy must take into account the character of neighborhoods with respect to green space. Also, to meet goals of concentrating various aspects of people's lives in urban centers (such as

jobs and commerce), the Strategy should include parks, recreation, urban agriculture and open space within walking distance which also reduce car dependency and would benefit families and public health.
Proposed Changes:
Revise GS2.4: Coordinate planning for transportation, utilities, open space, public gathering places, parks and recreation opportunities, and other public services to meet the anticipated growth and increased density.
Revise GS2.6: Plan for development in urban centers and urban villages in ways that will provide a broad cross-section of Seattle households with better access to services, transit, recreation, and educational and employment opportunities.
Revise GS2.5: Encourage infill development, restoration of natural areas, and/or development of parks and recreation opportunities on vacant and under-used sites, particularly in urban centers and villages.
Revise GS2.10 to include Open Space as a Characteristic in Growth Strategy Figure 1.
Add the following to GS2.16 to reflect the benefits of open space and natural areas as buffers and contributors to cleaning industrial pollutants: Development of open space and natural areas to offset industrial pollutants and to provide clean air and clean water benefits.
Clarification Requested:
GS2.17 would designate the Ballard-Interbay and Duwamish areas as manufacturing/ industrial centers. However, these are areas where people currently live, where there are bike trails, parks, environmentally critical areas and significant natural areas. How will these current uses be supported and enhanced by a designation of "manufacturing/ industrial centers"?
Urban Design
While the Discussion section refers to the city's close relationship with nature, as well as the importance of parks and public spaces, these aspects of the physical environment are not reflected in the Policies section of the Natural Environment. The Comprehensive Plan needs to address the inadequacy of the current Tree Ordinance, and should incorporate greater tree protection in its policies.
Proposed Changes:
Add the following to GS4.1: Encourage the preservation, protection, and restoration of Seattle's distinctive natural features and land forms such as bluffs, beaches, streams, and remaining evergreen forests, and encourage urban design to foster a close relationship with nature through access to parks, community gardens, public spaces, and vistas.
Add the following additional policy under Built Environment: Preserve green infrastructure and neighborhood character and needs of natural environment by protecting natural features, trees and plant life.
Revise GS4.26: Design public spaces that consider the nearby physical context and the needs of the community, such as access to nature.
Annexation
Upon incorporation, areas abutting South Seattle will have additional need for green infrastructure as well as access to parks and natural areas. We recommend that a policy be added to plan for and support these needs.
Proposed Changes:
GS5.6 [new]: Retain publicly owned land in South Seattle to accommodate future needs for green infrastructure, parks and natural areas.
GS5.7 [new]: Develop plans for vacant and under-utilized land in South Seattle to accommodate future needs for green infrastructure, parks and natural areas.
Land Use
The land use goals fail to reflect an underlying mission of the Comprehensive Plan to enhance and preserve our natural environment. The goals also fail to reflect the need for parks and recreation for purposes of public health. (Parks and recreation are not merely "amenities" but vital parts of our living

environment.) Also, the goals omit reference to our climate action goals. These should be included.
Proposed Changes:
We propose the following additions to LUG2: Provide zoning and accompanying land use regulations that:

- Allow for a variety of housing types to accommodate housing choices for households of all types and income levels
- Support a wide diversity of employment-generating activities providing jobs for a diverse residential population, as well as a variety of services for residents and businesses
- Accommodate the full range of public services, institutions, parks and recreation, open space, and amenities needed to support a fully developed, diverse, and economically sustainable urban community
- Support green infrastructure and enhance stewardship of the natural environment
- Support the City's Climate Action Plan, Urban Forestry Stewardship Plan and Food Action Plan

Add to LU2.1: Allow or prohibit uses in each zone based on the zone's intended function as described in Section 2 of this land use element and the expected impacts of a use on other properties in the zone and the surrounding area. Generally allow for a broad mix of compatible uses in those zones that allow the greatest densities of development while balancing stewardship of our natural environment.
We request that LU2.2 be deleted. It is unnecessary as standards for mitigation are addressed by the Environmentally Critical Areas Code. As written, LU2.2 is vague and could be interpreted to encourage "conditional" development without best scientific practices for mitigation.
Single-family Residential Areas and Multifamily Residential Areas
Throughout the City, we are not meeting our open space goals. While we are preparing for growing density, we must also make opportunities to grow our open space and natural areas.
We recommend the following additional policies:
LU8.13 [new]: Seek opportunities to grow our open space, green space and natural areas.
LU8.14 [new]: Retain public-owned surplus and excess properties for open space, green space and natural areas.
LU8.15 [new]: Aspire to engage community groups in opportunities to meet our open space goals.
LU9.16 [new] Seek opportunities to grow our open space, green space and natural areas.
LU9.17 [new] Retain public-owned surplus and excess properties for open space, green space and natural areas.
LU9.18 [new]: Aspire to engage community groups in opportunities to meet our open space goals.
Industrial Areas
To reduce industrial pollution and improve air and water quality, we recommend that natural areas be developed in the industrial areas. We propose the following additional policies:
LU11.27 [new]: Seek opportunities to develop natural areas to reduce industrial pollution and improve air and water quality, and retain public-owned surplus and excess properties for buffers and to reduce industrial pollution and improve air and water quality.
Environmentally Critical Areas
Growing density and development are putting pressures on our environmentally critical areas and placing more demands on our green infrastructure. To balance these pressures, we recommend the following additional policies:
LU17.19 [new]: Seek a net gain in tree canopy and biomass functions for carbon sequestration and to improve air quality across the city.
LU17.20 [new]: Retain publicly owned surplus or excess properties in environmentally critical areas as natural areas.
LU17.21 [new]: Seek to acquire vacant or under-utilized property in environmentally critical areas as parks or natural areas to enhance the natural environment.

Transportation
Other cities have begun to use alleys for flood control, water retention, green space, and community gardening. While some alleys in Seattle have been vacated for commercial use, the potential to vacate alleys for public use merits further exploration. We recommend revising policies T2.11 and T4.1 to reflect this opportunity as follows:
T2.11 [revised]: Maintain, preserve and enhance the City's alleys as a valuable network for green infrastructure and public spaces and where reasonable, finding alternative means for access, loading and unloading of freight and utility operations.
Revise T4.1: Design and operate streets and alleys to promote green infrastructure, new technologies, and active transportation modes while addressing safety, accessibility and aesthetics.
Environment
One of the top priorities of the Comprehensive Plan is protecting our ecosystem. While the Environment section describes certain aspects of the ecosystem, it does not address the basic need to acquire and preserve natural areas. This is fundamental to balancing the environmental impacts of past, current and future development which puts a great burden on residents and wildlife, and our ecosystem as a whole. We recommend revising the goal to include fostering healthy green spaces, parks and natural areas, not just trees, vegetation, and soils.
EG1 [revised]: Foster healthy green spaces, parks and natural areas, as well as trees, vegetation, and soils to improve human health, provide wildlife habitats, reduce drainage costs, give residents across the city access to nature, and increase the quality of life for all Seattleites.
We recommend adopting additional policies under the Environment Section to address protecting and enhancing our physical environment.
E1.8 [new]: Quantify the nature and quality of the City's green infrastructure needs and how those needs are and are not met by the ecosystem services provided by private and public lands
E1.9 [new]: Retain public-owned surplus and excess property to offset growing density and to restore our ecosystem.
E1.10 [new]: Develop protections for environmentally significant or distinctive land and features.
E1.11 [new]: Develop open space goals for the growing city population and plan for how to meet those goals.
E.1.12 [new]: Ensure that our natural areas and environmentally significant features are protected from degradation.
Water
We recommend an additional policy to preserve wetlands and streams.
E2.6 [new]: Retain publicly owned surplus and excess properties in watersheds and/or containing wetlands and streams.
E2.7 [new]: Seek to restore wetlands and streams on under-utilized or vacant land.
Parks and Open Space
Seattle is not meeting its current open space goals. While the current Comprehensive Plan contains metrics for the amount of open space per resident and the distances for nearby parks and open space, the Draft Comprehensive Plan has eliminated those goals. We request that the Comprehensive Plan adopt levels of service and metrics for open space needs for a growing population.
Further as the Parks Department owns and maintains a sizeable portion of the City's open space, the Parks Department is the steward of a significant part of Seattle's green infrastructure. To prepare for future growth, we require a plan to implement Seattle's open space goals, which would integrate parks and open space into Seattle's green infrastructure needs.
We recommend the following additions:
PG1 [revised]: Provide a variety of outdoor and indoor spaces throughout the city for all people to play, learn, experience nature, and build community.

PG2 [new]: Integrate DPR's stewardship of land into the green infrastructure needs of the City.
P1.13 [new]: Identify potential private-public partnership opportunities to fund acquisition of land.
P1.14 [new]: Provide incentives, impose impact fees, and utilize other mechanisms to require developers to provide funds for the city to acquire open space.
P1.15 [new]: Adopt levels of service and metrics for open space needs for a growing population.
P1.16 [new]: Retain public-owned surplus and excess property to meet the open space needs.
Thank you for considering these comments
Contact Information
Mary Fleck, Steering Committee, Seattle Green Spaces Coalition
Elaine Ike, Steering Committee, Seattle Green Spaces Coalition
Martin Westerman, Steering Committee, Seattle Green Spaces Coalition

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Laura Cooper

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I urge you to prioritize green space and keep public lands in public hands----ie stop selling public land to developers. Once its gone, its gone forever and we are already lacking green in the Emerald City.
Thank you,
Laura Cooper

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Laura Cooper

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

I urge the exclusion of Land Use Guideline 16: GOAL LUG16 Maintain the city's cultural identity and heritage by rehabilitating, restoring, and reusing structures in designated historic districts and landmarked sites, objects and structures.
A city that honors its history is richer than one that does not.
Thank you.
Laura Cooper
Ballard Historical Society Trustee

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle For Everyone,Kylie Rolf

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Good Morning,
Please find the attached letter from members of the Seattle for Everyone governance committee regarding the draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
If you have further questions or need more information please feel free to reach out to me.
Thank you,

Kylie

_____

Kylie Rolf
Sound View Strategies
--
To: Department of Planning and Development (DPD) From: Seattle for Everyone Governance Committee
Date: November 20, 2015
Re: Seattle 2035 draft comprehensive plan

We are writing on behalf of Seattle for Everyone—a broad coalition of affordable housing developers and advocates, for---profit developers and businesses, labor and social justice advocates, environmentalists and urbanists. We are united to build an equitable, prosperous, thriving, and inclusive Seattle that shares the benefits of the city's growth among all current and future residents—from those struggling with homelessness to wage---earners and families. Seattle for Everyone is working together to support the city's Housing and Livability Agenda (HALA) provisions to produce and preserve critically needed affordable and market---rate housing in the City of Seattle. We believe that the HALA recommendations represent the first ever comprehensive package of affordable housing policies that will provide for a growing, inclusive city over the coming decades.

The Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan provides the critical framework for growth in Seattle. Addressing our city's affordable housing crisis as we grow will take bold and innovative action to create and expand more affordable housing options throughout Seattle, most especially in areas with the greatest access to jobs, amenities, services and mobility choices. It is therefore essential that Seattle 2035 policies and HALA strategies are consistent, mutually supportive, clear and actionable.

Broadly Seattle for Everyone supports provisions in Seattle 2035 that seek to increase housing supply, diversity and affordability. In particular, we want to express our strong support for the following three key proposals put forward in the draft plan:

- Guide more growth to areas within a 10 minute walk of frequent transit
- Create a Future Land Use map that communicates future development in urban villages and provides more flexibility in changing between commercial, mixed use and residential development activities within urban villages.
- Increase the diversity of housing types in lower density residential zones, including single---family zones.

These proposals would increase land zoned for multi---family and expand urban village boundaries near transit, consistent with HALA recommendations MF.1, MF.2 and MF.3. We view these proposals as critical pieces to the successful implementation of HALA and the Grand Bargain.

We support the Grand Bargain agreement to require developers to provide for affordable housing in conjunction with increased capacity for multifamily housing and commercial development. We urge the City to add language to the land use and housing elements which reflects the City's commitment to enacting this policy as

well as developing strong provisions and measurable timelines for implementing proactive affordable housing preservation and displacement prevention strategies.

Seattle for Everyone urges your strong support for these key proposals to ensure that we leverage our city's unprecedented growth to create communities that are affordable, livable, accessible, inclusive and sustainable. We look forward to working together in the future and would welcome the opportunity to meet in person as you move forward with the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan development process. If you have any questions about Seattle for Everyone please feel free to contact Kylie Rolf

Thank you for your time, Adam Glickman, SEIU 775
David Moseley, Alliance for Pioneer Square
Faith Pettis, Pacifica Law Group
Hilary Franz, Futurewise
Kelly Rider, Housing Development Consortium of Seattle---King County
Maud Daudon, Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Rebecca Saldana, Puget Sound Sage
Sara Maxana, Ballard Resident
Seattle for Everyone Governance Committee

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Joy Estill

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

[subject: Expand Urban Village Into Mt Baker and Cheasty]
Please do not entertain this notion. The sanctity of this neighborhood is greatly at risk.
It is filled with hard-working, quiet and many elderly people.

DO not destroy the sanctity of this area. There is no need.

C. Joy Estill

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Ted Hunter

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Greetings:
I've read it, digested it, discussed it and am familiar with it. I'd like
you to consider a few changes before you go to a final recommended plan:
1. Consider limits to growth. Oh, I know, the GMA says you must plan for
20 years to accommodate expected growth. But that can be done in a number
of ways. One is to encourage out-migration. Seattle should be home to
those who work here; we need not accommodate those who merely choose to
live here, but work in Bellevue or other outlying communities. Consider
placing a commuter tax on those who do, as they are taking up road space,
cause higher pollution, use more carbon fuels, and generally have a
greater impact on our city. There are undoubtedly other strategies as
well. Put your planners to work identifying and implementing them.

Seattle housing should be for those who choose to work here.
2. Promote public schools. Yes, the draft plan places this as a focus area, but you could do far more. Discourage charter and private schools, and show more support for our public schools by easing permitting, utilizing schools as public parks in off hours and summer, and generally offering support.
3. More and better parks. Obesity is a serious problem. Encourage active recreation with parks that offer opportunities for exercise. Encourage parks at or near ALL city buildings, such as what is happening at the North Transfer Station. There is a nice block for a park across from City Hall. Make it happen!
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
--
Ted Hunter, Attorney
Sound Law Center

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Mariners,Susan Harsh,Bart Waldman

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Greetings -

Please see the attached letter from Bart Waldman.

Susan Harsh

Seattle Mariners

Susan Harsh
Seattle Mariners
Executive/Legal Assistant
--
BART WALDMAN
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
LEGAL & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
November 20, 2015
Via Email:
Tom Hauger and Kristian Kofoed
Department of Planning and Development
Re: Comments on Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan
Dear Mr. Hauger and Mr. Kofoed:
The Seattle Mariners have actively participated in the City's planning process to establish a Stadium District, in recognition of the unique role of the existing sports and entertainment venues. Creation of a Stadium District is an outgrowth of the Stadium District Concept Plan with its shared vision for the area around Safeco Field and

CenturyLink. We strongly support the creation of the Stadium District as described in Goal LUG15, and the Policies that implement it. However, we ask that you consider these additional comments about those Policies.

1. Policy LU15.8 refers to "minimizing the need for parking facilities" for major sports and entertainment uses. We do not believe that language is appropriate. Since the time Safeco Field and CenturyLink were opened, more than 4 000 parking spaces have been removed from around these facilities. Both venues cotmted on that parking supply to accommodate patrons. With its elimination, Safeco Field, for example, may in the future need to construct new parking. Policy LU15.8 should not discourage that or possibly be used to prevent such new parking when the implementing regulations are adopted. The key issue is limiting traffic impacts, and that can be accomplished in various ways. Thus, we ask that Policy LU15.8 be amended as follows:

Encourage transportation management strategies by major sports and entertainment uses and other large uses in the district to minimiZ">e the need for parking facilities and limit the traffic impacts associated with events, by encouraging patrons to ride transit and choose non-motorized modes of travel.

Recognize that major sports and entertainment uses have unique needs for oversized signage or displays associated with venues, and accommodate such needs in sign code regulations.

You may recall that in 2012 and 2013, we discussed how the existing sign code regulations do not anticipate the large sports venues, and thus do not adequately address the signage needs of these unique buildings. Some changes were later made to the sign regulations to address a different topic, but there has not yet been a comprehensive look at the signage needs of the large sports venues. Instead of leaving this topic solely to the implementing regulations, we ask that the Plan include this policy direction in order to guide the later work on the regulations.

3. Policy LU15.4 states that building heights will be allowed that are compatible with the historic development pattern, "generally 65 to 85 feet" with some exceptions. We understand that this Policy is not itself establishing what heights apply within the Stadium District. Nonetheless, we wish to emphasize our previous comments that views to and from Safeco Field should be carefully considered in setting building heights on the southern portion of the WOSCA site and the property across the street, west of Safeco Field. Heights above 65 feet in those locations would cause adverse impacts on public views, whereas a height limit of 65 feet would preserve those public views. We appreciate your continued consideration of this point.

Finally, as noted in our prior comments on tbe Stadium District, we believe that a master planning process should be initiated for the WOSCA prope1ty before zoning regulations are established for that property. Public view protection and open space opportunities need careful consideration.

Thank you for extending the public comment period on the draft Plan, and we appreciate the City's efforts to implement a Stadium District.

Bart Waldman
Cc: Melody McCutcheon
SusanRanf

Date: 11/20/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:
Allow me to voice my strong opposition to the proposed North Rainier project that threatens single-family-zoned areas within 10 minutes waking distance of the Mount Baker station. This plan - promoted by developers who eye money-making opportunities and the politicians who take their money - commences the destruction of single-family homes in favor of lining the pockets of the construction industry and real estate speculators.
The people who crafted the urban village plan during the Norm Rice administration recognized the importance of protecting the single-family-zoned areas embraced by the vast majority of Seattleites. The North Rainier plan seeks to destroy that vision by encouraging significant development in residential areas. The family home is under seize by the City of Seattle and its financial benefactors.
The ten-minute walk territory covers considerably more real estate than the Rice plan. I love Mount Baker, and don't want to see it destroyed the way Ballard, Wallingford and Greekwood, i.e., single-family homes razed and replaced by townhomes and rowhouses purchased by more affluent people. Great neighborhoods - the kinds where neighbors knew each other and shared common goals of enhancing their neighborhoods - are replaced by people who come outside of their units to pick up their Amazon packages and answer the door for the Bite Squad delivery people. They have no investment in the nearby schools or parks.
The amount of "affordable" housing is a sham. Developers devote little space to low-income residents, and prefer to use that money for city programs that build projects in the Rainier Valley (away from the 10-minute radius). $450K townhouses are not "affordable" to most Seattleites.
I've seen single family residences - through aggressive sales and foreclosure tactics - decimate entire neighborhoods for higher-density projects. There are several near the Rainier Avenue Safeway along Courtland and 36th Avenues South. What happens to those people who are chased away from their homes. Do they go to Renton, Federal Way or Kent because they don't comport to the city's utopian vision of what New Seattle should look like?
The city bases these plans on PROJECTIONS of potential growth. What happens if there is a recession or economic slowdown? Probably the same thing that occurred on Courtland Avenue after 2008. No money to build meant empty lots.
I know you have already made your decision to forge ahead and are paying us lip service. It's like what Mark Twain wrote about the missionary and the cannibals: "They listened with great interest to everything he said, and then they ate him." You don't want true democracy, but at least I offered my two cents (versus the tens of thousands of dollars the development, real-estate and construction lobbyists have paid to promote these projects.
Democracy in name only.
Midori Sumida
Sent from my iPhone

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Ann Stevens

Draft Plan Element: Environment

Comment:

I find this policy in the plan: "Make most of limited land available by developing parks and open spaces so that they can accommodate a variety of active and passive recreational uses" This policy should

specifically excludes open spaces that are designated as Natural Areas and those that are managed by Seattle Parks and Recreation as Natural Areas. Increased density means that it is more important to keep these areas undeveloped as a refuge from the built environment. Many of us who have been volunteering hundreds of hours per year to restore the forests in these areas are alarmed by the prospect of the areas being developed for active recreation.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Laurette Culbert

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Growth Strategy, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years. However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.
Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.
Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.
Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.
Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.
Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.
Thank you!

Laurette Culbert
98107

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Parks Foundation,Thatcher Bailey

Draft Plan Element: Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Thank you so much for your thoughtful, inclusive, and important work. We submit a response to the section of the plan that focuses on Parks.

The following comments are more attitudinal than specific but we submit them because while we agree with and support all the public space goals the plan lays out we also feel we need to make a quantum shift in how we think about public space in Seattle, and how we integrate that thinking into a much broader and interrelated conversation about all facets of equity and quality of life.

Seattle Parks Foundation is currently working with, and learning from, 30+ community groups across the city that are reimagining their neighborhoods and organizing to enhance, expand, and create new green public spaces.
These are not casual participants in a bit of local improvement work; these are fiercely devoted volunteers, activists, and donors who are fundamentally transforming Seattle. Their efforts reflect an overwhelming consensus that our parks, trails, and recreation facilities are essential infrastructure in our growing city—a consensus that we can now back up with data.
Our partners at Forterra recently commissioned a values survey for the Puget Sound region. Respondents ranked two regional growth strategies higher than several others:
· Making it safe and convenient to walk or bike to neighborhood stores and schools (82%)
· Preserving and restoring remaining natural areas and creating more playfields, trails, and park facilities (75%)
Seattle's Draft Comprehensive Plan devotes a section to parks and open space and notes the importance of accessible, quality public spaces for our economy, health, safety, and environmental quality. This is good stuff, but it doesn't begin to convey the passion and purpose of the community leaders and volunteers that Seattle Parks Foundation works with every day—or the values corroborated by hard data from the Forterra survey.
Simply put, parks and open space are essential civic infrastructure, no less than housing and transportation. But while Seattleites are keenly aware that our growth poses serious housing and transportation challenges, there is far less awareness of how growth threatens residents' access to green space.
A recent parks-versus-housing debate in the Roosevelt neighborhood illustrates the need to broaden our frame of reference. In the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association's newsletter, the Roosie, Cory Crocker lamented the antagonism between these interests:
The more dense living situations are made livable only with access to sufficient public open space. Multifamily, affordable housing pushes density further to provide housing as efficiently as possible to the widest audience, thus making access to public open space even more essential.
The stresses of growth are real, but these stresses will only be exacerbated if we think about growth in terms of what we must give up. One of the key findings of the Forterra survey is that the majority of people in our region are realistic about the inevitability of growth but also optimistic that this growth will make all our lives better.

Growth forces us to think big—to understand that the challenges we face are not discrete but interconnected. Solutions for transportation, or housing, or parks must be solutions for the city as a whole. This means that our measure of successful public space extends far beyond particular amenities or programs or Yelp ratings. What matters is how the life of a particular public space aligns with our vision of the kind of city we want Seattle to be.

Thank you again!

Thatcher Bailey
Executive Director
SEATTLE PARKS FOUNDATION

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Linda Melvin

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

I am very worried that the 2035 Comp Plan deletes too many features that were in the previous 1994 Plan--those that protected the neighborhoods somewhat from unregulated growth.
See the bullet points below for particulars.
I also ask that you read this recent editorial from the Seattle Times:
http://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/puget-sound-recovery-hinges-on-blocking-polluted-runoff/
I agree with this editorial, that so much of our current development is detrimental to our precious Puget Sound Water.
Bottom line: Let's develop measures aimed at preserving and improving both the livability and affordability of the city and that truly reflect the needs and wishes of existing residents and small businesses.
My opinion after comparing the 1994 plan with the proposed 2035 plan is that the 1994 Comp Plan is superior to the "update" because it protects elements that matter most to me: livable neighborhoods, a healthy environment, preserving existing affordable housing stock, and protection for, and enhancement of, Seattle's public open spaces and its natural, historical, and cultural resources.
Listed below are the particular points about the 2035 Plan that disturb me, since they DELETE or change important features of the 1994 Plan:
• Deletes policy LU11: "In order to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of the Plan."
Effect of deletion: Eliminates current protections for affordable housing and neighborhood character.
• Deletes goal LUG2: "Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses."
Effect of deletion: Eliminates the Comp Plan's neighborhood focus.
• Deletes policy LU3: "Establish rezone criteria and procedures to guide decisions about which zone will provide the best match for the characteristics of an area and will most clearly further City goals."
Effect of deletion: Allows wholesale upzones without regard for local conditions and preferences.
• Deletes policy LU34: "Limit the maximum amount of lot area covered by a structure to maintain compatibility with the scale and character of an area, to provide an adequate proportion of open area

on a site relative to the area occupied by structures, and to provide occupants with sufficient access to light and air, as appropriate to the intended character and use of an area."
Effect of deletion: Removes current expectations for yards, landscaping, and trees.
• Deletes policy LU39 to "preserve and enhance the City's physical and aesthetic character and environment by preventing untimely and indiscriminate removal or destruction of trees" and to provide incentives to property owners for tree retention; deletes policy LU41 for street trees; and deletes policy UV39 to enhance the tree canopy and understory in urban villages.
Effect of deletion: Trees are no longer specifically identified as important.
• Deletes policy LU81: "Limit building heights to establish maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent buildings, and limit view blockage."
Effect of deletion: Eliminates current obstacles to unlimited increases in building heights.
• Deletes policies LU1, LU5, LU76, LU164 that currently direct that zoning, rezoning, and conditional use changes reflect community preferences, and be consistent with neighborhood plans.
Effect of deletion: Ignores community preferences and eliminates the neighborhood planning process.
• Deletes policies LU59 and LU60, which define and protect single family zoning.
Effect of deletion: Removes the Comp Plan's current obstacles to eliminating single family zoning.
• Replaces policy LU67 with policy LU8.9.
Effect of change: Allows ultra small lot development in single family and multifamily zones.
• Deletes goals LUG6, LUG6.1, and TG17 and policies LU20, LU49, LU, LU50, T-39, T-40, and T-46 that currently direct that parking policies "account for local objectives," recognize parking as a part of "moving people and goods," consider "access to local businesses," "parking spillover into residential areas," and "truck access and loading," and not "introduce serious safety problems or blighting influences" but rather "achieve vitality of urban centers and urban villages" and "preserve Seattle's competitive position in the region." While deleting those goals and policies, the Comp Plan "update" would introduce two new policies: LU63 to "rely on market forces" for onsite parking and T40 to give higher priority to "greening" over "storage" (the City's new negative term for parking) in the allocation of street space.
Effect of deletion: Eliminates any balance or sanity in parking policies.
Please consider these comments carefully as you finalize the 2035 Comp Plan.
Thank you.
Linda Melvin, Ballard

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Peggy Sturdivant

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Along with Seattle Green Spaces Coalition I have sent comments about the Land Use section but I also want to make a strong appeal for policy follow-through on L.U. 16. GOAL LUG16 Maintain the city's cultural identity and heritage by rehabilitating, restoring, and reusing structures in designated historic districts and landmarked sites, objects and structures.
The proposed special review districts is crucial to this. Seattle's jewels are currently historic districts but we cannot be a city of eight separate jewels. We need more designated historic districts and special review districts that can help 1) stop demolition of structures and special parcels, and 2) guide design within areas not previously subject to design review.
I don't want to keep mourning what has been lost unnecessarily when our land and structures throughout every neighborhood deserve to be considered for their historical and green value rather

than just "real estate."
Peggy Sturdivant

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Human Rights Commission,Danielle Wallace

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

Dear Department of Planning and Development,
Please find the attached letter from the Seattle Human Rights Commission with our input on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
Respectfully,
Inline image 1
_____
Danielle Wallace, Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights Task Force Chair
Seattle Human Rights Commission
Danielle Wallace
--
November 20, 2015
Transmitted by email to: 2035@seattle.gov
Re: Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan
We, the Seattle Human Rights Commission (the "Commission"), write to share our support for the work accomplished by the Seattle 2035 Growth and Equity Analysis (the "Equity Analysis") and the efforts of the City of Seattle (the "City") to use an equitable development framework to achieve racial and social equity. As stated in the Commission's Input Letter (attached) regarding the Equity Analysis, the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan (the "Plan") presents a tremendous opportunity to embed human rights, including racial and social equity, within the City's growth strategies and policies.
The City of Seattle was declared to be a Human Rights City in 2012, and it made the commitment to protect, respect and fulfill the full range of inherent human rights for all, as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ("UDHR"), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ("ICESCR"), and numerous other international human rights treaties.
The stated principal purpose of the Plan is to provide polices that guide the development of the City in the context of regional growth management (p. 18). Specifically, the Plan will be used by the City to help make decisions about proposed ordinances, capital budgets, policies and programs (p.18). However, the Plan recognizes that inequities exist for certain portions of the population (pgs. 5 & 10). It additionally acknowledges that projected growth in the City may affect marginalized populations negatively (p. 5 & 10).
The Commission acknowledges that populations do not become marginalized naturally; the City's inequity is a result of a history of racial segregation and intentional disenfranchisement. To that end, the Commission urges the City to adopt a plan that seeks to eliminate inequities associated with the projected growth, rather than participate in the creation of greater disparity. Furthermore, when prevention is impossible and other options to prevent inequity have failed, the City is obligated to adopt strong mitigation and remediation policy strategies in order to equitably protect affected communities.
The Housing section of the Plan accurately recognizes that housing costs "unduly affect marginalized populations," thus resulting in growing inequities and racial disparities, and makes the protection of marginalized populations a central focus in its recommendations. These recommendations and others provide a strong vision and a path toward ensuring that all people in Seattle have the opportunity to

benefit from the city's growth and have access to safe, healthy, and affordable housing options. In order to accomplish this vision, the Commission believes that this section of the Plan must invoke a greater sense of urgency and should include more specific requirements in its recommendations. For example, this section of the plan should include more details on tenant protections and other supportive measures to both affirm human rights and mitigate the loss of existing affordable housing stock. Given Seattle's unsheltered homelessness crisis, this section should also place a greater emphasis on housing as the solution to this problem, as well as express support for interim survival solutions for people who are experiencing homelessness, which for many is the direct result of rising rents and the lack of available affordable housing. The Plan should further describe how the listed policy recommendations will reduce racial disparities. Overall, this section of the Plan provides a strong vision for equity in housing because it advocates for the expansion of affordable housing and also recommends measures to prevent displacement; both approaches are essential in order to make this vision a reality.

As the Plan recognizes existing conditions of inequities in the Housing section, the Plan should also offer more strategies to address existing and potential adverse impacts on historically marginalized communities. For instance, the Environment section of the Plan "prioritizes investments, policies, and programs that address existing disparities in the distribution of environmental burdens and benefits" (p. 128). The section fails to cite specific policies, strategies, or resources that would address these disparities, and strategies such as emergency planning for extreme events and commitment to address contamination can be better embedded throughout the environment section. Additionally, the report does not examine existing conditions for historically marginalized communities' access to parks and open space. The report should thus make a clearer case for protecting these rights in more communities. In order to authentically support poverty reduction, the City should also make more explicit the types of investments in human services the City seeks to implement. The Plan should aim to prevent homelessness and encourage significant investments in human services. Additionally, the Plan should recognize the disproportionality in access to services delivery (p 143). The plan should emphasize policies for this in both access to open space and offering park activities. The Plan should prioritize mitigating and reducing impacts on communities that have already shared a disproportionate burden, and include explicit strategies to leverage the City's growth to benefit historically marginalized communities.

The City should also aim to increase marginalized populations' access to opportunities that influence social, economic, and physical well-being. As discussed in the Equity Analysis, many communities in Seattle historically lack access to education, economic opportunity, transit, civic infrastructure, public health facilities, and healthy food, all of which are enumerated as human rights in the UDHR, ICESCR, and numerous other international human rights treaties. The Plan should include clear and objective goals or benchmarks aimed at preventing and reducing displacement; increasing access to opportunity; and mitigating and remediating adverse impacts related to the growth anticipated between 2015 and 2035. Doing so will allow the City to have more meaningful guidance, and it will aid the City's efforts to embed the advance of human rights for all residents within its growth strategy.

The adoption of the 2015-2035 Seattle Comprehensive Plan is an opportunity for Seattle to affirm its commitment to human rights by explicitly incorporating international human rights principles. Seattle should be a place where everyone can have the opportunity to live happily, healthily, and freely, regardless of their race or ethnicity, income level, language or cultural background.

Respectfully,

_____

Danielle Wallace, Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights Task Force Chair
Jason Poydras Julianna Tesfu
Jason Poydras, Commission Appeals Chair Julianna Tesfu, Commission Secretary
_____ Ken Nsimbi

Alex Becker, Commission Co-Chair Ken Nsimbi, Commissioner
_____
Sarah Bishop, Commission Co-Chair Margaret Babayan, Commissioner
CC:
Mayor Edward B. Murray
Seattle City Council
Diane M. Sugimura, Director, Department of Planning and Development
Seattle Planning Commission
Patricia Lally, Department Director, Seattle Office of Civil Rights

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Robert Dexter

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

To City Planners:
When the mayor held his new conference at 14th Ave NE and NE 65th last spring to announce the acquisition of some of our slum lord property to form a pocket park, he comments that the city had "made a mistake" at other urban villages by not including more amenities, specially parks. We need parks, trees, paths, and some peaceful walks. Where better to support this vision of an essential element of urban living than Ravenna/Cowen Parks? Preserving the function and value of these parks should be a priority, including keeping a low density buffer around the parks. To increase the density around the parks only takes away our chances of preserving this magnificent historic and natural area.
Further, many locations south of NE 65th, and particularly east of 15th Ave NE, are stable neighborhoods of 100-year old homes that have been maintained and are considered part of the character of Seattle. We have all seen the pictures of housing developments in Eastern Europe and China. I have lived in Cleveland and seen the "projects" in Chicago. We need to ensure that we maintain the balance between necessary urban density and livable neighborhoods with character and charm for everyone to enjoy.
The "squiggly" line drawn by the computer is simplistic. Living in the area, it's hard to believe that it realistically represents a 10-minute walk to the station. It also seems arbitrary to include in the village portions of the parks, as well as small portions of stable neighborhoods that lie to the east of a major arterial, instead of following already existing natural boundaries. Further, areas to the north are already shifting to of the station while areas to the south and west are closer and substantially more accessible to the station. I therefore feel strongly that the Roosevelt Urban Village boundary should stop at least by 15th Ave NE to the east, avoid including the parks, and include low-density buffers where the boundary approaches the parks.
Thank you for considering my comments,
Robert Dexter

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Steve Cohn

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

My comments are attached.

--
Comment on Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Proposal
My name is Steven Cohn and I am a member of the Ballard District Council's Comprehensive Plan Review Team. I am writing this as an individual and my comments do not represent those of the Review Tem.
I like many things in the proposed plan; however I have some concerns which I hope you will address prior to the development of the Mayor's proposed Plan:
A. Changing the Hub Residential Village Boundaries in areas without fixed rail rapid transit.
I have a number of thoughts about the proposal to modify Urban Village boundaries to reflect a 15-minute walkshed, particularly as it applies to the Ballard Urban Village and the Crown Hill Urban Residential Village. Some of my comments may be applicable to other Urban Villages as well; though I am not familiar with the specifics of other Urban Villages.
1. The residential and job targets can be met through current capacity under the current zoning. (Actually, under the terms of the "grand bargain", residential capacity is increased by 10-15%. So there is even more capacity than the Comprehensive Plan assumed when the staff proposal was released).
2. Until ST-3 is passed, there is no assurance about where the new lines will go, where they will stop, and when they will be operational. Unless there is funding and a plan, improved and reliable transit service to a particular station is not assured. Until then, Seattle is relying on the largess of Metro to provide bus service, and as we've seen in Ballard time and time again, Metro has its own metrics for deciding where to expand, reduce, or eliminate routes or bus stops.
3. The GMA requires concurrency to mitigate the impacts of growth. Until the plan and funding is in place, concurrency cannot be guaranteed. Currently the Central Puget Sound Growth Management hearings board has a case before them that includes related issues (See "Shoreline Preservation Society v. City of Shoreline" case). The Hearings Board decision on this case may have implications about whether the proposed expansion requires immediate implementation and whether a full environmental review of the implantation action is required prior to adoption of either action.
4. In addition to the general question of concurrency and whether or not further environmental review is necessary, the question of implementation of this change is important to discuss. How would this change be implemented? Would rezones be initiated by the city or by the property owners? What timeframe is expected? Would new transitional zoning be developed that would protect the adjacent single family neighborhoods? The boundary change should not occur until these questions are answered.
In summary, I suggest that there is no immediate reason to change the Urban Village boundaries. This decision can be put off until the next Comprehensive Plan Update, which will occur probably 8-10 years prior to the implementation of ST-3 in Ballard.
B. School District Capital Facilities Plan is not in the spirit of the GMA mandate for a 20 year plan.
The School District's Capital Facilities Plan only goes out to the year 2021. Considering that the Comprehensive Plan won't be adopted until 2016 at the earliest, this is only a 5-year plan. GMA requires a longer view than this.
Having done demographic analysis myself, and being a long-time participant in the PSRC's regional forecasting group, I know that long-term small area forecasting is hard. But that doesn't mean that it shouldn't be attempted (with the appropriate caveats) to respond to the spirit of the GMA.
The School District has a demographer, as does the City of Seattle. The PSRC has long range demographic forecasts based on national models. It seems it would be worthwhile to work with the School District to develop an extended forecast, at least going out 10-12 years, if only to offer Seattle residents a glimpse of how things might change—since the change will directly affect us. For example, if a new middle school or high school is contemplated to serve downtown Seattle and immediate environs to take some pressure off the Northend schools, where are likely areas where that school might be

located? Are we in danger of losing some park space or other publicly owned space for one of these schools? In the suburbs, a middle school historically requires 20 acres of property, and a high school twice that. I assume in the city the school district could get by with less property, but even so, property acquisition is something that needs to be considered.
C. Development Impact Fees
GMA requires that land use regulation has basis in adopted policy. Since the city is suggesting that Affordable Housing Fees are impact fees and since the community is beginning to discuss impact fees for schools and transportation, there should be a policy basis for this. Addition of policy support in the Mayor's Draft Plan will assure robust discussion of this concept (both pro and con) prior to a Council decision as to whether other impact fees should be imposed.
D. Encouraging more of a Jobs/Housing Balance in the Urban Villages
Transportation congestion is difficult to deal with, and it is probably only going to get worse in the future as the number of jobs in the City, Eastside and North County grow. One way to provide some mitigation is by encouraging more job growth in the Urban Villages throughout the city so that some people can live close to jobs (not just close to a transit stop). The Comprehensive Plan should include more policies about encouraging family wage jobs in the Urban Villages so that regulations can be developed which provide incentives for family wage jobs to locate close to some of the new development.
Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.
Steve Cohn

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Matt Pearsall

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

November 20, 2015

Honorable Edward B. Murray
City of Seattle
PO Box 94749
Seattle, WA 98124

Dear Mayor Murray,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan and its impact Seattle's industrial land.

As a resident of Georgetown any change in industrial zoning affects my quality of life. I would like to address the core values of the Comprehensive Plan and how they relate to our neighborhood.

Community - developing strong connections between a diverse range of people and places.
Georgetown is a neighborhood that is home to a diverse community of people and businesses. The broad stroke, one-size-fits-all approach to industrial lands fails to take into account the aspects that make our neighborhood unique. The residential community was shut-out of the stakeholder process for the industrial land study that helped shape the staff recommendations for the Comp Plan. As a result, this perspective is not represented in the current Seattle 2035 plan.

Environmental Stewardship - protect and improve the quality of our global and local natural environment.
Improving our environment has been a priority for years. We combat air, water and noise pollution every day. The Seattle 2035 plan provides us an opportunity to have different conversation about environments, to re-examine our green policies and the ban of open space in our industrial areas. Let's revisit urban canopy goals. Georgetown has the smallest canopy and the most need, yet current city policies prevent us from making noticeable increases. Include 1:1 tree replacement and require landscaping requirements for all businesses, even industry.

Economic Opportunity and Security - a strong economy and a pathway to employment is fundamental to maintaining our quality of life.
We support a strong economy, and living wage jobs. However, profits to industry should not come at the expense of quality of life for residents and workers. Georgetown is an excellent example of a mixed-use community. We have an opportunity to be a national model. However, the success of the relationship between industry and residents depends on a stakeholder process that involves a broad range of voices.

Social Equity - limited resources and opportunities must be shared; and the inclusion of under-represented communities in decision-making processes is necessary.
Clean air and water should be a right no matter where you can afford to make your home. Residents of Georgetown have a life expectancy that is 10 years shorter than our neighbors just two miles away. Industrial Commercial (IC) zoning provides opportunity to create meaningful buffers between industry and residents. Eliminating this designation, as proposed in the current draft plan, would preclude future land uses in Seattle's industrial border areas and thus eliminate flexibility in providing means to address health disparity and social equity issues.

I ask that you consider the long term affect the Seattle 2035 plan will have on the health and vitality of our community. I ask that you not trade the character of our neighborhood in exchange for an arena in SODO. And finally, I ask that you consider excluding all of Georgetown from the proposed industrial comp plan amendments.

Sincerely,

Matt Pearsall
Georgetown Resident
cc:
2035@seattle.gov
Tim Burgess, Seattle City Council
Bruce Harrell, Seattle City Council
Mike O'Brien, Seattle City Council
Kshama Sawant, Seattle City Council
Tom Rasmussen, Seattle City Council
Sally Bagshaw, Seattle City Council
Kate Joncas, Deputy Mayor, City of Seattle
Sara Belz, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Mayor
Steve Lee, Senior Policy Advisory, Office of the Mayor
Diane Sugimura, Director, Seattle Department of Planning & Development
Kathy Nyland, Acting Director, Department of Neighborhoods

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Paige St. George

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

July 19, 2015

Dear Councilmember Harrell,

I'm writing to express my great concern about the proposed Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Amendments that impact Seattle's 6,000 acres of industrial land.

These amendments from the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) place unnecessary limitations on land use in the city's industrial areas. They impose a one-size-fits-all set of rules on all of Seattle's diverse industrial lands – areas that feature a unique mix of land uses and should not be painted with the same broad brush.

With restrictions already in place from the 2007 downzone, there is no immediate, imminent threat to Seattle's industrial areas that necessitates new restrictions. Banning further I/C zoning designations would eliminate flexibility and preclude future land uses in areas that serve as buffers between residential urban areas and industrial and manufacturing centers.

Finally, I have major concerns about the implications of the proposed amendments for Georgetown without the benefit of a study and the lack of outreach associated with the Department of Planning and Development Studies that led up to the proposed recommendations. In spite of Resolution 31026, Georgetown residents are consistently left out of the discussion when it comes to the direction of industrial land in our community.

Before sweeping recommendations are advanced, it's time to bring balance and fair representation to industrial land policy direction.

As such, I urge you to not move ahead with the proposed restrictions on industrial development from the Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,

Paige St. George
Georgetown Resident

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Jody Grage

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

FROM JODY GRAGE, 2428 NW 56th, BALLARD/SEATTLE,

member of the Ballard Comp Plan Review Group, writing as an individual
COMMENTS ON STAFF DRAFT OF 2035 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
Background: I am a Seattle native born in 1936. I bought my 1890
house in Ballard in 1976. I have no plans to sell or move although
there are six story buildings to the south and east of me now.
1. DO NOT EXPAND URBAN VILLAGE AND RESIDENTIAL VILLAGE BOUNDARIES
A. There is sufficient capacity for growth within current village
boundaries in Ballard.
B. Sellers are providing enough development opportunities to increase
the number of housing units needed.
2. PROVIDE TRANSITIONING FROM VILLAGES TO TRADITIONAL HOUSING AREAS
A. One-block buffer zones outside current village boundaries would
increase acceptance of increased density.
B. Buffers could include stacked flats, DADUs, cottages, rental areas
within existing homes, etc.
3. FACILITATE RETENTION OF EXISTING HOMES ESPECIALLY OUTSIDE VILLAGES
A. Programs such as tax breaks and low-interest loans could be used to
preserve/repair homes, adapt homes
for elderly owners, create rental units within owner-occupied homes, etc.
B. Long-term rentals could be encouraged through programs such as tax
breaks and low-interest loans.
C. Redefine "vulnerable" populations to include renters and the elderly.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Northeast District Council,Gabrielle Gerhard

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hi -
The Northeast District Council in NE Seattle is sharing the attached comments on the Comprehensive Plan.
Thank you for considering our comments.
Gabrielle Gerhard
NEDC Co-Chair
--
Gabrielle Gerhard
--
Northeast District Council
November 19, 2015

Diane Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning & Development, City of Seattle
700 5th Ave #2000 Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Comments on the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft

Dear Ms. Sugimura –

The Northeast District Council (NEDC), a group of 15 neighborhood organizations in Northeast Seattle wanted to give a joint comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan draft, in addition to comments to be submitted by individual neighborhoods.

The NEDC representatives are opposed to expanding the existing boundaries of the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village. We believe that the current boundaries are most appropriate as the neighborhoods in the area grow and continue to absorb increased density.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

Sincerely,

Gabrielle Gerhard, Co---Chair Jeannie Hale, Co---Chair

Belvedere Terrace Community Council Hawthorne Hills Community Council Inverness Community Club Laurelhurst Community Club Matthews Beach Community Council

Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council Ravenna Bryant Community Association Residents of Magnuson Park
Roosevelt Neighborhood Association Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance University District Community Council

University Park Community Club View Ridge Community Council Wedgwood Community Council Windermere North Community Association

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Mariska Kemna

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Neighborhood Planning

Comment:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed expansion of the Roosevelt Urban Village designation included in Seattle 2035 - Draft Comprehensive Plan into the heart of old Ravenna and its parks, located East of 15th Ave.

First off, lines for urban villages should not be drawn by computers, but by real people who have visited the neighborhood, so that they truly know the impact of these lines. Ideally, the city should collaborate with the affected neighborhoods when drawing the lines, so disastrous decisions based on computer generated borders can be avoided, and neighborhoods can stay vibrant while welcoming more residents in their midst.

The area East of 15th Ave is truly the old heart of Ravenna, a wonderful historic residential neighborhood with 100-year old bungalows, set among lush gardens. It would be such a shame to destroy these homes to be replaced by modern and 'affordable' townhomes, crowded onto the lots. Many Seattlelites enjoy and support our older neighborhoods, neighborhoods that work to maintain their character. The neighborhood East of 15th is one of those well-preserved and unique old

neighborhoods. For example, when we moved into the neighborhood the Seattle Historical Society was organizing city walks to Naomi Place, a street now partially included in the expansion plan (the line goes through the middle of the street). Also, in 2011 I received a letter from an older man from Texas, whose grandfather had built our home. He had recently paid a visit to Seattle and marveled at how well the neighborhood had been maintained throughout all these years. "Again, we were so impressed with how well the beautiful old homes in your neighborhood have been kept up so nicely for so many years." I will include the letter for your perusal to illustrate how much natives and tourists alike enjoy historic neighborhoods. This is not unique to Seattle, it is a common theme anywhere in the world. When visiting other towns (Paris, Amsterdam, San Francisco, etc) all of us gravitate towards the older unspoiled, preserved neighborhoods. Seattle is no exception. In Ravenna, many stroll through our neighborhood to enjoy the peace, quiet and history. Every Christmas Eve it is lit up with luminaries, a long neighborhood tradition, befitting its setting among older homes. Please don't destroy the heart of Ravenna. Seattle should keep its historic neighborhoods intact rather than subject them to boom-bust economics. They can easily coexist with affordable apartment buildings, with the latter contained to the major arteries. By forcefully blending historic homes with new development we would destroy the uniqueness of each.

I also worry that allowing the building of some townhomes on some lots in historic neighborhoods will in time lead to townhomes on all lots, turning historic neighborhoods completely over into blocks of modern town homes. It is my observation that these days multiple newly constructed townhomes are often crowded onto a single lot in Seattle, using every inch of available space without too much concern for proximity to neighbors or street. For example, I am including pictures of 6 townhomes, built on a single lot on 9th Ave NE, all in very close proximity to their neighbor. They seem out of place and out of step with the rest of the houses on the street: bigger, higher and not setback from neighbors or street. I hope you will agree that the presence of these overpowering townhomes has changed the feel and character of this neighborhood irreversibly. When the neighboring Craftsman house eventually goes up for sale, it seems more than likely that no one but another developer would purchase it. More townhomes will subsequently be built, crowding the next Craftsman house etc. One townhome begets another townhome. In fact, just down the street another 6 townhomes are being built on a single lot close to their neighbor. Eventually, the entire street will be comprised of expansive and expensive townhomes. Sadly and ironically, none of these townhomes are actually affordable, starting at a price tag around 600,000. Certainly, I can understand why developers and potential buyers are attracted by townhomes that are set among lovely houses on a residential street. Developers are targeting old charming neighborhoods as 'marketable' (AKA profitable), precisely because they are full of character. Sadly, while they built these 'affordable' structures at maximal density in desirable neighborhoods, they ruin that exact neighborhood for future generations to enjoy. And ironically, building these same townhomes in a non-historic and less-desirable neighborhoods, would likely make them a lot more affordable – and some of these neighborhoods can be found right along the light rail route. In addition, apartment buildings along arterial streets are much more efficient in offering affordable housing since they will be able to house so many more residents than a couple of town homes will.

I am assuming that the inclusion of Ravenna Park is merely done to increase the percentage of green space in the Urban Village, without a true intention of building affordable homes in the park. However, including green space by literally stretching the border is artificial. While it may satisfy administrative requirements of an Urban Village, it is not truly in the spirit of the agreements and it does not improve the livability of the Urban Village. Green space should be among the residents, for their daily enjoyment. Green space ensures that the Urban Village does not turn into blocks and blocks of high risers, encroaching on the streets, providing ample shade and little sunshine on the street, providing ample

concrete and little green. While today's building frenzy may seem appealing in our common quest for affordable housing, it is unlikely to sustain its appeal in 20 years from now, after the new apartment buildings have lost their initial shine. I urge you to look into the future, truly look, beyond projected numbers of homes to be built, and think what it would be like to live there in 20-30 years. What is considered modern now, may not look as swanky in 20 years, especially if there is no green space interspacing them.

It doesn't have to be this way. I recently paid a visit to Portland, and was pleasantly surprised and inspired by their development of commercial neighborhoods similar to Roosevelt into Urban Villages. Apartment buildings were limited to the commercial strip, setback from the street, aesthetically pleasing, and provided ample green space with common areas that even non-residents of the buildings were welcome to enjoy. How different from what is going on in Roosevelt right now. The commercial strip remains pleasant and inviting to stroll around on, so that all neighborhood residents can enjoy urban living for many years into the future.

Lastly, I would urge the city to make a comprehensive transportation plan for neighborhood. The added density requires a well-crafted and thought-out plan for transportation, that goes beyond "we will have a light rail station in 2020". Counting on the light rail to transport the majority of new people is not a comprehensive plan. The reality is that many people will need to drive, either to work or to other activities that are not along the routes of the light rail and busses. Public transportation in Seattle is simply not at the level of a city like New York City. People in affordable new homes will need cars. They will need additional infrastructure and parking- both limited in the current development plans. Please make sure developers do their share to make this happen. Their profits should not come at the cost of livability of a whole future neighborhood.

I understand we are already surpassing the goals for Roosevelt set in the affordable housing plan. Hence, we do not need to make further expansions of low-rise density into the surrounding neighborhoods, specificaly East of 15th Ave NE. Our neighborhoods have already seen much change come to the area and have thus far generously supported the city in reaching their goals. Maybe it is time to take a step in place, and think about protecting our historic neighborhoods. They are the heart and soul of Seattle. Let's try to imagine how we want Roosevelt and Ravenna to look in 30 years; it is only one generation away.
Mariska Kemna

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Peter Wehrli

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Thank you for the public discourse.
For perspective, my background:
•40 year resident of Detroit area (I've seen what doesn't work.)
•Seattle resident since 2008
•Real estate investor since 2004
•Hold a degree in real estate ?Specialties in sustainable real estate, commercial investment, and property management
•Active residential real estate broker in Seattle

Random thoughts:
1.City growth in the 21st century cannot copy the methods of the 20th. 1.Sustainability is a crucial component
2.Cities require variety to thrive
3.Modern rail is necessary city-wide
4.A CBD blob growing from the center is inefficient and destroys human scale development. Prevent CBD creep.
2.TODs are critical to achieve sustainability, affordability, and economic variety
3.Small businesses need affordability protection just as much as housing affordability. Small locally-owned businesses is one of the draws to Ballard and Capitol Hill, but they are being forced out by the rents required by new building owners.
4.A 10-minute walk upzone is too large in urban villages. The right way is higher height restrictions at every rail station, all mixed, all requiring affordable housing units on site.
5.All multifamily developments should include affordable units on site.
6.Trees are frequently illegally cut down. Much, much stronger measures to protect large carbon-sequestering trees is imperative both for the environment at large and the human need for beauty and nature.
7.TDRs are fair compensation to land owners and developers for restricted/managed/guided growth rules.
8.Affordable housing is NOT addressed by supply. (Simple-minded economics.) You have to plan it, where you want it.
9.Developers will build whatever maximizes their profit (I know, they're my acquaintances.) Strict definition of what they can do are necessary. Plan what we want.
10.Upzoning large areas of SFH will not work. Concentrate upzoning to transit locations. Example: Ballard should have a rail station, 100-200 foot height restrictions within 2-3 blocks of station, and leave the rest of the urban village as is. Every major urban village should be this way. Hyper density around rail stations, then rapid step-down to sfh.
11.A city should be planned. Zoning can be more precise with more variety. The free market is too random and wasteful.
12.Residents should have some protections against sea-change in neighborhood character. Right now, developers, who may not even be residents of this city, this state, or this country, make those decisions without local input.
13.Energy and water efficiency requirements in the built environment should be more stringent.
14.A DADU should be allowed on SFH parcels where an ADU already exists.
15.Variety, variety, variety. Allow cottage developments, allow single cottages, allow dadus, adus, tiny houses, even on wheels, just make sure it makes sense in context.
16.If I can buy a house and just rent it out, why can't I buy a house with an ADU and rent both units?
17.I see so many landlords violating the rights of their tenants, it's overwhelming. Some are malicious, many are just ignorant. Require landlords--when they register for RRIO--to take a 3 hour class on their responsibilities. RHA has a good one.
18.Attractive older buildings--which draw people to commercial areas--should be preserved more rigorously. There are plenty of crappy buildings next door that can be demoed.
19.Require recycling at every building demo.
20.Bring beat cops to major urban villages so locals know their officers.
?

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Marietta Zintak

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Rezoning SFR to allow for townhouses will not provide affordable housing. EACH unit typically is priced from $450,000 to $699,000. Clearly this only serves developers and realtors. I live in South Seattle surrounded by land originally zoned for multi-family, and then up-zoned twice to further encourage affordable housing. Much of the land is still vacant. If you upzone SFR, you further postpone & dis-incentivize development of this land which provides for the density more likely to be affordable.
Develop to current zoning limits. Only then consider further changing the character of Seattle. Leave people CHOICES in housing.
MARIETTA ZINTAK

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Ravenna-Bryant Community Association,Inga Manskopf

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing

Comment:

Seattle 2035 Planning Team,

On behalf of the Ravenna-Bryant Community Association I am submitting the attached comments regarding the drafted comprehensive plan update.

Thank you for enabling community members to learn about and weigh in on plans for the growing needs of our city.

Sincerely,

Inga Manskopf, President
Ravenna-Bryant Community Association
--
November 20, 2015
Diane Sugimura, Director Sent via email
City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development
Attn: Seattle 2035
Re: Future Land Use Plans
Dear Ms. Sugimura,
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The Ravenna-Bryant neighborhood has unique geographical characteristics that need to be taken into consideration when making future land use plans.
1. Well-served by transportation infrastructure: When it comes to transit, the Ravenna-Bryant neighborhood is uniquely located between two future light rail stations. The southern end of the neighborhood is 1.5 to 2 miles from the UW Husky Stadium station. Easy access to the Burke-Gilman Trail will make biking to the station very attractive and frequent bus service to the station will create a quicker way to get downtown. The rest of Ravenna-Bryant will likely look to picking up light rail at the

Roosevelt Station which will be from 0.2 to about 1.5 miles from the station. With easy access to transit and, eventually, a bike lane along NE 65th and along NE 68th east of 20th Avenue NE this second light rail station will be well-used by our community members.

2. Located between a Residential Urban Village and an Urban Center: On the west side of our community, 15th Avenue NE divides Ravenna from the Roosevelt Urban Village. The south side of our community abuts University Village which is part of the University Urban Center. Both of these areas provide easy access to a variety of businesses that are easily accessed by multiple modes of transportation.

3. Located near large employers: The University of Washington, University Village, and Seattle Children's Hospital are all within easy walking and biking distance from most people who live in Ravenna-Bryant and are served by transit that runs through our neighborhood. These three places of employment provide a variety of jobs with a variety of salary ranges.

Because of our unique location, we ask that the City consider the following when finalizing future land use plans.

- Enable access to planning resources. The RBCA supports the City's goals to increase housing capacity in transit-oriented areas and to increase housing for people of all income levels, but we are experiencing the growth without the commensurate planning resource and priority of infrastructure dollars afforded Urban Villages. In the context of the 2035 process, we invite a dialogue with appropriate people at DPD about how the City can best implement land use policies and investments that support growth along key corridors in Ravenna-Bryant, including whether portions of Ravenna-Bryant would be appropriate for a new Urban Village. If not, how can we best secure the funding for resources needed to support growth?
- Inclusionary housing is essential. RBCA wants to increase affordable housing and the diversity of our neighborhood. We therefore support the HALA recommendation for mandatory inclusionary housing. All of our other comments are predicated on the understanding that an increase in housing will include options that are affordable.

- Address density in other areas of Ravenna-Bryant. Almost none of the commercially-zoned areas in our neighborhood are within designated Urban Villages. These areas include NE 65th Street between 20th and 25th Avenues; NE 55th Street between 25thand 35th Avenues; and the west half of the Union Bay place from University Village to Five Corners in the "Ravenna" Urban Center. In addition to being commercially zoned, the area around University Village and along NE 55th Street are already well-served by bus routes and very close to the Burke-Gilman Trail, making for easy access to the UW light rail station. Three large employers are within biking and walking distance from these areas.
- Include plans for community amenities. It is essential that all plans for increasing the population of neighborhoods include plans for meeting community needs. Specifically, plans should address an increased need for schools, libraries, public safety services, and community center activities. Ravenna-Bryant area schools are already at or above capacity and the NE branch of the Seattle Public Library is the most-used outside of the downtown central library.
- Maintain current Roosevelt urban village boundaries. Based on concerns heard from community members, the Roosevelt Urban Village boundary should remain west of the centerline of 15th Ave NE between NE 62nd Street and NE 70th Street and the Roosevelt Urban Village should exclude Ravenna Park and Cowen Park. Attached is a petition circulated among residents in the area within the proposed Roosevelt Urban Village expansion articulating concerns. We feel that keeping Roosevelt's Urban Village within Roosevelt's neighborhood boundaries also makes sense.

The Ravenna-Bryant Community Association looks forward to working with you as we plan for a transit-oriented, affordable community.

Sincerely,

Inga Manskopf, President
Ravenna-Bryant Community Association
Cc:
Councilmember Elect Rob Johnson
Councilmember Tim Burgess
Councilmember Elect Lorena Gonzales
--
[SIGNED PETITION ATTACHED]

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Marietta Zintak

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Rezoning SFR to allow for townhouses will not provide affordable housing. EACH unit typically is priced from $450,000 to $699,000. Clearly this only serves developers and realtors. I live in South Seattle surrounded by land originally zoned for multi-family, and then up-zoned twice to further encourage affordable housing. Much of the land is still vacant. If you upzone SFR, you further postpone & dis-incentivize development of this land which provides for the density more likely to be affordable.
Develop to current zoning limits. Only then consider further changing the character of Seattle.
Leave people CHOICES in housing.
MARIETTA ZINTAK

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Seattle Neighborhood Greenways,Cathy Tuttle

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

November 20, 2015

City of Seattle
Department of Planning & Development
Attn: Tom Hauger
How we measure success matters. Measuring the success of our transportation system based on how many vehicles can pass a certain line is outdated thinking, and does not align the with Seattle's values or vision of itself for the future.

We strongly support the moving away from the vehicular "level of service" to a level of service that focuses on moving people and goods in a way that promotes the health, safety, and wellbeing of Seattle's residents.

That is why we applaud the Seattle's development of a mode share based level of service. We urge the planning staff to continue down this path, to create a measurement system that pulls us towards safe and healthy future.

Specific recommendations:

T1.3 Invest in transportation projects and programs further progress towards meeting Seattle's mode share goals and reduce dependence on personal automobiles, particularly in urban centers.
We appreciate the table of "non-work trips" in addition to the "trip to work" table. Another table is needed to define mode share goals for walk, bike, SOV, HOV, and transit.
T2.8 Develop a decision-making framework to direct the future planning, design and optimization of street right-of-way.
Add "and prioritize the safety of people who walk and ride bicycles."

T4.1 Design and operate streets to promote green infrastructure, new technologies, and active transportation modes while addressing safety, accessibility and aesthetics.
T4.2 Reduce single-occupant vehicle trips, vehicle dependence, and vehicle miles traveled in order to help meet the City's greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

Rather than simply "promote.. active transportation" and "reduce" VMT, please use this opportunity to call out specific mode shares needed for walk, bike, SOV, HOV, and transit to meet our GHG Climate Action Plan targets.

T6.1 Reduce collisions for all modes of transportation and work toward a transportation system that produces zero fatalities and serious injuries.
Safety is our primary objective in transportation planning with strong Mayoral support. Please specify a goal to "work toward a Vision Zero transportation system."
T6.5 Emphasize safety as a consideration in all transportation plans and projects, including in developing project prioritization criteria.
Add "that prioritizes the safety first of people who walk and ride bicycles."
T6.6 Consider lowering speed limits on residential streets and arterials as a way to reduce collision rates.
In the near future, we will lower speed limits on our streets. Restate as "Lower speed limits on residential streets and arterials as a way to reduce collision rates".
T9.3 Consider establishing level-of-service standards that include non-motorized modes in order to advance this Plan's goals of encouraging use of travel options, reduce dependence on drive-alone automobile use and accommodate growth in urban centers and urban villages.
Strike "consider". The Seattle Comprehensive Plan will be a success if it benchmarks counting and moving people, not vehicles, as the standard to follow for our transportation future.

Thank you for your public service and for creating and implementing an innovative way to measure our transportation system's success.

Cathy Tuttle, Ph.D., Executive Director
Seattle Neighborhood Greenways

cc: Tracy Krawczyk, Seattle Department of Transportation
Kevin O'Neill, Seattle Department of Transportation
Patrice Carroll, Department of Planning & Development
2035@seattle.gov

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Carl Slater

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

To The Seattle 2035 Planning Activity
I am sending you a copy of the Seattle Time editorial regarding the rush to pass the HALA "grand" bargain.
The city itself says that the current zoning will hold all the population projected rove the next several years.
Our neighborhood wants neighborhood but back into the comprehensive plan and into HALA deliberations.
Many years ago Seattle did a similar process, Seattle 2000, this process was a bottom up process that involved all sectors of our communities. Neighborhoods had an important place in that process which has stood the test of time.
Carl Slater President
Wallingford Community Council
http://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/city-council-rushed-to-pass-seattles-grand-bargain/
Seattle City Council rushed to pass HALA's 'grand bargain'
YOU rarely want Seattle to slow its process, but that's what it should have done with sweeping land-use policy changes the lame-duck City Council approved on Monday.
Seattle will be forever changed by Mayor Ed Murray's controversial Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) Committee, a wish-list of policy changes requested by developer and housing advocates.
When HALA leaked last summer, it ignited debate about the character of Seattle and what would be gained or lost in the quest for housing affordability.
Murray, responding to the backlash, in July called for "renewed public dialogue" on the issue.
Unlimited Digital Access. $1 for 4 weeks.
But on Monday — while the city was still distracted by the ongoing election counting — the council went ahead and unanimously passed an ordinance approving HALA's "grand bargain" with developers.
This seems contrary to a public-process timeline the city released last summer, saying HALA would be subject to citywide "community conversations" in 2016 plus an environmental review that wouldn't begin until spring.
Outgoing Councilmember John Okamoto, whose housing committee shepherded HALA through, denied it's being rushed. Much of the plan "has been in the works for some time" and there will be more process as sections are implemented, he said.
Yet Monday's vote codified HALA's linchpin — linkage fees that will be collected from developers of commercial buildings and used to subsidize affordable housing projects. That's the heart of the "grand bargain" Murray cut with developers in crafting HALA.
The council staked out the rest of its HALA work with a companion resolution Monday, preparing for upzones that would expand the sort of dense development seen in Ballard and South Lake Union. It also calls for an "inclusive public engagement plan" by Jan. 31.
Linkage fees won't take effect until upzones are done — that's the sugar developers were given to help the medicine go down — but the city signaled that it's a done deal.
Murray reinforced this Monday by congratulating the council "on passage of the grand bargain."
This is not a time for kudos. The council was too hasty and Monday's action undermines the public input process scheduled for 2016.
How much say will the public have now that the council has approved the essence of the plan, inked the "bargain" and started the ball rolling?
Hearings will at least let residents question upzones. They might also ask why the city insists on ever-taller buildings and doubling or tripling density in single-family zones with "accessory dwelling units,"

even though planners say current zoning has plenty of capacity.
Residents might also use hearings to protest loopholes in Monday's ordinance.
Some passages are so generous to developers, they're destined to be the punchline of jokes their lawyers will tell over $60 steaks at the Metropolitan Grill.
One loophole perversely cuts linkage fees if developers show that poor people won't get jobs in their new buildings. By the city's logic, better-paid workers don't need "affordable" housing and won't have the same impact on the housing market as lower-paid workers.
So, if a building would be filled with workers earning more than 60 to 80 percent of the median income ($37,680 to $46,100), the developer gets a break on fees, according to the ordinance.
That undercuts the basic premise of linkage fees — that new buildings bring people, increasing housing demand and affecting affordability. It also encourages developers to build upscale offices instead of manufacturing space for working-class jobs.
Such loopholes would likely benefit most new buildings in Seattle — mitigating the impact on developers and clarifying who gets the "bargain."
Don't worry — the council says kinks will be worked out by "a robust stakeholder engagement process" involving the same people who crafted HALA.
Plus, there's that belated "inclusive public engagement plan."
Editorial board members are editorial page editor Kate Riley, Frank A. Blethen, Ryan Blethen, Brier Dudley, Mark Higgins, Jonathan Martin, Thanh Tan, Blanca Torres, William K. Blethen (emeritus) and Robert C. Blethen (emeritus).

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Rick K

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

Seattle DPD & Interested Parties,

Of all the input provided below, the most important is...
"Add a Community Involvement chapter that is at least as good as Portland's."
Attached is an example of what the chapter could be.

This is a key opportunity to build on our greatest asset, the people.
Without a nurtured interest in current events and community improvement, it seems unlikely that local, national, and international well-being will be advanced.

Thanks,
Rick K.

From:
To: "2035@seattle.gov" -2035@seattle.gov-
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 1:05 AM
Subject: Seattle Comprehensive Plan Input. Rick Klingele. 20 November 2015.
Thank you for the opportunity to volunteer time towards the creation of a better Comprehensive Plan, a key to advancing:
A) Environmental Stewardship.
B) Social Equity, Including Environmental Justice.

C) Economic Opportunity And Security.
D) Engaged Community.
...and a key to meeting the intent of the Washington State Growth Management Act.

In order to advance the above,
the below input is being provided.

1)
ENGAGEMENT.

-- Planning for community involvement has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that community involvement applies to ALL aspects of planning and budgeting, then this clarification has not occurred. The appearance instead is of a Comprehensive Plan that claims "community" as a theme, yet has no place for community.
Add a Community Involvement chapter that is at least as good as Portland's.

-- Please provide independent analysis of how the next draft of the Comprehensive Plan guarantees INCREASED and visibly IMPACTFUL community involvement in city planning and budget decisions, and encourages more public participation in decisions affecting all aspects of City policies.

-- Employ a communications specialist to address, and report on communication shortcomings in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal.
Eliminate use of the term "storage" when the word that diverse people would understand is "parking".

-- Remove language that stereotypes, unnecessarily limits participation, and divides populations.
Replace language of "engage XXX communities"
with "engage individuals from ALL communities, including from XXX communities."

2)
HEALTH & SAFETY.

-- Because of the many benefits that street trees provide to both property owners and the general public, encourage the preservation or planting of street trees as development occurs, except in locations where it is not possible to meet City standards intended to preserve public safety and utility networks.
REF: LU41, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Pursue a comprehensive approach of prevention, transition and stabilization services to decrease potential homelessness, stop recurring homelessness and promote longterm self-sufficiency.
a. Encourage efforts to expand the supply of extremely low-income, permanent housing to meet the needs of those for whom the cost of housing is a chief cause of homelessness.
b. Strive to develop a continuum of housing opportunities, ranging from emergency shelters to transitional housing to permanent housing, in order to assist homeless households regain and maintain stable, permanent housing.
c. Strategically invest in emergency and transitional housing for specific homeless populations.
REF: H45, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- In recognition of the fact that for certain people housing support services can mean the difference

between housing stability and homelessness, coordinate housing planning and funding, where appropriate, with the following types of housing support services:
a. Services that respond to emergency needs of the homeless (such as emergency shelters).
b. Services that assist clients to secure housing (such as rent and security deposit assistance, housing relocation assistance).
c. Services that help clients to maintain permanent housing (such as landlord / tenant counseling, chore services, in-home health care, outpatient mental health treatment, employment counseling and placement assistance).
REF: H46, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Work to reduce environmental threats and hazards to health in the workplace, at home and at play.
a. Make use of the City's building and fire codes, food licensing and permit processes, and hazardous materials and smoking regulations for fire and life safety protection.
b. Collaborate through joint efforts among City agencies, such as fire, police, and construction and land use to address health and safety issues in a more efficient manner.
c. Prepare land use plans in ways that support development and design that promote physical activities, use safe materials, and protect water and air quality.
REF: HD23, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Encourage connections between services that coordinate, link and integrate public, private and community-based services. Facilitate collaboration of programs through the use of City funding.
REF: HD48, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Achieve an increased sense of security and a decrease in the per capita incidence of crimes, as indicated by decreased homicides, aggravated assaults, residential burglaries, and auto theft; increased perception of police presence; and decreased perception of crime.
REF: HDG8.2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Collect data and regularly report on the sustainability measures and numeric goals in this plan to inform and enable citizens and decision-makers to consider alternative policies or programs, where outcomes differ from what was intended. Conduct an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions in Seattle at least every three years. Use data, public input, and approaches developed by other public agencies and private organizations that address sustainability. Consider combining this monitoring activity with the one described in the Urban Village Element of this Plan.
REF: E18, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage.
REF: E24, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

3)
LAND USE

-- Do not advance a FLUM that discards current zoning. It is irresponsible for the city to so radically change the rules after people are already so invested. It would be irresponsible for such a FLUM to fuel displacement and increase inequity as those with largest resources at their disposal will be relatively advantaged in the transition.

-- The city cannot afford to waste the value of upzoning (the increasing of the capacity to which a particular parcel of land can be built) by giving it away with nothing in return.
It would be a crime against past, current and future Seattleites to now give away this huge benefit to land investors to redevelop the land to this new capacity (at a sizable cost to the current user before and during displacement).
DO NOT use the Comprehensive Plan to auction off the city's assets for short term benefit.

-- Require sweeping zone-wide change proposals to prove equity through an analysis of local conditions. Fairness occurs when all are treated fairly, not when the benefits for population 'A' equal the losses of population B.

-- Tie all increases or decreases in zoning capacity or regulation to specific and MEASURABLE local benefits proven transparently with scientific data.
Though current zoning capacity is more than sufficient for the Comprehensive Plan's projected growth levels, the 07-2015 DPD proposal is full of language changes that would increase building capacity and decrease oversight and control, which are already not sufficient. Such changes would take the plan out of compliance with the assumptions of the DRAFT EIS.

-- Guarantee inclusion and fairness in zoning change consideration, through assuring a process that is to be:
-- On a site-specific basis.
-- In the framework of a coherent planning process (w/ concurrency addressed).
-- Openly informed by the best available data and analysis.
-- Includes all interested stakeholders.

-- Provide policies that condition permitting of development to specific site impacts and to cumulative area impacts.

-- Raise setback and landscaping requirements in communities not meeting open space targets.

-- Provide policy support for housing preservation, including preservation of affordable rental housing stock and other functional and well-built structures which accomplish the "reuse" aspect of the common environmental policy: "reduce, reuse, recycle."

-- Provide clarity regarding the method by which the best use of surplus property is to be determined. Open space is a continual need, while additional housing need may ebb and flow. As such, a method that involves all stakeholders will be needed in order for there to be good results in all eras.

-- Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses.
REF: LUG2, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal, replaced with language that requires the city to "allow", "support", and " accommodate" for everything rather than designing something that works.

-- Preserve and protect low-density, single-family neighborhoods that provide opportunities for home-ownership, that are attractive to households with children and other residents, that provide residents with privacy and open spaces immediately accessible to residents, and where the amount of impervious

surface can be limited.
REF: LUG8, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Preserve the character of single-family residential areas and discourage the demolition of single-family residences and displacement of residents, in a way that encourages rehabilitation and provides housing opportunities throughout the city. The character of single-family areas includes use, development, and density characteristics.
REF: LUG9, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- To maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan.
REF: LU11, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU59, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when ALL of the following conditions are met:
+ The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.
+ The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.
+ The rezone procedures are followed.
REF: LU60, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Reflect the character of existing low-density development through the regulation of scale, siting, structure orientation, and setbacks.
REF: LU69, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- DO NOT PROVIDE FREE ACROSS THE BOARD UPZONES VIA THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. Therefore, DO NOT:
"Designate low-rise multifamily zones in places where low-scale buildings can provide a harmonious transition between single-family zones and more intensive multifamily or commercial areas."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU9.10 to replace LU75.
Please respect the diversity of options available for addressing transitions.

-- Limit multifamily zones to areas that do not meet the single-family zone criteria, except in circumstances where an adopted neighborhood plan indicates that a different zone is more appropriate.
REF: LU75, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

4)
TRANSPORTATION.

-- Define transportation service performance categories (levels) not merely on the basis of frequency, but on the usability, including usability by diverse populations.

-- Establish a practice of assessing the transportation service performance category (level) of a location on the basis of the current situation, and on the basis of future housing and employment estimates.

-- If land use rules for a parcel are to deviate with proximity to transportation services,
then condition the approval of a development proposal for that parcel on proof of the transportation service performance category (level) present as of the date of the proposal application, and on independent service level projection analysis for the next 10 years.

-- Derive fair policy for parking requirements, including in urban centers and villages, which account for local conditions, and BALANCE all uses, including local business uses, rather than declaring winners and losers.

-- Encourage off street parking in new developments where there is not a demonstrated capacity to absorb the projected additional parking demand.

-- Consider visitor parking demand when establishing parking requirements.

-- Provide consistent definitions (in the glossary) for terms like “transit corridor”, “transit stop”, “frequent transit”, "rail station", frequent rail station", “superior transit”, etc.

-- DO NOT
"Rely on market forces to determine the amount of parking required."
...as listed in 07-2015 DPD proposal as LU6.3.
This proposal would REQUIRE the city to have NO rules on what amount of parking any development must include.
MARKET FORCES are NOT a sufficient tool for city planning.

-- Improve the interconnection between nearby places to reduce the opportunity bias and inequity that has been existing and escalating, due to the institutionalized transportation bias.
Increasing direct access between, for example, business districts that are east/west of each other outside of downtown is a way to add diversity, stimulate economic activity and improve equity of opportunity.
For the Comprehensive Plan to promote equity, its Transportation element must REVERSE the many years of accumulated bias favoring downtown.

5)
ADMINISTRATION.

-- Use of the "neighborhood plans" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that the "neighborhood plans" are now to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that the neighborhood plans are to be discarded, or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to Neighborhood plans and citywide plans, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Use of "neighborhood planning" has been almost completely eliminated in the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal. If this was to clarify that neighborhood planning is to be eliminated, then this clarification has not occurred.
Either tell people that neighborhood planning is to be replaced by full central government control or create a Comprehensive Plan that gives equal weight to neighborhood planning and citywide planning, using the best examples from other municipalities.

-- Define clearly the role that adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies, neighborhood plan work-plan matrices, and recognized neighborhood plans play in the City's decision-making and resource allocation.
REF: NG4, deleted by 07-2015 DPD proposal.

-- Include (as was done in the past) growth estimates for EACH urban village, not just for the 6 urban centers.

-- An independent assessment should occur to determine what growth is most likely to occur if this Comprehensive Plan is adopted. (These policies seem designed to create far greater growth than that which was studied by the draft EIS).

-- Establish a vision for housing and job levels 40 and 60 years from now, and provide an analysis of anticipated capacity distribution for those periods.

-- Provide policy which reduces boom-and-bust cycling to achieve increased equity, smaller negative impacts, and increased long term benefits & efficiencies.

-- Make concurrency a primary goal of the Comprehensive Plan.

-- REMOVE ALL proposed goals/policies that in effect state that "the city shall NOT do its job". The city government and the people DO have a right to accomplish planning and to apply laws that limit land uses.
The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal contains many statements that the city shall "allow", "accommodate", etc unlimited use, and these are an irresponsible abandonment of responsibility of stewardship for current and future generations.

-- Provide a Comprehensive Plan that is unbiased and invites participation, rather than one that biases and closes the conversation. The 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal is riddled with bias, and no transparent and accountable process has been provided to correct that. For illustration, here are 2 examples:
Example A:
"Determine the appropriate uses and densities on hospital and college campuses that are located outside an urban center or village through a master planning process that engages nearby residents and businesses".
vs.
"Plan for uses and densities on hospital and college campuses that are located outside an urban center or village in ways that recognize the important contributions of these institutions and the generally low-scale development of their surroundings."
The former provides for inclusion and community building, while the latter is biasing the conversation and providing no opening for diversity.

Example B:
(from the 07-2015 DPD Comprehensive Plan proposal):
“Encourage street widths and building heights that are in proportion with each other by reducing setbacks from the street and keeping reasonable sidewalk widths for lower buildings.”
"Reducing" is a bias without also proposing "increasing" for the opposite case.
"Reasonable" is a bias in that it has been listed here as applicable for "lower" buildings, implying no applicability to "higher" buildings.
There might be a suitable policy intended by this language, but that can become apparent only when the biases have been removed.

-- Incorporate the following 4 Comprehensive Plan amendments submitted in 2014, which staff was directed by the Seattle City Council to review for inclusion:
1. In order to monitor the effects of the urban village strategy: collect data, review, and report on growth and change in urban centers, urban villages, and manufacturing/ industrial centers at least every 3 years. Include in these reports factors such as: progress on implementing neighborhood plan approval and adoption matrices; changes in the numbers of jobs and hous-ing units; housing costs, including net loss or gain of low-income and very low-income housing units; housing types; crime rates; transportation systems and their use; business types; public facilities; services; and open space, to the extent information is practically available. Collect and report on similar data for typical areas outside villages for comparison. Broadly communi-cate the results of monitoring efforts. Provide a Briefing to City Council by July of the year following the review in order to be used for consideration in the annual Budget cycle. Provide the results directly to the Neighborhood Plan Stewards on record with the Department of Neighborhoods. Work with community members to identify appropriate responses to significant growth, lack of growth or changes, including: community-led activities; additional planning for, or re-prioritization of, City Programs or infrastructure improvements; partially or entirely updating a neighborhood plan; or working with other public agencies to address community goals.
2. Review situations where the rate of growth is significantly faster or slower than antici-pated in the growth targets contained in Appendix UV-A or where other measures indicate significant changes in the center or village over an extended period of time. Evaluate the significance of the changes or the significance of lack of change with center or village residents, business owners, and other community stakeholders in light of the expectations underlying the neighborhood plan for the area, the actual level of growth, progress toward neighbor-hood plan implementation, and the relative maturity (level of mixed-use development, the pedestrian environment, infrastruc-ture, and public facilities) of the area as an urban center or village
3. To ensure compliance with [the two new polices suggested above], the Council shall receive and consider a report, compiled by DPD and DON, that documents the impacts of growth in each Urban Village when approving capital and operating budget for all departments. These growth impact reports shall be available for public review prior to the start of the annual Council budget cycle.
4. When housing or job growth exceeds 100% of targets in any urban village or center, the city shall make all affirmative efforts to re-direct job and housing growth to designated growth areas that have not yet reached their targets.

-- Define the terms "goal", "policy", etc.
The Seattle Comprehensive Plan seems to misuse these terms in a way that damages transparency and participation.
A "goal" should be an end state, in other words, a NOUN.
GOAL:
"Vibrant commercial districts."

INSTEAD OF: "Encourage vibrant commercial districts."
The use of the word "policy" is similarly problematic.
This would be a POLICY:
"Transportation routes shall contain a bias that makes transportation to downtown easier than transportation between other neighborhoods."
Instead, the goals and policies have been written with active verb forms, with actions that are not DIRECTLY accomplishable, leaving everyone to guess what the actual actions (and impacts) will be.
It is fine to have ACTIONS in the comprehensive plan, but they should be directly accomplishable and labeled as actions.

5a)
ADMINISTRATION. Regional.

-- Demonstrate how Seattle's policies of growth distribution support the Puget Sound Regional Council initiatives promoting subregional centers, including downtowns in suburban cities.

-- Provide a mechanism by which Seattle will work with PSRC members to re-balance growth on a regional basis (using incentives and disincentives) when development at the regional level becomes unbalanced, with other metro areas underperforming.

-- Provide the rationale for determining the appropriate sharing of growth between the five metro areas (Seattle, Everett, Bellevue, Tacoma, Bremerton).

--
Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan.
Community Involvement Element.
DRAFT - 8 October 2015.

Table Of Contents.
1.1. Introduction.
1.2. Principles.
1.2.1. PRINCIPLE "P1": Holistic Solutions.
1.2.2. PRINCIPLE "P2": Social Equity, Including Environmental Justice.
1.2.3. PRINCIPLE "P3": Transparency.
1.2.3. PRINCIPLE "P4": Accountability.
1.2.4. PRINCIPLE "P5": Continuous Improvement.
1.3. Goals.
1.3.1. GOAL "G1": Community Involvement As A Partnership.
1.3.2. GOAL "G2": Full And Meaningful Participation.
1.3.3. GOAL "G3": Accessible And Effective Participation.
1.3.4. GOAL "G4": Community Knowledge, Experience And Wisdom Harnessed Through Valued Participation.
1.3.5. GOAL "G5": Strong Civic Infrastructure.
1.4. Actions.
1.4.1.1. ACTION "A1.1": Implement partnership.
1.4.1.2. ACTION "A1.2": Implement partnership communications.
1.4.1.3. ACTION "A1.3": Network the partnerships.
1.4.1.4. ACTION "A1.4": Establish participant responsibilities.

1.4.2.1. ACTION "A2.1": Implement continuous involvement.
1.4.2.2. ACTION "A2.2": Implement high standards of notification.
1.4.2.3. ACTION "A2.3": Enable multi-demographic involvement.
1.4.2.4. ACTION "A2.4": Demonstrate equal opportunity.
1.4.2.5. ACTION "A2.5": Implement inclusion on advisory board and commissions.
1.4.3.1. ACTION "A3.1": Achieve accessibility.
1.4.3.2. ACTION "A3.2": Eliminate burdens.
1.4.3.3. ACTION "A3.3": Implement lessons from the 2004-2014 Comprehensive Plan.
1.4.3.4. ACTION "A3.4": Implement "quality of life" metrics.
1.4.3.5. ACTION "A3.5": Implement concurrency metrics.
1.4.3.6. ACTION "A3.6": Create a Performance Accountability Program (PAP).
1.4.3.7. ACTION "A3.7": Establish a "call log" system.
1.4.3.8. ACTION "A3.8": Implement website quality standards.
1.4.4.1. ACTION "A4.1": Conduct community analysis.
1.4.4.2. ACTION "A4.2": Enable community participation in data collection.
1.4.4.3. ACTION "A4.3": Open data.
1.4.4.4. ACTION "A4.4": Implement data utility.
1.4.4.5. ACTION "A4.5": Implement mechanisms for networking knowledge.
1.4.4.6. ACTION "A4.6": Enable multigenerational involvement.
1.4.5.1. ACTION "A5.1": Build community capacity.
1.4.5.2. ACTION "A5.2": Implement community planning and investment decision-making literacy.
1.4.5.3. ACTION "A5.3": Build agency capacity.
1.4.5.4. ACTION "A5.4": Implement the Community Engagement Manual (CEM).
1.4.5.5. ACTION "A5.5": Implement the Community Involvement Program (CIP).
1.4.5.6. ACTION "A5.6": Implement the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).
1.4.5.7. ACTION "A5.7": Enable Community Involvement Program evolution.
1.4.5.8. ACTION "A5.8": Promote & reward civic responsibility.

1.1.
Introduction.
Ever since the words "we the people" were first laid in writing, there has been a belief that a more perfect union can be formed through wider participation.
This belief is to be fostered in this Comprehensive Plan.
Values such as social equity, stewardship and community can only be reliably achieved if community involvement is fostered.
Economic opportunity & security can only be reliably achieved if community involvement is fostered.
As a culture of laws, reasonable application of law can only be assured if access to the process of writing, monitoring and enforcing the laws is widely distributed.
Results tend to be better -- more durable, more equitable and more accountable -- when a diversity of people are involved in the scoping, development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of plans and investment decisions.
No one person, agency, organization, business, or government can provide all things that the city's diverse communities need.
Collaborative partnerships and inclusive community participation in planning and investment decision-making are essential to creating and sustaining a prosperous, healthy, equitable, and resilient city.
This city has a long history of community involvement. We owe it to those who have participated before us to honor their participation by continuing to open opportunities.
As this is an information age with rapidly-evolving tools, there is now the greatest possible range of

outcomes. There has never been a larger potential to either utilize or squander the immense civic assets amongst us.
Such responsibility shall not be left to chance, but rather must be designed into the Comprehensive Plan and all offspring of the plan.
Likewise, budgeting for performance of this element cannot be left to chance. Budgeting for the implementation of any other element of this plan must be accompanied by budget for this element to not be a violation of this plan.
As monitoring is a necessity in this element, performance assessments must also be budgeted for, and designed into, the accomplishment of this element.
It is the City's responsibility to promote deep and inclusive community involvement in planning and investment decisions.
A new paradigm of community involvement and engagement -- one that supports intercultural organizing, recognizes that diversity is an advantage, and works to achieve equitable outcomes -- must be embraced and integrated with the city's neighborhood organizational structure to create a robust and inclusive community
involvement system.
The following definitions are provided for reference when mentioned in this chapter.
-- Definition of UNDERSERVED: Provided with inadequate service.
(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/underserved).
-- Definition of UNDERREPRESENTED: Inadequately represented.
(http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/underserved).
We the people hold these Principles (in section 1.2) and have established these primary Goals (in section 1.3) contained in this element of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan. In order to achieve these Goals while respecting these Principles, we have listed these Actions (section 1.4) in the comprehensive plan for its implementation.

1.2.
Principles.
Principles are goals which every Action of this Element must serve.
The principles are as follows.
1.2.1.
PRINCIPLE "P1": Holistic Solutions.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which solutions address root cause and consider all elements of a situation, rather than disenfranchising one interest in service of another.
1.2.2.
PRINCIPLE "P2": Social Equity, Including Environmental Justice.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which opportunity exists equally for all community members, with none being underserved or underrepresented, in planning and investment processes and decisions.
A condition in which planning and investment decision processes account for the potential for unequitable distribution of burdens, benefits, and outcomes.
DEFINITIONS:
Social equity: Fair, just and equitable creation and implementation of public policy.
Environmental Justice: The equitable treatment and meaningful involvement of all people in public decision-making, as it applies to the development, implementation, and enforcement of laws, regulations, and policies that govern the uses of air, water, and land.
1.2.3.

PRINCIPLE "P3": Transparency.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which city planning and investment decision-making processes are clear, open, documented, and publicly audited.
1.2.3.
PRINCIPLE "P4": Accountability.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition in which processes make clear to the community what individual is responsible for making each decision, and how community input is utilized, with systems designed to assure responsive interactions.
1.2.5.
PRINCIPLE "P5": Continuous Improvement.
DESCRIPTION:
A condition of continually building on learning rather than "re-inventing the wheel".

1.3.
Goals.
Goals are achieved through the Actions listed in 1.4.
Performance of the goals is to be measured by evaluation of accomplishment of the Actions, except when measuring the performance of the Comprehensive Plan itself.
The goals are as follows.
1.3.1.
GOAL "G1": Community Involvement As A Partnership.
DESCRIPTION:
City operations as a genuine partnership between all communities and interests.
City operations as a genuine partnership between public employees/electeds and members of the public.
City processes which promote, build, and sustain relationships, and communications with individuals, communities, neighborhoods, businesses, organizations, institutions, and other governments to ensure meaningful community involvement in planning and investment decisions.
City processes which result in fair distribution of information, with all partners equally informed (unless expressly forbidden by law).
1.3.2.
GOAL "G2": Full And Meaningful Participation.
DESCRIPTION:
Community members have meaningful opportunities to participate in and influence all stages of planning and decision-making, including issue identification, project scoping, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and enforcement.
Public processes which engage the full diversity of affected community members, including historically underserved and underrepres

Date: 11/20/2015

Name: Cass Turnbull

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

The new comp plan eliminates many of the goals and metrics found in the original which were used to

reassure us that Urban Villages wouldn't destroy city--our local environment, our neighborhoods, the livability and beauty that draws people here.
The Density Part is alive and well, and going strong. Most people have noticed.
But what sort of a place uses gridlock as a transportation strategy? gives up acquiring new parks when 220,00O more people are headed our way? and fails to cash in on a building boom? We are going to be the sort of place that people are trying to get away from when the move here. Crowded, dirty, noisy, hot, full of rude and frustrated people, gridlocked,and with no respite in site.
Please restore the metric of one acre of public open space per person. And remove the reference to adding more uses to existing parks.

Date: 11/20/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Community Well-Being

Comment:

Can each urban village have a designated area in case of a disaster/citywide emergency/epidemic such as war, tsunami, earthquake, terrorism, etc.

Date: 11/21/2015

Name:

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

There is no need to expand the urban village boundary into Mount Baker! Develop right around light rail! PLEASE!!!
Sent from my iPhone

Date: 11/21/2015

Name: LAN Remme

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Please do not extend the Urban Village boundaries to neighborhoods which currently allow only single family dwellings (And mother-in-laws in some instances) our neighborhood is filled with the richness of community connectedness. Developers would change the face of the area and erode the community we now enjoy.

Date: 11/21/2015

Name: Seattle Subway,Keith Kyle

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Transportation

Comment:

Hi,
I've included Seattle Subway's official input to the Seattle 2035 draft as an attachment.
Thanks,

Keith Kyle
President, Board of Directors
Seattle Subway
--
November 20th, 2015
Diane Sugimura
Director, City of Seattle, DPD
Dear Director Sugimura,
Seattle Subway is an allvolunteer, advocacy organization that envisions a city and region fully connected by fast, reliable high capacity transit. Allowing people to live, work and play near transit is the easiest and cheapest way to bring transit to more people. Seattle Subway fully supports the Draft Comprehensive Plan's strategy of focusing growth near fast and reliable transit. We are also very supportive of the plan to focus growth where future transit infrastructure: These plans take a very long time to be realized and we should be keeping our eyes on where growth will be.
With Seattle growing at historic rates we worry that the plan is not ambitious enough. We need to ensure that no one is forced out of the city due to lack of available housing in the city. We believe there need to more Urban Villages (especially around Link Stations) and that restrictive zoning regulations should be relaxed further in our Urban Villages, Hub Villages, Residential Villages, and Multifamily Areas with access to high quality transit.
We also feel that the mode share goals should be more ambitious. For instance 55% nonSOV usage in South Lake Union in 2035 is very low. With the proper investments there is no reason that area cannot have a mode share more in line with downtown. With the Sound Transit extensions to Northgate, Lynnwood, Bellevue, Redmond and Federal Way all coming online within the next years, along with Seattle's own new RapidRide+ corridors we have some very large transportation investments coming soon. Combined with a possible Sound Transit measure linking up even more of our city a mode shift of only 8% in the next 20 years is a very low target. We worry that a low target will be a self fulfilling prophecy.
Seattle is a city on the rise. We need to aim high and then work hard to meet the challenge. The Draft Comprehensive plan is moving in the right direction but we worry that it isn't moving fast enough. Please be bold when considering the future of Seattle, the Seattle residents of the future will be best served by this approach, and though they probably won’t thank you for it we will on their behalf.
With Regards,
Keith Kyle
President, Board of Directors
Seattle Subway

Date: 11/21/2015

Name: Nancy Christensen

Draft Plan Element: Community Well-Being

Comment:

Please keep our city clean! Spend a little money to get crews out at night and clean up the rotting garbage along the freeway. There is garbage on both sides of the freeway between Union and Mercer that has been there for months on end. Also on the right when you get off the exit at Stewart St. I am a native Seattlelite and have never seen our city look so sad?? Please clean it up! Nancy
Sent from my iPad

Date: 11/21/2015

Name: Eastlake Community Council

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Housing, Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

Attached is the Eastlake Community Council's comment letter on the draft proposal for update of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan.
--
URGENT NEED TO REBALANCE THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
To the Mayor, City Council, DPD, and Planning Commission:
The current draft "update" of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan is in effect a new plan that would unleash unprecedented and unbalanced growth pressures upon those neighborhoods that the Comprehensive Plan since 1994 has designated as urban centers, hub urban villages, or (like Eastlake) residential urban villages. The current draft would impose on these urban centers and villages major new growth expectations while removing hundreds of protections in the current Comprehensive Plan that now ensure them some semblance of village-like livability.
The information that the City has so far given out at public events and on its web site discloses few of the hundreds of provisions of the current Comprehensive Plan that would be deleted or weakened. The City must revise this draft to make it more balanced; and it must tell the public about the actual changes from the current Comprehensive Plan that the proposed "update" would actually make.
This "update" would repeal current protections for livability and public involvement. Officially terming these neighborhoods as "urban villages," as the Comprehensive Plan has done since 1994, was a promise that while growth would come, it would be no more than is consistent with the intimacy and charm of a village. The commitment was that urban problems like crime, noise, traffic danger, etc. would not be worsened by growth; that public investments would bring amenities like parks, sidewalks, etc.; that the growth expectations for urban villages would be scaled back if livability would otherwise be sacrificed by growth; and that the residents, businesses, and community organizations in each village would (especially through neighborhood planning) play a central role in decisions about how much it should grow and in what ways.
Contrary to those commitments, the current "update" would transform the Comprehensive Plan into an engine of growth at any cost. Goals and policies that currently protect sustainability, livability, and public participation would be either weakened or entirely deleted. The "urban village strategy" would be redefined to deny the urban centers and urban villages the balancing protections that they now enjoy in the current Comp Plan.
Policies and goals in the Comp Plan have protections in state law; removing them would eliminate that protection. Washington state law (the Growth Management Act) requires cities and counties each to have a Comprehensive Plan, to obey it, to amend it only once a year, and to do so in accordance with City laws and resolutions. Enforcement action can be imposed by the Washington state Growth Management Hearings Board and the state courts. Because so many policies and goals in the current Comprehensive Plan would be either deleted or moved to a plan other than the Comprehensive Plan, the public would lose major protections under state law; this must not be allowed to happen.
Following are specific responses and comments on different parts of the proposed Comprehensive Plan update. Most of the comments are about parts of the current Comprehensive Plan that are slated for elimination but should be kept. Some comments are about additions that should not be made. And a smaller number of comments are about City proposals that should be accepted, or proposals that we hope that the City will consider. Goals are those with a G and policies are those without a G. In most cases a proposed deletion is complete; but here a policy or goal is also deemed deleted if whatever

language proposed in its place is not a meaningful replacement.
BALANCE GROWTH WITH LIVABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY
1. Do not delete Toward a Sustainable Seattle from the Comp Plan's title. The proposed update would eliminate these words from the Comprehensive Plan's title; since the Plan was first adopted in 1994, its title has been Seattle's Comprehensive Plan: Toward a Sustainable Seattle. (The proposed new title is A Comprehensive Plan for Managing Growth.) Effect of the proposed change: The Comp Plan's title would all too accurately reflect what this proposed update seems intended to make it--a growth machine, no longer a means to ensure that growth is balanced with sustainability and livability
2. Do not delete the current priority for sustainability from the Comp Plan's text. Throughout, the current Comp Plan's references to sustainability would be deleted. For example, the proposed update would eliminate the following from page vii of the current introductory Vision section: "Sustainability is the common-sense notion that the health of our environment, our economy, our bodies, and our community as a whole, are not only closely linked, but dependent on one another. The four core values described above -- economic opportunity and security, environmental stewardship, social equity and community -- are the pillars of sustainability. The overarching goal of this Comprehensive Plan is to promote sustainable development -- that is, development that reflects, protects, and advances these core values, through a smart and well-integrated approach to where and how we grow." Effect of the proposed deletion: the Comprehensive Plan would favor growth at any cost rather than seek a balance with sustainability and livability.
3. Do not delete goal UVG35, "Achieve development within urban villages at a pace appropriate to current conditions in the area." Growth is not sustainable if it is pressed at a pace faster than is physically or socially bearable. Effect of the proposed deletion: would break a promise to urban villages that has been in the Comprehensive Plan since its adoption in 1994: Growth must be kept to a pace that does not damage or disadvantage the community.
4. Do not delete policy UV30, for balanced growth. The proposed update would delete UV30, "Balance objectives for accommodating growth, supporting transit use and walking, maintaining compatibility with existing development conditions, maintaining affordable housing, and responding to market preferences for certain types of housing, through the density and scale of development permitted." Effect of the proposed deletion: would break a promise to urban villages that has been in the Comprehensive Plan since its adoption in 1994, namely that growth will be of a magnitude and kind that is compatible with local conditions and with affordability.
5. Do not delete policy UV69 for coordinating investment and growth. The proposed update would delete UV69: "Maximize the benefit of public investment in infrastructure and services, and deliver those services more equitably by focusing new infrastructure and services, as well as maintenance and improvements to existing infrastructure and services, in areas expecting to see additional growth, and by focusing growth in areas with sufficient infrastructure and services to support that growth. Effect of the proposed deletion: would eliminate guidance and incentives for equity in sharing the impacts of growth and of investment in and maintenance of infrastructure and the private investment that follows it.
NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AN D AFFORDABILITY
6. Do not delete policy LU11: "In order to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of the Plan." Effect of the proposed deletion: would reduce current protections for affordable housing and neighborhood character.
7. Do not delete goal LUG2: "Foster neighborhoods in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and

individuals, income groups, and businesses." Effect of the proposed deletion: would reduce the Comp Plan's neighborhood focus.
8. Affordability criteria must moderate efforts to promote density. Much in the proposed update favors increased density, with the apparent assumption that affordability will benefit when it may not and in fact may suffer from related displacement. The environmental impact statement done as a part of the proposed update [section 3.6.3 Mitigation Strategies (for Housing)] stated:
Under all alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, housing affordability and risk of displacement will continue to be a significant concern. As described previously, housing affordability and displacement are driven by demand generated as a result of Seattle's strong job market, land value, construction costs and other factors outside of the proposal and alternatives.
Nevertheless, the City recognizes the critical importance of these issues and recommends consideration of the following mitigation strategies. Housing affordability strategies should be tailored to meet specific objectives, for example: Creating an environment where the community retains the conditions that afford it good opportunities while providing for stability and economic mobility for people vulnerable to displacement; expanding choices in areas that are currently unaffordable for lower income people who may want to live or operate a business there; and stabilizing areas that are transitioning to higher levels of desirability due to amenities such as light rail service.
9. Retain the current policy LU102 and reject the proposed LUG7 so that density will not be prioritized over affordability. LU102 offers zoning incentives and other tools to provide for or preserve public benefits including "housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households. The proposed new LUG7 would use those same tools to push density without any reference to affordability.
10. The proposed housing element contains some good provisions for neighborhoods. H3.5 says to "Consider allowing additional housing types that respect existing neighborhood character in single-family areas, particularly within or near urban centers and urban villages" H4.7 says to adopt development standards and design guidelines that help achieve a variety of quality housing types and respond flexibly to unique neighborhood contexts.
11. The proposed housing element seems be concerned mainly about the low end of displacement. Its proposed policy H5.9 recommends addressing "the needs of communities most vulnerable to displacement due to redevelopment pressure through policies and funding decisions related to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income housing." This seems too narrow a view. People who are above the low-income level may significantly at risk for displacement, and with few options.
12. Do not add policy LU9.11 on midrise zones: "Use midrise multifamily zones to provide additional housing opportunities in urban villages and centers." Effect of the proposed addition: Encourages midrise zoning with its taller buildings in parts of urban villages and centers whose neighborhood plan does not call for it. Disempowers neighborhood planning.
13. The proposed new goal LUG2 on zoning fails to give priority to neighborhood impacts or even mention them. As proposed, LUG2 states that zoning will "Allow for a variety of housing types to accommodate housing choices for households of all types and income levels; support a wide diversity of employment-generating activities providing jobs for a diverse residential population, as well as a variety of services for residents and businesses; and accommodate the full range of public services, institutions, and amenities needed to support a fully developed, diverse, and economically sustainable urban community." The goal needs to be revised to give priority to the local conditions that make for a successful neighborhood. Effect of the proposed revision: zoning would increasingly be based on citywide priorities rather than on neighborhood conditions and needs.
14. Do not delete policy LU3 on rezones: "Establish rezone criteria and procedures to guide decisions about which zone will provide the best match for the characteristics of an area and will most clearly further City goals." This proposed deletion is one of many in which the proposed update would throw out policies in the current Comprehensive Plan which direct that land use decisions be respectful

of the local context. We are concerned that relying mainly on the Future Land Use Map could encourage a cascade of rezones that would ignore local conditions and neighborhood plans. It would be better to adopt a policy requiring that all rezones be consistent with neighborhood plans. Effect of the proposed deletion: Encourages wholesale upzones without regard for local condition, plans, or preferences.
15. In new policy LU5.16 on view protection, the proposal should allow private view impacts to be considered when permitting or denying a conditional use, rezone, or other departure from the land use regulations. As the proposed update encourages rezones, conditional uses, and other departures, it is important for potential view blockage by a new project to be a valid objection.
16. Do not delete policy LU81 limiting building heights: "Limit building heights to establish maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent buildings, and limit view blockage." Effect of the proposed deletion: lowers current obstacles to unlimited increases in building heights.
17. Do not adopt proposed policy GS4.20, "Consider taller building eights in key locations to provide visual focus and define activity centers." Effect of the proposed addition: unusually tall buildings are more likely to shadow activity centers and to block vies rather than provide visual focus.
18. Do not adopt proposed policy GS4.23, "Encourage street widths and building heights that are in proportion with each other by reducing setbacks from the street and keeping reasonable sidewalk widths for lower buildings." Effect of the proposed addition: reduced setbacks aren't a good thing in an urban village where yards and especially trees are lacking and much needed to green up the area. Plus: the proposal doesn't make sense.
19. Do not delete policies LU1, LU5, LU76, LU164 that currently direct that zoning, rezoning, and conditional use changes reflect community preferences, and be consistent with neighborhood plans. Effect of the proposed deletion: ignores community preferences and marginalizes the neighborhood planning process.
20. Do not delete policies LU59 and LU60, which define and protect single family zoning. Effect of the proposed deletion: lowers the Comp Plan's barriers to eliminating single family zoning.
21. Do not replace policy LU67 with policy LU8.9. Effect of the proposed replacement: could bring back the previously prohibited ultra small lot development in single family and multifamily zones.
PUBLIC AND NEIGHBORHOOD INVOLVEMENT
22. Do not eliminate the commitment to public involvement in the current Comp Plan's Vision section. That section (proposed to be entirely deleted in the update) now reads (p. ix) as follows: "Citizen participation in City processes will build upon the dialogue between government and citizens that began with the development and adoption of the Plan. The City will strive to find improved means to communicate with and involve citizens in planning and decision-making. The City will strive to provide information that can be easily understood and to provide access for public involvement. This will include processes for amending and implementing the Plan." Effect of the proposed deletion:
would undermine City efforts to reach out truthfully to the public and involve it meaningfully—a new neglect already reflected in how the current update process is failing to inform and involve the public.
23. Do not remove the commitment to widespread public involvement in the current Comp Plan's Urban Village element (proposed to be renamed and refashioned as the Planning for Growth element). But do add (and practice) transparency. Both of the following provisions would be eliminated in the proposed update: UVG10, "Collaborate with the community in planning for the future."; and UV8, "Involve the public in identifying needs for planning, and designing public facilities, programs, and services. Encourage and provide opportunities for extensive public involvement in City decisions, and encourage other agencies to provide similar opportunities."
24. The proposed Comp Plan update should not delete UVG10 and UV8 or replace them with a rather weak goal and policy. The new goal would be GSG1, "Have strategies that prepare the City for the challenges and opportunities of growth and that represent the needs and desires of a broad cross-section of city residents and business owners." ; and the new policy would be GS1.2, "Engage Seattle

residents and businesses in discussions leading to the adoption of plans that guide growth, City government activities, and City services so that the outcomes reflect the public's values and concerns." These proposals are not worthy of replacing UVG10 and UV8, which should be kept. Effect of the proposed change: The proposed new GSG1 and G1.2 fail to give any priority to widespread public involvement. The original language from UVG10 and UV8 (quoted above) should be retained.
25. The proposed new GS1.2 is good and should be added: "Maintain an updating process for this Plan that is predictable and transparent to the public." Unfortunately, this standard of transparency is not being met in the current update process.
26. The proposed update would unjustifiably remove from most of the Comp Plan's sections the policies and goals for community involvement. The update would systematically remove all of the references to community involvement throughout the Comprehensive Plan. Effect of the proposed deletion: eliminates the Comp Plan's current openness and encouragement for public involvement.
27. Do not adopt the huge number of deletions in the element on neighborhood planning, and do not remove from most Comp Plan elements most other references to neighborhood plans and neighborhood planning. The proposed Comp Plan update would virtually eliminate any recognition or priority for neighborhood planning. Among the policies proposed for elimination are those numbered N10 to N19 regarding its implementation:
N10: Establish a firm and clear relationship between the City's budgeting processes and adopted neighborhood plans and, using the biennial budget, demonstrate how the urban village strategy is being carried out.
N11: Assess as part of the City's budget process, neighborhood plan implementation needs and resources, taking into consideration the results of implementation activities for each area and public input into the budget process.
N12: Use adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies and the City's neighborhood plan work plan matrices to help balance between competing goals in City decision making and the allocation of budget resources.
N13: Consider recommendations from neighborhood plans in the context of Seattle as a whole. Incorporate such requests into City prioritization processes, as appropriate, for capital expenditures and other decision making recognizing the City's legal, administrative and fiscal constraints.
N14: When allocating resources to implement neighborhood plans, at a minimum consider the following factors: Where the greatest degree of change is occurring; Where growth has exceeded current infrastructure capacities; Where there is a deficit in meeting service levels called for by the Comprehensive Plan or the expectation of other City policies or agency plans; Where there is an urban center or urban village designation; Where the neighborhood plan goals and policies or work plan matrix have specific prioritized plan recommendations endorsed by the City; Where resources would help spur growth in urban centers or urban villages; Where there are opportunities to leverage other resources, or partnerships; Where the resource would address priorities of more than one neighborhood; and Where the impact of a single, large activity generator will have detrimental effects on the infrastructure capacities of the neighborhood.
N15: In implementing neighborhood plans, work with neighborhood groups to refine and prioritize recommendations in light of changing circumstances and consistent with the adopted goals and policies of each neighborhood plan.
N16: Permit the addition of new strategies, including regulatory changes, through the neighborhood plan implementation process when existing tools are inadequate to meet implementation needs.
N17: Support and encourage the incorporation of cultural elements, such as public art and historic resources, in the implementation of neighborhood plans. In future planning efforts, include a broad range of creative skills to improve the value of the neighborhood projects.
N18: Monitor progress toward implementing Council adopted neighborhood plans and communicate

results to City officials, neighborhood planning participants and interested citizens.
N19: Support neighborhood plan stewardship with the goal of promoting continued cooperation between the City and local neighborhoods in implementing adopted neighborhood plan goals and policies, carrying out neighborhood plan work plan activities and implementing this Comprehensive Plan. These efforts should be directed toward not only accomplishing specific projects, but also toward fostering the ability of neighborhoods to inspire people with the energy, interest and ability to work collaboratively with the City in implementing neighborhood plans.
The Neighborhood Planning element should NOT suffer deletion of the above ten policies numbered N10 to N19 that are in the current version. Effect of the proposed deletion: eliminates the centrality of neighborhood plans and neighborhood planning to the current Comp Plan. In fact, it consigns neighborhood plans and planning to a negligible role.
The Neighborhood Planning element should NOT suffer deletion of the above ten policies numbered N10 to N19 that are in the current version. Effect of the proposed deletion: eliminates the centrality of neighborhood plans and neighborhood planning to the current Comp Plan. In fact, it consigns neighborhood plans and planning to a negligible role.
28. As one example among many, the addition of policy LU9.1 (discussed in the above section on neighborhood character and affordability) would undermine neighborhood plans by promoting midrise zoning whether or not called for by the neighborhood plan. The proposed new policy LU9.1 should NOT be adopted.
29. Do not weaken goal GSG1 by stating that in amending the Comprehensive Plan, only a “broad cross-section of city residents and business owners” will be consulted. Keep the original language that makes clear that the Comprehensive Plan is not a top-down or centralized process, but a process of dialogue between the government and its publics.
OPEN SPACE, TREES, SHORELINES, AND COMMUNITY CENTERS
30. Public land (including submerged parcels) that is surplus to its original agency should be kept in public ownership as open space, and sold for possible benefit to housing only if there is no open space use needed.
31. Do not delete policy LU34 which encourages yards: “Limit the maximum amount of lot area covered by a structure to maintain compatibility with the scale and character of an area, to provide an adequate proportion of open area on a site relative to the area occupied by structures, and to provide occupants with sufficient access to light and air, as appropriate to the intended character and use of an area.” Effect of the proposed deletion: Removes current expectations for yards, landscaping, and trees.
32. Do not delete policy LU39: to “preserve and enhance the City’s physical and aesthetic character and environment by preventing untimely and indiscriminate removal or destruction of trees” and to provide incentives to property owners for tree retention.
33. Do not delete policy LU41 for street trees.
34. Do not delete policy UV39 to enhance the tree canopy and understory in urban villages. Effect of the proposed deletions: Trees would no longer specifically be identified as important.
35. Do not weaken policy E10 favoring vegetative cover. E10 in the current Comprehensive Plan is as follows: “Strive to increase the amount of permeable surface and vegetative cover in the city in order to mitigate the heat island effect of developed areas, control storm water flows and reduce pollution.” The proposed update is not preferable, as it would eliminate the reference to vegetative cover. New E1.4 would read: “Increase the amount of permeable surface by reducing hardscape surfaces where possible and maximizing the use of permeable paving elsewhere.”
36. Do not delete policy E11 on aquatic areas. The proposed update would eliminate E11: “Identify long-term goals and develop plan or strategies for improving the environmental quality of each of the city’s aquatic areas, including a long-term plan to restore and sustain Seattle’s creeks.
Consider in these plans or strategies the use of incentives, regulations and other opportunities

for action to restore and sustain the long term health of Seattle's creeks and shorelines."
37. Proposed policy LU4.8 on minor communication utilities should be amended to not allow them in shoreline areas.
38. Do not delete policy CF9, which gives urban centers and villages a priority for public facilities. The proposed update would delete CF9: "Encourage the location of new community based capital facilities, such as schools, libraries, neighborhood service centers, parks and playgrounds, community centers, clinics and human services facilities, in urban village areas. The City will consider providing capital facilities or amenities in urban villages as an incentive to attract both public and private investments to an area." Eastlake is probably the only urban village that lacks either a public library, a community center, or a neighborhood service center. The only public meeting space is in the
local school, which is closed all summer. Effect of the proposed deletion: The current priority for public facilities granted to urban centers and villages would be eliminated, just at the time they are being asked to take on still more growth.
39. Do not delete the current policy CF7 (proposed for elimination in the update): "The City will consider capital improvements identified in neighborhood plans, in light of other facility commitments and the availability of funding and will consider voter approved funding sources."
40. Do not delete the current policy CF8 (proposed for elimination in the update): "Explore tools that encourage sufficient capital facilities and amenities to meet baseline goals for neighborhoods and to address needs resulting from growth."
TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING
41. Do not delete goals LUG6, LUG6.1, and TG17 and policies LU20, LU49, LU, LU50, T-39, T-40, and T-46 that currently direct that parking policies "account for local objectives," recognize parking as a part of "moving people and goods," consider "access to local businesses," "parking spillover into residential areas," and "truck access and loading," and not "introduce serious safety problems or blighting influences" but rather "achieve vitality of urban centers and urban villages" and "preserve Seattle's competitive position in the region." While deleting those goals and policies, the Comp Plan "update" would introduce two new policies: LU63 to "rely on market forces" for onsite parking and T40 to give higher priority in the allocation of street space to "greening" (e.g. on-street parks) over "storage" (the City's new negative term for parking). Effect of the proposed deletions and additions: reduces balance and sanity in parking policies.
42. Proposed policy TG9 should be amended to include improvements in the measure of transit level of service to reflect actual loads and the lack of space or sitting room on some bus routes.
43. The transit mode shares shown in proposed Transportation figure 1 need improvement. The 2035 target for South Lake Union is only 55 percent, much lower than for Downtown (85 percent), the University District (85 percent), Uptown/Queen Anne (75 percent) and even Seattle overall (65 percent). Eastlake is deeply affected by increasing levels of traffic from the South Lake Union area.
44. Do not delete two policies that support the maintenance and expansion of public stairways. The proposed update would delete T32, " Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment. And T33, "Accelerate the maintenance, development, and improvement of pedestrian facilities, including public stairways." Effect of the proposed deletions: public stairways would be neglected if their priority in the current Comprehensive Plan were to be erased.
45. Do not delete policies T8 and T70 to discourage damage from heavy vehicles and to finance the needed repairs. The proposed update would delete T8, " Pursue strategies to reduce and help prevent road damage from heavy vehicles." and T70, "Pursue strategies to finance repair of road damage from heavy vehicles in a way that is equitable for Seattle's taxpayers." Road and bridge use
by vehicles that are heavier than normal weight limits (causing exponentially greater damage than

vehicles within normal weight limits) has caused hundreds of millions of dollars in unnecessary damage. The Comprehensive Plan is where these important policies need to be so that the City will take timely action to prevent such damage and will recoup some of the repair cost from those causing it rather than from Seattle taxpayers. Effect of the proposed deletions: would weaken City efforts to address damage from heavy vehicles.
NEW PROPOSALS
46. Add a new section on community involvement. A serious omission throughout the history of the Comprehensive Plan has been the lack of a community involvement element. Such elements are in the comprehensive plans for Portland, San Francisco, Bellevue, Spokane, and Tacoma; Seattle should catch up. Public involvement is not something to be feared or avoided; it is a valuable resources for planners, and is a fundamental value in a democracy. Yet the proposed update does not reflect this value in what is proposing or in the way it is dealing with the public about the proposals. Effect of the proposed addition: Policy decisions would be higher in quality because of public input, and would also be better understood and supported by the public.
47. Adopt a new policy to limit the "Airbnb" type of short term rental that is displacing affordable housing. Other cities are grappling with this issue, and Seattle needs to.
48. Require public facilities and infrastructure to keep pace with growth and growth targets. Effect of the proposed addition: concurrency of growth with the facilities it requires. See the City Neighborhood Council letter for details.
49. Direct growth to where it is needed and can be accommodated. Discourage building in urban centers and urban villages that have met their growth targets or whose infrastructure is under capacity. Encourage building in urban centers and urban villages that have fallen short of their growth targets or whose infrastructure has unused capacity. Effect of the proposed addition: greater equity in sharing the impacts of growth and of investment. Greater incentive for investment in and maintenance of infrastructure.
50. Reinstate Policy L61 from the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 Comp Plan ordinance section L61 (pages 29-30 of the original document, but pages 35-36 of the PDF scan of Ordinance No. 117221) required the City to "monitor development activity annually to identify situations where the rate of growth is different from that anticipated by growth targets, either because: 1) it is occurring too rapidly and may be disruptive; or 2) there is insufficient growth to achieve planned conditions in designated villages." This section L61 also required the City to "initiate … a special review procedure" which "should include a review process with the affected community" that shall "consider the following, or othe

Date: 11/21/2015

Name: Miranda Berner

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Housing, Land Use

Comment:

Dear Elected Officials,
Please consider the following comments on the "Seattle 2035, Draft Comprehensive Plan."
Thank you,
Miranda Berner
Wallingford, Seattle
--
Regarding the Land Use portion of Seattle's Draft Comprehensive Plan 2035.
Seattle is a city of neighborhoods. The acknowledgement and appreciation of Seattle being a city of neighborhoods has been removed from the Land Use portion and no longer sets the tone.

· Re-instate neighborhood planning processes in this proposal for re-zoning and development. Why are we, both current & future residents, being excluded from the process?

· Re-instate the Land Use directive to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances our communities.

· Say no to Ultra small lot development – Seattle neighborhoods are made up of both multi-family and single family homes. The proposed language in LU8.9 not only allows for Single Family Homes to have "mother-in-laws" but also opens the door for ultra small lot development. Please close this loophole.

Single Family Neighborhoods
· Currently, existing Single Family neighborhoods are protected from multi-family development via distinct urban center and urban village boundaries. Proposed Section LU1.1 eliminates these boundaries. Rewrite Section LU1.1 to include these distinct boundaries.
· Re-instate the criteria that land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria can only be upzoned when all of the following conditions are met:
o The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary
o The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan
o The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multi-family or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas
o The rezone procedures are followed

Seattle is known for its greenness – yet Seattle 2035 does not include the basic green attributes of requiring trees or not developing in wetlands.
· Re-instate the requirement for the preservation or planting of trees as new development occurs
· Do not allow development within critical areas (LUG15 permits development "that is reasonable" within critical areas (i.e., wetlands, fish and wildlife conservation areas) as well as in areas that are prone to erosion, landslides, liquefaction or floods.)

Off-street Parking
Until Seattle is an "interconnected city where people have reliable, easy-to-use travel options that get them to their destinations," new developments need to include adequate parking.
· Eliminating parking does not eliminate cars
· Not requiring parking in new developments pushes residents of these new multi-family developments to park in the street. Once the street parking is full, then no one has a place to park. Not the residents and guests of the development nor the residents and guests of the single-family home areas that abut them.
· Without off-street parking, small, independently owned shops, cafes, restaurants and other businesses lose customers. Customers go where it is convenient. Not being able to find parking in the vicinity of shops, services, cafes, restaurants, etc. means customers go elsewhere and businesses close or leave the urban village.
· The Parking Myth (eliminating parking eliminates cars) is inequitable and creates more burden for both the working poor and the working middle class: extra cost of parking (& parking tickets) / bus / uber / taxi associated with being at one's job adds to financial burden of both the working poor and the middle class

· Negative impact on quality of life: Extra time spent commuting due to no-place-to-park near home/ work equals less time to be with friends/ family, to work (for those working two – three jobs), to go to school (for those working and going to school), to enjoy life, to sleep, etc..
· Currently, developers are building multi-family buildings without parking; once these buildings are built, it will be too late to add parking to them. This potentially creates areas in our neighborhoods that have no convenient off-street parking options for residents, customers, patients, employees, students, friends, etc..

Date: 11/21/2015

Name: Pat Naumann

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Very, very good Mira. Thank you.
Pat
From my Android phone on T-Mobile. The first nationwide 4G network.
-------- Original message --------
From: Mira Latoszek
Date:11/20/2015 11:29 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: 2035@seattle.gov,"Murray, Ed" ,LEG_CouncilMembers
Subject: Draft comprehensive plan update comments
Dear DPD, Council-members and Mayor Murray,
Reading through the details of the draft Comprehensive Plan update, I noticed the following general trends that I disagree with:
An almost complete elimination of the neighborhood planning process and the neighborhood plans that were created after the adoption of the Comprehensive plan 20 years ago. As an example, the proposed language for item UVG10 changes the existing "Collaborate with the community in planning for the future" to "Have strategies that prepare the City for the challenges and opportunities of growth and that represent the needs and desires of a broad cross-section of city residents and business owners". Item UVG16 changes from "Guide public and private activities to achieve the function, character, amount of growth, intensity of activity, and scale of development of each urban village consistent with its urban village designation and adopted neighborhood plan" to "Encourage investments and activities in urban centers and urban villages that will enable those areas to flourish as compact mixed-use neighborhoods designed to accommodate the majority of the city's new jobs and housing, provide services andemployment (sic) close to housing, and pormote (sic) efficient use of public services, including trnasit (sic), with housing options for a variety of households and a range of incomes." There are many other examples throughout the draft proposal.
Instead of planning to continue the conversation with the local community to get it's input on how to accommodate growth, the draft Comprehensive Plan update proposes to effectively do away with the existing neighborhood plans and stop the conversation at the local level. Instead it proposes to open up neighborhood planning and development to the broad desires of the city at large defined in any way the current or future administration desires. If some neighborhood plans are outdated, then the City should plan to involve the local community in updating them rather than eviscerating this important tool. Most Seattle citizens are not against accommodating future growth but they don't want uncontrolled growth with no say in the way that it affects their lives. The North Beacon Hill neighborhood plan was updated in 2010 - the City paid $800,000 in translation and liaison services to ensure the widest community input. The draft proposal throws those voices out and opens up the potential development of the North

Beacon Hill urban village to developers and investors who won't have to deal with the impacts of that development.
A route to degradation of natural spaces and a de-emphasis on providing open space and breathing room for all the residents of Seattle - human and wildlife. There is a consistent emphasis on opening up of natural areas for higher intensity and structured use. As an example, item UV47 is proposed to change from "Designate and preserve important natural or ecological features in public ownership as greenspaces for low-intensity open space uses" to "Provide natural areas to preserve important natural or ecological features in public ownership and allow people access to these spaces." Low intensity open space uses means slow and limited trail usage for people of all ages and abilities to enjoy the natural beauty and fragility of Seattle's remaining wild spaces and the wildlife that resides in it. The proposed language opens up access of these fragile spaces to all kinds of uses - recently propose mountain biking and ziplines come to mind. If these are acceptable, then why not opening these spaces to further access? How about archery ranges in the woods or mountain bikes with electric motors? Proponents of these types of activities will claim that the are being denied "access" and that it is inequitable to not include them in in natural areas. There is nothing in the proposed language to limit the expansion to such extreme uses and protect our natural resources.
In addition, the language also de-emphasizes acquisition and development of park land and open space to accommodate the needs of current and future residents of the city. For example, UV48 "Identify City-owned open spaces on the Future Land Use Map" is proposed to be deleted. If we don't map the existing open spaces that the city owns, then there will be nothing to stop them from being sold off for other uses instead of preservation. Another example is the proposed change to LU122 from "Use zoning incentives and other development-related tools to provide for, or preserve, public benefits. Public benefits or other features may include housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, preservation of historic resources or provision of new public open space" to "Use development incentive programs to provide opportunities for increasing density in areas targeted for growth while addressing the impacts of the added density on the livability of urban neighborhoods, with particular emphasis on addressing the needs of those residents who are least likely to be served by higher density development provided by the private market". In the changed language, public open space is no longer mentioned as a benefit that would be a target of development incentive programs - only "opportunities for increasing density" are to be the targets of the development incentive programs. This is the language of the road to riches for developers, not a route for a livable, vibrant city.
An elimination of specific and measurable goals for City government and the departments. The language of E23 "Achieve no net loss of tree canopy coverage, and strive to increase tree canopy coverage to 40 percent, to reduce storm runoff, absorb air pollutants, reduce noise, stabilize soil, provide habitat, and mitigate the heat island effect of developed areas" is reduced to "Strive to increase citywide tree canopy coverage to 40% over time". "Achieve no net loss of tree canopy" and mitigation of "heat island effect of developed areas" are measurable, specific goals. The proposed language is not - "striving" is not measurable. Neither is "over time". What is the length of time? Is Seattle going to get 40% tree canopy in 20 years or in 100. The draft Comprehensive Plan update is specific about the growth in population and jobs that it wants to achieve in the next 10 years, yet when it comes to tree canopy it suddenly goes limp and uses the language of underachievement.
Another example of this is E8.1 with a proposed change from "Where there would be measurable benefits to people or wildlife, place priority on solving drainage problems, such as flooding and frequent reliance on the combined sewer overflow system, with natural drainage system approaches and by restoring watershed elements such as forest, wetlands, and natural channels" to "Strive to manage 700 million gallons of stormwater runoff each year with green stormwater infrastructure by 2025". Can we check this goal off in 2025 if we only manage 1% of the 700 million gallons as long as we "strived"? Portland is way ahead of Seattle in doing this, incorporating green stormwater infrastructure in street

and sidewalk upgrades - you see them all over the city. On Beacon Hill, SDOT rebuilt the intersection of 14th and Holgate and added a huge amount of concrete in the form of new sidewalks, curb-bulbs and infrastructure. It was a perfect opportunity to include swales to handle stormwater. Instead we got a few spindly street trees that are unlikely to survive the drought of last summer. Can we at least add language to achieve what Portland is already doing?
These other specific and measurable goals are simply eliminated:
•E24 - "Update the tree canopy inventory in the Urban Forest Management Plan at least every 10 years to measure progress toward the goal of increased canopy coverage."
•E.11 - "Identify long-term goals and develop plans or strategies for improving the environmental quality of each of the city's aquatic areas, including a long-term plan to restore and sustain Seattle's creeks. Consider in these plans or strategies the use of incentives, regulations and other opportunities for action to restore and sustain the long-term health of Seattle's creeks and shorelines."
•E.16 - "In the operations of City government, strive to reduce the use of resources and toxics, prevent pollution, reuse existing resources such as historic structures, control waste, and protect natural areas and biodiversity. Repairs of City-owned buildings should employ green building practices."
•E.18 - "Collect data and regularly report on the sustainability measures and numeric goals in this plan to inform and enable citizens and decision-makers to consider alternative policies or programs, where outcomes differ from what was intended. Conduct an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions in Seattle at least every three years. Use data, public input, and approaches developed by other public agencies and private organizations that address sustainability. Consider combining this monitoring activity with the one described in the Urban Village Element of this Plan."
•E.20 - "Consider long-term environmental costs, in City planning, purchasing and operating decisions. For instance, look at all of the environmental impacts caused by materials from their production to disposal."
The notes in the associated spreadsheet claim that these are "too vague" or that it is "not the comp plan's role". Really? These are very specific and measurable, not vague. The goals to increase density by any means possible specified in other parts of the Comp Plan are written to interpretation and manipulation. Yet when it comes to specific actions that the City government can take to achieve environmental goals, the draft Comprehensive Plan update tries to get City government off the hook.
These are just a few of the problems and examples of why DPD should go back to the drawing board as far as this Comprehensive Plan update is concerned. Don't ignore the work that was done in the past by so many people in neighborhoods, incorporate and build on it.
Mira Latoszek

Date: 11/22/2015

Name: Patricia Davis

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Land Use

Comment:

Hello - I just wrote an email with regard to the Comprehensive Plan. I then (afterwards) saw the link to this 2035@seattle.gov

Please include both in the public comment. This is an easier format for me to print/document what I wrote.

Historically, one of the main reasons for zoning classifications (as you know) was to separate uses. In particular to try to protect people/residential areas from highly polluting and noisy industries. As time as

gone on - we have found various methods of reduce air and noise pollution, and consequently the zoning classifications have become more 'blended' shall we say.

The Comprehensive Plan looks at growth, zoning, parking, and many important issues.

I would like to bring you attention to one profound issue that must be addressed as we grow - and hopefully via Land Use decisions and the Comprehensive Plan. That issue is WOOD SMOKE. I would imagine you are surprised that is the topic. But let me give you a brief backdrop on the urgency of the issue:

1) Did you know that wood smoke is 12 TIMES (not double, but twelve TIMES) more toxic than a cigarette? (EPA, 1991) (Actually the research was on second hand smoke - so it is really even more deadly than 12 times, but I will keep it simple for the purposes of this letter)

2. According to the American Lung Association: wood smoke particulate is so small that a) it goes down into the deepest part of the lungs and b) it gets into neighbors homes even with all the doors and windows closed.

3. The American Heart Assoc (2013 as I recall) research showed causality between air pollution and heart disease. And we know heart disease is a top killer

4. Did you know that in Washington State that 1,000 people die early - every year - from exposure to wood smoke?

Clearly wood smoke is extremely toxic.

Why do I write you?

Well, there is an underlying LAND USE/ZONING ISSUE/PERMIT issue with wood smoke being generated by
businesses such as wood burning pizza places.

There is truly no enforcement available and that is a complex - buck passing issue. We suffer under tremendous UNFILTERED SMOKE going on hour after hour.....7 days a week. Inside our homes tastes like smoke. (Like a chain smoker lives in the house). Who to call? Answer: no one. PSCAA states that although they empathize - they cannot enforce it because DPD has given a permit for that wood burning pizza business. DPD states that they can't do anything about it - because it is an air quality issue. The Fire Dept states they can't do anything about it because they BBQ/recreational burning is unregulated. There is simply no remedy. Each agency points the finger 'elsewhere' while the general public endures this health hazard. And now, even more are opening up.

DPD requires that restaurants have 'diffusers' or filters on their emissions from cooking. Seems DPD also need to require that of wood burning restaurants/food trucks/pizza places.

The average person must have a certified wood burning stove to burn wood. Yet, a wood burning pizza place can burn wood, or a BBQ place, on and on and on. Massive, unregulated smoke - and we have no method of intervention/solution.

How does this relate to the Comprehensive Plan? It relates twofold: 1) Seattle/DPD have specific goals around the environment and 2) the mixed use zoning and what is permitted/allowed near residential populations needs to be protected. To be specific: It is a opportune time to put this in the Comprehensive Plan, as well as get this handled in the permitting portions of DPD. We need wood smoke (and any well known toxic air pollution activities to be ILLEGAL) and most certainly restricted via zoning.

I would like to hear from you on this issue please.

Also if you would be so kind as to forward it? I am sending a copy to Diane Sugimura, Director, DPD as well as Craig Kenworthy, PSCAA in the hopes some coordination can take place to curtail unfiltered wood smoke being generated inside the City of Seattle (at a minimum)

cc: Diane Sugimura, Director, DPD
Craig Kenworthy, Director, PSCAA

Thank you

Patricia Davis

Date: 11/22/2015

Name: Priscilla Allen

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

We must save other neighborhoods from suffering the same fate as Ballard. We must require:
- wider sidewalks
- more trees between buildings and street
- more space between buildings even if that means buildings will be taller.

Thank you.

Date: 11/22/2015

Name: Kimberly Leeper

Draft Plan Element: Environment, Housing, Transportation

Comment:

Dear Seattle 2035:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft. Here are my priorities for the future of Seattle:
Make Seattle more affordable. People who work in Seattle should be able to live in Seattle. As our city becomes less affordable, more families must move farther away, leading to significant negative social, economic and environmental impacts. We need the Comprehensive Plan to support our strategies that create greater affordability. It should include more funding for affordable housing, and it should include policies that increase the supply of market rate and affordable units.
Put growth in high opportunity locations with good transit service. We should continue our urban village strategy, which has helped us grow efficiently and responsibly over the past twenty years.

However, some of our urban villages are home to people and businesses at risk of displacement. We should protect these areas by directing growth to other urban villages and creating new urban villages in low-displacement risk areas. We should have policies, programs and investments that help people and businesses stay in their neighborhoods if they choose.

Keep investing in our transportation system with innovative, multi-modal strategies that will keep us moving affordably, safely and sustainably. As Seattle continues to grow, we must change the way that we move around or we will become mired in gridlock. Smart, strategic use of our limited roadways will be required to keep Seattle moving as we add more people and jobs over the next 20 years. We need investments in bike lanes, transit and sidewalks to give people many ways to get around safely while protecting our air and our environment.

Seattle must do more to prevent climate change. We need aggressive, bold action to meet our climate goals. Our transportation, land use, capital facilities and environmental goals and policies should work together to protect our natural environment and to prevent climate change. We need to prepare for climate impacts and be sure to protect our most vulnerable residents who are most at risk.

Support our growing neighborhoods and villages. Seattle is fortunate to have so many special neighborhoods and villages. Protecting and enhancing neighborhood character through historic and cultural preservation, urban design and investment in amenities will help everyone succeed and make our neighborhoods and villages great for future generations.

Work towards a more equitable future for all. Not all of our residents and communities have the same access to opportunity. The City should be proactive and intentional about advancing race and social justice through its policies, programs and investments.

Accountability and measurement. Quantifiable goals will help us track how we are doing. We should expand our metrics and make sure that we are moving in the right direction. It is critical that our tracking and accountability not just focus on city-wide results, but also on neighborhoods and specific populations so that no one is getting left behind.

Thank you!
Kimberly Leeper
98116

Date: 11/22/2015

Name: Heather Taylor

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

I urge you to preserve open space and green space in Seattle as well as retain older interesting buildings. It is already too crowded on the buses and light rail, not too mention trying to drive, so why push more and more people into this area? we're already past carrying capacity. Where is the rain and the sewage going to go? we don't have infrastructure for a cement jungle of over-priced micropods.

Why don't you push population into other depressed regions? - there are still many dying cities trying to recover from the last "builder's binge" has everyone forgotten the building booms of Las Vegas and Phoenix? Developers used those same arguments and look what happened. Or the empty cities of China? Enough is enough.

There are empty buildings that need business tenants as well, Weyerhouser campus Federal Way or Russell building in Tacoma, develop there and let Seattle retain a minute amount of livability?

It is not inevitable that Seattle has to continue to develop, that is a specious argument.

STOP BUILDING - PRESERVE GREEN SPACE- STOP BUILDING - KEEP SEATTLE AFFORDABLE- THESE AMAZON STYLE JOBS CAN GO TO OTHER REGIONS THAT CAN STAND AND WANT DEVELOPMENT- STOP BUILDING IT IS OVERBUILT ALREADY STOP BUILDING STOP BUILDING STOP BUILDING STOP BUILDING

Date: 11/23/2015

Name: Michelle Eggert

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hello Team Seattle 2035,
Love the long range planning!
Totally for the Cherry Hill Urban Village! We own rentals there, and it is so well connected, perfect for an urban village!

Date: 11/23/2015

Name: Michelle Eggert

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Love the 2035 ideas!
Please review North Beacon Hill again.
It is close to TWO light rail stations - the Beacon Hill station and the planned Judkins Park station.
My property is at ___, a forgotten area between two urban villages. My tenants walk to the Beacon Hill station every day.
Please bring it into an urban village.
Thanks so much!
Michelle Eggert

Date: 11/23/2015

Name: Allison Davis

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Dear City Councilmembers:
I strongly oppose the proposed expansion of the Roosevelt Urban Village Boundary. Allowing pootentially very tall buildings to live next door to single family dwellings on our street -- 17th ave -- would destroy the community we've built over the last decade. It would also degrade the proppoerties we've carefully kept despite the fact that you allowed much of the citty blocks near our community to be trashed by a landlord that conducted illeegal activities for decades. This is a guhe breach of trust -- especially given that the boundaries were decided on through a careful neighborhood plan approved by the City and thousands of local citizens. I want to be able to tell my children that their city leaders care for them, and respect local citizens as much as they respect out of state developers who will profit from

teh change in boundaries. IF this change is adopted, i will not be able to make this calim.
Stand up for regualr people today, and maintatin the current boundaries. Seattle and the legacy you leave will be better for it.
thank you:
allison Davis

Date: 11/23/2015

Name: Scott Rockwell

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

This e-mail bounced back last week so i am resending. Hopefully it will still make it into the comments...

Dear Mayor, City Council and Planning Commissioners,
We are writing in regards to the proposed zoning changes in DPD's Seattle 2035 comprehensive plan. While we feel that increasing density within a 10 minute walking distance of major transportation hubs is a good approach, we are concerned about the lack of public process, insufficient analysis in certain Urban villages, and the omission of key regulatory tools.
1. In a random survey of 28 single family homes in a 4-block section of the Crown Hill neighborhood, NOT ONE SINGLE HOUSEHOLD knew of the proposed up-zone from single family residential to multi-family/commercial, nor of the public meeting that was held in Ballard to provide comments. Homeowners have the right to be notified of such changes and to have the opportunity to engage in a dialog with the city. These changes have the potential to greatly affect home value, neighborhood character and private investments.
2. At a minimum, homeowners should have been notified via a mailer letting them know that their properties are under consideration for these up-zone changes. We feel that the lack of information dissemination and loss of opportunity for a conversation are distressing.
3. The majority of homeowners in this area fully support walkability. However, DPD has not done it's due diligence in regards to the Crown Hill neighborhood: we have not seen an increase in transportation modes, in fact we have lost service. East-West walking routes are severely hampered by the fact that 90th has a constrained pinch point which prohibits sidewalks being installed. DPD's map shows a private cemetery as colored green, indicating a public park - which it is not. Secondarily, there are private homes due north of the cemetery. Unless DPD is considering a taking via imminent domain, there is insufficient room for sidewalks in that key stretch. It makes no sense at all to then propose changing density levels on the east side of the cemetery.
4. The majority of homeowners in this area fully embrace accessory dwelling units. This allows for increased density while preserving the neighborhood character. We feel that this approach should be included in DPD's 2035 Comprehensive plan strategies.
5. Of major importance and an area that is lacking and cause for much concern is solar rights. Since 2012 the City of Seattle has seen a 34% increase in solar energy, the majority of which is on single family residences in the form of solar panels. This increase in renewable energy is due to the public-private partnership of homeowners embracing the Federal, State and City's incentive programs funding solar energy. Any consideration of up-zoning needs to have a solar rights component. While consideration to change many of the Single Family zones to Multi-family/mixed use is a good strategy for increasing density, it would have a detrimental impact on homes such as ours, where an apartment complex could go up next door, effectively blocking out all our sun light and negating our $45k investment in solar energy (note, the $45K does not include interest accrued on the loan over the next 15 years).

There are approximately 2,200 solar premises served by City Light, this includes residential, commercial and industrial. The general rule of thumb for residential solar is that it costs $5 per watt with all of the credits and incentives factored in. With a guesstimated array size of 5 kW per solar premise, 5000 watts per property x 2,200 = 11,000,000 x $5 = $55,000,000 in public-private investments. These investments need to be protected if Seattle truly intends to be a progressive city. Per City Light's website, even a small obstruction in the surrounding landscape, e.g. a utility or flagpole, (let alone a 65 foot structure) can result in significant shade losses. As little as 10% shade on a module can reduce output by as much as 80%.
Seattle City Light webpage
http://www.seattle.gov/light/solarenergy/solarfaq.asp
We respectfully request that solar rights be a component of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan and that homeowners have an opportunity to actually weigh in on any zoning changes that impact their properties.
Sincerely,
Scott Rockwell

Date: 11/24/2015

Name: Curt Green

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Give some emphasis to protection of historic homes and buildings.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
Do not eliminate or reduce parking requirements. Off street parking required to reduce traffic (drivers looking for parking) and increase safety in single family zones
10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
In residential zones, reduce allowable height and lot coverage limits to align them with existing housing stock. Prohibit 35' structures with maximum lot coverage in neighborhoods of 1,200 sq ft, 1 story craftman homes.

Date: 11/24/2015

Name: Paula Myer

Draft Plan Element: Capital Facilities, Neighborhood Planning, Transportation

Comment:

8. Are there other guidelines we should consider to identify urban villages expansion areas or drawing expanded boundaries?
Require more parking in new multi-family building and houses. The experts at live wise said 30% of cars are looking for parking. Seattleites are going to always drive in dark, wet weather!
proportion funds for roads and bike paved an % of total users.
9. What other comments and ideas about the Draft Plan do you want to share with us?
The city should provide safe areas around all schools, not just Seattle Public Schools. Create a list of guidelines for motorists to identify the interpretation of all new lanes and markings for bicyclists and pedestrians,

10. What else should the City consider in planning for livable, walkable, transit-rich urban villages?
Create historic districts to maintain the character of long established neighborhoods (ie Alki) as is done in California. Create a data base of all historic homes over 100 years old to see what we have and where they are located.

Date: 11/24/2015

Name: University District Advocates & U District Square

Draft Plan Element: Land Use, Neighborhood Planning, Parks and Open Space

Comment:

Dear City Officials,
On behalf of the University District neighborhood and Seattle public spaces, University District Advocates and U District Square has put together the following comments of the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
First off, we would like to thank Seattle 2035 for considering parks and open spaces as a priority when looking at the future of Seattle. You stated in your introduction to the Parks and Open Space section that, "Seattle's parks and open spaces help make this city a great place to live, play, and raise families", and are necessary in guaranteeing that the future growth of Seattle is sustainable and livable. In the University District there is a need for centrally located parks and open spaces, included in the recently approved U District Parks & Open Spaces Plan. With the incoming Light Rail station to 43rd & Brooklyn and the potential for increased development in the neighborhood it is an opportune time, taking advantage of this limited opportunity, to bring a central plaza and public spaces to the University District.
Looking over the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan, we have drafted the following recommendations. We believe that the adoption of these suggestions would work to better support Seattle public spaces and the University District.
- Using a clearer definition of Urban Centers in comparison to other Urban Villages. Also explanations to how the implementation of the plan will affect the University District compared with other Urban Centers (Downtown, South Lake Union, Uptown, and Capitol Hill/First Hill).
The land use appendix shows that the University district is way behind other Urban Center areas when it comes to public space. We have only 8 acres, compared to 20 for downtown and 23 for First and Capitol Hill.
- Better explaining the difference in the document between parks and open spaces, to show the division between privately owned spaces (building plazas, institutions, etc) and public spaces (City Parks, intended for the general public, etc).
P1. 1 "Continue to expand the City's park holdings, with special emphasis on serving urban centers and urban villages and areas that have been traditionally under-served"
- Incorporating parks and open spaces into CW1.1, showing their use as facilitators for community building and forming connections.
"Promote opportunities for people to build connections with their peers, neighbors, and the greater community by supporting intergenerational and inter-cultural programs, activities and events."
-Changing the language of NP1.3 to be more cooperative to the needs and ideas of Seattle Neighborhoods. The city should adapt its plans in accordance with the neighborhood plans, like the recently updated U District Parks & Open Spaces Plan, to remain consistent with other components of the Seattle 2035 Plan's focus on neighborhood interests.
"Develop neighborhood plans to be consistent with this Plan's vision and allow neighborhood plans to focus on issues that are unique to their areas. II

-We support LU14.16, requiring a master plan whenever a Major Institution proposes development that could affect the livability of an adjacent neighborhood. We encourage the use of stronger language like this in regards to Major Institutions and developers. Using stronger language around developer incentives and requirements in the development of urban centers, like changing "may/might" to wording that enforced more certain policies, can help communities to keep these groups held to agreed standards.
"Require a master plan whenever a Major Institution proposes development that could affect the livability of adjacent neighborhoods or has the potential for significant adverse Impacts on the surrounding areas. II
Thank you for allowing University District Advocates and U District Square to comment on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan and being transparent during this drafting process. We support the City's commitment tb parks and open spaces, and we hope our recommendations can be used to strengthen the Comprehensive Plans' long term impact on Seattle.
Thank You,
University District Advocates & U District Square

Date: 11/24/2015

Name: Laurelhurst Community Club

Draft Plan Element: Land Use

Comment:

Re: Comments on Seattle 2035
November 20, 2015
The Laurelhurst Comunity Club (LCC) commends the efforts of the City of Seattle to plan for the accelerated growth in population anticipated over the next 20 years. Preparing for good solutions for housing, schools, commercial services, open and park greenspace, and the supporting transportation infrastructure will require active collaboration of citizens from all affected types of residents and governmental agencies to make it successful.
LCC has attended the Seattle 2035 Open House, and reviewed the proposals. The futw·e land use map (FLUM) has many proposed goals and also underlying changes that support the goals, yet many the actually undermine the stated goals.
In order to balance city growth, and retain what makes Seattle such a desirable place to live and work, some ofthe proposed changes are too damaging to the liveability and quality of life of the city and should be struck from the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
Laurelhurst Community Club agrees with many of the stated goals in the 2035 growth plan, yet many of the codes are then followed by loopholes which will undermine such goals.
LCC recommends the following changes and comments:
I. In section on "Uses", page 39, it states, "regulating land uses provides predictability about how an area will evolve over time, which is necessary to support neighborhood stability."
LCC agrees, and yet the "policies" state: LU2.1 "Generally allow for a broad mix of compatible uses in those zones that allow the greatest densities of development." This can leave a loophole, or catch all for exceptions. This sentence should be stricken.
2. Under "Special Uses: Public Facilities and Small Institutions" (pages 40-41): The "goal" is to allow public facilities and small institutions to locate where they are generally compatible with the function, character and scale of the area, even if some deviation from certain regulations is necessary"
• Under "policies", LCC applauds LU3.1, LU3.3, LU3.4, LU3.5, and LU3.6 in requiring these types of buildings to be well integrated into local communities.

• LCC objects to LU3.2 which gives wide latitude and a "free pass" that development can use to waive away compatibility requirements. We request that LU3.2 be stricken, or changed.
• In regard to LU3.7, the repurposing of surplus schools, LCC recommends the formation of a citizen's advisory committee be required as a formal process to allow any use change.
3. LCC agrees with the goals and policies on the Telecommunication Facilities, and applauds the firm stance to keep them out of residential areas. (LU4.5).
4. Land Use "General Development Standards" (Page 43): LCC supports the Seattle 2035's statement "The City uses development standards to ensure that new development is in keeping with the existing and planned character of a neighborhood, and that it accounts for physical and environmental constraints.,.
LCC also supports the stated goal: "Maintain development standards that guide building design to serve each zone's function and produce the scale and character desired." However, LU5.1 "Allow for flexibility in developmental standards" ... . provides for development that undermines the above worthy goals, and should be stricken from the Seattle 2035 comp plan. The other codes do support the overarching goal, such as LU5. 2, through LU 5.16, and are excellent inclusions in the land use code which maintain and enhance the quality of life in the city.
Proposed code LU5.17 (page 45) is not clear in its implementation, and leaves open loopholes too large for developers. The policy is too vague as written, and can allow a wide variation of underlying code or zoning to be wiped away for a non-specific incentive. LCC supports landmark preservation, and mitigating increased density, but this policy should be separate for both issues, and written with specitlc allowances.
Policy LU5.19 is definitely on target to help prevent some poor quality of development that Seattle has experienced in the past 15 years. The policy does not state the mechanics ofhow a design review process will be part of the land use process. LCC is very supportive of this policy, and would like to see it imbedded as a process more clearly in this policy.
5. Off Street Parking: The Laurelhurst Community Club supports the use of transit and other transportation modes, but also recognizes that transport for some businesses, outlying job locations, job mobility requirements, parents' trips for children to/from daycare or schools, runs for heavy groceries, access to non-transit served (or if you are actively ill) healthcare appointments, etc., also require that the City plan to accommodate the use of and some parking and use of personal vehicles. The goals ofLUG6 to reduce the reliance on automobiles are lofty, and LCC generally supports it.
• With respect to Seattle 2035, and the concurrent social justice goal of having Seattle grow to accommodate a wide range diversity of income levels, family types, etc., some of the policies to squeeze out parking actually will create an unfair burden on lower income families.
• Many small business owners and employees, the backbone of our City, rely on use of their personal vehicle to deliver services. For example, tools for builders, housecleaners, dog walkers. etc. need to be transported by vehicles and to various daily locations.
• Seattle 2035 need to provide for more growth in all transportation modes policies to be consistent with it's strive to provide housing and jobs for a diverse economy. More residents will bring in more vehicles, and we are short sighted not to plan for that as well as transit and bikes.
• Specifically, LU6.1 is not balanced for a very large and diverse city. Promoting economic development and also reducing parking may not work. In policy sections LU6.2, LU6.3, LU6.4, LU6.5, LU6.6, LU6.7, LU6.8, LU6.9., LCC requests that the policy be re-written to include both citizen and business community involvement for imposing changes on existing parking requirements. The impacts on the elderly. lower income families, and the local small businesses must be considered, such as in LU6.1 0, but with more specifics.
• The other policies LU6.1 0, LU6.11 coop spaces do not work well, and one business will benefit while the other loses customers who drive past seeing no parking.

• For businesses, especially restaurants, they operate when transit stops running. It is important that they have some parking available for potential customers of other Seattle neighborhoods. (e.g. it is nearly impossible to dine now on Capital Hill-no bus, and no parking)
• The policy LU6.13 the concept of retaining open space maximum is a good one. However, transit does not serve parks well, and has limited operating hours, especially on weekends, holidays and evening hours. Thus. this policy must be mindful that some sports fields for our youth are located in the parks, and parking for families is very important. We want to encourage citizens to use parks, not penalize people by not allocating adequate parking for all ages of walkers, families using the playgrounds, youth and adults using fields, dog walkers, and nature wanderers. Seniors will not use the parks if some parking is not available, and that is discriminatory, so Seattle2035 must maintain access to parklands for all.
• Policy LU6.15 Stand alone park n ride should be explored to multi use with other entities. Having some parking will encourage transit use, and the city should encourage businesses, or institutions nearby transit hubs to allocate some parking for this purpose. The city might grant a tax reduction (like developers of low income housimng) for providing this for transit users, parking is a bonus underground for the city as well.
• LCC opposes the deletion of goals LUG6, LUG6.1, and TG 17 and policies LU20, LU49, LU, LU50, T-39, T-40, and T-46 that currently direct that parking policies "account for local objectives,'' recognize parking as a part of"moving people and goods,'' consider ·'access to local businesses;· "parking spillover into residential areas," and '·truck access and loading," and not '·introduce serious safety problems or blighting influences" but rather "achieve vitality of urban centers and urban villages'' and "preserve Seattle's competitive position in the region." While deleting those goals and policies, the Comp Plan "update" would introduce two new policies: LU63 to '·rely on market forces'' for onsite parking and T40 to give higher priority to ·'greening'' over .. storage" (the City's new negative term for parking) in the allocation of street space. LCC asks that you restore the deletions.
6. Incentives: The goal ofLUG7 ret1ects the emphasis on providing new housing at the expense of impacts on existing urban neighborhoods. Many urban villages and centers have already achieved targeted growth. In adding to that density unless the measures such as providing open space or "other community resources" is spelled out, it will not happen. For proposed LU7.2 .. LCC would ask that the cornp plan add specific language to ensure that open space component is actually built out with each project, and that cumulative effects be allocated to each development, so they all do not go "under the radar" to provide such amenity.
7. Land Use Areas: The definitions include "single family areas in different parts of the city developed at different times with distinct character that may be defined by a particular architectural style or a unique relationship to their surroundings" In the goals (page50) for detached single family, it adds "Provide single family and other compatible housing options" ... This language should be struck as this wording automatically undermines the "single family" character. Single family residential is just that, not any given "mix" of types of housing. Seattle is well known across the country for those neighborhoods where residents of any economic or social background can actually live in a single family horne, and not share walls, with the savings that have accumulated. Restore land use codes LU59 and LU60 which define and protect single family zoning. At the Open House in the Rainier Valley on November 7, 2015, several local residents expressed opposition to the changes of their single family zones. Their homes were something that they aspired to with financial and sweat equity. Further, the point was made that sf homes often house adults, young adults in transition (broke from being students), seniors who cannot live alone, and/or perhaps another family friend or student renter. Thus, in fact within the single family structure, one single family structure provides housing for three households. Retaining the set backs, yards and character of such sf zones make it workable with extra breathing room for those residents, and perhaps an attic room, and kitchen garden, and a place for their children to exercise in their yard.

8. The same reasoning follows that the City must restore LU 1. LU5, LU 76 and LU 164 that direct any conditional use changes, reflecting community preference, and require any change to be consistent with neighborhood plans. Use changes to properties adjacent sf zones will only be in character and successful with a collaborative neighborhood public process, and not "back door" deals with developers who have no stake in its outcome, except profitability, and such changes cannot be reversed.
LU.8.1 Designate as single family residential areas those portions of the city that are predominantly developed with single family houses that are large enough to maintain a consistent residential character of low height, bulk and scale over several blocks." However, LU8.2 includes the working "respond to neighborhood plans for redevelopment or infill. But allows for a greater range ofhousing types".
4
Laurelhurst Community Club requests that this be deleted, as it essentially is a free pass key for developers to add non- single family residents or undersized lot development which is opposite of LU8.1 designed to establish the single family residential zone. LU8.4 Recognizes the single family zone as the principal use, and LCC agrees with that statement, but opposes policies such as LU8.5, LU8.9 and LU8. 11 which undermine that type of land use zone.
Policy LU8.9 is especially disturbing as it allows below standard Jot sizes to be inserted into existing single family neighborhoods based on outdated historic lots that are no longer used. Developers troll these records to find a way to wedge in a "tall skinny house", opposed by all Seattle neighborhoods, which actually destroy the intent ofLU8.1. Thus, LU8.9 cannot be included in the comprehensive plan as it does not support the stated land use goal. LU8.11 Permitting of non conforming developments by City Council or "conditional use" approval gives another loophole that can destroy the intent of the land use code stated in LU8.4. This policy should be eliminated from the proposed plan. LU8.5 Allowing developments of any residential structure should be struck as well. It can destroy well planned set back requirements and protections for open and green spaces that necessarily make the single family zones livable.
9. In order to retain some liveability with relationship of the built environment to the relief of open space, view corridors and fresh air, LCC requests that LU81 be retained to maintain that balance, and enforces the respectful adjacencies of building heights. Without this regulation, a domino effect occurs, and creates an unfair burden on the code compliant height dwellings to continue to "top off'', when most cannot afford to do so. 10. Seattle's tree canopy preservation and enhancement seems to be abandoned in the 2035 goals for the City. The Urban Forest Management Plan's 5 year Implemention Strategy parallels Seattle 2035 growth plan, and targets a comprehensive strategy for increasing the urban canopy to 30% coverage in 30 years. Seattle's trees provide environmental and social benefits and enhance the liveability of the city. Trees and plants absorb global warming pollution, provide habitat for wildlife, clean the air and waters, lessen impacts of storms by absorbing rainwater, calm traffic and improve the walkability of our neighborhoods. The priorities stated include the following in regard to the critical tree canopy on private property, which now holds the majority of the City's trees. Page 12 of the report states:
"The urban forest occurs primarily on private property and therefore is sutainable when
the community values trees and is engaged in planning, preserving planting and caring for them"
Priorities include:
"Improve regulations to encourage tree preservation and protection on private property,
and on the right of way.
"Provide additional incentives for tree planting focusing on single family residential
zones especially in neighborhoods with lower tree canopy cover."
5
The Laurelhurst Community Club asks that the 2035 Comprehensive Plan look to add back the zoning and tree policies which will strengthen the Urban Canopy as the city grows into 2035 with concurrent

health and liveablity.
11. Urban boundaries: LCC opposes expanding the existing boundaries of the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village. We believe that the current boundaries are most appropriate as the neighborhoods in the area grow and continue to absorb increased density.
12. Multi family Residential: The policies and goals appear to be compatible and LCC agrees with those provisions.
13. Commercial/Mixed Use: LCC generally agrees with most ofthese goals and policies.
14. Industrial Areas: LCC supports the goal, and especially LU11.11 which proposes landscaping and installing street trees for screening to offset visual impacts. LCC also supports height restrictions of LU11.20 for a reasonable transition to neighboring zones.
15. Downtown areas: LCC supports the goals and plan to establish a Master Plan Community. Retaining open space and view corridors should be considered in the Master Plan.
16. Major Institutions: The stated goal "Encourage the benefits that major institutions offer the city ... , while minimizing the adverse impacts associated with development and geographic expansion". -The policy LU14.3 which establishes using onJy the institution's master plan instead of underlying zoning is a one-sided policy, and LCC requests that this be stricken, and zoning should be also shown. Using both overlays demonstrates the impacts on neighboring areas to be shown accurately.
• LU1 4.14 LCC suggests that community involvement to be "required" and not "encouraged" as it currently states. If "encouraged" only, the major institution will not do it.
• LU14.6 undermines the goal of compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods and should be stricken. "Allow the MIO to modify underlying zoning provisions and development standards are a gift to any major institution, and allow them to basically do whatever they want.
• LCC strongly requests that LU14.6 be eliminated from the Comprehensive 2035 Plan.
• LU 14.15 This policy should be stronger, perhaps stating that demolition of existing housing will not be allowed. The affordable housing stock is so limited, and major institutions have no right to demolish it. Major Institutions can always find another way to expand.
• LU14.16 This is the real requirement for community involvement so LU15.14 should be stricken (see above note).
17. Stadium District: LCC generally concurs with the goal and policies.
18. Unwarranted deletions that protect sustainability and livability are either weakened or entirely deleted. Please restore the proposed deletions below:
• Deletes policy LUll: "In order to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and 6
displacement of residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of the Plan.''
• Deletes policy LU34: "Limit the maximum amount oflot area covered by a structure to maintain compatibility with the scale and character of an area, to provide an adequate proportion of open area on a site relative to the area occupied by structures, and to provide occupants with sufficient access to light and air, as appropriate to the intended character and use of an area.,.
• Deletes policy LU39 to "preserve and enhance the City's physical and aesthetic character and environment by preventing untimely and indiscriminate removal or destruction of trees" and to provide incentives to property owners for tree retention; and deletes policy UV39 to enhance the tree canopy and understory in urban villages.
• Deletes policy LU81: "Limit building heights to establish maximum heights, maintain scale relationships with adjacent buildings, and limit view blockage.''
• Deletes policies LUI, LU5, LU76, LU 164 that currently direct that zoning, rezoning, and conditional use changes reflect community preferences, and be consistent with neighborhood plans.
18: Environmentally Critical Areas: LCC agrees with the goal to protect the environment, especially

wetlands and public health. The policies are excellent, but LCC notes that LUI 7.3 to "Allow adjustments of development standards ... " is not consistent with the goal, allows a "back door" for potentially harmful impacts on these environmentally fragile areas and should be stricken.
Thank you for your attention in integrating the comments of the Laurel hurst Community Club, and we offer to work with you in any of our proposed changes to the 2035 comprehensive plan.
Sincerely,
Colleen McAleer
Vice President and Land Use Committee
cc: City Councilmembers; Diane Sugimura
Jeannie Hale
President

Date: 11/24/2015

Name: Patrick Derks

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

We have reviewed the proposed expansion to the Greenlake/Roosevelt urban village (http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cs/groups/pan/@pan/documents/web_informational/p2351099.pdf) and we find it odd that the boundary would be expanded south-east predominantly. The dotted line indicating a goal to expand it into areas that are within a 10 minute walking distance of the new link light rail station seems at odds with the actual area the dotted line encompasses. If a 10 minute walking distance is the criteria then a circular area emanating from the station would seem more fitting rather than an arbitrary boundary that encompasses some areas that are within 10 minutes' walk but not others. It is particularly odd that 15th Ave NE is used as a border at the northern edge of the urban village but not the south.

Ideally we believe if the urban village is going to be defined by transit than the I-5 should play a part as well as the commercial and cultural heart of the community. Perhaps a more appropriate plan would be to have the 10 min radius emanate from a position in between the I-5 and light rail station, the actual heart of the Roosevelt urban village which in all reality is the intersection of NE 65th street and Roosevelt Way NE.

Regards,

Patrick Derks & Kelly Tansing

Date: 11/24/2015

Name: Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board,Kristi Rennebohm Franz

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

Dear Kevin,
On behalf of the Bicycle Advisory Board, thank you for all the work you and your colleagues have done on the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update. we especially appreciate your presentation at our SBAB meeting and the follow-up workshop.

Here is our SBAB Advisory Letter on the Comprehensive Plan.
Please let us know if you have any questions about our comments.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We look forward to continuing to collaborate on the Seattle Comprehensive Plan as it moves forward.
Sincerely,
Kristi Rennebohm Franz, Chair
Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board
--
Kristi Rennebohm Franz, Chair
Adam Bartz, Vice-Chair
Merlin Rainwater, Vice-Chair
Don Brubeck, Secretary
Jeff Aken
Jed Bradley
Leah Curtiss
Steve Kennedy
Riley Kimball
Lara Normand
Phyllis Porter
Michael Wong
November 20, 2015
To: Kevin O'Neill, SDOT
Copies: Nicole Freedman, SDOT
Subject: Comments on Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update
The Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board has collaboratively and thoughtfully reviewed the Seattle 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update and is following advisory comments.
The Comprehensive Plan obligates the City to provide infrastructure to accommodate growth targets. The Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board supports Comprehensive Plan elements that encourage the use of bicycle transportation. Improving our transportation network for safe use of bicycles for daily transportation is a cost effective way to accommodate growth, and has many other benefits for public health, community wellbeing, and environmental quality.
If developed with care and with true involvement of the affected communities, bicycle transportation infrastructure improvements may also help fulfill Seattle's goals of equity and racial and social justice.
The Comprehensive Plan is important because it provides the foundation and overall framework for a variety of City plans and policies including the Bicycle Master Plan and the Climate Action Plan.
STRATEGIES
We have these specific comments on the overall Strategies:
1. Growth Strategy
The growth strategy is to "Guide more growth to areas within a 10-minute walk of frequent transit." We suggest that this be expanded to include a 10 minute bicycle ride to frequent transit with bike parking and roll-on coaches.
2. Land Use
The land use provisions would "Designate a Stadium District on the Future Land Use Map, an area around the professional stadiums, where housing and hotels would be permitted while protecting freight mobility."
We suggest expanding this to include planning for transit, bike and walking access to and through the

stadium district to protect freight mobility and to provide alternatives to private vehicle access.
3. Transportation
We strongly support the strategy to "Move towards transportation service standards that consider all travel modes, including pedestrians, bicycles, cars, trucks, and transit."
4. Parks and Open Space
The plan would "Set goals for parks and open space that focus on quality, equity, and proximity to jobs and residences."
Kristi Rennebohm Franz, Chair
Adam Bartz, Vice-Chair
Merlin Rainwater, Vice-Chair
Don Brubeck, Secretary
Jeff Aken
Jed Bradley
Leah Curtiss
Steve Kennedy
Riley Kimball
Lara Normand
Phyllis Porter
Michael Wong
To achieve these goals, we encourage inclusion of policies that would promote park access by bicycle, and use of parks to provide safe walking and cycling connections as part of neighborhood routes accessible for all ages and abilities. This would particularly improve equity and quality of life for those too young to drive to parks.
CORE VALUES
We have these comments on the Four Core Values included in plan:
1. Race and Social Equity
The plan strives to address displacement and the unequal distribution of opportunities, to sustain a diverse Seattle. The Draft Plan promotes equitable access to housing, jobs, education, parks, community centers, and healthy food. Affordable housing and affordable transportation are interconnected and to be considered together. For transportation planning including bicycle facilities we suggest inclusion of these strategies:
• Engage the whole community in outreach and planning.
• Use alternatives beyond standard public meetings and mainstream online social media to connect to all residents and ensure inclusion of non-English speaking communities.
• Take special care that transportation infrastructure improvements are not just avenues of gentrification, improving districts to the point that low-income people are pushed out by wealthier people attracted by the newly improved conditions.
2. Environmental Stewardship
Seattle protects rural areas, forests, and green spaces in the city by taking on a significant share of the region's growth and concentrating that growth in urban villages. The City is committed to become carbon neutral by 2050. The Draft Plan calls for development that significantly increase bike, walk and transit mode share percents. By making these modes more viable options, people can be less car-reliant. We support this goal. More than 40% of Seattle's carbon emissions are from surface transportation. Seattle cannot meet its Climate Action Plan goal to be carbon neutral by 2050, and protect its air and water quality from pollution, without making biking, walking, and transit viable options that are actually used for the majority of all trips.
3. Economic Opportunity and Security
Jobs and livable wages create opportunity and stability in Seattle's communities. The Draft Plan includes

policies that help the City accommodate and direct employment growth. It also addresses the education and skills residents need to fill the new jobs in Seattle.
Providing safe, efficient, connected transit, bicycle and walking routes, with bike share and car share options, will help alleviate the high cost of new housing, and rental rate increases for existing housing, by making it feasible to live without the expense of owning a car. The growth in Seattle population is primarily in young adults, the age group most like to walk, ride or use transit.
Kristi Rennebohm Franz, Chair
Adam Bartz, Vice-Chair
Merlin Rainwater, Vice-Chair
Don Brubeck, Secretary
Jeff Aken
Jed Bradley
Leah Curtiss
Steve Kennedy
Riley Kimball
Lara Normand
Phyllis Porter
Michael Wong
Bicycle infrastructure is cost effective, keeping the tax burden down. It has far lower cost per mile and cost per trip than light rail, streetcar, or new vehicle lane construction. This adds to financial security for people with fixed or low income.
4. Community
As Seattle grows and becomes more diverse, the Draft Plan encourages more public participation in decisions affecting all aspects of City policies. We reiterate the comments we have made above for Race and Social Equity. Geographic equity is also applicable.
Investments that promote walking and bike riding as viable options to driving a car are investments in public health and community life. They improve public health by reducing air pollution and noise, and reducing injuries and deaths caused by vehicle crashes. They improve the quality of community life on the streets and in neighborhood and downtown commercial districts.
TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
“Transportation systems will respond to travel demands, economic needs, development patterns, and changing lifestyles. Seattle will continue to work with regional transportation agencies to move people within the city and the region.“
We support these Goals/Policies Relating to Bicycles:
• T1.6 Improve connections to urban centers and villages from all Seattle neighborhoods, particularly by providing a variety of affordable travel options (bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities)
• T2.1 Designate space in the public right-of-way to accommodate multiple travel modes.
• T3.1 Develop and maintain high-quality, affordable and connected bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities.
• T3.9 Develop and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities that enhance the predictability and safety of all users.
• T3.10 Prioritize bicycle and pedestrian investments on the basis of increasing use, safety, connectivity, equity, health, livability, and opportunities to leverage funding.
• TG6 Provide and maintain a safe transportation system that protects all travelers, particularly the most vulnerable users.
Kristi Rennebohm Franz, Chair
Adam Bartz, Vice-Chair
Merlin Rainwater, Vice-Chair

Don Brubeck, Secretary
Jeff Aken
Jed Bradley
Leah Curtiss
Steve Kennedy
Riley Kimball
Lara Normand
Phyllis Porter
Michael Wong
• T6.3 Invest in education measures that increase mutual awareness among motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
We support the new draft consideration of right-of-way allocation and function, with the idea of multi-functional streets, making the best use of the streets we have. Allocate space on Seattle's streets to safely and efficiently connect people and good to their destinations while creating inviting spaces within the ROW (Goal TG2)
We affirm the first three considerations listed for "integration of the top priorities":
1. Improve safety
2. Address sidewalk width before allocating space to other ROW zones
3. Preserve the transition zone for non-mobility purposes where possible
We have concerns regarding the last two considerations listed:
4. Prioritize shared and shorter duration uses.
Concern:Often, bicycle routes are best as separated routes, not shared.
5. Relocate the most flexible uses to other streets or private property
Concern: Some may consider bicycle use is to be the most flexible use. The easiest to shunt off to less direct or steeper routes instead of more desirable and useful routes. This consideration should be phrased in such a way that people on bikes, on foot, or using wheelchairs or mobility scooters are not considered the "most flexible" uses or users in most circumstances.
LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)
Level of Service is a quantitative or qualitative measure of the performance of transportation systems and facilities. Traditionally, LOS has focused on vehicle congestion (traffic volumes/ road capacity). The Growth Management Act requires LOS standards for all locally-owned arterials and transit routes. Puget Sound Regional Council is seeking LOS standards that focus on all modes of transportation.
We support a new approach to LOS that is multi-modal, not just car or vehicle-based as has been the case in the past. The emphasis should be on moving people, not simply moving cars or vehicles. This would align with MOVE Seattle and other citywide plan goals. Such an approach should encourage greater use of alternative modes including bikes, walking, and transit (bus and light rail).
Kristi Rennebohm Franz, Chair
Adam Bartz, Vice-Chair
Merlin Rainwater, Vice-Chair
Don Brubeck, Secretary
Jeff Aken
Jed Bradley
Leah Curtiss
Steve Kennedy
Riley Kimball
Lara Normand
Phyllis Porter
Michael Wong

We understand the City is currently considering mode share targets for sectors of the City. We would support forward-thinking, "aspirational" LOS mode share targets that reflect increased use of bikes and transit. This would be consistent with the planned build-out of light rail in Seattle and nearby cities, and an increasing mode share for bicycles as new infrastructure and facilities such as protected bike lanes and greenways are implemented, as defined in the new Seattle Bicycle Master Plan adopted in 2015. Such a new and innovative approach to LOS should be designed so as to not restrict development but rather result in smart growth that is consistent with other City policies and strategies, including those in the Comprehensive Plan.
Sincerely,
SBAB Leadership Team:
Kristi Rennebohm-Franz Adam Bartz
Chair Vice Chair
Merlin Rainwater Don Brubeck
Vice Chair Secretary
SBAB Members:
Jeff Aken Leah Curtiss
Jed Bradley Steve Kennedy
Riley Kimball Lara Normand
Phyllis Porter Michael Wong

Date: 11/27/2015

Name: Mindi Bohrer

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Re: Green Lake/Roosevelt Urban Village proposed expansion
I opposed the Green Lake/Roosevelt Urban Village proposed expansion to the east. It is clearly single family homes and it should stay that way. Many of us have purchased our homes many years ago before the light rail station was even a thought. We have a strong sense of community in our neighborhoods which I think should be respected. We are being asked to accept a tremendous amount of growth, but please don't take away our neighborhood. I am also concerned that there is no plan for parking for all the new residential units. I could be wrong, but I would think that young people moving in will be happy to take mass transit to their work, but will likely have a vehicle for their leisure activities with this beautiful environment that we live in.
Thank you for listening.
Mindi Bohrer

Date: 11/28/2015

Name: Kendahl Cruver

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hi Tom,
The teardowns/enormous rebuilds in this article are the kind of thing that keep me up at night:
http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/data/teardown-town-1500-small-houses-replaced-by-giants-since-2012/

I'm feeling increasingly despondent about my family's future in Seattle. I've lived here all my life, and I had planned to stay, but I can't see how this 2035 plan is going to serve the sort of middle class family that I grew up in, and that I have now.

I have already witnessed three enormous houses being built to replace smaller dwellings on my block since we bought our home in 2007. I can see where this is headed. My husband and I have worked so hard to get to where we are today, in a small, but comfortable home, where our two daughters have plenty of room to play and grow. This is all the space we want, and it is more than enough.

If our neighborhood is taken over by these mega structures, it will inevitably push us out. Who wants to live in a shadow? And yet, we will have nowhere to go in Seattle if we move. We can't afford one of those huge houses, or really anything in the city now, and we don't want to live in a large home either.

I attended the 2035 meeting in Crown Hill and saw a pie chart that allowed housing for developers, and which made allowances for lower income housing. There was no consideration for the middle class. Nothing to preserve a decent standard of living for the people who are the heart of this city.

If Seattle doesn't protect those of us who are college educated, hardworking, but not interested in a lavish lifestyle, it will become a city of the wealthy and those who serve them. It will lose all the character that made it a great place to live in the first place.

I can accept a certain amount of change, quite a lot in fact. I've seen lots of development that accommodates density without destroying neighborhoods, such as the project on Holman Road, across the street from Crown Hill Park, which takes an ugly spot and makes it useful to many. I don't love the new luxury building looming at the end of my street; guests of these new owners will likely make our already difficult parking situation more challenging, but again, it is replacing an ugly, abandoned warehouse; it's the kind of compromise I can live with.

It is these towering houses stretching the property limits in my neighborhood that feel like an assault. From what I heard at the meeting I attended, I have every right to feel that way. When I asked about this issue, I was met with blank stares, leading to vague answers that seemed to indicate that what I feared was true. What is being done for the middle class? What is the plan? Our family loves this city, we work hard and we want to be able to afford to stay here. I can't believe that true progress would mean edging out those in our income range.

Regards,
Kendahl Cruver

Date: 12/02/2015

Name: Ann Krumboltz

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

To Whom it may Concern,
We write about Ravenna Park and its community as showed by a dashed line on the 2035 draft comprehensive plan.

Steve Forman and I live in this neighborhood and are very progressive citizens. We believe in affordable housing. We believe in good transit. We support higher taxes for well-functioning cities. But we also believe in sound judgement around keeping the historical nature of neighborhoods. We have lived in other cities, such as Washington, DC and San Francisco. Both of these cities, by illustration, have made egregious mistakes in zoning and housing, so we hope Seattle is not destined to do the same.
We looked carefully at the dashed line and at the goals of the city. It seems like this expansion is unwise and capricious plan based on a computer algorithm that does not take into account whether the

Ravenna neighborhood has already met its density goals (which, as we understand it, we have). Anyway, if there is disagreement on density here, let's at least do what works, such as allowing mother-in-law apartments or garage conversions. This area is one of the special old places with character that people come to see, walk and bike around. They come because it is preserved, and not yet mired with buildings that are not in keeping with its historic nature.
In sum, we ask that you let wise minds prevail and remove the dashed lines from the draft plan. Please contact us, if there is more input you need from us.
Sincerely,
Ann Krumboltz and Steve Forman

Date: 12/02/2015

Name: Maria Langlais

Draft Plan Element: Housing

Comment:

Hi David,
We've met before at Delridge food system related meetings, and I was at Monday's OPCD meeting. As there were dozens of faces around that table, allow me to reintroduce myself.
I'm with Aging & Disability Services (ADS), which is a division within HSD. We also are the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) for King County and have a 27 member Advisory Board of volunteers who are out and about in the community advocating on behalf of older adults.
I was thrilled to find out (see the email below) that one of our Advisory Council members attended a comp plan open house. She mentioned that she had a conversation with you about senior housing needs and offered to connect you to ADS staff for more info. Here I am, so please let me know if there are any questions I can answer for you about the needs of older adults.
Here are links to a few related documents which may be of interest:
· 2016-19 ADS Area Plan
· Area Plan Summary
· A Quiet Crisis, 2009 Senior Housing Study
I'm cc'ing Katie as I ran into her this morning and we had a somewhat related conversation regarding WHO/AARP's Age Friendly Cities / Livable Communities initiatives. ADS is in the early discussion stages with several community partners about initiating an effort in this region. Many potential connections with the comp plan, and with OPCD's new role and the communities that were highlighted at Monday's meeting.
More to come on all this. In the meantime … thank you for being so receptive to our Advisory Council member's comments, and please let us know if we can clarify or provide more information on anything.
Thanks,
Maria
Maria Langlais
Aging & Disability Services
Seattle King County Area Agency on Aging
Seattle Human Services Department
www.agingkingcounty.org

From: Kathleen Wilcox
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 3:26 PM
To: Meinig, Gigi

Cc: Subject: City of Seattle 2035 Housing Planner Contact Information
Hi Gigi,
I am so sorry to be late providing the contact information for the person I met at the Seattle 2035 Open House. His name is David Goldberg. I hope this is helpful. He seemed genuinely interested in including folks with input regarding the long-term needs of the elderly.
I hope you and the family have a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday, and I look forward to being in touch in December.

Kathy Wilcox

Date: 12/03/2015

Name: Mark Olsoe

Draft Plan Element: Growth Strategy

Comment:

Hello Seattle City Planners,

The Urban Village is an Urban Myth. Why do I say that? Because urban villages do not have enough amenities and adequate public transportation to inspire their residents to live without cars. The result is that growth of 'Urban Villages' creates more and more cars flooding our already gridlocked road system. Seattle's growth should be in the city center where amenities and adequate public transportation does inspire residents to live without cars.

The 'Urban Village' experiment has been an unmitigated disaster, wiping out our friendly, service oriented neighborhood centers and creating horrible gridlock. In my West Seattle neighborhood we have lost our fabric store, our only two auto parts stores, our only service station (Barnecuts) and one of our best neighborhood bars (The Alki Tavern). In exchange we've gotten gridlock traffic. And this is only the start of this process for us. The Husky Deli and other friendly, service oriented small businesses in the Admiral Junction are going to be replaced by faceless big box retailers. Seattle's growth should be in the city core only.

Very concerned 'Urban Village' resident, Mark Olsoe

PS Please rescind my vote for growth within 10 miles of a bus stop. After thinking about it and experiencing all the above disasters I have definitely changed my mind.

Date: 12/04/2015

Name: Cascade Bicycle Club,Cascade Bicycle Club,Andrea Clinkscales

Draft Plan Element: Transportation

Comment:

See attached Comment Letter.
Thank you,

_____
Andrea Clinkscales, AICP, PMP Principal Planner
November 15,

2015 City of Seattle Department of Planning & Development Attn:
Seattle 2035
Re:
Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan,
Transportation Element Comments We greatly appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan,
Transportation Element.
The Cascade Bicycle Club (Cascade) is a regional nonprofit with nearly 16,000 members.
Our mission is to improve lives through bicycling.
We support growth distribution that makes it easier to experience Seattle by foot, bike, or transit.
Making bicycling safe, comfortable, and convenient will advance Seattle toward its goal of creating an interconnected, vibrant, and affordable city.
INTEGRATING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION Cascade supports TG1,
as land use is the most powerful influence on the City's transportation system.
We have recently seen a great deal of excellent projects and now we must focus on better bike and transit connections to urban centers and urban villages.
We cannot reduce auto dependency until we provide safe, reliable, and affordable alternatives.
Recommendation:
o T1.2 Design transportation infrastructure in urban center and villages to support compact, accessible, and walkable neighborhoods for all ages and abilities.
• Add bikeable.
o T1.3 Invest in transportation projects and programs to further progress towards meeting Seattle's mode share goals and reduce dependence on personal automobiles, particularly in urban centers.
• Include a table outlining specific and individual mode share goals, such as those for transit,
drive alone, rideshare, walk, and bike. MAKE THE BEST USE OF THE STREETS WE HAVE We support TG2 to allocate space on Seattle's streets to safely and efficiently connect people and goods while creating inviting streetscapes.
We specifically support T2.1 in designating space in the public right---of---way to accommodate multiple travel modes, including bicycling.
Cascade Bicycle Club Re: Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan,
Transportation Element Comments Page 2
Cascade would like the City to ensure that The Plan is consistent with other recent Seattle planning efforts.
The Bicycle Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, and Climate Action Plan have engaged residents on issues of growth, development, and transportation.
Much good work has been completed. But The Plan must be bold and make space for the actualization of the goals adopted in these earlier plans. For example, the Climate Action Plan establishes a 25% drive alone rate by 2035. This does not match, and is 10% more aggressive than, the 65% non---drive alone (or the 35% drive alone) work trips mode share target as indicated in Transportation Figure 1.
Recommendation:
o Include a policy stipulating that modal and other related plans have consistent quantitative goals.
TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS Cascade advocates for increasing safe, affordable, and healthy travel choices that are accessible for people of all ages and abilities.
Correspondingly, the City must expand access to safe infrastructure for bicycling as promised in the Bicycle Master Plan.
We are especially supportive of the following policies:
o T3.1 Develop and maintain high---quality, affordable and connected bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities.

o T3.8 Provide high---quality pedestrian, bicycle, and bus transit access to high---capacity transit stations, in order to support transit ridership and reduce single---occupant vehicle trips.
o T3.9 Develop and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities that enhance the predictability and safety of all users of the street and that connect to a wide range of destinations.
o T3.10 Prioritize bicycle and pedestrian investments on the basis of increasing use, safety, connectivity, equity, health, livability, and opportunities to leverage funding.
o T3.11 Develop programs and facilities, such as bike share, that encourage short trips to be made by walking or biking.
o T3.15 Create vibrant public spaces in and near the right---of---way that foster social interaction, promote access to walking, bicycling and transit options, and enhance the public realm.
Recommendation:
o Create a map that integrates modal plans for better analysis of how modal plans interact.
ENVIRONMENT As in TG4,we support promoting healthy communities by providing a transportation system that protects and improves Seattle's environmental quality.
But in order to meet the following policies, the City should identify mode split targets in The Plan:
o T4.1 Design and operate streets to promote green infrastructure, new technologies, and active transportation modes while addressing safety, accessibility and aesthetics.
o T4.2 Reduce single---occupant vehicle trips, vehicle dependence,
and vehicle miles traveled in order to help meet the City's greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.
Recommendation:
o Identify mode split targets in these policy statements.
Cascade Bicycle Club Re:
Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan,
Transportation Element Comments Page 3
SUPPORTS A VIBRANT ECONOMY Cascade has recently collaborated with the freight community with regard to safely sharing the road with bikes. We support T5.4 to improve safety for all modes of transportation on streets heavily used by trucks.
Recommendation:
o T5.10 Build great streetscapes and activate public spaces in the right---of---way to promote economic vitality.
• Bike infrastructure has been proven to increase sales for proximate businesses. Add promote bicycle access.
SAFETY We support TG6 to invest in safety for our most vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and bicyclists. Because collisions involving pedestrians and bicyclists are a relatively small percentage of overall collisions in the city, but represent a much higher percentage of the serious injuries and fatalities, we would like to see Vision Zero more clearly called out in this section.
Seattle has proposed to eliminate serious injuries and fatalities by 2035. Cascade would like confirmation that the growth strategy will accomplish Vision Zero.
Recommendation:
o T6.1 Reduce collisions for all modes of transportation and work toward a transportation system that produces zero fatalities and serious injuries.
• Add Vision Zero.
o T6.6 Consider lowering speed limits on residential streets and arterials as a way to reduce collision rates.
• Strike consider.
CONNECTING THE REGION The City's investment in transportation is especially worthwhile once disparate projects are seamlessly connected.
The City should also ensure that it is safe and comfortable to bike within a 3---mile bikeshed in and

around the urban centers and urban villages.
Recommendation:
o T7.6 Support expansion of regional light rail and bus service to encourage more trips to and through Seattle on transit.
• Add improve bicycle and pedestrian access o Add T7.9:
Support expansion of regional multi---use trail system to encourage more bicycle and pedestrian trips to and through Seattle.
MEASURING LEVEL OF SERVICE This section states that the City is currently considering alternative methods of level of service (LOS) standards that consider all travel modes.
Cascade suggests employing multimodal LOS to ensure that urban villages can
Cascade Bicycle Club Re:
Draft Seattle Comprehensive Plan,
Transportation Element Comments Page 4
enjoy multiple mobility options.
Seattle must be resolute and look beyond auto---centric LOS standards.
We applaud the City for exploring growth scenarios around present and future Link light rail stations.
But access to transit alone does not make a community successful.
Station links to the first and last mile of trips are critical.
Recommendation:
o T9.3 Consider establishing level---of---service standards that include non---motorized modes in order to advance this Plan's goals of encouraging use of travel options,
reduce dependence on drive---alone automobile use and accommodate growth in urban centers and urban villages.
• Strike consider and specify multimodal LOS.
FUNDING Cascade strongly supported the City in passing the Move Seattle Levy.
Even so, many projects listed in the measure are also dependent on grant matches and other outside funds. But we cannot solely rely on property tax and automobile---related taxes, such as the commercial parking tax and vehicle license fee to fund transportation. Concerning the latter two, this practice is particularly risky if we continue to discourage car--- dependency as stated throughout The Plan.
Similarly risky, especially in the event of recession or even a milder economic downturn, is reliance on sales tax. Accordingly, diverse funding sources will lead to better planning, design, and construction of transportation capital projects.
We applaud the City for the following policies:
o T10.2 Work with regional and state partners to encourage a shift to more reliance on user---based taxes and fees,
and to revenues related to impacts on the transportation system,
the environment.
o T10.7 Consider the use of transportation impact fees to help fund transportation system improvements needed to serve growth as envisioned in this Plan.
Overall, we support the great goals and policies outlined in the Transportation Element.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on how active transportation can safely,reliably, and affordably move Seattle residents and visitors over the next twenty years.
Sincerely,
Andrea Clinkscales,
AICP,
PMP Principal Planner Cascade Bicycle Club cc:
2035@seattle.gov

Date: 12/15/2015

Name: Seattle Planning Commission

Draft Plan Element:

Comment:

City of Seattle Seattle Planning Commission Seattle Planning Commission, Commissioners Amalia Leighton, Chair Marj Press, Vice-Chair Michael Austin Luis Borrero Lauren Craig Sandra Fried Yolanda Ho Grace Kim Kara Martin Jake McKinstry Tim Parham David Shelton Lauren Squires Spencer Williams Patti Wilma Staff Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director Diana Canzoneri, Demographer & Senior Policy Analyst Robin Magonegil, Administrative Staff November 18 2015 Honorable Mayor Edward B. Murray Mayor of Seattle City Hall via email RE: Seattle 2035 public draft – the major update of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan Dear Mayor Murray,

As stewards of our City's Comprehensive Plan, the Seattle Planning Commission has closely reviewed the public draft of the Major Update to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan – Seattle 2035. The Commission would like to recognize the high quality work of the Department of Planning and Development (DPD). Per guidance provided by you and City Council in resolution 31577, race and social equity has been elevated as a core value in the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, the equity analysis conducted by DPD is an exceptional and important step that will help inform goals, policies and strategies to help Seattle become a more equitable city as it welcomes 120,000 new residents and 115,000 new jobs. While the draft plan has incorporated equity in many regards, we look forward to the Mayor's proposed Plan being even more explicit in establishing a clear and powerful vision for how the city will grow over the next 20 years as it welcomes new residents and jobs while sustaining and elevating the quality of life for those already living and working here.

Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, which is required through the State Growth Management Act, is the appropriate guiding document for establishing a "cohesive and focused approach to planning and development.1" The following recommendations address how the plan can articulate a more explicit vision for an equitable Seattle; make the plan more accessible and relevant to community members; provide direction for a process through which we monitor our progress to achieve racial and social equity in Seattle.

1 Executive Order 2015-04: Directing the Creation of a New Executive Office to Coordinate Planning and Implementation to Build Thriving and Equitable Communities Seattle Planning Commission Comments on Public draft of Seattle 2035 November 18, 2015 Section 1, Page 2 Articulate a more explicit vision for an equitable Seattle.

The plan should set an aspirational tone for the next 20 years and establish a pathway that will help achieve this vision. The existing draft Plan states: "We envision Seattle as a city where growth benefits and increases opportunities for all residents while offering ways to enhance and preserve our natural environment." This is a strong vision that should be echoed through all elements of the Plan. When the Plan was last updated in 2004, the focus on environmental sustainability led to pioneering programmatic changes which have had an enduring impact on the region. This update should do the same for racial and social equity.

The public draft incorporates race into the Plan's core value of social equity and many of the Plan elements make great strides in addressing this value. However, more could be done on this front. In late 2014, the Commission participated in crafting equity statements for each element of the Plan. These statements provide valuable models for articulating an equitable vision. We urge that components of these statements be integrated more consistently across the elements with introductory narrative clearly describing the role each element plays in advancing equity. The introduction to the Community Well Being element; "The City of Seattle invests in people so that all families and individuals can meet

their basic needs, share in our economic prosperity, and participate in building a safe, healthy, educated, just and caring community.' is an excellent example of how equity should be discussed and addressed in the Plan.
Furthermore, the Commission supports the urban village strategy which guides most future households and jobs into designated growth areas. The Commission would also like to see the Plan acknowledge and address the inequities and displacement that can be consequences of the growth strategy.
The Commission supports a data-driven approach to the establishment and/or modification of Urban Village boundaries, taking into account ten minute walking access to existing and planned frequent and reliable transit as well as easy access to other essential components of livability (e.g. adequate open space, sidewalks, etc.) as articulated in our Seattle Transit Communities report.
Make the Plan more relevant and accessible to community members.
This update provides a renewed opportunity to establish policies for coordinating and prioritizing investments in infrastructure and services. By prioritizing equity considerations in these policies, this update sets the stage for Seattle's neighborhoods to become complete, compact, and connected communities where everyone can attain the resources, opportunities, and outcomes that improve their quality of life and enable them to reach their full potential.2 DPD is working hard to streamline the Plan and make the intent and impact of its policies on people and communities easier to understand. Yet, the Plan remains a long and complicated document that the public may see as bearing little connection to their day-to-day lives. This 2 From the definition of race and social equity in resolution 31577 Seattle Planning Commission Comments on Public draft of Seattle 2035 November 18, 2015 Section 1, Page 3 challenge is inherent in setting forth a comprehensive set of long-range policies. The final Plan should communicate its relevance and importance by showing more clearly how it guides the regulation of development, and the prioritization and implementation of community services and infrastructure.
The public draft includes some helpful references to other planning documents, such as the Climate Action Plan and SDOT's modal plans. These are functional plans that describe and prioritize how we invest in our communities in alignment with Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. The Comprehensive Plan should communicate these connections more explicitly. Interactive graphics could also be included in individual elements to allow readers to quickly navigate from goals and policies in the Plan to projects that implement the vision.
Seattle is at the heart of a growing region that is grappling with equitable development challenges on a broader geographic scale. Framing equity within the context of our regional growth strategy can help remind readers that of this context. Resolution 31577, which called for the incorporation of race into the core value of social equity, also called for the Principles of Equitable Development, ratified by the Puget Sound Regional Equity Network in 2012, to be included in the Plan. These Principles are currently not in the draft Plan and should also guide Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.
Earlier this year the Commission wrote in support of additional resources that would help ensure that Seattle's Comprehensive Plan is accessible to all residents. We hope that your recommended Plan will include an interactive version with additional graphics that explain complex concepts. The current version does include a diagram that illustrates how the Comprehensive Plan fits within the context of state and regional plans as well as the implementation plans, codes, and initiatives. This diagram should continue to be refined. Current technology allows for web-based and printable pdfs to be developed simultaneously. Because the entire content of the plan is being updated, this is an excellent opportunity to make use of this software. It is especially important to ensure that the Plan is readily accessible for people with disabilities.
Provide direction for a process through which the City will monitor our progress and highlight community-wide efforts to achieve racial and social equity in Seattle. 3 A strong and sustainable monitoring process is essential for gauging the extent to which the City is making progress toward the vision, values, and goals set forth in the Plan. Monitoring is also necessary to identify whether policies

need to be strengthened or implementation strategies changed.
While the Commission generally cautions against incorporating specific metrics within the Comprehensive Plan itself, we would like to work with your office and the new Office of Planning and Community Development to provide advice for establishing a process to measure and report 3 From Executive Order 2014-02: Race and Social Justice Initiative Seattle Planning Commission Comments on Public draft of Seattle 2035 November 18, 2015 Section 1, Page 4 on the City's progress and highlight community-wide efforts to achieve racial and social equity in Seattle.
Equity Measurements. Resolution 31577 also calls for the City to identify and measure over time "quantifiable city-wide community indicators of equitable growth." Reporting on these equity measures in concert with the broader monitoring process could help make the Plan relevant and accessible to more Seattleites.
Indicators will have to be developed with great attention to measurability and context. Many monitoring processes at city and broader levels have been cut back between major plan updates or have been dropped entirely. It will be crucial to develop a monitoring process that is feasible to sustain throughout the 20-year planning horizon.
Summary of element-specific comments Following is a summary of key comments and recommendations for the specific elements we reviewed. We offer more detailed comments and suggestions by element in the second section of this letter following page 6.
Seattle's Growth Strategy

- Support added language regarding equity and access to opportunity
- Support revising urban village boundaries consistent with Seattle Transit Communities methodology and policies
- Ensure final equity analysis and mitigation strategies are addressed in the Plan
- Address growth that occurs outside of urban centers and villages - (particularly along frequent transit corridors)
- Clearly articulate how public investments will be equitably prioritized, not based solely on growth

Land Use

- Support proposed change to the Future Land Use Map
- Concerned that single family zoning continues to be designated as an area protected and removes these areas from our regional growth boundaries limits diversity of housing types
- Allow more flexibility to support a diversity of low-density housing options
- Emphasize mitigation strategies that will minimize displacement, particularly for most vulnerable individuals, businesses, and communities
- Confirm which policies are consistent with HALA, revise as necessary those policies inconsistent with HALA
- Reiterate support for industrial uses in manufacturing and centers

Seattle Planning Commission Comments on Public draft of Seattle 2035 November 18, 2015 Section 1, Page 5
Transportation

- Support mode share goals that reflect the Climate Action Plan and Seattle Transit Communities policies.
- Support overall connection between this element and implementation as articulated in Seattle's modal plans and maps; the final version of the Plan should include links to these modal plans
- Support recognition of transit-dependent communities rather than just peak-hour commuters
- Support recognition of connections to all business districts in addition to the Port of Seattle
- Support Vision Zero

Housing

- Support extensive incorporation of race and social equity throughout element
- Support policies related to housing for families with children
- Reference Growth Strategy and Land Use element and how housing policies are related to them both
- Acknowledge regional nature of housing challenges
- Reiterate need for more access within single family areas to enable a broader variety of housing
- Appreciate incorporation of health; would like to see Environmental Justice addressed
- Add a policy about monitoring as required by Countywide Planning Policies; could also monitor HALA goals

Community Well-Being

- Support how equity is referenced in this element; a great example of including equity in the Plan
- Explain and highlight role of element in the overall introduction – consider moving element to front of Plan
- Support the multiplicity of ways policies advance race and social equity, including promotion of civil rights
- Strengthen connections with Housing, Parks and Open Space and Environment elements; connections to the Growing Seattle and Land Use elements are good.
- Strengthen policies related to emergency preparedness
- Co-location of facilities are important and should be encouraged
- Acknowledge at-risk youth in policies who have already dropped out of school or gotten entangled in the criminal justice and need access to services and opportunities that promote rehabilitation

Seattle Planning Commission Comments on Public draft of Seattle 2035 November 18, 2015 Section 1, Page 6

The Commission appreciates the work of the DPD and in particular Tom Hauger and Patrice Carroll. The Commission would not have been able to do as thorough a review of the public draft without their willingness to attend many meetings and present regularly on their work. The Commission looks forward to your recommended Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of our recommendations and please do not hesitate to contact me or our Executive Director, Vanessa Murdock, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Amalia Leighton, Chair Seattle Planning Commission CC: Robert Feldstein, Mayor's Office; Seattle City Councilmembers; Diane Sugimura, Nathan Torgelson, Susan McLain, Tom Hauger, Patrice Carroll, Department of Planning and Development; Patricia Lally, Seattle Office for Civil Rights, Kevin O'Neill, Seattle Department of Transportation Element-specific comments and recommendations 11/18/15

Seattle's Growth Strategy Section GS# Goal/Policy/Text Comments overall

Support change of element name (previously Urban Village). Recommend clearly stating this is the growth strategy and as such is different from the other elements in the Plan.

Planning for Growth policies 1.5 Monitor urban centers and villages to track changes over time in the number of housing units and jobs, population and public investments and use this information to make decisions about… Add an additional policy after GS 1.5 and before GS1.6 that says: public investments will be made using an equity lens. Acknowledge past inequities pulling language from the Equity Analysis.

Planning for Growth policies 1.6 Monitor development activity in areas with high potential for displacement of marginalized population… Requires more specificity in regards to which strategies

(Incentives, job to education, etc.) or it should specifically call out the Equity Analysis as the implementing document.
Urban Village Strategy discussion Second to last paragraph of Discussion: Because urban centers and villages are the places where the City expects to concentrate public facilities.
Support.
Urban Village Strategy discussion Final paragraph of Discussion: …On the whole, however, the urban village approach continues to direct most new development away from Seattle's single-family focused communities… Strike this sentence entirely. It is single-family protectionist and doesn't allow access to opportunity that may be presented in single-family areas.
Urban Village Strategy policies 2.8 Direct the majority of future development to centers and urban villages, and limit the possibility of scattered growth along arterials… Describe what growth along arterials is acceptable. Describe what growth outside of Urban Centers and Village should look like.
Urban Village Strategy policies 2.9 Use zoning and other planning tools in places where growth and development are expected to shape the amount and pace of growth in ways that will control displacement of marginalized populations, community services and institutions.
Support the intent of this policy but is this language consistent with Equity Analysis?Strike "Use zoning and other planning tools" zoning does not create equity and planning tools could be more specific (incentives, etc.) missing graphics Map of the urban villages missing graphics Graphic that shows what three ideal urban villages would look like if they were to be created. This will give a much needed visual for the reader.
Urban Village Strategy figure 1 F1 Characteristics of Urban Centers and Villages table Remove Zoning and Land Use, it is confusing to the reader because this plan is above zones and zoning.
Urban Village Strategy figure 1 F1 Characteristics of Urban Centers and Villages table Add policies about urban village boundaries to the table.
Urban Village Strategy policies 2.11 Permit varying sizes of urban villagese… move to Figure 1 Section 2 Page 1 of 14 Element-specific comments and recommendations 11/18/15 Seattle's Growth Strategy Section GS# Goal/Policy/Text Comments Urban Village Strategy policies 2.12 Reflect the area that is generally within a ten-minute walkshed… move to Figure 1 Urban Village Strategy policies 2.15 Promote meaningful choice for marginalized populations to live and work in urban centers and urban villages throughout the city.
Add to 2.9 or discussion; vague and unnecessary on its own.
Urban Village Strategy policies 2.20 Retain land in manufacturing/industrial centers for industrial uses and develop criteria for evaluating request to remove land from a M/IC… There has been extensive public process as well as two stakeholder groups to develop this criteria. What will become of this work? What more is there to be done to get to a resolution on this issue?
Distribution of Growth 3 Distribution of Growth 3.4 Base 20 year growth estimates for each urban center and manufacturing/industrial center on:… Distribution of Growth 3.5 Encourage a distribution of growth that both fosters opportunity in low-income neighborhoods and provides access for marginalized populations… Urban Design Public safety and crime prevention are covered in the Community Well-Being Element, but there are also opportunities to help prevent crime via design. We recommend the Urban Design, or the Built Environment section of the Growing Seattle Element include a policy on crime prevention through environmental design.
This is EIS alternative 1; is following past trends acceptable for growth estimates? If the purpose is to dramatically change equitable outcomes should we not also change our thinking about growth allocation?
Section 2 Page 2 of 14 Element-specific comments and recommendations 11/18/15 Land Use Section LU# Goal/Policy/Text Comments Introduction Seattle has a long history as a maritime, manufacturing, and freight distribution center for the region. These activities are now largely located in industrial zones,

and clustered primarily in two manufacturing/industrial centers… Include stronger language regarding the importance of preserving Industrial lands in order to preserve living wage jobs and the transportation efficiencies to be gained through collocating industrial use.
Uses 2 ...Allow for a variety of housing types to accommodate housing choices for households of all types and income levels....Providing jobs for a diverse residential population.
Support. Good incorporation of equity.
Uses 2.8 Evaluate all new land use regulations to determine if there are potential adverse outcomes that may affect certain groups or individuals unfairly, and seek to avoid or mitigate such potential outcomes. "that may affect certain groups" – is this consistent language with the equity appendix? Who is being referenced by the phrase 'certain groups'?Be more specific on which programs we would likely use to “mitigate”.
General Development Standards 5.17 Impose conditions on higher-density development to offset the impacts of increased densities, including consideration of incentives for Landmarks Preservation, additional open space amenities, and affordable housing, and encourage new development to contribute to affordable housing throu

Consider.It Comments Received

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I didn't really understand how the Capital Facilities Element, as it exist right now, pertained to schools.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Cf5.3 reads: "Partner with Seattle Public Schools to plan for expected growth and to encourage the siting, renovation, and expansion of school facilities in or near urban centers and villages."

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thank you. Based on the wording of the Key Proposal I guess I expected more than one sentence in the six pages of explanation. Maybe more details later as to how the Key Proposal goals will met?

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

When you claim to talk about schools, please actually talk about schools

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Partner and encourage is very vague and not measurable. Apparently, this isn't an issue developers can seize for profit.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Will result in better learning environments for students.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Of COURSE plan more schools if we're expecting more children. Please site them where they are safe & comfortable to walk & ride bicycles to. Many schools now are fairly accessible.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks! We could use existing and new school facilities to help meet the increased demand. New schools could be sited near walkable Urban Centers or Urban Villages.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Pre-k schools in urban villages/centers would provide an efficient way for parents to get young kids to pre-k school options near employment.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

West seattle is sorely in need of better school planning in relation to the population growth. One school has 20 portables!! How did the city/school district allow that to happen?? The new school currently being buildt to replace the old, small building w

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Very few schools in Seattle are sited near the downtown. Yet, the downtown area has many more residents than before, including families with school-age children.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Great point. Maybe, future planning should include a downtown school.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Consider building schools in mixed use buildings with affordable apartments above.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Consider designing school buildings themselves as "mixed use". Flexible designs that can be built large for high enrollment periods and re-adapted for other uses during low enrollment periods.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Our NW schools are overcrowded already. We need to be thoughtful about building new schools where they are needed and stop relying on portables!

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Many neighborhoods where growth is highest don't have any large parcels that can be a school. Consider making K-12 an allowed use in industrial zones.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

More schools should be concentrated near transit and Urban Villages

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I like the idea of incorporating schools into a Urban Villages & mixed use environment. They have the transportation infrastructure to support students. Transportation is a huge cost for school districts. Mixed Use buildings would also allow schools to

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Public Schools are the foundation of a just society. Discourage private and charter schools.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Teachers must have the ability to teach students without pressure of teaching to pass tests. They also must be adequately compensated.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Schools should be located with reference to school age population. However, the proposed changes to not do that. Urban village doesn't mean more kids.

Draft Plan Proposal: Schools

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Schools must be safely accessible on foot and by bike. That means sidewalks and safe crosswalks.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Provides clarity about how and when neighborhood planning projects are initiated.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

If the intent is to really insure the people that live in a neighborhood are included and involved with the city in future plans for their neighborhood I support it.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I think their will always be some differences of opinion and change is full of fear for many who only see the worst case. we should be able work out reasonable progress and adapt. HALA should be given more credit as a starting point to discuss how we stay

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

This would hopefully tie neighborhoods into a larger vision, giving that vision more strength.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Any plan needs to have policy back it up to give it any teeth. If there is to be another planning effort, it should be coordinated with policy changes to make the effort worthwhile

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I'm torn on this. I would advocate for public officials to pursue maximum appropriate involvement of communities.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this concern. The City needs to clearly articulate a co-design process and be transparent about where neighborhoods can weigh in but don't carry the day - it is a meeting in the middle between community and planners and that should be realist

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

So the plan is to help neighborhoods create new plans, and then continue to ignore those plans when developing those neighborhoods for another 20 years?

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this comment. The neighborhood planning process needs to precede and supercede the development plans and zoning changes. The neighborhood plan should drive how development happens, not be forced to follow what is "current practice". Whittier

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this comment. The neighborhood planning process needs to precede and supercede the development plans and zoning changes. The neighborhood plan should drive how development happens, not be forced to follow what is "current practice". Whittier

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

The city should improve the process for neighborhood engagement around specific projects/permits.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Weâ€™re currently in the process of improving the Cityâ€™s Design Review Program. For more information: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/completeprojectslist/designreviewprogramimprovements/whatwhy/default.htm

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Every project should have more review of design and functionality with neighborhood. However we also need to allow progress and diversity of ideas.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

The neighborhood plans should be updated by throwing them away. They are redundant, outdated, sclerotic and deeply counterproductive

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Truly inclusive planning (not just for the loudest voices) is the right way to go.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I hope it doesn't slow down approvals, or simply add a layer of bureaucracy.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I think planning should be city-wide. Neighborhood plans tend to breed parochialism and focus on what people are getting, not on how they are supporting the future of the city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

However, a top-down, citywide approach breeds one-size fits all solutions that really only work for stakeholders with a lot of clout. Right now, Seattle has a very top-down approach to development, and that's been great for single-family homeowners in hig

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

You are spot on!

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

In theory, I agree, but in practice I've seen neighborhood planning dominated by narrow interests who have excess time and extra loud voices. It's not honest representation.

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with you about the potential pitfalls of neighborhood level planing, however right now planning is dominated by the stakeholders with the money to effectively lobby City Hall. That's not honest representation, either.
Where is the middle ground?

Draft Plan Proposal: Neighborhood Planning

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agree with this.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Considers a broader range of goals to guide investments.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

De-emphasizing acreage goals increases pressure to overlay active uses in natural areas which will degrade the quality of habitat for wildlife and native species.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Parks should be measured by the enjoyment the residents derive from them. Large, unused parkland in the middle of a city is a waste. Wild areas should be wild, not parks.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks. What types of programming do you think should be implemented at local parks?

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

As Seattle grows, the need for parks and other public spaces will grow. There are few large parks in

Seattle. Look for greenery between the International District and Queen Anne.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

We need to increase quality and new types of open space AND continue acquiring new open space where there are still gaps and where growth is creating greater demand.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I absolutly agree!

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Also consider mass transit efforts that can get people to parks and outdoor areas easier, cheaper and faster.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Well maintain parks are terrific for property value and have shown to decrease vandalism. Pet owners will also appreciate more off-lease dog parks.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Reread the proposal. It is NOT calling dor more park space, just a better quality of park space...

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I feel the urbane park spaces need more TLC.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Equitable growth requires usable open space for dense communities

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Bridge Gaps In Open Space Where Density Is Focused!

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I strongly support the idea of developing new types of public spaces. Specifically I think that the public right of way in our streets can be reconsidered for park-like uses.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree. More green spaces goes hand in hand with more individuals choosing to walk or bike in order to make use of these public spaces.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Absolutely. Especially if streets are slowly converted to bioswale stormwater treatment, and an intensive program of street tree planting (and care!) is implemented.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for joining the conversation. With limited open space, we need to think creatively about how to make the most of the space we have for parks and open spaces throughout the city. What are some of your ideas?

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Here are a few more ideas for increasing Seattle's green space and tree canopy while preserving and enhancing our ability to welcome more people to the city:
â€¢ Reduce the width of streets to allow wider tree lawns (or wider "parking strips" as they are

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

The equity piece is not emphasized strongly enough above - this needs to be focused in communities that lack attractive & useful open community spaces

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agreed. For example, current plans call for a new park near the Roosevelt Link station, in an area well-served by parks, whereas there are huge gaps in parks in SE Seattle per the Parks Gaps Analysis.
For more on the Roosevelt park question, have a look

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Hopefully the Council will recognize this disparity and apply the social justice tool kit to bridge the well known Mount Baker Town Center gaps.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for your feedback. We know there is a need for parks in areas that have been traditionally underserved and recognize that equity is a major factor in the planning and decision-making process.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Quantity of green space/parks still matters!

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agreed. Parks are a unique community resource that should be available to all demographics, as well as a place for community building. Parks support health, community, and livability. Creating dense villages and town centers without preservation of

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

The city has enough parks as it is.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

People who live in affordable housing deserve equal if not better access to community resources like open space. The City Parks Department developed standards for identifying where there are needs for usable open space within walking distance of the fami

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Public Realm Improvements Must Be Accessible For All

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Parks can function well as directed walking/biking areas to mass transit and create safe walking connectors between urban centers.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Look to add greenery between the International District and Queen Anne.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Another more to catering to developers and big business.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

What's wrong with quantitative measures? Shouldn't there be more parks where more people live?

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I like the idea of other park-like spaces like green streets and parking space parks.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree. The planned woonerf on 8th avenue is a good example. Acreage goals are bad since the city should be prioritizing affordable housing with public land. The park slotted for 15th Ave and 65th St should have been low to middle income housing IMO. Roo

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

"Open spaces near new development" sound like a euphemism for "We'll get developers to pay", which is fine, except I thought the priority was affordable housing.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Affordable housing without public amenity or healthy breathing room is not affordable in a human or humane sense. If our goals for affordable housing do not include room for public spaces and breathing room, then we are supporting affordable housing de

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

If this is like our "public" Street Cars, the developers asked for them, and the taxpayers are paying .....SLU & First Hill street cars benefit from having Vulcan as their developer/lobby.....amenities at taxpayer cost. I don't think it is a coincidence

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I think many of the recent parks since 2000 are totally homogeneous. They have the same boring child-proof equipment. It may be high quality, but it doesn't stir the imagination.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Focus on equity, public safety and public health

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Micro-parks could be good, but I fear what we give up if this means encouraging developers to put parks on private land. Freedom of speech and assembly wouldn't apply there.

Draft Plan Proposal: Parks and Open Space

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The goal is great, but the plan doesn't do that. It locates facilities in urban villages without other considerations. UV is only one factor.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Will give people of more limited means a choice to remain in their neighborhood as growth occurs.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

As land assembly and large new buildings replace older stock, what works for small businesses is often lost. Code for design of ground level space should better address this.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for your feedback. Maintaining or encouraging smaller commercial space could encourage small businesses to stay in neighborhoods.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

This should include senior citizens who live on fixed income and may be living in a SF Zone or otherwise that is negatively impacted by city initiated rezoning and development

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

A vibrant city needs people of all backgrounds and means to live and work there.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

small business represents the character of a neighborhood. these businesses should be supported during growth

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I absolutely agree with this point.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

You can't have your cake and eat it too unfortunately. Developers only jump when there is profit or tax incentives involved so this "public investment" burdens tax payers.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

While we should minimalist displacement we have to be careful about giving out too much free stuff at the extent of already over burdened tax payers.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Absolutely. Displacement mitigation I think will require a suite of policies and programs that are coordinated. My highest priority is the production of new affordable housing.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Yes, yes and yes, and please involve the communities/people most affected by displacement as to what will to reduce it

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

The City has the power to require community benefits from developers when they are working in at-risk areas.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

In addition to affordable housing, there should be affordable retail space for small businesses.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thank you for joining the conversation. We agree that independently owned and operated businesses in our neighborhood business districts strengthen local neighborhoods and enhance cultural identity.
One of the goals of the Draft Plan is to encourage an e

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We need to create more rezoning opportunities for small business along arterials with lesser transit. The neighborhood store concept needs to be restored and tweaked to allow more stores, cafe, office, exercise, pub and other uses that all neighborhoods n

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

One of the incentives for promoting small business development is to offer Prime Contractors additional points during RFP evaluation for subcontracting work out to locally owned businesses. That creates jobs, income, and sustainability for the small busin

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Agree with intent, but it is less clear how this would be implemented without impacting others.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

There is an ever increasing need for housing affordable at low and moderate income levels, both subsidized housing and market rate housing.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Agree with intent, but the issue cannot be constructively regulated via land use regulations. Effective mitigation of displacement comes in the form of financial aid, not land use

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I would like to see more emphasis on another means of creating affordable housing in perpetuity: land trusts.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Preservation of older affordable housing (whether publicly financed or "naturally affordable") tends to be in conflict with our goal of carbon neutrality. We need both.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

We should ensure poor and minority people can live in desirable places to live in the city, not necessarily their "current location" which was heavily determined by exclusion.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Perhapes but the city can get alot more "bang for their buck" making the current locations more desirable coupled with protections that prevent displacement. This even might create synergy that helps more people then a lucky few.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

It seems like neighborhoods revitalize one at a time. Hard to have investment in urban renewal and hold prices steady. Do all neighborhoods have to be affordable all the time?

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The only way to minimize displacement is to add supply.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Offset displacement with replacement. Encourage development that replicates and expands on any uses that might be getting displaced by other development.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Keep people here that want to stay, welcome those who arrive, That is the only job a city has

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Keep people here that want to stay, welcome those who arrive, That is the only job a city has

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Striking the balance needs to be handled carefully. When new corporate development money comes in,so does the preference of leasing commercial spaces only to corporate entities.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This issue is too much in the developer's hands

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This fails to provide for some "middle" income group. The focus on "affordable housing" is focused at the most poor and distracts from the displacement of the middle.

Draft Plan Proposal: Displacement

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This could be rewritten, "tax on displacing the poor and middle wage earners"

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Targets to reduce single-rider vehicles in downtown are not aggressive enough

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Proposed light rail system is not comprehensive enough

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

In addition to more 'legs' of light rail to these communities, new rail ought to fly down the middle of the existing freeways. Free advertising to Autos sitting in freeway traffic everyday. Should expedite process as State already owns that property. Need

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with Peter Carberry. People need to be able to get to transportation hubs like light rail stations

easily and the system needs to be fast. Focusing on serving the people who are within walking distance and building a system that meanders through

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The key here is speed which is the best selling point of light rail systems. I lived in SF most of my life. I see similarities between SF and Seattle in terms of population boom. San Francisco's MUNI and BART has been good with transporting an city suffer

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agree with the above, We need light rail urgently, on an accelerated schedule. In addition to the routes mentioned above, we need service from West Seattle to Downtown.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with the comments that people will only stop using cars if public transit is efficient. Removing bus stops for developers doesn't help. Getting rid of bus schedules because busses come really often sounds great, but let's see these busses coming q

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Light rail should not be run down freeways as that precludes transit oriented development. Instead, let's make light rail the fabric of our communities the same way it is in New York. Build towers next to stations and let people commute to an from not onl

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with the points made. Light rail is appealing as it indicates separate lane from other traffic which

increases reliability and efficiency. The current bus system has provided more frequency i.e. Rapid D line but it is by no means efficient. It p

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We live in a geographically diverse region and that needs to be addressed using many different modes of transportation. Busses and transit are great if they accommodate bikes and connect us to water taxies and ferries. Integration of services is key!

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I like the direction of the proposal, but would like to see more aggressive traffic reduction targets

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I encourage establishing LOS standards for non-motorized modes. Transportation Element pg 91 T9.3 - don't "consider" it, make it happen.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

What are LOS standards?

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I apologize, "Level of Service" standards. Currently they're generally used to measure throughput of vehicles on a roadway. Roads are given a letter grade A through F.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

If we don't count people who walk, bike, bus, we indicate we don't value them â€” or provide money to make streets safe and comfortable to use by anyone other than people who drive.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I absolutely agree with your comment. Walkability is THE hallmark of a great urban city. By increasing sidewalk safety maybe we would be able to take the strain off the road - some people would leave their cars if they feel comfortable walking or biking (

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thank you for your feedback. One of the Draft Planâ€™s goals is to encourage the use of travel options and reduce dependence on drive-alone vehicle use. What other strategies could we consider?

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Totally agree we need more mass transit in city and to destinations around city. Just keep in mind not everyone is healthy enough or capable of walking and riding a bike.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I'm in support so long as the holistic approach does not prevent making progress in individual types of transit. Sometimes two types of transit can interfere with each other.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

That is interesting, I can see how bike lanes might interfere with other transit systems. One of the reasons why I am undecided even though "on paper" I support this plan - realistically, how would they be able to implement it successfully?

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

We need more integrated transit options and safer bike transit

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I think this city has the worst transit system imaginable. Everything is oriented north and south. Try going east or west in some areas; a 15 min trip by car takes 2 hours by bus!

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The city is too I-5-centric and not inter neighborhood focused. Planners think that 100% of our commuting population works downtown (ie Westlake) and lives directly North and South as the crow flies.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Making a city that addresses all modes of mobility makes for a healthier, more active and vibrant city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

We should move towards a standard that reduces car use's importance rather than equalizes it with walking, biking, light railing and busing. Those modes of transit are constructive

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

100% agree. It's vital that we work to utilize our streets in ways that serve the greatest number of people most efficiently. Investments in transportation choices is essential.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this point. Seattle has to be more accessible by other modes outside of personal vehicles. Bikers, commuters, and walkers want to move into this city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for sharing your thoughts - Seattleâ€™s transportation system in 2035 will likely look very different than it does today and weâ€™ll have to use our existing streets in the most efficient way possible. What other ways can we use our streets more ef

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Doesn't go far enough

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Having come from a communist society, trusting higher ups that partner with big business is fishy-I heard about PSRC and that is big govt

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

While I agree with considering all modes, I would think transit should be given the highest level of resources for such a fast-growing city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

This proposal is not specific enough. Road capacity should be allocated on a "per person moved" basis, not on a "cars moved" basis. Prioritize transit and people will switch to it.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Build it all, but don't fool yourselves that cars are going away anytime soon.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree but the safety of pedestrians and bikes needs to be priority. Cars will just need to have less priority and wait more. Bertha will help us on that one. Less cars on surface + less fatalities on surface.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Until ST figures out how to run the trains past 12:30 am, we're just playing at being a city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This is not a bikeable city for the majority of people.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Yes, Seattle hills are a considerable hindrance to biking! You can't go far in Seattle without a major 1/2-1 mile long hill. But if we get enough transit options, such as the buses with bike racks (assuming the racks not full, the bus comes on time and co

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Current transit is unreliable, and I see no plans to update that, especially in the West Seattle Junction Urban Village.

Draft Plan Proposal: Transportation

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The Westwood Transit HUB, which is inside the Westwood Highland Park Urban Village appears to have been ignored in the draft plan.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

A stadium district is fine, but adequate protections are already in place for industrial zoned land. Industrial zones should not be frozen, especially around Georgetown.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

This area will serve as the terminus of the new waterfront. A more pedestrian oriented environment would be highly beneficial.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

need to improve transportation around the stadium district at the same time.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

On Game Day, traffic from downtown to West Seattle & points south is gridlocked. More stadiums in an already congested "district" unfairly penalizes the same commuters more often.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I live in Seattle and it takes me 20-30 minutes to get home on game day, including my walk from the stadium to the car. I think Stadium district in conjunction with better transit options serving said stadium district could work really well

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I agree with the intent to make the district more pedestrian oriented, but I don't necessarily think that industrial land should be frozen. Land use should be allowed to evolve

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree. I feel that freezing industrial land use in the MIC's outside of this stadium zone is essentially a pay-off to industrial interests such as the Port of Seattle to get them to support construction of a new basketball/hockey arena. The city has nei

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I do not think that any stadium district should be considered until the city discards their current plan of freezing industrial zoning throughout the rest of the city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Definitely need to allow more housing

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This seems unnecessary and wasteful of taxpayer dollars.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Need to encourage public use of stadiums as well - not just professional teams.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

This seems unnecessary and wasteful of taxpayer dollars.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

A waist of time and money.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Drawing a distinct boundary around land already used for pro sports facilities will limit its spread and focus responsibility on those businesses to fund their neighborhood impact.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

No more stadiums in the city! Send them to the suburbs!

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I would like to see new stadiums in Seattle, not sure why it needs a "district" type designation...

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

No public money for professional sports facilities!

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We should eliminate big money owners of our "non-profit" teams and go back to the old style like Green Bay has, make them truly owned by the fans. The fact that the taxpayers continue to pay for stadiums that are not accessible for use by the full public

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Another stadium will interfere with the freight traffic that serves the multi billion $s of foreign trade the Port of Seattle brings into the region.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

City needs to protect industrial land because it helps maintain economic diversity and provides good paying jobs. You can't replace that land once it goes to other uses.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

In order to maintain the competitiveness of our port, we need to preserve industrial uses and segregate rail transport from conflicts with cars and trucks.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use 3

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Evolve away from professional sports toward participatory sports

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Uniformity of rules between urban villages will make it easier to discuss impact of policy changes. The neighborhoods are unique, but not so unique they each need differing rules

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

But perhaps help redevelopment to add to neighborhood style and character that makes each neighborhood unique. Architectural review board could do this. There are many examples of higher density that fits in residential and that does not.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Maps must be specific enough to clearly understand who will be impacted by changes based on their

addresses. Detail must underli the high level map and be accessible to all citizen

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The proposed future land use map does not clearly identify major arterial Zor streets that can help residents understand specifically where boundaries are being proposed.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Make zoning more clear to the layperson (me) in general.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I do firmly agree with this policy, but I would like to wider dispersion of growth in single family areas of the city in addition to urban villages and centers.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Opening more areas to more dense development will require new infrastructure and more revenue that the new development won't provide.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Completely agree that we need dense urban villages, but we also need more multi-family family zoning; less exclusive single family zoning across the city as a whole

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Which for me includes encouraging developing boarding house, duplex, and MIL of large single family homes.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Also adding arterial streets that still have some transit access like a bus.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Residents need to be a part of new development plans. Open communication and collaboration on what the community needs is key.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for sharing â€“ hearing from you is critical to planning for our future together. Your feedback here will help inform the Mayorâ€™s Recommended Plan.
Iâ€™d also encourage you to join us at an upcoming Open House. For more info: http://2035.seattle

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I don't see the value in the new map and it both obscures and creates inconsistency with the underlying zoning.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agreed.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The proposed maps/information provided by Seattle 2035 do not clear/y show who will be negatively impacted by the changes, which will force too many POC families out of Seattle.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Let's require a clear, concise map and simple graphics of allowable buildings under the zoning to be part of every listing of property for sale.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Similar maps and explanatory graphics for what is possible under the underlying zoning should be created for single-family zones as well.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Single Family zoning inside Urban Villages needs to change.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Communication is key

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

A lot to like, especially the focus on the desired character of 'single family' neighborhoods rather than the 'only one family per building' aspect.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The existing map lacks details regarding actual zoning changes on a street level. Need to create a version of this map that can zoom in to details.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Plan states there's shortage of city-owned land. Very true but what they do own shouldn't be sold to developers. As density increases the open space gap will increase.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Yes, keep the promise of directing all new growth to the villages.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

When you keep expanding the boundaries of the "urban villages" or changing the zoning around them, you create the city equivalent of suburban sprawl.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

No need to expand existing villages or develop in SF areas. City's report shows there is enough development capacity already for 60 years.

Draft Plan Proposal: Land Use

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Allowing more flexibility for ADU's, duplex develop in existing housing stock makes more sense than building new low rise structures that often are jarring in design.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

So much of our land is zoned for single family, it will be challenging to build enough housing if we set it off-limits to new development.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

It would be helpful if the City could clarify the capacity of current City zones to accommodate growth, and clear up some of the confusion created by conflicting numbers recently presented about the percentage of single family zones making up our City.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

DO NOT believe what the Mayor and HALA report are saying about the need to rezone in single family areas. Take a look at the study done in 2014 by King County on the potential for additional housing under current zoning...there is plenty. Single Family ho

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The capacity for buildable land within the North Rainier Urban Village is an excellent example of why expansion of the urban village into historically recognized residential zones is not warranted. See 2014 King County Report; see North Rainier Urban Vil

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

In areas like Crown Hill there is a lot of land that is already zoned multifamily along 15th but not well utilized. It is filled with parking lots, big box stores and business that discourage residential development (like two strip clubs, the liquor sto

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

city's 2014 report says that even without changing zoning the city could accommodate over 200,000 housing units.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Building higher and denser also means that the demand on roads, schools, and other services rises. Infrastructure improvements will have to be made and will not be cheap.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Firstly, no one is saying to build "higher" in SFZs. Secondly, building higher and denser in urban villages does the opposite: it puts less demand on the roads, because people can give up their SOVs and take the light rail or streetcar to work. Schools ar

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thank you for your feedback. Yes, as our city grows, services, infrastructure, and transportation will have to grow with it. The Urban Village strategy helps guide growth to areas with existing infrastructure and services.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

That's why this is a comprehensive plan. These individual issues have to be looked at as part of the bigger picture being proposed...and as an integral piece, not a stand alone piece.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Zach...you seem somewhat out of touch with reality.
Firstly, the HALA up zoning proposal does allow increases in height in SFZ.
Second, It is a wonderful dream to think we can live without cars for transportation and mass transportation will satisfy al

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Absolutely oppose this policy. SF zone neighborhoods are the character of Seattle and the reason people like living here. Adding density and multi family housing will ruin

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

That report has a specific assumption in their math that makes it not realistic: it assumes that every lot is built to its maximum allowable height. So that means that the report assumes, for example, that we raise Benayora Hall and put in a Columbia Towe

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Actually, it is happening. If you look around downtown small buildings are being replaced by larger, taller buildings...and most of it is new housing. Compare SLU now to what it was a few years ago.
All you need to do is look around. There is ample spac

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We need to rezone so that family sized homes are available for working people in Seattle. Hi rizes only pencil out for 1 bedrooms or penthouses given the restrictions on development. 1 bedrooms are the most profitabile per sq ft. We need more land for mul

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

There has been hardly any new development of single family housing. Almost all new housing has been multi-family. Obviously many are choosing to live here and a huge majority of them aren't choosing standard single family housing. If it's not what peopl

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Conventional assumptions about supply and demand does not directly apply to Real Estate. Did NYC, or SF become more affordable as more housing supply came online? Nope. Simply put, there is a "build it and they will come" factor at work. Don't preserve an

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Exactly what is of concern to me. We bought after housing prices fell when Boeing was downsizing. For a long time there were no children to be found in our neighborhood as families were all moving to the the Eastside. It seemed that Seattle was only fo

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I live in multifamily housing in a multifamily zone and my neighborhood is very much in demand, and had tons of character.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Higher density housing makes it easier to preserve common green spaces like parks and trails by limiting our human footprint.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree there are benefits to higher density, but it is not all benefit and no cost. It also puts pressure on infrastructure (utilities, transportation, communications, parking, green space and services). So far, the mayor's plans do not address the addit

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Many areas zoned for single family can't support the transit that comes with higher density

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Increasing density increases efficiency and resource use per person. Density makes the delivery of some public services more efficient but taxes others

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Please look at the 2014 king county report on buildable land in the county and Seattle in particular. They conclude there is no need to rezone to accommodate projected growth in Seattle and the county. The false assumption that we need to rezone into sing

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We need to be very careful to preserve the character of all our Seattle neighborhoods. This is a primary driver of why people want to live here.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Increasing density throughout the city instead of concentrating it in specific areas allows for a retention of pedestrian and neighborhood scale.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

All this new development is geared towards more transitory residents. Say, younger, tech workers, who aren't tied to this city. They don't have the staying power of families.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Single family zones should be preserved. Owning a home provides stability and a sense of safety and community that is very important for the elderly and families with children.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this point, I am a single woman and while I am not elderly or have children owning a home is also providing me with a sense of stability and safety.
It is how how chose to invest and Crown Hill was a place that I was able to purchase in while

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

More density in single family homes will raise prices and decrease livability for families who live in Single Family Homes area. There is a concerted attack on Single Family Homes. There should be a new Proposal to Protect Single Family Homes. High Tech C

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Totally agree with you. There are communities in this state who would seek this growth without taking away farm land. Why shouldn't there be prosperity for the entire state?

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Because people want to live in Seattle. Just like you.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I would not have chosen to live in the Seattle being proposed by the developers out to make their fortunes.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree that we should focus density around transit centers. But the City should also recognize the value of our single family neighborhoods, despite the polarizing attacks raised in the political arena against those who own single family homes. For in

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Increasing density reduces traffic by allowing more people to walk and bike to work and to errands.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Increasing density (of people living in an area) only increases congestion. Increasing services is what enables people to live with more density. In Seattle the mayor and department of planning and development have the first part down, but not the second

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

You are objectively wrong, sorry.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Infrastructure plays a critical role in providing the essential elements of livability for a dense community. The City must ensure that it is aggressively using the tools for infrastructure and community values to keep pace with development throughout t

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I live in Crown Hill. Before rezoning SF, smarter density development on 15th Ave NW which is already zoned for multifamily but poorly utilized without adequate infrastructure

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Very similar scenario exists in the North Rainier Urban Village. The North Rainier Assessment Report (Berk, 2015) documents the huge potential to develop within the undeveloped village footprint, and the need for the City to help provide the infrastruct

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Allowing for more flexibility for detached houses could allow retirees to downsize, stay in the neighborhood while earning a needed income and creating another living space.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Develop EXISTING wasted space on 15th Ave NW, which is already zoned for multifamily, before rezoning single family.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this point, and would like to extend the idea to 15th Ave NE in the Roosevelt/Ravenna area. From what I've heard, there's already enough proposed development in the Roosevelt area to already meet the goals for 2035. Why push to rezone neighbo

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Great on paper, dubious in practice

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Seattle has fantastic neighborhoods and I think it is vital that our neighborhoods contain housing choices that make them accessible to people with various types of means.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Ah, to be young, naive and inexperienced again.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Well said. The most degree to which incumbent SF homeowners are willing to deny an opportunity to live in neighborhoods to those for whom only a duplex, triplex, or 3-flat would be affordable because they personally feel such buildings are "ugly" and the

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

You are entirely missing the point. What has been happening and has been proposed, is a giveaway to developers who are tearing down the existing modestly sized, median and lower priced single family homes to replace them with multiple units of the same or

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

When we bought our SFH it never occurred to us that multi-family development at comparable scale had been prohibited. (There is a grandfathered duplex at the end of our block and older attached row houses a couple blocks away). We always assumed what you

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Adding more housing in SF areas is not about accepting or not accepting 'new people', and it certainly is not about providing affordable housing because any new housing built in these areas will be at least as expensive as the SF houses they replace.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

A triplex gives 3 middle class families a shot at living on a lot where only the rich can afford a single family detached home

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree. We have to stop living with the mindset that more people moving into the neigborhood will mean less space or increased congestion. Sharing city space in meaningful ways like mixed used buildings, multi-family homes, co-working spaces means that w

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Increasing housing density could help lower rent prices.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The principles of supply and demand do not work in housing. Unless the housing is designated as affordable housing, it will not relieve the pressure we are seeing on the housing market.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Single family home owners move into those neighborhoods because they have stability.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The implication that renters are inferior human beings is offensive. My family rented the same apartment for 12 years in a mixed neighborhood of three flats and single family homes when I was a kid not because we didn't value (or contribute to) "stability

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Did someone call you or a renter an inferior human being? This is not a venue to exorcise your personal demons, it is a venue to express opinions on policy. My single family street is full of long-term renters who oppose this change as much as the homeown

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The previous poster: "Single family homeowners move into those neighborhoods because they have stability. Home values will go down if multi-family or microhousing units are able to be built next to single family homes."

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

In Seattle I have seen no evidence that home values will go down if micro-housing is allowed. Generally the opposite has been true. The point is to allow new housing choices in more of the city that is consistent with the single family character, rather

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Set The Stage For Density Within The Empty Mount Baker Town Center

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

This point is applicable to Crown Hill ... there is wasted space along 15th Ave North that can be developed that is already zoned multifamily. Right now, 15th is lined with big box stores and many business that many residents consider undesirable neighb

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Seattle is one of the few cities that doesn't allow mixed density housing in its neighborhoods.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Even more striking: for many SFH neighborhoods this is the result of a downzone. Our SFH 5,000 zone includes many homes on much smaller lots as well as grandfathered row houses and duplexes, none of which could be built today. Wonderful neighborhoods in

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

That's because the city determined it would be smarter to have most of the growth occur in urban villages first since that makes it easier for more people to access transit, services and employment without using a car. Comparison to Boston is irrelevant

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The end result will be the displacement of a population that is already at high risk of losing their homes. Only the developers will win with this plan.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The crazy real estate market tells us people want single family homes. These homes need to be protected. Add density through ADUs and DADUs, not changing neighborhood character.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Isn't that what the proposed changes do? "Add density ... without changing neighborhood character"?

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

It's terribly unfair that so far multifamily zones have had to shoulder the majority of Seattle's growing pains. Growth is good. SF zones should do their part.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

It is not unfair. It is part of the rational strategy the city adopted 20 years ago that helps more people be close to transit and services. Most SF land is too far from those things to be efficient.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I like the idea of transitional zones. And I think that duplexes and triplexes can fit in just fine with single family houses.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Encourage multi-generational communities

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Yes. Accessory Dwelling Units (mother-in-laws) and Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (backyard cottages) preserve historic character but allow density.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Schools! There is no plan for schools in the rezoned neighborhoods.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

It is interesting that individuals driving this change are the wealthy ones and they seem to suggest that those that don't want this change are selfish and don't want "social justice".
Not only are schools a concern, but there are less and less grocery

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

We need to fit more people in less space unless we only want the rich to live in the city

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The Plan already has a strategy to put more people into less space. That less space is the urban villages, and the city's own report says these places are already zoned to take 3 times the expected growth.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

You can't undo oversupply. Downturns are inevitable.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Well said. A downturn is inevitable. It wasn't that long ago that we had huge projects here that just sat for years. The idea of endless growth and expansion is a false dream. Don't forget the recessions that come along almost every decade. What is in

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Absolutely makes sense, allows growth, allows more housing choices (especially affordable alternatives to large apartment buildings).

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

New development on expensive SF lots will not be as affordable as new apartments in MF zones.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

If Milwuakee can accommodate diversity in single family zones, then so can we. Right now we are on par with DALLAS.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Great story on duplexes lowering the price of entry to owning. Duplexing is also a way for single family homeowners to remain in their homes as they age/downsize or as property values rise.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Duplexes in SF zones will mean twice as many cars driving in/out of these places - contradicting the Plan's goals of reducing car trips and greenhouse gases

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

ADU are good, allows homeowners to increase housing supply.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

homeowner likely displaced by high density rentals, due to no rules or regulations in place to ensure safety and noise level.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Developers have exploited loopholes in zoning, reduced setbacks and no need for Design Review in single family zones. How can we believe this process will work?

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I want to be able to build a small detached dwelling on the back of our lot but I agree with this comment. Though I want this I am a bit afraid that I will get what I don't want and never had envisioned for our neighborhood. Perhaps excluding developers m

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Higher density in SF areas means more people who are not within walking distance of transit & services, which is what the urban village strategy is supposed to be about.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

SF areas provide open space and visual relief from the more densely developed areas of the city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

SF areas are major contributors to the city's tree canopy that disappears when these lots are developed for MF or commercial uses.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Personally I like row houses a lot, and they can easily fit into single family neighborhoods. We need a diversity of housing types. Seas of detached SF homes aren't providing it.

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

all areas of the city should share the burden to some extent; in current plan SF zones don't add enough people, putting the burden on Urban Villages

Draft Plan Proposal: Housing

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Keep SF-zoned areas as they are. Rezoning should be examined on a case by case basis, and should not be easy.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Makes sense to direct growth near investments in transit.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I fully agree, although I would consider stretching the boundary along Leary in Ballard to 8th Ave NW.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Frequent, reliable transit service as well as short walks or bike rides to the stations and stops are imperative if we want people to consider leaving their cars behind.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Keep in mind our older citizens will not be able to walk or bike ride as younger folks. Building transportation infrastructure along with new housing is critical.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Growth should be guided to Multi Family Zoned areas. No need to rezone or upzone SF zoned neighborhoods at this point

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I have little faith in the "guided" approach Seattle has used in the past and for the most part it just tramples on property rights of land owners, something we need to get back to honoring.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Well stated and agreed. A natural growth and development approach will direct where areas of commercialization and increased residential housing is most needed/desired and thus how best to incorporate public transit to service those needs.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Why shouldn't SF zones see growth, too? Why should people in multifamily zones be the only ones to have to cope with living next to a construction zone every day? SF dwellers need to do their part.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

When the current zoning map was created, we didn't have the conditions we have now. Just as our economy has evolved, our plan for dealing with growth needs to evolve as well.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Increasing development around transit could potentially have the effect of pricing out existing residents.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

"Being priced out" is a basic consequence of competition. Just because a person was here first does not give said person more leverage over another human to stay. How did you think America was born? Bleak when you think about it huh? That's life.
Reliabl

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

So you are opposed to efforts preserving the housing of vulnerable populations? Cold.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I don't care what happened in San Francisco, move along.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

It possibly could price out residents if all new development is geared towards luxury apartments and those on the top half of the income spectrum. Thats why things like allowing more variety in single family zones are so important - its not geared toward

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

In South Lake Union there's a new upscale condo building with an organic "pick your own veggies" garden on top. Like they need it - they are steps from Whole Foods. These units rent at $3,000+ per month, and they could have been affordable housing inste

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Growth away from transit just facilitates sprawl, which facilitates traffic congestion. Growth near transit counteracts those forces

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for your feedback about reducing sprawl. By guiding growth to areas served by transit, our city can grow in an environmentally sensitive way and reduce sprawl - one of the goals of the Growth

Management Act.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

really good point about how growth away from transit and existing services will increase traffic congestion . . . and greenhouse gas.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Locating people around transit corridors and light rail stations reduces sprawl and allows for cheaper housing by reducing parking spaces per unit.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

that's right. Only the wealthy should have cars and parking places.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

When development occurs, we can encourage varied building forms and heights to create attractive and walkable neighborhoods and group buildings together to define districts.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This approach may make people nervous about getting transit in their neighborhood, if they see it is tied with too much density and growth.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Make better use of existing multifamily zoned areas instead of expanding and upzoning existing single family areas.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree, but would like to say this point should also be extended to 15th Ave NE in the Roosevelt/Ravenna area.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Existing multifamily areas should be used to make more densely-populated areas near existing transit. In addition, transit options should be better developed prior to allowing any increased densities.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The new multi unit development is too expensive for families. This plan favors small families with HIGH incomes

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

An urban village at 130th will disrupt the current neighborhood. There is adequate space to put in a light rail station at 145th without such increased disruption.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

A light rail is good for a new urban village because it can ease traffic congestion in a high density

location. 10 minutes of walking is not a problem for most people in America...at least I really hope not. We evolved working upright legs for a reason.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I'm in favor of creating walking areas/paths that are established when there's a need and desire. 130th is 15-20 walk from three other well served urban/commercial locations (NG, LCW, 145th) and all with better public transportation access/zoning.
Ther

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I have no probelm with the station at 130th, since 145th and Northgate is to big of a span. Plus it will be beneficial to all those living in this corridor. A ten minute walk is nothing, especially in this part of town where people are always running/jog

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I strongly support this approach, but in addition to this I would like to see zoning changes in single family neighborhoods that allow for modest new choices such as duplexes.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with this point and believe we need to create some architectural review board to help new buildings fit in to the existing housing stock. there are many examples of duplexes and even 10 plexes that actually look like a house on outside and fit wel

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Transit first, then growth.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Spot on here. There are so many giveaways to developers up and down these plans that the conspiracy theorist in me suspects kickbacks are occurring.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Not enough transit to support the proposed growth.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Yes, there is such a thing as frequent transit in Seattle. Currently it's defined as 15-minute headways all day, and even if for one hour, the headways drop off, it's no longer "frequent" (this will change under HALA recs). To give a specific example, the

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

We need more accessible transit. Make transit the easy choice and we can reduce travel by car.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Growth near light rail is right, but 5-7 stry boxes with no street presence is a mistake. Vancouver's model: go taller, in a smaller zone, with green space at the base.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Downtown Vancouver does not have green space at the base of its towers downtown. "Towers in a park" have not been a successful urban form because they are not walkable and the lack of ownership of the large shared spaces have generated social problems as

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The problem with Vancouver is the model really makes the city very un-affordable. Luxury highrises and extremely expensive single family homes, with very little in between. These proposed changes are about that "in between" space where you fit young fam

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Buildings over 7 or 8 stories are much more expensive to build and make overall housing affordability worse.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Densify the current Roosevelt Residential Urban Village before expanding to Ravenna park and East of 15th Ave NE. Go taller in a smaller area and be more efficient with density!

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Too many light rail stations as it is (look at S. Seattle). Soon it will take longer to take the LR then to drive to the airport and/or downtown locations.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The light Rail does take much longer than it should but that is because there is no express service. In my opinion we do need a line that is a direct non-stop train from Downtown to the Airport. People will not stop driving to the airport otherwise.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

I would like to see density shared among urban villages, multifamily and single family zoned areas.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

There is a great opportunity to develop the Rainier Ave corridor so that the entire avenue becomes a safe place to walk, run and stroll with kids and families...not sure why some parts of the Avenue are still run down and unpleasant to drive and walk thru

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

We should move transit toward density and we should move density toward transit. I see a future where all homes are 10 minutes from *fast* transit (bye bye personal cars!)

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

It will take a lot more growth than the city expects in the next 20 years to create transit-supporting densities all over the city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Which SF areas are changed should include more than just the 10 minutes walkshed. Some areas make

sense, others don't.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

More thought needs to go into how redevelopment of SF areas would be designed. Most ADUs work well. Design of duplexes tend to be awful. Townhomes can be well designed, or not.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The plan fails to reflect that many of the SF homes in the Othello Urban Village/proposed additions currently house multiple families/income. earners/households.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The problem I have with this point is the word "more". There's already a lot of development and growth happening in the Roosevelt area. Let's hold off on "more" for now.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Let's do this AND implement the HALA recommendations for SF zones AND allow corner stores.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Giving the largest number of residents a way to do most of their trips without having to drive should be one of cities main goals.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Agree with this point to some degree, but suggest using existing multi-family zoning and Urban Village/Hub growth plans to the extent possible.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Please do not develop Ravenna and Cowen Parks. They are a treasured part of our city.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Help low-income families and individuals by reducing travel and commute time.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

We need to focus growth near transit and amenities, and we also need to increase the land available for new buildings so that the city remains affordable.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Villages (urban or otherwise) must be somewhat self-contained, as well as offering easy connection to other areas

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Growth needs to include amenities for people of all ages & abilities

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Zoning within Urban Villages can be changed to encourage density without loss of historic character.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Disproportionate burden for S Seattle

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

doesn't mass transit cater to displaced people and neighborhoods? Seems to me the more mobile a community can be, the more active they become.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This is backwards. We should expand transportation options for all of Seattle and allow growth to occur in neighborhoods everywhere.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I disagree. Deciding to focus growth and transit investment together is "planning". Spreading growth and transit everywhere is.. just not feasible.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

We need to expand transit in more areas so that we can grow in all parts of the city within a 10 minute walk of frequent transit

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Need growth to happen to keep city afforadable

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Agree in concept but a 10 min walk is too far.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

There is no need to create more areas of high density in the city. The city's own capacity report shows the city has 3 times the capacity it needs for the next 20 years.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Hm. As I understand it, that "capacity" is calculated by tallying up the difference city-wide between existing buildings and empty lots and the maximum allowed by zoning. In order to achieve the 3x capacity you mention, every single building that wasn't b

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

This is a great comment, and a point that is frequently overlooked. A related concept is the "velocity" of redevelopment, which depends on the new zoning capacity being greater than the old by a big enough margin that the value of the site for redevelopme

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

NOI = net operating income. :)
And thank you AP for adding the notion of "velocity." I have heard a lot of people say (words to the effect of, only slightly exaggerating) they expect the bulldozers to arrive the day after a rezone is approved to flatten

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Utilize the existing Urban village at Beacon Hill before doubling it in size

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Let have a Urban Village at SoDo

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

People who now live in these areas may not like the changes

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

There is no other solution unless we want constant gridlock.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

"Displacing via Up-zoning" - is this a civil rights violation?

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

If we keep the city densely populated we could/should leave our fertile flood plains free to raise food locally.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Transit before growth.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Transit/city infrastructure first, before developers can start in. We're all tired of the city allowing development and dealign with transit as the afterthought.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Add more growth near transit lines with frequent service, even if only one route

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy 1

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Development with green space and sidewalks along arterials with transit lines makes sense. But not into

the neighborhoods.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Indicators will provide more and better information about how neighborhoods are growing and changing.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

While monitoring is OK, we need to maintain some degree of flexibility in the plan. I worry that monitoring will create rigidity, with unexpected results used to argue for a freeze

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We agree! Monitoring is helpful and will adjust The Plan's course over time.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

We see this now with fulfillment of neighborhood growth targets being used by neighborhood activists to argue against development.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Inclusionary Zoning -- Avoid Economic Segregation Through "In Lieu" Payment

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

It's only fair to base major policy decisions on facts rather than hunches or whoever yells the most.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

I like to walk around with my eyes open, thank you

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

CONCURRENCY of investment in city infrastructure must be mandatory.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Don't spend more money on monitoring than direct service/actions.

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Can We Guide Smart Growth? Affordability Vouchers For Commuters?

Draft Plan Proposal: Growth Strategy

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

GHG emission footprint of activities by urban village and other areas much needed.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Undecided. If the input and needs of the neighborhoods and citizens that live in them are seriously considered and acted on the plan could be very helpful to manage growth.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Since the City ignores or refuses input that is counter to what the City wants to do I have to say it is a waste of time. One of the porposals is to not due a master plan of each MIC but allow land in them to be rezoned one parcel at a time with the appr

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with greater resident communication and engagement throughout this entire process.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Thanks for joining the conversation. We need to hear from you to help plan our future. Your feedback will help inform the Mayorâ€™s Recommended Plan that will be released in March 2016. Join us at an upcoming Open House! For more information: http://203

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

This all seems like a "done deal" and these open houses are just a formality to say, "yes, we listened". I hope I am wrong.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I agree with the above comments. This website does not allow me to put in original comments, but only to respond to existing comments. I feel that the decisions have been pre-made by staff and political powers that be. Would like to see neighborhood plann

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This website needs more public exposure and input. These proposals are vague. The proposals sound good on paper but how to correctly execute them is the bigger problem here.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agreed.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

The proposed changes will result in more people of color, particularly African-Americans, forced out of their homes. Up-zoning means higher property taxes for current home owners.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

My neighborhood is one that is targeted for urban village expansion, but yet none of my neighbors can make heads or tails of this website. It's really disappointing that this site is the major forum for discussion.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Hi Amy, I'm the creator of this website. I'd be happy to help you make heads or tails of how the site works. Please let me know what you've found confusing or what you want to do but cannot. Feel free to post here or message me. Than

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This plan will primarily benefit one class of citizen; developers

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The committee driving this plan is not diverse

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Agreed. As a result, this plan will result in urban renewal/urban removal particularly for SE Seattle. The plan falls disproportionately on the shoulders of the working class and people of color in the Othello/Brighton Orchard neighborhood, which is an ar

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The plan asks the right questions but lacks specifics and a clear vision.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The plan lacks clear acknowledgement and integration of climate change mitigation strategies.

EmDraft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

If all 65 HALA recommendations make it into the Comp Plan intact we will be in a much better place in 2035.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

All 65 of those recommendations need to be closely analyzed and not taken on blind faith.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

This is a terrible website for feedback

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

It is the tip of the iceberg, if we support any change the City Council, Mayor and City Planners will use our acquiescence as the basis for even more changes in the near future.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The change will give developers the go ahead to rapidly build ugly apartments and add to traffic problems without providing solution

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The rezone will dramatically increase traffic problems because the current transportation planning, which relies on bicycles and busses, is a pipedream

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

How so? Thousands of people in Seattle commute by bikes and buses today, and their numbers are growing.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The rezone will convert the outlying neighborhoods in to ugly living spaces with terrible traffic problems

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

How so? I'm not seeing it.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The rezoning does not support creation of an enjoyable living environment in the outlying neighborhoods

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

I assume you mean rezoning to higher density...? Many thousands of Seattleites in denser neighborhoods seem to be enjoying their living environment just fine. Of course a variety of housing options is important. Nobody is suggesting Seattle ever get rid o

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

They certainly seem to be wanting to get rid of them in Wallingford but not in nearby, more expensive neighborhoods. I am happy that some are enjoying high density but it shouldn't be forced on us.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Isn't the answer to this question up to the City of Seattle planners and leaders?

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

There is something to be said for trusting the professionals, but they need to hear from residents to better understand who they are planning for.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Great that the comp plan is thinking hard about accommodating growth near transit. If we don't, and new people move to Auburn or Mill Creek, the traffic will get even worse.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Excited to see equity as a measurable goal

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Supply/demand economics to not apply to housing costs.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Where in the plan is there consideration for the infrastructure required before we start building? Or do we just hope.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Seems well thought out, with an eye towards pragmatically guiding change.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The percentage of residents commenting is too small to make a difference.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

COMMENT

Text:

Perhaps because only certain neighborhoods feel that they will be affected so less people are interested in commenting. Additionally, it does seem like a waste of time if the city leaders and developers have their own agenda.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

The plan puts too much growth in the urban villages. Agree the UVs should grow, but small parts of commercial areas should be converted and ADUs should go across the city SF zones

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Pro

Text:

Plan 2035 presents a clear roadmap with measurable action items. As a new resident, I am impressed with the level of public input being sought.

Draft Plan Proposal: Overall 2

Point or Comment?

POINT - Con

Text:

Climate Action Plan goals such as better energy efficiency in the building stock need incorporation in 2035 plan.