

Seattle Neighborhood Workshops

SUMMARY THEMES

Wallingford

Assets – While the table conversations at this meeting did not directly ask for assets, the notes indicated several neighborhood assets that participants said they wanted to preserve:

- Family-friendly neighborhood, walkability
- Neighborhood character, historic homes, opportunity to age in place
- Trees, parks, green space, access to sunlight

Proposed zoning changes – There were two areas where several tables reported favorable comments, but much of the conversations focused on concerns.

- Favorable:
 - Some tables included comments supportive of the SF to RSL change, though some wanted to ensure that owners still live on-site
 - Some were supportive of upzoning along transit lines and/or major arterials (Stone Way, 45th, Aurora), as long as the buildings don't produce a canyon effect
- Concerns:
 - Changing SF to L3 is too big an increase
 - Likely to cause displacement; consider equity, preserve existing affordable housing
 - Proposal will increase property taxes
 - Urban Village boundary issues: some suggested shrinking to along arterials in commercial zones and excluding single family areas within current Urban Village
 - Need for multifamily housing
 - Create homeowner incentives to encourage ADUs
 - Require parking; it is already a challenge and upzones will make it worse
 - Questions/concerns about MHA program:
 - No need for upzones since capacity exists for the projected growth
 - Fairness: why should Wallingford shoulder such a big percentage of growth? Other neighborhoods will not be affected as much.
 - Whether MHA will increase affordable housing, on balance
 - Use developer impact fees instead of MHA requirements and upzones
 - Requests for the methodologies and data sources, calculation of affordable housing added vs. lost, figures on the additional density needed citywide
 - Design review is needed. Development needs to fit neighborhood character; need 15' setbacks, access to light (especially to support owner-installed solar panels); concerns about canyon effect
 - Need for infrastructure improvements—including sewers, transportation, power— and amenities—schools, parks, trees – for livability. Developer impact fees could pay for improvements.
 - Poor process; lack of community outreach and involvement; speed of process that proposes major changes; lack of consistency with existing neighborhood plan