



City of Seattle

Seattle Planning Commission

Grace Kim, Chair

Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director

SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, July 13, 2017

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present:	Eileen Canola, David Goldberg, Grace Kim, Kara Martin, Marj Press, Julio Sanchez, David Shelton, Lauren Squires, Jamie Stroble, Patti Wilma
Commissioners Absent:	Michael Austin, Keiko Budech, Sandra Fried, Jake McKinstry, Tim Parham
Commission Staff:	Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director; John Hoey, Senior Policy Analyst; Katy Haima, Policy Analyst; Robin Magonegil, Administrative Assistant
In attendance:	Cindi Barker, Deb Barker, Lesanna Lahner, Chris Lehman, Ian Morrison, Jack Steinhauer, Judah Travis, Boting Zhang

Seattle Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript, and represent key points and the basis of discussion.

Referenced Documents discussed at the meeting can be viewed here:

<http://www.seattle.gov/planningcommission/when-we-meet/minutes-and-agendas>

Call to Order and Chair's Report

Chair Kim called the meeting to order at 3:07pm. She provided an overview of the meeting agenda and upcoming Commission meetings.

Announcements

Executive Director Murdock reminded the Commissioners of several upcoming community events and announced upcoming staff vacation dates. Commissioners Lauren Squires and Jamie Stroble provided an overview of their recent trip to Vancouver, along with a few other Commissioners. In Vancouver, they attended a dinner with members of the Vancouver Planning Commission and participated in a conference titled "Rethinking the Region." The conference covered challenges that both Seattle and Vancouver have in common, including affordable housing, foreign investment, how to grow equitably, and public participation strategies.

Public Comment: 2017-2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Lesanna Lahner spoke on behalf of SR3, a marine mammal rehabilitation organization. She described her organization's efforts to find an appropriate site for a rehabilitation and teaching facility, and noted that Seattle is an ideal location due to its proximity to the University of Washington. She asked the Commissioners to support the proposed Pier One Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Ian Morrison also spoke on behalf of the Pier One Comprehensive Plan amendment. He stated that the proposed use of the Pier One site requires a rezone for ancillary services to support a marine mammal rehabilitation center. He requested that Commissioners reconsider the application of criteria C4, in their decision whether to recommend to move the proposal to the docket for further analysis. Criteria C 4 states "... It is practical to consider the amendment because... The amendment has not been recently rejected by the City Council. Mr. Morrison stated that the previous Pier One amendment in 2011 was not rejected by City Council, but rather withdrawn by the applicant, and the applicant has not had an opportunity to discuss the merits of the proposal since then. He noted that the proposed use of the site is a completely different project than what was proposed in 2011 and asked the Commissioners to recommend moving the amendment forward for docketing.

Deb Barker, President of the Morgan Junction Community Association, urged the Commissioners to recommend moving the Morgan Junction's proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment forward to the docket for further analysis. She stated that members of the Community Association have reviewed the proposed Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) regulations, and they believe that certain aspects of MHA conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. She expressed her opinion that the Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) does not appear to be addressing these conflicts. The Community Association has submitted their proposed amendment as an opportunity to engage the community in a broad planning effort until the MHA/Comprehensive Plan conflicts are addressed. She encouraged the Commissioners to recommend moving amendment #3 forward to the docket for further analysis.

Cindi Barker commented that the Morgan Junction Community Association has been voicing their concerns about MHA at the neighborhood plan level, but OPCD has not yet responded. She expressed her opinion that OPCD's work is not taking place at the neighborhood level. The Community Association wants to get the full community involved as new policies are created. Their Comprehensive Plan amendment would hold the relevant existing policies in the Morgan Junction neighborhood plan until conflicts with the proposed MHA regulations are resolved. She urged the Commissioners to include language in their recommendation letter that expresses concerns about criteria C4 and the challenges this criteria has presented in the review and docketing process of proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Chris Lehman stated his opinion that the Comprehensive Plan amendment docketing process has been hostile, and that proposed amendments have been rejected without any study or documentation. He urged the Commission to recommend moving his proposed amendment related to skybridges forward to the docket for further analysis. He expressed his opinion that the City of Seattle lacks adequate prevention measures to reduce the impacts from heavy truck traffic.

Following public comment, a member of the public was escorted from the room by City Hall Security for disruptive behavior.

Discussion: 2017-2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docketing

John Hoey, Senior Policy Analyst, Seattle Planning Commission staff

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS: Executive Director Murdock asked Commissioners to disclose any potential conflicts of interest and recuse themselves from the discussion for any actual conflict of interest. There were no disclosures nor recusals.

Mr. Hoey presented an overview of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process and the submitted proposals. He presented a draft letter and reviewed the following four amendment proposals that required additional discussion from the Commission. As the criteria for docketing proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan is cited several times in the discussion, we have included it as an attachment to this set of minutes.

If you would like to view the presentation, it is included in the supporting documents found in the minutes section of our website.

Amendment # 12: Pier One

The applicant proposed to amend the Future Land Use Map to remove Pier One, located at 2130 Harbor Avenue SW from the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing/Industrial Center and designate it "Mixed Use/Commercial". This amendment has been previously submitted, most recently in the 2015-2016 cycle.

The options presented in the draft letter were:

Move Forward: "Consistent with the Commission's decision last year to docket amendments pertaining to industrial lands, the Commission is recommending this amendment for docketing, acknowledging the forthcoming recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Industrial Lands." Or:

Do Not Move Forward: "The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C4. This proposal has been previously considered and rejected for docketing several times. Also, the proposal requests to rezone the property from the current IG2 U/85 zoning district and UI shoreline district to a commercial/mixed use district to allow a 'marine mammal rehabilitation center.' This would be a permitted use under the current zoning and would therefore not need a Comprehensive Plan amendment."

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners noted that, per public comment, the proposal does not appear to have been previously rejected by the City Council, therefore it does not appear to meet the criteria C4.
- Commissioners asked for clarification about whether the proposed use of the site would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezoning. Executive Director Murdock explained that the proposed marine mammal rehabilitation center would be allowed under current zoning, but the entire package of uses noted by the applicant during public comment would not be allowed under current zoning.

- Commissioners made a motion to recommend moving this amendment forward to the docket for further analysis, with the reasoning that the scope of the Mayor’s Task Force on Industrial Lands does not include this property, and the proposed use is a different project than previously submitted.

ACTION: The Planning Commission held a vote to determine whether the Pier One amendment should move forward to the docket for further analysis. The vote was eight Commissioners in favor, one opposed, and one abstention.

Amendments # 1, 2, & 3

These three amendments were presented together to reflect discussion at the Commission’s June 22nd meeting. Mr. Hoey stated that, for consistency in application of the docketing criteria, the Planning Commission can recommend the following three amendments either move forward or do not move forward for further analysis.

Amendment #1: Wallingford Residential Urban Village

The applicant proposed to amend the boundaries of the Wallingford Residential Urban Village to remove single-family zoned properties from the urban village. This amendment has not been previously submitted.

Amendment #2: West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village

The applicant proposed to amend the boundaries of the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village to remove single-family zoned properties from the urban village. This amendment has not been previously submitted.

Amendment #3: Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village

The applicant requested to amend the Morgan Junction neighborhood plan policies so as to require formal community planning engagement as a pre-requisite for further amendments to neighborhood plan policies 13, 14 and 19. This amendment has not been previously submitted.

The options presented in the draft letter to address these three amendments were:

Move Forward: “The Commission recommends these proposals for docketing. The proposals meet the criteria and as such warrant further study.” Or

Do Not Move Forward: “The Commission does not recommend these proposals for the docket citing criteria A5. These proposals would be better addressed through the public process associated with City Council’s review and consideration of the citywide Mandatory Housing Affordability regulations.”

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners stated a preference for addressing these three amendments separately, rather than grouping them together. Amendments #1 and 2 are proposed future land use map changes, while amendment #3 involves neighborhood plan policies.

- Executive Director Murdock clarified that the reason for grouping the three amendments together was based on discussion from the previous meeting (June 22) in which Commissioners expressed the need to be consistent in the application of the criteria.
- Commissioners commented that the three urban villages addressed in these amendments are being extensively studied by OPCD and the City Council, and there have been a series of community meetings to address the proposed MHA changes in these urban villages. There have been significant opportunities for neighbors to be informed and get involved.
- Commissioners noted that the Wallingford urban village boundaries are not proposed to be changed by MHA, so criteria A5 would not apply. Criteria C3 does apply to both amendments #1 and 2. These proposals are not consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy. Criteria A5 would apply to amendment #2.
- Commissioners commented that it is unclear how MHA will deal with neighborhood plan policies. Executive Director Murdock stated that OPCD is planning on proposing additional amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to resolve any conflicts between MHA and neighborhood plan policies.
- Commissioners expressed concern with moving amendment #3 forward because the described conflict with MHA applies to other neighborhoods, not only Morgan Junction. There was an equity concern with only one neighborhood receiving the benefit of further analysis if this amendment is docketed.

ACTION:

The Planning Commission held a vote to not move forward Amendment #1 to the docket for further analysis, citing criteria C3. The vote was unanimous.

The Planning Commission held a vote to not move forward Amendment #2 to the docket for further analysis citing criteria C3 and A5. The vote was unanimous.

The Planning Commission held a vote to move forward Amendment #3 to the docket for further analysis. The vote was six opposed and four in favor. A subsequent vote was held to cite criteria A5 as the rationale to not move forward the amendment for docketing. The vote was seven in favor and three opposed.

Mr. Hoey continued his presentation by reviewing the remaining amendments in the draft letter. Commissioners noted a need to be consistent in the language used for all amendments not recommended to move forward for docketing citing criteria C4. Commissioners suggested the letter be revised to include "rejected by the City Council" wherever necessary for consistency.

ACTION: The Planning Commission held a vote to approve the 2017-2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendments letter with the revisions described above. The vote was unanimous.

Minutes Approval

Chair Kim asked for a motion to approve the draft minutes from the June 22nd meeting.

ACTION: Commissioner David Shelton moved to approve the June 22 meeting minutes. Commissioner David Goldberg seconded the motion. Commissioner Patti Wilma and Commissioner Julio Sanchez abstained. The motion to approve the minutes passed.

Discussion: Mandatory Housing Affordability DEIS Comments

Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director

Executive Director Murdock provided an overview of the alternatives studied in the MHA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as well as comments provided by Commissioners on their review of the DEIS at the July 6 Housing and Neighborhoods Committee meeting. Executive Director Murdock provided specific questions for the Commissioners to consider at the next meeting.

If you would like to view the presentation, it is included in the supporting documents found in the minutes section of our website.

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners noted a correction to the presentation. The Japanese bathhouse is within the International Special Review District, but is not within the boundary of the National Historic District boundary, so it is subject to MHA rezoning.
- Commissioners offered another correction to the presentation. The Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases section of the DEIS is not just focused on construction impacts, but construction impacts are only discussed as being temporary. Actual construction impacts are longer-term, especially in an area with many projects underway over many years.
- Commissioners did not feel that the urban village boundary expansions studied in the DEIS took community assets and investments into account.
- Commissioners discussed income levels analyzed in the Housing and Socioeconomics section, specifically how MHA affects residents within the 60-80% AMI range.
- Commissioners expressed concern that directing too much growth to areas of high opportunity will prevent resources from being directed to areas of low opportunity.
- Commissioners noted a preference for more alternatives with 10-minute walkshed boundaries, rather than 5-minute walkshed boundaries to reduce displacement.
- Commissioners expressed disappointment that the DEIS studies alternatives that emphasize concentrating growth in high-density development along corridors. Commissioners noted more growth in low-rise (LR) and residential small lot (RSL) zones should be proposed in a growth alternative and analyzed.

Public Comment

There was no additional public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:32pm.

Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendment Selection (from Resolution 31402)

The following criteria will be used in determining which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will be given further consideration:

A. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:

- It is consistent with the role of the Comprehensive Plan under the State Growth Management Act;
- It is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy;
- Its intent cannot be accomplished by a change in regulations alone;
- It is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision; and
- It is not better addressed through another process, such as neighborhood planning.

B. The amendment is legal under state and local law.

C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:

- The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information to make an informed decision;
- City staff will be able to develop within the time available the text for the Comprehensive Plan and, if necessary, amendments to the Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review;
- The amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council wishes to consider changing the vision or established policy; and
- The amendment has not been recently rejected by the City Council.

D. If the amendment would change a neighborhood plan, it either is the result of a neighborhood review process or can be reviewed by such a process prior to final Council consideration of the amendment.

E. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.