



City of Seattle

Seattle Planning Commission

Rick Mohler and Jamie Stroble, Co-Chairs
Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director

SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, June 24, 2021
Approved Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Alanna Peterson, Mark Braseth, McCaela Daffern, Roque Deherrera, David Goldberg, Matt Hutchins, Radhika Nair, Dhyana Quintanar, Lauren Squires, Kelabe Tewolde

Commissioners Absent: Rose Lew Tsai-Le Whitson, Patience Malaba, Rick Mohler, Julio Sanchez, Jamie Stroble

Commission Staff: Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director; John Hoey, Senior Policy Analyst; Robin Magonegil, Commission Coordinator

Seattle Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion.

Referenced Documents discussed at the meeting can be viewed here:

<http://www.seattle.gov/planningcommission/when-we-meet/minutes-and-agendas>

Chair's Report & Minutes Approval

Acting Chair David Goldberg called the meeting to order at 7:32 am. He read the following land acknowledgement:

'On behalf of the Seattle Planning Commission, we would like to actively recognize that we are on indigenous land, the traditional and current territories of the Coast Salish people. Land acknowledgement is a traditional custom dating back centuries for many Native communities and nations. For non-Indigenous communities, land acknowledgement is a powerful way of showing respect and honoring the Indigenous Peoples of the land on which we work and live. Acknowledgement is a simple way of resisting the erasure of Indigenous histories and working towards honoring and inviting the truth.'

Commissioner Goldberg asked fellow Commissioners to review the Color Brave Space norms and asked for any additions or amendments to those norms before stating the expectation that everyone practice those norms.

<p>ACTION: Commissioner McCaela Daffern moved to approve the June 10, 2021 meeting minutes. Commissioner Matt Hutchins seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes passed.</p>
--

Announcements

Vanessa Murdock, Seattle Planning Commission Executive Director, provided a brief review of the format for the online meeting, and noted that due to the online format, public comment must be submitted in writing at least 8 hours before the start of the Commission meeting.

Discussion: Draft 2021/2022 Comprehensive Plan Amendments Docketing Letter

John Hoey, Seattle Planning Commission staff, provided an overview of the Planning Commission's draft 2021/2022 Comprehensive Plan Amendments docketing recommendations letter. He stated that the Commission will take action on the final docketing recommendations letter at the July 8 meeting. Mr. Hoey reminded the Commissioners that the annual amendments are reviewed against a set of criteria established in City Council Resolution 31807. The amendments are not evaluated at this point in the process on the merits of their substance. Proposed amendments that meet all the docketing criteria are recommended for further study.

The City Council received seven application forms for the 2020/2021 Comprehensive Plan amendment process, including two proposed amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and five proposed text amendments. Mr. Hoey reviewed the seven amendments and the draft recommendations for which of these proposed amendments should be docketed.

The Planning Commission recommends moving forward the following amendment proposal to the docket for further analysis:

#1: Florentia Street

The Planning Commission recommends the following amendment proposals not move forward to the docket for further analysis:

#2: 9201-9215 3rd Avenue SW (FLUM)

#3: 1511-1551 W Armory Way (FLUM)

#4: Setbacks and Trees

#5: Skybridges, Trams and Tunnels

#6: Open and Democratic Government

#7: Heavy Vehicles

Mr. Hoey provided the following details for each of the proposed amendments and the rationale for the Commission's draft recommendations:

#1: Florentia Street

Reclassify West Florentia Street (between 3rd Avenue North and Queen Anne Avenue North) and Florentia Street (between Queen Avenue North and Nickerson Street) in the Queen Anne neighborhood as non-arterial streets

- This amendment has not previously been submitted.
- Draft recommendation: Recommended for the docket. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.
- Arterial streets and non-arterial streets are included on the Comprehensive Plan's Transportation Appendix Figure A-1 map.
- Per docketing criterion F, this amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision, as this reclassification would influence future City budgetary decisions on physical improvements to the street.

#2: 9201-9215 3rd Avenue SW

Amend the Future Land Use Map to change 9201-9215 3rd Avenue SW in the south Seattle/South Park neighborhood from Single-Family to Multifamily

- This amendment has not previously been submitted.
- Draft recommendation: Not recommended for docketing citing criterion G.
- These three parcels are in a Single-Family Residential zone with a zoning designation of SF 7200, which generally allows only detached single-family houses. Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) requirements do not apply to development in this zone.
- A FLUM amendment is not necessary when it would affect an area less than a full block in size and adjacent land is the same or compatible.
- These three parcels are less than a full block in size, and the adjacent land is Single-Family.

#3: 1511-1551 W Armory Way

Amend the Future Land Use Map to change 1511-1551 W Armory Way from Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing/ Industrial Center to Commercial/Mixed Use

- This amendment has not previously been submitted.
- Draft recommendation: Not recommended for docketing citing criterion B5.
- These parcels are in the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center with a zoning designation of IG2 U/45, which generally allows only industrial and certain commercial uses. MHA requirements do not apply to development in this zone.
- This amendment would be better addressed through another process, in this case the ongoing work of the Mayor's Industrial and Maritime Strategy.

#4: Setbacks and Trees

Amend the Land Use element policies related to building setbacks and yards to allow for preservation and planting of trees

- This amendment has previously been submitted, most recently in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- This amendment was not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- Draft recommendation: Not recommended for docketing citing criterion D.
- This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected.

#5: Skybridges, Trams and Tunnels

Amend the Transportation element to add a policy that discourages pedestrian grade separations, including skybridges, trams and tunnels

- This amendment has previously been submitted, most recently in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- This amendment was not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- Draft recommendation: Not recommended for docketing citing criterion D.
- This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected.

#6: Open and Democratic Government

Add a new Open and Democratic Government element to the Comprehensive Plan

- This amendment has previously been submitted, most recently in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- This amendment was not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- Draft recommendation: Not recommended for docketing citing criterion D.
- This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected.

#7: Heavy Vehicles

Amend the Transportation element to reduce road and bridge damage from heavy vehicles

- This amendment has previously been submitted, most recently in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- This amendment was not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle.
- Draft recommendation: Not recommended for docketing citing criterion D.
- This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected.

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners requested clarification on the draft recommendation for proposed amendment #2: #2: 9201-9215 3rd Avenue SW. Mr. Hoey referenced docket criterion G, which states “an amendment that proposes to change the FLUM is not necessary and will not be considered when it would affect an area that is less than a full block in size and is located adjacent to other land designated on the FLUM for a use that is the same as – or is compatible with – the proposed designation.” The proposed amendment would affect an area that is less than a full block in size and the adjacent Single-Family area is compatible with the proposed Multifamily designation. Commissioners asked for more information about the process options available to the applicant if this proposed amendment is not docketed for further consideration. Mr. Hoey stated that applicants can pursue other administrative review options. Executive Director Murdock stated that Commission staff will follow up to determine the range of options available to applicants when proposed FLUM amendments are not docketed.

Public Comment: Industrial Maritime Strategy Recommendations Letter

Ms. Murdock read the following public comments, which were submitted by email:

Planning Commission Members,

The Mayor's Industrial Lands Reform Committee and City Staff are advocating for further down zones in the industrial lands, preserving 5000 acres for future Maritime/Industrial use, and are refusing to compromise on any meaningful mixed-use zoning in and around Light Rail Stations, the Stadium District, and current commercial corridor of 1st Avenue South.

High Density mixed-use zoning recognizes the City's evolving economic base, maximizes our investment in Sound Transit, and capitalizes on the commercial business activity along 1st Avenue S. and the Stadium District. Without significant expansion in allowable uses, the problems that have plagued the SODO for decades (aging infrastructure, public safety, environmental hazards) will continue to worsen.

Everyone in Seattle deserves an honest EIS process that asks key questions. What would the impact be to Port activities if 6% of the 5000 acres zoned IG1 and IG2 changed to TOD/Mixed-Use Zoning? What would the impact be on Transit if dense commercial activity were allowed around the Stadium and SODO Light Rail Stations? What impact could housing in and around those very defined areas do to our City's Housing crisis? How could rezoning in these critical areas improve the environment by allowing people to work next to their homes and reduce dependency of cars? How would the community benefit if work force housing were to be included in SODO's future plans? How would Port employees benefit by having work force housing in their neighborhood?

We are all trying to make long term meaningful policy decisions that benefit all of Seattle's citizens and, as a result, the City must ask the questions above in a thorough and honest EIS process. Please encourage City Staff to broaden their scope and let the data help inform their decisions.

Ted Lehmann
6th and Lander Stack Family Representative

Dear Planning Commission:

On behalf of the Washington State Ballpark Public Facilities District (T-Mobile Park) and the Washington State Public Stadium Authority (Lumen Field), we respectfully submit the following comments on the Commission's Draft Industrial Maritime Strategy Letter. In addition to these comments, we attach here the letter co-authored by Charley Royer (PFD) and Fred Mendoza (PSA), both of whom represented our respective organizations on the Mayor's Industrial and Maritime Advisory Group.

The stadium area is unique in many ways. While it's currently zoned for Industrial Commercial use, it has almost no light industry left. It is contiguous to two historic districts and is the southern terminus for the Waterfront Seattle project. It brings in millions of visitors each year for games and other events. As you know, our current Comprehensive Plan policy states that areas that draw large numbers of people are inappropriate for industrial zoning.

We agree with the Mayor and with the Commission that the Makers District concept represents a meaningful opportunity to encourage small, entrepreneurial businesses. Seattle Made, representing approximately 600 maker businesses, of which about 70 % are owned by women and people of color, lists affordable rental space as the number one need for these businesses. We also know that the development of affordable spaces such as these present a difficult financial proposition for developers and investors - creating an artificially low cap on residential development makes these kinds of projects even more difficult to build.

We have been advocates of allowing the City's EIS process to meaningfully evaluate the impacts of residential development in the stadium area. This analysis would take into account concerns about environmental impacts, as well as what a "no change" scenario would look like. We share the City's goal of not eroding Seattle's industrial job base - the EIS is the way for the City to evaluate a "no change" scenario (which would likely result in significant new office development) and compare that to the various levels of housing to understand how these options would impact freight mobility.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

John Marchione
Executive Director, Washington State Public Stadium Authority

Joshua Curtis
Executive Director, Washington State Ballpark Public Facilities District

Action: Industrial and Maritime Strategy Recommendations Letter

Mr. Hoey reviewed revisions to the Commission's draft Industrial and Maritime Strategy recommendations letter. These revisions reflect comments from Commissioners during the June 10

meeting and additional edits submitted by Commissioners since that meeting. Mr. Hoey highlighted substantive revisions within the following sections of the letter:

- Unique Characteristics of Seattle’s Industrial Lands
- Previous Seattle Planning Commission Reports and Recommendations
- Public Safety Partnership to Support Maritime and Industrial Areas
- Transportation Priorities to Improve the Movement of People and Goods
- Environmental Justice and Climate Action
- High Density Industrial Development
- No New Residential Uses
- Georgetown and South Park Neighborhood Goals

ACTION: Commissioner Roque Deherrera moved to approve the Industrial and Maritime Strategy recommendations letter. Commissioner Matt Hutchins seconded the motion.

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners suggested several minor edits to various sections of the draft letter. There was consensus among the Commissioners on these proposed revisions.
- Commissioners proposed the underlined addition to the following sentence: “This strategy recommends no new residential uses on industrial and maritime lands with limited adjustments to existing allowances in transitional zones to support industry and arts entrepreneurship opportunities, with the possible exception of the 10-minute walkshed of light rail stations.” Ms. Murdock expressed concern that this proposed addition was substantive in nature and does not reflect all perspectives on the Commission. Commissioners stated that there was not consensus on this proposed addition.
- Chair Goldberg suggested that action on the draft letter be delayed until consensus can be achieved. Ms. Murdock stated that Planning Commission staff will review the draft letter and identify areas for additional discussion and revision.

Public Comment

Ms. Murdock read the following public comment, which was submitted by email:

Opinion by Donna L. Breske, PE (Professional Engineer) and owner of Donna Breske & Associates, Land Use Consulting and Civil Engineering

SOCIAL INEQUITY IN THE SEATTLE SIDEWALK CODE:

As a condition of permit approval for increased dwelling units, (ADU's/DADU's) on single family residential lots, property owners within Urban Villages are required to install sidewalks along the property frontage. However, the more affluent population of property owners outside the Urban Villages are relieved from the requirement to install new sidewalks.

This is because there is a two-tiered sidewalk requirement within the City of Seattle Municipal Code. Specifically, 23.53.006.D SMC does not require, as a condition of permit approval, that new sidewalks are installed along the project frontage of the more affluent owners of those properties located outside Urban

Villages. However, SMC 23.53.006.C places added burden for property owners within Urban Villages by requiring sidewalks to be installed as a condition of permit approval.

Why not give all property owners within the City relief from new sidewalks for small projects of less than ten-units, not just those outside of Urban Villages. Instead collect a fee in lieu of, so there is a cumulative "pot" of money for strategically placed sidewalks and crosswalks where they are most needed within the City.

It is requested that the City of Seattle address this social inequity found within the Code.

*Sincerely,
Donna L. Breske, PE*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 am.