



City of Seattle

Seattle Planning Commission

Commissioners

Amalia Leighton, Chair
Marj Press, Vice-Chair
Michael Austin
Luis Borrero
Lauren Craig
Sandra Fried
Yolanda Ho
Grace Kim
Jeanne Krikawa
Kara Martin
Jake McKinstry
Tim Parham
David Shelton
Lauren Squires
Spencer Williams
Patti Wilma

Staff

Vanessa Murdock,
Executive Director

Jesseca Brand,
Planning Analyst

Diana Canzoneri,
Demographer &
Senior Policy Analyst

Robin Magonegil,
Administrative Staff

June 26, 2015

Honorable Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Chair
Planning Land Use and Sustainability Committee
Seattle City Council
PO Box 34025
Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Dear Councilmember O'Brien,

The Seattle Planning Commission (SPC) is pleased to provide our comments and recommendations on which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments should be placed on the docket for further analysis. We outlined areas we suggest be considered as the review process moves forward. Our recommendations are based on our responsibility as stewards of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and through the application of Council adopted criteria, Guidelines for Amendment Selection, included in Resolution 31402.

SPC recommends moving forward the following three amendment proposals for further analysis:

1. NE 68th Street Map Change –
The applicant is requesting a change to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) for the designation of several parcels within the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village from “Multifamily” to “Mixed Use Commercial”.
The Commission recommends this map change for docket setting. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and meets the Criteria. Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan has an adopted growth strategy, the Urban Village Strategy. A change from “Multifamily Residential” to “Mixed Use Commercial” within an Urban Village is consistent with the Urban Village Strategy.
2. 40th Ave. NE Map Change –
The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM for the designation of several parcels in the Windermere neighborhood from “Multifamily Residential” to “Mixed Use Commercial”.

The Commission recommends this map change for docket setting. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and meets the Criteria.

The FLUM change can only happen through this process as the parcel is outside of an Urban Center/Village or Neighborhood Planning area.

3. 35th Ave. NE Map Change –

The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM for the designation of several parcels in the Wedgewood neighborhood from “Multifamily Residential” to “Mixed Use Commercial”.

The Commission recommends this map change for docket setting. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and meets the Criteria.

The project has received Neighborhood Matching Funds and is budgeted in the 2015 DPD Workplan, and will allow gathering of sufficient information to make an informed decision.

SPC recommends the following amendment proposals not move forward for further analysis

4. NE 94th Map Change –

The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM to expand the Northgate Urban Center to include additional parcels to the South as well as land use designation changes from “Single-family Residential” to “Multifamily Residential”.

The Commission does not recommend this map change for docket setting siting Criterion C.3. The Commission has consistently supported more flexibility within the “Single Family Residential” areas and a reexamination of the Urban Village boundaries. However, the currently adopted Comprehensive Plan policies state the intent to maintain and preserve “Single Family Residential” outside of Urban Villages, and this amendment would be inconsistent with the current goals and policies. The Commission looks forward to a continued conversation, through the major update of the Comprehensive Plan, on flexibility in “Single Family Residential” and the vision for these areas of the City.

5. Pier One Map Change –

The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM for the designation of several parcels in the Duwamish Manufacturing/Industrial Center from “Industrial” to “Mixed Use Commercial”.

The Commission does not recommend this map change for docket setting siting Criteria A.5 and C.4. This proposal has been submitted several times and rejected for review. The Commission believes that this proposal should be addressed through an area wide planning process that takes into account the needs of this specific area and the zoning adjacencies. Through Seattle 2035 there is an opportunity to review Industrial Land Uses, transitional land uses, and the criteria for removal of land from the Industrial Areas. The area planning process in conjunction with the Seattle 2035 update will help guide the City Council in any Future Land Use Map changes specific to Industrial Areas.

6. Open and Participatory Government –

The applicant is requesting the creation of a new element or appendix for the Comprehensive Plan called, “Open and Participatory Government”.

The Commission does not recommend this amendment for docket setting siting Criterion C.4. The applicant has submitted this proposal several times and it has been consistently rejected by the City Council.

7. Race and Social Equity Core Value –

The applicant is requesting several text changes to the Comprehensive Plan. The changes would remove and or change several text changes directed by City Council in their recent adoption of Resolution 31577.

The Commission does not recommend this amendment for docket setting siting Criterion C.1. The City Council unanimously passed Resolution 31577 on May 11, 2015.

We appreciate the opportunity to review amendments for docket setting and provide our recommendations. If you have any further questions please call either myself or Vanessa Murdock, Seattle Planning Commission Executive Director at (206) 733-9271.

Sincerely,



Amalia Leighton
Chair

cc:

Mayor Ed Murray
Seattle City Councilmembers
Robert Feldstein, Steve Lee; Office of Policy and Innovation
Diane Sugimura, Nathan Torgelson, Susan McLain, Tom Hauger, Kristian Kofoed; Department of Planning and Development
Ketil Freeman, Lish Whitson, Eric McConaghy; Council Central Staff

City of Seattle Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendment Selection (from Resolution 31402)

- A. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:
1. It is consistent with the role of the Comprehensive Plan under the State Growth Management Act;
 2. It is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy;
 3. Its intent cannot be accomplished by a change in regulations alone;
 4. It is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision; and;
 5. 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:
1. The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information to make an informed decision;
 2. 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;
 3. 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
 4. 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.