

Growing Seattle

Recommendation/Comment	Example
Support change of element name (previously Urban Village). Recommend clearly stating this is the growth strategy and as such is different from the other elements in the Plan.	
Support the removal of UV36	UV36: Allow limited amounts of development in areas of the city outside urban centers and villages to maintain the general intensity of development that already characterizes these areas and to promote the targeted level of growth in village and center locations.
Support the removal of the amenities section of Figure XX	
Recommend – include a process for establishing an Urban Center or Urban Village or transitioning from one category of Village to another or Center	GS2.11 describes the criteria to be used to establish Urban Centers and Villages in the table Figure XX
Recommend – establish criteria for determining when areas may be removed from an Urban Center or Urban Village	See existing LU273, Transit Communities
Recommend – move GS2.13 to figure XX	
Recommend – be more direct about establishing an Urban Center or Village boundary within a ten minute walkshed of frequent and reliable transit – not just a light rail station	GS2.13
Recommend – replace reference to light rail with frequent and reliable transit when describing allowable scale of development near light rail stations.	GS2.14
Recommend – move GS2.14 to the “Growth Accommodation” section of Figure XX	
Recommend – Add transit access that is defined within existing Transit Communities adopted policy. “Light rail stations exist, or where light rail stations are planned and funded...” (LU273)	Figure XX, “Access” section
Recommend – Include walkshed definition from existing Land Use element section C-6 discussion “A walkshed is the distance that the average person is able to walk in about ten minutes, which is about one-half mile.”	Figure XX, “Access” section

Growing Seattle

<p>Recommend – a more aspirational figure expressed in density per acre of what growth we want to see in Urban Centers and Villages beyond the bare minimum required</p>	<p>Figure XX, “Growth Accommodation” section</p>
<p>Recommend – remove redundant public involvement policies</p>	<p>GS1 keep, but incorporate inclusive language GS4, GS5, GS6 and GS22 also reference</p>
<p>Recommend – make prioritization clear and remove vague and redundant policies</p>	<p>GS16, GS18, GS22, GS23, GS24 and GS41</p>
<p>Recommend – incorporate equity into policies</p>	<p>(Suggested NEW policy) GS1 Develop plans and implementation tools that are equitable</p>

APR 3 STAFF DRAFT

Land Use

Recommendation	Example
Recommend - Better connect the introduction to the four Core Values.	Community – Support complete compact walkable communities that build community. Equity – More access to areas of high opportunity and build opportunity in areas with high access.
Support - Changes to Future Land Use Map that promote Urban Villages/Centers as areas of Change	All Urban Villages should be shown as a consistent color on the map and be labeled as areas where we expect additional development and where development will help us reach the vision set out by the “Growth Strategy” Support LU1.9
Recommend - Urban Village boundaries should be modified using currently adopted “Transit Communities” typology.	LU273-LU275 in current Comprehensive Plan
Recommend – Add Equity to Uses section	Add policy after goal LU2 – All new land use regulations should be vetted through an equity lens and adverse outcomes known and if possible mitigated.
Recommend – Remove Conditional Use language	LU2.2
Recommend – Design Review language that is more aspirational and less prescriptive.	LU2.8
Recommend – Include in the final plan a definition of “small institution”	
Recommend – Broaden Telecommunications goal language to include impacts to public health	LUG4
Recommend – Broaden language in LU4.2 and then eliminate LU4.3 and LU4.4 as they are redundant.	
Recommend – Eliminate all language that protects private views.	LU5.4, LU5.16
Recommend – Eliminate overly prescriptive language.	LU5.5 – LU5.9 Use language about the quality we wish to achieve and be less prescriptive.
Recommend – Moving LU6.1 into the goal	
Recommend – Remove redundancy in policies	LU6.6, 6.7, 6.12, 6.13. These policies all talk about pedestrian friendly parking location/requirements.
Recommend – Remove overly specific language	LU6.14 Statement is not exclusive to Parks yet policy calls out Parks specifically.
Recommend – Single Family name change	Modify land use to Residential and move away

Land Use

	from Single Family as a classification
Urban Villages and Urban Centers should not include Single Family as a land use category on the Future Land Use Map	
Allowable uses within Single Family Land Use should be broadened	Uses such as duplexes and other configurations such as stacked flats as long as the development envelope and standards are consistent with existing single family zoning requirements.
Recommend – Strike language about homeownership and environmental sustainability in LUG7	Multifamily developments are more environmentally friendly because they have higher standards for run off and require less land to house the same number of people. Home ownership may also be achieved in Multifamily.
Recommend – Support for housing choice	LU7.7 should be changed from allow to support or encourage ADUs. Cottage housing should be included in the plan as another housing choice.
Recommend – Modify language to include Single Family	LU8.10
Support – Family-friendly policy but move policy up in order to not apply only to Lowrise	LU8.9
Support – Use of Highrise and Midrise within Urban Centers. Could this language be used to also support vision for multifamily throughout the City?	LU8.15
Recommend – Auto-Oriented commercial should not be promoted?	LU9.4-LU9.6 should be modified. LU9.22 Should this be broadened to include Commercial areas outside of UV
Recommend – Remove redundant policies	LU9.8 & 9.9
QUESTION – Does this policy intend to talk about large scale commercial that is typically seen along corridors?	LU9.13
QUESTION – Confusing policy	LU9.15
Recommend – Remove the pedestrian overlay language and move it to the overlay section	LU9.18 & 9.19
Support – Regional role of Industrial areas	
Question – Confusing policy	LU10.11
Recommend – Clarify role of Industrial Buffer	Is it only applied when adjacent to residential? It appears to be broader than that. What is the policy reason for having this?
Recommend – Clarify role of Industrial Commercial	Policies state that commercial should be allowed in support of Industrial. Is this defined and does it still make sense?

Land Use

Recommend – Clarify role of Industrial General	Is this tool broad enough if it is to be the only category that remains?
--	--

APR 3 STAFF DRAFT

Transportation

Recommendation	Example
Recommend – Incorporate right of way adjustment and allocation as part of the update	
Recommend – Incorporate safety language into the overall Transportation Introduction.	
Recommend – Incorporate equitable approach into the policies about Transportation and Growth to show tension.	T1.1
Recommend – Modify Goal language that is too auto-focused.	TG2 – Movement of people and goods
Recommend – Hyperlink to adopted modal plans	T2.10, T2.11
Recommend – Incorporate a placemaking policy	Define in glossary
Recommend – Reorganize the Complete Streets to move modal plans up in the hierarchy.	
Question – Does the Boulevard policy better belong in the Parks element?	T2.13
Recommend – Policy on Speed Management	T2.14 – Modify to talk about all speed management tools in neighborhoods.
Support – Introduction for Encouraging Transportation Options sets the stage for measurements and programming prioritization.	
Recommend – Remove redundant policies within this section.	T3.3, T3.4(could be moved up as part of the discussion or eliminated)
Recommend – Better weave equity through this section.	T3.7
Support – Regular mention of funding and how transportation projects are actualized.	Introduction and T3.9
Support – Focus on transportation innovation but broaden to all modes not just auto focused.	T3.13
Recommend – Clarify policy	T4.5 Could mean that we support car ownership for disadvantaged. Could mean lessening the impacts on disadvantaged that tend to live on heavily auto dependent corridors.
Recommend – Modify policy on street canopy to include manage and enhance based on climate change resiliency.	T4.6
Recommend – Add to introduction that commute times limit city-wide productivity.	
Recommend – Add to policies the tension that major freight corridors have with quality of life	T5.1, T5.2

Transportation

for residents on these. An equity issue	
Recommend – Add policy to explore or promote enhancing user experience while on transit. How can productivity while in congestion help with our economy.	
Support – Add Vision Zero language to the Safety Section.	
Recommend – Add equity language to safety discussion on prioritization.	T6.5
Recommend – Broaden language to be more than just light rail.	T7.6

APR 3 STAFF DRAFT

Housing

Recommendation/Comment	Examples/Additional detail
<i>Stylistic comments</i>	
Recommend – Tighten the background narrative to remove unnecessary statistics and references to specific sources, which can become quickly dated.	Detail that could be removed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentages of severely cost burdened in the introduction. • Source notes in Supply of Housing discussion.
<i>Introduction</i>	
Recommend – Add key context within the Housing Element introduction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note big picture challenges and opportunities given Seattle’s role in region. • Piggyback on references in the Introduction to the overall Comprehensive Plan about regional planning guidance. In Housing element intro, further highlight: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ King County Countywide Planning Policies, which provide guidance for accommodating housing growth and setting affordability goals. • Describe the role the Housing Element plays vis a vis closely related elements in Comp Plan, especially the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growing Seattle element (Urban Village Strategy). ○ Land Use element.
Support – The explicit incorporation of race and social equity in the introduction.	
<i>Supply of Housing</i>	
Recommend– Broaden policy aimed at reducing unnecessary development costs	H1-7 is too limited and specific. Provide broader policy direction for exploring ways to reduce development related costs (including process-related costs) in order to facilitate growth in housing supply and to help reduce housing costs.
Question - Where in the Plan will development capacity be addressed?	
<i>Interconnected issues in Supply of Housing (1st section)& Affordable Housing for Very Low- to Moderate-Income Households (last section)</i>	
Recommend – Refine the text in the Supply of Housing discussion	Further articulate role of supply: Reintegrate some of the language in current Housing element “Accommodating Growth & Maintaining Affordability” section and explain how facilitating growth in supply helps reduce upward pressure on housing costs.

Housing

	<p>Expand on statement about income inequality to include importance of retaining middle class within Seattle.</p>
<p>Recommend – Fine-tune the discussion and policies in these sections to reflect more breadth in the respective roles that market-based developers, the City, and other entities can and should have in facilitating affordability. A dichotomy in the City’s approaches for addressing low-income affordability v. middle-income affordability is currently signaled in some of the discussion and policies.</p> <p>Strengthen policy/ies aimed at encouraging affordability for middle-income households.</p>	<p>H1-5: We support promoting market-based strategies for middle-income. However, clarify intent is not to avoid <i>any</i> use of public resources to facilitate middle-income affordability.</p> <p>H5-12 and H5-13: Consolidate and broaden these policies about employer-assisted housing, and clarify that approach can be used to help middle- as well as low-income households.</p> <p>H5-10 on incentives for newly constructed housing is overly narrow given that some of City’s affordable housing incentives actually extend above 80% of AMI.</p>
<p>Recommend – Consider revising section headings in the current Comp Plan Housing element for these two sections and rearranging some policies between these sections</p>	<p>Section heading “Affordable Housing for Very Low- to Moderate-Income Households” implies that policies in section do not apply to middle-income households, but some policies (even as drafted) include middle-income households.</p> <p>H5-16 This policy about financially sustainable homeownership appropriately references moderate- and middle-income households.</p>
<p>Support – inclusion of glossary in Plan</p>	<p>Include definition of middle-income.</p>
<p>Diversity of Housing</p>	
<p>Support – Increasing flexibility for compatible housing types and facilitating broader and more affordable housing opportunities.</p>	<p>In Discussion, use less tentative language about compatible low-density housing types in single-family zones.</p> <p>Add statement about need for greater array of single-family and multi-family housing options suitable for low and middle-income families. (To lay rationale for policies in this section and help lay foundation for related need for more low-rise that should be addressed in Land Use element.)</p>
<p>Recommend – include some diversity of housing types, and household sizes and incomes within all neighborhoods, not just</p>	<p>HG 2: Add “in all neighborhoods” to end of this policy.</p>

Housing

<p>in the overall city.</p>	
<p>Support – H2-5 and H2-6 on single-family. It will be important to ensure that Land Use policies are consistent with these.</p>	<p>The cross-cutting recommendations in our memo include more consistently strong policy direction to facilitate diversity of housing types for a variety of household sizes.</p>
<p>Recommend – Address broad policy direction for complete compact communities in Growing Seattle and Land Use elements, rather than in Housing element. Explore replacing with a similarly intentioned policy focused on housing-tool</p>	<p>H2-2 is consistent with the kind of complete, connected communities the Planning Commission has advocated, but is too broad for the Housing element. Consider adding Housing Element policy for using combination of housing tools in coordination with zoning mechanisms, incentives, and design standards to encourage housing in urban centers, urban villages and frequent transit walksheds (or complete compact communities) that is attractive and affordable for households of varied sizes, types, and income levels, including families with children and mixed generation households.</p>
<p>Support – Added policy direction for encouraging family-sized housing in family-friendly buildings.</p>	<p>H2-2, H2-4, etc. Consider adding policy language to one of these policies to consider proximity to neighborhood schools, parks, and child-focused amenities policies when encouraging housing for families with children.</p>
<p>Recommend – Move some aspects of policies in the Diversity of Housing Section to the Housing Design section. Alternatively, the Diversity of Housing and Housing Design sections could be combined.</p>	<p>Portion of H2-1 on including innovative designs and construction types. Move H2-5 on customizable modular designs and flexible housing to Design section. Also, broaden H2-5 to refer to “households” (rather than just “families”) changing needs.</p>
<p><i>Housing Design</i></p>	
<p>Recommend – Incorporate health considerations.</p>	<p>Health considerations should be incorporated in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion ○ Goal HG3 ○ Policies H3-1, H3-3
<p>Recommend – Clarify policy to help ensure safety of housing is not limited to rental housing.</p>	<p>Understand H3-1 provides policy basis for RRIO program, but need to broaden to refer to all housing or add mention owner housing in policy.</p>

Housing

<i>Equal Access to Housing</i>	
Support –Inclusion of this section and specific background provided in the discussion about the Fair Housing Act. Goal and policies in this section are vital for equity.	
Recommend –Add policies where needed in Housing Element and elsewhere in Plan to adequately address environmental justice considerations.	
<i>Affordable Housing for Very Low- to Moderate-Income Households</i>	
Support –Policy direction prioritizing efforts to address Seattle’s most severe housing needs.	H5-2
Support – strong commitment to enhancing affordability for very-low to moderate-income households communicated by the combination of policies within this section.	
Recommend – This and any other quantitative goals included in the Comprehensive Plan should be meaningful and measurable.	HG-5
Recommend – A stronger policy direction to address the need for housing that is affordable to middle-income households, particularly families.	See earlier comments about interconnecting issues with Supply of housing Section.
Support – Promotion of housing choice and ability of low- and moderate- income households to access housing in a broader variety of neighborhoods, including high-cost areas where greater subsidies may be needed.	H5-4
Recommend – Integrate considerations of access to transit and essential components of livability.	<p>H5-4: clarify that emphasis on high cost areas is not a general emphasis but on areas with key components of livability such as access to transit, well-served by transit, proximity to quality neighborhood schools.</p> <p>Add back policy direction contained in Comprehensive Plan policy Hg.5 to consider potential household cost savings associated with proximity to good transit service in making choices about where to use funding resources.</p>

Housing

	Look at potential to integrate policy direction in existing Comp Plan policy H9 into Growing Seattle Element.
Support – Addressing needs of communities vulnerable to displacement. Recommend – Review Equity Appendix of DEIS and, if needed, augment Housing Element policies as appropriate to more fully address displacement risks.	H5-6, H5-17, H5-18, H5-19

APR 3 STAFF DRAFT

Capital Facilities

Recommendation	Example
Support – Removal of CPG3 and addition of CPG1	<p>CPG3: Make capital investments consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan, including the urban village strategy</p> <p>CPG1: Develop and manage capital facilities to maximize the long-term environmental, economic, social, and health benefits of available money, land and facilities</p>
Question – Is the prioritization of investments adequately equitable?	<p>CP1.1</p> <p>Reference to consistency with Neighborhood Plans in inherently inequitable as not all Neighborhood plans are equal in scope and depth</p> <p>TG9 is a good example of how to describe equitable investments: "This section identifies goals and policies related to providing and prioritizing funds for transportation projects, programs and services. It also identifies the types of multi-year investment plans to be developed that will support implementation of this Element.</p> <p>TG 9: Provide transportation funding at levels adequate to operate, maintain and improve the transportation system and to support transportation, land-use, environmental and equity goals in this Plan</p>
Recommend – Explicitly describe the variety of sources that fund these Capital investments	In the Discussion section of the element

APR 3 STAFF DRAFT

Introduction to Neighborhood Planning element

Recommendation/Comment	Examples/Additional detail
<p>Support - The introduction notes that for many neighborhoods, the vision, goals, and policies in the plan remain largely relevant, and updates have focused more on detailed planning and implementation. This is consistent with the Commission’s broad observations and recommendations* from the 2008-2010 Status Check.</p> <p>*Instead of embarking on a cycle to fully update every neighborhood plan, the Commission recommended that the City be more strategic in selecting planning and implementation tools to respond to specific needs or opportunities in a neighborhood.</p>	
<p>Recommend – Clearly describe the relationship of other types of planning work to Neighborhood Planning</p>	<p>Include a basic diagram outlining the relationship of Neighborhood Plans to the Comprehensive Plan, and the relationship of subarea planning and community development efforts to Neighborhood Plans.</p> <p>A more detailed diagram could be posted on DPD’s website as a companion guide to illustrate this further with respect to specific current practices.</p>
<p>Recommend – Articulate the relationship between the original neighborhood plans developed by community members and the subset of goals and policies that constitute the neighborhood plans formally adopted by the City.</p>	<p>This is in the introduction within the current Neighborhood Planning Element and needs to be reinserted in the draft for the major update.</p>
<p>Recommend – Clarify references to “neighborhood planning efforts” in goals to indicate whether they are meant to address neighborhood planning and subarea planning efforts broadly or are intended to address Neighborhood Plans more narrowly.</p>	<p>NP1.1 ...“neighborhood planning efforts” NP1.2 “each neighborhood planning process”</p>
<p>Recommend – In prioritizing areas to receive neighborhood planning efforts, the City should not only consider areas “expecting or experiencing significant change,” but also areas that are not equitably benefitting from the city’s growth or investments. Neighborhood Plans that no longer reflect the community’s vision and/or broader goals in the Comprehensive Plan are key candidates for</p>	<p>NP1.1</p>

Introduction to Neighborhood Planning element

<p>updating.</p>	
<p>Support - The emphasis on the inclusive engagement of diverse communities and interests in the city’s neighborhood planning processes.</p>	<p>The narrative highlights that the diverse communities and interests in the city’s neighborhoods are one of Seattle’s greatest assets and describes the City’s practice of fostering engagement of a wide range of people through both the planning and implementation of plans. Policy NP 1.2 not only articulates this practice as a specific policy of the City but also places special emphasis on groups who have historically been under-represented in planning.</p>
<p>Support– Inclusion of policy direction for neighborhood plans to be consistent with this Plan’s vision and allow neighborhood plans to focus on issues that are unique to their areas.</p>	<p>NP1.3</p>
<p>Recommend – Consider adding a policy to streamline the Neighborhood Plans as they are updated to reduce unnecessary duplication with goals and policies in the other Comprehensive Plan elements, provide greater clarity, and achieve more consistency between neighborhood plans. To this end, develop style guidelines, similar to the style guidelines for the Comp Plan major update. (The detailed stylist guidance itself would not be appropriate to include in the Neighborhood Plan Update.)</p>	