

Seattle Neighborhood Workshops
MADISON MILLER: TABLE SHEETS
February 28, 2017

Note: **Yellow highlight to mark consensus**

TABLE 1

Comments on proposal:

- Agree on principles of HALA; implementation extremely lacking
- We have already achieved density
- Proposal as it stands benefits developers, not affordable housing
- Fees, payment or performance:
 - Why aren't we incentivizing people with taxes on existing structures?
 - Development will not be invested in neighborhood; not much money to pay into the fund
 - Development waiting for two or three years will be bad, will lead to empty homes – could tax that enormously to get revenue
 - More user fees for development:
 - Parks
 - Infrastructure
 - None of the lines are buried
- City has inaccurate view of current density and diversity
- Census misses the nuances in diversity – change will continue
- Changes are too radical
- **Already have affordable housing - Consensus**
- Lack of assets within the urban village – T.T. Minor
- Need more green spaces
- Asset: smaller streets slow traffic
 - Parking on both sides
 - These are hazards in another sense
- 21st Ave. designated bike path
- Parking:
 - No parking requirement, no limit to long-time parking – all sorts of things that the city can be doing
 - Miller parked all day every day
 - Parking and elderly – very limited parking, really need to consider
 - The more NC commercial, the more unrealistic the RPZ hours
- Infrastructure needed
- Potholes
- Limited community center hours
- Density will make these assets wrong

- [Fear] losing the character and soul of this neighborhood - proposal not taking that into consideration
- EIS: Postpone until you have real information, and after Meany Middle School reopens
- Need single family areas
- Incentives to owners to keep current affordable housing
- Tax exemption for seniors with incomes \$40K/yr or less
- Map doesn't show current use accurately
- Want to maintain historic nature of neighborhood
- Our neighborhood transitional – not an accurate reflection of current condition
- Do a neighborhood walk with the city – listening session, perhaps
- City permitting issues

Specific suggestions:

- Upzone from St. Joes. Along 19th
- Already have natural transition along John
- 19th & Madison very hard
- Put SHA houses throughout the whole city
- Raise it all up and really be more robust
- Need to extend the Urban Village north, share the burden to the north and east
- The Urban Village is an artifice that doesn't reflect the conditions on the ground in many ways – East 23rd north to Montlake
- Density seems too concentrated for us – extend the Urban Village to reflect the actual conditions

Design considerations:

- Design review reform resonated with some in group; need design review board
- Setbacks from the street; a lot of the stock doesn't have setbacks, need to include
- Mature trees; minimum diameter of trees for upzones
- Preserving the line of the sidewalks
- Missing affordable housing for families
- Single family should be filled by RSL
- ADU and DADU:
 - Address ADU and DADU in areas
 - Reasonable solution: DADU and ADU
 - Make the current but not permanent ADUs and DADUs LEGAL
 - Small kitchens
- Small lots here hard to build, high on these lots

See Appendix 1 for several maps, photos and plans provided by Table 1 participants

TABLE 2

Assets

- Connect to neighbors
- Bus service
- Diversity of housing options- like the mix of all types
- Scale!
- Walkability and access
- Mix of residential and commercial is an asset
- Connectivity
- Age of the neighborhood, and the character of that age
- Renters are an asset- want to protect their access
- Trees and landscape
- Setback for yards soften the appearance of the architecture
- Light
- Balance of openness and green

Comments on proposal:

- Neighborhood Scale
 - Check about the scale of the new development – how will it fit with what is here?
 - Community enjoys the current neighborhood scale, neighbors connect to neighbors
 - Scale is important to community members who have a disabled dependent who can navigate the current area, but change/growth may present challenges
 - Neighborhood is already dense, with small lots and some backyard cottages
- Concern about loss of parking with growth
- Concern about LR height (40') – feels high and out of scale
- Concerns about investments to home – RSL might be a better option. Some have already invested in cottages, etc.
- Small lots – neighborhood is already dense
- Concern about feeling like a fishbowl with the small lots
- ADU/DADU:
 - ADU/DADU are in neighborhood
 - Want to talk more about RSL and ADU/DADU
 - Renters love ADUs/DADUs
- Some expressed sentiment that this was the wrong place for LR
- Concern that the impacts are hitting middle class, teachers, low-income harder than homeowners, who have some equity in homes
- Some didn't want density to be only on arterials
- LR – Add units not with height but with density, like LR1
- Some concerned that MHA fees are too high; others are OK with M fees as they are proposed
- Some expressed sentiment that they built the neighborhood, want the legacy

- Others expressed that younger people wanted to help continue to build the community, but that they can't do that currently, given prices.
- Some expressed that it took a long time to afford to buy into the neighborhood. To others, this felt similar to red lining.
- How does this relate to the GMA?
- We do have affordable housing crisis
- Discussion about, and some support for, alternatives such as fee reduction for development to do more housing that isn't height based, tax benefits, or other fees that helps protect character
- Many want to increase heights and housing opportunities
- Incentives would help, but will that happen?
- Should Amazon pay? Or other commercial entities?
- Some property owners feel they take the brunt of growth, but a renter noted that they are taking the brunt, due to lack of equity and protections from rent increases.
- Concerns about older residents on fixed income – how can they stay in homes?
- Concern that many renters are often just one or a few steps away from homelessness risk
- Social/racial justice needs to be considered with growth.
- Green street designation – what are the requirements?
- Can city fund open space? Want more P. Patches, pollinators
- Aging in place options are desired
- 2-3 bedroom units are desired
- Lower density benefit
- Some felt that the economics of MF development = more feasible, works best if there is a mix
- Can the city provide incentives to help with financing? U. District may have done this
- Kids want places to play, yards – park becomes community yard, multiple parks types
- Diversity of housing types – this is the most important, how do we get it through growth?
- Concerns about outreach for MHA:
 - Some of what is being said sounds like red lining
 - Concern African American neighbors aren't here at the table
 - Need more announcements

Specific suggestions:

- North part of Urban Village isn't close to LR-high capacity, tackle gaps
- S. of E. Thomas – is there still opportunity?

Design considerations:

- Neighborhood design guidelines – are they here? Sentiment that they haven't been effective
- Setbacks can help moderate growth impacts
- Front setback should address the street – front setback is desirable
- High-quality building materials are desirable
- Want livability – sun and light access
- No ugly buildings

- What is design review doing?

See **Appendix 2** for a map with comments provided by Table 2 participants

TABLE 3

Assets:

- Feel of residential in an urban neighborhood (lots of agreement)
- Neighbors
- Parking
- Shopping on 15th
- Walkability
- Ada's bookstore, other local businesses
- Green – worry about it going away – canopy, landscaping
- Proximity to downtown

Comments on proposal:

- 15th is getting more dense
- Discrepancy of buildings across the street from one another (small houses, lots, alleys), parking
- Why are there not upzones in areas outside of Urban Villages or new Urban Villages?
- DADU/ADU does not fit into the neighborhood
- Streets feel not neighborly, would like less people
- Lots of people being pushed out
- Existing housing being demolished and replaced by townhouses that people can't afford
- Homeowners have put significant investment of money and love into house, sad that it will be torn down
- Reached density goal already – why does neighborhood need to absorb more?
- Worried about making sacrifices and not getting benefits in your neighborhood
- In upzoned areas – concern that there will be more units but fewer people (fewer people per unit); there used to be SF homes housing many people, but many of those homes have been torn down and replaced with smaller units
- Parking as part of design review should be more stringent
- Parking should be considered in the future
- Use of Spot zoning, and whether it could be used to better reflect site conditions, but also that it does not provide certainty for homeowners or developers. Lack of coordination between depts. – Land use and street allocation.
- RSL area – lots and streets are too small to be upzoned
- Lots of psychological trauma associated with upzones on their property and difference of what they bought in the past

Design considerations:

- Concern about setback of building from sidewalk being too small
- Greater setbacks from street should be required
- Buildings facing park shouldn't be concrete walls, have windows to provide "eyes on the street"
- Code should include:
 - Aesthetics
 - Setbacks (especially in LR)
 - Tree canopy
- Building design:
 - Don't like "refrigerators" (set of developments in the neighborhood – literally a white box)
 - Pitched roofs
 - Colors similar to other buildings in neighborhood
 - Wood/masonry
 - Setback from street

Summary:

- Concern about whether affordable housing will result because of MHA
- Changes have been made with broad strokes and don't capture the details and nuance of neighborhood context
- Citywide need – city –all of it, not just urban villages—should bear the burden
- 2X and 3X upzones are inappropriate, more appropriate to upzone SFR
- Details and design of LR zones not constraining enough:
 - Aesthetic
 - Vegetation

TABLE 4**Assets:**

- Walkable for able-bodied, but people need parking
- Like the trees
- Scale, porches, very "talkable"
- Family neighborhood
- Value the diversity because of family-sized units
- Capitol Hill Housing is a treasure
- Already near transit
- Neighborhood park and kids (community)
- Little backyards, no shading
- Diverse ages, sexual orientation, races

Comments on proposal:

- The bulk is too much; need to consider light access.

- Want the affordable housing (in the neighborhood)
- Need investment in transit, parks, etc., in the neighborhood. Capture the property taxes locally!
- Don't want upzone without a plan. Must have resources to support growth
- Don't add a story to the "L" zones – change the zone itself – a change in zoning plus a change in the height of the zones is confusing.

Specific suggestions:

- Make more RSL in a larger area outside Urban Village but with setbacks, etc.
- Some wanted RSL around the school and park; others said LR1/LR2

Design considerations:

- Rethink the whole building type concepts – more types but need to fit with neighborhood
- Need development standards, more setbacks and stepbacks

Summary:

- Need to have family-sized units!
- Higher ratio for family units – family housing can be shared housing

TABLE 5

Assets:

- Neighbor relations
- Mix of good and poor quality buildings
- Craftsman homes scattered throughout
- Many existing group homes and older apartments
- Very good transit and walkability
- Relatively little airport noise

Comments on proposal:

- Old infrastructure with older homes, require upgrades with zoning changes
- Parking:
 - Lack of parking requirements is a concern, needs careful consideration
 - Area does have an RPZ, which removed commuter conflicts
 - Balance parking requirements with other goals, needs to be 0.1 spaces per unit
- Need variety of child care
- Balance with green space
- Concern of that changes will reduce racial/socioeconomic diversity
- Possible incompatibility between SF and townhomes
- Very small lots (3,000 sq ft is common) will have empty homes while waiting for buyout
- Environmental Impact Statement:
 - Study "no action" and compare to current zoning

- EIS needs to evaluate school capacity compared to growth projections and ongoing development
- Concern of payment option not coming back to neighborhood
- Lyric Building on Broadway has good transitions
- More multi-bedroom, family-sized units around parks and schools
- Loss of community potential if only developers can buy properties
- Need to integrate community spaces in larger rental buildings
- Current lack of public open space (Miller Park is not very passive)
- Vacant home concerns with multi-lot development
- Concern of neighborhood character preservation
- Commercial areas need to remain, wide sidewalks with trees
- Issues of open space, school capacity, traffic
- Is MHA adequate for the city and will it solve the problem?
- Evolve neighborliness with good design, public open space, diverse population (age, income, race)
- Need more direct outreach, mailers to homeowners (group members not getting mailers), different religious congregations, refugees, immigrants, different formats of public meetings

Specific suggestions:

- More RSL spread out across larger area
- More density on Madison (not not many sites left) – concern of canyon effect and traffic congestion, remove some street parking

Design considerations:

- Lack of setbacks, front yard provisions, tree protection
- Lack of ground level setbacks reduces community opportunities
- Tall buildings need elevators so residents can age in place

Summary:

- More setback requirements at ground floor
- Spread out density for services and transit
- Extend family size unit requirements beyond LR1
- Improve public notice, less Internet reliability, newspaper/TV PSAs, news stories, neighborhood blogs

See Appendix 3 for a map provided by Table 5 participants

TABLE 6

Assets

- Diversity
- Can still park

- Connections
- Walkability
- Social capital and personal connections
- Transportation
- Tree canopy and green-ness

Comments on proposal:

- Setbacks, parking – density OK with these
- Not NIMBYs
- Low-income housing is already present
- Already making (growth) projections without (MHA)
- Keep current low-income stock; retrofit existing stock
- Create affordable housing here with large-scale projects
- Require affordable housing – NO BUY OUT!
- Buy-out fees have to stay in the neighborhood where they come from
- Upzone has to include a place for families
- Mix of types/incomes is vital
- Cluster density!
- Maximum build-out – bad
- Parking
 - Parking pass for single family – new units need to provide
 - Any new buildings without parking requirements don't get to park
- Small business affordability, small businesses provide the character
- Too much traffic
- More diversity
- Capture all growth for affordability; don't have Urban Villages carry all of the burden
- Housing Levy is a good tool
- Green:
 - Open space amenities required as part of new development
 - Need green infrastructure
- 50/50 enforcement needs to be strong!
- Dedicated, affordable senior units in multifamily, based on demographic proportion of neighborhood
- Need a range of affordable housing
- Townhomes are good option
- Mixed family sized product
- Force developers to pay fees
- Foreign investment tax? Halted development
- No more bonuses
- Stronger transitions between zones
- How will current housing projections play out?

- Bike infrastructure – grade/traffic makes conditions dangerous
- Outreach:
 - Notify neighbors much sooner
 - Why are people not being notified from beginning to end?!!!
- Slow down, Mayor
 - More focus groups
 - Input needs to be incorporated
 - Design guidelines need to be incorporated
 - 2, 3, 4 years
 - Get community support
- Do not exempt any funds from developers
- No good

Design considerations:

- Design quality is poor; hold developers accountable
- Buildings too big for block
 - Need setbacks to reduce impacts of bulk
 - No bonuses moderate form
 - Maintain traditional architectural styles
- Superblocks bad; use human scale
- Need design guidelines
- People could lose solar power opportunities
- Design review – local neighborhood, give neighbors the power
- Current setbacks – 5’ – need to be increased to 12’
- Community-based design guidelines

TABLE 7

Assets

- Trees
- Transit (#8, #12, #48)
- Density and mix of housing and commercial
- Location to other neighborhoods
- Walkable and livable community
- Kids run between yards
- Architecture and older homes
- Historic diversity of the neighborhood
- Sense of community

Comments on proposal:

- Concern that in LR zones, development will be “box” without setbacks
- Some would prefer single family to change to RSL, not LR
- Some prefer more LR to provide more housing options
- There is enough current zoning capacity to accommodate development of housing now.
- Concern about scale of development and height of development
- Concern about loss of character
- Zoning changes will result in loss of family (single family) housing. Zoning won't create enough family housing
- Not convinced changes will impact the amount of affordable housing.
- Concerns about developers paying into a pot
- Maintain a mix of residential and commercial uses
- Allow corner stores in LR zoning
- Need more green space – pocket parks
- Preserve trees in neighborhood – old trees are worth protecting
- Concern about losing open areas/space in RSL ones with greater density
- Use traffic calming to create more pay space
- Developers getting off too easy – others feel that if you load too much on developers, development won't happen
- Supply of units and price of units are directly correlated
- Make sure fee is set appropriately so there is a good mix of housing

Design considerations:

- Consider increasing setbacks, but tension with larger setbacks and size of units

See Appendix 5 for maps and materials provided by participants at multiple tables

See Appendix 6 for a study conducted by a group of residents and their consensus viewpoints

APPENDIX 1

Materials Provided by Table 1 Participants

New Construction in keeping with character of existing buildings. Set backs allow for light and open space.



New Construction NOT consistent with character; too tall; uncomplimentary materials; no set back from sidewalk.



APPENDIX 2
Map Provided by Table 2 Participants

APPENDIX 3
Materials Provided by Table 5 Participants

APPENDIX 4
Map Provided by Table 7 Participants

APPENDIX 5

Maps and Materials Provided by Participants at Multiple Tables

New Construction with set back for light and open space.



New Construction – no set back; overwhelms adjacent building.



APPENDIX 6
Study Conducted by a Group of Residents, Including Their Consensus Viewpoints