

**Seattle Neighborhood Workshops**  
**ROOSEVELT WORKSHOP SMALL GROUP NOTES**

**October 29, 2016**

*Note: Yellow highlights for consensus; blue highlights for unreadable notes*

**GROUP 1**

**Assets**

- Concern: The room doesn't reflect the diversity in the neighborhood.
- Roosevelt High School
- Mix of housing and small businesses, restaurants, bars, Roosevelt Square shops
- Light rail station
- Neighborhoods around Cowan Park/Ravenna Park
- Mixture of single family and multifamily homes
- Good neighborhood in which to raise children
- Access to public amenities, even outside Roosevelt Urban Village: Green Lake, Cowan Park
- Quiet neighborhood streets, where kids can play
- Having opportunities to close residential streets for children to play
- Commercial areas on Roosevelt, 65<sup>th</sup> and 12th.
- Easy connections to other areas of the city by car or bus
- Issue: Lot south of high school should be a park
- Concerns: How to keep traffic on main corridors and protect quiet neighborhood streets
- Concerns: Traffic patterns of left turns in some areas, such as on 65<sup>th</sup>, where traffic backs up
- Concerns: Low-cost housing is being torn down; no Section 8/public low-income housing in the neighborhood
- Concern: Potential for Green Lake Community Center to be sold by parks

**Questions:**

- 10-minute walkshed – What is the research behind this?
- Will city surplus land be sold for affordable housing?
- What is happening with the reservoir?

**Zoning**

- Urban core near commercial area could be denser
- Interest in having affordable housing in *this* neighborhood, not in-lieu put elsewhere
- Need for expansion of Urban Village to get the number of affordable units
- Opportunity to develop Roosevelt Way from 65<sup>th</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup>
- Parking connected with zones not shown on map
- For new housing, sidewalks should be expanded for ADA access, and have ramps to street
- Walkability – Walk lights need to last longer to allow time for all people to cross the street
- **Consensus: Development should support walkability and livability**

- Houses on 16<sup>th</sup> and near Cowan Park have been fixed up – concern that zoning change would change their scale and not be as enjoyable
- Need for parking at medical centers and similar services
- If a building is built within the urban village and doesn't include parking, the developer shouldn't be able to apply for parking in RPZ in adjacent areas.
- Need for more parks
- Expansion of Urban Village might enable more variety of housing so it's more affordable; people could have a \$500,000 house instead of all at \$1 million.
- Variety of sizes and costs of units – need some to be for families
- Will the city's actions be facilitating razing of single family homes?
- What will the UW do? They often help young professors with mortgages.
- Suggestion: Since the block south of the high school is getting more dense, make the blocks north of the high school lower in scale, with less traffic—LR1 at most.
- Disagreement on whether more height on 65<sup>th</sup> is OK
- Renters need to feel a part of the community, too – What can the city do? What can other organizations do?
- Concern: Displacement, tearing down housing where seniors live. They need the ability to buy/rent in the same neighborhood.
- Desire for affordable housing options in the neighborhood, and for diversity of ages and ethnicities to be able to live in the neighborhood
- Buses and light rail should be the hub of new development
- Transportation options promote community – people can live in the neighborhood, walk to shops, easily get to jobs
- Concern: Affordable retail for small, local businesses, not just chain stores
- Concern: Two different transit systems (Metro and Sound Transit), not coordinated

#### **Questions:**

- Question on brochure: Is "in scale" true?
- With MHA, will there be exceptions available to developers for more height?
- Do numbers on map show maximum height, or can developers get an exception to build higher?
- Where is the data about parking need and use?
- Do millennials need/want parking?

#### **Design Considerations**

- Desire for public or publically-accessible courtyards, plazas, public art, seating, play space – use the Portland model
- Want set-backs, green space, architectural detail rather than sterile buildings; use design guidelines
- Needs to continue the community feel
- Integrate modern and existing historic architectural character

## Boundaries

- Heritage area around Ravenna Park; does it need a historic designation?
- Audubon Society effort to get more wildlife habitat
- Do boundaries need to expand?
- Is trade-off worth it in the transition area?
- Need to establish a realistic 10-minute walkshed

## Some Summary Points

- Questions about the need to expand the Urban Village boundary
- Transition issues need discussion
  - LR2 to RSL is tough
  - Needs to be more gradual
- Questions about 10-minute walkshed
- Generally, more density at the core
- Transportation benefits diversity
- Desire for diversity of housing
- Need set-backs, plazas, wider sidewalks, ADA access, pedestrian scale

## GROUP 2

### Assets

- Roosevelt High
- Parks – Cowan, Ravenna, Frioua, Coming[?], park on 14<sup>th</sup> between 65<sup>th</sup> & 66<sup>th</sup> (Sisely property)
- Ravenna Community Center
- Ravenna Blvd
- Park & Ride at at I-5
- Side street – livability
- Commercial center on 65<sup>th</sup> east of Urban Village boundary
- Reservoir – potential asset
- Commercial core
  - Roosevelt corridor, Roosevelt & 65<sup>th</sup>
  - Along 12<sup>th</sup>, as well
- New light rail station
- Sense of community
  - Disaster preparedness units held create sense of community
  - Block watches
- Sunshine Fruit Market
- Closing Weedin Place – possible public gathering place
- Calvary Church (not agreement)
- Historic character of existing single family neighborhoods, craftsman homes
- Density close to transit core
- Green Street on 66<sup>th</sup>

- 9<sup>th</sup>, south of 65<sup>th</sup> to Ravenna, there is a larger planting strip – opportunity for landscaping and pedestrian corridor
- Existing trees on arterials and residential streets

### **Zoning**

- Concerned about townhomes on side streets
- Concerned about having enough parking for commercial. Others don't want to encourage parking.
- Consider extending intensity of development east along 65<sup>th</sup> to Ravenna Bryant commercial district (not agreement). Create a corridor along 65<sup>th</sup> to the east.
- Reduce density for new urban village boundary in single family areas and increase in corridor along 65<sup>th</sup>.
- Have upzone along 65<sup>th</sup> as opposed to extension of urban village.
- RSL not a very big change in character of neighborhoods.
- There are already planned townhomes east of 15<sup>th</sup> near 65<sup>th</sup>, so upzone not needed. Others think upzone would be desirable to create more affordable housing.

### **Boundary**

- Consider adding triangle at north edge of Urban Village boundary to Urban Village up to NE 80<sup>th</sup> with boundary on the east along 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Have eastern boundary be 15<sup>th</sup> – not agreement on this.
- Could extend boundary along Roosevelt south of Ravenna Blvd – not agreement. This area is considered part of University District.

### **Transitions**

- Consider boundaries at alleys or back-to-back rather than only along streets.
- Concern about transition from commercial to midrise at 65<sup>th</sup> & Roosevelt
- If you move Eastern boundary to 15<sup>th</sup>, there would need to be some transition in NC zone along 65<sup>th</sup>.
- If commercial is extended east along 65<sup>th</sup>, there are concerns about transitions between commercial and single family. Massing of buildings should feel more like surrounding neighborhoods.
- Going from commercial to L3 is more appropriate transition.

### **Zoning**

- Consider upzone west of 12<sup>th</sup> north of 62<sup>nd</sup>
  - Concern about talking with homeowners there first
- Could extension of commercial east of 15<sup>th</sup> along 65<sup>th</sup> be NC 30? (lower height)

### **Design Guidelines**

- Increase setbacks and landscaping, particularly along pedestrian corridors
- Ground-level setbacks are more important than higher-level setbacks

## Miscellaneous

- Concern that not all neighborhoods are taking fair share of affordable housing
- Fees raised in neighborhood should stay in neighborhoods
- Make Roosevelt a pedestrian boulevard from Ravenna Blvd to 71<sup>st</sup>. Also along 65<sup>th</sup> from 15<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> (P Zone).

## Summary

- Assets: Transit, tree cover, parks, character of neighborhood assets at Ravenna, walkability
- Boundary along 15<sup>th</sup>
- Connection along 65<sup>th</sup>
- Several areas for increased density
- Transition at 65<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>
- Pedestrian connections – Roosevelt
  - Extend overlay
- Keep affordable housing in neighborhood
- Transitions at Roosevelt & 68th

## GROUP 3

### Assets (What's great about the neighborhood?)

- Walking to school, shops
- Easy to walk to needs
- Ravenna Park
  - Strong schools
  - Infrastructure to support family life
  - Close walk to community center
  - Walkability
- ADUs in area can support homeowners
- City of single family homes
- Established "historic" homes
- Walkable – Strong potential for additional growth but should preserve quality of buildings and character
- Change is happening
- More services at ground level
- More neighborhood serving businesses—cafes, pharmacy, grocery, etc.
- Diversity of services is important to foster, i.e., child care, etc.
- More diversity and choices are needed
  - And a variety of shops and services close by
- \*Roosevelt HS is a big asset
  - Retain a population that can be served
- \*Views from school and reservoir to Olympics
  - Preserve key view corridors

- Public view corridors can be highlighted when thinking about tradeoff with private views
- Concern about impact to historic homes and farmhouses
- Desire for more neighborhood activities – gyms, shops, etc.
- Variety of design and architecture
- Architectural diversity is an asset

## Zoning Changes

- Area south at 65<sup>th</sup> from 12<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup>
  - Parks [? PONB?] as a general principle
  - Livability and sustainability
  - South-facing light and rooftops
  - Zone higher on north side of streets
  - Lower on south to preserve solar opportunities
- Use topography to support preserving light
  - Solar panel possibility
  - Access to sun and light
- More home ownership options
- When we moved into Ravenna, we couldn't afford Roosevelt
- Sense of what the height will be
  - Increased predictability for p\_\_\_\_\_ [?] of \$ and affordable housing units
- Housing choice is not just about access to housing – schools, sidewalks and other features
  - Developers build housing on site
- Concern about parking
  - Desire for more provision of parking
- How best to support transportation options
- Building type/pattern
  - Spaces between the buildings
- Zone parking along 65<sup>th</sup>/68<sup>th</sup>/69<sup>th</sup>
- How to manage parking – share limited
- Whole RPZ for Urban Village
- North/south orientation of Roosevelt makes east-west access difficult
- Look into one-way street as study[?]

## Transitions

- Landscaping, trees
- Wide sidewalks
  - Act as sound barriers
  - Support livability
- Ravenna Blvd as Olmsted corridor
  - Think of an overlay to support larger buildings and open space

## Housing Choices

- New development is not supporting choices for families
- Allow smaller footprint houses
- Some housing
- Boundary
- Likelihood of affordability and degree of change in small lot
- Transition on eastern edge of 15<sup>th</sup>
- Boundary should be 17<sup>th</sup>
  - Responds to historic homes
  - Responds to ADU development
  - Responds to topography
  - Preserve some larger family housing
- 65<sup>th</sup> is a good opportunity to support walkable to light rail [? LR1?]

## Summary

- More family options
- Concerns about parking
- People are split about boundaries but want to consider some different strategies for committing[?] to commercial and respond to historic character
- Like approach to MHA
- Support housing variety in neighborhood
- Capitalize on Ravenna Blvd and 65<sup>th</sup> Street to Ravenna
  - More capacity to other areas
  - Not all MF should be on arterials
- Green space is an issue -- incorporate

## GROUP 4

### Assets

- School (Roosevelt)
- Ravenna Park
- Cowen Park
- Ravenna Blvd
- Green Lake
- Whole Foods
- Commercial district (Roosevelt & 65<sup>th</sup>)
- Green canopy
- Easy access to U. Village, U. District
- Easy access to other neighborhoods
- Future light rail
- Park/Reservoir? (future?)
- Neighborhoods surrounding Ravenna Park

- Historic Residential character (uniformity)
- Integrity of streetscape
- But don't have those in historic preservation currently, might speed up change if we rezoned

### **Zoning and Principles**

- There should be more services with Urban Village, like street cleaning
- BIA?
- Reduce lag between growth & investments
- Rental property value has gone down because of growth & construction – parking, noise, construction, leaf blowers, air quality
- Why are we growing so fast? Jobs, foreign investment? Why isn't the city doing more to slow growth?
- Transitions are not smooth enough
  - SF to MF and around Olmstead Blvds/parks, example: NCSS to RSL (65<sup>th</sup>)
  - Could focus more on 65<sup>th</sup> to East of Urban Village
- No eminent domain, this only occurs when owners choose
- Neighborhood Plan: We have already reached a reasonable amount of growth. Wanted density west of Roosevelt and have achieved that.
- We can't stop desirability of neighborhood. People will continue to move here and displace middle income; only the most wealthy people will be able to afford to live here.
- Without expansion of boundary, we won't have the "missing middle," family-sized housing, etc.
- Low-income units/housing should not be segregated or stigmatized.

### **Questions:**

- What are advantages of urban villages? What do we get?
- RSL? Are there guidelines for size? How do you make them fit?

### **Zoning and Assets**

- LRZ could be destructive to historic neighborhoods near Ravenna Park
  - Threatens the asset, as we've defined it (historic, uniform)
- What would be the impact of assemblage? Bigger building floor area ratio?
  - [Note: Drawings below this statement show a tall building with not space around it; then two tall buildings with large spaces to the left; then three tall buildings clumped together with a large space to the right]
- Roads are better cutoffs/transitions than alleys?
- Asset – Musicians, artists are an asset
  - Diversity – How do we keep that? Intergenerational, etc.
  - Need artists' lofts/Live-work
  - Need Senior Center; want incentivize performance space
- Have backyard cottages [Note: arrow from this bullet to above bullet]
- Concern about too many studios, one-bedrooms; need family-sized housing, need more bathrooms



**Boundary Expansions**

- Street is already dense – don't want Urban Village to expand (east of 15<sup>th</sup>) [survey]
- My neighbors feel 15<sup>th</sup> is natural boundary of neighborhood; trauma of Sisley might be informing
- Concerned about Ravenna – don't want lots divided, houses torn down. Want to see density, but new houses should fit in. (duplex, triplex, ADU, DADU)
- We've already met our targets; how much more do we have to take?

**Key Points**

1. Treasure historical, neighborhoods (trees, yards); these threatened by zoning (some disagreement here)
2. Some transition issues: Don't have RSL next to 55'
3. New development should honor/reflect design vocabulary
4. Less concern about zoning changes on main corridors (Roosevelt, 65<sup>th</sup>, etc.)
5. Want infrastructure, BIAs, services concurrent with growth

**Form**

- Apodments
- Can we better use existing housing? Subdivide, etc.
- Don't want everything to look the same, like SLU
- When buildings don't have parking, do they have to have bike parking?