June 25, 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 you with our comments and recommendations on which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments should be placed on the docket for further analysis. We have also 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 thorough the application of Council adopted criteria, Guidelines for Amendment Selection, included in Resolution 31402.

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

1. NE 68th Street Map Change –
The applicant is requesting a change to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) regarding 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 Criterion.

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.

1. 40th Ave. NE Map Change –

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

1. 35th Ave. NE Map Change –

The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM regarding 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 Criterion.

The project has received Neighborhood Matching Funds as well as budgeted in the 2015 DPD Workplan, these processes should gather sufficient information to make an informed decision.

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

1. NE 94th Map Change –

The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM that would expand the Northgate Urban Center to include additional parcels in the South and land use category changes from “Single-family Residential” to “Multifamily Residential”.

The Commission does not recommend this map change for docket setting siting Criteria 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. 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, about “Single Family Residential” and the vision for these areas of the City.

1. Pier One Map Change –
The applicant is requesting a change to the FLUM regarding 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 C.4. The applicant has submitted this proposal several times and it has been consistently rejected by the City Council.

1. Open and Participatory Government –

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

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

1. 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 Criteria 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

Lish Whitson, Sara Belz, Martha Lester; Eric McConaghy; Council Central Staff

**SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION RECORD OF DISCLOSURE & RECUSAL**

**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.