



Seattle

One Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Report

November 2022

**Prepared by:
City of Seattle
BERK Consulting**

Contents

Introduction	1
Summary of the Scoping Process	3
Topics to be Analyzed	4
Comment Summary	4
Revised Proposal	5
Alternatives	7
Comment Summary	7
Housing Types	10
Place Types	11
Alternative 1: No Action	12
Alternative 2: Focused	14
Alternative 3: Broad	17
Alternative 4: Corridors	20
Alternative 5: Combined	22
Investments, Policies, & Regulations	25
Comments Summary	25
Revised EIS Scope	25
Next Steps	27

Exhibits

Exhibit 1. 130 th and 145 th Street Station Area Alternatives Summary	2
Exhibit 2. Topics Mentioned in Comments	4
Exhibit 3. Relative Number of Comments on Alternatives	8
Exhibit 4. Most Common Housing Types Expected by Place Type	11
Exhibit 5. Alternative 1: No Action	13
Exhibit 6. Alternative 2: Focused	16
Exhibit 7. Alternative 3: Broad	19
Exhibit 8. Alternative 4: Corridors	21
Exhibit 9. Alternative 5: Combined	24
Exhibit 10. Comprehensive Plan Process	27

Introduction

What is the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan?

The City of Seattle is updating its Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is the vision for how our city grows and makes investments. The Plan guides City decisions about where we locate housing and jobs, and where we invest in transportation, utilities, parks, and other public assets. The updated Plan, which we are calling the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan, will address new and longstanding challenges including racial inequities, housing costs, access to economic opportunity and education, and climate change. We will explore different approaches to growth and investment, along with new strategies to reduce displacement pressures. The One Seattle Plan project began March 2022 with the goal of adopting an updated Plan in 2024. More information on the Comprehensive Plan Update process is available at:

<https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/one-seattle-plan>.

What is an Environmental Impact Statement?

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is an informational document that provides the City, public, and other agencies with environmental information to be considered in the decision-making process. An EIS is required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) ([RCW 43.21C](#)) for many large projects. An EIS describes:

- existing conditions in the city;
- proposed actions and alternatives (e.g., new policies and growth strategies);
- adverse environmental impacts that may occur;
- mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts; and
- potential significant, unavoidable, and adverse impacts.

The EIS focuses on identifying and avoiding adverse impacts and can also identify potential beneficial outcomes. The EIS evaluation and mitigation measures will help inform the development of the One Seattle Plan.

The first step in creating an EIS is to hold a scoping period. During scoping, the City released a draft approach to undertaking EIS analysis including the topics that would be covered and the alternatives that will be evaluated, in order to get feedback. The City held a scoping period in June through August 2022. In cooperation with a team of consultants, the City is now conducting the first phase of EIS analysis and expects to publish a Draft EIS in May 2023. After another comment period, the City will begin analysis of a final proposal, including a preferred alternative, and will publish a Final EIS in Spring 2024.

What are EIS Alternatives?

An EIS is required to identify and analyze alternative approaches to meeting the goals of a proposal. In the case of comprehensive plans, these EIS alternatives represent different growth strategies that describe the types and location of new homes and jobs that are anticipated during a 20-year planning period (2024–2044). Alternatives should represent a diverse range of options that can highlight the impacts of different potential policy choices. The alternatives should be broad enough that the final preferred alternative, which is included in the final plan, will fall within the range of the alternatives studied in the EIS. The City is not required or expected to choose one alternative (from among the alternatives studied in the DEIS) that will be included in the final plan; rather, the final plan can include a mixed or hybrid approach that draws from any of the strategies and locations studied in the alternatives.

130th & 145th Street Station Areas

The City is conducting additional in-depth analysis of the NE 130th and 145th Street station areas in preparation for zoning changes under consideration ahead of the opening of new light rail stations. The NE 130th and 145th Street station areas analysis will be folded into the citywide EIS. The scoping process included three station area alternatives nested in the citywide alternatives as summarized in [Exhibit 1](#).

Exhibit 1. 130th and 145th Street Station Area Alternatives Summary

Citywide Alternative	Alternative 1: No Action	Alternative 2: Focused	Alternative 5: Combined
Approach in 130 th and 145 th	Baseline growth and pattern with existing zoning.	Cluster growth in newly designated neighborhood anchors.	Potential new urban village at NE 130 th Street station and neighborhood anchor at NE 145 th Street.

Detailed EIS Scoping Comment Summary

In addition to this document, the City has also created a detailed summary of the comments received including appendixes containing the text of these comments. This document is available at: <https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/one-seattle-plan/project-documents>.


Summary of the Scoping Process

At the beginning of the scoping process, the City released a [scoping fact sheet, notice](#), and overview website describing the draft approach and held a 60-day comment period from June 23 through August 22 to solicit feedback on the draft approach. During the comment period, the City held two citywide scoping meetings on June 29 and July 19 and a special meeting on the 130th and 145th Street station areas on July 21.

OPCD also co-facilitated two engagement focus groups and a series of one-to-one interviews with Department of Neighborhoods [Community Liaison](#) partners. Community Liaisons are professionals paid by the City to serve as resources to engage with communities of color and other historically marginalized communities more effectively. The Community Liaisons also augment other language access services for non-English speaking communities. These discussions focused on both the individual Community Liaison's perspectives, as well as what each Community Liaison had been hearing in community. Community Liaisons were also instrumental in conducting outreach to inform their communities about the scoping process and guide individuals through the formal commenting process on OPCD's Engagement Hub. This outreach helped to overcome technical barriers to submitting comments, such as not having a working email address, by offering opportunities to submit verbal or hand-written comments through the Community Liaisons at focus groups and interviews.

During the comment period, the City received 1,496 comments through the Comprehensive Plan Engagement Site, engage.oneseatleplan.com, and 95 comments via email. We also received comment letters representing the following organizations:

- 350 Seattle
- American Institute of Architects
- Beacon Development Group
- Beacon Hill Council
- Bellwether Housing
- Community Housing
- Futurewise
- Habitat for Humanity
- Housing Development Consortium
- Interim CDA
- Labor Council
- Laurelhurst Community Council
- Master Builders
- Magnolia Community Council
- Mercy Housing
- Plymouth Housing
- Puget Sound Regional Council
- Puget Sound Sage
- Public Health Seattle-King County
- Seattle Neighborhood Greenways
- SEIU 1199
- Sierra Club
- Sightline
- Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
- Seattle Planning Commission
- Seattle Public Schools
- Tech 4 Housing
- Transit Riders Union
- Urban Forestry Commission
- Urbanist
- Welcoming Wallingford



Topics to be Analyzed

Comment Summary

Comments suggested a wide range of topics that should be covered in the environmental analysis. The most common comments on this subject were to consider the impact of potential changes on housing cost, residential and commercial displacement, tree canopy, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Many comments specifically suggested that we need to quantify these impacts at a regional level as well as a city level. Some also suggested that we should try to model potential outcomes specifically for low-income households, people of color, immigrants and refugees, LGBTQ+ people, and disabled persons. A couple of comments suggested that analysis of commercial displacement should be included in the EIS rather than in a separate document.

A detailed list of topics mentioned in comments is shown in [Exhibit 2](#).

Exhibit 2. Topics Mentioned in Comments

EIS Category	Specific Topics Mentioned
Earth & Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permeable area ▪ Runoff
Air Quality/GHG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GHG emissions ▪ Light and air quality concerns ▪ People within distance of high-volume roadways experience highest pollution levels within the first 500 feet of a roadway.
Plants & Animals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Urban ecosystem services ▪ Biodiversity
Energy & Natural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to state building codes, SCL green energy, and plans for electrification
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Airplane noise ▪ Arterial and major roadway noise and proximity to housing
Land Use Patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Localized impact of development in specific areas ▪ Where development is most likely to occur (particularly under a scenario of comprehensive rezones)

EIS Category	Specific Topics Mentioned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heat impacts and impervious areas ▪ Height/scale
Historic Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources that exist beyond formal local designation and/or National Register listing (individual or district)
Population, Employment, & Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diversity of housing types ▪ Number, type, and cost of new homes ▪ Impact on BIPOC households
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distance to shops and services ▪ Pedestrian safety
Public Services & Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to amenities (what % of residents will have access to parks, waterfront, etc.?) ▪ North precinct police station capacity ▪ Sewer system and water system capacity

Revised Proposal

The comments received will help shape where the City focuses the EIS analysis and identify specific metrics that it will consider studying. The City and consultant team will analyze each of the categories in the left column of [Exhibit 2](#) in the EIS, including a summary of the affected environment (existing conditions) and a separate analysis of adverse environmental impacts that may occur under each of the proposed alternatives. We will strive to consider each of the specific comment topics in the EIS, though the analysis will be citywide in nature. The environmental evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative approaches such as models (e.g., transportation) or adopted standards (e.g., stormwater LID practices, levels of service, etc.) to determine the effect of the alternatives. The EIS will also identify specific mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and any potential significant, unavoidable, and adverse impacts for each environmental topic. Evaluation and mitigation measures identified in the EIS will ultimately help inform development of the One Seattle Plan.

Comments received suggested that we should pay particular attention to analysis of impacts for housing displacement and tree canopy. For housing displacement, the City and consultant team will conduct detailed analysis of existing trends and potential future impacts. This work will start with analysis of where households vulnerable to displacement live as well existing trends in housing price, size, and demographics for existing and new construction. We will also look at recent trends in demolitions, rehabilitations, and condominium conversion and what new construction is producing. Next, we will use the City’s development capacity model to evaluate likely development scenarios. These scenarios will identify the types of housing produced and demolished in order to understand overall impacts on the housing market. We will also have a qualitative analysis of impacts on housing cost locally and regionally. This work will provide a comprehensive understanding of the many factors that will influence displacement under each alternative.

For tree canopy, we will analyze past trends on tree canopy and development to understand the potential impact of various alternatives. This work will be based on a Canopy Cover Assessment the City is conducting using LIDAR and satellite imagery from 2016 and 2021. The analysis will assess canopy cover change across the city during this period and specifically analyze sites with new housing or large commercial structures built 2017–2021 and 2012–2014. The City will estimate the number of sites in various zones that are likely to redevelop under each alternative based on past trends and on analysis of potential changes to Neighborhood Residential zones. We will then apply data from the Canopy Cover Assessment to understand potential impact of new development on tree canopy cover.

The City and consultant team will also analyze the regional impact of the proposal and alternatives in the EIS. For example, some environmental topics will consider:

- The consistency of the alternatives with major state and regional policies that influence the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update—such as the Growth Management Act, VISION 2050, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies—and selected other relevant regional plans and policy documents.
- How implementation of the alternatives may affect global climate change through GHG emissions related to transportation and land use changes, increased impervious surfaces, loss of open space and habitat, changes to utility and transportation networks, and other impacts of development. This will include a quantitative analysis of the regional impact of emissions of air pollutants—including greenhouse gases (GHGs)—from tail pipe, roadway, buildings, utility use, solid waste, and area sources under each alternative.
- The impact of land use and growth changes proposed under each alternative in relation to regional housing supply, cost, and sprawl.

Alternatives

Comment Summary

The most frequent type of comment received on this topic was an expression of support for specific alternatives. While measuring support of different alternatives was not the primary purpose of the scoping period and the City does not intend to simply choose one alternative from among those studied to include in the final plan, this feedback is still important as it helps the City understand what people value as it pertains to the range of alternatives that the EIS should explore. Most comments supported implementing a growth pattern that would lead to significant increases in the supply and diversity of new housing; however, opinions varied on the size of change desired and the potential locations of new housing.


Many comments expressed support for an “Alternative 6” that would create more opportunities for new housing than Alternative 5. While different groups and individuals had different ideas about what an Alternative 6 might include, they tended to include:

1. Allowing more high-rise towers in existing urban centers and villages.
2. Allowing more space for apartments and condominiums near transit and parks.
3. Allowing a diversity of housing types including cottage housing and small apartments and condominiums in all Neighborhood Residential zones.

A coalition of 17 organizations led by the Housing Development Consortium, a member organization representing affordable housing providers, summarized their version of Alternative 6 as follows: “It could look like a connected network of complete neighborhoods, allowing 4- to 6-story apartments in all neighborhoods, with bonuses for affordable homes by right, and ground floor commercial and community spaces to serve people’s daily needs.”

Below is a chart showing the number of people commenting about different alternatives. Most comments expressed support for a specific alternative, although some comments discussed the pros and cons of different alternatives.

Exhibit 3. Relative Number of Comments on Alternatives



Note: Comment from letters, meetings, and hub. Some commenters provided input on more than one alternative.
Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Separately, Councilmember Pedersen requested an "Alternative L" that would limit changes in Neighborhood Residential zones to projects with 100% low-income housing and located in frequent transit corridors. There were no other public comments on this specific approach.

Many other comments focused on the pros and cons of adding significant capacity for new housing. Comments supporting more housing in more locations tended to focus on the importance of:

- Reducing the cost of housing.
- Addressing the exclusivity of many neighborhoods by creating new, lower-cost housing options.
- Increasing the diversity of housing options.
- Reducing displacement by reducing housing costs and creating more housing options.
- Creating more space for affordable housing projects.
- Reducing greenhouse gas emissions by allowing people to locate in areas near transit, jobs, shops, and services.
- Reducing regional sprawl.

Comments requesting a smaller or less intensive change in capacity for new housing tended to focus on the importance of:

- Focusing growth near transit where it will have the least impact on traffic, on-street parking, and car ownership.
- Limiting change in certain areas to retain existing housing, preserve tree canopy, and support architectural character.

- Reducing demolitions of existing detached homes, particularly those occupied by renters
- Reducing impacts on infrastructure.

Many people expressed support for making it easier for people to walk and bike to everyday needs. These comments often support the concept of “15-minute neighborhoods” where people can meet most daily needs within a short walk of their home. Many comments expressed a desire to allow more flexibility for commercial spaces including creating or expanding neighborhood business districts, allowing more corner stores, encouraging grocery stores in more neighborhoods, and allowing at-home and low-impact commercial uses everywhere. Others expressed concern about allowing commercial uses in the middle of Neighborhood Residential zones. Many comments referenced the importance of locating new housing near existing shops and services and investing in walking and biking infrastructure to make it easier and safer to walk and bike to local businesses.

Other comments to modify alternatives suggested:

- Focusing new housing away from busy streets or areas with bad air quality.
- Adding more urban villages rather than just smaller nodes.
- Allowing more capacity for apartments in existing urban villages.
- Allowing more housing in areas of low displacement risk and areas with amenities; specific areas mentioned included Madison Park, Queen Anne, Magnolia, Laurelhurst, Sunset Hill, Wedgwood, Northgate, Montlake, the east side of Capitol Hill, and the Central District.
- Studying additional housing, equal to the same rate of growth that occurred over the last 10 years.
- Treating land use on corner lots differently.

The following pages outline the updated alternatives we will study in the EIS and the comments we received specific to each alternative. The first pages give additional information on housing and place types the EIS will discuss, and the remaining pages detail the updated alternatives.

Housing Types

Below is an overview of common housing types that will be discussed in the place types and alternatives shown in this report.

Detached homes are in their own structure that do not share walls with any other homes.



Detached Homes on a Small Lot
Existing home preserved with two new homes added behind (left), three homes on one lot (middle), and eight homes on two lots (right).



Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU)
A second unit added to a residential lot, usually behind the main house.



Cottage Housing
Detached homes of 2-3 stories arranged around a shared open space.

Attached houses share walls with other homes, where each unit is owned outright.



Duplex & Triplex (side-by-side)
Two or three units that share walls with one another.



Townhouse & Rowhouse
Homes that share a wall with another home that can all be owned outright.



Courtyard Housing
Attached homes of 2-3 stories arranged around a shared open space.



Stacked housing includes multiple units arranged vertically.



Foursquare
A traditional form with two units per floor in a structure that often resembles a large house.



8-plex
A four-story structure with two homes per floor.



Sixplex
A three-story structure with two homes per floor.



Apartments & Condos of 5-8 Stories
Midrise buildings with multiple homes per floor that can be rented as apartments or owned as condominium units.



Highrise Apartments & Condos
Buildings above 12 stories with multiple homes per floor that can be rented as apartments or owned as condominium units.

Place Types

The alternatives described in this report discuss a set of place types that describe the characteristics of different areas and the types of development that might occur there. Some place types align closely with existing elements of the urban village strategy; others are new concepts created for this update. The place types are defined as follows:

- **Urban Centers** are regionally designated places with a diverse mix of uses, housing, and employment including several centers that comprise greater Downtown along with the University District and Northgate. These areas are Seattle’s densest neighborhoods and contain most of the City’s jobs.
- **Urban Villages** are dense, walkable, mixed-use places with a wide range of housing and businesses located near transit, amenities, and jobs.
- **Neighborhood Anchors** are places with a wide range of housing and businesses that primarily serve the local community. These areas are similar to urban villages, but with a smaller size and lower intensity of allowed development.
- **Corridors** are areas near frequent transit and large parks. These areas could allow a wide range of housing types ranging from duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes to 5-story buildings closer to transit in areas that are currently zoned exclusively for detached homes. Corridors include areas already zoned for multifamily and commercial use.
- **Broad changes to Neighborhood Residential zones** would allow flexibility for new forms of housing in areas currently zoned exclusively for detached homes.
- **Manufacturing and Industrial Centers** are regionally designated industrial job centers. The One Seattle Plan process would not change the boundaries of these centers nor the goals and policies for these areas. The boundaries, goals, and policies for these areas are currently being updated as part of the [Industrial and Maritime Strategy](#) project.

Exhibit 4. Most Common Housing Types Expected by Place Type

	Broad Neighborhood Residential Changes	Corridors	Neighborhood Anchors	Urban Villages	Urban Centers
Detached home	X	X			
Duplex, triplex, and fourplex	X	X	X		
Townhouse and rowhouse	X	X	X	X	
Sixplex/3-story stacked flats	X	X	X	X	
4- to 5-story building		X	X	X	X
6- to 7-story buildings			X	X	X
8- to 12-story buildings				X	X
HIGHRISE BUILDINGS (above 12 stories)					X

Source: City of Seattle, 2022.

Alternative 1: No Action

Every EIS must have a no action alternative that studies what would happen if no changes were implemented in order to compare it to other alternatives. The no action alternative for the One Seattle Plan maintains the status quo of focusing most housing and jobs within existing **urban centers** and **urban villages** with no change to land use patterns. It also incorporates changes proposed as part of the recent Industrial and Maritime Strategy EIS.

Comment Summary


There were few comments on Alternative 1 compared to other alternatives. Several commenters felt that job and housing numbers in Alternative 1 seem too small for expected growth. Those comments that supported Alternative 1 felt that preserving Seattle's supply of detached homes with yards was important for raising families or that current zoning already allows a variety of housing across all zones in the city.

Revised Alternative

Alternative 1 will study the impact of adding 80,000 new homes and 158,000 jobs over 20 years, based on growth targets adopted by the King County Growth Management Council for the years 2019-2044. The 20-year estimates for the EIS have been adjusted to account for population, housing, and employment change for the years 2019-2023. These homes and jobs will be distributed across the city based on the growth that occurred between 2010 and 2020 and the distribution of growth in the Seattle 2035 comprehensive plan. In addition, growth in any urban center or urban village does not exceed existing zoned capacity.

Under this alternative, new housing will continue to be primarily rental apartments concentrated in existing mixed-use areas. Most land outside urban centers and villages will remain limited to high cost detached houses. New jobs will continue to be located primarily in existing urban centers and villages.

Exhibit 5. Alternative 1: No Action



Source: City of Seattle, 2022.

Alternative 2: Focused

This alternative will study the creation of additional areas of focused growth called **neighborhood anchors** to create more housing around shops and services. Neighborhood anchors would be similar to urban villages in that they would allow a wide range of housing types and commercial space, but with a smaller geographic size and lower intensity of allowed development. This alternative would result in a greater range of housing options with amenities and services in many neighborhoods.

Comment Summary

Most comments on Alternatives 2 focused on the potential benefits of this approach in focusing growth near transit and limiting potential impacts to other areas. Some people suggest adding more urban villages rather than or in addition to adding neighborhood anchors. Comments about the location of potential neighborhood anchors (and housing in general) tended to focus on:

- Identifying areas of focused growth in a diversity of areas so that more people have an opportunity to walk and bike to everyday needs
- Focusing new housing away from busy streets or areas with bad air quality
- Allowing more housing in areas of low displacement risk and areas with amenities; specific areas mentioned included Madison Park, Queen Anne, Magnolia, Laurelhurst, Sunset Hill, Wedgwood, Northgate, Montlake, east side of Capitol Hill, and the Central District

Revised Alternative

The updated Alternative 2 identifies specific locations that could be considered as future neighborhood anchors. Centered around existing commercial areas, these locations were identified based on previous planning with minor additions to ensure citywide coverage. The adopted 1994 Comprehensive Plan included locations for neighborhood anchors that were later removed in the 2004 Plan update. The potential neighborhood anchors shown in Alternative 2 include those locations designated in the 1994 plan as well as designated pedestrian overlay districts. After mapping these areas, we identified significant neighborhood gaps and included six additional locations representing existing business districts.


Each potential neighborhood anchor is shown as a circle of 1,000-foot radius (about 3-4 blocks), trimmed where necessary to prevent overlap with any industrial zoning or other growth areas. Neighborhood anchors could contain a mix of residential and mixed-use development from townhouses to 5- to 7-story apartments and mixed-use buildings. The neighborhood anchors within the 130th and 145th Street station areas are shown with more detailed specific boundaries due to previous neighborhood planning work in that area.

Alternative 2 will study a total housing growth of 100,000 housing units (20,000 more than the no action alternative) to account for the potential additional housing demand that could be met within the neighborhood anchors. As in Alternative 1, 80,000 units would be located primarily in existing urban centers and villages, with the additional 20,000 locating within the new

neighborhood anchors. Potential neighborhood anchors in areas with low displacement risk would be allocated 50 percent more housing units than those in areas with high displacement risk. This distribution is generally consistent with our approach of encouraging housing choice in all neighborhoods while focusing additional growth in areas with low displacement risk. This alternative studies the same number of jobs as the no action alternative but includes a small shift in the distribution of jobs and commercial space toward neighborhood anchors consistent with the distribution of new housing. All neighborhood anchors already contain areas zoned for commercial or mixed-use development; however, we expect additional jobs and commercial space in these areas might increase more quickly due to the local demand from new housing.

This alternative addresses City Council’s request for an alternative that supports the development of “15-minute neighborhoods” where more people can walk to everyday needs.

Exhibit 6. Alternative 2: Focused



Source: City of Seattle, 2022.

Alternative 3: Broad

This alternative will study allowing a wider range of low-scale housing options, like triplexes and fourplexes, in all **Neighborhood Residential (NR) zones**. This approach would:

- Expand housing choices in all neighborhoods.
- Increase production of homeownership options.
- Address exclusionary nature of current zoning.
- Allow more housing options near existing large parks and other neighborhood amenities.

Comment Summary

Comments on Alternative 3 tended to focus on the benefits and potential impacts of this option. Discussion of benefits tended to focus on the importance of allowing more housing choices in neighborhoods citywide to address limited supply, expand more homeownership options, address exclusivity, and prevent impacts to cities south of Seattle as people leave Seattle to find homeownership opportunities and compete for limited housing in those areas. Discussion of impacts focused on potential impacts to infrastructure, on-street parking, or architectural character as well as whether increasing capacity in these areas is necessary if we allow more apartments and condominium construction in other areas.

Many comments requested that this alternative study allowing development denser than triplexes or fourplexes. These requests often suggested allowing buildings with stacked units such as “sixplexes” rather than just detached and attached units. Other comments also suggested allowing additional capacity for affordable housing.


Revised Alternative

This alternative will study allowing detached and attached homes in all Neighborhood Residential areas, including duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as well as stacked flats including sixplexes on larger lots. Market-rate development in these areas will continue to have a 3-story height limit, consistent with current rules in Neighborhood Residential zones. The City will also study potential height, floor area, or density bonuses for affordable housing projects.

This alternative studies a total housing growth of 100,000 housing units (20,000 more than the no action alternative) to account for the potential additional housing demand that could be met with broad zoning changes. As in Alternative 1, 80,000 units would be located primarily in existing urban centers and villages, with the additional 20,000 accommodated in new housing types within Neighborhood Residential zones. This alternative studies the same number of jobs as the no action alternative but would include a small shift in the distribution of jobs and commercial space toward existing Neighborhood Residential areas to reflect local demand with the distribution of new housing. The City will also consider allowing more flexibility for commercial space in these areas such as allowing corner stores or making it easier to operate at-home businesses.

This alternative addresses City Council’s request for an alternative that provides additional housing capacity and housing type diversity in Neighborhood Residential areas. The commercial flexibility to be studied addresses City Council’s request for an alternative that supports the development of “15-minute neighborhoods” where more people can walk to everyday needs.

Exhibit 7. Alternative 3: Broad



Source: City of Seattle, 2022.

Alternative 4: Corridors

This alternative will study allowing a wider range of housing options only in **corridors** to focus growth near transit and amenities. This alternative would increase production of both homeownership and rental options in various neighborhoods and support city and regional investment in transit.

Comment Summary

Similar to Alternative 2, most comments on Alternative 4 focused on the potential benefits of focusing growth near transit and limiting potential impacts to other areas. Several comments expressed concern that Alternative 4 would focus new housing on busy streets where residents would be impacted by air pollution, noise, and reduced safety due to the high volume and speed of traffic. These comments often focused on the equity impacts of placing apartments (which tend to house lower-income households and thus are disproportionately households of color) in areas with a potential lower quality of life. Other comments on this alternative suggested that the City should allow even more zoning for apartments in areas close to transit and expanding corridors to a broader area such as a 15-minute walk.

Revised Alternative


The corridors studied in this alternative are defined as areas within a 10-minute walk from a light rail station and a 5-minute walk from frequent bus transit service and entrances to large parks. Frequent bus transit meets the City's existing definition of at least four trips per hour between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. and twice hourly in other timeframes on weekdays and weekends. Large parks include large multi-block parks designated as Tier 1, 2, or 3 through the City's Outside Citywide initiative. Under this approach, corridors include about 50 percent of areas currently zoned Neighborhood Residential, excluding parks.

Within corridors, this alternative would allow housing ranging from duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes to 5-story apartments. These corridors also include some areas already zoned for multifamily and commercial development that could also have changes in height.

We received comments on the importance of encouraging housing near transit, shops, and services without focusing it primarily on the busy streets where these amenities are located. Consequently, this alternative would tend to focus growth in locations that are just off busy streets in existing Neighborhood Residential zones. However, this alternative would still study some additional residential growth on lots located directly on busy streets.

This alternative studies a total housing growth of 100,000 housing units (20,000 more than the No Action Alternative) to account for the potential additional housing demand that could be met within the corridors. As in Alternative 1, 80,000 units would be located primarily in existing urban centers and villages, with the additional 20,000 accommodated in new housing types within the corridors. This alternative studies the same number of jobs as the no action alternative but includes a small shift in the distribution of jobs and commercial space toward transit corridors, consistent with the distribution of new housing.

Exhibit 8. Alternative 4: Corridors



Source: City of Seattle, 2022.

Alternative 5: Combined

Alternative 5 will study the largest increase in supply and diversity of housing across Seattle. It includes the strategies for encouraging housing growth in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 plus some additional changes to existing urban center and village boundaries and changes to place type designations. This alternative would:

- Accommodate abundant housing in neighborhoods across the city
- Promote a greater range of rental and ownership housing
- Address past underproduction of housing and rising housing costs

Comment Summary

Most comments on Alternative 5 were expressions of support for this approach or comments that more change was needed to address our housing crisis. Many comments on how to change Alternative 5 were also relevant to other alternatives, like allowing more space for apartments and condominiums near transit and parks or allowing a wider diversity of housing types in all Neighborhood Residential zones. Additionally, some comments suggested that Alternative 5 should also include increased capacity for housing in existing urban centers and villages.

Revised Alternative


Alternative 5 represents a combination of the revised Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. Additionally, it would study the following additional changes:

- Expanding the boundaries of seven urban centers and villages to include a 10-minute (half-mile) walkshed from their central point or light rail station. Several urban centers and villages were already expanded to this size under previous projects. The remaining urban centers and villages include four neighborhoods not considered in past work that are relatively small compared to other urban villages (Admiral, Greenwood–Phinney Ridge, Morgan Junction, and Upper Queen Anne) and three areas with new light rail stations (Uptown, West Seattle Junction at Avalon, Othello at Graham Street).
- Designating Ballard as an urban center rather than an urban village. This change would suggest a larger role for this area as a housing and, particularly, job center and could make it eligible for greater transportation funding from regional funding sources. It would also make it possible to allow high-rise zoning in this area as part of future zoning changes.
- Designating NE 130th Street station area as an urban village rather than a neighborhood anchor. This change would result in a larger rezone to accommodate more housing and job growth.
- Studying additional housing growth in existing urban centers that do not meet standards for designation as a Metro Growth Center by the Puget Sound Regional Council and existing urban villages that do not meet the standards for designation as a Countywide Center by the King County Growth Management Planning Council, both of which are criteria for eligibility to for receive certain transportation funds. Specifically, we would study higher levels of

growth in six urban centers and villages, including Northgate, Crown Hill, Othello, Rainier Beach, South Park, and Westwood–Highland Park.

This alternative studies a total housing growth of 120,000 housing units (40,000 more than the no action alternative) to account for the potential additional housing demand that could be met within the areas of change identified in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 as well as changes to existing and new centers and villages. As in Alternative 1, 80,000 units would be located primarily in existing urban centers and villages, with the additional 40,000 accommodated in other areas. The distribution of jobs and housing would be a combination of the other alternatives after accounting for expanded urban village boundaries and potential changes to place type designations.

Exhibit 9. Alternative 5: Combined



Source: City of Seattle, 2022.

Investments, Policies, & Regulations

The EIS deals with investments, policies, and regulations by:

1. Studying the impacts of changes proposed as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update; and
2. Identifying mitigating measures that could address impacts resulting from potential changes, including growth strategies studied in each of the alternatives.

The initial documentation provided by the City at the beginning of scoping did not contain a specific proposal for the investments, policies, and regulations that could be included in the plan update.

Comments Summary

The City received many suggestions about desired investments and specific changes to policy and regulations to include in the One Seattle Plan. Many people expressed a desire for adding more amenities as the city grows. The most common amenities mentioned included green space, Green Streets, bike infrastructure, street calming, and bus-only lanes. Other comments on this subject varied substantially, but the following actions were mentioned by multiple people:

- Strengthen tree regulations
- Remove or reduce existing regulations and processes such as parking requirements and design review
- Implement anti-displacement measures
- Increase transit funding
- Fund local community groups to acquire land
- Implement rent control
- Incentivize mass timber and passive house construction
- Create more accessible units
- Create a height bonus for affordable housing across the city
- Purchase older apartments to preserve their affordability

Revised EIS Scope

The topics mentioned above will be considered as part of EIS process either as changes that could be proposed by the One Seattle Plan or as mitigating measure that could be included in the EIS. In addition to those topics, the City will also study potential changes to development standards that would support City goals such as allowing more people to walk or bike to everyday needs, encouraging better building design, or reducing the cost of housing. These could include approaches such as:

- Modifying heights, lot size, density limits, coverage limits, setbacks, amenity standards, and other similar standards affecting the scale and form of new construction.
- Allowing more flexibility for commercial uses such as more retail on arterial streets, home businesses, and corner stores in certain areas.
- Allowing more height and/or floor area for projects that provide needed housing types or public open space.
- Supporting the vibrancy of downtown as a 24-hour neighborhood by allowing the conversion of office or hotel space to residential in downtown.
- Reducing or eliminating parking requirements.
- Combining the multifamily and mixed-use/commercial designations on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map categories to reflect that commercial space may be reasonable in a wider variety of areas.
- Prohibiting residential development in C2 zones.
- Changing the Industrial designation on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map to an Industrial/Commercial designation including C2 zones to reflect those areas where residential development is limited.
- Other changes to goal and policy statements.

The EIS will also study changes to investments, policies, and regulations specifically designed to minimize displacement. While increasing the supply and diversity of housing is necessary to address the increasing housing prices that are driving displacement, it is also not sufficient by itself to address the displacement that is occurring. In addition to analyzing the impacts of different growth strategies on displacement, we will also study other anti-displacement actions including but not limited to:

- Generating more affordable housing in NR zones by implementing MHA or a voluntary incentive program.
- Allowing more height and/or floor area for affordable housing and equitable development projects.
- Funding nonprofit groups to purchase property to support community stabilization.
- Updating tenant relocation assistance requirements.

Other measures that will be considered for meeting City goals or mitigating the impacts of development include:


- Moving toward a proactive system of identifying and reviewing historic buildings.
- Requiring street trees with new development in all non-industrial zones.
- Requiring mitigation for removal of existing trees.
- Updating our transportation level of service standards and concurrency requirements.

Next Steps

The City is now working with an EIS consultant team led by BERK Consulting to begin analysis. This analysis will be summarized in a Draft EIS released along with the Draft Plan in spring of 2023. Once the Draft EIS is released, we will hold a 60-day comment period to solicit feedback. We will then develop and analyze a final preferred alternative that will be included in the updated Plan. While creating the preferred alternative, we will also develop legislation to implement changes to zoning and development standards that would help enact the vision in the updated Plan. Public engagement around the draft legislation will occur starting in late 2023. We will summarize updates to the Draft EIS and analysis of a preferred alternative in a Final EIS released with the Mayor’s Recommended Plan, which we will send to City Council for review and adoption in 2024. Updated legislation would also be analyzed in the Final EIS and sent to City Council allowing with the Mayor’s Recommended Plan.

Concurrent with the development of the Draft EIS, the City will continue engagement to inform the creation of the Draft Plan. More information on events and other opportunities for engagement is available on our engagement website at engage.onesattleplan.com.

Exhibit 10. Comprehensive Plan Process



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.