

# Seattle 2035 – Seattle Key Directions Open House

## Public Comments

### June 24, 2014

Public Comments from Display Boards (pages 1-16)

Public Comments from 69 Comment Sheets returned (pages 17-21)

#### 1- Welcome to Key Directions

No comments

#### 2 - What is Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan?

Comments:

- Have a big bold vision.
- Break down silos and work cooperatively
- Break down silos, work cooperatively!
- ↑Nice! I like this part.

#### 3- What’s Next?

No comments

#### 4 - Urban Village Strategy

Comments:

- Hubs said to strive to be like downtown Vancouver B.C., but we do not have their setbacks and trees. We need green spaces and greenery. And where is design in advance for schools, library buildings, affordable housing for service workers – not included that I can find.
- New mixed use buildings could include low-income or “small business” rent to allow small businesses to flourish.
- Keep urban village concept – works well.
- How does the Comp Plan propose to “direct growth?” What’s the mechanism beyond using existing zoning capacity? What city investments need to accompany the growth?
- What do you do when you achieve/exceed targets? Nothing. Is this a way of covering up inequities/lack of investment in other areas?
- How can an urban village lose its designation? Bitter Lake with 700 units of senior housing lost its closest bus stop (140<sup>th</sup> & Aurora) to Rapid Ride. Now, it’s too far for my friend with bad feet to walk, and there’s not enough parking. Who decided half of seniors give up their cars at 65??
- Have smaller spaces to decrease costs for both! And, sharing services like parking, utilities, etc.
- Greener, pedestrian-friendly streets.

- Transit is wasted if density doesn't support it. If drivers are subsidized with spaces, they will rarely choose transit. Density around light rail supports people making transit oriented lifestyle choices.
- Protecting farm lands should not mean we have to keep cutting down Seattle's urban forest. Build up.
- Please daylight creeks and restore bogs so we have a little bit of nature in our lives.
- Protect village from being overrun by hubs on either side – plan ahead, do not approve development without better idea of consequences.
- As we develop urban villages, please require premier transit access and a network of neighborhood greenways. Walkable with open space over car oriented, please.
- More recreational opportunities in the city. Yes! To Cheasty Park.
- Do not open natural areas for use that sacrifices wildlife and plant habitat. No bike park in Cheasty Greenspace, for example.
- In light of growth, preserve all natural areas as a matter of policy.
- Tell DPD they have not met requirement for parks in Ballard by extending the boundary to include 7 acres at Hiram Chittenden Locks. Reverse and revisit this decision which does not serve residents. No play area, dog walk, etc.
- I live between Dexter and Westlake, on Crockett St., and love the access to transit and proximity to the lake. I'm concerned about the safe green space along that neighborhood, and see a density of condos/apts. going in that are usually high end . . . I'm concerned that will make diversity and accessibility of that housing difficult. Alternatively, I love density in urban centers, which should reduce our carbon footprint.
- Urban villages should not all rise to 65'. There has to be a buffer transition to SF and lowrise.

## 5- Urban Village Strategy Key Directions

### Questions:

1. Should we move goals and policies related to urban design – how to enhance Seattle's character and sense of place – to this element?
2. Should we eliminate growth targets for individual urban villages?
3. How can we minimize displacement of residents and small businesses?
4. How can we support and strengthen existing cultural networks?

### Comments:

- How do we ensure the City (council and exec. depts.) respect the plans (or work with neighborhoods to change them)?
- City appears to have abandoned this concept "make sure all neighbors have a voice in neighborhood plan goals and policies as they are revised over time."
  - In the Cheasty Greenspace with a "pilot project" they are shoving mountain bikes, without neighborhood input, down our throats with no input.
- Is Neighborhood Planning a real thing?

- Where is it happening?
- What status do the investment priority matrices have?
- How can they be updated?
- What is the process? Who owns it?
- If it's not being used, why keep pretending and talking about it?
- There needs to be testing of ideas before implementing.
- Tall skinny buildings to allow for better sidewalks and open space. Remodel and maintain rather than tear down and replace. Coordinate better programs to make energy efficient upgrades in multifamily buildings.
- Larger urban villages. More housing units and jobs within walking distance of frequent transit stations. Like Chicago's north side and Vancouver's New Westminster, Metrotown, Surrey Central, Yaletown, Broadway.
- More important, how can we assure that increased density is accompanied by improved urban infrastructure and services? That's the purpose of GMA and was the original intent of the urban village strategy. I've heard nothing about this in the current Seattle 2035 conversation.
- Maybe there should be a minimum height in urban villages to avoid underbuilding.
- Make transit fares payable across systems instead of using multiple payments between buses/light rail, etc.
- More urban density – urban villages make mass transit easier to implement and encourage small shops – groceries, etc.
- Promote affordability through entrepreneurial opportunities – smartly-scaled – food/farm to table, etc.
- Do not eliminate growth targets. Emphasize residential/job growth in urban centers.
- You should not move urban design to the UV element. Character is important everywhere, even in the little business nodes outside UV's and along arterials.
- Disingenuous to say people will use transit when it keeps getting cut. Need parking ramps by light rail for commuters to park and ride. Not everyone can nor wants to ride a bike. Need to provide for cars, transit, and bikes – not so much just bikes.

## 6- Land Use

Comments:

- FAR density in LR zones is not an effective density for a transition zone. Microhousing/mini-units should be incorporated as part of unit mix in higher density MF zones.
- Allow for flexibility of housing options! Infill, height, apodments, etc. in urban centers. Quit protecting single family housing to our detriment.
- Please allow ADU's in single family neighborhoods.
- Upzoning should not be allowed when there are inadequate schools for the children who will move into the upzoned areas.

- If directing growth means “upzoning”, please say that. Don’t surprise people; be straightforward and put the real issues in front of them respectfully. There is no strategy otherwise to “direct growth”.
- Need more space for people to walk. Utility poles (\$ other thing) get in the way. Encroachment on sidewalks is a big problem for mobility. Connect the grids.
- Instead of code driving retail on too much street frontage (and then it sits empty), allow/encourage brownstone/stoop type units at curb: very pleasant and pedestrian friendly.
- Protect SODO for manufacturing and maritime industries – we need and want them in the city where they are.
- Protect industrial and freight mobility areas near port from stadium and other gentrification.
- We need a tree removal permitting system. Other cities across the country do this, and we need to support this important infrastructure item.
- Current land use and zoning laws should be enforced rather than ignored, particularly re: micropermitting.
- When a developer does something wrong or illegal, put a ban on them building again in Seattle.
- Row housing!
- Telecommunications facilities
  - Municipal broadband

## 7- Land Use Key Directions

Questions:

1. How do policies for single-family zones affect equity and affordability? **(1 dot)**
2. How can we encourage the development of more housing for families with children?
3. Should we simplify the Future Land Use Map (FLUM)?  
**Need to build tactile, raised line maps, talk to UW for braille printing (see DC examples).**
4. Should we add urban design rationale for development standards? **(1 dot)**  
**Universal design**  
**Braille signage and wayfinding**  
**Interior signage too!**
5. Should we consolidate policies about development standards in one section and remove related policies from individual land use types?
6. Should we add incentive zoning policy?  
**Inclusionary zoning**  
**Yes!**
7. Should we add a new goal for multifamily areas?

Comments:

- Pets with multifamily – provide space on site for dogs to relieve themselves (poop and pee).
- Yes! Just visited and toured S.F.’s POPOS (privately owned public spaces).
- More east coast style row houses with more flexible parking requirements. Relax rules on accessory dwelling units to encourage them. Don’t block microhousing. It fills a market niche.

- FLUM needs granularity to respond to local context.
- Growth should not just be accommodated in urban villages. Current single family neighborhoods need not be zoned for highrises, but loosened mother-in-law, small lot development can help with giving people a place to live.
- Upzone single-family blocks within walking distance of transit stations so that more people can live near them without being in the 1%.
- More non-chain businesses as part of new multifamily.
- Per the spring 2014 family housing report, change L2 – L3 to family housing, both townhouses and stacked 3+ BR apartments.
- Refer developers early on to community group or Council to understand the community they are moving in. (1)
- Much more development of no-frills multifamily housing and 2+ bedroom apts. in neighborhood villages.
- Change minimum setback requirements.
- Should implement a mandatory, city-wide incentive zoning policy. This is how to ensure effectiveness. (1)
- Housing that is in close proximity to parks and schools so children can walk and parents can ditch the backyard.
- Don't we have incentive zoning which is underutilized (thinking of affordable housing)? How do you know/Can you ensure its effectiveness?
- Give tax credits for green infrastructure, LED building, trees, urban wildlife habitat.
- Note: New manufacturing (e.g. digital) opportunities)/needs with greater democratic access may overtake current zoning.
- Make sure all low income housing facilities are provided safe, accessible places to walk within 1 mile of facility.
- Rezone some SF zones to LR-MF zones, and reduce parking minimums to encourage rowhomes and other housing types that fall between detached SF and apartment.
- Respect neighborhood culture. Developers seem to have 10x the say in planning – want their money and don't care they are destroying what makes the neighborhood a neighborhood. Leave space with setbacks, put in trees, provide parking areas.
- Need affordable housing close to urban hubs, not just in surrounding villages. Microhousing not the answer. Need coordination with neighborhood. Keep in mind infrastructure needed prior to approval of development.
- Corresponding investment in schools.
- CVS project in Uptown – minimum densities.
- Urban school (downtown).
- Ditto!↑

## 8- Transportation

### Comments:

- Streets that have livability.
  - Ground-story retail.
  - Good sidewalks.
  - Construction impacts w/sidewalks.
  - More mass transit.
  - More transit frequency.
- How to densify transit service like we are densifying our neighborhoods?
- Anticipate new technologies for transportation services. Focus on adaptation.
- Coordinate land use and transportation! Space for cars could be occupied by other uses
  - e.g. housing, retail, sidewalks, parks, how many people are being moved by the
- vehicle, the types of services being moved. (\*KNS)
- Provide parking ramps next to light rail hub stations like in Washington, D.C. – provides easier commutes for everyone and is very successful there, so no reason it can't work here.
- All urban villages/centers should be served by rail transit.
  - Local buses to u-villages, centers.
  - Regular buses to outside of city.
  - Streetcar for high volume local buses.
- More light rail. More routes (esp. East-West). I would really like to bike around the city (I don't own a car), but as it is now, I wouldn't feel safe using bike lanes downtown.
- Best way to deal with congestion is to enhance transportation options.
  - Transit service (xx stops) needs to be focused at the hub, or center, of urban villages.
- Make it easier to refill ORCA cards.
- More light rail and/or subways.
- Connect neighborhoods that are hard to travel between in cars, like Lower Queen Anne and University.
- Light rail in NW Seattle – BALLARD.
- Better way – marking for transit stops and tunnels.
- Increase funding for transit to incentivize public transportation. It takes too long and driving is highly subsidized.
- More transit, separated and protected bike facilities.
- Connection counts!
- Maintaining sidewalks is important (West Seattle Junction, for example).
- Do traffic assessments for development to assess full impacts.
- Free street parking is not a “right”
  - Public ROW is public.
- Improve East-West connection.
- In NE Seattle, we need sidewalks so people will be safe when walking to transit stops. (1)

- More \$\$ incentives for carpoolers.
- Don't be afraid to reduce/eliminate parking requirements – it's working!
- Create a more multimodal city. Expedite creation of protected bike lanes throughout city, especially downtown.
- Expedite build-out of light rail system. Whole city's light rail could be built in  $\leq 25$  years. Needs dedicated ROW
- Safety and separation of users (1) : Green space, Curbs, ↑ They have to connect.
- Fully fund Northgate bridge and coordinate resources around major investments.
- Encourage better coordination between ST and Metro (avoid Mt. Baker issues).
- (KNS).
- Bike Boulevards!
- Exclusive ROW for transit.
- Arterials shouldn't have parking (at least during rush hour).
- Transit is too slow.
- ROWxx should reflect land use more, particularly in sidewalk width. (KNS)
- More shelters.
- Put transit centers on both W & E side of Seattle Center.
- How can 700 units of senior housing retain an urban village designation when Metro Rapid Ride E removes its bus stop at 140th making it too far for seniors with mobility problems to use?
- Please develop the network of neighborhood greenways rapidly so that people have options to leave their cars. Invest in transit at the same time.
- Disingenuous to keep saying transit available to ease commutes when it keeps being cut. Not ok to approve large population increases without infrastructure in place first!
- I want the City of Seattle more clean with more electric transport used. If we try to improve the transportation, people will start using it.
- More bike parking (bike carrels) at major transit stops.
- Address funding for transit in the Comp Plan → people need a reason to give up their cars. Put \$ in units, not parking.
- Questions about neighborhood greenways and BMP implementation.
- Plan should deal with innovations in transportation – ride share, car share, etc.
- Focus on non-fossil fuel transportation – electric cars, etc.
- Nice work on BMP! Suggested improvements:
  - Bike lanes/cycle tracks on right side of parked cars for protection from traffic.
  - Continuous bike lane up University Way.
  - Complete street on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Pacific St. to Lake City Way.
  - Prioritize construction of facilities and bike share around LRT stations and TLs.
- Rail ideas:
  - Extend SLU or First Hill Streetcar (or both) to University District (50<sup>th</sup> St.).
  - East-west light rail U-District to Ballard.
  - Eastern streetcar (Central District, Lake Washington) – 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue?

- Jump on rail, Seattle is growing fast and desperately needs HCT.
- Comp Plan must support all adopted transportation master plans. No back sliding now.
  - Freight mobility must be planned, but that is not the positive factor in Seattle urban centers.
  - Consider improving service alleys for freight availability.
    - John Coney
- Homeless families or low income families attempting to access jobs in order to provide for their children often receive bus “tickets” from social service providers. These bus “tickets” cannot be used on the light rail (which stops in their neighborhood). This means jobs at Seatac or elsewhere are out of their reach.
- Put new stadiums in SE Seattle with the transit infrastructure.
- Freight mobility is an absolute must. We must retain/grow those family wage jobs. Build S. Lander? overpass!
- Do not put any stadiums in SE Seattle.
- BRT not a great match for Madison. Madison lacks connection at 1st, 2nd, or 3rd. Madison Park not in urban center or village.
- Bus passes for low income individuals. They can’t contribute if they can’t move from one place to another. Or bring back the ride free zone!
- We should have more bus and light rail to save gas and keep the environment clean.
- It will be awesome if we can have more buses.
- Approach transportation in a balanced way. Design to benefit peds, transit, bikes and cars.
- They all have a place in the city.
- Walking and biking should be treated as separate modes. Ensure safety separated places for people to walk and ride.
- Accelerate the Transit Master Plan, especially frequent corridors and high-capacity transit.
- Much faster development of light rail and bike infrastructure. I’m 26 and want to use it before I’m dead.
- More fixed rail please! Light rail streetcars.
- We need to realize that people who walk/use transit/ride will also need to park their cars because they drive too.
- When bus service is cut, it is problematic for new developments trying to reduce the amount of parking (esp. underground parking) built per unit. Streetcars inspire more confidence in people to give up their parking spaces when buying in multifamily buildings. More streetcars!

## 9-Transportation Key Directions

Questions:

1. How can we reach our goals for reducing the percentage of trips by people who drive alone?
2. How should light rail, regional buses, local buses, and the streetcar network work in concert to connect people to major destinations and neighborhoods?

3. Seattle's major streets are increasingly asked to meet multiple demands: transit, general purpose traffic, freight movement, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and on-street parking. What factors should SDOT consider when trying to make streets work for multiple users?
4. Given the vision future growth urban centers and villages, how do we balance the need for transportation infrastructure in growing areas as well as outside urban villages?
5. How do we ensure our transportation investments result in a connected, multimodal transportation system?

Comments:

No comments

## 10- Housing

Comments:

- Definition of workforce housing (deserving subsidies, incentives) is critical. We need workforce housing for those making 30 – 60% AMI. To subsidize those making  $\geq$  \$60K is unconscionable!
- Why subsidize those making more than a living wage??
- What is the City doing about keeping housing affordable? Options: Rent control, Public subsidies, Developer incentives, More supply
- Accommodate families in “multi-family” development.
- Housing - affordable housing – needs to be accessible to transit.
- Look to Vancouver. Look at what they've done wrong with it taking 108% of pre-tax income to afford the average home.
- Open up the 65% of Seattle land area devoted to SF to more housing types like row homes, cottages, etc.
- Change zoning (SF) to allow for cottage style/”tiny house” cluster development. Need more multi-generational and affordable options.
- We need to control investment. Buying and flipping somehow pushing up home costs for families. Too many young families moving to suburbs after having kids. We need to support affordable low and middle-class housing with great schools, parks, and safe streets.
- Consider the effect of “induced demand” in new development, where improvements in neighborhoods and housing supply create demand faster than supply – similar to highways. This helps explain counter-intuitive increases in price in neighborhoods that are becoming denser, and relocation of poor households to SE King County.
- Give tax credit for green yards (trees without grass, lawn), rainwater catchment.
- Upzones and density will make housing more affordable; token levies and set asides CANNOT solve this problem.
  1. Less regulation over ADU's to encourage use. Look to success in Vancouver.
  2. More housing options between SF home and apartments.
- Need to incent private developers to provide middle-income housing. Otherwise, we will be rich and poor.

## 11- Housing Key Directions

### Questions:

1. How can we promote equitable development and support fair housing throughout Seattle?
2. As historically disinvested communities see new development and investment, what strategies and policies can prevent the involuntary displacement of existing residents while welcoming new ones?  
(2 dots)
3. How do we provide housing opportunities near high capacity transit for all households and income levels?  
(1 dot)
4. What tools are most effective for ensuring enough housing is available to very low-, low- and moderate-income households?

### Comments:

- Homeless families, now youth, and soon single adults in King County must register through a “coordinated entry system” to have access to shelter and housing resources. This coordinated entry system has been run by Catholic Community Services Family Housing Connections for going on 2 years. The numbers of homeless families needing shelter and housing cannot be served well by this very small staff. When will the contract for coordinated entry be opened up for other agencies to provide service?
- Social service housing providers are being asked to transition away from providing transitional housing and supportive housing services. Many low-income families and individuals need supportive housing and will not do well in Rapid Re-housing programs (with no support), especially those with disabilities like mental illness. The options should be available, but it should be a choice.
- Include HUD requirement in Comp Plan.
- The Rapid Re-Housing Pilot Program is being advertised to landlords, social service agencies, and the low-income housing community with misleading statistics and success rates. The Rapid Re-Housing Pilot Program does not serve its intended population in a sustainable way. It is very concerning and homeless families are being forced into the program despite their (and their case managers’) concerns. Ask any case manager in RRH Pilot!
- I wanted Seattle to give more help to people who necessarily need help with it. Shouldn’t give to people who have no need.
- We are called an urban village yet we are being built out like an urban hub. DPD appears to use little common sense judgment in approvals – just because old rules can be interpreted as “allowing” if read “just so” does not mean it makes sense to approve.
- Have respect for neighborhood and its culture.
- Tax developers more for not including “affordable” housing to encourage rent rates that don’t exceed current rent averages.

- Density increases are needed, but including single family neighborhoods takes pressure off urban villages, and makes changes citywide more incremental and equitable.
- Hold absentee landlords responsible for blight - Central District
- Do not allow developers to buy out low income housing allotments. We need mixed income and affordable housing downtown and in neighborhoods.
- Allow duplexes and triplexes in single-family neighborhoods.
- Tax the rich!
- Yes, we need affordable housing, but it needs to be done respectfully, not by bullying developers buying up wonderful old buildings, tearing them down and putting in microhousing – with no fire exits or provision for garbage/recycling pick up, or parking for tenants – who do use cars).
- Have City Council vote that developers must include units for the lowest of incomes.
- AFFORDABLE HOUSING!
- Need housing for people with disabilities closest to the station (e.g., Northgate), so they have easy 1-bus/train access to downtown. Eliminate parking for these units (very low income, no cars.
- Relax regulations to allow for accessory dwelling units to be more easily built.
- We are not building any family housing outside of SF. Per consulting study (2014), change L2 – L3 to family housing (townhouses or stacked) as a transition zone.
- Pay for transit service rather than parking garages.
- Love urban village concept – we need to stick with this concept and encourage supporting the infrastructure they need. Working wage housing should be close to the jobs.
- Ask people for their personal stories – where will I be in 20 years . . .
- Access to public health care - let residents buy in to public employee benefits.

## **12-Economic Development**

Text on Board

*Promotes the idea of directing most new jobs into centers /villages and recognizes the importance of high-wage jobs. Establishes local goals, policies, objectives, and provisions for economic growth and vitality and a high quality of life. Topics include:*

- *Economic Development and the Urban Village Strategy (2 dots)*
- *Clusters (1 dot)*
- *Workforce Education, Development and Training*
- *Bubble “Low interest loans for small business in growing areas” (1 dot)*

Comments:

- Workforce education, development and training is Super Important, esp. for young people of color, immigrants, folks coming from low income backgrounds. Also, encourage small, local businesses . . . micro-shops, pop-ups, shared industrial kitchens . . .
- More accepting/open/non-judgmental jurying process – really – equal opportunity.
- More company and market for people to work.

- Training can be overrated. Doesn't necessarily lead to jobs. Instead, we need more access to capital and more business training, like Washington CASH.
- Services for neighborhoods, small businesses too.
- Incubators that provide scaled rents similar to Pike Place Market. Apply this concept to struggling business districts.
- The City needs to have development by research, a new form of energy, or how to get people to work.
- More jobs start in garages or basements than anywhere else. Be more flexible.

### **13- Economic Development Key Directions**

Questions:

1. What economic development policies could help transform low-opportunity areas into community anchors?
  2. Should the key industry clusters that are Seattle's strength be recognized?
  3. Should a clearer definition and stronger emphasis for living wage jobs be included? (1 dot)
  4. Should small businesses, startups, and entrepreneurial activity be emphasized? (1 dot)
- Comment: Current development requirements are too large, not flexible, create chain restaurants.
5. Should growing more local talent for fast growing sectors be a higher priority? (3 dots)

Comments:

- Scale down access! (+1 dot)
- Better development of internet access for ↓cost.
- Local jobs and businesses should have higher priority.
- Yes! Encourage street retail in new buildings to have smaller spaces, narrower storefronts!
- Current development is often only good for large retail or established chains.
- Interspersing commercial services in primarily SFR neighborhoods.
- Let businesses give away paper bags to their customers again.
- Stop removing parking from business districts.

### **14- Environment**

- More support/encouragement to developers to incorporate "green building" into projects.
- Protect our precious green spaces – we need to preserve the flora and fauna that live "in" there.
- Replace all the sidewalk trees on 35th Ave NE with the same species to maintain the boulevard effect. (Hint: the City doesn't!).
- Seattle says they want to be like Vancouver, B.C., but Seattle does not have building setbacks for trees and plantings. We do not have urban forest. Seems we destroy what makes us special instead of emphasizing how "green" we are and can be.
- Pass tree ordinance requiring permits, xxx, and tree replacement to protect urban forest.
- More trees and plants.

- The Parks Department should be split into two: one to focus on natural spaces, and a separate department to focus on renovation. We should fund a Department of Natural Resources.
- We need a tree canopy ordinance to prevent developers from cutting trees with no consideration. Replacing 50-year old trees with shrubs and saplings doesn't count.
- Conifers!!
  - Consider only if of significant ecological or Parks capacity? Otherwise, interrupts the urban fabric. Perhaps a way to protect these features that doesn't impede mobility or development of a vibrant place (i.e. not just dead zones).
- Clean air necessary in a city like Seattle that's growing every day. Trees are the key to help a clean environment.
- ECA's should include areas that are prone to landslides – steep slopes should not be developed.
- We need stronger tree policies because developers come in and remove everything on site
- (4) in agreement with above call-out on presentation board.

## 15-Environment Key Directions

### Questions:

1. Should we address climate change adaptation more thoroughly? (6 dots)
2. What direction should the plan give for reducing carbon production in the city?
3. How can the City manage storm runoff to prevent flooding and improve water quality? (2 dots)
4. What should be the City's goals for the urban forestry?

### Comments:

- Keep natural areas as it. Don't give to mountain bikes using "pilot project" to change use with no public process.
- Need to have more visible plan for natural disasters, climate change adaption. Encourage sharing economy, beyond car-sharing. If I didn't have to buy, say, a food processor, and could borrow/rent one instead, that's one less thing to eventually end up in a landfill.
- Regulate protection of trees – but not by DPD as they have conflict of interest to remove so can build. (+1 dot)
- Urban forestry goal of x number of trees per street (linear feet of street?).
  - Require developers to plant new trees in ROW if none exist.
  - Integrate with stormwater strategies on minor streets (bioswales).
  - Incentive or require vegetated roofs on new non-residential buildings (lots of benefits).
- 40% canopy by 2035
  - Green canopy to include all green growing things.
  - Single city forester.
- Leash laws for pet cats! Like Edmonds, WA now – outdoor cats kill birds.
- Yes, climate change must be more addressed. Seattle should be role model for environmentally-conscious policies.

- Stop installing lawns! Plant trees, green roofs, plant native plants. Stop mowing existing lawns so much – if it’s there, let it grow.
- When multiple occupancy units are built, they should have a place to accommodate the dogs that live there – don’t count on relieving pet dogs on other peoples’ or public property.
- More trees, more ground (use areas of no parking?).
- More trees and plants to keep clean air and green environment.
- 40% tree canopy goal aspirational – 30% by 2037.
- Net zero communities at district scale collect yard food waste, locally bio digest and use resources in the community w/out transmission losses. Phinney Ridge would be ideal.- Duncan Griffin
- To reach 2037 goal of 30% tree canopy, every 3 years 1% of city area must add trees to grow canopy.
- Put emphasis on mature vegetation and trees for wildlife – birds, insects, bees, etc.
- This whole process makes it difficult to incorporate the needed changes to the City’s structure that would be necessary to truly address Seattle’s environmental goals.
- Process = Grade D Results to Date = D-
- Trees are an important part of our infrastructure and they multitask in helping our environment, dealing with water quality issues, wildlife, rain retention that puts less stress on our drainage system . . . why don’t we protect and support them more?
- Goals: Urban forestry, Retain - do not make a park out of our green spaces, natural areas.
- Transfer all green space natural areas to office sustainability. Save them!
- Lawns→pollinator pathways!
- More large trees, less paved cover.
- Mulching lawnmowers

## 16- Community Investments

- We don’t’ have enough schools!!! They need to be part of the Plan update!!! (2 dots).
- Developers must be required to finance concurrent infrastructure with impact fees – esp. schools, as they do in other cities. We need 3 new elementary schools per year (1,500 students) to handle SPS growth.
- Dogs are important members of our families – less than .4% of our park space is dedicated to dogs. OLAs help dogs be healthy and happy, which means less vet bills for families. Where is our dog compassion?

Bury I-5 through downtown and put a linear park and affordable housing on top of it.

Comments: (1 dot); I-5 is currently a significant barrier between Capitol Hill and Eastlake. Perhaps a phased approach that prioritizes pedestrian connection?

## 17- Community Investments Key Directions

Questions:

Capital Facilities & Utilities

- How can recently adopted citywide plans (Climate Action Plan, Parks Legacy Plan, Sustainable Buildings and Sites Policy, Property Reuse and Disposal Policy) be integrated?
- Should the Plan encourage emerging opportunities for the smaller scale systems to provide energy, water and other utility services?

Cultural Resource

- Should we expand policies about cultural spaces, cultural districts, and introduce policies about creative placemaking?
- Are new policies needed for special buildings and unique places that don't meet the rigorous standard for historic landmarks and districts?

Human Development

- Should we call it Human Services to align more closely with policies about the delivery of those services to our most vulnerable populations? (2 dots)

Comments:

- Parks legacy Plan should be reviewed once (if ever) an external audit is done of the Parks Dept.
- Where are schools? They need to be part of the City's planning.
- Need more interdepartmental coordination (e.g. San Francisco) to ↓ costs. (1 dot).
- Help create artist live/work spaces.
- Utilities should include municipal broadband (1 dot).
- Uptown is cultural/entertainment center – don't lose that to SODO.
- Have a cap on the number of historic buildings to choose only the best. Over-preservation blocks needed housing and walkable neighborhoods. (1 dot)
- Where's Urban Forest Stewardship Plan!
- ↑ Worth experimenting.
- Schools and access to schools should be one of the factors to development and upzoning. (2 dots).

## 18- Neighborhood Planning

No comments

## 19- Neighborhood Planning Key Directions

Questions:

1. How do we make sure all neighbors have a voice in neighborhood plan goals and policies as they are revised over time? This may include everyone who lives in, work in, runs a business in, or visits a neighborhood. (1 dot)

2. How can the Comprehensive Plan present neighborhood plan goals and policies so they are easily understood by all?
3. Today's planning looks at short-term implementation in addition to longer-term visioning for neighborhoods. Is this important? How should implementation be reflected in the Comprehensive Plan?

Comments:

None

## Key Directions Event

Results from Comment Forms – Total 69 filled out and returned

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Venue	24	37	8	0
Exhibits	25	33	10	0
Location	28	22	8	1
Overall event	21	35	11	0

## Would You Attend Another 2035 Event?

Definitely	Maybe	Probably Not
44	20	1

## What other ideas about Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan do you want to share with us?

- It’s a good idea to integrate the more specialized plans.  
Accelerate the Transit Master Plan. We need more frequent and faster transit now, actually we needed it twenty years ago.
- It’s frustrating to see such a surface treatment of every issue, and virtually no information about either the content or process.
- Lots of great work represented here. Look forward to seeing the results.
- Are the boards/comments going to be available online?
- Feedback: When the comments are made available online, email everyone who came to this meeting or another Comp Plan meeting. Include the link.
  - City Departments need to learn to play together better rather than working against each other.
  - Where are parks and open space? Where are schools?

- Boards are **very** nice. A few more definitions would be nice, but not as wonky as I feared.  
FYI: I wouldn't mind prioritizing things.
- Wondered why only one of the three growth strategies were represented in a poster?
- Working to lessen effects of climate change, planning comprehensive transit, green spaces, and access to Real Food for all people are critical pieces of a city that I care to live in.
  - AND: I learned of this from Facebook – please continue to advertise in a way that can reach all residents!
- Maybe more interactive exhibits.
- Seattle's natural areas must be preserved as is. Stop using "the pilot project" in the Cheasty Greenspace to change existing policy, a very major change without allowing public process.
  - All of the people in Southeast Seattle want to work on vision. They have been excluded by lots of behind the scenes work with a small sector of the population: mountain bike users. Stop the pilot project!
- Thanks! Great job! Support the Think Local concept – build on this framework. Engage more youth→stewards of this plan→link with SPS curriculum/community service credits.
- More online – the problem is there is another meeting tonight for Central Area.
- This was a mix of information – I wasn't sure if this was geared for a Planning wonk audience or for your everyday Seattlelite (I am not a Planning wonk). More info about the Comp Plan process and how events like this and input from Seattlelite Joe will affect it/impact it would be helpful.
- Being new to this, it would be nice to hear someone speak at the event to tell more about what's going on and the direction that we're headed.
- The existing feedback mechanisms are a bit clunky, booths would jam up, but overall worthwhile.
- Upzoning around transit seems the obvious choice for traffic and the environment (and build more transit).
- Venue a little hard to find. Great interaction and staff presence.
- Please include security and safety in downtown core and public parks, etc. for crime, violence, drug activity. Downtown (3<sup>rd</sup> – Pike/Pine rapidly declining). It's an embarrassment to Seattle when tourists visit – fix it. Getting dangerous to catch a bus downtown.
- Respect history, communities/cultures, and neighborhoods.
  - Urban density means density in services, infrastructure, and transportation as much as housing.
  - Adaption – be ready for innovation in technology, transportation, in work and business, in climate, etc.
- Venue was hard to locate on Center and no one knew where, or what, it was. Found it almost by accident.

- City broadband, fiber, is an important infrastructure (aka utility). I would like to see the Seattle City Light “smart meter” initiative help to partially fund a municipal fiber network. To “light up” the City’s dark fiber. Once built, the City could allow any ISP (e.g. Comcast, Century Link, Condo Internet, etc.) to use the infrastructure to service customers (only if the City doesn’t want to be an ISP itself).
- Please include school buildings in the Comp Plan process.
- Exhibits: Good questions, but need more interactive exhibits.
- Thought there would be a program – info about what’s going on. Disappointing.
- I’m so happy to see you including climate change adaptation and affordable housing for all – great priorities.
  - I would like to see the City take on more pilot projects to keep thinking and testing about how the City can be sustainable into the future.
- More overall plane changes happening.
- Need someone to step up on environmental aspect – sadly lacking. See Urban Forestry **recs** from Steve Zemke.
- More in depth meetings on each section might be nice.
- More emphasis on the qualitative built environment. We can densify, but if the quality of the buildings are less than what we replace, then we have devalued the city.
  - Perhaps mix a few presentations along with interactive exhibits to outline some key issues.
- More advertising on the event! You should get more agencies of all kinds and community partners here who have opinions and care. People would come if they heard about this!
- More interactive with examples from present neighborhoods.
- How can you gather more input and ideas outside of the demographic in attendance (white, mid/upper class, tech-savvy, etc.).
  - It feels a little bit awkward that the diversity piece in the evening’s event is the entertainment.
- Yes to denser zoning. Yes to allowing alternative living units (in garages, dividing existing structures, etc).
- More translation! More room for answers on boards.
- Continue with the urban village strategy.
  - Aim for increased rail transit.
- Less specific ideas to mark preferences, i.e. – “do you like mixed use retail overlooking a public green”. Those are two ideas that can be separated.
- A first draft to work off!
- Continuing to have highly interactive meetings in other city neighborhoods would increase awareness and buy-in from more Seattle communities! This event was awesome!

- Energy and environment appear to be given too little attention. Urban Villages are in place and will grow. That’s a win. Declare victory and move on to the next part of the puzzle, which is:
  - How can we make the white areas on the map – single family areas outside the “urban” zones – more sustainable and vibrant? How do we allow SF neighborhoods to retain essential elements while also increasing population, amenities, and access to transit?
- Set concrete goals and achievement metrics to gauge City’s performance over time. Great event, thanks for taking our input!
- More translation and support for primary languages other than English. Great broad time range to support different work/school schedules.
- Not sure if Planning Commission and City Planners (DPD) are fully representative of the community and neighborhoods.
  - Mark ups to Plan are being done which may or may not reflect community and neighborhood consensus. There is already great difficulty in gaining current information from DPD!
- 1. Prioritize decisions to support carbon neutral Seattle.
- 2. Prioritize family friendly downtown initiatives.
- 3. Support more transit oriented development and small/local businesses.
- Comprehensive planning to 2035 is not realistic as people keep changing their minds on what they want (e.g. urban villages) and changing technology, global warming and earthquakes affect what is possible, in both positive and negative ways.
- Slides of different urban villages.
  - More statistics on low income profiles by urban village.
  - More stats on builders who waive low income housing requirements.
  - Food was advertised, but not available ☺
  - If using this location, should offer water.
  - Put timeline (history) on web.
- I always wonder just how much our input matters as seems decisions often already made and these are just “feel good” events to make us think somebody in the City cares about what we have to say. I will believe the citizens really matter when I see developers having to meet our standards and not the ones they bully into acceptance.
- Fantastic, FUN event! I saw lots of other comments about affordable housing (and left some myself), but it’s worth repeating: We need to make sure families and individuals of all incomes can afford to live in all of Seattle’s neighborhoods. Mixed-income, inclusive neighborhoods are where I want to live, work, and visit.
- A better job could be done with outreach for the event. If I wouldn’t have physically walked into the DPD office I never would have known about it. It seems like many groups that are typically left out of the planning process were absent. I understand that it’s often difficult to have strong attendance from these groups, but a community like Seattle should really try to buck this trend.

- Proposal does not significantly protect urban forest – only talks about trees “on sidewalk area”. Need to protect trees in all land use areas – build up not spread out.
- Please include more clarity on it. Stickers mean positive or negative?
- Utilize social media and the internet more!
- Landline telecomm, include utilities – metering.
  - Stop fluoridating the water supplies – i.e. give people a choice whether they do or don’t want be – microwaved, fluoridated. (Both toxicants greenwashed for tasks that can instead be accomplished nontoxically).
- Encourage people to tell their own stories and where we will be and fit into Seattle’s plans and growth.
- The Comprehensive Plan housing section refers to “market-rate affordable housing”. There is no such thing! Market rate = 80% of AMI. The market is building 80% units sufficient to meet needs. We need housing affordable to workers (i.e., “workforce housing”) making 30% - 60% AMI. This is where the need is, and where we should put our subsidies/incentives.
- Exhibits: Fun, but a bit discombobulated.
  - The exhibits strained for coherence on theme. Where were the other options – transit focus and downtown focus. I only saw urban village focus.
- More of this kind of outreach – activities, “voting by dots”, responding to questions – at existing neighborhood events and festivals! 😊
  - More use of non-English language!
- Would like to know what came out of last event.
- Focus on low income communities and the effects of comprehensive planning efforts.