

## 3.7



# OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION.

## 3.7.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

### INTRODUCTION

Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) manages a 6,400-acre park system of more than 485 parks and open spaces that comprises about 12 percent of the Seattle's land area.<sup>1</sup> Other open spaces in Seattle include the Chittenden Locks, Olympic Sculpture Park, portions of the Burke-Gilman Trail, fields and playgrounds associated with public and private schools, waterfront access points provided by the Port of Seattle, and open spaces on college and university campuses. There are also privately owned open spaces, such as plazas, available to the public.

Projected growth in Seattle would result in increased demand for parks and open space. Because the Comprehensive Plan guides most population growth to urban centers and urban villages, SPR expects parks and open space demand in those neighborhoods to grow substantially (SPR, 2016). This chapter provides a programmatic assessment of potential impacts to parks and open space in the EIS study area resulting from increased housing and employment capacity proposed as part of MHA implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Parks and open space include natural areas and greenbelts; community, neighborhood, and regional parks; mini/pocket parks; specialty gardens; community centers; pools; swimming beaches, fishing piers, and boat ramps; golf courses; small craft centers; outdoor camp; and tennis centers.

## POLICY FRAMEWORK

This section summarizes plans and policies applicable to the provision of parks and open space in the study area in light of future residential growth.

### Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan

The Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan outlines the City's goal to provide a variety of parks and open space to serve Seattle's growing population in accordance with the priorities identified in the City's Parks Development Plan. Accordingly, the City plans to expand its park holdings and open space opportunities, particularly in urban villages. The City also encourages private developers to incorporate on-site publicly accessible open space (City of Seattle, 2016). In addition, a goal in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan is to consider access to parks by transit, bicycle, and on foot when acquiring, siting, and designing new park facilities, or improving existing ones. The 2005 Comprehensive Plan provided quantitative, population-based goals for the provision and distribution of open space in urban center villages, hub urban villages, and residential urban villages, as well goals specific to village commons (City of Seattle, 2005). The Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan generalizes these open space goals, and the 2017 Draft Parks Development Plan provides specific level-of-service (LOS) standards and walkability guidelines (SPR, 2017).

### Seattle's Parks and Recreation Development Plans

The 2011 Development Plan is the adopted plan for this assessment; however, it incorporated parks and open space goals from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan and the 2006 Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan, which are no longer applicable (such as population-based standards at the urban village scale). Because of this, the analysis for this Seattle MHA EIS only considered the goals from the 2011 Development Plan that are still relevant (Exhibit 3.7–1). SPR is currently updating its 2011 Development Plan with a Draft 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan (released in May of 2017). Although the 2017 Plan has not been finalized, it is likely to be adopted in the fall of 2017. The analysis for this Seattle MHA EIS uses the metrics from this plan to identify significant impacts because it incorporates goals from the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with 2014 Parks Legacy Plan, the 2016 Seattle Recreation Demand Study, the 2015 Community Center Strategic Plan, and other city plans. How these two plans were used and considered is described in greater detail in the subsections below.

## Seattle’s Parks and Recreation 2011 Development Plan

SPR’s 2011 Development Plan guides acquisition and development efforts over a five- to six-year period. The Development Plan provides goals and policies for park acquisition and development, identifies locations where distribution guidelines for parks and open space are unmet based on an open space gap analysis, and includes an adopted capital improvement program for parks and recreation facilities. Through the Development Plan, SPR aims to provide an appropriate number and distribution of park and recreation facilities and to site future facilities in part based on demonstrated or anticipated demand and distribution guidelines. To achieve this, SPR must acquire property for parks and open space to “fill the identified gaps in usable open space and to manage future growth and change consistent with the City’s growth management goals and policies as outlined in the City’s Comprehensive Plan” (SPR, 2011).

SPR typically prioritizes new parks and open space where the City expects population growth, such as urban villages, and in areas currently deficient according to the population-based goals for open space.

The City has not adopted LOS standards relative to parks and open space. However, the 2011 Development Plan does establish distribution guidelines for provision of parks, open space, and recreational facilities (Exhibit 3.7–1). Even if an area does not meet the goals in Exhibit 3.7–1, it can still fall within the “acceptable” designation if approved offsets compensate for the overall shortfall of open space and/or neighborhood parks. Approved community offsets include school grounds, green streets, boulevards, and trails, among others (SPR, 2011).

**Exhibit 3.7–1** Distribution Goals for Provision of Parks, Open Space, and Recreational Facilities

Location	Type of Open Space Evaluated	Acceptable
<b>Citywide</b>	<b>Breathing Room / Total Open Space:</b> combined acreage of parks, greenspaces, trails, and boulevards.	1/3 acre per 100 resident population
<b>Single-Family Residential Areas</b>	<b>Neighborhood Park / Useable Open Space:</b> relatively level and open, easily accessible, primarily green open space available for drop-in use. Can be part of a larger, citywide park space.	1/2 acre of neighborhood park within 1 mile of households
<b>Urban Villages</b>	<b>Neighborhood Park / Useable Open Space:</b> publicly owned or dedicated open space that is easily accessible and intended to serve the immediate urban village. This encompasses various types of open space for passive enjoyment as well as activity that includes green areas and hard-surfaced urban plazas, street parks, and pocket parks. Dedicated open spaces should be at least 10,000 ft <sup>2</sup> in size.	1/4 acre of neighborhood park within 1/2-mile of households

Source: SPR, 2011.

## Seattle’s Parks and Recreation 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan

The Draft 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan (the Draft 2017 Plan) is a six-year plan that “documents and describes SPR’s facilities and lands, looks at Seattle’s changing demographics, and lays out a vision for the future” (SPR, 2017). There are substantial differences between the Draft 2017 Plan and the 2011 Development Plan. In order to maintain a citywide LOS that is compliant with Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office requirements and the Growth Management Act, a citywide population-based standard of 8 acres per 1,000 residents is proposed in the Draft 2017 Plan, as opposed to the existing 1/3 acre per 100 residents goal (Exhibit 3.7–2). In addition, the individual urban village population-based open space goals would be replaced with a long-term acquisition strategy based on walkability, in accordance with updates to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Draft 2017 Plan also takes a slightly different approach to identifying open space gaps and prioritizing areas for acquisition by considering a broader range of public resources as parks and open spaces (including public school property, major institutions and universities, and other non-park owned property), and considering equity and walkability in addition to population density. The proposed LOS standard and the walkability guidelines are summarized in Exhibit 3.7–2.

**Exhibit 3.7–2** 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan Draft LOS Standard and Walkability Guidelines

Guidelines/Standard	Location	Description
<b>Population-based standard</b>	Citywide	8 acres/1,000 residents
<b>Walkability standard</b>	Within Urban Villages	5-minute walkability
	Outside Urban Villages	10-minute walkability

Source: SPR, 2017.

## Seattle Municipal Code

In certain zones, Seattle’s Land Use Code (SMC Title 23) requires a minimum amount of open space for private development. When required, private open space must meet standards in SMC 23.71.014 and 23.86.018. Open space is often required as an “amenity.” In Lowrise multifamily zones, new development must provide an amenity area equal

to 25 percent of the lot area, with at least 50 percent of the amenity area at the ground level. In commercial zones that allow residential development, five percent of residential floor area must be a residential amenity open to the outdoors (City of Seattle, 2016b; City of Seattle, 2016c). Although such open spaces provide benefits to Seattle residents and visitors, they are not counted in the quantities of open spaces analyzed below because they are privately owned.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

Presently, about 43 percent of the City’s parks are wholly or partially located in urban villages. But only five percent of total park acreage is located in urban village boundaries (City of Seattle, 2014; City of Seattle, 2014b). Seattle’s six urban centers contain the largest number of parks, while the 18 residential urban villages contain the most park acreage. Among individual urban villages, Admiral has the highest share of parkland (12 percent), while parks comprise less than one percent of land in West Seattle Junction, Greenwood-Phinney Ridge, and Morgan Junction (City of Seattle, 2014; City of Seattle, 2014b).

Under the 2015 baseline conditions, the City of Seattle meets the 2011 Development Plan goal and 2017 LOS standard by providing roughly 9.34 acres of parks and open space per every 1,000 residents and 0.93 acre of parks and open space per every 100 residents (Exhibit 3.7–3).

**Exhibit 3.7–3** Baseline Condition Acres of Parks and Open Space per Population

Population (2015)	Acres of Parks and Open Space	Acres of Parks and Open Space per Population
686,800	6,414	9.34 acres per 1,000 residents 0.93 acre per 100 residents

Source: SPR, 2017.

Exhibit 3.7–4 shows the acreage of parks and open space for each urban village in the study area and the acres of parks and open space per 100 people under baseline conditions in 2015. Although there are no urban village scale population standards, identifying the number of acres of parks and open space per resident population is one measure to indicate how changes in population density could potentially change the relative need for additional parks and open space in urban village or neighborhood areas. Exhibit 3.7–4 also identifies urban villages in the

**Exhibit 3.7-4** Baseline Conditions for Parks and Open Space Provision and Distribution

Urban Village	Acres of Parks and Open Space*	Acres of Parks and Open Space per 100 Residents (2015)**	Open Space Gap is Over Half of Urban Village (2011)	Walkability Gap is Over Half of Urban Village (2017)
<b>23rd &amp; Union-Jackson</b>	63.19	0.65		
<b>Admiral</b>	12.33	0.61		
<b>Aurora-Licton Springs</b>	7.55	0.12		X
<b>Ballard</b>	11.54	0.07	X	
<b>Bitter Lake Village</b>	10.36	0.18	X	X
<b>Columbia City</b>	32.16	0.67		
<b>Crown Hill</b>	4.69	0.2		
<b>Eastlake</b>	6.16	0.09		
<b>First Hill-Capitol Hill</b>	17.73	0.03	X	
<b>Fremont</b>	4.25	0.07	X	
<b>Green Lake</b>	2.33	0.05		
<b>Greenwood-Phinney Ridge</b>	0.42	0.01	X	X
<b>Lake City</b>	4.52	0.1		
<b>Madison-Miller</b>	7.85	0.16		
<b>Morgan Junction</b>	0.66	0.03	X	X
<b>North Beacon Hill</b>	6.28	0.24		X
<b>North Rainier</b>	66.83	1.53	X	
<b>Northgate</b>	19.88	0.25	X	X
<b>Othello</b>	11.52	0.23		X
<b>Rainier Beach</b>	31.52	1.16		
<b>Ravenna</b>	2.85	0.1	X	
<b>Roosevelt</b>	0.15	0.01		
<b>South Park</b>	15.39	0.67		
<b>Upper Queen Anne</b>	0	0		
<b>Wallingford</b>	4.49	0.08		
<b>West Seattle Junction</b>	1.39	0.02	X	
<b>Westwood-Highland Park</b>	0	0	X	X
<b>Outside Urban Villages</b>	6,032	1.56		

\* Parks and open space acreage in urban villages was calculated using 2014 SPR GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives (minus expansion areas).

\*\* Urban village population figures come from 2015 baseline housing data (Chapter 2) assuming an average household size of 1.78 people. The population outside urban villages assumes 2.06 people per household (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2017.

study area that were noted in the 2011 and 2017 gap analysis findings as having shortages in distribution of open space. For the 2011 Development Plan, an open space gap over half of the urban village indicated that future park acquisition in that urban village would be necessary. Although the 2017 gap analysis has not been finalized, urban villages with walkability gaps over half their area or more are also considered for this analysis. It is likely that such areas would be slated for future acquisition and possible development projects under the 2017 Plan.

Under existing conditions, 11 of the study area urban villages were identified as having substantial open space gaps in the 2011 Development Plan and 8 were identified as having substantial walkability gaps in the Draft 2017 Plan.

## 3.7.2 IMPACTS

### IMPACTS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

No direct impacts to parks and open space in the form of physical disruptions, alteration, or removal of parks land would result from housing and job growth in the study area. Indirect impacts to parks and open space could occur from changes in the distribution, accessibility, use, or availability of parks and open space due to additional population growth. The primary impact to parks and open space under all alternatives would be a decrease in availability, or the acreage of park and open space land available relative to a specific number of people. Impacts to parks and open space users may be in the form of greater crowding in parks, a need to wait to use facilities, unavailable programs, or a need to travel longer distances to reach an available park facility. Population growth without a commensurate increase in the quantity of parks and open space decreases availability. The quality or level of services available within parks and open space is another factor in the determination of adequacy of parks and open space, but because measures of quality are difficult to obtain and subjective this analysis focuses on the amount of and walkability to parks and open space lands, and distribution of parks and open space.

To assess impacts to parks and open space, this Chapter uses SPR's 2011 distribution goal of 1/3 (0.33) acre of parks and open space land for every 100 residents citywide, hereafter referred to as the 2011 distribution goal, and the 8 acres per every 1,000 residents (0.80 acre per 100 residents citywide) LOS, hereafter referred to as the 2017

**Exhibit 3.7–5** LOS Evaluation of Alternatives

	ALTERNATIVE 1 (2017 PARKS PLAN)*			ALTERNATIVE 2 AND ALTERNATIVE 3**		
	Population	Acres Parkland	Acres / 1,000 Residents	Population	Acres Parkland	Acres / 1,000 Residents
<b>2015</b>	686,800	6,414	9.34	686,800	6,414	9.34
<b>2035</b>	806,800	6,414	7.95	855,900	6,414	7.49
<i>Additional Acres of Parkland Needed to Meet LOS by Seattle 2035</i>		40			434	
<i>With Additional Park Land</i>		6,454	8.00		6,791	8.00

\* Growth estimated in the 2017 Parks Plan is considered as the No Action scenario for this analysis.

\*\* A rounded, 95,000 additional household growth amount is assumed for the action alternatives for the purposes of this analysis. Average household size is 1.78 persons per household.

Source: SPR, 2017.

LOS. The analysis also considers the findings of the 2011 and 2017 gap analyses in that they indicate areas where there are deficiencies in the existing parks and open space network. A project impact comes in the form of decrease in parks availability, as these urban villages will have more residents populating areas that may not have adequate park resources. All of the alternatives would meet the 2011 distribution goal. However, none of the alternatives would meet the 2017 citywide population based LOS. Exhibit 3.7–5 describes how many additional acres of park and open space land would need to be acquired for the 2017 LOS to be met. Under Alternative 1, 40 acres of park and open space land would need to be required, and under Alternatives 2 and 3 approximately 434 acres would be required.

Significant impacts are only assigned to proposals that would result in the City not meeting the citywide 2017 LOS.

For analysis purposes in this EIS, the population density per acre of park land is also assessed at the urban village level to better understand the distribution of impacts associated with the various alternatives. Exhibit 3.7–6 compares parks and open space availability by urban village under each alternative. All alternatives anticipate housing growth over the 20-year planning horizon both inside and outside urban villages, with Alternatives 2 and 3 directing more growth to urban villages than Alternative 1. To better understand the changes that would occur as a result of each of the action alternatives, the impact assessment focuses on how demand for parks and open space would change in urban villages in the study area, particularly those identified as having open space gaps or walkability gaps in the 2011 Development Plan or the Draft 2017 Plan, respectively.

**Exhibit 3.7-6 Comparison of Parks and Open Space Availability Across Alternatives**
**URBAN VILLAGE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY  
(ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS)**

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Open Space Gap (2011)	Walkability Gap (2017)
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>						
Rainier Beach	1.16	0.88 (24%)	0.55 (53%)	0.57 (51%)		
Othello	0.23	0.17 (26%)	0.33 (+43%)	0.19 (17%)		X
Westwood-Highland Park	0.00	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	X	X
South Park	0.67	0.51 (24%)	0.45 (33%)	0.47 (30%)		
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.13 (28%)	0.12 (33%)	0.12 (33%)	X	X
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>						
Green Lake	0.05	0.04 (20%)	0.04 (20%)	0.03 (40%)		
Roosevelt	0.01	0.00 (100%)	0.00 (100%)	0.00 (100%)		
Wallingford	0.08	0.06 (25%)	0.05 (38%)	0.05 (38%)		
Upper Queen Anne	0.00	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)	0.00 (0%)		
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)	0.05 (29%)	0.05 (29%)	X	
Ballard	0.07	0.05 (29%)	0.04 (43%)	0.04 (43%)	X	
Madison-Miller	0.16	0.12 (25%)	0.11 (31%)	0.10 (38%)		
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	0.01	0.01 (0%)	0.01 (0%)	0.01 (0%)	X	X
Eastlake	0.09	0.07 (22%)	0.07 (22%)	0.07 (22%)		
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)	0.01 (50%)	0.01 (50%)	X	
Admiral	0.61	0.48 (21%)	0.46 (25%)	0.43 (30%)		
Crown Hill	0.20	0.13 (35%)	0.06 (70%)	0.05 (75%)		
Ravenna (2)	0.10	0.05 (50%)	0.05 (50%)	0.05 (50%)	X	
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>						
Columbia City	0.67	0.52 (22%)	0.24 (64%)	0.25 (63%)		
Lake City	0.10	0.07 (30%)	0.07 (30%)	0.07 (30%)		
Northgate	0.25	0.15 (40%)	0.06 (76%)	0.06 (76%)		X
First Hill-Capitol Hill	0.03	0.03 (0%)	0.02 (33%)	0.03 (0%)	X	
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.19 (21%)	0.08 (67%)	0.09 (63%)		X
North Rainier	1.53	1.09 (29%)	0.64 (58%)	0.65 (58%)	X	
23rd & Union-Jackson	0.65	0.50 (23%)	0.38 (42%)	0.33 (49%)		
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>						
Aurora-Lixton Springs	0.12	0.10 (17%)	0.09 (25%)	0.09 (25%)		X
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)	0.02 (33%)	0.02 (33%)	X	X
<b>Outside Villages</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>1.47 (6%)</b>	<b>1.43 (8%)</b>	<b>1.44 (8%)</b>		

Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).

Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2011.

However, it is important to note that 95 percent of City parks and open space land is outside of urban village boundaries. Therefore, it is likely that parks and open space near urban villages that lack sufficient facilities would also experience greater demand as the urban village populations grow. This growth would exacerbate existing deficiencies.

## IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 1 NO ACTION

Parks and open space impacts under Alternative 1 No Action would be the same as those evaluated for the Preferred Alternative in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Final EIS (City of Seattle, 2016). Although Alternative 1 would meet the 2011 distribution goal, it would not meet the 2017 LOS unless 40 acres of park and open space land is acquired. According to the Draft 2017 Plan, acquiring the land to mitigate for projected growth under Alternative 1 is feasible (SPR, 2017). Therefore, existing and future parks and open space resources can serve the growth anticipated under the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan, even though gaps in geographic availability or shortfalls from optimal location, size, or number of parks could remain over the long-term.

Exhibit 3.7–7 details the urban villages identified as having open space and/or walkability gaps and the potential reductions in park availability

Housing and job growth over the 20-year planning period would generate more demand for parks, recreation facilities, and open space across the city. Urban villages would see residential growth that would proportionately increase demand for parks and open space close to these areas. As certain urban villages have an existing shortage relative to the goal, growth would widen the existing gap between supply of and demand for parks and open space, resulting in less availability, particularly in the urban villages identified in Exhibit 3.7–7. Impacts could also occur on parks and open space in urban villages served by current and future light rail transit as these parks and open spaces would become more accessible to people residing elsewhere. In addition, there would also be an increased potential for impacts on parks and open space in urban villages served by current and future light rail transit as these parks and open spaces would become more accessible to people residing outside of the urban villages.

Significant open space gaps in single-family areas in northwest Seattle, northeast Seattle, and West Seattle would likely continue. As neighborhoods outside urban villages grow under Alternative 1, impacts on parks and recreation could increase as demand for parks and open space increases.

**Exhibit 3.7–7** Changes in Park Availability in Urban Villages with Open Space and/or Walkability Gaps, Alternative 1 No Action

**URBAN VILLAGE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY  
(ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS)**

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 1 No Action	Open Space Gap (2011)	Walkability Gap (2017)
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>				
Othello	0.23	0.17 (26%)		X
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.13 (28%)	X	X
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>				
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)	X	
Ballard	0.07	0.05 (29%)	X	
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)	X	
Ravenna (2)	0.10	0.05 (50%)	X	
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>				
Northgate	0.25	0.15 (40%)		X
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.19 (21%)		X
North Rainier	1.53	1.09 (29%)	X	
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>				
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.10 (17%)		X
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)	X	X

*Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).*

*Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2011.*

## IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 2

Growth under Alternative 2 would have similar types of impacts to Alternative 1, but to a larger degree due to the potential for more growth.

Under Alternative 2, Othello would have an increase in parks and open space availability because urban village boundaries would expand to include existing parkland. Population and job growth in Alternative 2 would generate more demand for parks and open space than Alternative 1 in study area urban villages. This impact would be greatest in urban villages with the largest increases in growth under Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1, such as Ballard, Northgate, First Hill-Capitol Hill, North Beacon Hill, North Rainier, and Aurora-Licton Springs (Exhibit 3.7–8).

**Exhibit 3.7–8** Changes in Park Availability in Urban Villages with Open Space and/or Walkability Gaps, Alternative 2

URBAN VILLAGE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS)				
	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 2	Open Space Gap (2011)	Walkability Gap (2017)
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>				
Othello	0.23	0.33 (+43%)		X
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.12 (33%)	X	X
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>				
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)	X	
Ballard	0.07	0.04 (43%)	X	
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)	X	
Ravenna (2)	0.10	0.05 (50%)	X	
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>				
Northgate	0.25	0.06 (76%)		X
First Hill-Capitol Hill	0.03	0.02 (33%)	X	
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.08 (67%)		X
North Rainier	1.53	0.64 (58%)	X	
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>				
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.09 (25%)		X
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)	X	X

*Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).*

*Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2011.*

## IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 3

Impacts to parks and open space in Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2. Compared to Alternative 2, urban villages across the study area would see similar level of parks and open space availability reduction; however, with the different distribution of growth, certain urban villages would experience higher percentages of growth than under Alternative 2. However, overall there would be similar reductions in park and open space availability would occur under Alternatives 2 and 3 in most of the urban villages with walkability or distribution gaps (Exhibit 3.7–9). However, under Alternative 3 there would be less of a decrease in availability in First Hill–Capitol Hill and North Beacon Hill. In addition, under Alternative 3 the Othello Urban Village would experience a reduction in parks and open space availability due to its smaller boundary expansion.

**Exhibit 3.7–9** Changes in Park Availability in Urban Villages with Open Space and/or Walkability Gaps, Alternative 3

### URBAN VILLAGE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE AVAILABILITY (ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE PER 100 RESIDENTS)

	Baseline (2015)	Alternative 3	Open Space Gap (2011)	Walkability Gap (2017)
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>				
Othello	0.23	0.19 (17%)		X
Bitter Lake Village	0.18	0.12 (33%)	X	X
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>				
Fremont	0.07	0.05 (29%)	X	
Ballard	0.07	0.04 (43%)	X	
West Seattle Junction	0.02	0.01 (50%)	X	
Ravenna (2)	0.10	0.05 (50%)	X	
<b>High Displacement Risk &amp; High Access to Opportunity</b>				
Northgate	0.25	0.06 (76%)		X
North Beacon Hill	0.24	0.09 (63%)		X
North Rainier	1.53	0.65 (58%)	X	
<b>Low Displacement Risk &amp; Low Access to Opportunity</b>				
Aurora-Licton Springs	0.12	0.09 (25%)		X
Morgan Junction	0.03	0.02 (33%)	X	X

*Note: The acres of parks and open space within the urban villages were calculated using 2014 Seattle Parks GIS data and the urban village boundaries used for the alternatives. The number of residents residing within urban villages was calculated using housing data provided in Chapter 2, with an average household of 1.78 residents per housing unit applied for urban villages and 2.06 residents per housing unit applied for areas outside urban villages (City of Seattle, 2016).*

*Source: SPR, 2014; SPR, 2011.*

### 3.7.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Given greater overall demand for parks and open space in the study area, SPR should consider these growth projections for the next open space gap analysis to address future potential impacts through the next Development Plan. According to the 2017 LOS, approximately 40 acres of new parks and open space land would be required under Alternative 1, and approximately 434 acres would be required under Alternatives 2 and 3. Provision of additional parks and open space land should occur in urban villages with substantial walkability gaps that would see a reduction in park and open space availability.

The mitigation strategies outlined in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan EIS would provide tools necessary to accomplish the City's parks and open space goals. One of these strategies is to incorporate incentives and other regulatory tools to encourage and enforce developers to set aside publicly accessible usable open space. Examples of specific vehicles to achieve mitigation in this way include impact fees for open space, or a transfer of development rights (TDR) for open space that could be implemented in certain zones or locations.

### 3.7.4 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Development under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would have significant adverse impacts to parks and open space. However, these impacts can be avoided through mitigation as described above