

Attachment 1

1.a. Provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment.

Response: We propose the following amendment of the Comprehensive Plan:

Amendment to Neighborhood Planning Element B-27 (Roosevelt):

- R-LUG1 Foster development in a way that ~~preserves single family residentially-zoned enclaves and~~ provides appropriate transitions to more dense, or incompatible, uses.
- R-LUG2 Promote the growth of the Roosevelt Urban Village in a manner that concentrates residential and business uses in the commercial core near the light rail station, and ~~with less dense residential, mixed use and commercial development~~ along the commercial arterials that extend from the core.
- R-LUP2 Support the infill, rezone, and development of residential and commercial zoned properties that are vacant or underutilized.
- R-HP1 ~~Promote the preservation and maintenance of existing single family homes in single family zones and~~ Control impacts to homes on the edge of single-family zones bordering more intensive zones.
- R-HP6 Encourage mixed-use and larger multifamily structures near Roosevelt Urban Village's light rail station, the commercial core, and along arterials to encourage use of the light rail station, to reduce the neighborhood's carbon footprint, and in and immediately surrounding the transit and commercial core to accommodate increased density in our neighborhood.

Amendment to Land Use Policy 59:

Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting single-family rezone criteria, only when 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.

Amendment to Future Land Use Map: Please see attached map, Attachment A.

1.b. If the proposed amendment would also require a change to the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC), please indicate the section(s) needing amendment.

Response: To maintain consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, SMC 23.34.010 would require amendment in the following manner:

SMC 23.34.010 Designation of single-family zones.

A. Except as provided in subsections B, ~~C~~, or D of this section, single-family zoned areas may be rezoned to zones more intense than single-family 5000 only if the City Council determines that the area does not meet the criteria for single-family designation.

B. Areas zoned single-family or RSL that meet the criteria for single-family zoning contained in subsection B of Section 23.34.011 and are located within the adopted boundaries of any urban village may be rezoned to zones more intense than single-family 5000 when all of the following conditions are met:

1. A neighborhood plan has designated the area as appropriate for the zone designation, including specification of the RSL/T, RSL/C, or RSL/TC suffix when applicable;

2. The rezone is:

a. To a Residential Small Lot (RSL), Residential Small Lot-Tandem (RSL/T), Residential Small Lot-Cottage (RSL/C), Residential Small Lot-Tandem/Cottage (RSL/TC), Lowrise Duplex/Triplex (LDT), Lowrise 1 (L1), or Lowrise 1/Residential-Commercial (L1/RC), or

b. Within the areas identified on Map P-1 of the adopted North Beacon Hill Neighborhood Plan, and the rezone is to any Lowrise zone, or to an NC1 zone or NC2 zone with a 30 or 40 height limit.

C. Areas zoned single-family within the Northgate Overlay District, established pursuant to Chapter 23.71, that consist of one or more lots and meet the criteria for single-family zoning contained in subsection B of Section 23.34.011 may be rezoned through a contract rezone to a neighborhood commercial zone if the rezone is limited to blocks (defined for the purpose of this subsection C as areas bounded by street lot lines) in which more than 80% of that block is already designated as a neighborhood commercial zone.

D. The area proposed for rezoning is within the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village and within ¼ mile of a planned or constructed light rail station.

2. Describe how the issue is currently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. If the issue is not adequately addressed, describe the need for it.

Response: The proposed amendment would provide consistency with the Residential Urban Village Goal, which provides that residential urban villages should “function primarily as compact residential neighborhoods” and should “support densities in residential urban villages that support transit use.” See Goal UVG28.

The proposed amendment would also promote residential and commercial density around a transit station, which reduces greenhouse gas emissions, promotes the efficient use of land and services, and encourages pedestrian-oriented, walkable communities. Thus, the amendment is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan goals and policies: UV1, UV2, UVG9, UVG10, UVG5, UVG4, EG7, E15, E15.5.

3. Describe why the proposed change meets the criteria adopted in Resolution 30662 for considering an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Response: The proposed change meets the following criteria outlined in Resolution 30662:

A. The amendment or policy is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan:

- The amendment is not appropriate as a regulatory measure, and warrants a Comprehensive Plan amendment;
- The amendment is not better addressed through another planning process, such as neighborhood planning, or
- The Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates the amendment as part of the 10-year update.

Response: The amendment is proposed in connection with a contract rezone. It is therefore not appropriate as a regulatory measure, and is not better addressed through another planning process. The change is not mandated by GMA.

B. The amendment is legal—the amendment meets existing state and local laws.

Response: The amendment is legal. It complies with GMA, which requires Comprehensive Plans to be internally consistent.

C. It is practical to consider the amendment:

- The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information necessary to make an informed decision.
- City staff will be able to conduct sufficient analysis and to develop policy and code language within the available time frame. (GMA requires that implementing regulations, if needed be adopted at the same time as adoption of Comprehensive Plan policies).
- The proposed amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council is interested in significantly changing existing policy.
- The amendment has not recently been rejected.
- There has been a neighborhood review process to develop any proposed change to a neighborhood plan, or a neighborhood review process can be conducted prior to final Council consideration of the amendment.

Response: The applicant has also proposed a larger rezone, a small piece of which corresponds to this Comprehensive Plan amendment (i.e., that small portion of the

amendment area that must be reassigned in the Comprehensive Plan from single family to commercial/mixed use). An EIS will be prepared in connection with the proposed rezone and amendment. Therefore, it may be appropriate to consider the amendment when the EIS is completed. The proposed amendment creates a higher level of consistency between the Roosevelt planning element and the Residential Urban Village element. The proposed amendment has not recently been rejected. The neighborhood will be involved in review of the EIS and contract rezone proposed in connection with this amendment.

4. What do you anticipate will be the impacts caused by the change in text, including the geographic area and the issues presented? Why will the proposed change result in a net benefit to the community?

Response: The impacts of rezoning areas in the Roosevelt neighborhood will be examined in an EIS to be prepared in connection with the proposed rezone. The proposed change will result in the redevelopment of several underutilized properties, resulting in a net benefit to the community by the addition of new residents and neighbors, a revitalized neighborhood, pedestrian amenities, and new commercial areas.

5. How would the proposed change comply with the community vision statements, goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan? Please include any data, research, or reasoning that supports the proposed amendments.

Response: The proposed amendment would promote increased residential and commercial density within walking distance of a planned Sound Transit station, which reduces greenhouse gas emissions, promotes the efficient use of land and services, and encourages pedestrian-oriented, walkable communities. Thus, the amendment is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan goals and policies:

- UVG4: Promote densities, mixes of uses, and transportation improvements that support walking, use of public transportation, and other transportation demand management strategies, especially within urban centers and urban villages.
- UVG5: Direct the greatest share of future development to centers and urban villages and reduce the potential for dispersed growth along arterials and in other areas not conducive to walking, transit use, and cohesive community development.
- UVG9: Use limited land resources more efficiently and pursue a development pattern that is more economically sound, by encouraging infill development on vacant and underutilized sites, particularly within urban villages.
- UVG12: Increase public safety by making villages places that people will be drawn to at all times of the day.
- UV1: Promote the growth of urban villages as compact mixed-use neighborhoods in order to support walking and transit use, and to provide services and employment close to residences.
- UV2: Promote conditions that support healthy neighborhoods throughout the city, including those conducive to helping mixed-use urban village communities thrive, such as focused transportation demand management strategies, vital business

districts, a range of housing choices, a range of park and open space facilities, and investment and reinvestment in neighborhoods.

- UV2.5: In areas surrounding major transit hubs, except in industrial zones, allow densities sufficient to take advantage of significant investment in public transportation infrastructure. Use incentive zoning programs and other strategies to help ensure the provision of affordable housing.
- UV7.5: Coordinate public and private activities to address transportation, utilities, open space, and other public services to accommodate the new growth associated with subarea rezones (e.g., in transit station areas) that result in significant increase in density.
- UV30: Balance objectives for accommodating growth, supporting transit use and walking, maintaining compatibilities 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.
- UVG30: Encourage growth in locations within the city that support more compact and less land-consuming, high quality urban living.
- EG7: To control the impact of climate change globally and locally, reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other climate-changing greenhouse gases in Seattle by 30 percent from 1990 levels by 2024, and by 80 percent from 1990 levels by 2050.
- E15: Work with private and public sector partners in seeking to achieve goal EG7 for reducing climate-changing greenhouse gas emissions from private and public sources to control the impacts of global warming on the city's water supply, electrical energy supply, ecosystems, public health, and economy.

It is also consistent with the following Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan goals and policies:

- R-LUP1: Support a zoning strategy that consolidates similar zoning into whole blocks in and near the urban core and light rail station, to result in more compatible development.
- R-TG9: Promote and support the integration of the Sound Transit Light Rail Station into the transportation network of the Roosevelt Urban Village.
- R-HG2: Create housing types that can provide housing opportunities for a wide range of residents and household with varying incomes and housing needs.
- R-HP4: Encourage housing options for people with disabilities, senior citizens, and those with low or moderate income levels.
- R-HP5: Create housing opportunities that allow Roosevelt residents to stay in the neighborhood through various life stages.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan to be further examined in the Land Use discussion in the EIS associated with this proposal.

6. Is there public support for this proposed text amendment (i.e., have you conducted community meetings, etc.)?

Response: The applicant has conducted the following monthly meetings with the Roosevelt community to discuss the proposed changes in the neighborhood:

- July 17, 2008
- August 26, 2008
- October 25, 2008
- December 15, 2008
- January 5, 2009
- January 21, 2009
- February 17, 2009
- April 20, 2009

Attendance at each meeting ranged from 25 to 40 people, with about 80 people attending the October 25, 2008 meeting. The applicant has also been in frequent contact with the Chair of the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association's Land Use Committee. Scoping meetings related to the EIS have also been conducted.