



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Director



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF REGIONAL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

MEMBERS

Yvonne Sanchez
Eastlake Community Council

Douglas Campbell
University District Partnership

Kay Kelly
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tomitha Blake
Montlake Community Club

Jon Gaines (Co-chair)
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Joan Kelday
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

Scott Cooper
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Matthew Fox (Co-chair)
University District Community Council

Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council

Brian O'Sullivan
Wallingford Community Council

Kerry Kahl
University of Washington At -Large

Ann Nguyen
University of Washington Students

Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty

Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff

Alternates

Chris Leman
Eastlake Community Council

Louise Little
University District Partnership

Leslie Wright
Laurelhurst Community Club

TBD
Montlake Community Club

Barbara Krieger
Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Pamela Clark
Ravenna Springs Community Group

Jorgen Bader
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Natasha Rodgers
Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance

TBD
Roosevelt Neighbors Association

Jorgen Bader
University District Community Council

Ruedi Risler
University Park Community Club

Jon Berkedal
Wallingford Community Council

TBD
University of Washington At -Large

Evan Carver
University of Washington Students

TBD
University of Washington Faculty

TBD
University of Washington Staff

Ex-Officio

Maureen Sheehan – DON
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods

Sally Clark – UW
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting #153

July 12, 2016

Adopted September 13, 2016

UW Tower
4333 Brooklyn Avenue
Seattle, WA 98105
22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Doug Campbell	Matt Fox	Leslie Wright (Alt. – non-voting)
Kay Kelly	Barbara Quinn	Barbara Kreiger (Alt. – voting)
John Gaines	Brian O'Sullivan	Pam Clark (Alt. – non-voting)
Joan Kelday	Kerry Kahl	Ruedi Risler (Alt. – non-voting)
Brett Frosaker	Jan Arntz	John Berkedal (Alt. – non-voting)

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan Sally Clark
(See attached attendance sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. John Gaines opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping

The committee reviewed the June minutes and there was no changes or clarifications.

A motion was made to adopt the June minutes as amended, and it was seconded. The Committee voted with one abstention to adopt the June minutes and the motion passed.

III. Public Comment

Mr. Gaines opened the discussion for public comments, and there was no public comment.

IV. University District Rezone (00:02:49)

Mr. Dave LeClergue is with the City of Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) that does long range planning including zoning, and design guidelines.

The U-District Rezone draft proposal is currently out for public review and public comments are due at the end of this week. Later this year, OPCD will be submitting their recommendations to the City Council.

The University of Washington is a hub and the largest employer in the area, as well as the major transit system upgrades. The U-District was identified as one of top urban centers due to its job growth, residential density and cultural activities.

It is projected that there will be significant redevelopment in the next twenty years with or without any zoning changes. Mr. LeClergue stated the neighborhood has been asking the City to plan and anticipate for this growth.

There also has been a very high public interest among members of the community who have become actively involved in the conversation about the future of their neighborhood.

A working group comprised of 25-30 residents, property and business owners, social service providers developed the Urban Design Framework. This document is not a regulatory document, but rather a high level description of the neighborhood's concerns and issues. An Environmental Impact Statement followed that studied possible zoning approaches, and it was presented to this CUCAC for comments. In the past year, there were a number of neighborhood Plan amendments to the document to update goals and policies for consistency. The City Council also adopted these amended neighborhood plans.

Later this summer or early fall, OPCD will submit its recommendations to the City Council. There have been 80 public meetings since 2011. There were concerns in these meeting about growth and loss of commercial vitality and investments. There was also excitement because of the upcoming light rail system. The goal of the current proposal is to balance the concerns and aspirations of these groups.

There are three main parts of the current zoning proposal. 1) increased height and density in the core blocks around the Light Rail Station; 2) new design standards that are tailored for the U district and new development regulation, and 3) requirements for affordable housing, public open space and historic preservations.

Mr. Gaines commented on how the study and analysis were taken. Mr. LeClergue mentioned that in the Comprehensive Plan, it looked at the citywide growth based on the Puget Sound Regional Council numbers, current trends, as well as the neighborhood goals. An educated estimate was taken to determine how much growth will happen in the next 20-30 years.

A diagram of the zoning changes was shown to the Committee. A core part of the zoning changes would allow up to 160 ft. office buildings and small residential high rise buildings up to 320 ft. Not all properties will go to this building height due to design and development standards and particularly Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The Ave will keep its existing zoning north of 45th street with an upzone up to 85 ft. south of 45th. There will be no high rise allowed on the Ave. The rationale was to stimulate redevelopment and encourage new investment and new businesses in a high density zone. The majority of the feedback in the public process did not agree, instead, they would like to see the Ave as a pedestrian and commercial district because of its distinct identity, and continue to focus the growth around the Ave.

A comment was made about the height range for mid-rise buildings, and Mr. LeClergue mentioned that the Ave would retain the existing zoning of 65 ft. and south of 45th will go up to 85 ft.

It is important to look at the floor area ratio (FAR) which is a mathematical formula that shows how much development can happen in a parcel because as residents see the development of the same type of mid-rise, they would like to see a greater variety and combination of both mid and high rise buildings.

A comment was made about alleys and wind tunnels, and if alleys behind the large buildings will be designed for more walkability and pro human. Mr. LeClergue noted that most of the alleys at the U District does not meet SDOT standards in terms of width; they are very narrow. The redevelopment would widen the alley, and with the zoning proposals it was not summarized in details but will follow up after the zoning. Regarding the wind, there are a number of design standards that will be used, but it will all depend on the design of the building itself. There is a strict requirement on tower separation in the proposal.

A comment was made by Ms. Colleen McAleer, a member of the public, about the altitude level on where the buildings starts. Mr. LeClergue was guessing about 100 to 200 ft. above sea level. A follow up suggestion that this information should be embedded in the proposal.

Every building, no matter the size, is required to comply with the housing affordability requirement. There is also another set of requirements that apply only to projects that takes advantage on the new capacity plan.

Mr. LeClerge mentioned that the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) has been a priority of City of Seattle Mayor Ed Murray and the City Council for over a year and a half. The Mayor organized a task force comprised of, but not only, low income housing advocates, developers and spent

many months identifying, analyzing and developing recommendations to tackle the issue of homelessness, increased rent, homeownerships, etc. One of the recommendations is to build 50,000 new housing units over a 10 year period. About 30,000 will be new market rate housing units, and 20,000 will be affordable housing. The two most notable methods in achieving this goal is through renewing and increasing the housing levy and applying the mandatory affordable housing requirements.

Developers in this rezone will be able to meet this mandatory housing affordability through building affordable housing on-site (performance) or by payment in-lieu of. These incentives come with increased zoning capacity. Currently the discussion is that the U-District is looking to set aside about 5 to 7% units for affordable housing, and payment in-lieu charge of approximately \$7 to \$12 a square foot.

A comment was made that the payment in-lieu might be popular but affordable housing may not be created in the U-District. Mr. LeClerge mentioned that intuitively it will be likely that every building will have affordable units.

Mr. Risler commented on how these requirements will be monitored. Mr. LeClerge mentioned that OPCD will be responsible for tracking on how the program does.

He encouraged the Committee to submit their comments or any concerns. OPCD wants to balance the people's interest and feedback received at this stage and will assist in fine tuning the recommendation. More details about the proposals are available at the website. The comment period ends on Friday.

Mr. LeClerge noted that there are no minimum parking requirements, but there are maximum parking requirements for big offices similar to downtown Seattle. The U-District proposal is a limit of 1 space for 1,000 sq. ft. for commercial development. There is a separate proposal to the City Council that would grant greater flexibility for apartment buildings that exist today to have its underutilized parking spaces be available for lease.

Mr. Risler commented about reasonable transportation planning in the U-District. Mr. LeClerge mentioned that there are more details in the zoning proposal that he was not able to discuss. Currently, OPCD is working on better documentation for some of the investments SDOT, Human Services, etc. are making in the neighborhood.

A comment was made about the average building size of the low income housing. Mr. LeClerge mentioned that it all depends on where the building is built.

V. Committee Deliberation (00:56:10)

Mr. Fox began the deliberation by discussing the comment letter that the Committee submitted two years ago addressing their concerns. He mentioned that he still has his concern of having an 85 ft. zone in the lower Ave. There is no guarantee of central open space or other key mitigation. There is a strong possibility of upscale office towers predominating. We are still likely to see higher levels of development district wide and it won't simply be focused in the up zone area. The EIS never did a worst case analysis on it not being a question of whether there is growth either in the area of the upzone or in the rest of the district, but rather get both. He also commented that over the last 20 years, the City decided to appeal to the international wealthy. By building cruise ship terminals, convention centers, and buildings that public money has been spent on and subsidizing high tech developers, these contribute to the rise in the cost of living. He noted his concern of an office park above the Light Rail station. Another big concern was that the mitigations were not guaranteed in any circumstances.

Mr. Campbell commented that there is nothing in the proposal that assures what the neighborhood defines as its core which is the desire to have a central public open space. The City is not willing to form an aggregation process to invest in a public space. He noted about he is strongly in favor of a central public space, but there is nothing in the proposal to address that. There are little incentives that head in the right direction, but the likelihood of getting it done through the process is not likely. As it stands, Mr. Campbell voiced his opposition to this proposal.

Ms. Quinn echoed Mr. Campbell's comments, and she also does not see any proposals regarding parks and schools and a place where families would want to live.

Mr. Frosaker echoed Mr. Fox's comments regarding the southern part of The Ave. He was disappointed in the lack of a vision to preserve the Ave for small retail spots and stores and limiting the heights and making it more likely to go up to 85 ft. That it is enough incentive for individual owners to get together and cash in.

With regards to open space, Mr. Frosaker commented that he gave up on it because of the direction it was heading. He noted that the City could create a public open space if it had the will to.

Mr. LeClergue responded that the open space goals that are outlined in the Comprehensive Plan in the 90's were hard to achieve. He acknowledged that everyone will be disappointed, but commented that one of the solutions as an urban city is to be smarter in using the open spaces the City has now especially the privately owned open space, for example the school yards and the federally owned locks.

A comment was made about the public benefit such as a lighter, greener, sidewalks, and buildings that were being built along sidewalk lines, and why are these not part of the development standards. Mr. LeClergue mentioned that these are in the development standards.

A comment was made about if a developer builds market rate housing and they don't want to include low income housing, this developer can pay money that goes into the City to develop, is there a guarantee that low income housing will be developed by the City in the U-District. Mr. LeClergue responded that it is not.

Mr. Fox noted that one of the Committee's lingering concerns is moving forward with the up zones without mitigations in place.

Mr. Campbell commented the Committee indicated of wanting a public square and its function for the community. He noted that the process should not go forward without having this mechanism.

Mr. Fox commented that he agrees with Mr. Frosaker concerns about the up zone on the south Ave would affect the character of The Ave.

Mr. Campbell reiterated that the Committee has a consensus that the up zone should not go forward without a mechanism for creating a central public open space for the neighborhood.

Mr. Fox and Mr. Campbell summarized the Committee's comment regarding the up zone as follows:

"The zoning changes should not move forward until a significant open space has been identified and a mechanism for paying and funding for its continued maintenance has been identified."

Ms. Sheehan and Ms. Arntz will draft a letter based on the Committee's comments and responses and submitted to OPCD by Friday.

Ms. Sheehan commented about the next scheduled meeting on August. She mentioned that the draft master plan will be coming out in September.

Ms. Clark suggested that she will check with Ms. Theresa Doherty regarding the draft documents and will make a decision to cancel the August meeting.

Mr. Fox noted that majority of the Committee members decided to wait and hold the August meeting until they hear from Ms. Doherty about the status of the draft documents, otherwise, it will be cancelled.

VI. Adjournment

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.