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Planning Estimates for Growth

- **3,900** Housing Units
- **4,800** Jobs

Estimates informed by the City's adopted 2024 growth targets, historic development trends, regional growth estimates and a recent analysis of the U District real estate market.

**Proposal**

- Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Code to allow greater height and density in the core of the U District (41st to 50th)
- Incentive program for affordable housing and public amenities
- Development and design standards, such as setbacks, tower separation, and street frontage improvements

**Alternatives**

- **No Action Alternative (Alt. 3)** assumes growth under current Land Use Code standards and development patterns
- **Two Action Alternatives (Alts. 1 & 2)** assume different code standards and development patterns
- All alternatives assume **same planning estimates** for growth
- **No Action establishes baseline** for identifying impacts of possible zoning changes
Determination of Significance and Scoping Notice for the U District Urban Design EIS was issued on September 5, 2013

Scoping comment period closed on October 7, 2013

Draft EIS prepared

Issued on April 24, 2014

45-day period following issuance of the Draft EIS — includes public hearing — ends June 9, 2014

Respond to public comments after close of public comment period

Tentative issuance Summer 2014

Purpose
- Disclose environmental information to inform plan-level decisions

Project Area
- Typically subarea or jurisdiction-wide

Level of Detail
- Analysis is broad and cumulative
- Sufficient to support policy decisions by Mayor/Council

Future Use
- Platform for future SEPA plan-level and site-specific review
Alternative 1
LOWER HIGH-RISES IN MODERATELY DISPERSED PATTERN

Key Features

- Development pattern more dispersed than Alternative 2, but more concentrated than Alternative 3
- Maximum building heights between 125 and 160 feet — including along the Ave
- Mid-rise development extending north of 50th
- High-rise buildings allowed closer together — minimum 60-foot separation between portions above 75 feet
- Landscaped setbacks on both sides of Brooklyn, 42nd and 43rd
- Widened sidewalks on 45th and 50th
Alternative 2
TALLER HIGH-RISES CONCENTRATED AROUND TRANSIT CENTER

Key Features

- Greatest heights and concentration of growth in core area
- Maximum building heights between 240 and 340 feet in core area
- Development standards reduce appearance of building bulk and increase separation, compared to Alternative 1
- Along the Ave buildings limited to 65 to 85 feet tall—significantly less than Alternative 1
- Fewer changes to zoning designations north of 50th, compared to Alt. 1
- Area-specific setbacks and landscaped setbacks on both sides of Brooklyn, 42nd and 43rd
- Widened sidewalks on 45th and 50th
Alternative 3
RETAIN EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS AND STANDARDS

Key Features

- Retains existing zoning designations
- No increased potential for building heights
- Development pattern most dispersed of all alternatives — new mid-rise buildings extend further north

LEGEND
NC = Neighborhood commercial
LR = Lowrise multifamily residential
MR = Midrise multifamily residential
IC = Industrial commercial
IB = Industrial buffer
For each topic, the environmental analysis considered existing conditions, mitigation and significant unavoidable impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE/PLANS &amp; POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>development pattern, character and scale, and applicable plans and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION, HOUSING, EMPLOYMENT</strong></td>
<td>current and future housing conditions, employment and income patterns, potential for change in mix and types of jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AESTHETICS</strong></td>
<td>visual model demonstrating street and aerial perspectives of each alternative, shadow impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>historic context and properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td>trip generation, transit, bicycling and walking, parking and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</strong></td>
<td>GHG emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN SPACE &amp; RECREATION</strong></td>
<td>location, design, character and level of service of park and open space amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>police, fire/emergency services and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td>electricity, water supply, stormwater and wastewater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing**

**KEY FINDINGS & MITIGATING MEASURES**

### Occupied Housing Units in 2012

- **U District**: 90%
- **Citywide**: 52%

#### Structures

- Detached Single-family: 48%
- Attached Multifamily: 52%

#### Units

- Owner Occupied: 10%
- Renter Occupied: 91%

### Impacts

#### SUPPLY

- All alternatives provide development capacity that exceeds growth estimates
- Both action alternatives increase more multifamily housing capacity

#### AFFORDABILITY

- Lowest rent properties likely replaced by newer, higher cost housing units — an impact common to all three alternatives
- More concentrated development in action alternatives decreases extent of demolition of existing lower cost housing
- Mid- and high-rise construction costs more on a square foot basis and will rent for more on a square foot basis

### Affordable Housing Funded by Private Development (Incentive Zoning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Area</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Zones</td>
<td>247,660 sf</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Zones</td>
<td>349,045 sf</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR Zone</td>
<td>7,338 sf</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigating Measures**

Although no significant impacts to housing affordability were identified, housing affordability remains a major challenge. Potential actions:

- Expand geographic eligibility of MFTE program
- Expand incentive zoning
- Direct funding to build and preserve affordable housing units

In 2011, of all Seattle residents...

- 53% paid less than 30% of their household income in rent
- 47% paid more than 30% of their household income in rent

In 2011, of U District study area residents...

- 34% paid less than 30% of their household income in rent
- 66% paid more than 30% of their household income in rent

Note: Information for comparison purposes only—future zoning provisions and development decisions could lead to different results.
Aesthetics
THE AVE (UNIVERSITY WAY) LOOKING NORTH FROM 41ST

Existing Conditions

Alternative 1: lower towers in moderately dispersed pattern

Alternative 2: taller towers concentrated around transit center

Alternative 3: retain existing zoning designations and standards

Note: The colored buildings represent potential new development under the various alternatives.
Aesthetics
KEY FINDINGS & MITIGATION

**Height, Bulk and Scale**

**ALTERNATIVE 1**  High-rise development in the core up to 160 feet. Compared to Alternative 2, buildings are more closely spaced and taller buildings extend further north and south of the core.

The Ave  High-rise buildings 125–160 feet tall

**ALTERNATIVE 2**  High-rise development in the core up to 340 feet. Compared to Alternative 1, greater spacing between towers with development more focused in the core and few zoning changes to the north and south.

The Ave  Mid-rise buildings up to 85 feet — 20 feet higher than currently allowed

**ALTERNATIVE 3**  Existing zoning to remain, allowing a continuation of the existing low-rise and mid-rise development pattern. Development would generally be dispersed throughout the study area.

The Ave  Mid-rise buildings per existing development standards

**MITIGATION**

Employ recommendations in City policy SMC 25.05.665 and in U District Urban Design Framework (UDF)

**Shadows**
All three alternatives increase shading due to infill development

Affected public open spaces:
- University Heights Open Space
- Christie Park
- University Park
- Peace Park

Taller heights in action alternatives increase these impacts

**MITIGATION**

Employ strategies for public open spaces in City policy SMC 25.05.675 Q2e as well as high-rise separation, tower orientation and upper level setbacks

**Light and Glare**
All three alternatives increase artificial illumination — no significant impacts anticipated

**MITIGATION**

Employ measures authorized in City policy SMC 25.05.675 K2d related to surface materials, lighting techniques, screening, shielding and landscaping
Note: The colored buildings represent potential new development under the various alternatives.

**Existing Conditions**

**Alternative 1**: lower towers in moderately dispersed pattern

**Alternative 2**: taller towers concentrated around transit center

**Alternative 3**: retain existing zoning designations and standards
### Transportation

#### PROJECTED IMPACTS IN 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>BASELINE Alternative 3 No Action</th>
<th>IMPACTS Alternatives 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Potential Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto &amp; Freight</strong></td>
<td>5 corridors operate at Level F</td>
<td>Same 5 corridors operate at Level F</td>
<td>Manage demand for auto travel to reduce congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use incentive zoning to encourage parking for car-share and bike-share programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td>3 corridors operate at Level F</td>
<td>6 corridors operate at Level F under Alt 1</td>
<td>Consider projects in Seattle Transit Master Plan with some funding from new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 corridors operate at Level F under Alt 2</td>
<td>Install transit signal priority on Roosevelt, 11th, the University Bridge, 15th, Campus Parkway, and Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement transit-only or Business Access and Transit lanes along Roosevelt and 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong></td>
<td>Substantial increase</td>
<td>Substantial increase, especially between 42nd to 50th</td>
<td>Consider projects in Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, University Area Transportation Action Strategy, and U District Urban Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modify zoning codes to require wider sidewalks in key locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>More collisions at 45th &amp; Brooklyn</td>
<td>More collisions at 45th &amp; Brooklyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-street Parking</strong></td>
<td>Impacts spread over large area</td>
<td>Impacts spread over large area with greatest impacts in core area</td>
<td>Revise parking minimums and limit number of parking spaces built with new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade parking revenue control systems (PARC) to interface with electronic guidance system that directs drivers to parking facilities with available capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PM Peak Hour Modes for All Alternatives**

- **2015**
  - 47% by car
  - 24% by transit
  - 29% by foot, bike, other

- **2035**
  - 37.5% by car
  - 30.1% by transit
  - 32.4% by foot, bike, other
Pedestrian and Bicycle Potential Mitigation Measures

1. Improve Pedestrian/Bicycle Crossing
2. Construct Pedestrian/Bicycle Crossing
3. Bike Lanes & Improved Sidewalks
4. Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
5. Separated Bicycle Facility
6. Separated Bicycle Facility
7. Separated Bicycle Facility
8. Pedestrian Improvements
9. Separated Bicycle Facility
10. Burke-Gilman Trail Improvements

Transit and Freight Potential Mitigation Measures

1. Eastlake High Capacity Corridor
   Downtown – Roosevelt
2. Priority Bus Corridor
   Othello – U District
3. Priority Bus Corridor
   Rainer Valley – U District
4. Priority Bus Corridor
   Lake City – Northgate
5. Priority Bus Corridor
   Ballard – Laurelhurst
6. Priority Bus Corridor
   Crown Hill – Green Lake
7. Pacific Street Corridor ITS
   to support freight movement

Source: Seattle BMP, 2013 / Seattle PMP, 2009
Open Space & Recreation
EXISTING & PLANNED FACILITIES

Existing and Planned Parks and Recreation Facilities

- Shiga Gardens
- University Heights P-Patch
- University Playground
- Burke-Gilman Trail

Legend:
- Parks owned and managed by the Seattle Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- Open spaces owned and managed by others
- Open space adjacent to the planning area
- Parks planned by the Seattle Dept. of Park and Recreation
- Open space and parks not considered in this study
Population growth will out-pace expansion of open spaces and recreation facilities — increasing deficiencies the same under all alternatives.

### Comprehensive Plan Open Space and Recreation Facility Goals for U District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Goal</th>
<th>U District Target</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Village Open Space</td>
<td>6.77 acres</td>
<td>3.85 acres</td>
<td>2.9-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 Village Open Space</td>
<td>11.15 acres</td>
<td>6.04 acres</td>
<td>5.1-acre deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Village Commons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all three alternatives)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One indoor, multi-use recreation facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No City-owned</td>
<td>Goal not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Dedicated community garden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 Dedicated community garden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal not met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mitigating Measures

- Acquire and improve new Seattle Parks property — especially between 41st and 47th
- Provide dedicated, publicly accessible open space (POPS) as part of private development
- Provide on-site open space as residential amenity
- Develop, manage, and program public open spaces with public/private partnerships
- Provide additional community gardens
- Improve designated green streets with outdoor seating and other amenities.
- Adopt green street concept plans
- Designate and improve “festival streets”
- Improve access to UW campus open spaces