

Seattle Neighborhood Workshops
WEST SEATTLE JUNCTION: TABLE SHEETS
January 26, 2017

*** Please also see map of potential zoning changes discussed at the workshop*

Notes from Facilitated Tables

TABLE 1

- Small town character worried about losing more of the quality
- Concern about overcrowding. We have too much traffic, competition for roads, only one bridge in and out
- Safety concerns:
 - Traffic on Fauntleroy as a whole is fast and dangerous for children
 - Concern about sex offenders renting small units in RSL
- Greater density along transit spines and in urban villages is essential
- Additional development could limit options on where light rail can be built
- Not everyone can use transit – need car for child care dropoff
- One suggestion to eliminate all parking requirements
- Concern about impacts to views
- Fence makes access to Camp Long a challenge
- Concern about displacement of older apartment building and current residents, with respect to affordable housing
- Concern that affordable housing will not necessarily be built here. No contractual obligation to invest in affordable housing in the Junction.
- Owned units are good for neighborhood character
- Need to design for families – not all singles
 - Will need more schools with more families
- New buildings are generally OK in terms of style and design.
 - Make sure to maintain wide sidewalks – they are key
- Can city encourage office space along California and arterial spines to have more jobs in West Seattle?

TABLE 2

What we love:

- Small town feel within a city
- Family oriented
- Views
- Neighbors – renters and owners
- Walkability
- Engagement of community

- Know each other
- Parade

Boundary and proposal:

- Neighborhood plan language to protect SF neighborhoods is being discarded. Urban Village boundary should be shrunk to protect SF neighborhoods.
- Why aren't there incentives for SF property owners to create additional/accessory dwelling units? Incentives for homeowners to build/occupy an ADU. Landlords are not incentivized to bulldoze existing houses.
- In RSL, if you build an extra unit, incentivize developer to include parking.
- RPZ process is too long
- Parking enforcement doesn't exist on evenings/weekends
- 500 extra units for the amount of change is not a reasonable tradeoff
- Triangle: work/office space appropriate
- Neighborhood north of Mount is 35% non-owner-occupied
- Meeting with JUNO and neighbors in the SF areas within current Urban Village boundaries. Ask about RSL.

Concerns:

- Plan is more about profiteering of developers than about building affordable homes
- Views are a huge part of the character of the neighborhood; concern about losing views and character
- Developer cashes in on the view, affordable housing doesn't get realized
- Losing the character of neighborhood
- Pedestrian safety with greater density
- Loss of light
- Design standards – who so different in South Lake Union than in West Seattle? Design of current development here is not good quality.
- Hard to have zoning conversation without knowing where Sound Transit route/station will go
- Quality of life – density requires more green space. Pets come with people.
- Why trade so much SF housing for dense apartments when there is still room for density in already densely zoned.
- Loss of neighborliness
- Increase in traffic
- Density brings more trash, people who aren't taking care of the community
- There should be park and green space proposals as part of HALA
- Current neighbors won't be able to stay in neighborhood, especially renters
- Why aren't Magnolia and Queen Anne included in Urban Villages?
- Concern if MHA gets struck down, the upzone remains. Go get legal opinion.
- RSL outside urban villages should be considered – provide parking with development. This lessens the parking challenges.

- Consider zoning change outside Urban Villages
- Transition looks like small, incremental blocks around density, not wide swaths with many blocks.
- Zoning proposals could cause more displacement of affordable housing
- Taxes will increase as a result of zoning proposal
- Additional 10-feet on tall buildings is impactful in the neighborhood core (along California between Edmunds and Oregon). Concerned about a “canyon effect”.
- SLU design standards, please
- Can housing developers be mandated to provide receptacle for pet waste and bags? And space for pet relief.
- Would like to see a neighborhood planning approach.

Summary:

- Concern about any boundary expansion and upzoning of single-family areas within Urban Village
- JUNO small conversations with SF areas affected
- RSL outside the Urban Villages – another layer/buffer for RSL
- Incentives for existing homeowners to build additional units in RSL
- Design standards to preserve neighborhood core
- Loss of light and air access is a big concern
- Dog amenities

TABLE 3

Assets:

- Small-town feel, families – community – neighbors
- Accessible, handicapped parking
- 15- minute commute
- Mom & Pop shops
- Was affordable, now skyrocketing prices
- Historical homes, apartment buildings
- Neighborhood character, variety of single family homes
- Walkability, drivability
- Camp Long is a treasure

Challenges:

- No hospital or 24-hr clinic
- No library or community center
- Only one way in and out of neighborhood
- Quality of life has gone down with the addition of new apartments:
 - Streets crowded, not enough parking, can’t find parking to shop at Safeway
 - Debris, needles, dog waste on streets and left in yards

- Whole Foods going in on Fauntleroy and Alaska on ground floor of a 5-story building will make traffic congestion worse
- Renters don't care about the neighborhood
- Development along California has become a canyon and homes have dropped in value
- Meeting 6-7 years ago about development in the Triangle – supposed to be walkable and park-like, but didn't turn out this way

Zoning proposal:

- Where will new affordable units be?
- **Consensus** not to expand the Urban Village boundary. More density is still achievable. Some want to go back to the original boundary in the 1990s plan.
- Current infrastructure is not enough for more density
 - Rapid Ride C line is standing room only
 - Fairmont and Genessee schools are already overcrowded
 - Fire station, library, hospital/medical center, community center are needed
 - Parking needed around Mt. St. Vincent for 24-hour staff, near businesses for customers
 - More parks and green space needed; golf course shouldn't be counted as green space – can't play ball with the kids there or take the dog for a walk
- Transportation, traffic and parking concerns:
 - Concern about increased traffic congestion on the bridge
 - Consider traffic patterns – ferry traffic on Fauntleroy
 - Fire trucks can't get through from temporary fire station
 - Three private schools in northeast part of Junction bring more traffic for drop-off and pick-up
 - People park now on streets near the C line so they can ride the Rapid Ride C
 - New buildings need to have parking for residents
 - Why does a homeowner who wants to add a DADU have to provide off-street parking but an apartment developer doesn't have to put in any parking?
 - Need for more disabled parking
- Consider topography – areas of steep climb
- Bad idea to have housing density around a school playground because of safety concerns
- Safety concerns for seniors and disabled to walk and park
- ADUs and DADUs could be added also other neighborhoods
 - City should work with homeowners interested in adding these
- Need for 3- and 4-bedroom units for families, not the studios and one-bedrooms that are in new buildings
- There are a lot of vacancies in the new buildings now – why is more needed?
- Developers are using the idea of a housing crisis to keep the real estate bubble going
- Concerned about homes purchased by conglomerates for rental. Vancouver, BC, imposed a tax on foreign buyers of property for investment.
- Developers will want all the view property

- If developers can pay to opt out, they will all do so because it's too much trouble to follow the requirements for affordable housing and maintain records on an ongoing basis to show that it continues to be affordable
- Zoning changes will result in loss of affordable housing
- Is there a net loss or gain of affordable housing in the Urban Village?
 - More affordable housing is needed
 - What is the city doing to preserve currently affordable older buildings?
 - Don't knock down the four-plexes we have
 - In EIS will they count the current brick buildings?
- Importance of light and privacy
 - Cottage built on neighbor's lot now blocks light to garden
 - Tall building next to a single family home is a privacy concern
- Will the EIS include noise pollution?
- Importance of single family homes: 1999 Neighborhood Plan said "protect the character and integrity of single family homes"
- Architectural character of the neighborhood should be maintained
- Timing – delay proposal until we know where the light rail station will go
- What is the guarantee that the plan won't change again in 5 to 10 years?
- Consider development instead in the SODO district or other light industrial areas; Harbor Island is empty now and could be developed
- **Consensus:** More outreach needed on this proposal
 - Only heard about it 3 weeks ago
 - Need more real-time meetings where people can ask questions
 - The 10/20/16 summary didn't include all the comments made
 - HALA website is hard to figure out; how to comment isn't clear

Summary:

- Keep the original Urban Village boundary; keep integrity of single-family areas in Urban Village
- Livability is key
- Safety concerns – fire safety with density, pedestrians and street crossings, density by playgrounds and schools
- Public transportation and parking are not meeting current needs. Proposal will further strain both.
- Schools overcrowded
- Hold more meetings on the proposal

TABLE 4

- City needs to explore more creative solutions than getting rid of single family areas in Urban Village. Do not support re-zoning or single-family areas.
- Build out the existing capacity
- Wait for light rail station identification

- Require developers to provide green space, light, set-backs
- Explore opportunities to increase density in other parts of city. Delridge has huge opportunity for development.
- Increase density where it already exists instead of spreading out to single family homes
- Concern about not having enough infrastructure to support growth, including: school capacity, hospital, parks, roads, etc.
- Proposal will result in loss of currently affordable housing
- Consider live/work space
- Not consistent with neighborhood plan goal of protecting single-family areas
- Concern about MHA principle that entire blocks should be rezoned
- EIS Alternatives need to include input of these meetings
- Website for feedback is terrible
- Flyer that came out – nothing in it about the rezone
- Concern on how this was communicated – found out via West Seattle Blog, not city

TABLE 5

- Distribution of density
 - More ADU/DADU
 - Increased density with better retention of neighborhood character
 - Possible tax incentives would make more attractive
 - Not UV height
- Infrastructure – need more! Can't handle current population; many issues. Should be planning concurrently with ST3.
- More jobs desired within West Seattle!
- Green spaces – not enough pocket parks, open space requirements; take golf course out of open space count
- Density is okay, but increase parks, open space
- No growth
- Work with homeowners, not just developers
- Existing UV boundaries need to be reconsidered. Some said consider expanding boundary to the west down the slope. Consider expanding urban village boundary to make more single-family areas RSL. This could reduce pressure to increase density in core of Urban Village. Others said remove single-family areas from Urban Village boundary.
- Appalled at scale of proposed expansion given the current level of development happening
- Small town feel near urban center, sense of neighborhood, single family homes, able to know neighbors
- Walkability
- Recent development has made it an exciting place!
- Maxed-out schools
- Community population is more transient; less invested in neighborhood

- Preference for old neighborhood plan – protected single family areas, but has some issues
- Stay within densities outlined in the comp. plan
- Parking:
 - New building parking underutilized
 - Parking requirements should increase with housing
- Development may not build to highest and best use
- No superblock apartment
- PetCo is awful
- Support for retail, restaurants
- There are SF homeowners who never asked for transit, who are now greatly impacted by future light rail plans, and associated increased development
- Need bus service improvement, need more buses, better service
- Not enough road capacity to provide transit for increased density; consider other transportation corridor
- Reality of high numbers of incoming workers – where to house them?
- New housing developments aren't full; vacancies due to high prices
- MHA affordable units not sufficient, in terms of providing enough affordable housing
- There is a decrease in existing affordable units – due to demolitions
- No affordable housing payout – housing should stay in the neighborhood
- Impact of 50,000 units could be distributed across whole city, including existing SF areas
- Expand use of DADUs in SF
- Cost reductions for DADUs, especially parking requirements
- Seattle shouldn't have to absorb all population increases
- Junction is NOT live-work
- West Seattle is unprepared for major emergency. There is no hospital in West Seattle; W. Seattle Bridge is a major barrier, especially in medical emergencies
- Balance density with Admiral Junction
- High percent requirement for affordable housing
- Taxes – Can city work with County to monitor tax burden to allow homeowners to stay in place?
- Property owner incentives for DADUs
 - Apply “grand bargain” to homeowners
 - Without changing character of neighborhood

See Attachments for a summary email received from a Table 5 participant

TABLE 6

- Not enough parks
- Likes – coffee shops
- Neighborhood Plan supports keeping single family housing
- We've seen a high volume of housing development – well above city goals. We don't need more density.

- Will HALA pay attention to survey responses?
- New apartments – should have some 2- to 3-bedroom apts for families
- We don't know where station is going to be – some want to wait until we know
- Discussion about property values
- Too much, too fast. Transit (ST3) decisions about route and alignment should be made first.
- Remove single family from Urban Village Boundary
- Use neighborhood plan that was adopted by the comp. plan
- Parking requirements should increase with housing, lack of parking already a challenge
- Concern about housing crisis.
- Stronger design guidelines- no cookie cutters.
- Need more parks
- Need children's play areas
- Concern about legality of MHA program
- Don't want additional growth in the Junction.
- Need more feeder bus service
- Balance density with surrounding areas (Delridge, Admiral, White Center)
- Focus HALA on neighborhoods that want more density (not here)
- Green street amenities desired

TABLE 7

Assets:

- Small community feel
- Low density
- Quick access to downtown
- People
- Walkable and livable, especially for elderly
 - Three groceries
 - Drug stores
 - Small business

Proposal:

- Urban Village lacking in Magnolia and other areas – fairness
- Encourage development to pencil in dense places – where existing zoning is already dense
- Want owners to live onsite for ADUs/DADUs
- Sound Transit – will they respect zoning and locate where it makes sense?
 - Should be simultaneous planning
 - Slow down, not saying No
- Park and ride desired (not consensus)
- Parking
- Keep affordable for families, with family amenities (like yards); high rises not accommodating for families

- Feels city dishonest
 - Mailing didn't have enough information
 - Early maps unreadable
 - Don't respond to meetings quickly
- 1999 plan – we're 300% over that plan's projected growth; this area has already grown too much
- Developers taking too much freedom – sidewalks, parking lanes, streets, staging takes over during construction
- Loss of green space when SF redevelops as LR – concern
- Would like to see the “hottest” density increases citywide – is West Seattle taking more than others?
- Tall buildings south of SF is a problem for sunlight
- Traffic impacts, bridge limits West Seattle
- In emergencies, West Seattle is very isolated – consider that
- Brings Parks people to these MHA meetings
- Concern that city will not actually listen
 - Poorly managed process
 - Too many different meetings – should be holistic meetings
 - Livability (parks) and housing affordability addressed together
 - City Council
 - Want to know about “livability” meeting
- If SF built in “(M)” area, does it have to pay a fee/be affordable? Doesn't seem fair.
- Concern about one-lane ramp to I-5
- Access to hospitals
- Look at ways to accommodate density and affordability in SF-like housing types (apodments don't work for everyone)
 - How do other countries do it?
 - Multigenerational living
 - Family-friendly density
 - [drawing of homes around a shared courtyard with tree/park next to it]

Summary:

- West Seattle has already grown too much, too fast – should have amenities
- All existing single family zones should be protected
- Should have simultaneous light rail planning
- Prioritize already-dense zones for increased density
- Consider civic amenities and environmental issues simultaneously
- Look more into affordable, family-friendly housing types

Attachment – See attached photo brought by a participant

TABLE 8

- Delridge good candidate for more housing
- What about other neighborhoods' changes?
- Streets with more maintenance and high truck traffic
- Drainage, transit, roadways, open space, etc. don't have enough capacity today
- RSL may be more appropriate for transitions, with smaller strips of LR next to NC
- Plenty of existing NC zoning and commercial fairly built out; could use more offices, hotels, grocery store, cafes
- Plenty of grocery stores
- Principles applied with too much of a broad brush
- Transit is not effective in reducing congestion and parking demands
- Existing congestion, conflict with bus lanes
- Bus service not geographically spread out
- Light rail uncertainty is an issue
- Park & ride?
- Need more street sufficiency for emergencies
- Need wider sidewalks
- Full block "monster" developments are concerning – need better design standards, wider sidewalks, relation to pedestrians
- LR should shade solar panels, grids
- West Seattle golf course property could host a much-needed community center, housing, transit park & ride
- No parks community center since 1999 neighborhood plan
- Boundary could expand to west – not actually that steep
- Conflicts with 1999 Neighborhood Plan
- Existing SF to LR changes are a big jump
- Blanket proposal without details is a concern
- Existing traffic congestion, limited connections, not a place to live without a car
- Lack of parking minimums is problematic – RPZ in progress
- ULI recommends minimum parking
- Lack of parking causes street congestion

TABLE 9

- Concern that MHA is a giveaway to developers and will lead to too much construction
- Want growth to be over all Seattle
- Who is paying for the infrastructure? How is the city planning for infrastructure, schools, etc.?
- Transportation is a huge issue; add transportation and infrastructure before housing
- Parking is a major concern
 - Provide with development

- Parking at the stations
 - Want the no-parking requirement removed
- Repair streets after construction
- Street width concerns – makes parking and access difficult
- Traffic revision needed; roads over capacity; back-ups are frequent and long
- Curb cuts are tough to get, but take away street parking
- Transit: C Line is packed; light rail is not enough; there used to be smaller lines
- Explore possibility of upzoning areas around bus stops throughout the city
- Access challenges in the neighborhood
- Desire for an open forums and more than 30 days for EIS
- Inequity of proposal:
 - Why not wealthier neighborhoods?
 - Why no Urban Villages in Montlake or other areas?
 - Other neighborhoods aren't paying into this
- Some areas want the development
 - Delridge
 - Will it improve quality of life in other neighborhoods?
- Concerns about school capacity
- Concern that zoning proposal will result in higher taxes
- Do not want to lose single-family areas in Urban Village
- West Seattle has had growth already and we are not yet built to current zoning capacity
- Not opposed to the growth. Growth in Triangle area makes some sense.
- MHA – Want affordable housing in the neighborhood
- Would prefer a tax over MHA
- Would like to have more lot set-backs at ground floor
- Concerns about fire safety as we increase density
- Want more tools for urban design
- Concern about slopes near Mt. St. Vincent
- Concerns about timeline for approval of upzones
- Property values concern – potential for decrease
- Need clarification of what is binding
- Is there pressure from developers on Council?
- Why can't we take more advantage of commercial arterials?
- Construction noise! City noise ordinance needs to be revisited?
- Historic homes
 - What are protections?
 - MHA not recognized
- Interest in tools to help make the neighborhood livable and in keeping with what is there
- Setback help absorb density
- Some wanted to add housing at the Golf course; should not be considered green space

TABLE 10

- Concerns:
- West Seattle Golf Course should not be classified as a “green space” – unfair
- Shifting single-family to RSL is more acceptable than rezoning single-family up to LR1 or LR2
- Dealing with construction noise, detours, etc not desired
- It’s not about the money, it’s about the neighborhood
- Has multi-generational housing been given any thought?
- Not all housing types are appropriate for all times in life/families
- Some ages/family sizes would be happy with new development-type living spaces, others not
- Why all of it here? (Alaska Junction)
- There is a “cart-before-the-horse” approach from the city in regards to the proposed transit expansion to West Seattle. It would make more sense to have the Link station sited before rezoning a neighborhood.
- How many actual affordable units are likely to appear?
- Concerns from that a FEMA Slide Zone has been discovered and established in this area where rezoning is to occur [see map]
- Traffic is “untenable” now. It will get worse with this proposal
- The ratio of parking to tenants/residents is not 1:1 – need more parking
- Typically new multi-family development is built right up to the sidewalk, clashing with single-family home porches and front lawn character and neighborhood feel
- Preserve the vision of the neighborhood plan
- Concern that MHA will be struck down in court but zoning changes will remain
- Micro-zones within urban village
- Scale is a large concern
- Single-family homes towered over by condos on all sides
- ADU density
- “Choked” was a feeling described in regards to this Urban Village
- Density of traffic (again)
- Mention of 1990s-era bargain of density for transit improvements, and protection /retention of single-family homes
- Distrustful of current process and agreements not being met
- Public-engagement is flawed and communications process has been “terrible”
- Maps were published with no fanfare, it was not until West Seattle Blog put it on that people had time to react; by then time table was approaching closing
- Parcel subdivision costs will be high
- Don’t go more than one 1 level of change - SF to RSL
- Concerns about transitions to SF zones
- Setbacks for LR zones fosters greater sense of community
- Keep existing boundary
- Focus on backyard cottages / ADU/DADU

Notes from Self-Facilitated Tables (No table numbers assigned)

[TABLE A]

- Move density to other neighborhoods – bridge connection is a constraint for West Seattle
- Too fast, coming on top of the development that has already happened. Need to see the effects of recent development and fix issues before developing more.
- California is the “Main Street” – no height increase
- Density planning needs to and must coincide with:
 - Transportation
 - Schools
 - Parks
- Parking needs to be required
 - Mandatory payment offset for lack of parking by developers – buildings must have parking and not have outrageous cost to parking
 - Opposite of Park & Rides – central place to store your car for the week, then take it out the 1 to 2X per week you need it: “precinct parking”
- What percentage of developers will pay the fee vs. building affordable housing here?
- Keep character – preservation of corner at Alaska and California
- Quality streetscapes
- Electric, water, sewer – concerns
- Pedestrian friendly – walkability plan – quality of life on street – mid-block linkages – like where new Chipotle connects to Fresh Bistro
- More small green spaces to add to atmosphere
- Migrate center down Alaska Street toward Stadium – secondary center
- Is this really creating affordable housing?!?!
 - The penalty to developers is a pittance
 - Needs to be higher – or not opt out at all
- So much change already – need to fix the problems that have created by new development – schools, transportation, parking
- Add water taxi shuttles and
 - Make water taxi cheaper
 - Create more transit on downtown end of water taxi
- Parking rule of “no min. parking in urban villages” needs to be changed
- Just because your property development opportunity increases, a current owner shouldn’t have property tax increase until you sell and that value is realized

[TABLE B]

- Too much double grouping, Edmonds to Dawson. This totally destroys a single family area.
- Preference for smaller zone increases
- Phase-in development vs. grand-scale rezone without transit being fully known

- Bridge closures significantly impact traffic within the neighborhood.
- Could RSL expanded to SF areas outside of Urban Village boundary to help preserve the character of the neighborhood?
- Golf course is not a park, and should not be counted as green space
- Rezone areas on the west side of California.
- Make it easier to add DADUs – adds density but maintains a single-family neighborhood feel.
- Why are Queen Anne and Magnolia excluded? Is it about wealthy homeowners having more clout than neighbors that live in more modest homes?
- Preserve the 1999 Principles! Preserve the single-family nature.
- Delridge – They want more development and transit.
- Expand single family to residential small lot and eliminate double/triple jump areas.
- Stagger implementation of zoning changes using growth markers so single-family areas aren't converted until growth has filled in more in the current LR1 and LR2 areas.
- Positive: Backyard cottages – to Hudson from Brandon
- Expand transition zoning west of California
- Coordinate with transit and schools to ensure measured growth
- Transit is at capacity even now
- Concerns about parking, specifically buildings with no parking
- We feel like you are selling away the quality of our neighborhood for too low a price. Yes, we support affordability but not at the cost of the diversity, character and affordability of our neighborhood. The fee that developers would pay still requires finding more land to develop.

[TABLE C]

- Multiple existing springs in proposed LR2 area north of Oregon Street; high water table issues throughout neighborhood
- Eliminate existing SF areas from the upzone please = Preserve the character (heart symbol) of West Seattle
- Wall Street Journal, 12-7-16, p. A1, “Blackstone Is Taking Its Home Bets Public” – Blackstone Group LP is buying homes with the intent of turning as many as possible into rentals, therefore, turning them into an IPO commodity.
- Seattle Times:
 - 12-20-16, p. A1, Apartment Saturation
 - 1-1-17, p. A1, “Apartment Boom” – Almost 10,000 new apartments this year, 12,000+ in 2018
 - 7-17-16, p. B1, Danny Westneat, “City Plays Deflecting Blame Game”
 - 3-9-14, Sanjay Bhatt, “Blackstone Group buys homes in northend”
 - 8-22-16, p. A 15, Brier Dudley, “Homeownership is still a foundation of the American Dream”
- Next stop: The PDC offices in Olympia to start following the money

- The term “Urban Village” invokes an image of a cohesive aesthetic. Part of what makes West Seattle so special is the charm of the single family home. Tearing those down and putting up poorly constructed ugly boxes will seriously change our community for the worse. Also, serious concern for “rental saturation.”
- Need to build around light rail. Not before.
- Are you looking at Delridge as a location for housing? It would kill two birds with one stone: (1) provide housing; and (2) clean up Delridge.
- Traffic is already backed up from 35th along Avalon Way all the way to West Seattle Bridge during peak hours morning and evening; this will increase the problem.
- DPD (whatever they are called now) never wants to address parking or traffic with growth – guess what – it’s a fact of life and needs to be considered!
- Ballard and Capitol Hill have 15 ways out – we have one exit out of West Seattle with two lanes of traffic! What about rush hour medical emergencies?
- What about more density at Magnolia? There appears on the map that very little more is planned for Magnolia.
- The city is ruining West Seattle.
- We have a bridge. Why are we being zoned the same as places with more transit options?
- Emergencies!
- Wait until light rail station proposal to bring this to West Seattle
- Current transit doesn’t support the lack of parking
- Density should be where there are more egress points than our peninsula. What about emergencies?
- Are you working with support services (police, fire, post office) for this growth?!
- Put RSL in a three-block radius from every bus stop citywide.
- How do you prevent ghettos?
- Plan 10-minute walk zone around light rail station
- Increase commercial spaces to encourage “day jobs” here. Jobs in West Seattle will help traffic.
- Don’t build on the future light rail station. Don’t know where that is? Don’t build anywhere yet! Remember the monorail!
- Why do DADUs require parking but they aren’t required of large apartment buildings?

ATTACHMENT: TABLE 5

Email received from a Table 5 participant, 2/1/17:

Here is a summary of the primary themes of our discussion:

1. Expansion of urban village to the west, down the slope, so that it more closely aligns with the 10 minute walk shed, and provides more transition from current tall zones.
2. The idea of creating another ring of zoning changes outside the current urban village, making the Single Family into Residential Small Lot, would more widely distribute the incoming residents and development, in a way that 1) would be more gradual 2) at a lesser scale and 3) eliminate the need for many of the extra height bumps in the core. Spreading out density, rather than exclusively concentrating it in the Urban villages seems to be a more equitable, managable method the City should come back to.
3. There were several who recalled earlier plans and suggested redrawing maps to exclude Single Family from UV (at odds with the prior points but we're weren't attempting to achieve consensus).
4. Supporting more backyard cottages and mother in laws through out Single Family zones city wide. The cheapest apartment is the mother-in-law in the basement of a current house, and it can address our city's needs today.
5. Investigate tax incentives to either defray possible increases in assessments, or use tax breaks to subsidize the creation of affordable housing with in Single Family.
6. Concurrent planning with ST3 station, limitations of current transit and bridge access, lack of a hospital. Many questioned the whether the planning going into infrastructure was really going to be adequate, given that we're outpacing current projections.
7. More places to work in West Seattle, therefore taking commuter traffic off the bridge.
8. Find more park space. Personally, I am not sure that it is appropriate in the dense Hub Urban Village or even possible given the difficulty of acquiring new parcels at this point, but it certainly should be a very high priority for the health of the neighborhood as a whole, even if it doesn't get addressed in this MHA program.

In my opinion, the Urban Village idea has been a success across Seattle for the most part, however we cannot expect them to absorb all the new residents and growth coming our way. Distributing the grown by creating some additional flexibility with housing types, such as making backyard cottages easier to build, allowing more duplex, triplex, two or three story apartments, corner stores, would be preferable to having super blocks of 85' tall apartment buildings. It would be better for the pedestrian scaled downtown. We'd see a lot more housing units and housing options developed gradually at much smaller scale in ways that our neighborhood could absorb more readily.

Likewise, I hope that the MHA program itself can be modified to include more support (tax breaks, financing, etc) for people looking to create just a single unit of Affordable Housing, rather that only the big non-profit developers building large 100 unit apartments. Seattle will be richer if we support housing choices everywhere, for people across the socioeconomic spectrum, at every income level. Our neighborhoods will be much stronger and more livable.

Matt Hutchins, AIA

[\[mailto:matt@castarchitecture.com\]](mailto:matt@castarchitecture.com)

