

Appendix B to One Seattle Plan EIS Scoping Detailed Comment Summary: Engagement Hub Comments

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ryan DiRaimo	Choose Option 3 or 5. The other options are inequitable and segregating	Option 2 "Focused" continues the urban village strategy, which is not only inequitable, it has been proven by your own research to be racist and picks on communities with high displacement risk. Option 4 "Corridor" disguises the notion of housing on transit corridors, but does not realize those corridors are typically loud, polluted and dangerous arterials. The only equitable solutions are Option 3 "Broad" or Option 5 "Combined". These options fairly place housing opportunities on all Neighborhood Residential lots and does not pick and choose where housing can and should go. It gives the opportunity for housing growth to be the same between the North End wealthy white areas and the South End more diverse and economically varying communities. In addition, Option 5 "Combined" brings the most housing growth possible, something that has to be the top of your list. We cannot modulate or impose setbacks for jobs. There is no single family zoning for jobs. Jobs grow unbound. We need a housing model that can match job growth.	6/23/2022
Scott Alspach	More housing everywhere all at once	Seattle needs more housing across the city in existing urban centers, urban villages, smaller nodes, near transit, and in neighborhood residential zones. This will allow for people of all backgrounds and income levels to live and work in our wonderful city. I strongly support proposed alternative 5. I live one block away from Green Lake park, 13 minutes away from Roosevelt Light Rail, across the street from a bus stop, the Hearthstone retirement community, and Green Lake Elementary. It is ridiculous that my lot is zoned for only single family homes when it is across the street from a 10 story building which houses many more people near such wonderful community resources. According to Zillow, in the last 36 months houses on my block have sold for a minimum of \$1.1 million dollars up to nearly \$2 million. It is not surprising that of the neighbors I have met, all are either tech workers or physicians. The newish home next to me is three stories tall and has very few windows on the side facing our house. Our neighbors are lovely, but the home itself represents a missed opportunity and is in no way more conducive with the neighborhood than the Hearthstone across the street. There is no reason that it shouldn't have been a small apartment or condo building which more families could afford and enjoy the wonderful resources of the Green Lake community. I strongly support alternative 5 which would spread new housing throughout the entire city rather than focusing it on small areas. This will allow us to address our housing deficit and help prevent the displacement of under resourced communities who have not had the political influence of wealthy single family neighborhoods. My life will be greatly improved by having more neighbors, more restaurants, more shops, and more affordable housing in my neighborhood and I ask the city to please allow our neighborhood to grow like it so rightly should.	6/23/2022
Nathan Schlicker	Build As Much Housing As Possible!	I'd love to see alternative 5 chosen since it would result in by far the most housing being built. Although this isn't as important I would also like certain zoning changes that let small commercial buildings open on residential intersections, re-legalizing corner stores to help make these new neighborhoods that'll be built more vibrant. Also encourages walking.	6/23/2022
Justin Oaksford	Alternative 3 or 5 are the only choices for a healthy future.	As a 10+ year resident of Seattle and a lifelong homereater, the 3rd and 5th alternatives are the only real option for a future Seattle. Every lot in Seattle needs to equally share in the city's interest. Nobody, NOBODY should be able to "buy their way" out of participation in the city's growth. If people want to permanently enshrine their life in a place with big yards and a big single family houses, the onus should be on them to go out farther instead of occupying valuable, scarce land near parks and services and transit that could benefit vastly more people. Currently, those houses suck up those benefits and turn them into equity for very few. Alternative 3 + 5 are a Climate Solution, a Traffic Solution, a Business Solution, A Homelessness and an Affordability Solution, an Equality solution, an Efficiency solution. Do not let homeowners, who are increasingly higher and higher income and powerful people, calcify this city in amber as their plaything. We can build a Seattle as vibrant as any world class city, and what would make it so is many, many people of all incomes being able to live and thrive all over the city, not a limited number of wealthy people who have staked their claim on having 2000 sq ft of yard adjacent to a park and a light rail station who feel something is being stolen from them as their equity shoots through the roof when an apartment goes up across the street. Let the rich who can afford the time and energy to find their happiness and their disdain for neighbors elsewhere far from the services the city provides, and let the city serve the poorest and the average neighbors rather than forcing them outward into the isolationist suburbs on clearcut forest land that used to be why we were called the Emerald City.	6/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Eric Aderhold	More storefronts allowed in more places	One of the goals of this comprehensive plan update is to start "Fostering complete neighborhoods across the city to provide more residents with walkable access to shopping, services, amenities, and transit." A key component of improving walkability to shopping, services, and other amenities is to allow such things to exist closer to where people live. In the EIS, please study the impacts of changes to allow smaller-scale ground-floor retail scattered throughout residential zones. This pattern of development was commonplace in Seattle a century ago. Let's un-ban it. A minimal change could include allowing businesses along arterial streets and/or on street corners, while a more maximal change could include allowing these on all residential lots. Comparing these options to each other and to the "no change" alternative would be useful to help inform policy decisions going forward.	6/23/2022
Seth Geiser	5 is the clear winner	Thank you for undertaking this effort. Reading through the options, #5 is the only one that is up to the challenges we face now and in the next 50-100 years. We have to take our current affordability and environmental equity concerns seriously and create the conditions of resiliency for the changes that climate uncertainty will force upon us. #2 has proven to be an inequitable model that funnels growth into arterial conditions and displacement-risk communities in an attempt to preserve a privileged sense of place for single-family homeowners. The urban village strategy has too many inherent flaws and it's time we mature as a city past this model. #4 is just a bigger-scale version of #2 that continues to ask apartment and condo dwellers to serve as sound, pollution, and collision buffers for their established home-dwelling neighbors. This would continue to apply displacement pressure on targeted growth areas. #3 is a step in the right direction but doesn't go as far as #5 to promote resilient, walkable communities throughout Seattle. It's essential that we allow for the full-range of housing typologies to fit site conditions throughout the entire city and to fix antiquated codes that deter the intermingling of neighborhood retail and industry that enables non car-mandated living.	6/23/2022
Ben Watts	More options for housing make for a better Seattle	Option 5 seems like the best move here. Open up the entire city to as many options for housing as possible. I bought my first home 2 years ago in one of Seattle's urban villages. I don't see any reason why a home like mine (a duplex, next to another duplex, next to a triplex, all on the lot of the still existing 1918 home) should be banned in all but a few areas. Open up the zoning for more density in housing and options for small businesses.	6/23/2022
Jeffrey Jenkins	More housing options across the entire city. End exclusionary zoning.	Plan 5 is the best option for addressing Seattle's current and future housing needs. Plan 3 is an acceptable alternative. The other plans will fail to produce equitable outcomes. Plans 1, 2, & 4 are more of the same. They beg several questions. * Is it acceptable to continue exclusionary zoning? * Should people who want right-sized, affordable housing be forced to live along a transit corridor? * If I want access to amenities not near a corridor, should I be forced to travel long distances by car or spend more on housing? * Can we know with certainty that current transit corridors will satisfy Seattle's future housing and mobility needs? I think if you answer "no" to any of those questions, Plans 1, 2, & 4 are simply inadequate.	6/23/2022
Scott Berkley	Support freedom, support option 5	Americans love freedom and nothing is more foundational to our liberty than being free to live where and how we want. Option 5 will do the most to restore our rights to use our land as we see fit and to find the housing option that best fits our needs. We don't need or want the government to artificially segregate our city based on the theories of some central planner. Abundant housing is freedom. Let us be free!	6/23/2022
Sean Dunaway	Option 5 is the best option	If we want to live in a city with more affordable housing and is more easily walkable for more of its residents, meaning less emissions from transport and a healthier population, then option 5 is clearly the best option.	6/23/2022
amy richards	Build as much housing as possible - pick Option 5	I urge you to adopt Option 5 for this plan. We need so much more housing, and we need it everywhere. We cannot allow so many single-family homeowners to block development of housing. Doing nothing is not an option. The urban village/corridor approach should be a non-starter, considering the quality of life/equity issues it causes for lower-income folks forced to live near busy, dangerous arterials. The other plans still unreasonably limit growth and are ripe for obstructionists to carve away at through endless lawsuits, historic preservation applications, etc. Only by committing to building more types of housing everywhere can we hope to address Seattle's growing housing shortage and soaring rents caused by scarcity and greed. I'm a middle-aged, single tech worker with no kids and I despair that I will never be able to afford to buy in the neighborhood I've lived in for 20 years, and that the presence of people in my general demographic who are stuck in rentals by high housing prices are driving up prices for other renters. Please build housing everywhere. Pick Option 5 so I have some hope that me and all my neighbors will have better access to housing.	6/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Erik Nielsen	Family Sized Home Ownership Opportunities	As a lifelong Seattleite and young adult, my focus is finding a home I can afford to buy to raise my family in. There is a unbelievable lack of options for me and I do not want to have to move out of the city I've called home my entire life. EDIT: After considering the prompt more closely. I realized my preferred option wasn't the goal of this comment. I stand by my opinion but I also believe that a more bold option 6 should be evaluated just so we can see what that would look like. A citywide upzone to allow apartments everywhere should be studied because otherwise, we're not making a truly informed decision down the road. I STRONGLY support option 5 and somewhat support option 3. Option 5 will create the greatest opportunity for all of our housing issues but especially for people like me who want to raise a family in the city in a home they own.	6/23/2022
Joseph Wildman	Support Option 5 to allow for Housing for all!	As someone who grew up in Tokyo, a city with extremely flexible zoning, I saw firsthand the benefits of how having the freedom to build residential of all types didn't destroy neighborhoods, but rather created an abundance of housing that was convenient to transit, close to shops and most of all had a density to support the population yet wasn't overwhelming occupied by tall skyscrapers. I believe that by choosing option 5, Seattle would move in that direction, a direction where exclusionary zoning for Single Family Homes wouldn't continue to choke and control the housing market, stifling development in this great city, and in a direction where people of all income types would be able to comfortably live in the city, and have a missing middle density that would support more local businesses in our neighborhoods and support easy access to public transit.	6/23/2022
Stephen Dolan	Option 5 - Housing for All	Option 5 is our best choice for many reasons, but these are the ones that resonate with me as a home owner in Seattle. * Climate Resilience - Seattleites should be able to access services without being dependent upon a car and burning fossil fuels. Nor should the future of our city be beholden to humanities ability to mine enough battery materials to transition to 'everyone owns an EV'. We need a human scaled city and there are proven models to follow across the world (Paris, Montreal, London, etc). * Fighting regional sprawl - Every home we don't build in the city as part of our 2040 plan, leads to regional sprawl. Which increases car dependence and destroys our forest lands. * Affordable housing for all - with the fast pace of housing prices, our kids and grandkids won't be able to live anywhere near Seattle. Nor will we be able to house all of our unhoused neighbors. We need to enable the production of housing city wide. * Active happy lifestyles - the happiest nations on Earth (Denmark, The Netherlands) are places where citizens can choose active transit as their primary way of getting around because these methods are safe. We have an opportunity to build towards a future where Seattle joins these places with safe human scaled neighborhoods and transport systems. Seattle is a wonderful city, and I see nothing but opportunity for our home as it grows from a small city to one of the most livable and happy cities in North America. This transition asks us to make hard choices, but I believe in us.	6/23/2022
Robbie Adams	Support for Option 5 - Abundant Housing	Option 5 is clearly the best alternative, and I'm interested in an EIS that demonstrates why this option is the best for the environment, for housing affordability, for racial and social equity, and for city finances. Option 5 allows more people to live affordably in Seattle, close to employment and services. Importantly this closeness allows Seattle residents to walk, roll, and bike to the majority of their needs. Transportation emissions are our largest greenhouse emission and building housing near community amenities is the best way to reduce our dependency on polluting and expensive personal vehicles. We need a plan that delivers hundreds of thousands of homes, and distributes them in every neighborhood. We need a plan that supports a sustainable and healthy transit system. We need walkable infrastructure to support this housing. We need to repurpose car infrastructure to housing and sustainable mobility infrastructure. We need to end the urban village strategy that concentrated growth in poor neighborhoods while preventing housing growth exclusionary and segregated wealthy neighborhoods. We need to allow housing in all neighborhoods, instead of concentrating apartments on polluted arterials while wealthy single family homeowners are protected from pollution. Finally we need more fiscal resources for the city. Density and abundant housing will provide a surge of tax revenue, while also more efficiently using our city infrastructure.	6/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Brian Gillespie	PICK OPTION 5 (or an even better option 6!)- We deserve to be a first-class city	Seattle can be, should be, and deserves to be a first class city and the best way to get us on track for that is to pick option 5 or select an option 6 proposal that goes even farther for high density low-car options. I've been fortunate enough to travel all over the world. But every time I go visit other cities I am absolutely blown away by the fantasy lands other people have the privilege to live in. When I come back to the paved over cities of the US I feel completely let down by our policy-makers. Now what do the best cities have in common: density, mixed zoning, public spaces, walkable and bikeable spaces, places for people who live on the city to congregate. Barcelona, Berlin, Paris, Helsinki. There's no reason we can't be a global destination like them. We don't have to be a place for people to just come to work. We don't have to pave over everything and sprawl farther and farther out to support sparse housing. We can be a destination and we can be a home for all walks of life. I encourage you to read this thread by Rick Steves on his observations https://twitter.com/RickSteves/status/1537730698861154305?t=aFgp0HsbO036Yw8sGNba0w&s=19 . He's lives in our area and has traveled the world's best cities. He describes places where people gather in plazas to watch sports together. Where people hop on a street car or bike to the shops nearby. Or walk to bars, cafes, and pastry shops right on their own block. And the people running and working these businesses live right in the neighborhood. This could be us. This is how a community is built. If we don't build enough housing and become more flexible with zoning we'll never get there. Frankly I'm tired of dodging cars, inhaling fumes, and having my home shaken by plane traffic. Every other option just gives us more of that. Options 1-4 relegate most people into loud, polluted, unsafe storage areas that aren't homes. They support longer car trips between these areas as people come in and out of the residential zones. More driving makes more pollution and accelerates climate change. Forcing denser, more affordable housing along the resulting high car-traffic areas punishes our own citizens for being too poor to afford a single family home off of the arterial roads. It doesn't have to be like this. Design our city for the people who live here. Design our city to support housing for all, instead of throwing more heat on the housing fire just to preserve the wealth of those who own. Look at Paris, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Tokyo the list goes on. If	6/23/2022
Lewis D-H	All of Seattle Needs Up-Zoning	For Seattle to have a healthy and sustainable future, five is the ideal option, with three being acceptable. Seattle needs more housing and will continue to struggle unless all of the city is opened up for upzoning. Duplex-Quadplexes look perfectly normal and will blend in with the "character of the neighborhood" as many are concerned about more housing being brought up every time. Portland passed their up-zoning law, now it is Seattle's time.	6/24/2022
Grant Peltier	More housing in more places - Option 5	Option 5 is the clear winner. Making the lease dense areas of our city will be good for equity, the environment, our business, housing costs, and so many other things. Everyone I know who ends up living in a du/tri/quad/six-plex absolute loves it, but they aren't as common around the city as they should be. People who want to live in a more dense environment shouldn't be forced to live next to busy roads. If we keep forcing density near the loudest and busiest roads we will see increase pedestrian deaths and force the poorest members of our community to be exposed to more air pollution.	6/24/2022
Matthew Wiecek	Let's aim high Seattle!	I support the "Alternative 5: Combined Strategy." If anything, my concerns are that Alternative 5 is too modest. It's clear that Seattle has dramatically underestimated population growth and has not built enough housing under the last comprehensive plan. It's important that we do not repeat the same mistake for the next 10 years. This is our opportunity to not only ensure we build enough housing for growth, but to build enough housing to bring costs down. We can do this while showing the rest of the country that urban places are a pleasure to live in, with excellent amenities within walking and biking distance of every resident. Let's leave suburban development to the suburban cities surrounding Seattle and build an urban, affordable city we can be proud of. Let's aim high Seattle!	6/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Max Kauffman	To achieve "One Seattle," upzone citywide	Select option 5. Today, Seattle is a city of extremes. We have a homelessness crisis of thousands of people who need somewhere to live, while wealthy homeowners occupy large swaths of the city in what has essentially become luxury districts. This is a tale of Two Seattles. One struggles to pay rent, find a reliable bus, help a neighbor in distress. The other enjoys large parks, water views, and increasing wealth. To achieve One Seattle, we must even the playing field. We must eliminate luxury single family zoning so that pleasant and dense buildings can be built citywide, on every single lot. We have to stop prioritizing cars so that transit can be reliable and pedestrians and cyclists don't fear being killed by an errant driver. Around our world-class parks, we must allow the creation of true urban neighborhoods with affordable housing and cafes, shops, and schools. We must invest in climate change resilient planning, preparing for direct impacts here and for the millions of climate refugees fleeing more severe environments. Seattle can only do these things if we plan for growth. Option 5 provides the most freedom for the future and a path towards becoming a unified One Seattle.	6/24/2022
Louis Barbero	Alternative 3: broad is the most equitable	I've lived in Seattle for 6 years, I was born and raised in the area and it took me 5 years post graduating college to be able to afford to live anywhere in the city. I lived above a freeway for 5 years and only recently could afford a condo on a quiet street in an urban village. This is after an extremely successful career in finance. Most do not have this opportunity and most after me even in my position also won't as housing prices continue to rise to unachievable levels for those not already on the merry go round that is our housing market. Making this category "broad" would allow development in these same quiet neighborhoods undisturbed by constant freight and commuter traffic for people who make a normal Seattle wage. The years I lived over a freeway probably took years off my life from the constant exhaust that came in my windows. That isn't a fair price to make people pay just to live in the city they work and I would be very happy to be the last cohort who had to endure that just to live near my office.	6/24/2022
Aubrey Pullman	I support option 5	My first choice is option 5. My second choice is "Broad". Density is the key to more affordability, walkability and livability. Building only around frequent access transit ignores the power of bikes/scooter for mobility. I'm also concerned restricting to corridors would increase development pressure and pollution (noise, air) in these areas. I believe it would be most equitable to allow more density throughout the city.	6/24/2022
Will Gagne-Maynard	Option 5 for a more livable Seattle!	We need a future city that is more walkable, affordable, human-sized and equitable. Option 5 is the best choice for these objectives. We should not concentrate development in certain zones (exacerbating displacement and concentrating apartments along arterials) but rather allow more housing and commercial options throughout the city. For this EIS, we should study the impacts of not pursuing option 5 in terms of displacement, increased development in our ex-urban fringes and increased car traffic.	6/24/2022
Matthew Bailey	Expand mass transit and start congestion pricing	What happened to adding congestion pricing in Seattle? Jenny Durkin said she was going to start it, but then nothing happened. We need the drivers that are emitting carbon in our community and using our streets to pay for green infrastructure. Seattle has a big problem with smog and air pollution. We need car commuters to put their money towards better air quality. Let's put congestion pricing funds toward expanding emission-free mass transit and planting trees.	6/24/2022
PETER NIGH	Alt 2 provides a realistic path to growth	we need a thoughtful approach adding density to single family neighborhoods. Remember what happened last time? https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/get-rid-of-single-family-zoning-in-seattle-housing-task-force-says-in-draft-report/ The small neighborhood nodes offer a way to increase density easier into Seattle's wastelands of single family zoning. Many of these areas already have pockets like this that have since been outlawed. Alternative 2 with small neighborhood nodes would make these legal again and allow for expansion. the small residential nodes we have today are what make neighborhoods attractive to home owners (i.e. Tangletown). This approach will expose single family homeowners to density and remove their fears. Then we create more small nodes and grow existing ones into villages. It's just a more pragmatic approach.	6/24/2022
Caleb Miller	Alternative 5 for equitable housing choices	Alternative 5 would provide all Seattleites with options across the city to find housing - something we do not have today. The housing crisis has only worsened in the 10 years since I moved to Seattle; we need to address it head-on, and not with the same piecemeal urban villages approach. Our urban centers and villages have transformed dramatically while the single-family neighborhoods have been locked in time. It's time for those neighborhoods to contribute to the growth that many other neighborhoods have accommodated for decades.	6/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Thomas Geffner	Alternative 5 is what Seattle needs!	I strongly support alternative 5 and believe that it is the best path forward for Seattle. I grew up in the Seattle suburbs and have watched the City transform over the last 15 years. I am proud of the dynamic, global city that we have become, but am deeply troubled by the continuing housing crisis. Many of my friends struggle to pay rent, and have had to move far away from the urban core or move back in with family members, despite well paying jobs. I studied architecture and urban planning in university, and currently work in affordable housing development. My professional experience has taught me that we need more land zoned more types of housing. The land in urban villages is limited, and expensive, which makes it suitable for only specific types of development. Options 2-4 are a step in the right direction, but will not do enough to address our current housing crisis. If possible, I would also ask that this EIS study ways to streamline the land use entitlement process for housing projects. Current land use review can take 18+ months which slows or prevents the delivery of much needed housing. Perhaps triplexes, 4-plexes and small apartment buildings could be allowed by-right without requiring land use review (just building permit review for life safety reasons). The simpler the requirements are, the quicker housing can be produced. Thank you for your considerations.	6/24/2022
Chris Mason	Go with plan #1.	Please leave single family zones alone, it's what makes Seattle special. Even when smaller older homes are replaced with new larger housing, it's more expensive. This solves nothing. Stick to urban villages, a concept that's working.	6/24/2022
Adam Bartell	Go with Option 5 - allow densification!	The current status quo of massive, sprawling suburbs that are only navigable by car is unsustainable. Road infrastructure is expensive and heavily subsidized - and single-family zoning only makes things more expensive by requiring more and more roads. Sprawling suburbs means low density, which means poor transit availability and awful walkability. The entire point of a city is that everything is all in one place - with single-family housing comprising of 95% of all residential zoning in the city, it completely destroys the whole concept of a city. It makes it hard to walk anywhere, it makes it difficult to provide mass transit because people can only walk so far to the nearest transit stop (and each house contains only 1 or 2 potential riders!). Paradoxically, higher density means less vehicle traffic if done properly. With more people living within walking distance of a transit stop, they're more likely to take public transit rather than drive everywhere. Also, build more trains and build them now. Dig up old streetcar lines if you have to.	6/24/2022
Webster Crowell	Option 5 with incentives	We need density, and one of the things causing backlash against development is just how transparently shabby the bulk of new housing has come out. Seattle is one of the most desirable places to build, we owe it to ourselves to hold a higher standard for new construction. Increased density does not need to mean ugly buildings that begin falling apart as soon as they're sold! Higher building AND higher standards make the city denser and better.	6/24/2022
Dwight Harris	More Density	We need more density with good transportation options. Bicycles and good public transportation. Every part of Seattle needs to have greater density. As density increases we need to plan for greater access to parks. We must at all costs avoid sprawl that comes with the costs of roads and traffic congestion. As density increases we also need to have access to services. I think that is mostly a zoning question as well as a transportation question.	6/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Nils Hostage	More Housing - Pick Option 5	We need more housing. Lots of people and jobs want to move here and we need to provide the housing for it. Eastside isn't going to do it, Snohomish isn't going to do it, we need to do it. Housing costs are too high and we are barreling towards becoming a place where only the extremely privileged can live here. I own a single family home. I also understand that I live in a major city. I am so frustrated with single family home owners who live in a major city and insist on keeping their neighborhood quiet and suburban. They can move to Issaquah or something. This is a major city with a housing crisis so let's build housing. I'd prefer Option 5, with my second choice being Option 3. I strongly believe missing middle housing should be permitted throughout our city. Our city could comfortably contain millions of people. WA is an enormous state - those who want quietness and solitude can find it literally anywhere else. A triplex isn't actually going to ruin anybody's street anyway. We need to build housing everywhere. We need to upzone everywhere we can, we need to eliminate single-family-only restrictions, we need to reform and streamline the ridiculously tedious Design Review Board, and we need to actually build housing. Let people live here. Let the streets become busy enough that retail can actually survive. Let the city become dense enough that we can actually justify and afford expanded transit infrastructure. Let the rest of the country continue to deteriorate while we prove that an American city can actually be a comfortable, functional, fun, and attainable place to live.	6/24/2022
Michael DeMichillie	I am begging you to let Seattle become a real city. Choose Option 5.	With our current housing deficit, we can't afford to waste another decade tinkering around the edges with ADUs. If we're trying to create a 15 minute city concept in all neighborhoods, we have to at the very least allow more small urban nodes to give residents car-free access to grocery stores. The presence of food deserts in the city should be unacceptable. Option 5 is the only one that puts a dent in these problems. The next comprehensive plan should also add flexibility in Neighborhood Residential zones to allow some commercial activity accessible by walking or rolling.	6/24/2022
Jake Woll	Option 5 is the only real option	At a certain point we are either serious about addressing climate change, housing costs, and equity, or we are not. Option 5 does not cut corners, it does not appease the wealthy or elite landowners of the city. Instead, it facilitates the kind of city Seattle talks about becoming but has so far failed to act on. We need options to grow, we need the space to grow, and as the plan suggests, we need all of Seattle, as One, to grow and accommodate new neighbors.	6/24/2022
Ryan Wilson	Go with Option 5	Of the five alternatives laid out in the EIS for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update, Option 5 is the best alternative for equitably meeting the growing housing demand of our city and region and creating a beautiful city that people want to (and are able to) live in. Brutal housing price growth in the region due to a shortage of homes and a proliferation of jobs has all but shut out most potential homebuyers from the housing market, or even living in Seattle at all. The "corridor" strategy inequitably forces disadvantaged people into apartments on loud, polluted arterials. Allowing a variety of housing units in neighborhood residential zones (option 3) is the most cost-effective and equitable solution that Seattle has to tackle the housing crisis and continue growing as a city. Option 5 builds upon Option 3 by also increasing housing at nodes and existing urban villages, which allows the city to build a variety of housing options and create fun and livable neighborhoods (ala the 15 minute city) all over the city. That's the city I want to live in.	6/24/2022
Ryan Wilson	Suggested Considerations for Study	If within scope, I would love to see modeling around the following questions (I believe some are already considered) * Which alternatives result in lowest GHG emissions / resident? Washington state has a goal of reduce emissions to 95% below 1990 levels by 2050. Considerations would include estimated vehicle miles traveled, energy consumption / household (esp. considering new construction rates and updated building codes) * Which alternatives result in the best health outcomes for the most people? Ambient air quality, shade and heat, noise, and other pollution can be modeled and forecast. * Which alternatives result in the largest diversity of housing types? Consider "family-sized" housing that is actually affordable. Right now it seems like most new construction in either small 1-bdrms or crazy 2400sqft mansions that few families are able to afford. * Access to amenities (what % of residents will have access to parks, waterfront, etc?)	6/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Naishin F	Study an Alternative 6 that dreams big	<p>Please consider the many wonderful and thoughtful Alternative 6 approaches out there! Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, and if we are studying 4 options that do less than Alternative 5 then we need AT LEAST one option that dreams bigger. These proposals should not be treated as wildly aspirational, as they ask for considerations that are already seen in many world class cities around the world. As a homeowner in North Seattle on a street zoned neighborhood residential, I would personally love to see more types of housing on my street that can accommodate more neighbors. We can often get lost in the wonky (and important) nuances of land use, or get caught in circular conversations defending pro-housing stances against the common push back on things like parking, "neighborhood character", utilities, etc. But we already know what the solution is, and there is plenty of evidence to support it. When we have housing, climate, and racial equity crises at this scale, there is really no morally defensible argument against allowing for abundant housing, with an emphasis on allowing that abundant housing in areas that have been most exclusionary. Let's start from a place where we allow high rises in urban villages, abundant social housing, and missing middle housing (including 6 and 12-plexes) everywhere, and prioritize plans that undo the exclusionary zoning practices that have created so much inequity. From there, I have no doubt we can plan for growth responsibly in terms of other aspects. There should be no reason we can't do this and protect and grow our urban canopy - density done right can actually open up more space for trees. Yes, parking may get more inconvenient for some, and yes, there may be more construction noise and other nuisances. But are any of these real reasons to slow down progress towards climate sustainability and affordable housing? I think not. There will be ripple effects that benefit all of us. When more people can live close to where they work or where they need to be, there will be positive climate impacts, less traffic, better mental health, and less turnover in important roles in our communities like teachers, daycare workers, food service workers, and nurses. This allows us to build more vibrant communities that welcome people of all ages, incomes, race and ethnicity, family types, professions, and on and on. Lastly, we need to study the wider-reaching impacts of choosing a smaller alternative that doesn't create as much housing. What kinds of sprawl will it create?</p>	6/24/2022
Elizabeth Nelson	Alternative 5 for the most homes	<p>Alternative 5 is the best because it produces the most housing. Simple as that. The next best option is alternative 3, because it doesn't concentrate the more affordable housing options near noise and air pollution. It also makes every neighborhood more diverse, which is exactly what Seattle needs. When comparing the alternatives, I would like to see the EIS take into account recent changes to state and local building codes that will require new buildings to have more electric appliances. I'd also like to see the EIS take into account the emissions (or lack thereof) associated with Seattle City Light's electricity generation portfolio compared to fossil methane or heating oil. And I'd like to see the analysis incorporate King County Metro's plans to shift to a 100% electric bus fleet. In other words, if a neighborhood full of old craftsman houses with fossil fuel furnaces and garages for ICE vehicles is likely to be replaced with newly-built plexes full of folks who take the bus or light rail to work, it seems like the electrification of neighborhood residents' heating and transportation matters a lot for assessing the environmental impact of new construction.</p>	6/24/2022
Bruce Bonifaci	Option 5, please	<p>Increased density is our only route to climate stability. More housing everywhere!</p>	6/24/2022
John Waller	I support alternative 5	<p>I am in support of alternative 5 because it provides to most housing. Seattle suffers from a lack of housing, as such it only makes sense to provide more housing. There will be potentially negative impacts from pursuing alternative 5, but considering the negative impacts of the current situation (unaffordable housing leading to homelessness) and our inability to find a solution; the potential negative impacts of alternative 5 may be easier to address.</p>	6/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Donn Cave	Automobile usage as a function of concentration of housing	Some of the proposed options allow more dense housing, in areas that are less dense overall. Reversong the urban village concentration of housing density, and increasing the average distance between residence and other destinations such as retail or transit. That more automobile oriented distribution should certainly be accounted for, in calculations of greenhouse gas, activity-based population health, etc.	6/24/2022
Deb McGarry	Alternative 5	Alternative 5 provides the most opportunity for housing and more flexibility. This is what we need.	6/24/2022
Nathan Dickey	Things to Consider	The EIS should include study of increased use of bioswales and stormwater infiltration systems to mitigate impacts of increased and distributed density on our combined storm-sewer system. Our changing climate will result in more frequent major storms that may overwhelm our stormwater systems, and the city and property owners must share the increased burden that fully-developed impermeable properties will have on our stormwater system. Consider the designation of "superblocks" adjacent to arterials within Urban Centers that, in conjunction with new provisions within the Transportation Plan, could be closed to passenger vehicle traffic and include conversion of collector streets into "woonerfs" with stormwater collection and infiltration systems like those featured at Gemenskap Park and along sidewalks in South Lake Union. Widespread application of stormwater infiltration-in-place would reduce the need for additional impactful and costly infrastructure like the Ship Canal Water Quality Project, while increasing the amount of green space available to new residents, one superblock at a time. The EIS should analyze how the city can encourage use of construction methods and materials that reduce carbon emissions during redevelopment, such as exploring the potential for City Light to oversee a loan program of heavy equipment charging stations to construction sites, or expediting Mass Timber projects through the design review process. The EIS should also consider the impacts parking minimums on the size of the private vehicle fleet and impacts on electrical service capacity as the private vehicle fleet electrifies. This should consider how the number of active electric vehicles being charged at off-street parking locations associated with new households and workplaces will consume energy. If parking minimums are maintained, these off-street spaces will eventually fill with electric vehicles that will draw a significant amount of power from the grid. However, if parking minimums are reduced or eliminated, and some parking maximums are enacted, it prevent developers from encouraging new resident and new employees from using inefficient SOVs (either electric or internal-combustion), and encourage consideration of other transportation choices provided by the upcoming Transportation Plan. The EIS should consider treating the city not as a collection of discontinuous Urban Villages, but as a contiguous set of Neighborhoods, and should therefore formally define the boundaries of neighborhoods for	6/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Pat Wilkins	#5 (if it's all of the above, not all or nothing)	While #5 provides by far the most housing and should be pursued, my concern is if all the tactics are tethered together, delays will impact all three plans of action. 1) Alternative 2 expands existing urban village boundaries. This should encounter the least resistance as EIS studies should not differ much from existing data right next to the proposed area. Alternative 4 will be slightly harder but is doable. Streets with existing transit and areas near amenities better fit the profile for multi-family housing and the EIS studies would reflect that. 2) Alternative 3 will encounter not only the most resistance but will be spread out all throughout the City. Imagine 101 NIMBY Marty Kaplans fighting/suing, etc. Plus the EIS study will be on a case by case basis, literally 1000s of studies, counterstudies, lawsuits, etc. While expanding denser housing into entrenched neighborhoods is good and will eventually happen, it will take years if not decades. (See Magnolia fighting Discovery Park Housing, See Marty Kaplan fighting ADUs) To shackle the other alternatives to what will be a long and expensive process seems unwise. Also an EIS study conducted by the City can and will be countered by another EIS study by impacted parties and a long battle of the experts will ensue for each and every instance. I can tell you from experience it is much easier to make a claim of adverse environmental impact than prove there is not one. A bird in a tree, a clogged storm drain, an overtaxed water main, etc., to name just a few, can and will be used. All alternatives will greatly alleviate our housing crisis and should be pursued but some will meet much firmer opposition based not only on NIMBYism but with environmental impact studies used as both a sword and a shield. It would be quite tragic if the lower hanging fruit (2&4) are held back because of the guaranteed long, legal slog that Alternative 3 will trigger. If all 3 components of Alternative 5 are allowed to pursue their own paths unaffected by the success or failure of the other 2, we will advance housing in the near term, the medium term and beyond.	6/24/2022
Kevin Botterbusch	Invest in density and upzoning	We should be aggressively investing in as much opportunities to increase housing in Seattle as widely as possible. I support housing policies that encourage growth upwards and across the city. We should fully eliminate SFH zoning and increase height limits city wide. Given the current options, options 5 is the most broad plan. If anything it is probably not aggressive enough.	6/24/2022
Marsha Hudson	Alternative 4	I support expanding housing, especially near transit and services.	6/25/2022
Blue Frauenglass	Prefer alternative 5, but consider improvements to all options.	For option 2, consider expanding what's allowed in urban villages, especially new ones. Zoning that supports midrise and highrise buildings as well as lowrise can help the city make the most out of dense areas, especially around transit hubs such as new lightrail stations. For option 3, don't stop with triplexes. Courtyard buildings and rowhouses are excellent options to add density in ways other than "giant apartment blocks" (again, especially around transit hubs). Has consideration been given to increasing mixed-use zoning? More groundfloor businesses with housing on top, please! It leads to friendlier and more walkable neighborhoods. For option 4, consider broad corridors - not just the the block adjacent to rapid transit, but everything within walking distance. Corridors of density and amenities shouldn't be narrow (and especially not limited to the block adjacent to noise and unpleasant high-speed roads). Option 5 is by far the best proposal, bringing together the benefits of all the others. Take the above suggestions to heart when working on option 5. In particular, for all alternatives, consider their impact on the housing crisis - what will the additional density do to help with affordability?	6/25/2022
Gabe Briggs	Dense Housing = Climate Action	All evidence shows that those living in dense areas have substantially lower carbon emissions than those living in sprawl. We must be aware of this when thinking about the future of Seattle. The individuals who will live in our region over the next 5-20 years already exist. It is imperative we build a dense climate city for them and for ourselves. The alternative is to all be require a live of sprawl, long commutes, and high per capita carbon outcomes.	6/25/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ben Humphrey	Need to see more detail about how the options play out geographically	I'm all in favor of the 15 minute concept of neighborhood nodes. Over in northeast Seattle all we have is University Village, and that's hardly "neighborhood commercial." I was hoping to see the National Archives get redeveloped into a neighborhood higher density node, but that location is politically fraught. I am not in favor of option 3 - it's a giveaway to developers to ruin the quality of neighborhood residential in an ad hoc fashion and largely to their own benefit. What they build is not cheap but it's still cheaply built and would loom over adjacent properties (assuming tri and quadplex zoning would act like LR3). With corridor and urban village zoning, at least there are setbacks to "negotiate" the height difference between smaller scale neighborhood residential and higher density housing.	6/25/2022
MJ J	Alternative 5 is far and away the best alternative - Reach Seattle's Potential	Alternative 5 is the best option, hands down. It's the only option that deals with housing affordability, displacement pressures, providing more freedom of housing type and neighborhoods people can live in, moving towards being a family-friendly city, moving towards being a feminist city, and moving towards being a sustainable city. If I were to treat the alternatives like ranked-choice voting, Alternative 5 would be 1st place, alternative 3 would be a distant 2nd place, and all of the other alternatives are unacceptable and would not make the ballot. The affordability and choice around people's housing is fundamental to the well-being, joy, and thrivance people experience. Seattle has an opportunity to become a top-notch, world-class city. People deserve to live comfortably and joyfully through every phase of life in the city of Seattle. Alternative 5 is the path to reaching that potential. I've also attached just a little of the literature and research that supports why alternative 5 is far and away the best alternative.	6/25/2022
Dorothy Kate	Alternative 5, but go much further	* Migrate from a exclusionary zoning system to a maximum nuisance zoning system. There's plenty of evidence that maximum nuisance zoning results in cohesive neighborhoods that meet the needs of the people who live there. * Tax unimproved land value. There is a shocking amount of waste in land use such as surface parking lots, that would improve if taxes incentivized land owners to rapidly develop it into something appropriately valuable, or sell it to someone else who will. * Dramatically simplify land use classifications. The Seattle land use code section 23.30.010 defines 38 classifications, which leads to micromanagement and bureaucracy getting in the way of building housing. * Relax permitting and building codes. The cost and time for new construction needs to be driven down, in order to make the economics of redevelopment work out more often and build more housing. * Zone "neighborhood commercial" by default. The Seattle land use code section 23.30.030 defines the default zoning as the least dense classification in the code, single-family 9,600, which gets in the way of building daily shopping facilities close to where people live and forcing people into unnecessary car trips. * Prioritize transit frequency. For transit to be used, it must be so frequent that riders never have to look at or think about a schedule. * Prioritize redevelopment around transit. I recently travelled to the Sodo Link Light Rail station, and was greeted by a massive parking structure and industrial buildings. Turn every transit station into a cohesive neighborhood. * Prioritize transit hours of operation. For transit to be used, it must run on nights and weekends so riders can use it for daily shopping and life, not just commuting between home and work. * Prioritize protected bike lane connectedness. For bike lanes to be used, they must be protected and connected, for the entire routes between the places people need to travel. * Eliminate street parking. Street parking is a terrible land use, and a large subsidy for cars. The only cars that "need" to park on the street are emergency responders during emergencies, and they can simply block car travel lanes temporarily. * Eliminate parking minimums. People who live in the neighborhood don't need parking, and other land uses would provide more value to them. People from outside the neighborhood can pay the fair cost of off-street parking. * Narrow street lanes. Drivers go fast and don't pay attention because the streets are designed like highways. Roads should be designed so that	6/25/2022
Jason Rock	Alternative 5 doesn't go far enough	Broad upzones are absolutely required, but the example buildings for the Alternative 5 in neighborhood residential areas are insufficient. Stacked flats are neighborhood residential, limiting neighborhood residential to townhomes and detached oneplexes is unacceptable in a housing crisis.	6/25/2022
Ben Mitchell	Don't consider environmental "impacts" in a vacuum	There's a tired old chestnut that goes: "If we legalize more housing in Seattle that means we'll have to cut down trees, and there will be more people, and there will be more cars, and there will more noise, and I will lose the nice view from my deck. These are significant and bad environmental impacts." I've seen this argument indulged too much, and I hope that this EIS process is bold enough to make the obvious and true point that Seattle does not exist in a vacuum. People have to live somewhere, and one of the best things we can do for the environment and climate change is to cram as many people as we can into urban areas. The alternative is sprawl, which has far more serious environmental impacts than the loss of a few trees or someone's nice view.	6/25/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Daniel Metzel	Alternative 5 please - we need more housing!	I'm an owner of a single family home in Whittier Heights. I love my neighborhood and my house, but I hate that living in Seattle is out of reach for so many people. We need more housing! We need to leave the era of single family zoning behind. Please move forward with Alternative 5	6/25/2022
Kelly Sutton	Option #5 to Continue to Make Seattle a Global City	First of all, a thank you to Seattle for continuing to listen to its citizens and creating a safe, equitable, and exciting city to live in. It's amazing to see how much Seattle has grown and changed throughout the course of my life. Seattle continues to be one of the most promising cities in the country, and now is a crucial time to re-assess priorities. With the right direction, Seattle can probably become one of the premier American cities, continuing to raise the standard of living for all of its citizens. It can continue to be a magnet for culture and business. My vote would be for the Alternative #5 as presented. Seattle must pursue density and housing at all costs. Design reviews should be entirely removed, as well as any parking or affordable housing minimums. As a former resident of San Francisco, it was disheartening to see how well-intentioned policies harmed the citizens of the city and pushed the city toward a brittle monocultural and monoindustrial city. Housing of all types creates space for folks from all walks of life to live and participate, and creates a resilient city. Older housing units naturally become more affordable as new units are built; there is no need to mandate affordable units within new construction. Having had the opportunity and privilege to live in New York City and Berlin, it's incredible how important robust public transit is to a healthy city. With the decisions to adopt ST2 and ST3, Seattle creates the foundation to absorb new residents without grinding to a halt. It provides a variety of living options and varying commute times. With future transit bills, hopefully we can continue to connect other parts of the city with efficient and affordable transit. We should continue to plan for the best-case scenario, which is one where Seattle continues to grow and attract people from all walks of life and from around the world. Doing so requires choosing density and walkability for the coming decades. My vote is for Alternative #5 or something even more aggressive. If executed correctly, Seattle may become a premier global city and a template for other American cities to follow.	6/25/2022
Brian Belmont	Alternative 5 is the right choice: More housing everywhere	I want to live in a city where everyone can live where they want. We need drastically more housing to unlock that potential. Alternative 5 is the only path forward. * More housing will reduce homelessness. Housing costs and vacancy rates are among the biggest drivers of homelessness. * More housing is the only morally defensible outcome. Minorities and marginalized people shouldn't be forced into specific areas, or forced out of the city, because historic and current housing, income, wealth discrimination. * More housing will create more vibrant communities and support more local businesses. * More housing will allow people of all income levels to live here. I'm personally fed up with community members, such as teachers and childcare workers leaving their jobs to move somewhere that's affordable. Even coworkers and friends with 6-figure salaries are forced to leave the area. Let's finally do this. Brian	6/25/2022
Chris Bendix	I Support Option 5	Option 5, the combined option, which includes city-wide enhancements to ensure better housing diversity, more walkability, and more environmentally friendly development, is the best option. Multifamily housing at modest scale (4 stories and less) on quiet, residential streets with proximity to resources and amenities is comfortable, environmentally and financially sustainable, and comfortable for people of all ages and incomes.	6/26/2022
Meredith Rawls	Alternative 5 is the best choice	We can no longer limit dense housing to small urban village areas near loud, polluting arterial roads. This is inequitable and makes single family homes even less affordable. We need walkable neighborhoods with a variety of housing density throughout the entire city. Multiplexes, family rental units with 3-4 bedrooms, multigenerational housing communities, cohousing, ADUs, mid to high rise apartments and condos, all of it everywhere. This is a real chance to make Seattle more affordable and livable, please take it.	6/26/2022
Filip Gouglev	We need to pursue 15-minute city development everywhere in Seattle	We need to significantly upzone across the whole city, invest in public transportation, and develop walkable/bikeable neighborhoods. Providing greater housing options and types will not only address a major cause of our homelessness crisis, but also help Seattle grow into the world-class urban environment it can be. We all love vacationing in places where you can walk to your local cafe, corner store, hair salon, park, etc. So lets make that legal here! Option 5 is the best of the listed options and we need to adopt it fully.	6/26/2022
Ian Matic	I support option 5	Increasing housing density promotes commerce and consequentially increases tax revenue. Increasing housing density also promotes more walkable environments and decreases car dependency, which is a significant handicap for King County, as is apparent by the insane amount of congestion every single day.	6/26/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Cooper Cain	Support Option 5	Seattle has grown faster than expected with not enough housing to match. Changing nothing about our zoning is unacceptable for all future and current residents. To help reduce city-wide emissions and avoid displacement, we need to grow everywhere and not just in concentrated areas. In addition to what has been outlined in the EIS plan, I think the city should study the following points or ideas as well: * city-wide corner stores could help reduce some trips and add character and walkability to all neighborhoods while also adding a "Third place" everywhere. * The mental and physical health impacts of concentrating all growth near main transit corridors only concentrates more people on loud, busy, polluted, and dangerous roads. * All options that study housing along transit corridors should also include upzoning in 15 minutes walksheds of all current and near term future light rail stations. It is unacceptable that there are single family homes within 15 minute walks of these stations. * Study possibility of reducing design requirements for new building exteriors so developers can build cheaper and more sustainable buildings. * While ambitious growth has been outlined, the city should also study what may happen if we continually grow at a pace similar to 2010-2020 (~13k new residents per year) and the various impacts of the different options. * Study possibility of providing more variety of ownable homes through the city, not just detached or townhomes. * The city should work to reduce car traffic in higher density areas as much as possible and provide more space to active and public transportation options. I personally believe option 5 is the best possible option for the city long term to meet its goals on climate, increase housing affordability everywhere in the city, and provide a more equitable place for everyone regardless of where they currently or would like to live in the future.	6/26/2022
Jackson Cantrell	Option 5 Will Keep Seattle from Becoming the Next Palo Alto	I'm a Garfield High graduate who's slowly watched the prospect of living in Seattle slip away from me and my peers. The city has under built and over regulated housing options to the extent that the cost of living has jumped many middle-class incomes. Let's build more housing in more neighborhoods to make our city remain vibrant, carbon neutral, become increasingly car-optional, and remain economically diverse. Lets update our zoning to reflect the world class city that we are.	6/26/2022
Vicky Greenbaum	Focus on solving traffic congestion but NOT through making driving difficult	Don't make it harder to drive. Do maketransit accessible. Put bike lanes only on non arterial streets	6/26/2022
Susan Lammers	Major Work Shift	We are in the midst of a major shift in what is needed for office/work/home. Your plan is already out of date. We have 40 story office buildings downtown sitting empty. Microsoft and Amazon has 30 buildings around the city it no longer needs for offices. Single family homes now serve as workplaces and family residents. How about working with homeless organizations/companies and developers to "reimagine" the use of all the empty buildings for a "combination of housing/work/school/and play". You need to think like a BIG city. NYC big. My guess is you are going to have an avalanche of leases coming up on your downtown with no one interested in leasing those buildings for offices. Work with what we have!!! Your downtown is occupied by homeless and drug lords on street corners. Fix that! Right now the city is allowing builders to create cheap apartment housing that will be "garbage", ugly and falling apart in 6-10 years. THAT's not smart for climate change. It's like throw away housing. Your option 5 will be a free for all for developers and will lead to traffic and chaos and disgruntled people in neighborhoods with no place for kids to play. One benefit of the pandemic is that the solutions have landed right in your midst. It's a chance to instantly add supply to housing and reimagine downtown office buildings. It will takes the pressure off the rest of the urban villages and while it won't make developers happy, it will solve your housing shortage and lead to decrease in prices. Do that before you open up our neighborhoods to the developers who fund your campaigns.	6/26/2022
Mark Sincell	One more voice for option 5	I agree with the clear consensus in the comments that option 5 is the way to go. No need to reiterate the reasons that have already been ably expressed above, except to say please bring back small neighborhood businesses.	6/26/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Susan Keown	Support for option 5	Option 5 seems like the best option because it will add more housing across the entire city, plus additional growth in select areas with transit and amenities— ensuring that people who work or study anywhere in the city have a chance of finding a place to live in the vicinity. Our city desperately needs housing and adding more is better. And, adding more density in the city is vital for reducing emissions and slowing climate change. Growth should accommodate a range of residents including single people and couples, families with kids, and elders, those with various incomes, and those who want to buy and those who rent. Option 5 provides the greatest number of opportunities to create a range of housing types that suit everyone, throughout the city. If we want to remain a vibrant, creative, diverse city, we must embrace change that allows people to flock here— and to stay here.	6/27/2022
Andrew Freeling	Option 5, more density, more mixed use	If there was an option that went further than #5, I would seriously consider it. We need to massively increase the supply of housing to address affordability and homelessness. This combined with expansion of mixed use zones will strengthen the city in many ways. Density and the walkability that comes with mixed use improves safety and addresses climate change. Increased density bring financial benefits as well. Finally, it will make neighborhoods more lively, encourage interaction and strengthen the social fabric of communities.	6/27/2022
Harrison Lee	Best Option is #5	Seattle needs more housing, and option 5 offers the most options for addressing this need. I support broad upzoning, more development along transit corridors, and more nodes/centers of housing throughout the city.	6/27/2022
Jonathan Miner	Let's Make Seattle a Real City!	I live here, work here and own a home here. Sadly, many of my friends and family have been forced to move away as housing prices and rentals have skyrocketed. We must plan for a Seattle that has abundant housing and sufficient density to support environmentally friendly transportation so we stop driving single occupancy vehicles as much as we do. Option 5 (Combined) appears to be the best fit for adding equitable and abundant density to our city and supporting a rational and thriving mass transit system. Given that this plan is currently in the EIS scoping phase, I think it's important to consider not just the impacts the plan has here in Seattle once implemented, but also the impact on surrounding areas if we do nothing or make only small changes. People want to live in the Seattle area, we have great abundant jobs and a beautiful natural environment. People will move to the area regardless of what we do in Seattle, and if we don't provide adequate dense housing within city limits, we only push the growth to outer rings, which means more forest and farmland turned into environmentally harmful single family suburbs and more single occupancy vehicle traffic clogging the roads and belching out carbon. Those impacts are massive and need to be weighed as part of the environmental cost of doing nothing or too little here in Seattle. From my perspective, the environmental harm of not upzoning the whole city is clear and vastly outweighs any incremental harm from this plan. It's honestly sort of stupid to need to do an EIS on a plan like this, but here we are... Thank you for engaging us in this process.	6/27/2022
Daniel Heller	#5 or Bust	I grew up in Seattle but have lived away from the city for 10+ years. I want to move back but simply cannot afford a house or an apartment in the city right now. I am not alone in wanting to move to Seattle. Hundreds of thousands of people will move to Seattle in the upcoming decades. If they displace current residents, exacerbating the housing/homelessness crisis is up to you. Only option #5 will allow Seattle to grow and accommodate all of the people who live here now and will move here in the future. Yes, neighborhoods will change, but the city has always changed, and will always change. I love Seattle and hope to be able to move back soon!	6/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Isaac Gloor	Option 5 is best for Seattle	-Seattle needs more diversity of incomes and housing in all neighborhoods, especially those originally redlined and zoned for exclusive single family houses. -Seattle needs more opportunities for small business to locate within neighborhood zones by allowing small-scale commercial properties to site on street corners and elsewhere. -Seattle needs to plan to accommodate growth, not just along congested and polluted arterials, but everywhere. It should not be true that to live in an apartment means you must live next to a highway or busy street- apartment dwellers deserve density in places like Upper Queen Anne too. -Seattle needs to prioritize large scale upzones near all major transit centers. Across the Rainier Valley, Northgate, U-District, Roosevelt, Capitol Hill- all desirable areas that could easily accommodate even denser housing, including high rises. -Seattle needs to expand downtown by upzoning Belltown, Uptown, and Capitol Hill to allow for more high rise development. -Seattle needs to put active transportation and transit first and put downtown streets on a diet. All downtown streets should have safe pathways to walk and roll, and should be treated like the residential neighborhoods they are by de-prioritizing high-speed traffic that is merely passing through. SEATTLE SHOULD CHOOSE OPTION 5	6/27/2022
Phillip Coulson	Option 3 is best	As we all know, housing is unaffordable in Seattle. The City should seek to upzone as much as reasonably possible so as to allow as much new housing construction as possible. Based on basic principles of supply and demand this should help ameliorate the affordability crisis. It's understandable that not everyone wants to live in dense areas, but cities, by definition, should be dense. Those seeking to live in exclusively single-family zoned areas should move to the suburbs or rural areas. Let Seattle be a real world-class city!	6/27/2022
Matthew Allen	We are so far behind option 5 is literally the least we should be doing.	We are behind on housing the folks who want to live here. We are behind on our fight to stay ahead of global warming. We are behind on being affordable. Any metric you look at we are behind on. 5 is the very least we should be doing if we have any chance of catching up to where a world class city should be.	6/27/2022
Jeffrey Baxter	Make rents go down.	I am a renter in Seattle who makes about \$40,000 per year. Rents keep going up. This is bad. I want them to go down. Look at cities with lots of job growth where rents are cheaper, such as Tokyo. Be more like Tokyo. Look at cities with lots of jobs where rents are sky-high, such as San Francisco. Be less like San Francisco. In other words, build more housing. I see that this is represented by Option 5, which I support. With respect to issues other than the cost of housing, it also does no good for nature to have sprawl into currently forested lands, which Seattle's land use policy heavily causes. Nor would most people say that denser cities are bad for nature. Is Paris bad for nature? Of course not -- HUMAN BEINGS ARE A PART OF NATURE. It would also be good for Seattle's economy, and the environment with respect to climate change. The only legit argument against allowing more housing to be built is that the community would be disrupted, which I do somewhat accept. But what about the community of people who are being driven out of the city do to high prices for housing? Are they not worthy of being considered too? Lastly I would add that more housing provides a better source of revenue than raising taxes, which I believe are already to high.	6/27/2022
Kathleen Love	Option 5 is best!	Seattle needs to face big city reality, allowing density everywhere, not just along (polluted) corridors. The housing crisis will not be solved by playing this conservatively. Let's get increased density rolling citywide!	6/27/2022
Ian Hernandez	Option 5 is what Seattle needs	The only way to address the crisis of Seattle's lack of available and affordable housing is to engage all avenues for housing growth. The Urban Village strategy is no longer viable or sufficient on its own, and limiting growth along transportation corridors creates exclusionary suburbanization in the rest of the city. The Option 5 approach would mean that in four or five decades, most of Seattle could look something like the Upper Fremont neighborhood, with a healthy mix of owners, renters, locally-sustained businesses and varied housing types. Upper Fremont is a very desirable place to live, work, and play - Option 5 is what Seattle needs!	6/27/2022
Jonathan Adams	Option 5 of One Seattle is clearly superior	Let's not beat around the bush--Seattle needs housing and lots of it. We need as much land available for medium- and high-density residential as we can physically allow. Option 5 of the One Seattle plan would enable us to construct triplexes and fourplexes anywhere in the city, as described in Option 3, while also focusing more dense growth on urban villages (apartment buildings with 6+ stories, retail, and grocery) within one-mile radii of public transit stations.	6/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Benjamin Guyer	Option 5 is best	Option 5 is the best because Seattle needs as much new housing as possible! Increasing density reduces housing prices, preventing people (especially marginalized communities) from getting priced out of the city and allows more people to benefit from living here. Increasing density is better for business. More people means more customers and more tax revenue. If we want Seattle to continue to be an economic powerhouse, we need the city to grow. Increasing density is good for the environment. Not only are townhouses and apartments inherently less resource-intensive than single family homes, they also prevent suburban sprawl which requires bulldozing forests, and they make public transit a viable alternative to personal cars for more people. Increasing density is good for health and happiness. Walkability isn't just about convenience, it also makes exercise part of everyday life and creates a city that is pleasant to be in. Whether you care about social justice, the economy, the environment, or individual happiness, option 5 is the best plan for Seattle.	6/27/2022
Laura Little	Option 5 will be best for Seattle	Seattle needs more housing. Option five is the most promising considering this urgent need. Actually the least we can do.	6/27/2022
Anthony H	Option 5, the best option!	Option 5 is the most forward thinking & addresses the needs of a growing city. It is clearly the best plan. Plan 5 has the potential to make Seattle to be one of the best and most equitable cities in America.	6/27/2022
Liam Bradshaw	Build option 5, including on the golf courses.	We MUST build doption 5 to meet the severity of our housing and climate emergencies. The predictable results of restrictive zoning and urban villages are on full display in the rampant homelessness through your the city. Further, we must give people homes near transit to address the simultaneous crises of climate and transportation congestion. Our tax dollars are being wasted to build light rail to 130th and 145th as long as these stations are surrounded by publically owned golf courses that could be out tot much better use as public housing and parks.	6/27/2022
Kevin Heim	More Improvements Needed to Scope	Regarding the main "One Seattle Plan" * Alternative 2 should study adding highrise and midrise zoning. Currently, the plan contemplates adding lowrise and perhaps some new areas zoned for six-story buildings, such as the nodes in Alternative 2 and 5. Denser zoning types would generate more MHA contributions that expand the city's affordable housing stock. Zoning from midrise to 18-stories appears ideal for mass timber construction, which could greatly reduce the carbon cost of buildings while providing high quality homes. The burst of highrise development in the University District shows that Seattle can likely attract tower development in additional high demand areas, such as Ballard, Uptown, Mount Baker, and so forth. * Alternative 3 should study a wider range of missing middle housing types rather than just triplexes and fourplexes. The state legislature considered requiring sixplex zoning near frequent transit. This should be the bare minimum to study so as to not restrict policymakers with a lesser option. Rowhouses, stacked flats, or courtyard apartments would also fit in well in Neighborhood Residential zones. * Alternative 4 should study significant upzones in a broad area around transit corridors, not just a narrow band near the arterial street. A 15-minute walkshed would make sense given Seattle's 15-minute city aspirations, but the transportation plan must improve walkability and safety in these busy corridors for the plan to really thrive. When it comes to EIS work, it's easier to subtract than to add once scoping parameters have been set. * Alternative 5 should seek to quantify the impact to the housing affordability crisis that the extra housing and MHA contributions would have. Many cities do the bare minimum when it comes to comprehensive planning under the Growth Management Act. What would happen if a city embraced growth and more affordable and attainable housing types like missing middle and apartments? Could displacement be curtailed? It would be nice to find out. * For ALL Alternatives: Maximize housing opportunities near planned light rail stations. By 2026, 130th St Station is expected to open in North Seattle. The City should establish an urban village around the station rather than squandering this huge investment and major opportunity to establish a 15-minute neighborhood. Likewise Avalon and Junction could use expanded urban villages since they're expected to get light rail in 2032, as could Ballard, Interbay, and Uptown — expecting light rail in the mid 2030s.	6/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Rebecca Deardoff	Let's get smart with widespread density	Option Number 5 is the best choice (while option number 2 is the second best choice). We need density that is appropriate to existing neighborhoods: small ADUs where they fit in with good existing housing stock, and larger multiple unit structures where there is adequate transportation, close by amenities, and parks or roof gardens. Everyone needs access to both inside private space and local outside public areas that are available to them.	6/27/2022
Arun Ganti	Support Option 5	Make our city more sustainable for all by up-zoning everywhere!	6/27/2022
Tim Tufts	Option 5 and please add some data	It is clear that Seattle needs more housing, so I want to lead with my support for Option 5 which will do the most to address that need. However, I think the fact sheet is missing some really important data. The matrix provides a ballpark 80,000 new housing units over 20 years with no action. What is the projected housing under each of the other options? Do we have a projected housing need to compare against? If possible, I'd love to see those figures in the fact sheet to highlight the gaps between supply and demand. Every option is presented in a positive light, but I suspect at least options 2 and 4 leave us off the mark. Be honest with us about the costs of options that preserve wide swaths of exclusionary zoning. It will be hard to disrupt the status quo if everything is sugar coated as just "good" and "better".	6/27/2022
BRIAN OCONNOR	Need to legalize dense housing and neighborhood commercial in entire city	The wording of the choices is not clear for public comment best practices, but I support whichever plan yields legalizing dense housing (no limit on height) and neighborhood commercial on any public plot in the city. "Broad" (#3) seems to be the closest choice to this, but the description of "Combined" (#5) claims to yield the most housing, even though it also says it incorporates more limiting proposals (#2 and #4) which would yield *less* housing. Not sure what the planners are trying to say here, but legalize housing and commercial anywhere people are willing to build it in the city, please. And remove unnecessary barriers to the development process - it should be rare an approval takes more than 60 days from submission. Thank you.	6/27/2022
Evan Haliburton	I support Alternative 5!	We need as much new housing as possible! Housing construction has been lagging job growth for decades, and it's made Seattle unaffordable for our kids and service workers. The only way out is to build more than we think we need to. It's not fair to offload all of the 'costs' of density onto a few urban centers or corridors while those of us in SFH/residential neighbourhoods reap the distributed benefits. Our wealth shouldn't be a ticket to freeloader. It's best to allow moderate density increases everywhere to spread out the traffic and infrastructure load, with larger increases where the existing infrastructure can support it. If we believe what our yard signs say we do, then it's time for us to show our love, kindness, respect for black lives, and hospitality to immigrants by welcoming everyone into homes in our neighbourhoods.	6/27/2022
Denver Weston Lodge	Option 5 is what is needed	There are not enough places to live and it is driving out people and workers that are essential for a functional local economy.	6/27/2022
Ivan Schneider	Option 5 is the only realistic choice	To protect the natural resources of the State of Washington will require an order-of-magnitude increase in density for Seattle. This can only be accomplished with pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, frequent citywide transit, and abundant housing throughout the City. By doing so, Seattle will improve neighborhood health, foster business creation and job growth, attract tourism and conventions, and mitigate the impact of the irreversible trend toward remote work in the technology industry.	6/28/2022
Ryan Tansey	Option 5 at minimum	We have a desperate need for more housing, in more places with more types allowed throughout the city. Upzone everything so we can catch up!	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Mike Famulare	Option 5 all the way	I work in Seattle and own a historic house a few streets north of the border in Shoreline. Seattle's planning sets the baseline for the region. It's long past time to end the self-defeating restrictive zoning that impoverishes our daily experience and makes quality transit and infrastructure financially unsustainable. I look forward to corner stores and busy sidewalks and safe bike lanes and frequent transit that all make economic sense in support of many new neighbors. And I look forward to my town following Seattle's lead, so that when it's time to go, I can sell to a developer who will knock down my lovely little farmhouse and put a sixplex in its place.	6/28/2022
Michael Gillenwater	Support for alternative 5	So much of our future depends on housing abundance. We cannot address homelessness, climate change, transit, or economic inequality in a urban environment with chronic housing scarcity and unaffordability. Alternative 5 should be the base case to start. Even our national politics depends on progressive cities being seen as successful vs. unaffordable places for just the rich with there homeless camps. Seattle has a chance to be successful. Please give careful attention to The comments of The Urbanist. https://www.theurbanist.org/2022/06/23/seattle-reveals-rezoning-concepts-and-invites-scoping-comments-for-big-2024-update/ Sincerely, Dr. Michael Gillenwater	6/28/2022
Robert Olomon	Please Consider Option 5	In the years since the global financial crisis, American cities have been devastated by a huge shortfall in housing construction leading to ballooning prices. In order to prevent this crisis from becoming even worse, and begin to take steps to reduce the impact, the city must take aggressive action. I urge the council to consider Alternative 5, as it would best ensure that Seattle can make up this shortfall and create a more vibrant city for all of its inhabitants. This option would make the city more transit-oriented and eco-friendly while making it more accessible to average people, not just the wealthy. It will also provide great financial benefits to the city by expanding the tax base, making transit more profitable, and reducing homelessness and associated city expenses. Please choose Alternative 5 to make Seattle a vibrant, financially stable, and equitable city.	6/28/2022
Ian Brown	Equity through housing	Alternative 5 is clearly the most equitable option with the best chance of achieving greater housing affordability for more people throughout all of Seattle. It's the only option that somewhat reduces the current ban on multi-family/affordable housing in most of the city. Please seriously consider this alternative.	6/28/2022
Trevor Mauro	Option 5 for human rights	We've had 30+ years of urban village planning which has left most single family homes in place, while tens of thousands of people struggle to find and obtain housing. If the prior plan worked we could guarantee everyone the right to shelter. But we can't, so it must change. NIMBY's aren't affected by expanding development potential; presumably they and their neighbors can make a pact not to sell their lots. Or buy them to preserve as single family rentals. And those who wish to leave their single family homes behind also retain that right. In a world where our rights are literally being taken away from us - the right to housing is something our local government can expand while preserving the rights of others to maintain their current home in a way they see fit. To limit housing in any way would be limiting people's rights and an offense to humankind.	6/28/2022
Nicholas Righi	Fixing the housing shortage	This choice allows the most housing to be built and thus has the highest chance of solving our housing crisis. It will also allow for better neighborhood development and make it easier for Seattle to meet its climate goals.	6/28/2022
Gabriel Righi	Option 5 is best	In order to fix the housing crisis, we need option 5!	6/28/2022
Olivia Gelder	Option 5 - Only Realistic Option	While all options have pros and cons, option 5 is the only one that will truly allow for a brighter seattle future that accommodates all people and allows the city to grow without pricing out diverse groups of people who make the city a better, more interesting place.	6/28/2022
Thomas Hirschler	Recommend Option 5	Recommend option 5. In order to build a sustainable future and make Seattle more affordable to a variety of people, we need to broaden the housing options.	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Isak Linstrom	Option 5 is the best	Cities all over the country have been suffering from acute housing crises caused by supply side restrictions on new housing construction and Seattle is among the hardest hit. I would strongly urge the City of Seattle to choose option 5 because it would allow the largest increase in new construction. The most liberal states and cities in this country often times talk about inequality and poverty, but see their low income and working class residents seek out better lives in red states like Texas or Arizona that have been able to provide more affordable housing. In order for Seattle to truly be a city that is responsive to the needs of all of it's residents and care for the environment, then it must do all it can do increase it's supply of housing in a way that mitigates sprawl and car dependence. Tech jobs are creating an amazing amount of wealth and opportunity here, and we must choose option 5 to ensure that it is shared equitably to all of Seattle's residents, not captured in high rents and housing costs.	6/28/2022
Erika Kretzmer	Examples from elsewhere; also, I support trees.	Hello, I returned to Seattle after spending two of the pandemic years in Barcelona, Spain. The "Example" (Eixample) neighborhood in Barcelona is the kind of mixed-use, very pedestrian friendly neighborhood that I would like to see everywhere. (incluso en Seattle!) The streets have wider spacing (blocks are 113 meters square, and standard streets are 20 meters wide). The center of the block is often reserved for park space; although these are also frequently used for parking garages with privately owned roof terraces (for dog and garden lovers). The streets have ample space for trees and the tree root zones, mostly planted with London Plane trees. Furthermore, the buildings are 5-7 stories high. The trees and midrise buildings provide plenty of shade during the sunny times of the year. On the street level, it is allowed to have retail, commercial, and light industrial uses (including car repair and carwash, and small substations for delivery businesses). Nearly every street corner has a café or small restaurant, and there are small grocery stores and pharmacies throughout. This design, along with the presence of well established and regular trains and busses, allows for the Eixample areas of Barcelona to be superbly pedestrian friendly and livable. With respect to the One Seattle plan, this would look like more Urban Villages. However, the Urban Villages in Seattle built to date, do not successfully incorporate mixed use including retail and commercial offerings within walking distance of housing. Ideally, everything needed for daily life should be within a 1 kilometer distance: grocery, greengrocer, pharmacy, cafes, daycare, schools, parks, and gathering places (churches, community center, etc.). Future Urban Villages should allow for retail/commercial/public use only on the first floor - not residential. The street-level space should allow for interaction with public and neighborhood services. Urban Villages should also require developers to set aside large spaces that are appropriate for the roots of mature trees of 50 meters height. Two other aspects of urban planning for Seattle are worth mentioning. One, the planning should include planning for large tree maintenance and growth. This means setting aside public owned or public controlled land for tree root zones. Developers should not be allowed to rip out all of the mature trees. Furthermore, they should not be allowed to build up to the edge of the property line without allowing space for trees. The tree canopy is especially important during	6/28/2022
J Brent Large	Option 5 : Create denser, walkable neighborhoods	Building apartments on busy streets and SFH on quiet ones is an injustice. We need serious urbanization near transit At least option 5. We really need to up-zone the whole city. More business districts. More walking streets. More car free zones for rolling and walking. The city is ready for positive change! Be brave!	6/28/2022
Daniel Blackburn	Option 5 is without a doubt the best future for seattle	with people continuing to move to seattle, now and in the future (and for see that amount to increase as climate change makes other places hostile, for example i moved here to escape hurricanes) we need to have the option to build denser housing. Its more effective for building costs, for energy consumption, and would ease the cost of living. Best option is number 5	6/28/2022
Kellie K	Option 5 is best	We desperately need more housing. If Seattle wants to be welcoming at all to low and middle income residents, we need to increase all housing types across the city, not just along busy, noisy, unsafe, and polluted arterials. Please consider who lives in apartments, their incomes, the essential work they do in this city, and the inequity of pushing apartment residents and lower/middle income people into such narrow urban villages. We deserve diverse housing and a diverse population throughout the city.	6/28/2022
Aaron Blaha	Alternative 5. We need to abolish single-family zoning.	We also need to upzone around transit corridors and downtown neighborhoods with increased height limits and FAR while streamlining the design review process to get units on the market faster. Then we might see a more balanced market.	6/28/2022
Janelle Becker	Option 5 is best	I'm a homeowner in Seattle and I support option 5. We need to increase overall housing in Seattle, especially with more lower cost housing to help address everyone's housing needs!	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ronit Dalmat	Option 5!	We need abundant housing, everywhere in every neighborhood, in every space and configuration. There is no one-size-fits-all when it comes to housing and neighborhoods, especially not now that COVID has disrupted day-to-day patterns around which traditional ideas of housing and jobs were constructed.	6/28/2022
Ben Reid	Option 5: Build as much housing as possible, wherever possible	It is absolutely essential that Seattle pick-up the pace on housing construction and alleviate the housing shortage & accompanying economic problems as swiftly as possible. Eliminate exclusionary single family zoning everywhere in the city. Multi-family residential wherever you can put it is absolutely essential to improving living conditions in the present, & future proofing the city.	6/28/2022
Kiarash Kawski	I fully support option 5 --homeowner and long time resident	Given the rapidly increasing population and job growth in Seattle -and the past decade or so of growth-, confining density to specific areas seems wholly counterproductive. I fully support option 5 because it will allow us to alleviate the deficit between housing and growth most effectively. And, as a residential property owner I don't believe having its productive to limit what "can" and "can't" be built in certain areas within reason --i.e. no factories next to schools etc.	6/28/2022
Jeff A.	option 5 (but way more)	No major city in a democracy on earth successfully houses its population without a substantial public housing presence. Study public housing abroad (not in the U.S.) and adopt best practices learned. Even with loosened zoning and sped up permit processes, leaving housing to market forces will never succeed.	6/28/2022
Doug Fowler	Alternative 5 is the way forward	Seattle desperately needs to relax zoning requirements city-wide, not just in Neighborhood Residential zones. Therefore, I strongly support alternative 5.	6/28/2022
Rachel Powell	Option 5 is the best for our future	Option 5 is the best option for the future of Seattle! We need more dense multi-family housing to be able to meet the demand for the city's growth.	6/28/2022
R F	Support for Plan 5	I am a homeowner in Seattle and I support upzoning and building as much housing as possible as quickly as possible.	6/28/2022
William White	I support option 5	Option 5 offers the greatest possibility for increasing Seattle's housing stock and for creating more vibrant, diverse neighborhoods. If Seattle really wants to live up to its reputation as a progressive, welcoming city, this has to be the way. We already have more people moving to the city than we can accommodate. Many of these people are climate refugees, and we are soon to have refugees from nearby states seeking access to reproductive healthcare. These people need places to live and they need a city that offers a range of choices for mobility, not the least of which is the most basic form of mobility: walking. The ability to navigate one's community via foot would seem to be a basic human right, and I hope Seattle will do what it can to make that a reality here. So please consider this a strong vote in favor of option 5. It offers the best opportunity for creating a safe, productive city for all of Seattle's families.	6/28/2022
Michaela Barrett	All in for Option 5	Seattle is already vastly short on housing and it's only going to get much worse if we sit on our butts. We need all the housing in all the places as fast as we can build it.	6/28/2022
Alicja Mincewicz	Option 5 is the only option	The entire area needs more housing that caters to all types of people. The housing options in this area are extremely limited. We also need a more even distribution of housing to limit traffic and congestion.	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Lucian Eckert-Dean	Regional growth demands sufficient housing supply. Choose option 5 (or more)!	Seattle's population growth is not grinding to a halt any time soon, regardless of how anyone feels about it. Housing and homeownership costs are already through the roof, and continuing rapid growth in our regional population is not going to make this any better. We need to drastically increase our housing supply to keep up. The low density of single-family zoning also means less property tax revenue and economic activity overall. It would be a sensible decision to upzone pretty much any part of the city to avoid this. There is an excellent video (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Nw6qyyrTeI) on this by Not Just Bikes for anyone else browsing through the comments who are interested. Frankly, choosing any other option is a massively missed opportunity to help ease the region's growing pains and supplement the infrastructure that is growing to meet its demand, such as our light rail expansions. The city is growing, whether anyone's personal opinion favors this growth or not, and we need to start taking action to ensure the region is able to handle it. EIS Alternative 5 will accommodate this, or even better, an Alternative 6 that considers even broader zoning changes than what is currently set out.	6/28/2022
Molly Blank	Option 5 is just the beginning	'No action' would be an incredible injustice to current, future, and potential Seattle residents. For Seattleites to thrive, we need to build environments that facilitate more opportunities to live, work, and play. Mixed use and integrated work/living away from corridors can help facilitate diverse types of living units where developers don't need to cram units onto scarce lots on loud traffic corridors.	6/28/2022
Sadie Lee	Alternative 5 is the only way to house our ongoing growth	Historically once upon a time a multiplex could be built anywhere! It's part of our history and our future. We need density through out the entire city. Alternative 5! Improves affordability and livability for everybody! No matter what housing will be built, but suburban sprawl will contribute to climate change and is more costly overtime than simple urban density!	6/28/2022
Owain James	Option 5 is the best	I was born and raised in Seattle and I hope I am able to raise my family here as well. I had to leave my neighborhood because it did not have housing that worked for me and my family. I moved to a neighborhood that was built before Seattle's restrictive current zoning was in place and the home I live in now would be illegal in my old neighborhood. My sister and my mother in law are also struggling to find housing in this city that suits their needs because 70% of the city only allows single family homes, the most expensive type of homes. We need to legalize more housing types in every neighborhood of Seattle. If you can build a single family house, there's no good reason you shouldn't be allowed to build a small apartment building. My family is doing fine, but if it's this hard for us, it's even more so for people who make less money or are just coming to this state or country. We need to ensure more opportunities in more neighborhoods by allowing more housing. Blocking dense housing in our single family neighborhoods is exclusionary and unjust. It has led to an artificial housing scarcity that has forced many to leave or live on the streets. Denser housing near jobs and transit is also good for the planet. For too long Seattle has pretended to care about the environment by blocking housing in the city, forcing people to move far away, chipping away at our natural environment and requiring long car commutes to the city. Denser housing near jobs means less vehicle miles travelled every year, less need for car ownership, and less traffic on our highways. Dense housing also supports our local businesses. More people in less acres means more customers that are near by for businesses and services. This means there's less need for parking and more opportunities to walk to local businesses. For all these reasons, I support option 5 to build as much dense housing as possible in our beautiful city.	6/28/2022
Roland Upenieks	Choose option five. No discussion.	Our housing shortage requires serious solutions, not half answers or cowardly attempts at making everyone happy. Seattle deserves to grow and thrive and continue being a rich, booming city, and that is only possible if people can actually find a place to live. Homelessness and housing scarcity are not separate issues, and our community deserves the dignity of having a roof over their head. And that's yet to mention the absolute climate arson that is single family/low density zoning. Option five, for the sake of our community, our city, and our children.	6/28/2022
Johnathon Davis	Option 5 is the best way forward	Option 5 allows for equitable growth and the creation of a complete city. Apartment buildings shouldn't have to only be on busy arterials and six plexes plus other new housing options would create a more livable and affordable city for everyone.	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
pat simon	Option 1 only!	This document seems skewed to promote choices for Option 5--the wording suggests that is the desirable option. I don't agree. Option 1 is not as good as I would like it to be, but is the closest to what I support. We are allowing affordable housing to be torn down and replaced by expensive junk. All citizens deserve to have a choice of housing models, including those who prefer single family homes. Those folks appear to be moving out further to be able to access that choice; they are being chased out by people who appear to believe that tearing down and rebuilding Seattle as a place where only small, dense dwellings are available will somehow moderate prices. I don't believe that's true; it hasn't worked so far, and it's left people with choices of closets for their dwellings where it has been built. The idea that people will live in these things and not drive has also been disproven by the traffic. One only need drive through neighborhoods where no parking has been required to see the streets narrowed to near impassibility due to parked cars. Leave the urban villages for those who like to live that way, but don't expand them and don't create more. At some point we have to come to the realization that our city has reached and exceeded its carrying capacity and resume considering what quality of life we are creating and perpetuating. As a native, I am shocked and sickened by the changes taking place: while we have a fantastic selection of things to do and places to visit, we cannot easily access them, and we have to be willing to suffocate in the crowds. There is little peace left here now. For the newcomers that think they have a better idea, please consider why you came here: was it to replicate what you left, or to enjoy something different and beautiful? It's time to stop what we're doing to Seattle and allow us all to catch our breath and regain some elbow room.	6/28/2022
Philip Garcia	Alternative 5 is the best approach	We need more housing, and Alternative 5 appears to be the most aggressive approach on the table. Based on available forecasts, the city will continue to increase in population, and we're already in a housing deficit. We need to target above and beyond the projections because we will likely fall short, like any large project executed by many humans. But if we fall short of the hard target, we might be able to close the gap on our housing problem (and reap many other positive benefits along the way). "Plans are useless, but planning is indispensable." - Dwight D. Eisenhower	6/28/2022
Riley Noonan	Option 5 is the only choice	If Seattle is truly serious about housing affordability, fighting climate change, reducing homelessness and making the city more liveable, then option 5 is the only choice. Stop with the NIMBY ideas that have (unsuccessfully) ruled over Seattle land use for generations, and get serious about maximizing Seattle's potential as a world class city.	6/28/2022
Maarten v	Urging adoption of Alternative 3	Some 70% of Seattle is zoned for single family residences only, a restriction that was put in place after World War II with questionable motivation. For the past 30 years we've focused on Urban Villages and directed density to those areas and the arterials. It has not been enough and the result is not equitable. We need to loosen the SFR zoning on the rest of Seattle to allow more multi-unit structures. Multiplexes can still look like regular homes and fit in with the neighborhood, certainly as much as already-allowed new-built 4,000 sq ft modern homes do among small Craftsman homes. I strongly suggest you diversify the options we have for creating density. We already have density around transit, arterials, and urban villages. We need to address the other 70% of Seattle now, Please have the political courage to do this.	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Nicole Mazzuca	Option 5 is our only real option	Seattle has, for a long time, been under-building housing. It has created a city where the vast majority of people, especially young people, cannot afford to own their own home, and where even renting without roommates is increasingly out of reach. We have also created a city, and a region, where, for a large number of residents, a personal vehicle is necessary, or at least desirable, for basic transportation. Seattle is also growing. We are no longer the slow growing city of 550,000 that we were when the Urban Villages plan was put into place - we are quickly moving towards being a city of a million people. We can no longer build the car-centric, suburban city that we built in the 1900s; it's time for a completely new, transit and walking centric focus for the 21st century. When looking at the five plans put forward, there is only one that will create the Seattle that we need, and that's option 5. We need more, denser housing, across the city, in every neighborhood. We need every neighborhood to be mixed-use. Nobody should feel they need to drive in Seattle to get their basic needs met, and nobody should be out of reach of living in Seattle because housing is too expensive. Mixed use neighborhoods also create the kinds of small businesses that everyone loves - living in the West Seattle Junction, I have access to a local zero-waste soap business, to incredible local coffee, to wonderful local furniture stores, and to amazing restaurants - everyone in the city should have access to this kind of thing, and everyone in the city should be able to start their own small businesses that create opportunities for their neighbors and friends. The bones of our city are amazing, but we need to make certain that everyone is included in the decades of growth, and that we don't exclude underrepresented minorities as we have in the past. We need to make sure that our city is accessible to everyone, especially young people and families, and create a place that our kids, and our grandkids, and their grandkids, will love and cherish.	6/28/2022
Kenneth James	Option 5 will add the most housing and best solve our housing crisis	We should only be considering option 5. We need more housing in Seattle. More density makes for a more robust city with more tax base and lower rents for all. Yes, new housing will be expensive to rent or buy, but as supply goes up, costs for everyone goes down. The only people who benefit from the other options are people who currently own property in Seattle (which includes myself). Don't let the greed of the few get in the way of the greater good!	6/28/2022
Emily Sellinger	Option 5 is the best	I think option 5 is the best given the under-production of housing in the Seattle area. I would like to see an increase in apartments and multiplex housing across the city. However, I think that we also need an expansion of public transit in many areas of the city. Focusing development only in current urban centers will worsen the transit issue. Right now, it is difficult to move east-west in Seattle by public transit. The buses are usually stuck in traffic. The light rail is the only reliable mode of transportation and it stops running early at night (12 am), which is well before many businesses in urban centers close.	6/28/2022
Nelson Lowhim	Option 5 ftw	Urging Seattle and Seattlites to consider option 5 as the best way forward. Increasing mixed use neighborhoods would also be good. I would like a plan that includes increasing public spaces along with this density. This would mean more places to hang out, parks, dog parks, playgrounds, and things like outdoor gyms. Thank you	6/28/2022
Sean McEwan	I support Option 5	It is time for the City of Seattle to step up and take bold action on this. I moved here from Chicago where I lived in an eight-unit building on a street filled with a mix of housing types, including single-family. It really is a beautiful thing and is absolutely perplexing to me that a greater diversity of housing is not already permitted here in Seattle. Having so many areas where growth is restricted is not a sustainable option for the future. As the parent of two young children, I encourage the City to take bold steps for a more livable, affordable, and climate resilient place for all its residents. We can't wait!	6/28/2022
Anna Kawski	Option 5 is what Seattle needs	Seattle needs more housing built now to support the rate of growth with a priority to density!	6/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Nicholas Efthimiadis	Option 5: Seattle Needs Housing Abundance	We need housing abundance in Seattle to effectively mitigate our affordability housing crisis. It is clear that Option 5 creates the most opportunity for new housing and in a manner that is more equitable than the status quo or other scenarios. Now is the time to go big! Alternative 2 should study adding highrise and midrise zoning. Alternative 3 should study a wider range of missing middle housing types rather than just triplexes and fourplexes. Alternative 4 should study significant upzones in a broad area around transit corridors, not just a narrow band near the arterial street. Alternative 5 should seek to quantify the impact to the housing affordability crisis that the extra housing and MHA contributions would have. Maximize housing opportunities near planned light rail stations. By 2026, 130th Street Station is expected to open in North Seattle. The City should establish an urban village around the station rather than squandering this huge investment and major opportunity to establish a 15-minute neighborhood. Likewise Avalon and Junction could use expanded urban villages since they're expected to get light rail in 2032, as could Ballard, Interbay, and Uptown.	6/28/2022
Sean Blakey	Option 5 looks best, but does it go far enough?	Clearly, adding housing and building up density holistically, over the entire city, is one of the minimal steps needed to address housing shortages and transform into a more efficient, more livable, less dependent society. This cannot be accomplished by restricting our housing buildout to villages and corridors.	6/28/2022
Matt Gangemi	5+ We have a generational-scale housing shortage thanks to suburban-style zoning	Housing prices are at a record high because job growth (yay!) vastly outpaces housing growth in the city. We have been stuck with a suburban-style zoning concept throughout most of our land area, yet we ran out of buildable land generations ago. Option 5 is the best start to solving these issues. I want to see us look at upzoning everywhere, and upzoning strongly at neighborhood hubs (plus add more hubs). I want to see all housing type options in all neighborhoods. This should both be the most cost-efficient solution (allowing two story land inefficient homes into short wood framed multi-story dense housing, while not limiting growth in denser areas), and one that allows real housing options. It should also reduce pressure for change in any one area, spreading out this change throughout the city. If there's time or any chance to put this in scope, I'd love to see a re-writing of our building and zoning and land use codes from scratch. With well over a hundred years of history, it's become unusable for the layman and even politicians. We have everything from minimum number of sinks to strange FAR and open space rules that represent a different time and punish-developer mindset than is useful now. We want to make building here easy and profitable, because the more housing we build the less scarce it is. Last, I love that we're finally able to have a good conversation about upzoning. We're a city with suburban-style zoning across most of our land area, and we've been stuck this way since the late 30's. Thank you Seattle for this conversation - 80 years late is better than never.	6/28/2022
Jesse Franceschini	I support Option 5.	I believe Seattle should pursue Option 5.	6/28/2022
Noah Merlis-Stephens	I support option 5	Seattle has a severe shortage of housing units and must accommodate new construction in every neighborhood at every price range. Option 5 is the only one which permits growth both in existing high density areas and in neighborhood residential zones. There is no good-faith reason not to pursue all of the proposed growth strategies simultaneously. We owe it to the younger generation to create a city where everyone has a future.	6/28/2022
Thomas Powers	Option 5, but we need more	Option 5 is long overdue, but insufficient to address our housing shortage.	6/29/2022
Carmel Slee	Notifying the public	I am curious how you are soliciting the public? I sure wish the local news could get the word out. I'm going to have additional questions, but tend to go on.. I will do each question seperately. Thank you	6/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Todd MacDermid	Plan to support refugees	In this time of increased environmental and political stress, it is possible that Seattle will become a safe haven for people fleeing impacts from global warming, as well as people who believe in a woman's right to choose, and the rights of minorities. We must ensure that we allow for sufficient housing for those who may wish to find safety here, and cannot adopt a plan that puts refugees in conflict with existing residents. We must plan to allow housing significantly above what past trends may suggest as sufficient housing. In the light of those needs, out of the existing options, option 5 is the best, but I would encourage the city to consider allowing even more housing growth than any of the proposed options.	6/29/2022
Scott Kenley	Option 5 - Seattle needs all the housing it can get	A combined solution is the only possible way that Seattle might be able to meet the housing needs for today, let alone in the future. By building lots of housing units and housing units of different types, the city will hopefully be able to provide housing for people of different SES as well as in different phases of their lives. Building more housing can reduce inequality (by providing housing for all types of people and giving them a say in the future of the city), help with climate change (by building dense housing and increasing reliance on public transit and walking/biking), which are two of the most important issues facing the city today.	6/29/2022
J Warren	EQUITY: Alt 5 but prioritize density in UVs w/ most resources!	Alternative 5 is great! But also use this as an opportunity to put existing urban village resources within reach of more people. We can start by increasing density in Urban Villages with the highest access to opportunity and least displacement risk. 4 of the top 5 are classified as "Residential" Urban Villages, which limits growth and keeps people out. UVs like Roosevelt, Wallingford and Upper Queen Anne have access to good schools, parks and jobs. And they need to start pulling their weight with housing if we're to take equity seriously. So in UVs like these: 1) Increase household growth targets for these "Residential" Urban Villages, or reclassify them as "Hub" UVs. 2) Weight housing growth here (rather than UVs with low access to opportunity and high displacement risk). 3) Level up multifamily zoning +1 (eg NC-55 to NC-75, LR3 to MR, LR2 to LR3, etc.) especially near schools, services, bus lines and retail/business zones. More affordable housing citywide is great. But let's also increase density around existing resources too. Who says you can't have equity and the 15-minute neighborhood too?	6/29/2022
Drew Summitt	In support of Alternative 5	I'd like to write in support of alternative five for the OneSeattle plan. As a working class Seattleite, I think the city has drastically under built its housing for our working-class neighbors and needs a full set of options in order to house everyone who lives in this great city.	6/29/2022
Jacob Eisenstein	Option 5+: build dense, affordable housing everywhere	With Seattle's current housing policies, dense and affordable housing seem to be permitted only near the busiest and noisiest streets. This is completely backwards. People who live in apartments deserve quiet neighborhoods and clean air too. This city is losing too many of its most creative and community-minded residents because the city's policies make it impossible for them to raise a family here. We need to address the crisis of affordability by permitting more housing of all kinds everywhere.	6/29/2022
K Norton	Option Five	More housing everywhere!	6/29/2022
Jeff Posakony	Strongly in favor of option 5	We need much more housing in Seattle and all other options are woefully insufficient	6/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
MJ J	Questions and comments on 130th and 145th station EIS's	Reading through the alternatives I'm concerned the combinations of "amount and patterns of growth" and "building heights for new construction" don't match well with their respected alternative titles. Alternative 2 - Focused growth limits the amount of area in which increased density and growth can happen but also limits heights to only 80 feet? This is the same pattern on a smaller scale than the city has been doing with the urban village strategy which is now being reevaluated. If you are going to limit the growth boundary then the height needs to be allowed to go up much higher than 80 ft. (small growth boundary = taller buildings). Alternative 3 - More and Distributed Growth should keep it's higher height (go higher) because it's TOD and wants more, but because it is distributed it could have the tradeoff of lower heights if you needed a difference between alternatives (bigger growth boundary = allows for shorter buildings) [All assuming there is a home and ridership goal you are trying to achieve]. Therefore, my concern is really what you are saying with these alternatives is 1=no change, 2=slight boost to development opportunity, 3=moderate boost to development opportunity but still nowhere near the scale appropriate for TOD or scale of housing needed. Additionally you should look into and confirm how the max height limits of these two alternative essentially produce development of the same type of building 5, 6, 7 story buildings. The urbanists a few years ago did a couple of great articles on this, as it relates to the increasing cost of construction and how building codes + zoning codes + construction type essentially make it infeasible to build many 8 & 9 story buildings. Meaning your alternatives will most likely lead to the same building type in practice (missing mid-rise). Also, attaching an article where I think how it thinks and defines TOD is important to think about especially where it talks about differentiated density to enhance the alternatives. Okay long post, but want to touch on additional issues to consider with EIS for the 130th station. So EIS's already do this but analyzing mitigating noise from the highway for both sides but especially on the west residential side where the schools are due to probable development in that area. Studying new ways for Seattle to mitigate noise should be on the table, here is a photo of sound-blocking panels used in other countries on their highways as ways to mitigate sound (something to study, ldk if they are worth the cost or if were already to loud). Also, I	6/29/2022
David Lawson	Option 5 With Special Focus	We need more housing, and we need so much of it that we will inevitably struggle to build enough. At the very least we need to maximize the available options for building it, and remove artificial zoning barriers. Option 5 does better at that than the other options. But comprehensive rezones often run into trouble, and don't alleviate displacement the way they should, because the areas with the most resources try to wiggle out of them. We absolutely cannot let that happen here. In fact, it is probably best to rezone those areas first. And not just some of them—all of them. We need to allow apartments in Madison Park, upper Queen Anne, Magnolia, Laurelhurst, and Sunset Hill alike—and we need to do it as soon as possible—to stop the Central District and Delridge from having the entire city's growth needs focused into them. Allowing apartments won't be the end of those neighborhoods; far from it. Existing neighborhoods with lots of apartments like the west end of Uptown and the east part of Capitol Hill show that apartments are totally compatible with tree cover, beautiful quiet streets, and a charming neighborhood feel. They just make those amenities available to people at more income levels.	6/29/2022
Sandy Briggs	Reduce Homelessness Now	5 - We need to make it easier to get through the process of planning and building housing to reduce cost. Seattle needs to build housing to match the jobs that we are creating. We need the 15 minute city so that workers do not have to commute from 30 miles away - it will reduce traffic and make the city more livable for all of us. A city that only the wealthy can afford to live in is a city that no one wants to live in.	6/29/2022
Cooper Cain	Option 6? Simplify the zoning code.	Does 5 even go far enough to address current housing crunch, new future residents, reduce our emissions, and increase public safety? The city should study an option that allows for 3-5 story mixed use development through the entire city to allow for the maximum amount of new homes built as well as reducing the different types of zones. This frees up the need to have tapers and allows for equitable growth through the city. This will naturally increase housing in high-demand areas while also spreading out the pressure through our entire city. A side effect is it will organically create new hubs where shops and amenities pop up without the city having to plan them in a specific area. The city could use more organic growth close to where people are.	6/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Roslyn Martinez	Option 5 (need an option 6)	We need more housing of all types in all areas to make this a functional city. We need more reliable expansive public transit and safe walking spaces. Option 5 is our best choice- from these options.	6/29/2022
John Owen	Early comments	Alternative 5 seems like it makes sense but we need to evaluate the others to understand the opportunities and which elements of all alternatives to emphasize. Also, the Downtown must be an important element in an alternative. The Comprehensive Plan should do a better job at integrating various elements such as housing, land use, bike plan, education, environmental sustainability, etc. Finally, the analysis should identify how the city will fit in the region.	6/29/2022
Sean Dooher	Option 5 is necessary	Given the stark lack of housing through Seattle, option 5 is the only one that comes close to meeting this need. We must build more housing and we must do it everywhere. We should turn Seattle into a collection of vibrant walkable communities instead of building giant towers juxtaposed against single family homes. All neighborhoods need to be upzoned and made mixed use with good transit connectivity.	6/29/2022
Eric Stinson	Option 5 is necessary	Option 5 gives us the best chance of addressing the housing crisis and its myriad negative effects on Seattle. The secondary effects of a lack of housing reduce the quality of life in Seattle for everyone and cost us (the city, taxpayers) lots of money even while the expensive short-term "solutions" to the housing crisis fail to really address the issues. As a Seattle homeowner, I am not worried about the theoretical sale price of my house -- I'm much more concerned with the inability of others to find housing they can afford. A denser city is a healthier city, with more funding and support for transit and services, more walkable neighborhoods, and more diversity.	6/29/2022
Eric Baumgarten	Option 5 is the minimum	Of the proposed options, #5 is the best but could be improved to increase the supply of housing. We are in a housing crisis and need every resource possible to increase the supply of housing everywhere in the city. The cost of housing is a result of unnecessary restriction of supply and the result is real human suffering. The current urban village approach is not sufficient for the future of Seattle. As someone who lives in an urban village near a new light rail station, the lack of new housing is disappointing. There is currently more parking lots that housing surrounding the Northgate station. We have built at great cost a new light rail system but have not built new housing around the stations due to restrictive zoning laws. People are forced to drive to use the rail instead of being able to live near and walk/bike. Option 5 would allow more development close to current and future stations and reduce car dependent trips. Current development is limited to arterials which are terrible for walking, biking and health in general. Option 5 would increase options for housing in all of the city and reducing the burden of development on areas of the city that have shouldered the burden over the last 10 years. Please choose option 5 and increase the amount of housing in the city.	6/29/2022
Garrett Cobarr	Seattle needs real information for any growth plan, like rental transparency	Most important item Seattle needs to get to affordable housing? Information. Right now there is a measure before the council to require landlords to report their rental information: basic information about rental unit and price. This information is critical to any comprehensive plan, so far everyone is just guessing. It is called CB 120325. In a 5 to 4 vote the measure passed the Seattle City Council. Mayor Harrell sided with Real Estate industry and vetoed the legislation, they claim this information is proprietary, despite the fact that they advertise rents on sites like Craig's list. To overcome the veto requires a 6 to 3 vote. That vote will occur on July 5th. Council members: Sara Nelson, Debora Juarez, Teresa Mosqueda & Dan Strauss opposed the legislation. If one of these council members represent your district, contact them directly. Otherwise, leave comments at council@seattle.gov or monisha.harrell@seattle.gov Let's put some sunlight into affordable rental housing.	6/29/2022
Emily Johnston	Option 5 all the way	Seattle cannot pretend to be an equitable or welcoming city unless it builds a tremendous amount of new housing, affordable to folks at all income levels. It cannot pretend to be a world-class city as long as cars rather than housing, parks, and services dominate the landscape. And it absolutely cannot meet any of its climate goals as long as it continues to push people out of the city and into long commutes.	6/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Thomas Anderson	Option 5 is a good start, but we need to do more	I moved here in 1987. Our rent for a three bedroom, two story half a duplex apartment shared with two other people was \$600/month. Inflation adjusted, that would be \$1500/month today (\$500/person). That exact same half a duplex on Zillow is now \$1.2M. In other words, a shared apartment that was affordable to someone making minimum wage, is now so expensive almost no one could afford to rent it. In Seattle of 1987, homelessness was a problem but not pervasive; today there are multiple homeless sleeping every night three blocks away from that apartment. These are not unrelated. If we had been doing option 2 or 3 or 4 for the last 35 years, would that have been enough to keep rents stable and affordable? Absolutely not. In order for a \$1.2M plot of land to be affordable as housing, it would need to have 20 people living on it, not three. That is, it needed to become at least a six story building, built out to the edges of the property line, with zero parking. If you want to keep parts of Seattle not upzoned - what you mean by "corridors" and "urban villages" - you need to make the remainder even more upzoned. Somewhere else we need a twelve story building just to keep that particular house a half duplex. If you insist on parking for the twelve story building, make it even taller. The half duplex is a nice house, but its not that nice a house. What might have worked: automatic upzoning that happens as real estate prices increase - zoning for 1 person per every \$50K of assessed land value, and a special tax on any parcel that has less occupied density than that, used to subsidize housing for everyone else. Let's not keep making the same mistakes over and over and hoping that this time will work out better.	6/29/2022
Benjamin Keller	A Seattle for People (Option 5++)	I worry every day about the friends who may move away because they can't afford to be here. Every day I miss the friends who begrudgingly quit searching for a home here and settled in cities/states far away. If people are the soul of a city, then Seattle is losing its soul. Not from the new buildings, but from the people who are forced to leave. Forced out by high housing costs and limited housing starts. This is why 5++ is the only route. We need a deep and broad increase in the zoned capacity of all residential lots. This means simplification of the code, expansion of the types of units that can be built, and increases to the densities legally allowed. We need to expand the opportunities for residents to live near transit. Many urban villages are far smaller than their natural walk-shed to transit. We need to include urban villages in more "exclusive" parts of Seattle that have seen little to no zoned capacity added. We need to make sure that more people can afford to live here and lead fulfilling lives.	6/29/2022
Christoph Strouse	Alternative 5 provides the diversity of approaches needed to address our growth	It would seem that the challenge(s) associated with implementing the combined approaches of Alternative 5 is knowing where to apply what type of housing and to what degree to achieve more equitable, affordable and complete communities. Therefore, updating exclusionary zoning and land use practices should be driven by racial equity analysis mapping, anti-displacement strategies and Equity & Climate Change Performance Metrics along with community driven feedback and other evaluation tools.	6/29/2022
Grant Gangi	Remove strict zoning codes, use common sense instead	Most of the US is unfortunately known for its strict zoning of commercial, residential, and industrial areas. It's like trying to fit a modern city plan into the SNES version of Sim City. Residential areas should allow low density/low impact commercial anywhere as long as it doesn't impact the neighborhood. This used to be how mainstreet was across the country, and still is the case for many cities around the world, so we know it works well and puts businesses closer to those who need them. Besides that, the height limits for certain areas (like Northgate and new light rail station areas) are way too low. We are already way behind the curve for housing, so why would we continue to limit density when we have the perfect opportunities to improve it (Northgate mall is still mostly parking lots, lets put some high rise buildings there while we still can). Of course this will require upgrading infrastructure such as sewage, drainage, electrical, etc, but it will be much harder to dig up later, might as well plan for it now since the city failed to plan for the current growth trends.	6/29/2022
Logan Bowers	Where are the numbers? Option 6?	It's very concerning there's no definition of the scale of the problem. How many homes are required? Over what time horizon? How fast do we need to build for prices to actually decline? Is it even possible to meet housing demand under some of these plans? My back-of-the-napkin math suggests even Option 5 is insufficient. Where is an option 6 that's even more supportive of housing needs?	6/29/2022
Logan Bowers	Family-suitable Housing?	Seattle's median age is 35, which means a huge number of residents need family-suitable housing now or within a few years. Specifically: * larger housing with 2 or 3 bedrooms, 700-2000sqft * one floor living — a 3+-story townhome doesn't cut it when parents are carrying kids around * level entry - not every family can afford an elevator building, but plenty need ground-floor level entry due to disability or strollers or other reasons.	6/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Aria Blair	Additional greenspace, and bikable, pedestrian streets.	I love alternative 5, but the thing that makes this city great for me is bikeable, walkable streets. Every penny spent here reduces traffic and it's ecological effects, without building a single new road. I would love to see more pedestrian only streets in combination with mixed use zoning, especially in places like the market and major main streets in various areas. The better the pedestrian and bike infrastructure is, the more people will use it instead of driving. Of course, in combination with increased investment into public transit. In just about every city I've been to that's done this, it has increased local business and made the inner city feel alive again. I think that in combination with abolishing SFH zoning, this will make the city green, livable, and sustainable.	6/29/2022
Bryce Kolton	More housing, more transit, more neighborhood access	We must build more housing in Seattle by upzoning every piece of residential land. The city has used restrictive, racially-rooted zoning practices for the better part of a century. As the planet warms, we must rethink our energy intensive single-family zones, and reduce auto-oriented development to ease our transition to a clean energy future. Electric cars are not here to save the planet; they're here to save the car industry. I am distraught every time one of my long-time friends moves away from Seattle due to a lack of affordable, family-sized housing. I feel for the people I know who are priced out of Seattle due to our artificially inflated housing costs. It is time for the city to upzone ALL of its available land and provide frequent transit. Cars do not have a place in our dense city cores and neighborhoods. We must take the decision to return our streets to the people and create vibrant urbanities. Their noise, light, air, and particulate pollution dramatically worsens life in our great city.	6/29/2022
Raine Serrano	Expand walkable areas	Above all else, the comprehensive plan should seek to add as much housing as possible, but it should do so in whatever way is most likely to get new residents out of their cars. The key to that is walkability, so the emphasis should be on expanding areas that are already walkable. Single-family zones next to existing urban centers in particular should be targeted. Queen Anne, Montlake, the east slope of capitol hill, Wallingford, the central district... all should be upzoned dramatically. Existing middle-density areas (like my home, between Broadway and the 15th ave corridor in capitol hill, the area just north of market in Ballard, and the top of Queen Anne) should be allowed to grow much taller. Thoughts on each option: Option 1 The insufficiency of our current growth strategy is evident in sky-high rents and home values. Single family homes will always be expensive in the city because land is scarce, but condos don't have to be; that they are is the consequence of poor planning. We must permit more kinds of housing to bring down rent and condo prices. Option 1 should be discounted and only studied as far as the law requires. Option 2 The smaller an urban village is, the less likely it is to get residents out of cars, since there are fewer amenities immediately available. I am concerned that creating small "hamlets" will not enable Seattle residents to abandon their cars the same way that expanding existing urban centers would. It troubles me that those two options (expanding existing centers and creating new ones) are not distinguished. Option 3 While this option will increase the housing stock, it is the worst approach under consideration that does so. It has the same problem as adding new, small hamlets, but worse: someone living in a sixplex in remote single-family areas will still need to drive. Option 4 Concentrating density near transit corridors only half solves car-dependency. Transit is not a drop-in substitute for walkability. If you have to take a bus every time you want to grab groceries or go to a pharmacy, you're much more likely to want a car. When density is stretched along transit corridors, only a thin strip of the areas a resident can walk to have amenities. If density is clustered in blobs instead of strips, walking becomes a more attractive option. Also, there's an air of prejudice about crowding renters along the loudest, most dangerous and polluted stretches of our city. Option 5 Pursuing all available options to increase the housing stock is clearly the only sane plan in Seattle right now, so I endorse option 5. However, the best	6/29/2022
Connor Descheemaker	Option 5 is the only option	With population growth incessantly outpacing housing growth, skyrocketing rents, and continual business growth, we must build more housing and commercial development everywhere. As a renter in Capitol Hill for the entire duration of my time in Seattle, we need more walkable neighborhoods, as these few corridors have been forced to bear the entire brunt of growth. It is truly abhorrent that we can experience so much growth and displacement, while leaving 70% of our land-mass untouched. That needs to end now. The climate crisis is only getting worse; displacement is only getting worse. The only way forward is option 5, which upzones the ENTIRE city, and ALSO concentrates growth in high-traffic corridors. We do not have enough housing options in our city, and a more walkable, accessible city is the only way forward with no land to annex, especially with the dire need to preserve open space (which does *not* include golf courses). Option 5, or Seattle will no longer be livable for anyone but the elite, who will have no one left in the city to serve them.	6/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Adam Lee	Housing, Transit, Go	More housing, everywhere. More transit, everywhere. More biking, more walking, more scootering, everywhere. No more cars, no more parking, no more single-family, no more waiting.	6/29/2022
Tom Smith	Housing, housing everywhere!	Answer (e) - All of the above. I will add to the growing consensus for Alternative 5. Every neighborhood needs to absorb additional housing units including the highest income single-family home ones (yeah, I'm looking at you Laurelhurst). Initially those higher income neighborhoods may have to be 'corridor' options since there are so few walkable services, including access to transit, deep into them, but they should not be exempt. I am all in on density, but Capitol Hill and the Central Area cannot possibly absorb all future growth and still retain parks and open spaces vital to the health and well-being of everyone. Also, high-income neighborhoods would greatly benefit from some income diversity to reinforce that we are all connected, and that low-income people are not invisible or inferior. Sometimes, they're just public-school teachers.	6/30/2022
Morgan Gold	Option 5 but timelines needed	As this concerns Environmental Impact Studies how does the City plan to perform studies on each and every parcel in Seattle? Can see how options 2 and 4 could be mapped and EIS work performed as those are known quantities found on a map but where do you even start for option 3? Maybe if owners were required to do them as a condition of a rezone that might work. But to study all parcels and have reports done in a timely fashion seems impossible and would delay housing for years. We need housing now!	6/30/2022
Tim Hughes	Option 5 is the best option	Population growth and demand for services has far outpaced housing and infrastructure development in the past decade plus. Housing and infrastructure need to catch up, and ideally get ahead of the next decade or more of growth.	6/30/2022
Justin Clark	130th/145th EIS alternatives	I'm very excited that the EIS is being performed for the 130th/145th station areas, however, it would be EXTREMELY unwise and short-sighted to not explicitly include redevelopment option(s) of the Jackson Golf Course within one of the alternatives being investigated. Investigating this option does not mean it's going to happen - it shows the City is performing it's due diligence in using it's land to the highest and best use for it's citizens. It will allow the city to explicitly show the hurdles that need to be addressed to realize development (or alternative uses) on this park land instead of just dismissing it outright. This needs to be explored and the EIS is the forum to explore it. We are investing HUGE funds in these station areas so we need the land use to morph to meet the investment and make these station areas vibrant hubs of life, culture, and opportunity. The huge public asset in this area needs to be leveraged to achieve this.	6/30/2022
Rich Koehler	Study the environmental impacts of each alternative on livability	Unlike most comments here, mine is actually about scoping. Seattle's previous initiatives under it's Comprehensive Plan and its ill-formed "HALA" initiative emphasized development handouts while ignoring impacts on everyday life and health. As a result the city's infrastructure has been strained, public safety has worsened, pollution/trash has worsened, and the aesthetics, tree cover, and general livability in Seattle have declined. The comp plan must study these issues deeply along with each alternative. Examples include: (1) how growth policy affects, or is affected by, urban camping and the use of RVs as residences. For example, where will such activities take place in each alternative, and what will the effects be on public safety, environmental damage, and health; (2) how each alternative impacts access to parks and open space. The study should treat backyard space as open space, as it can be utilized by kids and residents for recreation in addition to parks. Benchmark open space and park access in Seattle's future to Seattle's past and also other major cities, so that we can see where we stand. Use benchmarks of acres per resident citywide and also acres per resident within their 10-minute walk shed; (3) how each alternative affects tree coverage; (4) how the impacts of clusters of growth that result from each alternative create highly localized impacts on the immediate area (e.g. transportation, sewer overloads) and what policies, such as developer impact fees, could be used to fund offsetting improvements in those areas; (5) for Alternative 5 specifically, whether the developer community will likely respond with distributed growth or whether they would concentrate their investments in small geographic areas anyway, thereby creating de facto urban villages but without the intentional planning and the mitigations that the other options afford; (6) how local residents would influence and contribute their knowledge of their local areas to growth activities to ensure that Seattle has unique and diverse micro-areas rather than a universal bland top-down aesthetic. Neighborhood plans were more effective than top-down mandates for example. (7) in areas with larger development capacities (e.g. RC-55+) how the use of incentive zoning can create a more attractive and diverse building footprint. Such as allowing taller but narrower buildings. (8) actually study how the construction of multifamily buildings without parking requirements affects automobile ownership by their residents, and where those residents park their cars,	6/30/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Shannon Sandin	Option 5 - pull all levers for housing	We need more housing. Period. We should be pulling every lever available instead of lurching in reactionary fits and starts. Option 5 is the best available choice.	6/30/2022
Annamarie Murphy Jiwa	Option 5	Option 5 is the only acceptable option.	6/30/2022
Ben Capodanno	Support Option 5+	Seattle needs more housing and more government commitment to building it. Option 5 is the most aligned with those goals.	6/30/2022
Alex Frederick	Option 5 is the best	We need more housing but not more sprawl. Build up! Choose option 5!	6/30/2022
Cameron Otsuka	Adding and Improving EIS Metrics	Some additional metrics and measures that I don't think have been considered within the draft performance metrics document I read: * Mood: You could turn this into a measurable by using hedonic comps between neighborhoods, willingness to pay, etc. * Heat: A modification/addition to the heat metric that includes the transportation paths that are used as well, not just the residences. * Mobility (for Vehicle, Bike, and Walking): Adding a measure of access to a school + grocery store + park (or some neighborhood amenity) within a 15 minute, 30 minute, 45 minute distance. Additionally, option 5 from the plan concepts seems to be the only one that would really address some core issues faced by Seattle. I think additional options that go further than option 5 would be best, either adding to the current options or replacing concepts 3 and 4 with new ones.	6/30/2022
Chidozie Nwobilor	Option 5 keep Seattle Alive!	Good news, people want to live here bad news is where? We need to build for current and future residents	6/30/2022
Christy Avery	Issues to focus on in the EIS	Please include in the EIS: * Tree and permeable space loss and how it relates to rising temps in the city. * Park space and services for the increased population. How will the city provide fire, police, park land, etc for the expected new population? * Pedestrian safety. The increased density and the rise of delivery services, Uber, etc have meant more cars on the road, and more driving on residential streets to avoid stoplights and meet delivery goals. How will this be mitigated as the city grows? * Second hand smoke and toxic scents from dryer vents: How will the city ensure that these carcinogens will not impact residents as density increases? * Traffic noise and pollution. If we can expect more vehicles as the population grows, whether these are owned by residents or they are Ubers, commuters coming to work in the city, etc, how will we mitigate the noise and air pollution?	6/30/2022
Douglas Kilpatrick	Allow moar housing. More housing more now.	While I'd prefer to literally allow building anything dense anywhere any ugly, the closest of the alternatives here is alternative five. Seattle is in desperate need of more housing. Housing costs are causing homelessness, and hurting out city. The only way out is through density. High density. Very high density. We need to build more housing. We need to build more housing until house prices tank. We need to build more housing until single-family homes are valued for their land only. We need to build more housing until landlord investors sell because there is obviously no scarcity. Build moar housing more now. Option 5.	6/30/2022
Courtland Allen	Alternative #5 is the right amount of ambition	We're short on housing and alternative 5 looks to be much closer to the level of housing that we need in this city. I want Seattle to be an equitable place for everyone.	7/1/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Patrick Taylor	Option 5 is the minimum Seattle should do	I am writing to support the inclusion of a robust version of option 5 in the EIS scoping. Seattle has been suffering from a severe lack of housing for years now with the city taking little or no action. This has resulted in a radical increase in residents living on the street, being displaced out of the city and the state, and housing cost burdens where folks are spending huge portions of their incomes on housing. This is both unsustainable and unacceptable. We are clearly on the road to the radical levels of unaffordability seen in the Bay area. By including a robust alternative in the scoping that allows for both the production of housing to accommodate future growth as well as make up for past under production we have an opportunity to build enough housing to bend the cost curve and provide places for everyone who wants to be in the city to live. Option 5 also supports our climate and transportation goals by increasing density which makes transit, walking, and biking viable as daily forms of transportation. To further these goals and support the vision of the 15 minute city, the options should include allowing greater commercial activity throughout the neighborhoods. The city should also recognize the unpredictable and provide for the flexibility to accommodate greater growth than predicted and allow new neighborhood nodes to develop rather than simply reinforcing what already exists.	7/1/2022
Ron Davis	Option 6+++	Seattle's best neighborhoods have great schools, parks, amenities, and transit. They offer incredible opportunities for everyone, most notably for improving the long term life prospects for poor children, (as shown by Raj Chetty of Harvard), in the rare case that we let them in. Unfortunately, the wealthy have hoarded these neighborhoods to themselves by building impregnable regulatory walls around them, refusing to let housing supply keep up with demand, while also refusing to pay for subsidized housing and displacement relief at a scale that can reach those the market will never serve in an in-demand city. We've also made the problem worse by embracing the lump-of-traffic fallacy and pretending our engineering choices have nothing to do with how much people drive, and then spending billions increasing automobile throughput and on parking minimums and all sorts of other absurdities like parking garages by Sound Transit stations. This scars the neighborhoods that do house the working class with pollution, vehicular violence, noise, and a lack of greenspace. The solution requires the kind of ambition Seattle's businesses are famous for, with the kind of long-term view and interest in justice that tends to be lacking among them. Housing and Neighborhoods Regarding the zoning questions raised by the comp plan alternates: * Alternate 5 is the only acceptable alternate, but it should be treated as a bare minimum floor. * Abolish the country club zoning that currently blankets and smothers our city. Allow small apartment buildings in all zones, including at least 8 or 12-plexes. If you are reticent, notice the many gorgeous 8 and 12 and 16 and 20 unit buildings on Capitol Hill, which sit nicely alongside single family homes. They don't ruin the character of the neighborhood; they enhance it. Make rowhouses and stacked flats easy to build. If that sounds too ambitious, visit Georgetown or Beacon Hill or Montreal or Amsterdam and learn that beautiful cities are routinely much more dense than Seattle. Lot sizes should be able to be much smaller. * Drastically expand the more intensive urban footprint that is currently locked up in our tiny urban villages. That way we don't confine opportunities for change to small places, forcing a few neighborhoods to change overnight while the rest remain stuck in amber. Allow minimum densities of 50 units per acre in all 15 minute walksheds of frequent transit, and 100+ units units per acre within a ten minute walk, and significantly more in core urban areas (e.g.,	7/1/2022
Jac Fitzgerald	Environmental considerations must consider effects outside city boundaries	Every housing unit not built in Seattle is built in the surrounding cities and suburbs instead. Every square mile of extra sprawling development increases the commute distance of residents and contributes directly to the worsening air and water quality of Seattle residents. It paves over greenspace and reduces the available habitat for native plants and animals. It adds miles of pipes and wires to deliver utilities, capital spending that could go to infrastructure upgrades in existing residential areas, and miles of road to stretch the capacity of public transit. Residents become displaced not only through the destruction of their home, but also when the area they live in fails to offer the support and amenities they need at new stages of life - just as children grow up and leave rural areas with no jobs, in Seattle they grow up and leave the city with no housing. When their parents grow old and no longer want to maintain a house and yard alone, they are locked out of the neighborhood they have spent their lives in by the lack of multi-residential housing. We should be thinking about how we can make it possible for residents to live here through all stages of life - and also encourage developers and incoming migrants to choose Seattle over Redmond and Everett, by offering them all the benefits of a real metropolis. Seattle is a city, and we should aim to grow as a city, not a collection of sparsely inhabited neighborhoods divided by dense strips of lower income families and minorities renting apartments above arterial traffic. It has long been the population and financial center of King County, Puget Sound and even Washington. We should not be making tentative plans for a slow increase in housing while Tacoma or Bellevue or Carnation leapfrog us and suburban development blankets the region; we should be looking at successful global cities for inspiration on how to become one.	7/1/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Zach Nehrenberg	Expressing Support for Option 5 and beyond	In the past year, the city reported a growth of over 20,000 residents. If that growth we're continue, the size of the city would double in 25 years. As it stands today, Seattle does not have nearly enough housing stock to support all of the new residents. Moreover it has lagged in housing for years. Allowing upzone across the whole city and allowing for more dense housing everywhere is desperately needed. All areas of the city should support small services such as smaller apartment buildings and corner stores. This would drastically increase the walk ability of the neighborhood residential areas. Additionally, transit corridors should be heavily upzoned. Anything within a 10 minute walk of a light rail station should allow for dense urban development with no parking minimums.	7/1/2022
Max Baker	Option 5 is the clear best option	We are seeing rent rises, home prices rising, and gentrification caused by a lack of available housing. The best way to combat these problems is through building so much housing that we have a surplus and prices start to drop. We also need to encourage mixed use zoning so residents are able to walk and bike to their local stores and rely less on car based transportation.	7/1/2022
Ryan Driscoll	Support for Option Five including an expansion of each component	I want to express my support for Option Five in addition to the following ideas on how to expand the examination of each component part as laid out in options 2-4. * Explore expanding the zoning particularly around light rail and other transit hubs to include midrise to 18-story buildings. * Expand the range of up-zoning options across the city beyond triplexes and quadplexes. * Examine the barriers to the creation of entry-level condos (such as the insurance requirements) and make recommendations on updates that would allow for the constructions of more entry-level housing for people making 80%-120% AMI. * Broaden the transit area corridors to a 15-minute walk range around corridors to spread out the more concentrated growth. * Anticipate MORE growth rather than less in population. One of the biggest failures of the last plan was underestimating growth. We need to make up for lost time and aim much larger.	7/1/2022
Trevor Reed	Option 5 +	Alternative 2 should study adding highrise and midrise zoning. Alternative 3 should study a wider range of missing middle housing types rather than just triplexes and fourplexes. Alternative 4 should study significant upzones in a broad area around transit corridors. Alternative 5 should seek to quantify the impact to the housing affordability crisis. Maximize housing opportunities near planned light rail stations. We need more than just 5. We need to explore high density sustainable development and alternative development methods like those found in Freiburg, Germany via Baugruppen (group build), social housing like in Vienna, or development programs like those in Singapore. The Code needs to be DRASTICALLY simplified and the review process shifted to be right. The code and review process currently binds creativity and biases towards what's been approved before. We can't legislate/prescribe taste since that's purely subjective. The role of the City is to prescribe standards. Let's make them high, transparent, and objective, then get out of the way and start building homes! The most energy, space, and cost-efficient construction are boxes. It's why every great city is populated by them. Barcelona's iconic Eixample district is literally a grid filled with them. There's beauty in function and making the City a place all can afford while reducing the energy intensity of the built environment is better than what any code can prescribe. We need the freedom to build in any appearance. It's what Freiburg does. Allowing a range of forms and facades creates both prettier and uglier buildings, but the diversity in the composition itself creates a sense of place and beauty. Nothing is uglier than prescribed monotony.	7/1/2022
Kenneth Clark	More owner occupied high density housing and yes option 5.	We need to build more high density owner occupied housing. All the units being built near the transit stations are rental units owned by out of state investment firms. There are no condos being built near Columbia city or Roosevelt light rail station. So you either by a 2 million dollar home or you rent. That's not right!! There needs to be some mechanism in these proposals to make sure these units are not all for out of state investors. They need to be owner occupied. NO AIRBNB!!!! New development in Vancouver is almost all condos in Seattle its almost all apartments. Here is an article on why that is https://www.kuow.org/stories/why-are-condos-in-seattle-so-rare-and-expensive .	7/2/2022
David Sundine	Option 5 is the only option	We need to be building a variety of housing types across the entire city. The entire city needs to be upzoned. Option 5 is the only viable option presented. That said, it is the bare minimum we should be doing.	7/3/2022
Adam Cornille	Option 5, 130th Now	Option 5 is what we need to address housing and create a community-driven Seattle. 130th should be given the support it needs to stick to the 2025 timeline, and not waste money and time with reviews.	7/4/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
A C	Another voice for Option 5	Option 5 is, as someone else stated, the least we can do as a city. It's incredible to me that there are still people opposed to upzoning in Seattle. The only way to meet housing demand and build a sustainable city for the future is to increase density. Allow more commercial space on ground floors in residential areas as well- this will reduce congestion and make neighborhoods more vibrant, dynamic, and community-oriented - rather than just a place to sleep. It's time we stop running Seattle as if it's 1970 and it's just a suburb for Boeing employees. If Seattle is to live up to the ideal of a world-class, progressive city, we need density, we need walkability, we need mixed-use development. Seattle is likely to become a refuge from climate change, so population can only be expected to go up. Instead of catering to people who want to remain in the 20th century, let's prepare for the 21st century.	7/4/2022
Adam Hantzis	Alternative #5 Gives us the chance at a diverse, affordable future in Seattle	Looking carefully over the five listed alternatives... it seems that #5 is the only common sense answer that offers us a future where Seattle can be lived in and enjoyed by people who don't just make six figure paychecks.	7/4/2022
J D	Seattle needs a combined approach	Alternative 5 is the best path forward. Seattle must allow for more diverse housing city-wide. For a growing city of our size, we are currently hobbled by overly restrictive zoning that only allows for single family housing over far too much of the city. These restrictions exacerbate the housing, affordability, and inequality crises and they stifle diversity, both racial and socioeconomic. The city is has grown and continues to grow and must be allowed to expand. Seattle must be affordable for all of the people who live and work here. It's wrong to expect the people who staff the grocery stores and make our morning coffees to commute two hours because they can't afford to live here. Obviously, there are logistical and practical reasons to focus development in existing major corridors and urban villages. Those same reasons call for creating new urban villages and smaller nodes as the city expands. But we also need more options city wide. This is why Seattle must take a combined approach (Alternative 5). I understand that homeowners may be understandably concerned with how changes to their neighborhoods may affect them, especially as it pertains to noise and crime and property values. But our housing supply crisis cannot be solved just from building more housing in high density areas that are already saturated. Seattle cannot be allowed to continue on the trajectory where it is becoming a mono-culture of wealthy people only. That's demonstrably bad for all of us. We have to be good neighbors for each other and that means that we have to take common sense approaches to increasing housing supply, decreasing housing costs, making home/condo ownership more affordable, and improving racial and socioeconomic diversity.	7/4/2022
David Moehring	Options 3 and 5 result in local heat islands and enhance climate change	We need urban planning that not only achieved additional density, but also combats climate change and accommodates natural habitats with land for maturing tree canopy. Only Conceptual Alternatives #2 and #4 would allow Seattle to increase its urban forest canopy cover to the 2035 Seattle Comprehensive Plan 30-percent canopy cover goal. Alternatives #3 and #5 would mathematically reduce Seattle's canopy cover to just 15-percent rather than 30-percent. Alternatives 3 and 5, however, do provide the most revenues to the City of Seattle and the real estate investment firms. See quick calcs from the 2016 Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment. All frequent-transit station locations - including that at interbay in 2040 - are the places where alternatives 2 and 4 may be embellished with adequate infrastructure and parking provisions for at least 75% of the residential units based on commuter and Seattle Times statistics.	7/4/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Evin Fairchild	I support Option 5	I grew up in Seattle but have since moved north to Lynnwood, but I really think Seattle absolutely must increase their density. Its population has increased by 200,000 over the past 20 years with no signs of this trend stopping, but we haven't zoned our city to accommodate that level of growth, so this has resulted in housing prices steadily increasing over the past decade. This in turn affects the suburbs, as people who are priced out of housing in Seattle proper have to go into the suburbs to find cheaper housing, increasing housing costs in the suburbs, which in turn pushes people further and further away from the city, and so on. As a result, traffic gets worse on our roads as people have to drive farther to get to work, and it is bad for the environment and increases CO2 emissions in a time where it is imperative to make every effort to reduce carbon emissions. Also, with more people being priced out of housing, there are more homeless people on our streets. If housing costs so much, how can these people possibly get back on their feet again and back into a decent home if it's so hard to afford housing in the first place? The homeless problem in Seattle is a symptom of a much greater problem: not enough housing available for people to live in. The way to solve this is simple: allow denser housing to be built on every square inch of land within the Seattle city limits! Currently, on the majority of Seattle's land, you're only allowed to build an expensive single-family home. This may be okay for a city out in the suburbs, but it is absolutely unacceptable for a city that is the heart of the Puget Sound region. It needs to be legal to build housing that is at least as dense as four-plexes everywhere in the city. Due to the laws of supply and demand, having more housing will result in housing being more affordable, and will solve the housing crisis our region is currently experiencing. So I support Option 5, which will be a mix of all the other options, and will give property owners the most freedom to build what they want on their own property. There should be greater density allowed all over the city, even more density along frequent transit corridors, and even more density in urban villages. The city needs to do everything it possibly can to attack the housing crisis with as much dedication as we did with dealing with COVID. Also, please don't listen to the NIMBYs who don't want their neighborhoods changing from predominantly single-family to a slightly higher density. If they don't like that the city needs to have higher densities, then they can	7/4/2022
Alex Kochanik	Demand is high - Build more housing!	There is so much opportunity in Seattle. We should build more homes so more people can afford to live here. I support Alternative 5	7/4/2022
Bernardo Chuecos	Seattle needs option 5	Option 5 will be the most sustainable. We need more and denser housing everywhere, not just in Capitol Hill and Ballard. If we want to really make a dent in the housing shortage and make the city more livable, walkable, accessible and environmentally sustainable the entire city needs to be upzoned.	7/4/2022
Tyler Quinn-Smith	Option 5 or bust!	Thank you, OPCD, for laying out these options and for igniting a long-overdue conversation about upzoning. Option 5 is the only path forward, but please push the envelope and do more! We must pair alternative #5 with design review reform (or elimination), elimination of parking requirements, reduction of minimum lot sizes, and MHA recalibration to not penalize small developers. Also include building/zoning reform to ease the internal subdivision of existing large single-family homes and rethink our system of alleyways to enable denser and more interesting human-scale minor streets with inner-block housing and small commercial spaces.	7/5/2022
John Lestina	Option 5, especially when combined with policies to reduce car usage	Car usage and the infrastructure that supports it is the biggest environmental detriment to inhabitants of cities. Cars are loud, produce noxious gas & particulates, require large spaces of impermeable blocks of asphalt to support their use, and are a leading cause of death for those under 54. Option 5 provides the city with the best path forward to reduce car usage among residents, when paired with strategies to reduce car usage such as [reducing on-street parking, and making residential streets a throughway only for bikes/pedestrians] (which results in more community gardens/parks/green space; reducing the need for private yards), and allowing more mixed use development (which allows people to open a business on their property, take trips closer to their house, and thereby lowering VMT per resident). This is not to unnecessarily restrict the movement of mobility impaired people; there are a variety of options (Such as Santa cars in bicycle lanes) that still reduce the negative environmental impacts of cars while addressing the needs of residents. Option 5 also produces the most equitable results, allowing housing to be cheaper (Compared to no changes in zoning policy) in the region.	7/5/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Liam Alancheril	Alternative 5 Please	Seattle is not a finished product. We cannot allow neighborhoods to stay stagnant while we have an opportunity to increase the social, environmental, and economic health of the city. The greatest cities in the world thrive on density and robust public transit. Choosing Alternative 5 will be an important step in guiding Seattle to that status. New zones should be modeled after the Land Use Zones system used in Japan which specify a maximum allowable nuisance in a each zone, rather than segregating residences, shops, offices, services, and schools.	7/5/2022
Bryan Kirschner	5 is the minimum; 1, 2, and 4 perpetuate environmental racism	Option five is the only option presented here that does the minimum necessary to address affordability, climate change, and racial equity. However, option five should be the "floor" rather than the "ceiling" and additional options that go further should be developed. Options one, two, and four should be dismissed because they perpetuate the segregation and environmental racism caused by the 1990s neighborhood planning process. As documented in the 2017 City of Seattle and Seattle Housing Authority Joint Assessment of Fair Housing: [H]ouseholders of color, particularly Black householders and Hispanic householders, are less likely to own their home.... [W]ith some exceptions, persons of color disproportionately live in areas of the city with zoning for multifamily housing or "commercial" zoning (which allows a combination of multifamily housing and commercial uses). In Seattle, this housing is primarily located along, or otherwise in proximity to, major roadways. Within a 200-meter radius of T-1 and T-2 roadways, roadways that carry an average annual gross tonnage of more than 4 million, the noise and air pollution impacts are most acute. Despite representing only 21% of Seattle land area and 19% of the total population, 40% of the miles of T-1 and T-2 roadways are in the areas with the highest population of our most affected classes. This means that people in protected classes are more likely to be living with exposure to acute noise and air pollution coming from high truck traffic roadways... Research is conclusive living in close proximity to major roads has adverse health impacts: Traffic pollution causes asthma attacks in children, and may cause a wide range of other effects including: the onset of childhood asthma, impaired lung function, premature death and death from cardiovascular diseases, and cardiovascular morbidity. The area most affected, they concluded, was roughly 0.2 to 0.3 miles (300 to 500 meters) from the highway [or other major road]. Living near major roadways is linked to higher incidence of dementia, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, and multiple sclerosis. The disparate impact of roadway pollution exposure and by extension health impacts of people of color is contrary to the city of Seattle's stated equity goal of being a city in which "African American, Latinos and Native Americans can expect to live as long as white people." "Zoning in" apartments to close proximity to major roadways while prohibiting it in areas away from major roadways perpetuates this inequity. This is all the more urgent	7/5/2022
Woody Wheeler	Housing in former mall spaces?	The city should look closely at malls around the city, including Northgate, Southgate and the Aurora former Sears Mall to see if there are opportunities to build housing on these sites. They have all the infrastructure needed, are on transit corridors, have shopping and other amenities. I also recommend that building housing for the homeless should be top priority instead of the market-rate housing which is currently being built everywhere.	7/6/2022
Bradley Meacham	Option 5 and More	Seattle desperately needs housing everywhere, not just in a few cores and along corridors. We've tried that approach and it's insufficient. Cities can and should evolve. Now is Seattle's chance to become a more equitable and sustainable place for more people to live. Option 5 is clearly the best here, but we really should go further. There's no reason we can't have additional residential development throughout the city. This would bring clear benefits for everyone: more tax base, more dynamism, more demand for community business, meaningful contribution to curbing sprawl and helping the climate crisis. Please be bold!	7/6/2022
Lynn Gottlieb	Options 3 & 5	Either option 3 or option 5 would work for me. I am concerned because it looks like multi-story SFD and townhouses would be difficult for people with mobility disabilities. They probably don't include street level entrances and residential elevators that can be accessed from corridors from the front door, back/side door/garage. Dumbwaiters are also extremely useful from garage level to upper floors.	7/6/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Neel Blair	End Exclusionary Zoning and De-Prioritize Cars	I am a 4th-generation Seattleite, who grew up in a single family home in Seattle, mostly driving around the city, and now lives in a single family home in Seattle, with less driving. Single-family-only zoning needs to end completely. Options for types of housing need to expand considerably. Zoning rules need to allow for more affordable and more types of multi-family housing to be built. More of the city must be opened to storefronts as well, as small-business rents are as out of control as housing costs. Car-first and car-mostly infrastructure needs to be massively curtailed. Cars make all public and private spaces worse - louder, more hostile, dirtier, more polluted, less appealing. We need to stop subsidizing cars. End parking minimums. Take car lanes and give them to transit-only, bike-and-walk-only, or public/business spaces like the outdoor eating spaces built during the pandemic. Parking lots are ugly, dead spaces returning minimal value. Reduce their number and size by allowing more active space, residential space, or business space to take over.	7/6/2022
Andrew Roberts	Strong growth needs aggressive expansion - Pursue EIS Alternative 5	Seattle is in the midst of a period of enormous growth in prosperity that has outpaced all previous and current estimates for job growth and regional population growth. The 2035 Comprehensive Plan expected 115K jobs over 20 years from 2015-2035, yet Seattle has achieved 102K in just 5 years (according to Puget Sound Regional Council). Even the One Seattle Plan's estimate of 132K jobs in 20 years seems grossly pessimistic. With the city gaining an average of 20K jobs each year from '15 to '20, we need to be prepared to build to a city ready to absorb closer to 400K new jobs over the next 20 years! With those jobs come new households seeking to find a home in our city and we need to be ready to absorb them while providing relief to current residents suffering from rising rents and outrageous home prices. The only way to address our current and future housing scarcity is to provide full support of city-wide upzones and broad-based endorsements of density that do away with the old notion of single-family neighborhoods and narrow transit-corridor development. Abolishing single-family zones and permitting 4- and 6-plex housing types city-wide should be just the first step in our effort to transform Seattle into a place that embraces the prosperity and growth we've been blessed with. Only Alternative 5 out of the all the EIS scopes comes anywhere close to considering the level of development we need. Please do not squander this opportunity to meet the challenge of our booming economy head-on!	7/6/2022
Matthew Higgins	Upzone Laurelhurst	Allow duplexes in Laurelhurst.	7/6/2022
David Moehring	Planning for BOTH density and 30% tree canopy cover	Tree canopy and increased density are mutually achievable. Why are so many suggesting that the urban forest has no merit. Look at newer denser cities in China and Singapore and the Seattle 2016 Tree Canopy Assessment which references the minimum tree canopy goals for each of the zoning Manag Units including multifamily and commercial and industrial areas of Seattle. Mathematically, we can only achieve half of the 30% canopy cover goal if no significant trees are planned on private land. Work together and plan smart to combat local climate change as Seattle is not an environmental wasteland. 4 minute video explains.	7/6/2022
Michael Roberto	I support Alternative 5!	Hello, I'm very supportive of a combined approach that puts as many options as possible for growing the housing stock in Seattle. Alternative 5 best supports this, and Alternative 3 is next best in my opinion. Thank you for the work you've put into this, I know it'll be a busy 2 years finishing this up but I love the work so far! Michael	7/6/2022
Maia Mares	I support option 5	I believe very strongly that Seattle needs to rapidly increase the housing available and housing options available to residents of this city. I would like to see more affordable housing, more duplexes etc available across the city, and more varied development. I would love to see more diversity in the types of housing available - in addition to duplexes and triplexes and housing like that, wouldn't it be cool to see more live/work options, so that people can run small businesses out of a shop in front of their home? I love the legacy shops that are like that, such as the Volunteer Park Cafe and some corner shops and restaurants in the Central District, and would love if that could be an option for residents in Seattle to build going forward. I believe that would bring so much vibrance and life into the city. Option 5 is the only option presented here that I believe will repair past impacts of inequitable housing policy and move Seattle to where it should be housing-wise. I support Option 5 and believe that all other options are too little, too late in terms of correcting past housing injustices and bringing Seattle to where it needs to be in terms of housing.	7/6/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Brent Silver	Alternative 5 with targets	<p>Please prioritize the EIS where you can get the most bang for your buck. To that end: 1) Study EIS for apartment buildings on transportation routes and in newly proposed expanded Urban Village boundaries. Economies of scale will yield a more affordable end product if you allow larger (12+ units per lot) in these areas. 2) Study EIS for multi-family housing on all corner lots. This will give you an exact number of parcels to study and rezoning these will only directly impact one neighbor. This is a good way to get the foot of multi-family into the single family door. More can come later but this seems a good way to get the ball rolling. 3) Rezoning everything as folks seem to think #5 does would likely result in accelerated gentrification as lower priced homes, rentals, corporate owned, etc. would be targeted by developers. To combat this it might be a good idea to allow only owner occupied properties to initiate a rezone. This would help the little gal/guy realize a return on their investment rather than the parasitic developers who ruin everything they touch. Best of luck to you as you have an important, complicated task to tackle.</p>	7/6/2022
Ryan Lorey	Option 5 & NE 130th St Station Area	<p>Option 5 is clearly the best. This option must be paired with the following: * Update zoning code to favor single-loaded corridors. Most new apartments have double-loaded corridors (one apartment on each side of the hallway). This leads to poor air flow and limits access to sunlight since only one side of the unit has windows (or two if it's on the corner), decreasing quality of life for the residents. To keep potential count of units the same as allowed with current zoning laws, the height limits should be raised accordingly. No one buying a single-family home or townhouse would be satisfied with windows on only one side of the unit, and we shouldn't settle for that with condos/apartments, either. * Improve transportation facilities to encourage more active transportation (walking, biking, rolling) and transit usage, and lower car usage. * Mitigate impacts along the densest corridors. Currently I live along 15th Ave NE in the Pinehurst/Olympic Hills area, and the noise pollution is unbearable. I cannot open my windows (a necessity in the warmer summer months) without being inundated with noise from car and truck traffic from outside. I'm certain the noise pollution is consistently above the recommended sustained noise level set by the WHO. We don't take noise pollution seriously enough in Seattle. Additionally, we need to mitigate safety concerns and air pollution exposure. Car traffic is too heavy along arterials, and it doesn't mix well with high population. We need to reduce the car traffic/improve traffic safety on all arterials, which would also address air pollution. * Remove design review. It just makes housing more expensive for little to no benefit. If there are any things design review does currently that we as a city want to keep, put it in the zoning code and make it administrative instead of discretionary to make development costs more predictable and consistent. I live near the NE 130th St Station area, and that whole neighborhood needs to be rezoned for 6-8 story apartments anywhere within 1/2 mile (minimum) of the station to make the most of the expensive investment there.</p>	7/6/2022
Tina Cohen	In favor of EIS Alternative 2	<p>This alternative appears to save the most trees.</p>	7/7/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Shane Dombrowski	Embrace Alternative 5 for Seattle's Future	We are so incredibly far behind in allowing a diversity of housing. Alternative 5 is what Seattle needed 40 years ago, but the next best time to implement it is now. Allowing citizens the freedom and liberty to build what they want gives citizens the opportunity to live/work where they want. We'd get a variety of uses, affordability, locations, density, etc. like a true traditional city. Alternative 5 also opens up the city to equal investment and housing. It is not fair or equitable to restrict all new mixed-use building along our urban village corridors. These corridors are often choked with traffic, loud, harmful to physical/mental health, uninviting to people outside vehicles, etc. By forcing all new development to small slivers of the city, we end up with single-family homes next to massive apartment blocks. It also doesn't help affordability when 80+% of the city remains zoned for single-family homes only. That's not natural nor is it fair to new residents. It's not even fair to current residents who want to have a neighborhood storefront or duplex conversion! Ultimately, Seattle shouldn't be in the business of restricting opportunity and freedom with exclusionary zoning. We should look to our city to be expanding opportunity, affordability, and traditional neighborhood building. Those things are what made this city so great to begin with! Embracing exclusionary zoning is not how we build a human-scale, economically resilient, and future-ready city. We need to let people build, live, and work where they want. The most vibrant and enjoyable areas of the city are traditionally built; many of our favorite buildings are non-conforming with the modern land use code and could never be built today. It's time to move past and embrace Alternative 5 to allow a variety of housing for a variety of future residents. This also helps us to begin achieving our climate goals and Vision Zero. With more mixed use and a variety of housing, there is less dependency on automobile trips within the city. More trips can be completed by walking, rolling, or transit. This encourages the use of those modes, which encourages more mixed-use development, which encourages more transit funding, and so on. This is the cycle we need to embrace to achieve our climate and sustainability goals. Land use and transportation are two sides of the same coin; by embracing one we'll embrace the other. It also simply creates a safer human-scale city. Alternative 5 helps us get there in the longterm. Finally, Alternative 5 can be done while preserving tree canopy if we truly want to. Plenty of other	7/7/2022
Cody Davis	Option 1 is best	I agree with this comment "We are allowing affordable housing to be torn down and replaced by expensive junk. All citizens deserve to have a choice of housing models, including those who prefer single family homes. Those folks appear to be moving out further to be able to access that choice; they are being chased out by people who appear to believe that tearing down and rebuilding Seattle as a place where only small, dense dwellings are available will somehow moderate prices. I don't believe that's true; it hasn't worked so far, and it's left people with choices of closets for their dwellings where it has been built. The idea that people will live in these things and not drive has also been disproven by the traffic. One only need drive through neighborhoods where no parking has been required to see the streets narrowed to near impassibility due to parked cars. Leave the urban villages for those who like to live that way, but don't expand them and don't create more. At some point we have to come to the realization that our city has reached and exceeded its carrying capacity and resume considering what quality of life we are creating and perpetuating. As a native, I am shocked and sickened by the changes taking place: while we have a fantastic selection of things to do and places to visit, we cannot easily access them, and we have to be willing to suffocate in the crowds. There is little peace left here now. For the newcomers that think they have a better idea, please consider why you came here: was it to replicate what you left, or to enjoy something different and beautiful? It's time to stop what we're doing to Seattle and allow us all to catch our breath and regain some elbow room."	7/7/2022
Jamie Swedler	Option 5, or more	Option 5 should be a starting point, and we should go up from there. We additionally need to allow small commercial uses interspersed through residential zones with plenty of space for non-automotive uses, as well as frequent transit throughout the city to encourage car-free lifestyles. Plans should allow more dense housing outside of busy arterial streets. Otherwise we're relegating people who can't afford detached houses or townhomes to more polluted areas with dangerous pedestrian environments.	7/7/2022
Jamie Swedler	130th/145th station areas: transit oriented housing, not transit oriented golf	The Jackson Park golf course should be replaced with dense housing and neighborhood commercial spaces, interspersed with real park land. While a golf course is technically "green space," it is unnaturally maintained with non-native grasses and chemicals, harming the biodiversity of the area. If a public golf course counts as "park land" in the eyes of the park preservation ordinance, Seattle Parks should use eminent domain to acquire one of our city's private golf courses as replacement, paying the assessed taxable value of the land. If Broadmoor believes their golf course is worth <\$10 million for tax purposes, then surely that would be the fair price for which to purchase it.	7/7/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Iskra Johnson	What is missing in these plans is the option to keep Seattle small	None of the plans offered engages with the question of what makes Seattle SEATTLE and how do we define and keep the desirable qualities of this city. The conversations around the planning always assume exponential growth, and the assumption that it must be accommodated. Always, the threat that if we don't "accommodate" the city will become unaffordable and unlivable -- which is exactly what is happening under the current period of exponential growth, under policies the 5 plans simply suggest we continue in varying degrees. What is ignored is that city policies and upzoning CREATE THE GROWTH. The city did not have to upzone South Lake Union or the University District for suburban-sized tech and medical campuses. But they did. The plan for the University District is for 40,000 more jobs. Why? Who said Seattle needs 40,000 more jobs in fields that pay highly and will contribute to competition for scarce housing? The City Council and the University of Washington said we did, and they made growth happen, with Rob Johnson ramming through even more additional upzoning at the last minute against the wishes of the majority of his constituents. When environmentalists discuss plastic waste they now stress that recycling is the last resort: it is far more important to stop the packaging from being made in the first place. The same principle applies to scale of cities. I you want them small, livable, green, with trees, yards, clean air, working infrastructure that matches its population, you do not manufacture jobs and population without thinking of the downstream effects. Job growth does not have to come here, and it is a persistent myth that it is an unstoppable force. High paying jobs=demand for housing=increase in housing costs. Also a myth, that if we only add more housing we can cope with it and remain "affordable." Nothing in the last ten years of urban densification on steroids has led to more affordability. To claim that simply doing more of the same will somehow get us to a magical tipping point where suddenly a three story townhouse costs \$350,000? The densest cities in the world are uniformly the most expensive, unless they have become so dense that they are unlivable, in which case some degree of price adjustment may occur. Is that what we want? To pave the entire city so it looks like central Ballard? Studies of cities like Vancouver BC, New York, Beijing, and others show little connection between density and affordability. In fact the opposite is true. The world's densest cities are its most	7/8/2022
Forrest Bradford	I support plan 5	I support plan 5, increasing density across all of Seattle will help lower the cost of housing.	7/8/2022
Shahar Levari	Support option 5	Seattle needs more housing to have affordable housing. This should include all the different forms of new housing. As a single family homeowner, I would love to see townhouses and apartments in my neighborhood. Spreading the new housing across single family zones and urban centers creates a far more cohesive and enjoyable city for everyone. At the end of the day, we need to increase density!	7/8/2022
Taha Bahadori	Leaned towards 4, but 5 is also accepted	Option 4 preserves most of Seattle's beautiful nature.	7/9/2022
Nat Henderson-Cox	I support option 5	I think a wide range of options is best for our city and our neighbors and the environment.	7/9/2022
Alex Woolf	option 5 - more upzoning	As Seattle plans for the future, the best policy is to upzone and remove apartment bans to allow for a wide range of housing options, especially dense urban infill that decreases car usage and can best utilize public transit	7/9/2022
Connor Stein	Option 5: The Bare Minimum	Option 5 is the bare minimum approach that Seattle should be taking. We need more housing everywhere, with access to amenities, outdoor spaces, and transit. We already face a massive housing deficit before we account for the quarter million new residents who will call Seattle home in 20 years. Six unit buildings should be allowed on all lots in Seattle. We also need to explore options for financing the construction of these homes, and we need our building codes to align with these goals in terms of applying the SRC vs SBC. We also need to be incentivizing deep green building standards such as Passive House. Lastly, I believe that 5' side setbacks should be eliminated. Building to side lot lines and allowing small walkup buildings with dual aspect units will preserve more front and rear yard space which is actually functional for the residents, on top of promoting passive design strategies like cross ventilation. WE NEED IT ALL!	7/9/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Stephen Cox	Seattle Desperately Needs More Housing	I strongly support Option 5. We should be engaging in all of our options for building denser housing in Seattle - high-density "nodes," arterial density, and doing it all over the city to ease the impact on our specific neighborhoods and communities. I live in the Central District where lots of changes have occurred over the years. The increased density is good! But it has not been without disruption, and it has been difficult to see how some neighborhoods seem to be bearing the brunt of Seattle's growing pains. Increasing density citywide will help ease all of our city into the needed changes, and provide the volume that is necessary to accommodate the influx of new residents, which shows no sign of slowing down over the next few decades. More housing - and more mixed-use developments - please!	7/9/2022
Lola Rogers	Option 5 is the best way to spread out the impact while optimizing transit	I live in an urban village, and my neighborhood has seen a massive increase in density, but it hasn't been enough to prevent skyrocketing housing prices. Option 5 would increase housing and disperse the impact of growth rather than futilely trying to fit all growth into a small handful of neighborhoods. That would make the change more gradual and manageable and add much more housing, to bring down costs. Plus it would concentrate the densest growth near businesses corridors and transit hubs, to make transit more efficient. Best option by far.	7/9/2022
Juan Esteban Echeverri	I support option 5	Option 5 is the most logical option for Seattle. Conserving the status quo for is a policy that will continue to keep the city segregated	7/9/2022
Susan George	As an owner of property in Broadview	As an owner of property in Broadview I wish the City could come up with a plan that would help people build the much-needed DADU. I would love to convert my garage into an apartment. I cannot afford to do it but would be happy to make room for a family. Broadview is the perfect area to increase density if it's done right. Design is an important element to consider. It's a win-win for everyone. I'm a senior so it would help me hold onto my home and it would make room for a Family. I do have a lot of thoughts on this and it's about how the city makes the presentation to the neighborhood. I'm happy to contribute ideas. Susan	7/9/2022
Annie Harlan	More housing everywhere -- particularly in older neighborhoods	Seattle needs to build more housing everywhere - to include public & affordable housing. Low-income housing is disproportionately built in areas that are already struggling & underserved (Rainier Beach, for example). This needs to be spread throughout the city so that resources in underserved neighborhoods aren't stretched even more thinly. The concentration of public/low-income housing in a limited number of neighborhoods has a real impact on schools in particular. Older, wealthier neighborhoods are insulated from these changes, which allows the long history of a Seattle segregated by wealth and race to continue. Older, more wealthy neighborhoods need to accept that, just like other neighborhoods, theirs needs to change too. They need to absorb newcomers of all socio-economic levels.	7/9/2022
Jonathan Ursin	Update set back restrictions and outdoor deck restrictions.	Seattle should consider updating set back restrictions. Setbacks should be set to 5 or 7 feet with no other qualifications. Restrictions with upper level set-backs and breaking up facades creates the strange looking 'modern look' that people find unappealing. Additionally these restrictions create less heat efficient buildings and require more construction materials to build. For both of these reasons the setback restrictions are not green. Outdoor decks are limited to a 20 foot maximum and must be separated from other decks by a distance equal to 1/2 the width of the projection. In a post-covid era outdoor spaces are absolutely essential to allow for safer gatherings and should not be restricted. In addition outdoor decks reduce the monolithic 'modern look' that people find unappealing. Last, the city should consider easing the restrictions on single stairway apartment buildings. By doing so many new kinds of construction with open center stairways could be created adding diversity to construction styles. Safety concerns for taller single stairway construction can be addressed by adding extra fire safety measures such as more fire resistant materials.	7/9/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Sylvia Stewart	Alternative 1 - Provides 80,000+ in 20 yrs	I'm for growth in Urban Villages so that single family neighborhoods can also exist. BOTH are needed because as families grow and change many will want or need more space and want a single family home. The Alternative 1 - which continues the existing Urban Village Strategy - will provide the 80,000 homes needed. Note the Urban Villages don't include things like the new housing on City land that has been proposed or is currently being built. Places like Discovery Park which has a large area that will be turned into affordable housing. The Interbay Armory which has 25 acres yet to be developed and other City Land that the City gave for affordable housing (near transit stations and Mercer Street Corridor). These will add to the 80000 to provide additional homes. If more is needed the urban villages should be expanded while keeping neighborhoods of single family homes intact and available. The economy is a factor in this crisis too as we are seeing. Sales are slowing and prices are decreasing in some areas. We should aim for sustainable growth without large boom and bust cycles.	7/9/2022
Maria Sandercock	Explore a broad range of alternatives that include big expansion of upzones	The proposed alternatives appear to cover a broad range of reasonable growth options. Clarity is needed on the "corridor" option: how are corridors defined? All lands within walking distance (0.25 or 0.5 miles) of frequent transit? Currently, higher-zoned corridors are only 1 or 2 blocks wide and quickly drop to SF zoning, which it not taking full advantage of frequent transit along those corridors. Also, description of housing allowed in corridors in Alt 3 is very similar to description of housing allowed in broad areas in Alt 2. For Alt 5, where these are combined, how would these differ? I hope the broad area would not go down, but instead the corridors would be zoned higher than in Alt 4. Will be good to analyze and compare alternatives for: * Quantity of housing expected * Affordability of housing produced for all income brackets * Likelihood of displacement of lower income residents, residents of color * Quantity of family-sized housing expected (2 and 3-bedrooms) * Quantity of housing expected in neighborhoods with high-performing schools (so more people can access good schools) * Quantity of housing expected in areas with access to parks and open space * Equity with regard to which neighborhoods will experience more growth * With regard to impacts to natural environment, tree canopy, etc - can the EIS consider where these people would live if they can't be accomodated within Seattle? More trees will likely need to be cut down if people have to live in suburbs instead of Seattle.	7/9/2022
Jonathan Behrens	Alternative 6: Real Housing Abundance	None of the proposed alternatives go far enough. Alternative 5 is closest, but Seattle needs to add hundreds of thousands of housing units to drive down rents and make our city more welcoming and inclusive!	7/9/2022
Luke Schlather	Seattle needs to lower median rent	I would like to see the city project median rent over the next 20 years under each of the options. My sense of the options is that even under "Option 5" which is the most "aggressive" option, rents will still increase, probably faster than inflation. What would an option look like that meant by 2035, rents will be as low as they were in 2005? (In real dollars or even not adjusting for inflation.) That's the option that Seattle needs. I sense a lot of people think option 5 is "too aggressive" but we declared a homelessness emergency 7 years ago and it has only gotten worse - we desperately need more aggressive solutions that match the scope of the problem. But we need to measure the problem.	7/9/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jason Weill	Alternative 6: Every neighborhood needs more homes, including social housing	Because of decreasing family sizes and increasing costs of living, some neighborhoods of Seattle are less populated now than they were in 1970. Existing historic, character-rich multi-family homes such as duplexes, triplexes, and four-plexes are now illegal to rebuild in most of the city. We need to allow multi-unit buildings throughout the city, not just along loud and heavily-polluted arterials that are known for unsafe, high-speed traffic. We need Barcelona-style superblocks that incorporate green space, mid-rise residential buildings, retail, and dining options, all within walking distance of many residents' homes. Between 2021 and 2022, Seattle's population growth represented about 2/3 of the population growth of King County. Our city remains tremendously attractive despite our significant and growing inequality problems. Market-rate housing alone is not going to get us out of our affordability crisis. We need a mixture of market-rate housing, affordable housing built by non-profit groups under current models, and a public housing developer that can build, buy, and manage housing units for the benefit of residents making between 0% and 120% of Area Median Income (AMI). Current affordable housing models allow units to revert to market pricing after a period of time has passed. Our current affordable housing stock is focused on residents making 50% or less of AMI, leaving middle-income households forced to fend for themselves on the private market. I encourage an "Alternative 6" that builds upon the ideas from Alternative 5: more multi-unit housing in more of the city, with more housing being made permanently affordable. We need to continue to encourage alternatives to motorized transit to reduce people's reliance on pollution-generating, expensive, and inefficient single-occupancy vehicle trips. Without sacrificing access for transit and emergency vehicles, we can connect our bike lane network, increase transit frequencies 7 days a week, and connect more of our city to the services that we need.	7/9/2022
Meera Lee Sethi	Alternative 6: A real plan to solve the housing crisis	None of the current proposals, including alternative 5, account for the current housing gap in our city—let alone the million or more additional residents we expect to add over the next two decades. We need a radical re-envisioning of Seattle that goes a lot further than alternative 6, allowing rezoning for denser housing throughout the city, not just in nodes or corridors. We need to invest in social housing that remains permanently affordable to low and middle-income Seattlelites. We should eliminate parking mandates for both business and residential developments in favor of expanding protected bike lanes and public transportation options, especially since we know that retailers vastly overestimate the importance of parking in their ability to thrive. And we can't let the current transit network dictate where we build, since that will lock us into constraints that should not and will not always exist. I want all of my neighbors to have access to safe homes close to retail, dining, green spaces, and public transportation. Give us an alternative 6 that envisions a genuine solution to the tremendous inequity we currently face. Let's dream bigger so we can build bigger. P.S. Also please extend the public comment period beyond 30 days and do better at outreach—almost no one I know has even heard of the Comprehensive Plan, let alone knows how important their voices are right now to shaping our future!	7/9/2022
Ian Kuehne	Consider second-order impacts of maintaining the low-density status quo	We must not consider the environmental impact of the new plan solely in terms of its local, first-order effects, such as noise and disruption from new construction. It is critical that the EIS for the new Comprehensive Plan emphasize the global, second-order impact of keeping the status quo of legally mandated suburban-style housing across much of the city. For instance, low-density neighborhoods are typically car-dependent, meaning that supporting them requires building vast highway networks that produce huge amounts of noise, greenhouse gases, and pollution. Allowing denser housing and mixed uses in more of the city will reduce driving per capita, so the EIS for the new comprehensive plan changes should include the reduced road construction, pollution, energy usage, and traffic violence that denser options will yield. On the flipside, any options that limit density should include estimates of the pollution, noise, and traffic deaths and maimings that the resulting suburban sprawl will cause. Finally, the environmental impact of displacing people out of the city should be carefully considered. Any restriction of density will force people out of the city to live in suburbs and exurbs where they will drive into the city, producing noise and pollution and requiring expensive and disruptive infrastructure.	7/9/2022
Nick Sattelle	More housing everywhere	Option 5 is best. It should be legal to build apartments everywhere. No other option will solve the housing crisis.	7/10/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Harry Maher	Option 7: Build a walkable city for people, not cars	Transportation and housing are inextricably linked. For example: the suburbs could not exist without the car and the parkway. Our city was built for car owners. Yet about 1/5 of our households don't have a car. As a non-car-owner it is very clear that the city was not built by me or for me. I get honked at and yelled at when I bike on the street or cross at intersections too slowly. Sometimes people rev engines at me or sweat and pass too close. It's stressful, unnecessary, and feels very unsafe. Car drivers kill and maim pedestrians/cyclists, pollute our air, give people asthma and heart issues, and release tons of CO2 and accelerate global warming. It's a policy failure if everyone needs to operate heavy machinery (1+ ton vehicles) just to carry groceries home or go to work or whatever. All the extra weight people propel around using cars is just such a waste. We need to build our city in a way that allows for people to walk, bike, or ride public transit everywhere. We need to reevaluate the use of so much of our public space. If 20% of our households do not have cars, we need to reserve a lot more of our street space for bike lanes and bus lanes, and we need accessible sidewalks. The proposed five housing solutions do not go far enough. And a sixth, which proposes more upzoning, sounds solid, but also doesn't address the automobile issue. We need to reallocate a lot of our public street space so that we have faster and more efficient bus, bike, and other transit options.	7/11/2022
Christy Bates	Option 2 with focused planning	Options 2 would give addition housing options, but not destroy the fabric and beauty of Seattle. Options 3 and 5 would be disastrous for Seattle. It would ignite urban sprawl and not planned neighborhoods. It would destroy all single family neighborhoods. We do not want a free for all where any type of building can be built anywhere. Wedding cake building sizes down from focused urban and neighborhood centers. 2 is the best option, followed by 4. Hard NO to options 3 and 5.	7/11/2022
Sonia J	More housing!	Seattle needs a lot more housing to make it affordable, so 'no action' is the worst option. (Even though I own my home, I would rather see property values decrease so people can afford to leave here) The city should be helping people take transit, so I am most in favor of the 'corridor' or 'combined' proposals	7/11/2022
Kaiden Cook	Plan 5, Prioritize non-car travel, missing middle housing, 15 min neighborhoods	Plan 5 is the most obvious and uplifting choice to me as we're so behind on the housing crisis we need to be able to effectively create the housing we desperately need. Allowing for density to continue to thrive in denser areas is great but without sharing the amount of density throughout the city typically underserved communities will be hardest hit by displacement. Plan 5 allows some relief to these communities and spreads density across the city. This also allows for more housing types for renters and buyers to choose from catering to individuals and allowing for more areas to be real options for residents. Places like central Lake City and even Northgate seemed isolated to a non-car owning person but now the housing options have flourished. Allowing for this kind of progress to occur across the city and not just in a handful of neighborhoods would greatly raise the livability of the city.	7/11/2022
Hold My Poodle	Need building incentives	None of the plans will work unless developers want to build in Seattle. The city already rezoned some single family neighborhoods to RSL, it didn't result in more housing because it's not feasible to take on smaller projects within the city limits. Permit delays, full capital gains tax at sale, no amortization of improvement costs (e.g., utilities, roadways) -- we won't get pretty little townhome communities in a green city if it's only profitable to build hamster-cage apartment complexes.	7/11/2022
Mike Bertrand	Option 5 please	We need as much dense housing as possible, NIMBYS be damned	7/11/2022
Stephen Grose	I support plan 5	Upon reviewing the different plans, I support alternative 5.	7/11/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
nico Guzmán	Option 5 but we must go even further	Expanding density burdens through citywide rezoning is excellent and needed but it needs to come hand in hand with real restrictions on rent. In 2020 we had more than 20,000 apartments sitting empty due in no small part to the incredibly high rent prices. Reasonable rent control would be an important step in solving our affordability problems and the ongoing humanitarian disaster that is our homeless crisis. The city can and must take steps to lower rents. Like others i also support building housing on our useless golf courses. We could even turn them into a park, anything would be better than what they are now. If the city can seize land and destroy homes to build a highway it can certainly get rid of one golf course to make things actually better for everyone who lives here.	7/11/2022
Alex Adacutt	Option 5 or more	Among the options considered for the study only Option 5 begins to address the severe housing shortage and climate crisis we are facing. Consider including options that add even more housing as well.	7/11/2022
Steve Corley	Alternative 5 - plus more	The city needs to open up for development citywide. Yes to focused high rises in villages, yes to development on good transit corridors, yes to allowing infill in what are now single home per lot neighborhoods, yes to neighborhood nodes. This is how the city originally developed. The street I grew up on is unchanged in 50 years, except now there are mostly just houses with one couple in a 3-4 bedroom house and hardly any kids on the whole street. Open this up to 2,3,4 plexes and allow those same homeowners to age in place while new families or singles can join the neighborhood. Improve transit, expand bike lanes, make living car-free an easy choice for anyone living city-wide.	7/11/2022
Zach Balter	Three floors and a corner store everywhere	I agree with the vast majority of the commenters here that Option 5 is clearly the strongest option, but also that it doesn't go far enough. In the process of studying Option 5, ensure that affordability, equity, sustainability and accessibility are core, central values to any of Seattle's growth. Every vibrant and lively city I've ever been to has a broad mix of housing and "third places" for people to gather, no matter where you are in that city. It's how the city even begins to feel like a place you want to explore and live. Even in Seattle the places that make a neighborhood worth living in have places to gather, meet and enjoy, often under or around small scale housing (Many of the buildings in lower and upper Fremont are excellent examples. Three-ish floors and some "third place" should be table stakes with regard to Seattle growing into a vibrant, livable and affordable city and we should not accept less.	7/11/2022
Emily Penna	Option 5 but take it further!	Please include plans for social housing, more robust fully protected bike lanes, expanded transit, & broad upzoning across the entire city. Our current upzoning practices have primarily impacted poor working class people of color and pushed many of them out of the city. With the housing crisis the way it is, Seattle needs to end apartment bans & incentivize broad changes that make our city affordable for all, not just those with generational wealth or high wage tech jobs. With the looming climate crisis - we need to ensure our city is less car reliant. Prioritizing fully connected bike lanes & expanded transit will allow more people to get their cars off the road.	7/11/2022
Ian Boudreaux	Option 5 - We need more housing	We need more affordable housing options that I think only option 5 can provide. My wife and I both work and we both make decent salaries (over \$100k) and we can still barely afford to live in Seattle. We need more housing options!	7/12/2022
Ariel Koh	Option 5 but expanded. More housing. More public transportation, biking, walking	we definitely need more housing of all types in Seattle, with a greater emphasis on affordable housing. Maybe a ban on creating new single family homes in Seattle, and require upzoning on 50% of all single family homes sold in Seattle. There also should be a higher emphasis on available higher density housing for ownership (like condos) rather than apartments. In addition, there should be twice the amount of light rail than what has been planned for already (each neighborhood should have at least one station) at a more aggressive timeframe than what is currently planned. Ideally this would all be completed over a 10 year timeframe. The city should also move from being car-centric and encourage things like walking and biking through building infrastructure that encourages these things. There should also be car free areas in the city similar to how Barcelona does their city zoning. We should also be taking a page from cities in the Netherlands like Utrecht and Amsterdam for their biking infrastructure.	7/12/2022
Laura Baumgartner	Alternative 5- more areas of the city and more kinds of housing throughout	To address housing shortages, the need for varied housing alternatives, solutions to displacement and gentrification, we need the widest possible evaluation of options we can manage. Increased density will be necessary in many parts of the city, not just in urban villages. Limiting the scope of the possibilities for future housing perpetuates current inequities in the housing market and concentrates lack of opportunities among the most vulnerable among our city's residents.	7/12/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Johanna Wilder	Initial comments - Alternative 5 Combined scenario	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have lived in Seattle for 31 years now and have watched it grow from a small town to a big town and I much, much prefer Seattle as a big, bustling town with lots of neighbors sharing this most beautiful part of the world. We should always be building with the eye to inviting more people to come be our neighbors, because they are coming one way or another, we might as well have nice places for everyone to live. We are going to need to have fewer personal automobiles and more room for pedestrians on foot and wheels and walkers, as well as bicycles and electric scooters and skateboards. I am firmly FOR the Alternative 5, Combined scenario. At the same time, we need to hold the designers of these replacement buildings to honor the lush green nature of Seattle neighborhoods. We should be welcoming multi-family homes because they bring beauty and wonderful neighbors to our neighborhoods. It is your job as our representatives to lead with a vision of a Seattle more in tune than ever with nature and our environment, that can house not only the people we currently have (which we can't, and that is a shortcoming we must immediately rectify), as well as house all the new neighbors we expect to welcome in the decades to come. We must face the future bravely and with all our mettle and resources. We cannot shirk this duty for a little temporary convenience in the present. As for my neighborhood in Bitter Lake, a block away from Shoreline, where I expect to make great use of both the 145th and 133rd ave Light Rail stops, please make ready for many wonderful new neighbors for us. We love our neighborhood and can't wait to be able to enjoy without the necessity to own a personal automobile, and to share it with our wonderful new neighbors from around the country and around the world. Alternative 3: More and Distributed Growth. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further service. Kind regards, Johanna Wilder 14002 Linden Ave. N.	7/12/2022
Sara Morimoto	We needed option 5 yesterday	Seattle could address the climate crisis and lead in sustainable urban planning, or continue on as is, with zoning laws that make it extremely difficult to rely on transit/biking/walking alone. The best thing individuals can do to reduce their carbon footprint is live car free. This can only happen if we build infrastructure that actually allows us to safely and practically do that. These comments make it abundantly clear Seattle folks want more dense housing with transit, protected bike lanes, and spaces dedicated for people not cars.	7/12/2022
Annie E	More affordable housing now!	Seattle needs more affordable housing now! Since COVID, there has been an increase in the number of people who are homeless. The number one way to help people get off the streets is to give them a home! Please implement option 5!	7/12/2022
Daniel Newton	Alternative 5	I believe Alternative 5 would be the best direction to pursue for the city. We should also still try for the council's desire for 15 minute neighborhoods.	7/12/2022
Jazmine Smith	More housing and complete neighborhoods!	We need housing and a lot of it—yesterday. The second best time is now. We have a duty to undo the racist exclusionary zoning from previous comprehensive plans and go beyond nodes, corridors and villages. Multiplexes and apartment buildings should not be banned anywhere in this city. Neighborhoods should be as diverse as the neighbors that need to live there. And housing affordability requires a serious increase in supply. Alternative 6 is the way, but I'm also happy to support alternative 5.	7/12/2022
Max Rappaport	Alternative 5 (at least)	Of the given options, alternative 5 is the only proposal that even comes close to meeting the needs of our city with regard to housing. That we would consider anything less in the face of this ongoing affordability crisis is unacceptable.	7/12/2022
Dan S	Option 5 to empower people and not large apartment owners.	Option 5 is the only one that will have a meaningful impact on housing supply and will create a job boom for smaller construction workers. Large projects favor large construction companies, large banks and large owners. Having a diverse group of small apartment owners will reduce the pricing power of the mega apartment companies. More options for renters in more areas is a great idea. Ensure that the increased density also funds additional public green spaces that are transit accessible. Onsite 'public' courtyards are rarely used by the public and often designed to discourage public use. Put those dollars into parks instead of fake public spaces.	7/12/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Tom Lang	Alternative 5 please	Seattle needs more homes fast. Not only will EIS Alternative 5 allow the greatest possible amount of new housing development, it also will focus future growth in an equitable way. As someone who lives on the edge of an urban village, it is absurd that there are 7 story apartment buildings next door to small 2 bedroom craftsman homes. Take away the guardrails and let the market determine how neighborhoods densify. We also need more small commercial areas amongst the residential neighborhoods. We shouldn't have to walk the length of a neighborhood - often 15 minutes or more - just to buy eggs or a coffee. Let's bring back the corner shop please!	7/12/2022
Melissa Hall	We need option 6, housing needs to be the focus.	Use based zoning has not worked and none of the options that would continue those restrictions for housing are realistic or an appropriate approach to a deficit that is a crisis.	7/12/2022
Raven Demers	Alternative 5? Alternative 6+!	I agree with Meera Lee Sethi's Alternative 6 plan tempered with Harry Maher's suggestion of prioritizing people over cars. We need more housing for all income levels (rental caps are essential to make Seattle liveable), more green spaces within and around that housing, directing more growth toward a walking/public transport city. It needs to plan in mind for our most vulnerable: accessibility for the disabled, resources for low income families, etc. And I'd add, encourage more corporations that don't regularly interact with the public to reduce space consumption by providing primarily remote employment opportunities and convert existing real estate to multipurpose buildings—shops, housing, and meeting spaces that can be rented by companies who need to occasionally meet clients or have an in-person meeting with select staff. Also, make use of urban gardening ideas, incorporating green spaces into tall buildings, roof gardens, etc. Add more available food sources like Beacon Hill's food forest, but on a smaller scale within and around buildings. Seattle could be a leader in reshaping the way cities in the U.S. look and function. The plans of 20th century builders are unsustainable both environmentally and economically going further into the 21st century. Seattle is my birthplace, it has been the home I've come back to again and again. We cannot survive, let alone thrive, as a functional city without radical changes to the way we view and utilize the land. By Meera Lee Sethi: https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/ideas/alternative-6-a-real-plan-to-solve-the-housing-crisis By Harry Maher: https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/ideas/option-7-build-a-walkable-city-for-people-not-cars	7/12/2022
Lindsey Daffy	Alternative 5 & EIS focus on impervious.	All the components of option 5 would be strengthened if changes to the impervious surfaces % was explored during EIS. With tight-lined gutters, Ridwell, rain gardens/barrels, etc. all better managing storm water, increasing the impervious % in all zones would greatly add to the housing unit yield count.	7/12/2022
Hunter Merrill	Option 5+ to reduce environmental impact	A growing population will continue to impact Seattle, and wishing it away will not lower housing costs or reduce environmental concerns. Seattle needs to be allowed to build more housing, retail space, and infrastructure to serve its residents and create a sustainable future. Option 5 is a minimum bar due to the massive gap between supply and demand for housing. Other options will continue to push people out of their homes due to high cost of living and will have unintended impacts on the environment. The EIS must take the full scope of the problem into account, looking beyond the immediate impact of allowing construction vs doing nothing. In a healthy city growth is inevitable, so we need to decide if Seattle grows sustainably, or continues to 'ban' growth while shipping it to the suburbs. Sprawling developments reduce green space and require driving, creating noise and air pollution along roads that need to be expanded in an endless cycle of induced demand. The only way to break the cycle of congestion and smog is to allow denser development where driving isn't the only option. Option 5 is the best proposal for allowing Seattle the flexibility to grow in a way that limits impact on the environment and aligns to a sustainable future.	7/12/2022
David Albares	Build more affordable housing now	I support Alternative 5 and I advocate for an even more aggressive plan to build more truly affordable housing. We must increase the supply of affordable housing through construction.	7/12/2022
Katherine Anderson	Need more housing	The city needs to build a LOT more housing if young people like me are going to be able to afford to live here in the long run. None of the plans go far enough. We should legalize at minimum 8-plex on any lot anywhere in the city with higher density near light rail stations. Multifamily housing shouldn't be confined to polluted, noisy, and dangerous arterials.	7/13/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Joby Moore	Housing equity	In the Rainier Valley we have tall apartments lining arterials. This uses poor people to absorb the noise and pollution while protecting single family housing. There is a shelter for women and children built between two arterials with no easy access to green space or playgrounds. Green spaces should buffer residential areas from arterial pollution. All neighborhoods should absorb density. Subsidized housing must be equally distributed throughout the city. One way to measure is the percentage of free/reduced students at schools. All neighborhoods should have equal homeownership and walkable areas accessible to all.	7/13/2022
Gerald Stewart	One Seattle Plan	To ensure that Seattle continues to be a healthy attractive city to live in we need to have a balanced approach for future housing planning. There is a shortage of all types of housing, Apartments, Condominiums, Townhouses and Single-Family Homes. The continued rapid increase in Single-Family Homes is a good indicator that the supply and demand for this type of housing might be the most out of balance. Alternative 2 first and then Alternative 4 if needed are the most practical. One of the driving forces that has increased all types of housing costs is allowing Contractors to purchase single family homes, tear them down and build expensive multi-family units. The belief that this would lower housing costs has proven to be incorrect. The Single-Family homes are now unaffordable due to the higher costs that the Contractors can pay, the Townhouses that are built are high end expensive to ensure that the Contractor can profit, and the rents of surrounding Apartments are raised due to the overflow of buyers that cannot afford purchasing. Alternative 3 would put this trend on steroids continuing the rapid increase in all housing costs. In addition, Alternative 3 or 5 makes it impossible provide to conduct a comprehensive Environment Impact addressing the following: Earth & Water Quality Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise Land Use Patterns & Urban Form, Population & Employment Housing & Displacement, Plants & Animals Energy and Natural Resources, Historic Resources Relationship to Plans, Policies, & Regulations, Transportation Services: Police, Fire, Parks, & Schools Utilities There is ample Multi-Family capacity in the existing Urban Areas and Corridors for many years. There will never be enough Single-Family capacity and once a neighborhood is re-zoned those Single-Family homes are lost forever driving families out of the area. This trend will not reduce housing costs and will degrade the quality of life in the Emerald City. Thank You Jerry	7/13/2022
Erica N	We Need Option 5 at the Very Least	We need as much thoughtful, well-planned, additional housing as possible. I also support more small storefronts in neighborhoods, increased walkability, better biking paths, and more mass transit.	7/13/2022
PETER DEWEY	support all of the above housing	We need more housing. Way way more housing. Although I supported the urban center and village concept when it was first enacted, it obviously did not allow the volume of new housing units that we required. Recent changes - upzoning certain villages and centers, allowing more ADU and DADU units in formerly single family zones - are fine as far as they go, but we urgently need much more housing to make up for the shortfall that we currently suffer. Alternative 5: Combined as the maximalist alternative is a good start at allowing housing growth. The City also needs to make housing permitting easier, faster and cheaper for developers. Yes I support MHA; other alternatives streamlining of the development process is required. One has to say that allowing DADU and ADA in formerly single family housing makes developers our of many more property owners. Finally, please don't wait for the comprehensive plan update to upzone the areas around all of the light rail stations on line one.	7/13/2022
Andrew Valentine	Seattle needs every new housing option	In order to keep housing affordable and combat climate change, Seattle needs to adopt an "all of the above" option for new housing. No area of the city should be allowed to prevent building small apartments (duplex, triplex, fourplex), but we also need to recognize that large buildings of more than 10 floors are necessary to take full advantage of our transit improvements. Option 5 is the only plan that accomplishes both of these, but it may need to think even bigger	7/13/2022
Andrew Freeling	Upzone around 130th station NOW	The 130th St. light rail station is now schedule to open in 2026, and currently the area within a quarter mile of the location is 100% "neighborhood residential" zoning. For this station to be effective, most or all of this area should be upzoned to allow denser housing, with some areas of commercial use. Making the change now will allow time for development before the station opens and avoid a wasted opportunity.	7/13/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Frank Strobel	Do not destroy residential neighborhoods!	I know that Seattle needs more housing but allowing builders to pack in super high-density \$1M townhomes and Mac-Mansions is not the solution. They do not add affordable housing or a significant amount of housing to begin with. But, they completely destroy the character and livability of many residential neighborhoods. Increase the density of housing around concentrated areas with significant access to public transportation. For example, the new buildings around most light rail stations are only 4 stories high (commercial ground level plus three residential floors). Why? Why are they not 6 stories or 8 stories high? The PCC building in Columbia City is 6 stories (ground level retail plus five residential floor) while the new building across the street is only three levels high in some parts. This does not make sense. If you are building a large residential building, why not add a couple of floors to begin with especially if neighboring buildings are already at the same height or higher.	7/13/2022
Mark Mayor	We are selfishly wasting our resources	My home sits on a plot that could easily hold 5 townhomes like they are doing a quarter of a mile north of me in Shoreline. But instead of 5 families, there is only one family living here. Now, we have a fabulous yard that I wouldn't want to give up, but it would be selfish of me to not share with others. Fortunately, it isn't me who is keeping this lot to myself, it is instead our local government who is preventing me from sharing it. Preventing me from developing it so that multiple families can own their own piece of Seattle. Option 5 was needed a decade ago, now it's time to simply remove the single family designation for any and all lots in Seattle or maybe ban all new single family homes. Also with the local tech sector growth and the severe droughts in the south, I forecast an increase in migration of people into the Seattle area looking for work and potentially some water to drink.	7/14/2022
Jon Swanson	Option 5 is the minimum	The lack of affordable housing is the most pressing crisis we're facing. It's driving the homelessness crisis and is making the dream of putting down roots in Seattle unattainable for even high earners, never mind those of us who work in the arts or in restaurants or retail. We need more homes for everyone, and choosing to limit the construction of new homes is a terrible dereliction of duty to this city. It only serves to benefit those who already own property and want to cover the city in amber and rack up gains on their increasingly scarce resource. In order for this city to be the vibrant, alive place we want it to be, we have to let it change. We have to let it grow. There have to be enough homes for the people who live here now and everyone else who will move here in the future. There have to be enough affordable homes for the people who work here and make the city with living in. Option 5 is the only option that even tries to embody this spirit. It's the one we need.	7/14/2022
George Fisher	Row Houses: dense family living with backyards	Why does a single family home suit a family? It has a backyard, it has a front door. A Seattle townhouse has no outdoor space and often no street facing entrance. Once kids get to 2-3 years old a townhouse or apartment becomes a challenging environment with no backdoor to open to let the kids go and play. Seattle needs density, but we need something that allows for the benefits of a single family home without the land usage. The solution is the row house. With a short setback from the street, shared walls, and three or four stories, this kind of house uses all of its space for the small backyard. The row house's small backyard is large enough for kids to play, grow vegetables or flowers, a table to be set up for an outdoor meal, a space for a barbeque - but not all at once. It's a private green space where families can open the back door and enjoy - without the great cost of a single family home. It preserves nature. A good row house zoning standard should result in a house that is healthy and intended to be long term residence. The row house itself can be appealing. Think of Boston brownstones and houses in London. They are compact, yet desirable. They can be built affordably or not. They also subdivide easily into apartments if required. Zone for livable row houses in single family zones. Not townhomes, they can go on arterials, or in urban villages. Row houses bring quality density to neighborhoods. Row house basics: · 3-4 stories (35 or 45 feet maximum) · 0-5ft setback from sidewalk · Front door facing sidewalk and street · Shared walls · Back yard stretching to the end of lot (never double stacked) · Narrow, but not too narrow (~20ft)	7/14/2022
jaimie white	Option 3 and go from there to all the above	Option 3 - build 2-3 bedroom units ^ in single family neighborhoods and emphasize shared green spaces. Getting to all of the above includes and requires option 3, which is going to be the hardest to pass through.	7/14/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Susan Ward	Option 5 is Unbalanced Development	The updated plan must acknowledge the crucial importance of trees, streams, and natural habitat, especially where there is a major urban watershed. This is critical for human health, both physical and mental, and responsible, in view of impacts on climate. Protection and expansion of tree canopy must be prioritized- this is not an either/or, trees/housing choice. Trees and housing must be in tandem to preserve/create a healthy environment, and to reduce further temperature rises in our increasingly hot, dry summers. The Thornton Creek Watershed must be protected. Option 5 would appear to be the worst choice for this. Please leave Option 5 out of the EIS.	7/14/2022
Mary Ellen Russell	Option 5 isn't thinking big enough, give us options that go further!	Option 5 is the only option that starts to address Seattle's pressing issues, but it doesn't think big enough. We have a severe shortage of housing causing an ever-increasing homelessness crisis. We also have a severe shortage of rental units that are large enough for families. Three of my kids' closest friends' families have moved out of Seattle THIS MONTH because housing is too expensive for families to rent or buy. A city that doesn't have space for kids and young families isn't a place that can remain vital for long. We need to radically densify in order to make space for everyone! Density also makes it much easier to support the robust transit system we need to finally move away from car dependence. We need to make our city a place where 20-somethings can easily rent or buy 3-bedroom places, where no one needs to own a car, and where walking or rolling, instead of driving, to nearby amenities is by far the most convenient option. We need to make our streets safe enough that everyone is happy for their kids to walk to school, and build enough housing that everyone can afford a nice place within walking distance of that school. Option 5 starts to imagine the scope of change needed to our onerous and labyrinthine zoning rules to make Seattle a vibrant city in the future, but there is a lot more that could be done. As we are planning for the future of our city it should be a non-negotiable baseline that we will plan for ample housing for all, and that renters will not be trapped along noisy and polluted commuting corridors. To have a real conversation about what a future looks like for all of Seattle we need to start with option 5 as the minimum. Please give us more options that meet the needs of all Seattleites. Eliminate options 1-4 and give us options 6, 7, and 8!	7/14/2022
Laura Lovell	Light please	I would favor option 4. I live in a bungalow in a bungalow neighborhood. It's not large, was built in 1923. I chose to live here rather than out in the burbs because of the grace and charm of these type of neighborhoods. I do not want to live in a dark cheerless canyon, hemmed in by behemoth towering architectural monsters without air or light or space or green growing things. But if some larger streets were to be like that it would be ok. Some people really don't mind living that way, and more power to them. Over and over I see lovely old homes going under the wrecking ball. Most are being replace with giant single family houses that really belong in an eastside development. No way does that help with diversity or density. The other option is to replace them with quadriplexes designed with single people and childless couples in mind. A modest increase in density, but not diversity, since they are way out of range of working class people. What's limiting housing availability is human greed.	7/14/2022
Jay Lazerwitz	Alternative 5 or greater, including Historic Districts in zoning changes	Alternative 5 (and nothing less) as this spreads density across the city more effectively. Secondly, any and all Historic Districts should not affect zoning changes, unless these are City or National Landmark areas with existing landmark governing boards.	7/15/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Anna Malesis	Option 5 for Powerful, Organized Growth-- Also Ban Construction of New SFHs	Option 5 provides much needed growth in a way that will build functional communities. Options 1 through 4 all have a logic to them. Designating centers of different sizes makes sense because people need resources and services, so growth should be proportional to the resources available. Focusing growth around urban villages or neighborhood centers creates walkable areas that foster community, reduce environmental impact, and support public health. Transit is another key resource, so building along these networks again enhances access to resources and jobs, and supports sustainable forms of transportation. Finally because of the extent of the housing crisis and the exclusionary effect of single family homes, it is important that we allow duplexes, triplexes, etc in these areas between corridors and nodes. While many people say these options don't go far enough, it doesn't make sense to add extreme density in areas that aren't walkable, lack transit, and lack resources. This will just create parking issues and road congestion because all of the added people will need cars to meet their needs. That being said, we don't need any new single family homes, and construction of new single family homes should be banned. All new construction should be multi-unit. However, as we add density throughout the city, it is important that we protect our environmental and cultural resources. Adding more people doesn't mean we need less green space--it means we need more. Growth at the expense of open space will only lower quality of life and erode the resilience of our environment. At the same time, just because Seattle is a young city doesn't mean it lacks history. Remaining historical homes and buildings, or at least their facades should be protected. Many new buildings are simplistic, bleak, and lack personality or character. Subdivision of existing buildings should be encouraged over new construction. Many large historic homes--or even relatively small homes--could be subdivided to add density and diversity to single family neighborhoods without erasing the personality or history of the area. New buildings may be shiny for now, but looks are cheap. We have a city that means something to people, and we don't want to lose any more of that than necessary. If we open the city up for more development, we need to do it in a way that's smart, and we need to outline what needs to be protected before it's gone.	7/15/2022
Mark Olsoe	Housing in Seattle	My vote is to do what was done so successfully in Vancouver BC which is to have high density in the locations with good public transportation and KEEP HIGH DENSITY OUT OF RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. Seattleite from birth, Mark Olsoe	7/15/2022
Brandon Glass	Support Option 5	I support the people of Seattle having the right to change their property to the next higher level of density. We are missing a lot of options for housing and need to enable natural densification. I get that people are scared of high density housing in their single family home neighborhoods. We have a shortage and the best way to solve that is for some of your neighbors to be able to choose to convert to a duplex without huge amounts of red tape. also, we need a bike network to connect all of our lovely neighborhoods! Make it safe enough for kids to use!	7/15/2022
Gerald Stewart	Option 2 and 4	Seattle has a serious housing shortage for all types of housing, Low Income, Apartments, Multi and Single-Family homes. To provide housing for everyone and to keep the Emerald City a wonderful place to live we need a balanced approach. There is more than enough capacity in the Urban and Corridor areas to provide housing for everyone. Letting Contractors decide what to build in all areas will drive up housing costs for everyone and make it impossible for new families, that are looking for a small house, to live in Seattle. They will purchase properties at inflated costs and then will need to build expensive housing to make the profit driving up housing costs even more. In addition, Option 3 or 5 will make it impossible to conduct a meaningful Environmental Study including the review and planning for; Earth and Water Quality, Noise, Population and Employment, Plants and Animals, Historic Resources, Transportation and Services, Police, Fire, Parks, & Schools Utilities. There will never be enough Single-Family homes to meet the demand and a blanket re-zone will result in a significant reduction in that type of housing. Once gone they will never be replaced. Increasing Urban and Corridor Zones with the comprehensive EIS can always be done in the future if needed. Thank You. Jerry Stewart	7/15/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Samwise Rowe	Dense housing everywhere with streets meant for people	For us to create a city with affordable, equitable housing, we need to build as much housing as we can. We need to remove barriers to building housing in general and also fund and build public social housing. Seattle is a city and for cities to be livable and affordable, they need to be filled with dense housing. We also need to make some bold, radical moves to improve mobility in this city. Seattle needs to shut down streets to cars and open them to people. We need to create streets and plazas that are meant to be enjoyed by people. Streets through our city should not be meant to move car-bound suburbanites in and out of Seattle efficiently. We need streets optimized for people walking, biking, and taking public transit; streets meant for the people who live around them. Urban planning decisions like these are often not initially popular. People are used to being able to drive and park everywhere. They are used to having their single family home with a lawn and no apartments in sight. But these changes improve the city for everyone and once people see how amazing Seattle can be, no one will want to go back to the car-infested, segregated city that exists now.	7/15/2022
Lee Bruch	Need more housing everywhere	The Comp. Plan will be a guide for many years. It should be forward-looking, allow Seattle to grow within it. It's imperative that it allows * much more * housing throughout Seattle to eliminate the severe housing shortage the afflicts Seattle and the US nationwide and drive up housing costs. Alternate 5 is the absolute minimum. But we really need an alternate 6 similar to Alt. 5 throughout ALL of Seattle, that also allows much higher buildings and density in some major nodes (similar to that in the U District), allows more multi-family further from polluted and dangerous arterials, and allows retail and commercial within a 15 minute walk from every residence in Seattle. 2 of many reasons: 1. Regional growth What Seattle chooses will affect the entire region and the health and welfare of its people. In 2017 the PSRC estimated that the population of the central Puget Sound (Snohomish, King, Pierce, & Kitsap Counties) would, by 2020, be twice as large as it was in 1993. The recent census shows that to date they many have underestimated the growth by 2%. Yet Seattle is constrained by the land use patterns of the 1990's. Where will all the people go? We have a choice: Either spread out into expanding suburbs throughout the Puget Sound lowlands like LA, Phoenix, or Dallas, forcing people to live further away, drive more, need more new roads & utilities, more pollution, & more costs to taxpayers to pay to support the needed new infrastructure. This will destroy the environment of the PNW that most of us love. Or allow much more housing within our existing cities. But to do so, the comp plan and zoning must change to allow that. You have to deal w/ lack of affordable housing. Supply/demand shows u have to allow & create more housing; without it, prices will continue to skyrocket 2. Effects of Restricting New Housing Our current zoning restricts new housing. As a result, the laws of supply and demand force housing costs to skyrocket. The results: Our children can't afford to live in the city they love. People who would like to live near their job are forced to live further way, in the furthest reaches of our area. People who would like to age in their neighborhood can't afford to do so, or can't find a smaller place that's available, or can't redevelop their home into a 4-plex that they can live in. Much research has shown that those areas like Seattle that have the highest cost of housing have, nationwide, the highest in incidence of homelessness. It's more of a factor in homelessness than is drug use or mental	7/16/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alec Billroth-MacLurg	Why I like Alt 5	<p>First, I'd like to emphasize how little POC I'm seeing from this group of commenters. And I really wish groups like Humbows Not Hotels, the Tenants Union of Washington, and WLIHA could chime in here. It is probable displacement by renovictions could catch up to displacement by price appreciations as rules change. And Census Bureau CPS data, denominated by King County Assessor data (a survey derived estimated #an actual counted#) suggests there over twice as many vacant units *in Seattle* than what the estimated number homeless people in the city, by the county, is. It is unfortunate state legislators in Lynwood and Tacoma are preventing any attempts at rent stabilization and effective vacancy taxes. A lot can be done from metering parking everywhere, ending the 72-hour parking ban, mobile homes on front lawns and backyards, and shared kitchens and bathrooms in existing structures. But since Olympia is still voting against transit-oriented development, I'm for alternative 5. I'm also spoiled and white. I'd like to know I can support the local community, without what could be, moving my own motor vehicle around, taking up over a third of my income. I'd like to know we have a justified, affordable, peaceful, and timely plan, addressing future energy price shocks and the inevitable perpetual decline of natural gas, coal, and petroleum production rates, for everyone, all over the world.</p> <p>https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03360253/document https://cob.org/wp-content/uploads/peak-oil-briefing.pdf https://archive.org/details/fe_Portland_Peak_Oil_Task_Force_Final_Report/page/n5/mode/2up https://www.eia.gov/energyexplained/use-of-energy/transportation.php https://facultystaff.richmond.edu/~sabrash/110/Chem%20110%20Fall%202021%20Homework%20Articles/Lang_B_Coal_resources_reserves_and_peak_coal.pdf https://www.postcarbon.org/publications/shale-reality-check-2021/ https://www.energywatchgroup.org/new-article-by-hans-josef-fell-a-massive-expansion-of-domestic-renewable-energy-stops-wars-not-just-climate-change/ https://cig.uw.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/09/kc05whitepaper459.pdf https://www.hcn.org/issues/53.8/indigenous-affairs-dams-the-upper-skagit-indian-tribe-calls-on-seattle-to-remove-the-gorge-dam https://crosscut.com/environment/2021/05/solar-power-</p>	7/16/2022
Maureen Mastrobattista	Quality with quantity	We need to maintain the quality of life that attracted people here— livable, walkable, community oriented neighborhoods— while increasing the housing stock for the true middle class. Mindless density is not welcome, 'villages' with infrastructure works.	7/16/2022
F D	Go beyond option 5	We need to increase density in all neighborhoods in Seattle. We already have a shortage of housing and our population is only growing. We need to build more in places that people want to live and in ways that allow people to live their lives without a car. Our city should be safe, affordable, enjoyable, and convenient for people living without a car. We need to prioritize transit, cycling infrastructure, and walkable neighborhoods. We must invest heavily in our light rail and bus system and at the same time invest in and encourage transit-oriented development to fully unlock the benefits of transit. People want to live here and people need options beyond the single-family home - we need duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, condos, apartments.	7/16/2022
Monica Johnson	EIS alternatives	I prefer alternative 4. It will add the right mix of multifamily housing while preserving the character of our SF neighborhoods. The SF zoning restrictions are important to maintain. I do appreciate the easing of restrictions regarding ADU and DADU; I believe this is a step in the right direction. There is an exception however- builders tearing down sf homes and building 3 units (home + ADU, plus one DADU), which sell for 1M, 1M, 600K respectively. That doesn't feel like the desired outcome.	7/16/2022
Joshua McNichols	Testing the comment system	I am a reporter at KUOW and am testing that the comment submission form works, after hearing from a listener that they had had trouble. Glad to see it works!	7/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Lee Pyne-Mercier	Homes for All	We are in the midst of a housing crisis and none of these plans are sufficient to address the lack of housing construction -- which has not kept up with MASSIVE job growth in Seattle and the region. We will continue to price out young families and have high rates of homelessness unless we address housing affordability. One of the key issues is restrictions on the supply of housing. Of the options, I support option #5 because it creates the most opportunities for new housing. However, I think we need to do even more. I am sad that locations like Interbay and Northgate have been squandered as opportunities for new residential neighborhoods. They should look much more like Ballston in Northern Virginia or Vancouver BC. We need to open up the entire city to multifamily housing and encourage higher density near LINK Light Rail stations. Let's be ambitious like the early settlers of Seattle! I think the new Lynnwood Link Stations in North Seattle need to be rezoned for high density multifamily mixed use communities that enable a large number of people to access the stations via foot and bike. Given the housing crisis and global warming, this is the time for Seattle's leaders to step up and take visionary action for a just, equitable, and environmental future. - Lee	7/17/2022
Marci Burden	Provide access to residents who already live here	While I do think it is important to build housing and retail close to transit stations, it feels like most of the current plans ignore the people who already live here and who would want to access light rail. The 1/4 mile radius of scope for these stations discounts the large neighborhoods at the east and west ends of the streets in question (130th & 145th). Greenwood, Aurora, 15th NE, Lake City Way...tons of people live in these areas, and yet Sound Transit and the City seem more focused on building tons of new housing without providing fast, easy access for the residents who already live here! Why not start with more buses, shuttles, bike lanes, etc. from these neighborhoods? I personally live in Broadview, but there is no reasonable bus that will get me to Northgate, 130th, or 145th for my commute to the UW, or to a sports event, or to the airport (the one Northgate bus from Greenwood takes 45 minutes to go 5 miles - not reasonable for a commute, or a drive that takes less than 10min). Parking at Northgate is increasingly limited or insanely expensive - thousands of empty pay spots when they could be free park-and-ride spots that would increase ridership today! When the 145th & 130th stations open - how is anyone who lives in these neighborhoods (including the thousands of apartment dwellers on Aurora, Greenwood Ave, & Lake City Way) supposed to get there? Sound Transit and the City of Seattle need to start with providing access to the residents who already live in these areas, and look further out than 1/4 mile. We need rapid, easy transit along those corridors to the light rail stations and many more people will use them, and this doesn't require anyone being pushed out of their homes, or high construction costs, etc. Upzoning and housing developments can come later. Thanks.	7/17/2022
Mary Keeler	Please remember Seattle's tree-canopy goal?	Re: Project 3038166 EG, 8314 13th Ave NW, 98117 I recently reviewed the developer's proposal for this project, which is located around the corner from my house. This project should be reduced in size to save some of the significant trees — this neighborhood is beginning to resemble the "desert" of South Seattle! Planting new trees does not assure their survival, and it takes decades for them to remove carbon at the rate of mature trees. Please remember the City's tree-canopy goal?	7/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
John Schlosser	Does Upzoning = More housing? In which neighborhoods?	<p>All "One Seattle" alternatives seem to presume that there's a straight line between upzoning and creating more housing. Thus we, understandably, see so many Comments here saying "Yes! More Housing!" and pick "Alternative 5" ie, whatever increases zoning capacity the most. I get it. We all get it. Here's the problem: Upzoning is the solution if and only if there's no where to build under *existing zoning*. Is that true for Seattle as a whole? No. Check the City's own data: Description: https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/population-and-demographics/zoned-development-capacity Dashboard: https://seattlecitygis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/3232628e387d467b904167b33fa38ad8 Data: https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/zoned-development-capacity-by-development-site-2020-v-1-3-151fe It may be true for San Francisco or Manhattan, where there's nary an empty lot to be seen. Not so in Seattle, where there's more zoning capacity than required by all population projections. The problem, for developers, seems to be that zoning constrains them from building where they prefer to build/sell: ie., the affluent areas. The developable properties aren't in SLU, QA, Cap Hill, Ballard etc where it's most profitable. Increase allowable density in richer areas, and developers will keep building there -- and thus divert new housing away from *less* affluent neighborhoods where it's needed. The "One Seattle" EIS needs to seriously address the real impact of zoning change on *where* that housing is built. Is zoning change a panacea? Which neighborhoods would lose out? What are the equity effects of zoning change that allows developers to continue to focus development on high income areas?</p>	7/18/2022
Brent Markee	Seattle Could Think Big – by thinking small	<p>Is it possible to think of a way to solve our urban growth demands other than wishfully thinking "the market" will magically create the future city everyone desires? As an attempt to start a dialogue on the subject, I will describe what I see as ripe opportunity to improve the distribution of people and quality of our neighborhoods without a total loss of diversity and further displacement. If urban villages have run their course, this is the perfect opportunity to think creatively about our urban ideals before we jump to signing away all our single family green space in one overly black and white thinking moment. All the components currently exist for a whole new added neighborhood paradigm; one that could empower and inspire communities to create the change they can support rather than fighting against changes forced upon them. Emphasis could be focused on individual neighborhood solutions block by block with more ways to keep people homes and trees intact. Some of the existing components are: desire for community, interest in co-housing, creative thinking around tiny houses, advances in prefab structures, community vegetable gardens and much more. One possibility would be to create incentives for multiple adjacent single family property owners to create micro communities within their blocks. The city could incentivize a more organic and diverse way of adding density to these blocks, starting by saving existing buildings, allowing additional low-rise in-fill, rental spaces, vegetable gardens, and supporting a choice to live more slowly, and incorporating more hands-on ways to support one's life and community. If multiple adjacent lots grow into entire blocks then allowances could be made for an occasional corner market or cafe, with living spaces above, owned and operated by the community. The idea is to create more density, but instead of monolithic apartment buildings, this would facilitate a way for less focussed density and provide the possibility for extended families, friends and newcomers to put down communal roots. Shared and consolidated labor, resources, and living expenses makes for more affordable living, including more affordable housing. Child care and elder care could be built into the design as well. Each community wouldn't absorb as many people as large apartment buildings, but if the incentives and support for such efforts made it worthwhile, meaningful and sustainable, it could add up to a significant impact citywide. Think of it like an inner-city sprawl of people filling in the spaces</p>	7/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
John Schlosser	Let's not Mess this up: Population Forecasting and Black Swan events	We all want housing: enough housing, at affordable prices, and of the type we want to live in. In the past 10 years we've seen high prices driven by sudden employment growth and less affordability. We've all endured it. We all know people who've suffered from it. It's natural to want the Comprehensive Plan to fix things. But can zoning change alter the dynamics that caused the problem in the first place? Will past factors continue to drive the problem? E.g., * Will Seattle, in the future, get more growth than King County in percentage terms? Unlikely. Latest data says future growth is trending toward non-Seattle areas. Note Amazon's building boom in Bellevue. * Will Seattle soon receive another employment bomb equivalent to Amazon's sudden add of 50,000 new Seattle employees (2000-2020)? Or was it a once-in-a-century Black Swan event? * What about the impact of Zoom & WFH (work from home)? Who expected this? Will this trend reduce housing pressure within the city? Why pay Seattle home prices if you don't have to? * And we finally are getting a light rail system. That's welcome-- and new. If Link can get you to work quickly, without traffic, from Shoreline, Redmond, Othello or SeaTac, why buy that expensive townhouse in Ballard? Our future population growth curve may not be like the past. My hat's off to the PSRC (Puget Sound Regional Council). It has the controversial and unenviable task of reading the tea leaves as it predicts future growth. Bottom line: How can any EIS evaluate Comp Plan Alternatives without agreement on population forecasts? There's no agreement now. The only consensus is that future housing demand will *not* resemble the past. Surely this is the elephant in the room.	7/18/2022
David Ramsay	Option 5+ Housing and More Housing	We need not just more housing, but particularly more affordable housing. Much more! In addition to an aggressive public funding strategy, Seattle needs to be more proactive in getting the private sector involved if we are to get the amount of affordable housing that is needed. This should include zoning it in through out the city and incentivizing it with subsidies, density and height bonuses, no parking requirements, permit streamlining and fee waivers. It should be required that a percentage of affordable housing units be integrated into all market rate housing projects. A direct linkage to transportation corridors is key. Once these affordable units are constructed, they must be carefully regulated to assure on-going affordability. The lack of affordable housing needs to be treated not like a serious problem, but as the crisis that it is! The livability of Seattle depends on it.	7/18/2022
john Owen	Consider Downtown	The Downtown is in need of clear thinking and a new direction. It offers plenty of capacity for residential development but that development needs to be shaped and supported as a community of neighborhoods. There is already a substantial downtown residential population (mostly high and low income with not much middle income) that can serve as a basis for a real community, but there needs to be public facilities and a safe public realm. Attention should be given to how the Downtown can grow and thrive - and fit with the other growth being analyzed in the alternatives.	7/18/2022
john Owen	Consider the region around the city	Seattle does not exist in a vacuum. The comprehensive plan should contain policies and actions for addressing its surroundings. For example, housing policies should acknowledge housing conditions in neighboring municipalities and address residential displacement on a regional basis. Homelessness is certainly a regional issue and deserves action-specific policies. Likewise, efforts to reduce flood hazard and sea-level rise is most effectively done on a watershed basis. The corridors alternative should be looking at the extensions of those corridors, how transportation and land use patterns mesh with segments extending out from the city. Of course, County-wide policies should be integrated into comprehensive plan policies in a forceful, pro-active way.	7/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
John Patterson	Alternative 5 is the way to go	Given that our city is one of the least affordable in the country, it is insane that we are still zoned for 75% exclusive SFH use. Firstly, if we want to get serious about tackling increasing rents and property prices, one of the easiest and cheapest ways is to make it legal for private entities to develop their land into lower per-unit cost options like apartments, condos, multi-plexes, and townhomes, and stop mandating that they build the least efficient type of building in terms of cost per unit of housing. Second, if we want to get serious about our climate and Vision Zero goals, we need to enable people to do more without their cars. Bringing shops, restaurants, bars, and other such amenities closer to where people live will enable more Seattleites to walk, bike, or roll to the stuff of life, removing traffic from our roads. As a part of this plan, we should shoot for walkability and bikeability metrics, such as Paris's 15-minute city plan, whereby the city is committing to planning in such a way that ANY resident has the things they need for everyday life within at 15-minute walk. For reference, my ranked preferences: 5 > 3 > 4 > 2 > 1	7/19/2022
Cynthia Rose	Seattle's Comments for Changing Land Use	I think that Alternative 2 would have the least impact on canopy cover, followed closely by alternative 4. The OPCD has not studied the impacts to the tree canopy for any of the concepts 2 to 4. As we stand, even existing conditions of Alternative 1 may not be able to reach 30% canopy cover by 2037. I hope you preserve trees for the current and future people of Seattle while you look at the ways to plan for land use.	7/19/2022
Kay Landolt	New Housing AND tree canopy	Seattle's tree canopy provides us with our main defense against increasing heat due to climate change. I want the EIS to examine all options with an eye to both furnishing more housing AND preserving and enhancing as much of our tree canopy as possible.	7/19/2022
Ryan DiRaimo	WE ARE BEHIND SPOKANE! SPOKANE!!!	Spokane Washington just legalized quadplexes, rowhouses, etc CITYWIDE in a 7-0 UNANIMOUS VOTE by their city council. What are we waiting for!!!!!!!!!!!! Are we really behind SPOKANE?! Their Director of Planning showed bold leadership and proposed a solution to housing affordability and homelessness. They did it by emergency ordinance and skipped the process of dragging out the timelines so that I and many others can write on this silly platform begging you to do what is right. OPTION 5 or BIGGER. HURRY UP.	7/19/2022
Marie Abaya	Option 5 or better	Many more knowledgeable people have spoken here for improvements to Option 5. I support more housing, more affordability, more density city-wide. I would love for all people who work in Seattle to be able to live in Seattle. I would love to take transit everywhere without having to allow large cushions of extra time in my schedule. I would love to walk to businesses and services in my own neighborhood. We can do it. We have the knowledge. We have the resources. We have the money. We have the will.	7/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alexis Stevens	Alternative 5 for a Healthier Seattle	<p>'----- Alternative 5 for a Healthier Seattle -----</p> <p>The Success of Density ----- Right now, the most common type of residential zoning in Seattle is Neighborhood Residential, at 81%. For a city that is one of the fastest growing in the country, in the 12th biggest county in the US, this is a miserable policy failure. Around the world, the most successful cities we see are the ones that allow people to live close to where they work, shop and play. This results in shorter commutes, with the ability to walk and bike, which leads to less pollution, lower-stress environments, and happier citizens. The Positive Financial Implications ----- Perhaps more importantly, denser areas have been proven to be considerably more financially successful. In almost all cities, the denser urban core subsidizes less dense areas, because infrastructure costs balloon as density drops, especially in places where cars are the best transportation option. In fact, the average cost of supporting single-family zoned areas is more than double that of multi-family ones (thecostofsprawl.com). Equity, Renters, and Sprawl ----- Additionally, zoning areas with absolutely no ability for developers to make multi-family homes artificially constrains housing supply, which drives up costs, pushes out renters, and contributes to urban sprawl and the buildup cliff. A city with this much single-family zoning is practically seeing renters as second-class citizens to buyers, but this is hardly equitable, especially since renters make up a large portion of long-time residents and include the entire spectra of income and of race. The Delightful Character of Dense Neighborhoods -----</p> <p>----- Cities like Montreal have many delightful neighborhoods which allow for duplexes, triplexes, and more, where each family still has plenty of room, but where density is high enough that infrastructure costs are lower, and walkability is higher. These neighborhoods have at least as much character as single-family zoned areas, with rich histories, beautiful architecture, and more. Let's Improve Our Paradise Together -----</p> <p>----- Doubling down on density will make a happier, healthier, more financially capable Seattle with room for everyone who has seen this city as their home and everyone who wishes to join us in our beautiful, green, rainy paradise.</p>	7/19/2022
brian krinbring	the alternatives	<p>* Alternative 2 should study adding highrise and midrise zoning. * Alternative 3 should study a wider range of missing middle housing types rather than just triplexes and fourplexes. * Alternative 4 should study significant upzones in a broad area around transit corridors * Alternative 5 should seek to quantify the impact on the housing affordability crisis * Maximize housing opportunities near planned light rail stations.</p>	7/19/2022
OLIVIA BERMINGHAM - MCDONOGH	housing density	<p>I think option 4 might be best. Seattle should protect the neighborhoods with single family homes, each of which has a distinct character. I would suggest that in any plan the developers must provide at least 1 parking space per unit. Even if there is access to transit many people who live here want to drive to the mountains or the water to recreate. This idea that everyone can use public transport or bike is seriously flawed. Yes maybe most of the week someone might use transit but then comes the weekend and they want to get out in nature. Also in bigger developments 20 % should be low income housing to address the homeless problem.</p>	7/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alice Palosaari	Combine missing middle with greater density around transit	Alternative #5, while not perfect, is the only option that combines two strategies that we MUST do: gentle, missing middle housing throughout neighborhoods as well as increase high density around transit and urban cores. I live in what was traditionally called a "single family neighborhood," with only one detached house on each lot. I would be enthusiastically supportive of allowing a wide array of missing middle housing types - duplexes, triplexes, four-, five-, and sixplexes; two ADUs on each lot; townhouses and rowhouses; and cottage housing - on every single lot in my neighborhood. In order to make these easy to build, permitting requirements should be no stricter or different than those for a single family detached house. It is important that we include up to sixplexes in the definition of "missing middle" because the research indicates that developers start to break even at fourplexes; in order to establish a strong market for building these types of housing we need to make it pencil out financially. In addition, we should utilize density incentives like those in Portland, where a house with more units can utilize a greater portion of the lot than a single-unit home. I feel strongly that allowing missing middle housing in my neighborhood would improve my quality of life and community. Currently, on my block, whenever an old house is sold, it is torn down and turned into an enormous, single-family house that maximizes space for only one family. As a result, the people in my neighborhood are increasingly either elderly people who bought their house before the housing market went up, or people who work extremely lucrative tech jobs. My husband and I are both public servants and were only able to buy our home because it was previously owned by my parents. None of my friends - most of whom are teachers, social workers, or work in other middle-income jobs - are able to afford to live in my neighborhood. It is no better for me and my family - and, in fact, is much worse - to have a \$1.6 million single family house across the street than if that same lot were to have six units. We would like our children to grow up in a neighborhood full of other children of diverse incomes, and that is simply not possible currently. In addition to allowing gentle density across the city, we need to allow much greater density near transit and in urban villages. It simply makes sense to allow significantly more density in the form of apartment buildings and condos in areas where people can walk to a bus and all the urban amenities they need	7/20/2022
Kelly Van Kline	Horror Show & too Slow	Just watched the Zoom meeting for the EIS and the City admitted that no new housing from this "process" will be realized for at LEAST 5 years! Whatever alternative the developers end up telling the City to choose, it will not happen until they have bought up all that land. Just yesterday, Spokane voted to allow duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes on single family lots. Not 5 years down the road but right now. Spokane steps up to the plate to address their housing crisis while Seattle fiddles, what a disgrace.	7/20/2022
Bruce Stanton	Alternative 5 but it won't happen	To anyone concerned about our housing crisis I strongly urge you to watch the EIS meeting from tonight July 19th. While other cities are taking real action to address their housing challenges we have paralysis by analysis that will take according to the City of Seattle 5 years minimum to get new housing. Heard that Spokane, yeah Spokane, just passed laws to allow 2,3 & 4 plexes on single family lots. Passed unanimously and in effect immediately. Why are we so far behind Portland/San Francisco/Spokane? Guess dragging it out runs up billable hours for consultants like Berk and keeps city drones busy doing analysis instead of action.	7/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ian Crozier	Study alternatives that have real differences	In this EIS it's important to look at alternatives with real substantive differences. Most of the starting-point alternatives presented here have minor variations on the established urban village pattern. The urban village strategy was defensible in its time but our population has grown 50% since then. It's no longer well-suited to our city's current situation, with high and rising densities in select areas, many around dangerous arterials, and surrounding neighborhoods with shrinking populations and skyrocketing home prices. Also, as the introduction video notes, the urban village strategy is shaped by a history of racial segregation and exclusion. Given those facts, it's extremely odd to see the proposed alternatives feature very modest changes from the baseline urban village strategy. Given the slow process of redevelopment, triplexes and fourplexes in RSF zones as proposed in the "broad" alternative is an extremely modest move. The broad alternatives (3 and 5) should look at much smaller lot sizes (RSL zoning as a starting point) and/or 6-8 units per lot. Alts that envision creating new urban villages (2 and 5) should focus new villages on wealthy areas with minimal displacement impacts. (See: Montlake) For 130th/145th St station areas it is critical that this process look at replacing Jackson Park with a mixed use neighborhood. This is merely a study - it does not commit us to a course of action, merely increases our knowledge about potential actions. We should not fear knowledge. To conduct a study and neglect to do so would be a waste of public funds. Overall, EIS analysis should focus on how the alternatives support or inhibit Seattle's adopted goals to reach carbon neutrality by 2050, reduce VMT by 20% (per Climate Action Plan), and increase equitable access to opportunity, high-quality housing, open space, transit, and schools. If a growth strategy that prioritizes protection of low-density neighborhoods (and golf courses) as exclusive enclaves for wealthy, older, predominantly White residents is to be pursued, it should be clearly stated why doing so is more important than pursuing other goals.	7/20/2022
Mike Knezevich	We need to allow more housing types and commerce in single family areas	We really need to get a lot more dense if we want to have any hope of mitigating climate change. It is irresponsible to allow single family homeowners to dictate housing policy in this civilizational emergency. I am a single family homeowner in favor of densifying single family zones. thanks, Mike	7/20/2022
kathy roeder	Ensure homes are used for housing	Strongly support expanding homes and housing everywhere in the city. Strongly support more variety in style and options. Duplex, triplex, four plex is thinking too small. Please use scoping process to evaluate how the city might ensure that housing units go to housing, and not short term rentals. For several years the city has been down at least 4,000 whole homes due to short-term rentals. These builds were permitted and zoned for housing not hotels. Use the comp plan process to regain that housing stock and protect new housing stock from going into the faux-hotel inventory.	7/20/2022
Brian Van Abbema	Every Residential Zone needs an Upzone	Any plan that continues to allow SFH only zones is a complete failure and will not address the housing or climate crisis. We have to upzone the entire city and stop restricting and hampering building. We need homes last decade, act now!	7/20/2022
Ben Anderson	More extreme alternatives required	When selecting alternatives for study, we should ensure we have alternatives so extreme that they can be differentiated as negative from more plausible options. There's already a do-nothing alternative, which will presumably demonstrate worse environmental impact than the more plausible alternatives. We should add extreme density options so we understand if there is any point at which density becomes negative - there should be an alternative where we remove all density restrictions from residential zoning (or relax them to an equivalently severe extent), one where we do the same for non-residential zones, and one where we do so for all cases - not because we would necessarily choose these alternatives, but so we don't miss out on understanding where the bounds of negative impacts lie and what to look out for when picking the actual limits.	7/20/2022
Benjamin Hamm	Option 5 is the least we can do	The spirit of an Environmental Impact Review should consider how our choices can best protect the environment. There is no longer any real debate to be had: true environmentalism demands dense, walkable cities. Option 5, while not going far enough, is the only viable option presented. We owe it to our neighbors, the planet, and ourselves to embrace this option and go even further.	7/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Melissa Hall	The EIS should study the environmental costs of not accommodating new housing	The proposed EIS all seems to focus on the environmental costs of doing things and not on the costs of failure to act. A real study should include the environmental costs of not building housing and instead having that housing be in other, more remote communities that require commuting and should likewise look at the costs of use separation in the zoning plan in general in terms of trip generation and the resulting impacts. It should also look at the environmental costs of mandating parking and on allowing parking on rights of way. The costs of not having sidewalks and the environmental impact of building a SFH vs a Quad vs a 4 story condo for each additional housing unit. What is the environmental cost of making dense housing illegal in most of the city? It seems like something that we should know to guide the comp plan choices.	7/20/2022
Dylan LeValley	More housing, everywhere	I have lived in Seattle for more than 20 years, and watched its growth outpace its housing. The simple fact that many more jobs and many more people have flooded to this city without new housing keeping pace has created an unaffordable nightmare. I have watched as friends and coworkers have moved away, unable to or unwilling to grow roots in a place they could not afford. We need more housing everywhere--in urban centers, on arterials, and in neighborhoods--and we need it fast. Only wide-spread upzoning of the city will come close to meeting our goals. Denser neighborhoods lead to more walkable communities, more benefit from transit development, and reduce the carbon footprint of the city by reducing driving. In short, denser communities are more livable ones. Please consider Option 5 as the bare minimum. We need more housing, everywhere.	7/20/2022
Bryan Kirschner	Ensure we stop blocking more affordable forms of housing with laws & policies	The Council adopted 2020 Comprehensive Plan states a goal (H G 5) to "Make it possible for households of all income levels to live affordably in Seattle, and reduce over time the unmet housing needs of lower-income households in Seattle." And specifically, (H 53) "Promote housing affordable to lower-income households in locations that help increase access to education, employment, and social opportunities, while supporting a more inclusive city and reducing displacement from Seattle neighborhoods or from the city as a whole," Option 5 is the only alternative offered here that does not embrace constraints that may conflict with these goals from the get-to. It should therefore be the minimum alternative considered--or at the least any other alternative considered should bear the burden of fostering progress toward these goals equal or greater to option 5. The Council adopted 2020 Comprehensive Plan also states a goal (H 5 4) to "Monitor regularly the supply, diversity, and affordability of housing for households by income level, and use this information to help evaluate whether changes to housing strategies and policies are needed to encourage more affordable housing or to advance racial and social equity." To fulfill these commitments, the EIS must take into account not just the number of housing units expected under any alternative, but their type and cost as well. Policies that conflict with these goals should be changed; policies that maximize "more, of more affordable forms of housing" should be adopted. This is important because floor area ratio (FAR) regulations or homes per lot limits beyond the requirements of health and safety can stack the deck against more affordable forms of housing. These experts, for example, have looked at what threshold makes below-market units or "missing middle" homes feasible (see references 1, 2). But this is most intuitive and acute in Seattle's "single family" zoning. Historically, a 5,000 square foot lot allowed, as right, a 5,250 square foot residential structure (5,000 square feet of land x 35 percent lot coverage x 3 stories). Today at most under the "Accessory Dwelling Unit" (ADU) rules, three homes are allowed. This sized structure could obviously hold many more homes--easily six two-bedroom homes or a dozen (or more) small efficiency units. As we grow, rules like this stack the deck in favor of displacement, gentrification, and segregation. For example: three people each renting rooms in an old home (likely for \$800 to \$1,000 per month in my neighborhood) are	7/20/2022
Kelly Hayes	Stop destroying single family homes	Not a fan of the rezoning and upscaling. I have seen the damage done in shoreline because of the 145th street transit center. Single family homes have been destroyed by developers. Please someone in planning consider those of us who are long term home owners near the 130th street station. Keep the footprint smaller around the station or down busy streets like 130th.	7/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Woody Wheeler	The Plan needs to address affordable housing, climate change and tree canopy	Seattle needs to grow intelligently. This means first acknowledging that climate change is real and has already taken the lives of dozens of Seattleites -- especially those in low-income, BIPOC communities where there is often little-to-no tree canopy -- and then balancing the needs of housing and density with sufficient green space and tree cover for all. We should encourage growth in urban villages, where transit and other amenities already exist (including some parks and green space). I subscribe to the "15-minute city" concept -- especially because many of our residents do not have cars. I favor alternatives #2 and #4 for this reason. In addition, focusing growth in urban villages provides better opportunities for Seattle to meet its 30% tree canopy goal, to pass a stronger tree ordinance and to ensure that the city does not become a dangerous, uninhabitable urban heat island. This Comprehensive Planning Effort underscores the need for the City to pass a stronger tree ordinance now - prior to further development that will otherwise likely reduce our existing tree canopy. The existing tree canopy must be fully evaluated and seriously considered in all development options and fully protected in the selected option. Metrics should be added to specifically address tree canopy. The metrics must be able to differentiate between exceptional and mature trees vs. newly planted shrubs or trees that the developers may put in; larger trees are by far the most important in mitigating climate change. In summary, the Emerald City in the Evergreen State needs to incorporate trees in its plans for the city, so that people and nature can continue to thrive here. ----- Comments(1) -----	7/21/2022
M W	Option 4 - Corridor	Option 4 allows for increased housing density while maintaining single-family-housing neighborhood backstreets. Backstreets are already clogged with two-way traffic, and adding density in these areas will compound the problem. Building sensibly along and around corridors creates the most diversity of housing solutions from apartments, duplexes, townhome, and stand-alone houses with yards. Density that is added off of corridors should include one-way traffic movement to maximize parking while keeping traffic moving.	7/21/2022
John Schlosser	Upzoning: Serves the Have's, not the Have-Not's?	We want housing to be more affordable. We all do. So upzoning seems like an easy fix. And it could be, IF (and only if) you already own property. If you own property *before* the zoning changes, your land costs *after* a rezone are lower, per housing unit. Don't have property? Well, upzoning hurts. Read on ... Unless you're already an owner, an upzone *increases* the land value and, therefore, its selling price. This is logical. With an upzone, the developer can now build more units, right? Example: Well-loved Hardwick's Swap Shop on Roosevelt NE just north of the University Bridge. Check the trajectory of its land value before and after the recent University District upzone (https://blue.kingcounty.com/Assessor/eRealProperty/Detail.aspx?ParcelNbr=1142000725): In 2014, the Assessor said it was worth \$880,000. In 2020, the Assessor said it was worth \$4,800,000. I am not making this up. Yeah, prices in Seattle have risen. But an increase of ~\$4,000,000 can only be linked to the upzone. So who benefits from an upzone? 1. Non-profit developers of social housing? It's super hard to see any benefit to Community Roots, Plymouth Housing, LIHI, Seattle Housing Authority and other non-profit developers from an upzone. In fact, an upzone probably makes its project cost more. Why? The upzoned property they want to build on is immediately more expensive. Yes, more apartments can be built on it. But any rational seller builds this increased value into the price asked of the non-profit developer. Overall, the resulting apartments are not cheaper. 2. For-profit developers that *don't* already own land? Higher profits. Why? Like non-profit developers, their land cost goes up due to the upzone, so land/cost per unit is about the same as before the rezone. They are still big winners because an upzone allows more density in the most affluent, high-demand areas where sale prices are higher and profit margins are fatter. They can develop the cool areas and continue to avoid less tony parts of town. 3. Land owners, speculators and real estate investors who owned property *before* the rezone? Winners. Their land is instantly more valuable due to the upzone. When they sell to a developer, they'll make larger profits. No wonder the real estate industry loves upzones. 4. Renters and first-time home buyers? Negligible benefit. Regardless of a developer's land cost/unit, a new condo or rental apartment will be offered at the highest price market will bear. If it's a single-	7/21/2022
Calvin Jones	I support more housing in more neighborhoods	I'd like to see the city legalize more types of housing throughout Seattle, especially in wealthy, white neighborhoods currently exclusively zoned for single family homes. The more housing we have and the more we subsidize it, the more welcoming, affordable, and sustainable we will be. Please consider an Alternative 6 that allows far more housing in far more places.	7/22/2022
Jeremy Swirsley	Alternative 5 is the best, but not enough.	We need all types of housing in all neighborhoods. The option that comes closest to doing this is alternative 5, but it still falls short. Most transit stops are on noisy, car-infested arterials. Emissions are much higher along these arterials. You should not need to live on one of those to be able to live affordably! Everyone deserves to be able to live on a quiet street if they choose, so we need more housing not just near transit stops but in all of the places in between.	7/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Richard West	Alternative 5: Combined is the clear best choice (and could go farther)	Seattle's been dragging its feet for long enough building enough housing for everyone. Not building is not going to make people go away, it's just going to exacerbate existing problems.	7/22/2022
Laura Marx	Alternative 5 is the Bare Minimum	Broad upzoning is badly needed to make Seattle more affordable. At the heart of the housing affordability crisis is the lack of supply to keep up with Seattle's growth. More housing of all kinds is needed and Alternative 5 provides the most options. We have seen in Seattle that communities that allowed townhomes have much better economic diversity than those that haven't. And that's just townhomes. Imagine the difference that some triplexes and fourplexes could make! Allowing this type of change throughout the city is the bare minimum needed. Of course, zoning changes are only the start, and there need to also be initiatives to create housing that is actually affordable. Transit improvements need to keep pace with increased density, to make it easy to navigate the city with fewer cars. Better bike paths and an expansion of bus lines with transit lanes will help to decrease congestion and improve quality of life. I work in healthcare and I would love to stay in Seattle long term, but I am the type of person who may be priced out of this city soon. The missing middle is a real problem. But even more pressing is increasing housing affordability so that we can keep more individuals housed. The link between housing prices and homelessness is clear. Seattle is way behind on solving this problem.	7/22/2022
Pat Wilkins	Alternative 5++ Here's how we do it >>>>	Spokane Council passed this Monday. Seattle Council could do it tomorrow. All it takes is a simple vote. Washington State law allows for and encourages it: https://www.spokesman.com/stories/2022/jul/18/suddenly-theres-options-spokane-city-council-oks-o/ Watch the EIS meeting from July 19th. Officials from the City admitted that we are a MINIMUM of 5 years from seeing any housing from this Plan. We needed drastic zoning changes yesterday and now must demand them for tomorrow. But there is hope. To help please send an email to council@seattle.gov urging them to pass emergency legislation like Spokane just did. If that happens we can get housing throughout the city ASAP and have this Comp Plan update build upon that when they finally finish it years from now.	7/22/2022
Jane Slater	Option 1 Do Nothing! No to up-zoning our neighborhoods!	Let's not ruin our neighborhoods, parks and green spaces. We, homeowners, work hard to afford where we live so we can enjoy our peaceful quiet and safe neighborhoods that are not overcrowded and appreciate the natural beauty around us. Note many people in the initial survey who want more housing don't live in Seattle and also those who are in favor of more housing/upzoning for townhouses etc don't want to live in them. I think the city needs to respect homeowners who value keeping our neighborhoods true single family neighborhoods. Why not convert so many of the empty downtown office spaces into condos and apartments. Also, why the need to have people live close to downtown/ upzone so much of Seattle neighborhoods when people are working from home and do not need to be close to downtown, when they can live anywhere.	7/22/2022
Tom Donnelly	Prefer Alternate 2	Seattle is or has been a city of neighborhoods but that seems to no longer be an option. The carpet bombing of the neighborhoods with housing that probably will fill the pockets of the developers but not provide working class families affordable housing will, in the end, create a very dense but much less livable city. It seems that massive building boom is not making housing any more affordable nor creating much in the way of housing for families with children. Alternate 2 seems to be the best median between being the Bronx and the Status quo. There needs to be some way that the developers of new housing MUST offer affordable units in situ and not allow the developer to buy their way out of supplying local affordable units. Otherwise the City will collapse upon itself due to the lack of nurses, firefighters, and other support staff.	7/22/2022
Susan Scanlon	Affordable Housing is Essential!	None of these options address the real problem we have in our city and that is lack of affordable housing! These options must have a way to hold the developers accountable, by law, to building housing that people with basic incomes can afford. It doesn't matter how many units, multi town-plexes, high-rise apartments etc., the city allows built. If the housing isn't affordable then we have not solved the housing crisis that we find ourselves in now. Let's address the real issue!	7/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
N M	Legalize Sixplex Housing Citywide	<p>Of the options presented, Alternative 5 is the best, as it would do the most in terms of allowing the housing market to catch up to and keep up with the job market. Housing abundance should be an ideal that Seattle should strive for. It alleviates all of our city's problems. Such a condition is really only possible if housing regulations citywide are made more flexible, such that market rate multiplexes can be built in every neighborhood. Broad legalization of multiplexes would allow the emotionally destructive redevelopment of Seattle's beloved small businesses to alleviate. A key reason why people are so upset at how the city has changed over the past decade is that their favorite neighborhood cafe, watering hole, or music venue has been redeveloped into a 5 over 1 type apartment building (or similar). Allowing sixplexes in every neighborhood residential area would make the city's growth more gradual and easy to adjust to. Social and subsidized housing are also part of the package of methods needed to arrive at housing abundance, but serve as supplements, rather than the main course. In general, the new comprehensive plan must include: >Sixplex housing allowed on every residential lot >Neighborhood scaled commercial allowed at all intersections >More commercially oriented urban villages and corridor villages of the same density within a 1/2 mile walk of frequent bus lines and more density where frequent bus lines intersect, 85' height limit minimum within new urban villages and corridor villages >Also create dense corridor villages along corridors that have historically been served by 30 min frequency buses, such that King County Metro upgrades them to 15 min frequency or better buses due to new demand that will develop on them >At light rail stations, urban center type development should be permitted within a 1/2 mile walk from the station, including high rises of residential and commercial use; these should not have a defined height limit, just a provision ensuring that the taller the building, the more sidewalk and buffer from arterial streets is required (7' sidewalk along Denny at Wall/6th next to Spire condo tower is unacceptable) >Tie housing development permitting to the growth in payroll in the city - as payroll grows year over year, a minimum of one housing unit needs to be permitted per \$30k in payroll growth (or whatever the calculation would be to restore the early 2000s level of housing affordability) in the city; if we are behind then housing permitting and design review must be expedited until we catch up</p>	7/23/2022
Zach Nostdal	We need an alternative that meets the moment	<p>A Government Accountability Office study (https://nlihc.org/resource/gao-report-congress-finds-increase-homelessness-likely-undercount-hud#:~:text=The%20report%20finds%20that%20a,to%20increased%20rates%20of%20homelessness) with the Federal Government found "that a median rent increase of \$100 per month are associated with a 9% increase in rates of homelessness." The Berk consulting report the City included as a supporting document states "If trends continue, Seattle will become increasingly exclusive to higher income households" We need more new housing than any of the stated alternatives provides. If we do not do that Seattle will continue to have increasing levels of homelessness and inequality as rents and housing prices continue to rise. Please provide at least one real alternative that will allow Seattle to regain housing affordability.</p>	7/23/2022
Martin Kaplan	One Seattle Scoping Comments - Martin Henry Kaplan, Architect AIA	Thank you in advance for reviewing and including my attached comments.	7/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Liam Alancheril	Alternative 5 Should be the Starting Point	Of the available options, alternative 5 is the best option. Housing needs to be deregulated everywhere in the city so as to ensure as equitable a process as possible for the unavoidable lack of housing supply. However, increasing housing density is not enough. Housing density needs to be combined with mixed uses, transit, and walkability investments so that the inevitable increase in population won't result in a proportional increase in car traffic/noise. Seattle should be planned for people's needs to either be close enough to walk/bike to, or within walking/biking distance of a transit station. A suggestion is to adopt a version of the urban land use zoning system of Japan which defines zones based on the highest tolerable nuisance rather than segregating land use types that can coexist. One Seattle needs to consider both sides of urban planning: land use and transportation. In addition to allowing a higher variety of building types, we need to build more protected bike lanes, remove costly minimum parking requirements, build more rapid transit, build higher density closer to rapid transit stations, and install bike parking areas in transit stations. Please also consider the environmental impact of maintaining the car-dominated status quo. I believe this is as important as analyzing the environmental effect of increasing density. Even minimal research about urban planning will reveal that density, walkability, and transit-orientation are better for the environmental, economic, and social health of any city than car-dependency. I'm not in support of building high-rises everywhere, but there is a medium density middle-ground that should be the north star for more places in and around Seattle. Seattle is still a developing city. We need to stop limiting Seattle's development potential so that it can be worthy of becoming a world-class, globally competitive city. *Attached are an image of Japan's Urban Land Use Zoning and a document with more details.	7/23/2022
natalie nairn	Support alternative 2 and protect existing affordable housing	Maintain existing affordable housing - inventory and protect. Many older buildings are purchased, torn down, and replaced with expensive new housing. I support Alternative 2, focusing growth in key areas. growth focused along high transit corridors also makes sense. Seattle should not turn into New York City.	7/23/2022
Aaftab Jain	Support for more urban village and/or corridor options.	I'm in favor of the corridor option. I'd love to see the arterial streets built up with apartments, blocking the noise from traffic for the townhomes in the block behind them, which in turn block the noise for the single family homes behind them. I also like the idea of always being in walking distance to an urban village with hums with activity. Shops, restaurants, live performances... within walking distance. I am not in favor of alternatives that would allow unplanned construction in all neighborhoods, since that would remove or reduce areas where neighbors know each other and have quiet streets to retreat from, while still being able to live in the city. Makes more sense to concentrate density than to increase the amount of people living and moving across the entire city.	7/24/2022
Meredith Ruff	Support Alternative 5! The only right thing for housing and climate	We need to build housing and we need to build up, not out. Our neighbors are out on the streets because we do not have enough housing and the draconian and racist zoning policies have kept the price of housing high. It should not be the state's job to protect the interests of private investment (i.e. housing that people have bought as an investment). Homeowners understandably do not want one of their major investments to decrease in price if more housing is built in surrounding areas. They will fight tooth and nail to protect that investment. However, building more housing, as much as possible is the only way we can adequate housing for all the people who need it. The state does not exist to protect the interests of the wealthy. Building more housing and increasing density is also the only responsible thing to do in the face of climate change. If sprawl continues, we will continue build over our forests and natural land. If we do not build housing densely, people will continue to rely primarily on cars to get anywhere contributing to the climate crisis.	7/24/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Emma Johnson	Focus on the Environmental Quality	<p>Dear City Staff, Thank you for the opportunity to comment. In reviewing the documents, I see a strong focus on resiliency, equity, affordability, and climate mitigation, which are critical goals. However, I fear a frenzied period of construction to build this future vision will bring about a very unlivable city; construction noise and demolition impacts, road closures, increased infrastructure degrade the quality of life in the city. As a person that lives under two flight paths, Beacon Hill is already suffering from noise and dust pollution and the idea of asking us to tolerate more seems unfair / untenable. I also have heard this idea tossed around that Seattle should somehow be prepared to host climate refugees coming from states that will be too hot or on fire or underwater in the next 10-20 years. The idea that a city that is only 83 square miles could possibly accommodate the rest of the nation's climate refugees is simply crazy - the math doesn't work- and we don't have enough resources or space. Housing is a profit-based venture right now, and I doubt the city can change that easily. Spec developers are the only ones able to afford/finance to buy private residential lots and transform them into triplexes or multiplexes, but those units aren't actually affordable because the construction costs and real estate prices were so high. DADUs and ADUs cost so much to build that they aren't affordable for the renters - the homeowners are going to try to make their money back; or rent them on AirBnB for \$200 a night. I don't see how moving growth into single family residential areas creates affordable housing, instead it simply makes a lot of market rate (unaffordable) new construction. In addition, I see little focus on preservation of the tree canopy (trees on private land) in the EIS plan. Trees provide shade, wind breaks, carbon storage/sink, and stormwater retention -- all critical to resiliency. Urban building, jobs, and retail cannot substitute for the ecological services of trees. It is too easy to cut down trees in Seattle - property owners can find any "reason" to cut down trees to make way for their project. To look at a real world example, look at San Francisco, where they have tight infill and no trees, and it is still extremely unaffordable. They can never build trees back. Finally, if the city feels that affordable housing is very important for sustainability and equity, the City should eliminate the provisions that allow developers to pay their way out of the Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) requirements. They should just build affordability into their projects. If the</p>	7/25/2022
Robin Briggs	Alternative 6: More Housing for Climate	<p>We need an Alternative 6 that goes beyond the alternatives outlined in the draft and allows for more housing. Giving more people space in the city and reducing sprawl is the only way we can meet our climate goals and avert disaster. Doing so will also put us on the path to solving a number of other major problems: housing affordability, homelessness, equity, and health. Why is housing a climate issue? Let me count the ways: * People who live in multi-family buildings use less energy to heat and cool their spaces. This is true for two reasons. First, because part of their space is bounded not by the outdoors, but by a neighboring indoor space that is already heated. Second, because people who live in these buildings are likely to have smaller living spaces; and it takes less energy to heat a smaller space. This gives people who live in these buildings a smaller carbon footprint. * People who live in cities are usually closer to all the places they need to go to every day. They are much less likely to be doing a long car commute to a neighboring city, and much more likely to be hopping on the bus or light rail for a short trip, or just biking or walking. If they are driving, they are driving a much shorter distance, on average. This gives people who live in denser areas a smaller carbon footprint. (People who live in the Puget Sound within a Regional Growth Center drive an average 7.1 miles/day; people who live outside drive 17.6 miles/day (Regional Transit Plan (https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/rtp_full_document_formatted_011322.pdf) p. 66 -local system). * When people live in denser areas, transit becomes much more practical than personal vehicles for getting around. With increased density, it is cheaper per person to build good transit with fast, reliable, frequent service. Transit can move many more people in the same space than cars, so it also reduces congestion. Riding transit in Seattle, where the light rail and many of the buses are electrified, and the electricity is also low carbon, is a much lower carbon footprint than driving a fossil fuel powered vehicle. Increasing the amount of housing available will reduce our per capita emissions in a way that very few other interventions will do, and it will do so without requiring additional government funding or intervention. Moreover, because we are already experiencing the effects of climate change, we cannot assume that the patterns of previous years will hold. We base our housing planning on growth projections. Our past projections have been consistently low-balled,</p>	7/25/2022
Pennie O'Grady	Too Valuable for Commodification: Social Housing and Environmental Quality	<p>Seattle needs to create more affordable housing by creating economic conditions that allow for affordability to flourish and sustain itself. Social housing does that. Building a truly inclusive, equitable and livable city requires Council and OPCD to go beyond thinking primarily in terms of zoning. Economics are in the foundation of how we relate to each other and our ecosystem, both problems and solutions. Private sector "investment" housing has created the conditions - and will continue to do so - that result in huge wealth gaps, equity disparities and environmental degradation to the detriment of everyone. I envision abundant cooling trees and green spaces with a plethora of affordable social housing ("missing middle") interwoven with reliable transit, pedestrian and bike infrastructure throughout the city. (Also, 400 pounds of CO2 emissions released for every cubic yard of concrete poured - there's got to be a better way to build.)</p>	7/25/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Zachary Smith-Evans	Support for Alternative 5	<p>I strongly support Alternative 5 that will maximize adding new housing that will begin to unravel the huge imbalance we have between jobs and housing that is driving the cost to live in this great city up and up. The City is already becoming a playground for only the rich, and if we do not act to allow more housing and housing types, this will only worsen with time. In addition, my understanding of social science on the issue leads me to conclude that the high housing cost is the primary driver of the incredible and cruel level of homelessness in Seattle and King County. The broad upzoning described in Alternatives 3 and 5 are important for getting the wealthier neighborhoods to take part in the change currently only being pushed on poorer neighborhoods. Adding modest density to these single family areas will allow more middle-class and lower income families to take advantage of the superior schools, parks, air quality, etc. In addition, I would support allowing small apartments (similar heights to existing homes), and more commercial activity, such as coffee shops and corner stores in these areas. The transit oriented development described in Alternatives 4 and 5 is also important to get the City to do what it can to mitigate Global Warming. A huge part of our City's climate emissions come from transit, and especially driving personal vehicles. The more we can focus development near light rail and high-speed bus routes, the better. Placing apartments near transit also can allow lower income residents to live car-free if they choose, taking a huge financial sink out of their budget. In addition, all alternatives should consider lessening or removing completely parking requirements, or even consider maximum parking allowances for commercial properties. Private developers and business owners are best positioned to decide if the extra cost of adding a parking space is worth it. Again, we need people to start finding ways to drive less often in their private vehicles. On a personal note, I am a middle class, 35 year old, that grew up in Spokane Valley. Seattle represented opportunity to young people from other parts of the state to move to, build a career, experience other cultures and lifestyles, and to grow and build a life. I have many friends that moved to Seattle in their 20s. Some moved back but many have chosen to build a life here and contribute to this great City like myself. I fear that 20 somethings today could not imagine being able to afford living in this City and see it only as an unobtainable place for the wealthy. I would very much like Seattle to</p>	7/25/2022
Holden Ringer	You live here, I live here, so let's make it easier for people to live here	<p>Seattle is an incredible place to live. I live here, you live here and someone from the office of planning who will read this lives here too. You know who can't live here? The firefighter who commutes from Everett, who can't afford a place to live. The young teacher graduating college who chose to go to Phoenix in search of affordability. The family that sleeps in their car after being forced out onto the streets after significant rent hikes. Seattle has an affordability crisis largely stemming from it's inability to effectively build dense housing. When 70-80% of the residential land in the city is exclusively zoned for single family homes, you are going to have a significantly harder time housing all the people that make this city run. The bus drivers, the plumbers, the janitors, and the working class shouldn't be forced to commute from Marysville. We claim to be this bastion of progressivism, but our historical desire to avoid dense development in the majority of the city really calls that into question. How can we claim to care about the environment when 62% of our emissions come from single occupancy vehicles, largely stemming from our inability to provide housing near employment? How can we claim to champion racial equity, when exclusive single family zoning and building code restrictions were largely used to gatekeep homes and wealth from people of color? How can we hope to solve the issue of people experiencing homelessness when we refuse to provide the most fundamental necessity, a home? These plans put forth are a means of addressing our future growth. However, if our current condition of general unaffordability, high housing costs, and high rates of people experiencing homelessness among many other issues are any indication of a previous need for more housing, then supporting a plan such as Plan 5 twenty years ago may have alleviated many of the issues we now experience. Since that is impossible, let's do the next best thing and support Plan 5 today, so that future generations of Seattleites are not burdened by our shortcomings and inability to do what was necessary to make Seattle the greatest city it can be. More housing today. More housing tomorrow. More housing forever.</p>	7/25/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jacob Tukel	In Support of Alternative 5... With Some Improvements	<p>I'd like to voice my strong support for Alternative 5. I think Alternative 5 could be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Encouraging or even mandating mixed-use development along corridors (shops, groceries, or light industrial spaces on the lower floors) * Allowing/encouraging single-plot commercial spaces such as day cares, hair salons, and small grocery stores in "Neighborhood residential zones". With no off-street parking, these businesses will primarily serve the neighborhoods they are in. This will help support the "15 minute neighborhood" goal set out by City Council. This differs from the "Smaller nodes" idea, in that it allows anyone to start a business out of their home. * Designate historically affluent neighborhoods as Urban Villages. Areas such as Queen Anne, Madison Park, and especially Magnolia are all ripe for absorbing growth. Traditionally, South Seattle has been forced to take on growth while retreats for the rich remain inaccessible. Magnolia in particular presents as a strong candidate for Urban Village status given it's schools, parks, and accessibility to downtown. Obviously increased bus service would need to accompany new Urban Village status. * Corridors, even primary arterials, need to have traffic calming measures put in place. 15th Ave between Ballard and Greenwood is a prime example of what we need to avoid. The corridor features dense housing, mixed-use development, and rock-star transit service, but is practically unlivable. With cars and trucks zooming past at 40 mph, the corridor is hardly walkable and feels unsafe. Try having a conversation while sitting outside an Un Bien, you'll understand what I mean. I know that freight interests have fought against traffic-calming on arterials in the past, but if we're going to continue building a strategy of urban growth along corridors, then traffic calming is a necessity. 	7/25/2022
Jacob Tukel	A Future Free of Public Golf Courses	<p>I know this is a hot-button issue, but I believe we should include a stipulation that eliminates any public golf courses that could better serve the local community and city as a whole. The goal would be to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Open up Jackson Park Golf Course to transit oriented development. A dense neighborhood here would be served by the new 130th St NE Link Station. 2) Better use the Jefferson Park Golf Course to bring housing, services, and green space to a neighborhood in need. 	7/25/2022
Ann Rodak	Option 5 with modifications	<p>Hi. I like and think option 5 is the most fair, flexible and helpful given our current situation. I feel given the surge in population in Seattle over the last few decades, Seattle requires us to evolve quicker than many of us have wanted but we still need to do so. I love aspects of the old Seattle; it's neighborhoods, it's open spaces, it's views, it's parks and relationship to nature, mountains and water. However, we are now a bigger city and many pressures are requiring an updated response to evolve the needs of the moment. I'm hoping we can do so in a way that is unique to Seattle and not a copy of some other city. To do so, we need all of Seattle to respond not just a few areas who are already feeling the pressure. Seattle is limited in its typography and we cannot let just a few areas carry the load while the rest sit in prime areas protected from change. We all need access and we all need to help solve the crisis. That said, I think the increase should be done in an incremental stepped up fashion that fits in with its current existence. For instance, single family zoned 5000 or higher could tastefully have townhouses with small yards or fourplexes and apartments with some setbacks throughout a neighborhood not to mention an urban center and transportation. Neighborhoods that already are dense could get larger public greenspaces, transportation, community buildings, or taller buildings with more space around the outside of the building for breathing room or art. We must have some talented, clever urban planners in this city. There have already been some fantastic things happening here. We just need more. Very excited about the new downtown waterfront and improvements coming to Greenlake. Where else can we give people access to areas they have not been able to go to or be part of? I'm hoping we can be comfortably dense, provide fair equitable housing in every neighborhood while preserving or reinventing safe green spaces, private gardens and field spaces for kids and adults to play. I'm hoping we can evolve to be a place not just for young urban professionals but seniors, families, and kids. With the current push to only build small yardless one/two bedroom units, where do families go? We shouldn't expect or want them to be pushed out to the suburbs. We should try to keep them here for a vibrant community. Density at all costs will not do that. We have to be smart how to develop a livable city at the same time as being dense. It means the whole city has to be included in that change and connected to the other</p>	7/25/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Tyler Lange	Seattle must remain livable, viable, attractive, and sustainable.	Options 1, 2, and 4 are to be preferred. A universal upzoning will further reduce the attractiveness of Seattle (those who can afford to leave will leave, as some already have) and its environmental sustainability (removing more of the vegetation that once made it the Emerald City). One of the pleasures of a great city is a variegated landscape, both of land use (large multifamily, small multifamily, single-family residences, and small and large commercial and industrial zones among parks and green spaces and bodies of water) and of economic stratum (large houses, smaller houses, and multifamily housing of varying price points). The goal should be to foster something like the fifteen-minute city, where residents can live, shop, and recreate within a fifteen-minute walk of their residences. Urban villages and corridors are a logical way to do this. Universal upzoning will destroy much of what makes Seattle attractive and make it less environmentally resilient. Corridors of development around islands of relatively green space are desirable. Please be careful of allowing for concrete jungles. It is very hard to move back to less intensive uses with more green space once yards and interstitial greenery are plowed under and covered with large apartment buildings or asphalt. Seattle is starting at a considerable advantage compared to London, Paris, New York, Mexico City, Lagos, etc. with respect to green space. Let's not waste that advantage too hastily. In addition, please focus on providing adequate basic services -- appropriate to municipal government -- such as waste removal, public safety, parks, utilities, libraries or internet access points and on constructing public spaces and buildings that elevate the citizens who use them. Our infrastructure is old and decaying. Millions have been spent elsewhere that might better be spent renewing the utility and transportation grid. Above-ground power lines are appropriate to a third-world country and go down in winter storms. Our water system is vulnerable to earthquakes. Our drawbridges are a century old. I strongly encourage the City to step up to its duties. Public input is fine, but many community members will offer only a partial view. It is the Mayor's and the Council's duty to take the broadest view and to prioritize basic City services. The basic issue is that the current grid is insufficient for the current city. How can the city expand or densify further without considerably intensified attention to utilities, transportation, public safety, cleanliness, and basic services? This is essentially missing from	7/25/2022
Diane Clifford	Infrastructure must be completed BEFORE planned density increase	People own private transportation vehicles and will continue to do so. There need to be safe and adequate roads with state of the art traffic flow technology. New and redeveloped housing MUST PROVIDE ADEQUATE OFF-STREET PARKING FOR CARS. Currently developers are allowed to build new apartments with hundreds of units each along already over-used arterials without providing a single parking space. None of the five options look practical or liveable to me.	7/25/2022
Simon Blenski	I support Option 5	Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I support Option 5 to increase housing options for all income levels and create more neighborhood and commercial destinations within a short walking distance. With this option, there should be equitable access to parks and open spaces, potentially by repurposing existing golf courses or former industrial areas.	7/26/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
David Moehring	Add Seattle regenerative ECO-district zones within Scope of Comp Plan update	On July 20, 2022, the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission invited Seattle's Larch Lab's architect, Michael Eliason, to present innovative land use initiatives for the City Of Seattle [(#_edn1). Some of the examples of Eco-District land use planning precedents have been included within the following pages. The mindset of both increased density and urban forestry has been tested globally as demonstrations for what Seattle's Office of Planning and Community Development must consider within their current scoping of the 2035 Seattle Comprehensive Plan update. It behooves the OPCD to work directly with the Urban Forestry Commission and the Seattle Planning Commission to introduce this eco-friendly land use growth strategy where opportunities already exist. Mr. Eliason noted that the current Northgate redevelopment was a lost opportunity, yielding bulky residential buildings without corresponding green spaces along the streets as well as integrated private property courtyards. Such examples of Seattle opportunities, where larger areas of land are already available or may be negotiated, include [(#_edn2): · Interbay commercial / industrial corridor anchored by a future Dravus light-rail transit station (image attached); · Undeveloped portions of the Expedia Campus at Elliot harbor also anchored by a future Smith Cove light-rail transit station, Interbay (image attached) · Fort Lawton Redevelopment, Magnolia (east of Discovery Park); · 6400 Sand Point Way NE, Northern edge of Magnuson Park transferred from US Dept of Interior to City of Seattle in 2002; · Talaris Conference Center, Laurelhurst; · Sacred Heart Villa & Missionary, Laurelhurst; · And these are just some of locations of where regenerative Eco-district zoning opportunities exist while consulting with the Office of Planning and Community Development. The key aspects of regenerative Eco-district zoning opportunity would incorporate the density and open space characteristics represented in the presentation by Mr. Eliason. Specifically identifying an alternative land-use pattern to counter existing canopy-reducing practices that fail to meet the urban forest canopy cover objectives for each Management Unit (residential, multifamily, commercial, etc...) as reiterated within the 2016 Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment (under the process of being updated.) With an emphasis on vertical floor area ratios (FAR), and perhaps a 1-to-1 correspondence of land coverage of buildings relative to non-vehicular-use open space, the Urban Forestry	7/26/2022
Tyler Van Dooren	Support for Option 5	It is widely known that Seattle has a severe housing shortage. This is in both the form of rentals and homes that can be purchased. Despite Seattle's large amount of residential construction over the past 5-7 years, this shortage still exists. With Seattle's current urban village concept the vast majority of construction consists of rental apartment blocks, and it can still be argued that there hasn't been enough of that built (especially affordable units). Critically, there has been very little additional housing constructed in terms of purchasable homes. The small number of townhomes (which are still only buildable in very limited areas) and ADUs DOES NOT COME CLOSE to demand. If a new single family home is constructed, it is almost always replacing a more affordable home with a large luxury home. We need to pass zoning changes to all single family neighborhoods to create the "missing middle" that has been much talked about recently. Spokane just did it, Portland has, and many of Seattle's suburbs are now having that discussion. There's no reason Seattle can't as well and if it doesn't the city is denying home ownership, and all of the equity and generational wealth that comes with it, to the vast majority of the population. In terms of zoning around future light rail stations at 130th and 145th, those areas obviously need to be upzoned. It would be incredibly stupid to spend billions on a fantastic new public transportation system only to neuter it with zoning decisions. There also needs to be a conversation about Jackson Park Golf Course and whether something with so little economic value per land area should be directly next to a new light rail line. I don't believe this should be the case, however I do think the greenery should be preserved as best as possible while accommodating additional density in the area.	7/26/2022
Jacob Baca	Support for option 5	we need more housing and this alternative creates a substantial amount of units that could move seattle in the right direction. Housing prices have become worse and worse. We need a change	7/27/2022
Elizabeth S	Support for option 5 (and more)	Seattle needs more housing and zoning laws must change, particularly in white, wealthy neighborhoods. All residents deserve to have the same amenities, safety, walkability, and access to public transportation that zoning changes & increased density can provide. We also need social housing. Seattle loses nothing by being a more equitable place. We can't go on with so many of our neighbors in crisis because of the existing policies.	7/27/2022
Paul Rogo	More mixed developments	There needs to be additional housing in ALL parts of Seattle, not just the already dense parts. Why should Capital Hill/Queen Anne/Ballard bear the brunt of Traffic with new developments while places like Montlake or Magnolia have none from only being SFH? It needs to be widespread across the whole city, including the wealthy SFH areas. I'd also like to see businesses at the bottom of these developments, so residents can live/play/work in the same spaces and minimize committing. Density near transit is extremely important as well.	7/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Shawn H	Increase transit and a focus on connection, Alt. 4!	I would like to express my support for the fourth alternative of the One Seattle Plan. While I have only lived in the metropolitan area for over a year, I have studied zoning and urban planning for years. I do believe that having a high focus on increasing public transportation options, by enhancing and growing the routes and options available, will help grow the city. Public transportation gives options to the impoverished, generally safer than a car dependent culture, is cheaper for the average citizen, promotes community, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. By focusing on public transportation while creating zoning legislation, multiple problems can be solved at the same time. However, housing affordability needs to be addressed as well. A general leniency on what types of housing can be built, will also have a tremendous effect on the city overall. Single-family housing should NOT be the predominant method of growth. Public transportation benefits from having dense, urban environments to thrive in. I advocate for mixed-use zoning, multi-family dwellings, and increased public transportation options. Thank you.	7/27/2022
Tony Passannante	Support for plan 5	It's well known that mixed zoning in other countries results in demonstrably better quality of life for families, and contributes overall to a more diverse and livable city while improving the environment	7/27/2022
Kinsley Ogunmola	I support more housing in more neighborhoods	I'd like to see the city legalize more types of housing throughout Seattle, especially in wealthy, white neighborhoods currently exclusively zoned for single family homes. The more housing we have and the more we subsidize it, the more welcoming, affordable, and sustainable we will be. I want to Seattle to be a place where people can work, live, and grow a family if they choose at any income level.	7/27/2022
Mark Sullivan	Build more housing. Build all the housing. Abolish single-family zoning.	Single family zoning laws are deeply rooted in racism. In our current times, they perpetuate not only racism, but also classism, homelessness, and environmental destruction. I support maximal building of housing and maximal subsidies for housing. Abolish single family zoning.	7/27/2022
Ryan Kelly	Options 2-5 are good, and 3 is best	Seattle clearly must do something to increase the supply of affordable housing, so option 1 is out. I believe option 3 integrates residents into existing communities best, without creating segregated areas of low income like 4 would, or 5 to a lesser extent. If this could be avoided, then building affordable housing (where low income residents are likely to live) near transit, commercial areas, ect would be great, and could reduce their need for cars (an additional expense). While I do believe the city needs more apartments, I am concerned large luxury apartments are being built but not integrating into their communities. I am in favor of some apartments being built in neighborhoods (particularly if commercial space is available on the 1st floor) but want to avoid entire streets turning into apartments with poor walk ability, poor transit options and poor parking.	7/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Natalie Bicknell	Creating denser housing in high opportunity/low displacement areas of Seattle	<p>There are many reasons why Seattle needs to bring more housing to its high opportunity/low displacement neighborhoods. People of all income levels deserve to have choices for where they can live, and the current system relegating the development of affordable multi-family housing to a very small part of the city's residential land has many negative impacts on low to middle income Seattleites, as well as the city as a whole. When I decided to buy an affordable condo in the Central District about 9 years ago, I chose the location because it was convenient for both my husband and I to walk, bike, or take transit to work. As an adjunct college instructor working at multiple campuses, living in central Seattle was the only location that gave me that opportunity. As a result, we were able to live without a car for several years, something that was really beneficial to us financially as people working in the education and nonprofit sector. It also reduced the amount of car traffic in the city. Close to where I live are several affordable housing communities, and something I have noticed over time is that many of the residents have cars. This topic also has come up in almost every community meeting related to affordable housing development in my neighborhood in recent years. I believe a major reason why so many low income households (and even homeless households) have cars is because there are not many areas of the city with affordable housing. Thus people have to take the housing that is available to them -- even if is not in a convenient location for them to get to work, school, family, etc. For a lower-income household, the cost of a car is a huge burden and stands as a barrier to becoming more financially independent and building intergenerational wealth. In addition to cars, low income people also benefit from living in mixed-income communities because of increased access to job opportunities and amenities. For families with children, living in a mixed-income community also helps ensure adequate funding for local public schools. Thus, there are many reasons why having more affordable choices available across the city would be beneficial to lower income people. Simply put ,more choices equals more freedom and a higher quality of life. The City should absolutely increase the development of affordable housing in high access to opportunity/low displacement areas as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update.</p>	7/27/2022
Alli Parrett	Would love more accessible and affordable housing	<p>After looking at the plan option, I really like the "Combined" model. I currently live in Lake City which has walkable resources on Lake City Way, but there are far fewer resources in the residential only areas. It would be great if we can expand housing options in those residential areas to be more accessible and affordable as well as provide folks with more walkable resources.</p>	7/27/2022
Elliot S	Disincentivize Surface Parking Spots for Townhomes	<p>A disappointing use of prime space To the extent that new townhome developments have dedicated parking- I think it would be a good idea to disincentivize surface parking spots in favor of private garages. I understand the appeal since they're cheap to build and can be outfitted with a porous surface- but ultimately it locks that space into being car storage forever. Realistically it will never transition into a more productive use. They also constrain floor areas which contribute to the cramped feeling that some townhomes can have. While garages aren't perfect- I think they're the lesser of two evils. They're not locked into being car storage forever. They can be a workshop, home gym, family bike storage, or even a small business. (Side note: The worst of both worlds is a shared parking garage. So please none of those. Also- covered car ports; again- worst of both worlds) A neighborhood that needs a car now hopefully isn't one that needs a car in the future. And when that happens it would be great to have buildings that are more adaptive. I would love to see Seattle implement both carrots and sticks that work together to reduce the amount of surface lots. What might this look in practice? Take a look at the plans for the picture at the top of the post. It's a 7 unit complex with space for 6 cars, plus an (ugly) driveway with a rough area of 3 cars. What could it look like? I'm 100% not an architect so there's probably a better way to design this but maybe something like this: The result? * 100% more green space for playing, relaxing, and stormwater mitigation * 20%-25% additional interior square footage for the lot * 2 surface parking replaced with 2 garages for more workshops, gyms, and bikes * Only a 16-32% reduction of the parking capacity Thanks for reading!</p>	7/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alex Peterson	Alternative 5, Costs of Non-Action, Streamline/Simplify	Seattle desperately needs more housing and more diversity of housing. For that reason I support Alternative 5 that allows for broad flexibility in the type of residences built. Secondly, any EIS or other assessment of housing must consider the costs to people and the environment of no action, including where and by whom the costs will be felt. For example, refusing to build density in the urban core means more housing on the urban-wildland interface, which increases human risks of wildfire (see e.g.: https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1718850115). In addition, high housing prices due to insufficient housing leads to instability & homelessness (see e.g.: https://projecteuclid.org/journals/annals-of-applied-statistics/volume-15/issue-2/Inflection-points-in-community-level-homeless-rates/10.1214/20-AOAS1414.short). Lastly, Seattle desperately needs a way to simplify and streamline housing development. Slow, burdensome, and repetitive design reviews, public comment periods, red tape, etc increase costs and do harm to citizens who need housing. A faster, simpler, but still transparent and accountable process will reduce costs & inequities and increase civic involvement.	7/27/2022
Rebecca Speiran	Option 5 with land back initiative	If this is all we get, I would go with option five. We need as much flexibility as possible to meet the needs of a growing region. I want to stay in seattle but my future here is in jeopardy because of the high cost of housing. I want to see us make real changes to support more diverse neighborhoods and work to not replicate patterns of environmental racism. Option five allows more mixed use buildings near parks and waterways and away from road noise and car pollution Beyond option five, I would like to see us investigate the environmental impact of land back initiatives that return stewardship of land to native peoples. The city is still on stolen land. Furthermore, development should come with significant investment in low and middle income housing. Cities in other countries have used the 40-40-20 rule to great effect.	7/27/2022
Kelsey Anderson Smith	More affordable housing, expand zoning to include more types of housing	I support more affordable, accessible housing throughout the city. I also support changing zoning laws to allow more types of housing, especially in neighborhoods currently zoned for only single family homes (i.e. primarily wealthy, often primarily white). There is a desperate need for affordable, safe housing.	7/27/2022
Alex Bartick	I support more housing in more neighborhoods	I'd like to see the city legalize more types of housing throughout Seattle, especially in wealthy, white neighborhoods currently exclusively zoned for single-family homes. The more housing we have and the more we subsidize it, the more welcoming, affordable and sustainable we will be.	7/27/2022
Emma Graysmark	More Denser Housing	I support alternative 5 and would also encourage the city to support more subsidized housing. we are in desperate need of dense housing, and also more transit. Please make seattle a city that doesn't require a car to exist.	7/27/2022
Benjamin Jensen	Legalize more housing in every neighborhood	Seattle desperately needs more housing in every neighborhood. Every residential lot in the city should be zoned for at least a six-plex. Remove minimum parking requirements. Remove side and front set-back requirements. Reduce the administrative and procedural burden on developers so we can get more housing built as quickly as possible. Get rid of design review, it only serves to slow down housing production and drive up the cost of housing for renters. Work with architects and developers to ensure mid-rise buildings can pencil and will actually get built. Option 5 is good, but not good enough. The scale of our housing crisis demands bold changes. Be bold and get it done! Oh, and support the efforts of the Social Housing Initiative 135!	7/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Cary Moon	We need a greener, more compact option - add a 6th alternative	I am a homeowner downtown, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Require permanently afford social, cross-class housing to be developed - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Upzone all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Require green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Slow gentrification and displacement - Create climate resilience - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options entrench the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this	7/27/2022
Marjorie Carlson	I support more housing in more neighborhoods	Housing is my number one concern for the future of Seattle. I support radically expanding multi-family zoning in ALL neighborhoods, not just historically POC neighborhoods. Housing should also be prioritized for people who would actually use it as a primary residence. Affordability will improve if access improves, but access will only improve if the housing isn't being bought up by people treating apartments like stocks. More housing also needs to be fully accessible. Everyone ages, so there will be a point in everyone's life when they will need an accessible home. Accessibility should be the default, not the rare find.	7/27/2022
amy richards	Alternative 6 needed to make Seattle an affordable awesome place to live	I am a renter in Capitol Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Require permanently afford social, cross-class housing to be developed - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow apartments and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Require that 25% of all new units be accessible - Require accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Promote racial justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase accessibility - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Slow gentrification and displacement - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would	7/27/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Emma Cunningham Adams	Alternative 6 needed for a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse Seattle	I am a homeowner in Lake City, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Build many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Upzone all current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Require public and free-to-access green space to be within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Require accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Enhance water quality and salmon survival via a reduction in car tire pollution - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Improve mental health - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and	7/28/2022
Maureen Hendrix	More Diversity of Housing	After reviewing the 5 options for EIS Alternatives, I'd like to state my enthusiastic support for alternative 5. I've lived in Wallingford, Ballard, the U District and Capitol Hill in my 31 years here and one day I would love to enter the housing market. I make 1.5x the median income for an individual and I'm not even close to affording a 2+ bedroom townhouse (current goal) unless I drain what I have saved so far for retirement. I'd love to see more types of housing allowed in more neighborhoods - duplexes, triplexes, housing clusters with a shared garden area. The current options, availability, and pricing do not reflect my needs or the needs of my peers.	7/28/2022
Brian Drew	More types of zoning needed	I would like to see more areas opened up to different types of housing. Exclusively single family zones are too abundant and make it impossible to find affordable housing. Please open these neighborhoods to multifamily homes.	7/28/2022
David Stephens	I support more housing in more neighborhoods!	I'd like to see the city legalize more types of housing throughout Seattle, especially in wealthy, white neighborhoods currently exclusively zoned for single family homes. The more housing we have and the more we subsidize it, the more welcoming, affordable, and sustainable we will be.	7/28/2022
Julia Jay	Diversification of zoning to allow greater density and affordable housing	Seattle is growing rapidly and that growth should be accommodated in all parts of the city. Seattle should expand urban zoning and encourage a diversity of housing options in all neighborhoods, to prevent overconcentration of growth and skyrocketing housing prices, which results in displacement. We should embrace growth instead of doing the bare minimum, and pro-actively plan for a city that is affordable and accessible.	7/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alexander Wallace	Alternative 6!	I am a homeowner in Wallingford , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Require permanently afford social, cross-class housing to be developed - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	7/28/2022
Jon Ravsten	Housing in seattle	Please consider allowing denser and more multi family housing in seattle. It is at least a start on ending homelessness. Thanks jon	7/28/2022
Claire C	I Support Low-Income and Multi-Family Housing	Hello, I would like the City to allow zoning for more middle- and low-income multi-family residences, particularly in wealthy neighborhoods that are currently zoned for single family residences. I think we need to provide and subsidize more multi-family residences in all neighborhoods to make Seattle more livable for young people and marginalized groups. I live in the Ballard neighborhood and have noticed more MFRs going up in the area, even among SFRs in wealthier areas. I support this and would like to see more of it - particularly low-income residences - across all of Seattle's neighborhoods. This would be good for Seattle because it would allow more people to live in the area, put more people within close access to public transit, and allow more people to contribute to the local economies. It would also makes Seattle more livable for its young people, low- and middle-income residents, and its marginalized communities.	7/28/2022
Melissa Petersen	Affordable housingsis #1 priority!!!	We must must must must must increase affordable housing options in Seattle! Option 5 is the only path which starts to address this urgent priority.	7/28/2022
Carter Wilson	Allow more housing, and simplify the code	I would like to see more housing, remove restrictions on single family zoning laws that only lead to the already wealthy becoming even more wealthy. the current code is complicated and hard to follow, I would like to see the code simplified so that a 5th grader could read and understand, not a team of lawyers	7/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
evelyn lewis	Alternative 5	I advocate for alternative 5 for the broadest possibilities for increasing housing density.	7/28/2022
yensin fly	More housing, more community	I support alternative 5, opening more types of housing, especially more affordable housing, throughout Seattle's neighborhoods. If we want to stop the growth of homelessness in Seattle, we need to drastically increase the housing that is allowed to be built, and drive housing prices back down.	7/28/2022
Veronica Suchodolski	More housing-dense walkable communities in Seattle!	I support Alternative 5 of the comprehensive plan, allowing for more mixed-use walkable communities, more housing, and fewer single-family homes in Seattle. I am a young apartment owner and non-driver living in Capitol Hill, and I love living somewhere where I can walk to all my needs — work, groceries, restaurants, bars, small business, etc. It is a shame that Capitol Hill is prohibitively expensive for many people, and that fewer similarly walkable communities exist within Seattle. I would love to see our city support dense + affordable housing and reduction in need for cars, which I think would strengthen the ties of our communities and inspire citizens to be more open and involved with our neighbors.	7/28/2022
Ross Milne	Diversify zoning to allow greater density and affordable housing	Seattle is growing rapidly and that growth should be accommodated in all parts of the city in a sustainable way in some version of Alternative 5. Seattle should expand urban zoning and encourage a diversity of housing options in all neighborhoods, to prevent overconcentration of growth and skyrocketing housing prices, which results in displacement. We should embrace growth instead of doing the bare minimum, and pro-actively plan for a city that is affordable and accessible.	7/28/2022
Jonathan McCurdy	More Housing, More Bike Lanes, More Crosswalks, Yesterday	My primary concern is housing. I am a resident of Seattle in the 98103 zip code and love the mixture of housing types in Fremont and Wallingford. Then I learned that many of the quads and large subdivided house apartments in the area are actually non-compliant and would have to be replaced by houses when they inevitably fall into disrepair. I support option 5 of the comp plan update, Combined Plan, for the maximum, optimally distributed new housing. At this point I'd be happy with options 3 or 4 as well. Converting just 12% of our current single family home stock into quadplexes would greatly alleviate our housing crisis. How is it that we've let CA and OR and even MN beat us to the punch in allowing missing middle housing to be built. I thought Washington and Seattle specifically were some progressive paradise, but what good does that do if nobody can afford to move here, even the grown children of current residents! We had a great, if incremental residential bill in the state legislature last session and just let it die. What gives?? ----- My second priority is pedestrian and bike safety. Living at 40th and Woodland Park, my options for walking down to the Stone Way x 35th St business corridor is either walking along the narrow, noisy, construction-laden sidewalk along Stone Way, or down Woodland Park, which is a much quieter street, but has as many as 3 unprotected road crossings, with no crosswalks, stop signs or even HAWKs (activity activated flashing lights).	7/28/2022
Evan Shaw	Dense, mixed zoning, car free developments, green space.	Density should be allowed all over the city. Development should be planned to link together by park-like walk/bike/transit corridors (no cars). Consider a special category of high density car free zoning around transit. Once we have a real transit system not everyone will need a car. Start building that housing now. When I say density I mean 4 stories in what is now single family and uncapped height around transit hubs. The city of Seattle should follow the German baugruppe model to build, own, and operate tens of thousands of social housing units. We can preserve a few historic neighborhoods of single family homes, but we do not need more than a few blocks of that in each neighborhood. Seattle can no longer pretend to be a suburb. Single family zoning is racist, bad for the climate, and bad for civic life. People who want to live in a single family area have plenty of options, but Seattle is too important to be held hostage to these groups anymore.	7/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Evan Chaney	Affordable housing everywhere	I'd like to see everyone who wants to live in Seattle have an opportunity to live in Seattle. Alternative 5: affordable housing throughout the whole city.	7/28/2022
Sasha K	In support of Alt 5 for mixed zoning, and beyond!	The city should legalize and offer more types of housing, especially in wealthy neighborhoods that are exclusively zoned for single family homes. We would benefit from mixed housing options both to rent and own, especially along corridors to allow for easier access to transit. The current housing market is not affordable; people are being priced out of Seattle. As a former Northgate resident, the 130th station doesn't seem like it will particularly serve residents better than the Northgate station does. The difference is there will be more parking, but there are not many businesses or homes around 130th. Legalizing multi-use zoning will provide more housing and have more use for the 130th station.	7/28/2022
Rebecca Sliter	In favor of an Alternative Six	I am a homeowner in Wallingford , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Reduce rates of homelessness - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Madrid, which closed off its downtown go through traffic, becoming a vibrant accessible place for humans to live and work. is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	7/28/2022
Max Rappaport	We need alternative 6	I am a homeowner in Judkins Park, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Require permanently affordable social, cross-class housing to be developed - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing, amenities and necessities are within walking or biking distance of almost everyone, and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	7/28/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Carly Rappaport	Alternative 6 option	I am a homeowner in Judkins park, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Require permanently affordable social, cross-class housing to be developed - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	7/28/2022
Bryan Kopel	Deregulate Zoning	In Japan there is very little zoning restriction and that has led to very affordable and abundant housing where it is needed. Allow the market to sort out the majority of the problem and use some public funds and lands to fill in any gaps if they occur.	7/29/2022
Stephen Bowie	We need affordable housing	Seattle needs affordable housing. That means upzoning communities to allow for multifamily buildings, increased density, and public housing.	7/29/2022
Carolyn Akinbami	Alternative 5	Diversify zoning for more urban density and affordable housing I have lived in Capitol Hill for over 20 years. Seattle is growing rapidly and that growth should be accommodated sustainably through all of Seattle. We should expand urban zoning and create a diversity of housing options in every single neighborhood, to prevent overconcentration of growth in any one area and to keep housing prices in check. Let's embrace the inevitably continuing growth, and pro-actively plan for it. We need a city that is affordable and accessible.	7/29/2022
Charlotte Tan	Consider explicitly including mixed-income housing and development as a goal	With the HALA and MHA "Grand Bargain" we got a total of 21 affordable units in 2020 and 95 affordable units in 2021. While it's great that the city also got revenue, I think it's clear that for-profit development will by default lead to class and race segregation. We see it again and again with schools, services, etc. because people who are well-off have more time to advocate for themselves and their communities. Integrated communities will help ensure that development benefits everyone and I think that's worth making an explicit goal. While I'm a proponent of upzoning, I think the default 4+1s have also failed to support local or interesting businesses. We don't need more mediocre burger places or T-Mobile stores. I would hate to see upzones in the U District make it unaffordable for the variety of restaurants that thrive there. Similarly, many of the businesses along the light rail in south Seattle are at risk of being priced out with new development. Please consider making it an explicit goal to develop without displacement by supporting the businesses already there.	7/29/2022
Ziadee Cambier	denser and variety of housing for all	Homelessness is one of the biggest problems facing our city and even middle class working people are priced out of buying and renting within the city. the plan must prioritize housing options for everyone. Denser housing with lower commute times for all the low income workers we require to clean our buildings and pour our coffee also serves flight climate change. Please implement a version of Alternative 5 that will accommodate growth in all parts of the city.	7/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Nicole Sweeney	Queen Anne Community Council Seattle Comprehensive Plan Comments	Please see attached for QACC comments on Seattle Comprehensive Plan.	7/29/2022
Katie Gullickson	More Housing in More Neighborhoods	I would like to see Seattle legalize and champion a wider variety of housing options in all types of neighborhoods, but specifically neighborhoods currently exclusively zoned for single family homes. I would like to see zoning expanded to include more dense housing options, mixed-income housing options, and affordable multi-family housing options. The more housing we have available and the more we subsidize it, the more welcoming, affordable, and sustainable we will be.	7/29/2022
Kyler Parris	Need Alternative 6 - Upzone for an equitable future	I am a union member in Seattle, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce rates of homelessness - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this failure. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	7/29/2022
Sarah Lovejoy	Increase Low-Income/Multi-family Housing	I support zoning that increases low-income and multi-family housing options across all neighborhoods, especially those currently zoned as single family. Create opportunities for affordable homes within transit corridors and easy access to daily shopping needs decreasing reliance on single occupant vehicles.	7/29/2022
Annabel Sherwood	Thoughtful urban planning vs. a free-for-all for real estate developers	Increasing density is a given in Seattle (and much-needed), but all I've seen so far are blocks of new townhomes that are still too expensive for most people to live in. Instead of doing away with single-family zoning laws outright, why not have a more thoughtful approach that provides different types of housing at a range of prices in a way that preserves the character of the neighborhoods (trees, walkability, diverse people of different ages and incomes) that makes people want to live there in the first place. There has to be thoughtful planning for infrastructure and environmental preservation to allow for the density predicted for the future. Otherwise, it's going to suck to live in this city with congested streets, no trees, zero community, and unaffordable new construction that's been the norm in the past few years.	7/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Thomas Dunn	We need more housing!	<p>I am a renter in Capitol Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow apartments and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Require public and free-to-access green space to be within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Require that 25% of all new units be accessible - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Require accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Enhance water quality and salmon survival via a reduction in car tire pollution - Promote racial justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Improve mental health - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Create climate resilience - Increase access to green space - Reduce the urban heat island effect <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options 	7/29/2022
benjamin garfinkel	alternative 5!	<p>As a white homeowner in Seattle, I believe that everyone deserves to have affordable housing. More housing types should be legal in every corner of Seattle, especially in historically white neighborhoods. We live in a city-wide community that is currently excluding it's less privileged in the name of "neighborhood fabric." We must do away with this racist framework of thinking about neighborhoods and reshape our city to be more welcoming and affordable for all. For the sake of our neighbors, community, and the future of this city I urge the city council to adopt alternative #5.</p>	7/29/2022
Shawn Wiisher	We Need a Sixth Alternative	<p>I am a homeowner in Fremont, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city * Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household * Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials * Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city * Build many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms * Allow sixplexes across the entire city * Eliminate parking minimums * Expand the bike lane and trail network * Require accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times * Reduce rates of homelessness * Reduce greenhouse gas emissions <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. * The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. 	7/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
GB Wong	Need Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in Fremont, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Require permanently affordable social, cross-class housing to be developed - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Build many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone all current single-family neighborhoods - Allow apartments and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Require that 25% of all new units be accessible - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Require accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Slow gentrification and displacement <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing 	7/29/2022
Cynthia Jatul	Alternative 5 with specifications for affordability	<p>I support increased density especially around transit. I live near the Roosevelt light rail station and think it's great that affordable housing is almost complete near the station and that zoning has allowed apartments 1to be built. My main concerns with planned development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Affordability-Seattle is impossible for low income and working people to rent and buy homes. Changing zoning to allow for greater density isn't sufficient to ensuring that that the units will be affordable. Developers can build plenty of multi-unit structures that are still prohibitively expensive. How will affordability be ensured in ongoing development? * Reduce GHG emissions-all development must have this goal with ease of access to transit and walkability high priorities. Safe biking also needed. * Livability-we all benefit from green space and pedestrian friendly areas for shopping/eating. We need more of these spaces for cleaner air, cooling, and improved mental health. 	7/29/2022
Eva Maxfield	Alternative 6 (or at least Alt 5)	<p>I am a renter in Queen Anne, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Require all major services to be within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining 	7/29/2022
Cerek Hillen	More mixed use walkable + bikeable neighborhoods	<p>Up first: I'm pro Alternative 3! We should open up the housing market in Seattle to provide more dense, mixed-use housing throughout the city. In a short time horizon, neighborhoods with a more residential charm will remain residential. But on a long time horizon it will allow developers to build up neighborhoods along the natural expansion of the city. The city should also prioritize making all new developments walkable and bikeable. Studies show residents are happiest when they can walk or bike for short commutes and take rail on long commutes. Build new link stations to improve residents' public transit experience. Ensure there is neighborhood-to-neighborhood transit, rather than solely spoke-and-hub. Prioritize mixed use housing. And of course, make everything walkable and bikeable as best as you can! Thank's y'all for opening up this forum for comment :)</p>	7/29/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Kelsey Nyland	Study Policy Intersections as Part of EIS	OPCD - Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scoping period for the Comp Plan EIS! It is my strong recommendation that this EIS prioritize studying the intersections between policy and planning decisions, as opposed to studying impacts in silos. Specifically, I would like to see the Comp Plan EIS study the following two issues: * Forecast the future of employment in the Manufacturing Industrial Centers (MIC) in a way that factors in the transition to a greener economy and needed/projected impacts on industrial jobs due to climate change. I reviewed a forecast on industrial jobs that was included in the Industrial & Maritime DEIS, but it made no mention of climate change impacts. I think it is a massive mistake not to study the impact climate change will have on jobs in the MICs over the next several decades. * Create alignment between the Seattle Transportation Plan update (currently underway) and the Comp Plan update. Multiple Alternatives (4 & 5) propose increasing housing types in areas well-served by transit. How do these proposals intersect with neighborhoods that are requesting - and may see an increase - in transit availability through the Seattle Transportation Plan update? Thank you again for the opportunity to comment, and I hope to see these issues studied in the eventual EIS. Best, Kelsey Nyland	7/29/2022
Doug R	Focus on walkable nodes	Focus denser development in walkable, complete neighborhood hubs that expand outward over time. Walk score is more important than transit score and the key to livability. 1/2 mile radius (10 min walk) is a good rule of thumb. Public investments in block-by-block urban planning, and protected bike trails, light rail expansion, etc. to encourage alternative modes of transit between hubs. No blanket up zones! Those will result in spreading density around car-dependent neighborhoods and more cars on the already-clogged streets.	7/29/2022
Brie Gyncild	Include a bolder, more comprehensive alternative	I agree with all the people calling for an alternative 6 to create more housing throughout the city, with an emphasis on safe and accessible active transportation instead of prioritizing cars. The language appears in several other comments, so I won't repeat it here. Instead I'll focus on why it's necessary. We face an existential climate crisis, and our city has been damaged by historic (and current) racism, as well as mind-boggling inequities in income and wealth. More people move here every year, and will continue to as other parts of the country and world become uninhabitable. We need to take bold action to shape our city to meet our climate, equity, and Vision Zero goals. Zoning, transportation, amenities, services all play a huge part in that. The Alternative 6 that many are proposing would focus us and accelerate our progress toward our goals.	7/30/2022
Miguel J	Eliminate ALL exclusionary zoning	I want to see a comp plan that recommends the elimination of ALL exclusionary zoning. Seattlites are creative, entrepreneurial folks. We should have cottage clusters and fourplexes in our neighborhoods. We should be able to combine lots and build DADUs for our elders across the previous existing property lines. We should be allowed to start salons, co-working spaces, or micro breweries in refinished garages. This will not "destroy" single family zones. It will make them vibrant walkable places. It will build community and introduce racial and age diversity. Current zoning limits our ability to live our lives to the fullest. This new approach would rely on ingenuity and give the power back to the people.	7/30/2022
Left Blank	Single-Family AND Density	I agree that we need more density in Seattle and that this is the only way to address the affordability crisis. However, completely uprooting single-family zones city-wide is not the way to do this. We need to be a city of both neighborhoods and housing options. It seems, to me, that the most logical course is continuing and expanding the urban village concept. This plan lets the city focus on density in areas near transit and parks while also allowing single-family zones to coexist in the fabric of our city. Hate them if you will, people like single-family zones and it would be silly to think that this will change just because our city needs to increase density.	7/30/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Caleb Heeringa	For climate and affordability, chose Alternative 5	It's vital that Seattle become a true climate leader by embracing abundant housing near regular transit service. Under the status quo vast swaths of Seattle are extremely car dependent, with the costs of detached single family homes quickly becoming out of reach for most residents. Embracing duplexes, triplexes, and small commercial spaces in our neighborhoods gives the next generation of working Seattleites a shot at calling Seattle home instead of enduring long commutes from outside the city, which means added climate pollution, suburban sprawl and loss of biodiversity. 20-30 years of the urban village strategy has failed us, and concentrated development pressure in a small sliver of the city's land. This has displaced many existing older, low-rise commercial spaces that typically are the only spots that our city's unique, independent businesses can afford. We need more commercial space generally, but especially for art, music, culture that can't typically afford the rent in new development. Spreading development around the city provides an opportunity for the city grow organically instead of the status quo, where all development is funneled into a few small areas while neighborhoods with suburban zoning patterns are preserved in amber, serving as defacto retirement communities for the wealthy.	7/30/2022
Xen Eldridge	Seattle needs Combined Plan at a minimum--even if wealthy home owners say "no"	This city desperately needs denser housing, with broader opportunities for home ownership to allow people of all income levels to escape forever renting from landlords who are lucky enough to have more capital. We cannot allow this essential step in developing an equal city to be stifled by the chorus of wealthy white landowners and landlords who are afraid of people with lower incomes than themselves existing in their line of sight. "Neighborhood character" is white supremacy in action. Every moment that SFH zoning continues to exist in Seattle is another moment of shame, perpetuating deeply racist and classist policy developed by--you guessed it--wealthy white land owners, intended to keep "others" away.	7/30/2022
Kristen Grote	Alternative 6: The City of the Future	Seattle has the opportunity to become a national leader in crafting the city of the future — but we must be bold. We are no longer a sleepy burg tucked away in the remote Northwest, so our housing strategy will enable us to take our place as one of the world's great cities. Alternative 5 is indeed an ambitious and forward-thinking plan, but we can and should go further. Affordable, quiet, safe, convenient, leafy, and vibrant neighborhoods should not be a privilege to a select few, but the standard for all Seattle residents. Multifamily Zoning Everywhere ----- a mix of single-family, townhome, and apartment buildings on a street in Fremont The city should open ALL neighborhoods to a wide range of multifamily housing options, not just duplexes and townhomes, but cottage courts, rowhouses, and yes, apartment and condo buildings. Many of our most vibrant neighborhoods have most of these housing types already in place from the days before more restrictive zoning, so we know this type of density expansion works, we simply have to bring it back and apply it everywhere. High-rises in Urban Villages ----- people walking in a tree-lined plaza in South Lake Union the shadow of a high-rise building The city already knows that proximity to transit and services is an essential component to thriving communities, which is why we need to maximize available housing by allowing high-rise buildings in "urban village"-designated areas. This kind of zoning already exists in South Lake Union, Belltown, and the University District, so let's expand it to all neighborhoods and supercharge density in the places people want to be. Light Industrial & Commercial ----- Why stop at 15-minute neighborhoods? Why not 10- or even 5-minute neighborhoods? Allowing light industrial and commercial uses like coffee shops, bakeries, and corner stores in residentially-zoned areas will further improve the vibrancy and quality of life for local communities and reduce traffic and crowding in urban villages, while providing opportunities for small business owners. Broader Reforms ----- Additionally, while not within the Office of Planning's power to regulate, I recommend city and state officials also advocate for the following reforms: * Repeal or amend the Washington Condominium Act to enable construction of new condo buildings, expanding home ownership opportunities to more people * Abolish Community Design Review to reduce development costs and speed up	7/30/2022
Robert Zeinemann	Alternative 2 or Alternative 4	I favor Alternative 2 "Focused" or Alternative 4 "Corridor" as making the most sense. I love the idea of 15-minute cities where people can walk, and corridors make sense as the place to put more density in the transit corridors. Some areas of the City are not suitable for higher density because they are isolated by geography or topography (water, steep slopes), or the existing infrastructure cannot support it. Historic preservation matters as well. Let's not repeat the mistakes "urban renewal" of the 1960s when existing neighborhoods were taken apart in a rush to rebuild cities.	7/30/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Greg Stinson	Alternative 5 with more trees & Green space	I like opening up general upzoning around the city to allow the market to determine where increased density is best placed. Allowing tall buildings around transit stops seems like a no-brainer. I hope that zoning requires there be green space within ~5 blocks of all new buildings and that the ground floor of buildings over 4 stories be dedicated to commercial space. I'm not super familiar with building codes, but apartments should be built with noise insulation between floors. As we live closer together, I hope that we can learn to share green spaces better together. Requiring commerce on the ground floor of buildings seems like the simple way to expand business around new residences so that the required 15 minute services are available to all.	7/30/2022
Jazmine Smith	Alternative 6	I am a renter in Lower Queen Anne , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Incentivize and allow permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this failure. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a	7/30/2022
Benjamin Maritz	8 stories everywhere height is allowed, 12 for mass timber	As a developer, I am heartbroken that I cannot provide family size housing to my neighbors in Seattle. Due to scarcity of land and regulation, it is very expensive to build in Seattle. It is so expensive, that even at our sky high housing prices, I can't provide a profitable return for my investors building any housing type bigger than a small apartment. If I can't provide a return for my investors, I can't build it. The only proven way to make housing cheaper is to make building sites more available, and to allow for greater density on each site. The lowest cost and most sustainable way of building is to maximize the use of wood in each building. As of now, traditional light wood frame structures are limited to 85' in height. We should allow up to 85' in every area we expect multifamily to be built. The "impact" on a neighborhood from a four story and and eight story is not meaningful. But doubling the amount of housing in a project is. In the future, mass timber, or heavy timber, will be an attractive construction type. Currently it costs more than light wood framing and so is not used much. If we allowed mass timber projects to reach their building code maximum of 12 stories, there would be a meaningful advantage due to the higher density. We would be come a leader in the most sustainable type of construction. So, 85' everywhere we allow multifamily, and 120' for mass timber.	7/31/2022
Alexis Michaels	Spokane Plan now, Alternative 5 (6) after	Shocked and stunned that our Council could have yesterday & must tomorrow vote like Spokane just did to immediately allow multi-family everywhere. That can then run for a year or two while the finishing touches are put on option 5 (6). To leave the future of housing in our city solely in the hands of the very people who created this mess in the first place and then got rolled by the developers during HALA is insane. https://kuow.org/stories/spokane-s-embrace-of-missing-middle-housing-sets-up-competition-with-seattle	7/31/2022
Anthony Asp	Alternative 5!!!!	More housing, way more density. I would ban single family only zoning if could. Zoning that increases affordability. Build so much housing that the market value of housing declines!	7/31/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Harris Schwartzreich	I support Alternative 5. Please increase density so we can afford to live here	<p>In Seattle we continue to have a hot housing market and one of the highest costs of living in the country: https://www.geekwire.com/2019/cost-living-study-ranks-seattle-fifth-expensive-u-s-city-live/ A greater supply of housing would ease the pressure on the housing market, lower prices and rents, reduce inequality, reduce homelessness, and also mean that I personally can still afford to live here. It's no more and no less than supply and demand: https://www.theurbanist.org/2021/06/02/new-round-of-studies-underscore-benefits-of-building-more-housing/ For too long, the environmental review process has been captured and exploited by special interests to protect their skyrocketing property values. But in the era of climate emergency, we know that actually building and investing in infrastructure, and allowing more density, is good for the environment: https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/13/opinion/berkeley-enrollment-climate-crisis.html https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/aug/22/cities-climate-change-dense-sprawl-yimby-nimby We are a large, growing, and grown-up city. It's absurd that there is so much single family zoning in the urban core - there's no reason we can't build more townhouses and duplexes in every neighborhood. Overconcentration of growth in already dense neighborhoods like Capitol Hill just leads to higher prices, inequality and more displacement. We need a diversity of housing in every neighborhood, and especially this 'missing middle.' Please go with Alternative 5.</p>	7/31/2022
James Suddarth	I support Alternative 5	<p>We need to rezone Seattle to build higher density housing, this will better address our housing crisis and make it more affordable to rent here or buy a condo/townhome/house. It will also create more walkable communities that will be better for the environment and create more retail space that people can utilize more effectively.</p>	7/31/2022
Evan Van Cotthem	Alternative 6: A Seattle for everyone	<p>I grew up in Seattle, and I hope to one day to raise my kids there. Unfortunately, I may never get that chance as the path that the city is currently on restricts housing, small business and community development in favor of maintaining an inequitable, unsustainable, and unaffordable status quo. My brother started a successful restaurant in Seattle in the aftermath of the financial crisis helping to revitalize downtown, but he was forced to move because it was unaffordable to raise a family here. I shudder considering how many others have been forced to make the same choice between home and a family. I believe that to prevent this Seattle needs an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, sustainable and diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Upzone the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and 12-plexes across the entire rest of the city - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Increase diversity throughout the city - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Slow gentrification and displacement - Create climate resilience - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 	7/31/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Olivia Harber	Alternative 6	I am a renter in The University District, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Legalize missing middle housing throughout the entire city - Incentivize and allow permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk or bike ride of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://www.shareable.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/blog_top-image_Wohnhausanlage_Sargfabrik_1140.jpg Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	7/31/2022
Robert Randoy	Density and Diversity	walking distance from light rail: incentivize little cities/ neighborhoods with housing, grocery, restaurants, entertainment, small business. Housing should include rental and owner (condos, townhomes). City owned public housing in proximity to privately owned condos of different sizes and costs. Less density as distance increases from transportation arteries. Public green spaces throughout. Make it possible to not need a car. Make it possible for schools and businesses to serve diverse income levels. Affordable housing should be a priority.	8/1/2022
Andrew Katz	We need a more ambitious, inclusive, foresighted, and equitable Alternative 6	I am a renter in First Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Enhance water quality and	8/1/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Madeline Burchard	We must do better	<p>I am a homeowner in Phinney Ridge, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/1/2022
Matthew Whitney	I support Alternative 5	<p>I am a white male homeowner in the Morningstar / Maple Leaf / Northgate area. I believe that all people should have access to affordable housing, and all who desire to live and flourish in this city should have every opportunity to do so. I also believe we must plan and build this city in an environmentally sustainable manner, mitigating our impacts to the climate, and atoning for historical racial injustices. Thus, I strongly support Alternative 5 (combined) of the EIS. I support the elimination of all single-family / single occupant zoning throughout the city. I support the implementation of "missing-middle housing" that includes duplexes and triplexes. I support any and all measures to increase transit, bike facilities, sidewalks, reduced parking for automobiles, taking away travel lanes from cars to support other means of travel, etc. Paint is not enough and speed limit reductions are not enough - as people are still dying in crosswalks, so I support the removal of access for cars from city right-of-way wherever appropriate. For the 130th and 145th Light Rail Stations, I strongly support the "Alternative 3 More and Distributed Growth (aligns with Comp Plan Alt 5)" options. Thank you.</p>	8/1/2022
Andrew Kidde	Seattle can become an equitable, sustainable city...	<p>I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/1/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Emily E	Seattle requires more affordable housing	My partner and I are both young urban professionals who graduated college last year. We moved to Seattle in hopes that it would be a city with a strong sense of community. We left Los Angeles to live here. Unfortunately, we were surprised to see that Seattle rent was overall worse than what we found in Los Angeles. The lack of rent control in all of King County has driven low-income neighborhoods to expect the same kind of rental payment in neighborhoods with more resources. Our 2bd apartment in Kent is \$1725/mo without utilities, and we hear gunshots every night, our car has been vandalized multiple times, and the nearby living alternatives are just as or more expensive. Despite our concerns, our landlord decided to raise rent to \$1795 for the next year. It's become obvious to us that landlords run this city, and they plan on making Seattle the Detroit of the PNW. They intend to drive rent so high that it's no surprise to me how impoverished this city has become. I worry for those like us who don't have college degrees, and are working hourly jobs with little benefits. We looked into the KCHA options, only to find it's possible after a years long waitlist. We are counting down the days until we can leave. It makes no sense to us that we could afford the luxuries and culture of Los Angeles at a cheaper price, and struggle to make ends meet in a place like Kent, which is very much still in development. Overall, I am very excited at the broad and focused development models the most. I feel that the outer-lying regions of Seattle are need of major facelift, and an urban-village type of development would relieve many of our issues with housing. My main complaints are that Kent is car-centric and somehow just as expensive as Seattle proper.	8/1/2022
Jatin Singhal	Improve zoning to allow affordable housing through densification	Some version of Alternative 5 is necessary for Seattle to continue growing in a sustainable way. Please use this option as a way to expand urban zoning for multi-family housing, prevent overconcentration of growth, and prevent skyrocketing housing prices causing the city's displacement/homelessness crisis. We should pro-actively plan for a city that is affordable and accessible, especially considering that the city's growth does not look like it's going to stop anytime soon.	8/1/2022
E.J. Foust	More Housing Everywhere	I support a phased option 5. We are in a housing crisis and the city is becoming unlivable. We must implement an all-of-the-above approach. Affording a one-bedroom apartment is becoming a luxury even for professionals. Nonprofit, service industry, blue-collar, and industrial workers should be able to live in the city in which they work, instead of commuting from neighboring communities, which increases traffic, pollution, and noise for every one. I would also like to see the city aggressively lobby the state to allow for rent control. Landlords and property managers have been increasing rents by unreasonable amounts year after year, displacing low-income communities and pushing them out of the city. They are rewarded for this. Until they are able to build enough housing, there should be caps on annual rent increases. Low-income and middle-income housing should be spread throughout the city, even in affluent neighborhoods, which require service workers in their commercial districts and homes. The city should also lobby for changes to state condo liability laws. Most of Seattle's workers are priced out of both the condo and single-family home market and are forced to rent while being taken advantage of by a rental market that allows exploitation. There's no reason why condos should be so rare and apartments so ubiquitous. Everyone, particularly the business community, wants to brag about how fast this wonderful city grows, but no one seems to want to come to terms with the fact that growth causes drastic change. Enough with the NIMBYs.	8/2/2022
Duran Abshir	Affordable housing a priority	Without affordable housing increase Seattle will deal with more people with mental issues and more homeless people and we have NO mental hospitals around. Why wait?	8/2/2022
Tim Deeb-Swhart	We need an option 6	Option 5 is progress but doesn't go far enough to pull us out of the grave Seattle has dug for its citizens. We need an option 6: * Social housing. Housing should be a human right, not a commodity. We need to house our neighbors (https://www.houseourneighbors.org/learn-more) not kick them out * High-density housing allowed everywhere. We need multifamily homes, apartments, and condos so that everyone – not just those with means – can afford to live. Spokane just did it (https://www.spokesman.com/stories/2022/jul/18/suddenly-theres-options-spokane-city-council-oks-ol/) , why haven't we?	8/2/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jim Keany	Housing and Zoning	I don't like Alternative 3:Broad. It is not land use planning. It takes a lazy way of increasing density in a helter-skelter process. I much prefer Alternatives 3 or 4 as they take some thought on how to increase growth taking into account TOD routes, existing infrastructure and land use, and growth pressures. I live in Wedgwood and there have been some good examples of focused development in the north end - the Roosevelt neighborhood around the light rail station made a lot of sense. Recently the Wedgwood Community Council provided a vision plan for 35th Avenue NE increased density - specifically at major intersections - NE 85th, NE 75th, and NE 65. It included step-down density along 35th as one moved away from these busy intersection. It made a lot of sense and was mostly adopted in the rezone by the City Council. I would like to see similar work engaging local neighborhoods. Not the Broad Plan of Alternative 3 - which is not planning - just a lazy solution to a complex problem. Thank you.	8/2/2022
Vanessa Murdock	Seattle Planning Commission scoping comments	Seattle Planning Commission comments are attached	8/2/2022
Julia Indivero	Investing in heat resiliency in Seattle	I think something that needs to be considered as part of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan is how the city is going to build climate resiliency in the city, in particular against future heat during the summers. The heat waves during summer 2021 and this summer are going to be the new normal for our summers, and our existing buildings (particularly apartments) are not built to handle these high temperatures. My apartment does not have building-wide AC, and because of the age and design of the building, it gets uninhabitably hot in my apartment. I know many others who are in some similar situations. People who own houses and have the financial means to install AC will be able to do so, but low-income homeowners and renters (who cannot force their landlords to install AC in their home or apartment building) will not be able to. City cooling shelters cannot be the only solution for improving Seattle's ability to cope with inevitable future higher summer temperatures, as they do not allow people to go about their daily lives and live in their own homes. As a city, we need to realize that higher summer temperatures are here to stay, and we need to start adapting our city buildings and infrastructure to allow us to cope. The city should consider 1) subsidizing low-income homeowners and incentivizing/subsidizing landlords of houses, apartment buildings, and condo buildings to retrofit buildings with energy-efficient cooling systems (such as heat pumps) or other AC infrastructure, 2) mandating in building codes for new construction of apartment/condominium buildings that energy-efficient cooling systems, and/or passive heat control architectural design, be used. For instance, the utility discount program for low-income residents could be extended to included discounts for installing AC, condo and apartment building owners could be given subsidies to install heat pumps, etc.	8/2/2022
George Winn	Please vigorously support all housing	I want there to be more housing of all types and sizes in Seattle. The process of protecting 'single family' zoning designations is ruining the livability of Seattle because it is so expensive. ADUS, DADUS, Duplexes, Triplexes, four plexes, five plexes, six plexes. All these types of housing should be allowed 'By Right', without the need for public input, hearings, et cetera, in all areas of the city. Bigger apt buildings that have 100, 200, 300+ units should be allowed in the busiest areas. If there is planned and funded rapid transit in an area, there should be no cap on the height limit of a building. Parking minimums just add extra cost to the construction process. Please eliminate parking minimums. This would allow the market to decide how many to build, and allow me, person who loves transit and biking the opportunity to not fund a climate change causing car. The design review process has to go. It slows down housing production and creates an extra layer of bureaucracy and insider knowledge that raises costs, and doesn't substantially increase the quality of the city's housing. Thank you!	8/2/2022
Carly B	I support more housing in neighborhoods	I want the city to expand housing in all neighborhoods, but especially in those zoned for single family houses (and especially the wealthy, white neighborhoods). This type of housing is racist, classist, and unsustainable. More housing-and subsidized housing- will allow more people upward mobility, a safe place to live, and create a more welcoming, affordable, and sustainable Seattle.	8/3/2022
Jessie Lawton-Crane	More housing everywhere in Seattle	As a homeowner in North Seattle, I strongly support Alternative 5 to create abundant housing in neighborhoods across the city. Restrictions on density have led to insufficient, expensive housing stock for the region. In addition, we need to think long-term: migration driven by climate change will likely bring an influx of new neighbors to Seattle, as a highly climate-stable region. A combined approach legalizing housing across the city has the best chance of increasing our housing stock quickly, and easing the massive upward pressure on rental and home costs.	8/3/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jamie Madden	Stop violating the Equal Protection clauses in the constitution	The No Action Alt. 1; Focused Alt. 2; and Corridor Alt. 4 would maintain the de jure racial segregation established through covenants, north Seattle's many decades as a "sundown town," red lining practices, Seattle's refusal to pass an open housing law before 1968, and the highly exclusionary and - let's be honest - racially motivated SF-5000+ zoning categories. As detailed in Rothstein's The Color of Law, our racially segregated city and the many government actions underpinning it violate the Constitution - even if the court that doesn't believe in bodily autonomy might also defend the rights of wealthy landowners to extract egregious rents. Additionally, the current code treats families who live in different zoning categories differently. Residents of buildings in areas zoned Commercial, etc. have fewer government protections and rights than residents in residential zones, even if the residential use of their location predates the non-residential zoning added later. This may also be a violation of the equal protection clauses. Alternative 5 seems to be the only one that would afford all Seattleites equal rights to live healthy lives in Seattle.	8/3/2022
Real Change	Real Change Alternative 6: Social Communities for All	The goal of city planning is to effectively manage population growth; therefore, the plan must be human-centered. If alternative 5 is meant to represent the most change, the city is actively choosing a path that doesn't allow those who work here to be able to afford to live here. We need a more equitable and inclusive 6th alternative, that will ensure all people in Seattle are permanently housed, no one is displaced, and every person has equitable access to community resources and schools. The following 6th Alternative has been authored and proposed by Real Change Vendors and Advocacy Staff, with help from community partners. We urge OPCD to study this 6th alternative in their Environmental Impact Survey and keep the proposals of extensive social housing**, 15-minute cities, and cross-class communities as an option moving forward. **Social Housing definition: Publicly owned in perpetuity, permanently affordable, cross-class, resident-led housing Goals of Alternative 6: 1. Ensure Housing Affordability for Everyone * Ensure sufficient social housing to serve the total quantity of people living at 0-120% AMI * Prioritize public lands for social housing * Remove design review process 2. Class Desegregation through Social Housing in ALL neighborhoods * Allowing for 6-8+ story apartment buildings for social housing in all neighborhoods * All public schools shall have social housing developments within a half mile of the premises 3. 15-Minute City for All * All public parks shall have social housing developments within a half mile of the premises * All current and future light rail stations and transit hubs shall have social housing developments within a half mile of the premises * All newly built multi-family housing developments shall have community or commercial space and childcare centers included on the ground floor * Requiring that all multi-story developments be ADA accessible, built with universal design principles 4. Anti-Displacement through Zoning for Community Leadership Give community-run development first priority to * Surplus land * Golf Courses * Air space above grocery stores * Air space above community centers * Air space above current and future light rail stations * Parking lots near parks Housing and affordability are the foremost crises we find ourselves in and we must have a comprehensive plan that addresses this issue on a large scale. The goals of alternative 6 should demonstrate the urgency and scale by which this type of housing is needed in order to make Seattle a more inclusive and	8/3/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Scott Berkley	Alternative 6 for a World Class Seattle	<p>What would our comprehensive plan look like if we weren't afraid to succeed? Seattle already has many great attributes, but what would it take to turn our city into a truly world-class city that others look to as an inspiration? I posit that we would just need to believe in the values already espoused by our leaders and previous versions of the plan: * Prosperity: Jobs would be bountiful. All residents would have the resources they need to live comfortable lives. Union membership would be widespread and policies like a high minimum wage and secured scheduling would ensure that all work is dignified. * Affordability: Everyone would have access to food and shelter at a price they could afford. People could get where they need to go without major expenses like automobile ownership. * Sustainability: No city can be a success in the 21st century if it doesn't achieve carbon neutrality and provide clean air, clean water, and abundant open space for all its residents. * Convenience: People should be able to fulfill most daily needs within a 15 minute walk or bike ride. Longer trips would provide a range of mobility choices so that we can choose a mode that works best for us. * Inclusivity: A world class city should be a refuge for anyone and everyone who wants to call it home. Children who grow up there should be able to stay, while newcomers should be welcomed as new neighbors with a spirit of hospitality and enthusiasm. If we embraced these values and built a city that embodied them, what would that entail? * Growth: Seattle has been no stranger to growth, but the more we succeed in making our city one of the best in the world, the more people there will be who want to join us. We don't seek growth or size for their own sake, but we recognize that they will be a consequence of our success and we do not fear them. Let's plan for greatness and not undershoot like we have in the past. * Density: Likewise, tall buildings aren't to be glorified for their own sake, but enthusiastically built as the key solution to the otherwise perplexing riddle of how to simultaneously achieve our goals of prosperity, affordability, sustainability, convenience, and inclusivity. * Geometry: We can make more room by using our vertical space efficiently, but some things like cars and the parking they require will need to be replaced by new and better ways of doing things. Luckily, by building things close together and using our space wisely for walking, rolling, and transit, we can maintain the convenience we all seek, while improving several other measures. How</p>	8/3/2022
Christopher Lish	Alternative 5 or better: end all exclusionary zoning	<p>Alternative 5 is the best option because it allows for more housing and would help us to work toward all our goals, particularly affordability (more housing) and reducing climate emissions (more density, more mixed use, more connections via transit, walking, and biking). We are in the middle of multiple emergencies, and we need to take action now to address them. Ending exclusionary zoning in the city would be the best option, since it is rooted in racism and other regressive origins, and it continues to enforce those things.</p>	8/4/2022
Clyde McQueen	We need more homes that families can buy	<p>Seattle needs more homes that families can buy. Families are looking to buy 2 and 3 bedroom homes, and these are almost impossible to find in Seattle today. Most of the housing units being built today are studio or 1-bedroom apartments. Most of these are being built along busy roads, making it extremely difficult to find a family-sized home that is quiet, safe and pollution-free. We should be building 2 and 3 bedroom homes on safe streets, close to parks and schools. Homes built on busy roads should have backyards or large, internal courtyards. The only 2 options that meet this objective are the Broad Plan and the Combined Plan. These are the only 2 options that we should consider.</p>	8/4/2022
Sara Brunstetter	Housing Alternative 5 Preference	<p>Howdy, after looking through the plan Housing Options Housing Alternative 5 is my preference. I'd like the city to legalize more types of housing throughout all Seattle neighborhoods, particularly in wealthier areas that are solely or mostly zoned for single family homes. As we increase housing I want the city to subsidize as much as it can. Middle & low income housing are harder to come by and more people are ending up without a home or pushed to the few areas of the city that allow for more housing other than single family homes.</p>	8/4/2022
Adam Monohon	I support Real Change's proposal	<p>I support Real Change's proposal</p>	8/4/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jesse Swingle	Build equitably. Build everywhere.	<p>I am a renter near Pike Place, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum. But it will not be enough to resolve the many simultaneous crises our city faces, and will certainly not be enough to create the vibrant, sustainable place we and our children hope to make a home in the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this failure. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. 	8/4/2022
Nicole Gomez	An Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update	<p>I am a homeowner in Greenwood , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow light industry and commercial uses in current single-family neighborhoods - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks 	8/4/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Taylor Merrill	Alternative 6 is a MUST	I am a renter in Pinehurst's only apartment complex (next to the giant public nuisance & waste of space we call a golf course and 15th Avenue where I can hear traffic from inside my apartment at all hours of the night), and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the absolute bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Upzone the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability and accessibility - Improve mental health - Increase access to green space - Reduce the urban heat island effect - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many	8/5/2022
Nick Kiest	Alternative 5, every job should come with a home	For too many years, Seattle has happily upzoned and permitted new office towers, letting an amazing number of high paid tech workers work in Seattle (I should know, I am one). But those jobs did not come with a commensurate increase in residential zoning and projects, leading to the current massive shortage of housing of all types. We need new housing to act as a pressure valve for all these new workers. That can be everything - Luxury condos, efficiency apartments, row houses, socially owned housing. But housing needs to come first, before new offices.	8/5/2022
Cam Mac	bike safety & increased density& sidewalks or parking solution in Greenwood	1. Bike Safety - Please prioritize adding more bike lanes and pedestrian only/bike only lanes in NW Seattle to connect to the Burke & other bike trails. The bike infrastructure in Ballard/Greenwood is lacking and dangerous. I have to bike to work each day (7 miles each way from Greenwood to Pioneer Square) and every day that I bike I have a near miss from a car not seeing me. I am scared to have to rely on this type of transportation for my daily commute but it is the most efficient since the transit services in Greenwood have gone downhill in the last 15 years of living here. 2. When you increase density consider all the impacts to surrounding areas...i.e. traffic calming measures and pedestrian safety: I support increased density in Seattle but it hasn't been executed well in my neighborhood (next to the Fred Meyer in Greenwood). We have no sidewalks there. With all of the upzoning, there are now a lot of developments in the neighborhood that do not provide parking so my street of single family houses now has people parking there to go to the pot shop or to live in the nearby apartments. The street parking is not a problem. The problem is that there are no sidewalks and there is significant increase in traffic & traffic speed in the 15 years of living on that street. So you have people walking on the street because there are no sidewalks having to duck behind a parked car every minute due to someone speeding (usually delivery trucks) by to avoid the light on 3rd & 85th. This is a sad result of increased density without consideration for the impacts. We live on a rural route for USPS but the streets are filled with cars and speeders. Our neighbors have requested traffic calming for years now and the answer from SDOT is always: it's not a priority or you can pay for it yourselves. So my request is that if you are going to increase density, please also provide measure by the city for the highest priority for safety of pedestrians. It shouldn't have to fall to the developer to do this. This should be done in conjunction with SDOT.	8/5/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Dana Fried	Strongly in favor of #5 (combined)	Seattle needs more housing, in more places. We cannot only build housing in neighborhoods served by existing transit and businesses and expect to be able to meet existing housing demand (never mind future demand). Also, adding housing only along main corridors means that those living in new housing don't have an option to have the same quieter streets and amenities as single-family homeowners do. A mix of new housing throughout the city will help ease the burden of skyrocketing rents and home prices while welcoming in new neighbors and businesses and helping reduce homelessness. Also and perhaps more importantly, we cannot only evaluate the environmental impact of new housing within the neighborhood in which it is built. Every apartment built is acres of exurban tract housing that *isn't* built; every tree removed to build denser housing is offset by tons of CO2 not emitted during long commutes by people who can now walk, bus, or bike to work. A holistic approach to building and evaluating the environmental impact of housing shows us that denser cities are an enormous positive for almost everyone involved. I understand that people do not want Seattle or their particular neighborhoods to change, but a city that is not changing and growing is dying. We need to keep Seattle vibrant and alive, and that's why I support the combined plan.	8/5/2022
Derek Pulvino	Alternative 5 is my preference	In considering future zoning and development changes one of the primary objections I have to current approaches is that under the urban village model, high intensity (relatively) development is shoehorned only into select areas of the city. This in my mind overburdens these areas, while expressly excluding areas with the political and financial wherewithal to fight any changes in development patterns in their neighborhood (read, Queen Anne, Magnolia, Madrona). To my mind a great first step in allowing for broader and more distributed development is the city-wide removal of the single family home development. Even low-density multi-family development would be welcome in these SFH zoned areas (townhomes, garden court apartments, duplexes, triplexes). Parking will always be a flash point in the City, but none of us have an exclusive right to street parking in front of our residences. In-neighborhood commercial pockets are also great features that could accompany these changes. Being able to walk to the corner store, a small restaurant, coffee shop for more places would also help foster more "neighborhood" centric community. Alternative 5 strikes me as the all of the above approach that opens the opportunity for more people to live and enjoy the city's amenities, and start to more broadly shift the balance to all areas of the city shouldering the burden for increased population density. Also...about the upzoning around transit hubs. Can we not continue to do half-measures? 3, 4, 5, 6 story apartments and condos surrounding areas where multi-billion dollar infrastructure investments land, it's just not enough and doesn't adequately leverage the benefit of these developments.	8/6/2022
Christopher Erwin	NOT in my neighborhood!	I do not want those tall multi family units replacing more single family homes in the neighborhood.	8/6/2022
Tyler Jorgensen	on the necessity of human centered planning	hello, my name is tyler, and i am interested in the field of urban design and planning with a focus on creating an environment build for and centered on people. to me, this means a strong focus on increasing the accessibility, reliability, and cleanliness of all public transit modes (the more modes the better as well), and a strong shift in housing policy AWAY from corporate interest. housing prices are skyrocketing due to large equity holding firms buying and selling single family homes, effectively removing housing from the market permanently. this practice of allowing large corporations to buy up houses is causing massive price gouging and driving many people who would otherwise be able to afford and live in a house to not secure a house to own. personally, i believe that this housing crisis can be addressed in a few ways. 1) ban corporate home purchases, thereby ensuring more access to housing for actual people. 2) current zoning laws that strongly and unfairly favor the development of single family homes drive housing prices up, increase sprawl, decrease walkability, and create a more car dependent (derogatory) city. mixed use/duplex zoning can alleviate this sprawl and increase walkability. additionally, equal housing access for all citizens must be ensured as part of this redevelopment plan. equity is critical. focus on improving the citizens to access to affordable housing and transit instead of allowing corporate greed to drive away locals	8/6/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Holly Townes	Climate Goals in Planning - address building emission	Seattle has climate goals for reducing emissions that we are way behind in meeting. These plans effect both transportation and buildings which are the biggest contributors to GHG emissions in our city. There are some good ideas on reducing transportation but not anything on building emissions. We need to reduce GHG emissions in buildings by 26% by 2030 to meet our goals. The plans should therefore also include requirements that existing buildings and housing be upgraded (especially smaller buildings >20,000 sf) - for efficiency and to get off fossil fuel heating which contributes 75% of GHG emissions for buildings. New buildings are already well on their way and we will soon have something for large existing buildings.	8/6/2022
Lonnie M	Mixed Use Zoning is Best	We should increase mixed use zoning in Seattle as much as possible. Look to all the most liveable, walkable cities in the world, from Amsterdam to Tokyo. Allowing single family housing to coexist with multifamily housing, large apartment buildings, businesses, schools, etc, increases access for everyone to what we all want and need to improve our quality of life.	8/7/2022
James Little	Alternative 6 from Real Change is a better choice	I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Incentivize and promote green-built housing, weatherized and electrified with heat pumps for space & water heating. - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions & create climate resilience Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/7/2022
James Little	Alternative 6 Can Help Us Meet Our Climate Goals	Seattle's 2019 Green New Deal (https://www.seattleclimate.org/goals/seattle-climate-goals) set the goal of net zero emissions by 2030. Seattle's prior 2018 goal was 53% reduction by 2030 and carbon neutral by 2050; this latter goal requires an 81% transportation greenhouse gas emission (GHG) emission reduction and a 26% building emission reduction by 2030. We are not on-track to achieve even the more modest 2018 goals. The Real Change Alternative 6 promises to reduce transportation emissions by reducing the commutes of Seattle workers. Alternative 6 should also include requirements for weatherization and electrification (heat pump space & water heating) in all new and existing public housing, such that building greenhouse gas emissions are reduced. Newer window heat pumps may reduce the cost of apartment building electrification (https://www.canarymedia.com/articles/heat-pumps/window-heat-pumps-will-help-electrify-new-york-citys-public-housing?).	8/7/2022
Rachel Ravitch	Alternative 6 provides the equitable housing we need now	Changes to our zoning code are critical in order to implement equitable housing across Seattle. Schools and parks should drive our development in order to create a livable city. Walk ability is a key part of a livable and equitable urban environment with access to quality parks and schools. Seattle needs to swiftly provide thousands of units of deeply affordable housing to solve our mounting housing affordability crisis. A Social Housing model is the answer. This alternative is evidence based and well researched based on functional urban environments that provide quality housing for all residents. Seattle could learn a great deal from cities like Nantes, France where they have hundreds if not thousands of units of affordable student housing and a very walkable city. We need to look outside for solutions to modes that create the outcomes we are trying to create.	8/7/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Bryson Hirai-Hadley	For a greener, more sustainable Seattle	<p>I am a homeowner in , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials -Make sure everyone has access to parks and green spaces If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/8/2022
Karen Taylor	Alternative 6!	<p>I am a renter in Beacon Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote racial justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Improve mental health The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing</p>	8/8/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Wes Mills	We need housing to match stations!	Seattle and our region are making big investments in transit that will serve riders, both people who live here now and people who will make the area home in the future, well into the future. We need housing and services and jobs around those stations and with easy access to those stations to match those major investments. Two of our new stations, at NE 130th and NE 145th, are very, very limited in how and where we will let people live, play, and work within easy reach of those stations. Right now, both station areas are dominated by detached buildings on large lots with limited sidewalks and loud streets that have poor access by foot or on wheels. We know how to encourage good development with a mix of uses that let people age in place and let people get access to what they need and want while bringing jobs with easy access by transit. One need only look one station to the south, at Thornton Place next to Northgate Station. This development brought a new park and new access to a vibrant creek (that had previously been in a pipe under a parking lot!), senior living to allow older residents to get the help they need and stay in the area, and vibrant shopping and night life and services like badly-needed healthcare. Please bring development like this all across both station areas! We can have an excellent mix of trees, nature, services, housing, and jobs; we just need to say Yes!	8/8/2022
Hannah Kunde	Sustainable Living for the Future Must Start Now	I am a renter in Ravenna, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household. If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times. The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the fact that the current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/8/2022
Deborah Carstens	Please Consider Alternative 6!	I am a homeowner in Green Lake, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/8/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Eric Nunn	Car-free made easy	I am a homeowner in Fremont, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Increase walkability The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Utrecht is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://assets.naturespath.com/files/uploads/2018/01/iStock-458286645-crop.jpg Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/9/2022
David Thaler	Alternative 5 is the minimum that should be considered	Consider these two properties (data from regrid.com): * 5046 15th Ave NE, zoned LR3. It has a 6480 sq. ft. lot with an assessed land value of \$1,814,400 (\$280/sq. ft.). * 5046 16th Ave NE, zoned SF 5000. This is also a 6480 sq. ft. lot. It has an assessed land value of \$658,000 (\$101 / sq. ft.). These properties are a block apart. The massive difference in land value is evidence of severe policy-induced scarcity of land on which apartments can be built. These costs are born by renters, and they are large. An 'extra' \$1.2 million in land cost is something like \$80,000 per unit for the type of building built on LR3 zoned land. The next comprehensive plan should stop imposing these costs on Seattle renters. It should end apartment bans on most buildable land. In terms of the 5 alternatives, that is beyond alternative 5. That the appropriate policy is outside of the range of alternatives considered is a flaw in the EIS scoping process. The EIS Scoping Fact Sheet says: The alternatives should be broad enough that the final preferred alternative, which is included in the final plan, will fall within the range of the alternatives studied. The current range of alternatives is not broad enough to do that. Alternative 5 is the option that gives Seattle the best chance of meeting its housing needs. There should be an alternative beyond Alternative 5, one that allows some small apartment buildings in areas that currently ban them.	8/9/2022
Amy Broska	Alternative 6 to let an affordable housing designer reside within city limits	I am an architectural designer who designs affordable housing and I see firsthand how hard the city has made it to add density to the urban fabric. I myself, a working professional, will most likely be moving outside the city soon because housing options are limited. How ironic is that? An affordable housing designer not being able to afford the city they design in? Seattle needs to reverse the pain that years of exclusionary zoning has done to our city. We need to go above and beyond and adopt an alternative that advocates for denser and more varied housing options. I want to see new 12 plexes with corner stores. I want to see cute DADUs plopped into existing backyards. I want to see an existing single family home subdivide into a duplex. We need missing middle housing. We need upzones everywhere. And We NEED to adopt an alternative 6.	8/9/2022
Ian Bond	EIS Alternative 6	Please explore the Real Change proposed Alternative 6. As a new parent in Seattle, the vision described in Alternative 6 gives me the most hope for how my child will grow up to see the full breadth of humanity in this city. Please pursue this human-centered alternative.	8/9/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
M Y	alternative 6: city-wide density is the only path forward for seattle	<p>I am a homeowner in Magnolia, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Focus on pedestrian and cyclist-centered transit by reducing lanes dedicated to car traffic and parking. - Encourage more sustainable, healthier, and more equitable transit with congestion pricing for cars and directing that money towards improving bus routes with dedicated lanes, subways, and concrete-barrier protected bike lanes. - In order to create more walkable neighborhoods, allow mixed use neighborhoods everywhere specifically by allowing businesses on the first-story of any multifamily building. - Eliminate design review, an outdated process which substantially increases the cost of much needed major multifamily developments. - Remove restrictions which effectively ban development of new cohousing buildings. When I was in school, living with a large number (~6) of other people in single family homes with shared kitchens and common spaces was not only the cheapest way to live but an enjoyable social experience. However, there are only a limited supply of single family homes with enough bedrooms for this situation. It is my understanding that regulations around number of bathrooms and other regulations designed to "protect" renters effectively bans or makes cost prohibitive the development of new shared space living in multifamily buildings. To better support students and provide a wide variety of living situations, developers should be incentivized to build units with more than two bedrooms. If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Increase walkability <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the 	8/9/2022
Shelby Ketchum	Option 5!!	<p>Hello, I believe option 5 is the best solution to dealing Seattles housing needs. We need more house and this option is the best shot we have. With the raise of the anti abortion movement, homophobia and a parched west Seattle should position itself as an affordable liberal place to live. This plan gives us the zoning capacity to do just that!</p>	8/9/2022
Jacob Miller	Seattle Comp Plan	<p>The City of Seattle should up-zone all of the low density districts to allow missing middle housing types from attached housing or townhouses to small apartment buildings. The plan should focus on incentivizing redevelopment of single family lots into multi-unit buildings where individual units can be owned. Creating housing ownership options for various income levels and socioeconomic statuses should be a key priority. The City should work with and help create BIPOC housing trusts to enable home ownership within their respective communities. Continue building high density near transit but incentivize multi-bedroom units that support families and larger households. Limit the influence of single-family neighborhood associations.</p>	8/9/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Mario B	Option 5 - urban villages and flexible neighborhoods in between	Continue to encourage lots of mixed-use development in new and existing urban village for vibrant neighborhoods, especially smaller unit sizes. Seattle's urban villages are one of its best assets and because they have been successful we should continue to grow them. I think that most of these are 1br or studio units, which is an important type of housing, though it is limited to small households. Even smaller units (150+ sqft) should also be encouraged for affordability. In between, we should have more flexible small-scale (2-6 units/lot or townhouse) redevelopment in former single-family areas, especially in high-opportunity areas next to transit, parks, and schools. Provide more rental or ownership options for people who may not necessarily fit in the urban villages, such as: -People downsizing: my retired parents live in a 3 unit stacked condo and it's great for their needs because they can walk places, go to restaurants and coffee shops, and it's single-level with minimal upkeep. It also is a bit larger than the 1br units in the urban villages, and they appreciate the extra space as they are retired. -Small time investor homeowners: allow them to redevelop, expand their properties, or invest in Seattle so that they can adapt changing lifestyles and generate income, and build more personal relationships with tenants. Buildings with >6 units are harder for individuals to invest in and run. -People (especially introverts) in small apartments: some just don't want to live on or near an arterial, or in a loud neighborhood like downtown, capitol hill, ballard, u-district, etc. -Multigenerational families in expanded houses: many houses are more or less owned by extended families. They should be allowed and encouraged to adapt them to accommodate multiple related households. -Families in condos/townhouses/apartments: I myself have a young family and would love to live in a stable-cost 2-3 bedroom unit with proximity to my Seattle job, transit, parks, and good schools. But there are very few good options in the city so I recently moved to the suburbs and have a long commute, and have to drive a lot to do anything. Also a lot of the older houses in Seattle (while some look quite good) in addition to their exorbitant expense require a lot of maintenance, for which I lack the expertise, time, and money. -Wealthy families: We should acknowledge that existing middle-income families who've bought these in the past and wealthy families who buy them now are valued members of our city. But going forward, SFHs are so expensive that their purchase	8/9/2022
Mark Spitzer	Building on Yesterday; Planning for Tomorrow	We think of Seattle as a classy and important city; and BestCities.org ranks it, by their criteria as 36th out of the top 100. But at the same time, Seattle in terms of size, is 750th in the world, a long way from the top 100. These two factors should drive our planning for the future. Seattle prides itself on being a "city of neighborhoods" in which the sense of neighborhood is often reinforced by the city's geography of hills and bodies of water. In the 1990's the Rice administration reinforced this organization with its Urban Village approach of concentrating development and density in the centers of the neighborhoods and connecting them with transit. This approach has worked well; and it should be continued. This approach did not, however, create effective transitions into the single family neighborhoods that surround their centers. These transitions (primarily in density but also somewhat in use) should be developed. At the same time, we should analyze our neighborhoods to see if they are complete and balanced. The things that make a neighborhood work are often available, but in a scattershot, unbalanced manner. Truly viable neighborhoods should all have a focal commercial area, a substantial public park, public amenities such as libraries, active recreation centers, medical-dental facilities, good transit connections, and a wide variety of housing types and sizes, including cluster housing. Many of Seattle's neighborhoods have many of these elements; but many do not. The Plan should examine the elements that are already working well in various neighborhoods and set those as models for implementation in the neighborhoods that are lacking and for those that are just getting organized. In addition, there are excellent examples of some of these elements in Portland and/or Vancouver, BC, (cities in our mega-region) that could become models of development for us. This kind of 'getting everyone up to speed' approach would have a huge positive impact in mitigating the social inequities that currently challenge us. We absolutely need to continue the matrix of transit development that began with Metro buses in the 1950's, has expanded with Sound Transit, and is continuing with elements such as the recent introduction of water taxi service. One of our failings during the Vision 2020 years was that the development of Growth Management did not at the same time produce Transportation Management in a balanced fashion. We need to make sure that Sound Transit and Metro's plans and our plans work well	8/11/2022
Zack Thill	More density, less single family zoning	We need more density and less single family zoning. Ask yourselves, why is single family zoning preserved in most of the historically white, wealthy parts of the city?	8/11/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alli Rico	Want Seattle to Thrive? We Need Alternative 6!	I am a new resident and homeowner in Queen Anne and I support an Alternative 6 for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update! Of the options presented to us, Alternative 5 is the literal floor - the bare minimum. And it will not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces. It *certainly* will not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable and diverse city of the future. We need a better option: Alternative 6. At minimum, this would: * Upzone the entire city: allow high-rises and mid-rises across Seattle * Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing * Create 15 minute walkable neighborhoods throughout Seattle * Allow for multi-family housing to be built away from arterials and busy major roads * Legalize missing middle housing: sixplexes everywhere! * Expand transit coverage and the bike lane/trail network An adopted Alternative 6 would enable more people to live closer to work, therefore reducing commute times; create the best health outcomes for children; reduce homelessness citywide; slow gentrification and displacement; create a more vibrant, thriving Seattle; allow for more opportunities throughout the city; and more. We already face a dire housing shortage. Option 1 shouldn't have even been proposed, and the other alternatives are equally embarrassing. Planning for the bare minimum guarantees our crisis will continue. Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. The proposed alternatives will only perpetuate this failure. We must think bigger. We need a broad vision for our city that will create the most opportunity for everyone that lives here, and who will live here in the future. Please study the proposed Alternative 6 so we can actually get to work on solving our housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises and create an equitable Seattle.	8/11/2022
Grace Kim	Need to study impact of increasing housing typologies in all neighborhoods	The Urban Village strategy was an exclusionary measure to "protect" single family homeownership (that specific language was included in the Comp Plan until Seattle 2035). So Alt 2 continues that exclusion - it keeps housing production out of single family zones...or another way to look at it - it keeps low/moderate income families out of single family neighborhoods. More housing choice (types of housing, potential for both rental/ownership, and access to all neighborhoods) should be studied. Missing middle housing typologies (rowhomes, triplexes, sixplexes, courtyard apts) all fit within the "character" of single family zones.	8/11/2022
Austin Skondre	Study if existing laws, codes, processes, etc could hinder execution of the plan	It is one thing to define a plan for Seattle. It is another to implement it. I believe that part of the EIS study should be to determine what laws, codes, processes, etc. could hinder future execution of the plan. One example is that the One Seattle Plan has a strong emphasis on protecting the environment. A great way to do that would be increasing the use of heat pumps in Seattle. However, in some areas heat pumps are not allowed due to noise ordinances. Those ordinances should be reviewed to determine if they align with the priorities set down by the One Seattle Plan. An additional example would be reducing housing costs. The One Seattle Plan has highlighted reducing housing costs as a main goal of the updated plan, with zoning changes identified as the main method for reducing costs. However, there is a chance that only zoning changes will not reduce housing costs as much is desired. If construction costs are too high, housing prices will not come down. Are building codes to blame? Is there regulatory capture by the incumbent developers? Is the process of getting a project approved too costly? The EIS study scope should include looking for additional barriers to low housing costs than just zoning. I'm sure there are many other examples. I'm not sure which ones are valid problems and which ones are not, but that is exactly why they should be studied. The last thing we want is to set out a plan, only to learn that existing laws, codes, and processes make executing the plan impossible.	8/12/2022
Austin Skondre	The study should include comparisons to other cities around the world.	Part of the EIS study scope should be looking at development around the world for inspiration and warning. I see a lot of good ideas in the plan and in the EIS alternatives, but how many of them are truly new? Perhaps similar efforts have been tried before. We should study those similar efforts to guide our own planning. Additionally, other cities can be a source of inspiration. I've seen Tokyo brought up as an example of a big city with cheap housing. What are they doing? Does it look like any of our EIS alternatives? Would their strategies be possible here? Closer to home, San Francisco is a very expensive city. What are they doing wrong? Do any of our EIS alternatives look like San Francisco policies? Can we avoid their mistakes? We are not exactly going through uncharted territory with this plan. Many other cities around the world are grappling with similar issues. We should examine that body of knowledge as inspiration and warning as part of the EIS study.	8/12/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Taylor K	Remove Parking/car lanes; build mixed housing and parks	What more need be said? OK lots of good transit, pedestrian areas and bike infra for sure. It will also help the city finances in the long run; density means higher property values and transit is cheaper to operate than maintaining roads for cars. But as much of the city as possible should belong to individuals, co-ops and non-profits otherwise we risk repeating the gentrification mistakes that will cause an unstable society.	8/12/2022
Arvia Morris	Comment on zoning proposals	The Seattle comprehensive plan must address the expected growth in population, meet Seattle's 2030 climate goals (and beyond) and enable the full income range in all neighborhoods. After Seattle's street car system was removed in 1954 the city became increasingly car centric with buses providing some public transportation. Currently, with the challenges of vast income gaps, the climate crisis, the dangers and inequity of car centric transportation we need to move the city to new ways of getting around and new neighborhood concepts. The emerging light rail system is a great start and as the system expands it will be most impactful to be building high density affordable housing near the transit stations and along rapid ride bus lines. The light rail transit stations with rapid bus connections create the convenience and reliability needed to provide an alternative to cars. We need to be zoning for more complete neighborhoods that have great transit connections between neighborhoods as well as downtown and University of Washington, welcoming public spaces near transit with more tree cover and parks in the public domain. Downtown and University of Washington will remain important hubs, but we need more neighborhoods like Ballard, Capitol Hill, Wallingford, Fremont with town centers that have good connections to transit. Alternative 5 seems to address the growth needs of Seattle the best, though none of the plans address the need for more greenery as the city grows in density. Trees keep streets and homes cool, people of all ages need places to be outside to relax and enjoy cultural events and recreation. Trees create oxygen which we all need! When designing more dense housing, consideration of natural light in homes being built and already existing homes needs to be considered. New more dense neighborhoods can include localized energy plans when appropriate with a micro grid with solar + storage to power the new homes. Complete pedestrian and bike infrastructure in new neighborhood centers and along interconnecting corridors will also make traveling between neighborhoods more attractive for rolling and walking. Currently these options are often not appealing due to poor pedestrian experiences along traffic arterials and dangerous road conditions for anything but a car. In short the comprehensive plan needs to optimize, mode shift away from cars, equity in housing opportunities, and climate goals together as they are deeply inter connected.	8/12/2022
Ethan DeNault	My opinion!	Although reading through these comments made me extremely happy to see all the well articulated and educated people calling for a change that I can truly agree with, I still feel the need to put my lil' comment here! I just want to state that I strongly believe in a close to whatever-means-necessary approach to minimizing the use of cars as much as possible especially in a city setting. Creating walkable and cycleable communities is the most important thing to me currently. There are many things - particularly about the city of Seattle since I am only moving here very very recently - I am uneducated on so I cannot explain or idealize my thoughts as well as some others have, but creating a greener future will always be the correct path.	8/12/2022
TJ McDonald	Choose Alternative 5 (Combined)	My son will not be able to live in the community where he grew up. The house next door is a rental with people renting out rooms. They used to be students, but are now all professionals. This has got to stop. I can't believe Spokane beat us to it! Under existing zoning multi-family is squeezed into a small (and noisy) footprint. The bulk of new units are small studios and one-bedrooms. New multi-family housing should include units that work for families. My only hesitation with allowing multi-family everywhere is that Seattle will end up a mono-crop of single person households. We already have one of the lowest median household sizes in the US.	8/12/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jesse Simpson	HDC Coalition Comment - Expanding Scope for Affordable and Abundant Homes	We, the undersigned organizations, represent a coalition committed to advancing housing affordability and addressing climate change through Seattle's Comprehensive Plan update, including affordable housing developers and operators, environmental advocates, climate activists, and grassroots housing organizers. It is essential that the City analyzes a full range of growth alternatives in the EIS. We urge you to expand the scope of analysis of each of the alternative growth strategies and to advance a new transformative Alternative 6, to provide as much flexibility to build as many homes as possible. This Comprehensive Plan update is a once-in-a-decade opportunity for Seattle to lead the region by reforming land use, increasing density, and allowing for mixed uses in neighborhoods. At this distinctive moment in time, the urgency of the city's affordable housing crisis is combined with a growing climate crisis and the disturbing reality of persisting inequities. We cannot ignore the interconnectedness that must bind our efforts inextricably on housing and climate action. We have an exacerbated housing crisis; far too many of our neighbors sleep unsheltered, struggle to afford rent, or have been displaced from their communities, all because of how expensive homes in our city are. Simply put, we have a shortage of homes, and we need to build more of them. We need more affordable homes, more sustainable homes, more homes to rent and to own, and more middle homes, apartments, and corner stores throughout our city. We also face a climate crisis, driven overwhelmingly by transportation, accounting for a whopping two-thirds. Car-dependent sprawl is not consistent with our climate goals or a sustainable future. As the center city of this region, Seattle must lead in welcoming sustainable land use patterns. Per capita emissions are lower in Seattle due to better access to transit, jobs, and walkable neighborhoods. By not welcoming housing growth in its borders, Seattle forces it to the suburban fringe, where residents are locked into car dependency and growth jeopardizes forests and farms. Of the options currently drafted, Alternative 5 is the only alternative to make a major positive impact on Seattle's housing costs by allowing for more housing growth to meet demand. Per the City's analysis, by promoting a greater range of rental and ownership housing, the Combined Growth Strategy would address past underproduction of housing and rising costs and support complete neighborhoods across the city. It furthers	8/12/2022
David Moehring	More apartment scope in study with tenfold higher MHA in lieu fee	Seattle has lost (https://data.seattle.gov/Permitting/Rental-Property-Registration/j2xh-c7vt) nearly 3,000 rental properties between May of last year and January of 2022. Those properties constitute roughly 10,000 units in total. Since May, only 27 rental units were added. Washington State Court of Appeals rules against portions of Seattle's eviction moratorium (https://mynorthwest.com/3402057/washington-state-court-seattle-eviction-moratorium/) Jim Henderson with the Rental Housing Association of Washington (https://www.rhawa.org/about-rhawa) attributes the loss to a growing number of rental protection laws, making it harder and more expensive to own rental property in Seattle. https://mynorthwest.com/3427627/seattle-loses-nearly-3000-rental-properties-in-less-than-a-year/	8/16/2022
Mark Miller	Sprawl is not the answer	The Growth Management Act recognized that allowing sprawl is a problem. That applies no less to the city. Any plan that does not concentrate housing and combine it with adequate, and hopefully super, transportation will fail. More urban villages as well as concentration of growth along major arterioles make sense. Broadcasting growth across the entire city does not. The AAA says the 2022 annual cost to own and operate a car is \$10,728. Living near one's work or where one need not own and use a car can essentially put that amount in a person's pocket (tax free). We don't want to make housing more affordable, we want to make living more affordable. We have a housing problem, but the lack of housing didn't generate the problem. Too many people is the underlying problem. We can't solve the problem by randomly throwing housing at it. We need an organized plan that recognizes cause, effect and goals. My guess is that a strategically located expanded urban village plan complimented by major arteriole housing as well is what we should aim for.	8/16/2022
Xio Alvarez	Legalize flats!	We need more missing middle housing! Townhouses are built with a short-term mindset, essentially expected to be torn down in 30yrs. The historic buildings we still have in the city have lasted because they can be transformed and imagined to fit other uses. Townhouses are a dreary and dull image of what a neighborhood can be, and limit the potential of vibrant communities. They're difficult to upgrade and adapt over time, and they prioritize a way of living in the city that only serves able bodies. We should be imagining a city that anyone can comfortably live in, and mid-sized, multifamily housing distributed throughout the city (not just on busy corridors and shouldered by communities of color that have already seen intense displacement through development) is a huge part of that future. Take notes from Spokane not Bellevue!	8/16/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ace Houston	We Need an Alternative 6	<p>The levels of growth that Seattle has seen in the past 6 years have far exceeded the number of housing units that were planned for in the past Major Comprehensive Process. We need an alternative that goes beyond Alternative 5 that is based on - at minimum - planning for a number of housing units across the city that looks at the growth rate seen recently and extrapolates it out 20 years, providing the ability to create up to no less than six units on each lot in the city. In addition, changes in land use should be provided that both embody the true tenants of the 15-Minute City Concept (as defined by the organization C40 (https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/How-to-build-back-better-with-a-15-minute-city?language=en_US)) along with embodying the tenants of environmental justice. These changes should be made with the understanding that anti-displacement strategies be developed as revisions to both the development process as well as how the City invests / finances both future public and publicly-subsidized housing. Changes in land use should also keep in mind that achieving goals of reducing homelessness while also preserving our tree canopy means that we must build up and not out. The revisions to the land use code as part of the process should emphasize increases in height along with a simplification of the number of rules related to design, allowing for an increased amount of interpretations and variety in buildings that are currently not possible. In this way, it can also make the idea of small-scale commercial and similar micro-mixed use buildings feasible for neighborhoods that currently lack a number of amenities that would establish them as meeting the requirements of a 15-minute city. Lastly, changes to overall zoning capacity should be made with the mindset that the buildings constructed last for 75-100 years. This is part of the solution to reducing both GHG emissions as well as vehicle-miles traveled (VMT), as required by the adoption of the Climate language outlined in HB 1099 proposed earlier this year and adopted by City Council. We cannot lean on circular knowledge to prevent the building of housing for perceived lack of transit or vice versa. We must plan and provide for both to address the twin crises of our housing and climate crises.</p>	8/16/2022
Julia Buck	Seattle deserves climate resilience	<p>I am a homeowner in Ballard, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Increase walkability - Increase bike-ability - Make our communities safer from traffic and build a stronger sense of neighborhood concord - Improve mental health - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Slow gentrification and displacement - Create climate resilience - Reduce the urban heat island effect - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all</p>	8/16/2022
Cooper Cain	Focus Density on quiet and non-polluted streets	<p>It's disheartening to see options put up that put more people on loud, dangerous, and polluted streets. Seattle should have an option in the plan to invert this idea and add more density away from dangerous arterials while keeping options for mixed use and commercial open on arterials. It's abhorrent that we focus the most vulnerable onto the least livable sections of land. IF we are to focus building on main streets, they absolutely need to be traffic calmed until the risk of anyone being hit by a car is 0 and the average daytime noise is below 65 db.</p>	8/16/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Cooper Cain	Passivhaus standard	Seattle needs to update our building standards to be more climate resilient. ALL new construction should be passivhaus designed, and all new apartments and homes should have cross ventilation. We should be doing more to make sure our buildings are climate resilient going into the future and provide the most comfortable environment for residents.	8/16/2022
Alexander Tran	Update the plan	I am a homeowner in West seattle, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. The city of Singapore, where 80% of the city's residents live in housing developed and managed by the government and parks/gardens occupy 47% of the land even while accommodating almost 6 million people, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/16/2022
Kyler Danielson	Add more housing and walkable streets	I am a homeowner in Ballard and I work in land use. My family has had some presence in Seattle, specifically Ballard, since before 1955. I'm asking that Seattle draft a comprehensive plan that addresses the numerous problems that have developed in this city over the past 70 years, from unwalkable neighborhoods to lack of housing stock. These issues are in your power to resolve. I understand that you are getting many communications from various interest groups on the comprehensive plan, but hope that you will seriously consider the emails asking for you to upzone the whole city to allow duplexes and triplexes at a minimum. Ballard is filled with duplexes and triplexes that were built long ago but still work very well in neighborhoods even if surrounded by single family homes. My house is next to one of them and I lived in a duplex before buying my home. They are great options for increasing density without changing the neighborhood. I agree with Share the Cities that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf	8/16/2022
Steve Zemke	Option that combines 2 and 4 focused and corridors	It seems you have left out an option that should be looked at - that is combing option 2-focused and option 4 - corridors. It is a step beyond either 2 or 4 that concentrates growth that has access to frequent transit service and would have amenities like grocery stores and other stores and restaurants along the corridors. Businesses thrive best if they are accessible for more people and frequent transit would provide that. .	8/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Sherry Y	Seattle can do better	<p>I am a homeowner in Ravenna-Bryant, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions, stemming from massive population and job growth over the past decade-as well as from insufficient housing production and planning, for a much longer period. The current alternatives don't do nearly enough to make up for this past underproduction. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. 	8/17/2022
Affordable Talaris	Seattle needs an Alternative 6	<p>Right now, we are living with the consequences (https://crosscut.com/news/2022/07/how-seattle-planning-quarter-million-more-residents) of accepting a past inadequate Comprehensive Plan (https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/OPCD/OngoingInitiatives/SeattlesComprehensivePlan/CouncilAdopted2020.pdf) . Housing is unaffordable to most—over 46% of Seattleites are rent-burdened, racial inequity across our neighborhoods persists, and community displacement is rampant throughout our city. We have the chance to improve things now. Seattle doesn't have to make the same mistake again. There is a huge, missed opportunity to foster community growth within our city by utilizing neighborhoods that are currently only zoned "Neighborhood Residential". "Seattle's first comprehensive plan, adopted in 1994, established the city's urban villages strategy. It concentrated density and new growth to neighborhood hubs along transit corridors, leaving about 75% of the city's residential areas for single-family houses. The city has largely adhered to that plan with 83% of new homes being built within the boundaries of an urban village since it was adopted." Read more in this Crosscut article (https://crosscut.com/news/2022/07/how-seattle-planning-quarter-million-more-residents) . The most glaring example of our failed land use patterns is the Talaris parcel in Laurelhurst (https://www.affordabletalaris.org/), discussed in detail, after our general recommendations below. We believe that the current proposed Alternatives (https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/8c90f3a5e0704f8687213b669efa6fb0?item=6) do not go far enough to meaningfully address Seattle's historically egregious zoning, which has deliberately prevented Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color from living in most of the city. Learn more about this in the City of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan Update Racial Equity Analysis of Seattle 2035 and Urban Village Strategy (https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/OPCD/OngoingInitiatives/Seattle%27sComprehensivePlan/ComprehensivePlanRacialEquityAnalysisPresentation2021.pdf) , July 2021. Alternative 6 needs to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Actively promoting building not only duplexes and triplexes, but midrise multifamily throughout the entire city and especially in neighborhoods that currently do not allow it, and that have many quality-of-life benefits, such as green park space, 	8/17/2022
Sarah B	focused and corridor plan please! (2&4)	<p>Let's build density/vibrancy but also leave pockets of calm. The negative space is just as important as the positive. Please tell me you are stakeholdering IRL in the community beyond this online software. It is difficult to use and not accessible to many. Zoning is half the story. The other half is how we fund affordable housing and the types of units we build. Hi density isn't inclusive if it is expensive and if it doesn't include families (3 bd +, please!)</p>	8/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at																				
Robin Briggs	Growth In Cities Is 10 Times Better	<p>I recommend that the One Seattle Plan EIS scoping include analysis comparing climate emissions from each alternative to climate emissions if growth takes place elsewhere in the region. When we block housing from being built inside the city, it creates a sprawl far beyond the city's edge as people move further and further out in search of affordable housing. What is the cost of this sprawl for the climate? Shoreline recently rezoned land around the new light rail stations being built at 148th & 180th, and as part of this they did a calculation of the average carbon footprint of someone living in an apartment or a house near one of the new stations and compared it to someone living in East King County. They found that people in East King County have a carbon footprint that is more than 10 times greater than those who will live in the new housing by the light rail. Here's the details: Table 1. Current Estimated Annual Emissions Per Household from Energy Use and Commuting, by Location Scenario</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Housing Size (SF)</th> <th>Natural Gas (mtCO2e)</th> <th>Electricity (mtCO2e)</th> <th>Commuting (mtCO2e)</th> <th>Energy + Commute (mtCO2e)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Existing Shoreline 2,200</td> <td>4.98</td> <td>0.24</td> <td>(drive) 2.93</td> <td>8.16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreline TOD 1,000</td> <td>1.52</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>(light rail) 0.00</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East King County 2,800</td> <td>4.76</td> <td>8.39</td> <td>(drive) 5.53</td> <td>18.68</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This means that for every person we can house in Seattle, we will reduce their emissions over 90% compared to business as usual. (Note that the Shoreline study assumed natural gas -- future computations based on new building codes will find a bigger difference between new multi-family buildings and single family homes where natural gas is allowed for space heating and cooling.) That's a compelling reason to increase housing in Seattle just considering climate. But there are other co-benefits that come with it and will improve our community. Here are just a few: * Reduced traffic. All these people will be on the light rail and on the bus, which will take cars off the road that would otherwise be commuting from places that could be two hours away. * Save farmlands and forests. This benefit extends beyond the climate and food system benefits of preserving these lands. The rural areas are getting further and further away as the sprawl pushes out, and this gives us a way to live closer to things that we care about: fresh farm produce, trees, small towns, hiking and other outdoor opportunities. One six-unit building in Seattle saves an acre of sprawl. * Greater equity for those cannot drive, prefer not to drive, or live here now and are at risk of displacement from community. The people in</p>	Housing Size (SF)	Natural Gas (mtCO2e)	Electricity (mtCO2e)	Commuting (mtCO2e)	Energy + Commute (mtCO2e)	Existing Shoreline 2,200	4.98	0.24	(drive) 2.93	8.16	Shoreline TOD 1,000	1.52	0.08	(light rail) 0.00	1.60	East King County 2,800	4.76	8.39	(drive) 5.53	18.68	8/17/2022
Housing Size (SF)	Natural Gas (mtCO2e)	Electricity (mtCO2e)	Commuting (mtCO2e)	Energy + Commute (mtCO2e)																			
Existing Shoreline 2,200	4.98	0.24	(drive) 2.93	8.16																			
Shoreline TOD 1,000	1.52	0.08	(light rail) 0.00	1.60																			
East King County 2,800	4.76	8.39	(drive) 5.53	18.68																			
Steve Zemke	Holistic urban planning needed to address climate crisis	<p>The climate impacts need to be considered for all proposals studied. More housing is needed but the way it is built and where it is built in relation to services people need, like access to transit and grocery stores for example will impact the carbon footprint for Seattle. Where housing is built in relation to transit will affect how many people decide they don't need cars and how many decide they do need cars, how much transit riding versus driving they will do to get to jobs and where they are able to purchase essential needs like food and medicine and household necessities, where and how their kids go to school and access to recreation and parks. The city needs to analyze in the EIS what impacts the different alternatives will have in relations to not just housing needs but transportation, climate, equity and environmental justice, park and recreation access, urban tree canopy, heat island impacts , water and sewer and energy infrastructure, schools, police and fire and emergency services. tourist impacts, job impacts and such. The city needs to do a holistic urban planning process that deals with all the impacts of increased growth.</p>	8/17/2022																				

author_name	title	description	published_at
Tiernan Martin	Increase The Growth Targets And Add A Sixth Alternative	<p>Futurewise supports the general framework of the five alternatives being considered in the EIS. However, we suggest that the City revise the alternatives to allow for higher amounts of housing and jobs growth—both in designated growth centers and overall. The Puget Sound Regional Council’s VISION 2050 plan contains multi-county planning policies that cities like Seattle need to consider as they plan for growth. The Regional Growth Strategy chapter establishes a framework for growth which contains specific policies and actions for cities to follow. RGS-Action-8 provides that “Metropolitan and Core cities experiencing high job growth will take measures to provide additional housing capacity for a range of housing types and affordability levels to meet the needs of those workers as well as the needs of existing residents who may be at risk of displacement.” So the City has the flexibility and a requirement to analyze housing targets beyond those adopted by the Countywide Planning Policies and VISION 2050. Given Seattle’s high rate of growth over the past twenty years, the role of housing supply in preventing displacement, the existing public facilities and services, the continuing regional investments in light rail, and the environmental and climate benefits of accommodating this growth in Seattle, Futurewise supports having the EIS analyze higher levels of housing growth than those included in the Countywide Planning Policies and VISION 2050. We suggest that the City use housing and jobs growth targets equal to or greater than the past ten years’ growth rates extrapolated to the end of the comprehensive plan’s new target period (2024 - 2044). In addition to assessing the proposed alternatives’ ability to meet appropriately high growth targets, we suggest that the City study a new alternative that would accommodate even higher amounts of housing and job growth than Alternative 5 (Combined). This sixth alternative should expand access to frequent transit service and essential daily needs across all residential parts of the city, while focusing high-density development near light rail stations and allowing mid-rise apartment buildings in all residential areas. It should also include density bonuses for affordable homes by right, as well as encouraging ground floor commercial and community spaces to serve people’s essential daily needs. Other Comments ----- Futurewise has submitted a comment letter containing all of our comments. We have highlighted six comments to share in the Engagement Hub: * Increase</p>	8/17/2022
Tiernan Martin	Use A “Gap Filling” Approach When Choosing Where To Focus Housing Growth	<p>Futurewise supports the general framework of the five alternatives being considered in the EIS. However, we are concerned that the City’s approach to identifying areas to focus new growth will “lock in” low levels of growth in parts of the city that do not currently have frequent transit service and/or enough residential density to support frequent transit service. Puget Sound Regional Council’s VISION 2050 in RGS-Action-7 directs cities to “support the implementation of a full range of strategies, including zoning and development standards, incentives, infrastructure investments, housing tools, and economic development, to achieve a development pattern that aligns with VISION 2050 and to reduce rural growth rates over time and focus growth in cities.” Futurewise suggests that the City follow this guidance by using a “gap filling” approach—i.e., identifying areas of Seattle that do not align with the development pattern described in VISION 2050, and using tools like land use policy change and transportation infrastructure investment to bring those areas into alignment. As the City refines its conceptual growth strategies into neighborhood-specific land use plans, it should avoid circular logic traps (sometimes referred to as “chicken or the egg” questioning) around the question of whether residential density should lead or follow beneficial existing conditions like transit service, public infrastructure, commercial density, etc. The City is required to plan for housing and jobs density patterns that align with the regional growth plan (i.e., concentration in cities and near frequent transit) and plan to achieve those patterns through policy and public investment. To meet this requirement, Futurewise strongly recommends that the City refine its proposed growth strategy alternatives to add density both to places that currently have beneficial existing conditions and to places that lack those conditions. In the case of the latter, the goal should be to encourage residential density levels that can support the citywide expansion of services like frequent transit and small businesses that provide essential daily needs. After all, the GMA provides that all elements, including the transportation and capital facility plan elements, “shall be consistent with the future land use map.” Other Comments ----- Futurewise has submitted a comment letter containing all of our comments. We have highlighted six comments to share in the Engagement Hub: * Increase The Growth Targets And Add A Sixth Alternative (</p>	8/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Tiernan Martin	Use A Racial Equity Lens When Refining Each Growth Strategy	<p>Futurewise supports the City's commitment to the goal of making racial equity a reality in Seattle. A City-sponsored analysis of the Urban Village growth strategy found that this growth strategy has not resulted in racially-equitable outcomes. The report found that while this strategy may have been created with good intentions, it "has not achieved its goals because it ultimately perpetuates the same housing insecurity of low-income Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) residents that has been in place for years". The Seattle Planning Commission reached a similar conclusion in its NEIGHBORHOODS FOR ALL report, which states that the City has exacerbated displacement pressure on BIPOC and low-income communities by concentrating housing growth into a small portion of the city while restricting housing options in areas with high property values. Racially-equitable outcomes should be one of the primary goals of every element of the One Seattle Plan—including the growth strategy. As the conceptual alternatives are refined into explicit land use plans and zoning alternatives, the City should use a racial equity lens to inform its refinement approach. For example, Futurewise supports the City's intention to refine each alternative to maximize housing production in low-displacement risk areas while still expanding housing choices in high-risk areas alongside anti-displacement strategies. We also support the City's plan to improve the Displacement Risk Index tool—which includes race and ethnicity as indicators of displacement risk—by adding new indicators and updating data sources to reflect the most recent data available. We strongly support the combination of city-wide growth and targeted anti-displacement strategies—especially a set of strategies that would operate in near-, mid-, and long-term time frames. This approach will improve the City's ability to "address and begin to undo racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing caused by local policies, plans, and actions" when it updates its housing element, as required by the GMA. We also suggest that this anti-displacement refinement approach be extended to include areas with high and low concentrations of BIPOC-owned businesses and BIPOC communities' cultural anchors. Where growth strategy changes result in new mixed use or commercial development, the City should work to achieve racially-equitable outcomes by supporting BIPOC businesses in securing commercial leases. These suggestions would align</p>	8/17/2022
Tiernan Martin	Add More Mixed Use To Each Strategy To Allow More Essential Daily Services	<p>Futurewise supports the general framework of the five alternatives being considered in the EIS. However, The City's proposed growth strategy alternatives are primarily focused on changes in housing density. This housing-focused approach would fail to assess the impacts of increasing access to jobs and services in neighborhoods that currently only allow residential uses. Puget Sound Regional Council's VISION 2050 plan in section MPP-DP-1 provides that urban communities should "[d]evelop high-quality, compact urban communities throughout the region's urban growth area that impart a sense of place, preserve local character, provide for mixed uses and choices in housing types, and encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use." Given the disruptive impacts of the COVID 19 pandemic and the growing severity of the climate crisis, the importance of creating walkable, mixed use neighborhoods may be greater now than ever. Rather than focusing primarily on housing, Futurewise suggests that the City's growth strategy alternatives should also explore a range of different levels of integration between residential and commercial uses. Mixed use typologies should include: home-based businesses, corner stores with housing above, essential service facilities, live-work units, popup businesses and food trucks in public spaces. We suggest that the action alternatives reflect a variety of ways to expand access to shops and amenities that provide essential daily needs. Seattle City Councilmember Morales's proposed comprehensive plan amendment (http://clerk.seattle.gov/~cfpics/cf_322316_1.pdf) defines essential daily needs as, "commercial or non-profit groceries, childcare, health services, fresh healthy food merchants, home goods, and cultural anchors." Other Comments ----- Futurewise has submitted a comment letter containing all of our comments. We have highlighted six comments to share in the Engagement Hub: * Increase The Growth Targets And Add A Sixth Alternative (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/increase-the-growth-targets-and-add-a-sixth-alternative) * Use A "Gap Filling" Approach When Choosing Where To Focus Housing Growth (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/use-a-gap-filling-approach-when-choosing-where-to-focus-housing-growth) * Use A Racial Equity Lens When Refining Each Growth Strategy (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/use-a-racial-equity-lens-when-refining-each-growth-strategy)</p>	8/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Tiernan Martin	Study Climate Impacts And Mitigation Measures	<p>The purpose of an EIS is to identify and disclose the potential impacts of the proposed alternatives and to identify mitigating measures. Futurewise supports the inclusion of impacts to the natural and built environment listed in the City's EIS Scoping Notice. We support the City's decision to study objectives and metrics related to equity and climate resilience across the environmental elements studied. Futurewise strongly support the City's plan to assess growth strategy alternatives' impacts on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transportation and vehicle-miles traveled (VMTs). SEPA defines climate as an element of the environment. SEPA EISs are required to analyze greenhouse gas pollution. Washington State enacted limits on greenhouse gas emissions and a statewide goal to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles traveled for light-duty vehicles. Futurewise, in full agreement with Seattle City Council Resolution 32059 (https://seattle.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11113924&GUID=36C6FB22-F00B-45A1-99FC-C548597CCBB0), supports analyzing whether each growth strategy alternative will meet these limits and goals. For both GHG and VMT, we support the use of total and per capita metrics to measure impacts. Comprehensive planning is one way to address both the reduction of greenhouse gasses and vehicle miles traveled. Almost half of all greenhouse gas emissions in our state result from the transportation sector. Land use and transportation strategies that promote compact and mixed use development and infill reduce the need to drive, reducing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions. Another important method of reducing greenhouse gas emissions is to include complementary land uses not already present in local zoning districts, such as supermarkets, parks, schools, and services in residential neighborhoods. These measures are often referred to as the "15-minute city" (https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/How-to-build-back-better-with-a-15-minute-city?language=en_US). The EIS should assess the impact of these land use changes on GHG emissions. Futurewise strongly recommends that any transportation model used to assess these impacts account for multiple types of transportation behavior changes, including: shorter-distance personal vehicle trips, replacing personal vehicle trips with public transit or private carpooling, and replacing personal vehicle trips with emission-free modes</p>	8/17/2022
Tiernan Martin	Study The Impact of Alternative Growth Strategies On The MHA Program	<p>SEPA defines housing as an element of the built environment. Futurewise supports the assessment of existing conditions, impacts, and mitigation measures related to housing in the EIS. Futurewise strongly recommends that the City assess the impacts of each alternative on the City's inclusionary zoning program, Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) (https://www.seattle.gov/housing/housing-developers/mandatory-housing-affordability). We suggest that the City assume that proposed zoning changes under each alternative will incorporate the MHA program and assess the impacts to both a) on-site performance unit creation, and b) in-lieu fee payments to support affordable housing construction. In addition to assessing impacts on MHA, we support the list of market-rate housing metrics and income-restricted housing metrics proposed by the City. We suggest that the City assess the impacts on the supply and condition of all housing types listed in RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c), including: "government-assisted housing, housing for moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income households, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, group homes, foster care facilities, emergency housing, emergency shelters, permanent supportive housing, and within an urban growth area boundary, consideration of duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes" Other Comments ----- Futurewise has submitted a comment letter containing all of our comments. We have highlighted six comments to share in the Engagement Hub: * Increase The Growth Targets And Add A Sixth Alternative (https://engage.oneSeattleplan.com/en/ideas/increase-the-growth-targets-and-add-a-sixth-alternative) * Use A "Gap Filling" Approach When Choosing Where To Focus Housing Growth (https://engage.oneSeattleplan.com/en/ideas/use-a-gap-filling-approach-when-choosing-where-to-focus-housing-growth) * Use A Racial Equity Lens When Refining Each Growth Strategy (https://engage.oneSeattleplan.com/en/ideas/use-a-racial-equity-lens-when-refining-each-growth-strategy) * Add More Mixed Use To Each Strategy To Allow More Essential Daily Services (https://engage.oneSeattleplan.com/en/ideas/add-more-mixed-use-to-each-strategy-to-allow-more-essential-daily-services) * Study Climate Impacts And Mitigation Measures (https://engage.oneSeattleplan.com/en/ideas/study-climate-impacts-and-mitigation-measures) * Study The Impact Of Alternative Growth Strategies On The</p>	8/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Pamela Dalan	Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in Jackson Park /Lake City , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Enhance water quality and salmon survival via a reduction in car tire pollution - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote racial justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Improve mental health - Keep families together by enabling children 	8/17/2022
Ron Davis	Option 6 is the only option	<p>The current menu doesn't cut it. It's a setup to make some "compromise" between the lunacy of options 1-4, and the not-quite adequacy of option 5--which won't keep up with growth or manage our climate or adequately address our environmental justice goals--look rational. Let's stop playing pretend and do the right thing - Option 6 is the only option. We know that to reduce emissions, create opportunities for working class people, and reverse dangerous concentrations of poverty, we need to build all the housing people need in every neighborhood, and those neighborhoods need to address their residents' commercial, educational, social service, and recreational needs. They need to be filled with trees, and safe places to play and get around. Option 6 means we need to allow wood frame apartments (which are low carbon) everywhere, rather than locking in 75 years of only duplexes in all the neighborhoods that have room to grow. Everything up to 4-5 story wood frame apartments should be legal on every lot in Seattle, with much more intense densities around light rail. We also need to let people choose what kinds of homes they want - including micro units, as they have for most of history in most places, including Seattle. Option 6 also means getting rid of all our silly rules about side and rear setbacks, and upper level setbacks, minimum lot sizes, and design materials - and design review for that matter- that make our city uglier and so much more expensive to live in. We need basic rules (FAR, coverage, maybe height) and to let creativity work. Option 6 means eliminating all parking minimums, handing over at least a third of our public right of way to plant 250,000 street trees, and creating safe spaces for walking, biking, riding transit, eating and for kids to play. Option 6 means building 100,000 social housing units over the next decade, serving people from 0% AMI all the way up to 120% AMI, restricting rent to 30% of people's incomes, and 5000 permanent supportive units in the same time period. Option 6 means legalizing small scale retail in every neighborhood, and subsidizing small scale grocery in places where grocery would not otherwise thrive. Option 6 means lush, safe parks and high quality schools in every neighborhood. Option 6 means that everyone has access to everything (beside work) that they need within a 15 minute walk. Option 6 also means that everyone has access to transit in a 5 minute walk, and high frequency transit (5 minutes or less at peak) within a 10 minute walk, and that this transit</p>	8/17/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Adrienne James	High Density and High Quality Public Spaces for everyone	Increasing Housing and Density is necessary. Social Housing Development proposed in Alternative 6 is a terrific idea. Increasing density and heights along traffic corridors and urban villages makes sense in order to offer denser urban areas to more people and to allow the character of smaller neighborhoods to remain. The following are additional matters of importance that could/should be considered in line with new development. The speed of necessary development is important but concerning if not done thoughtfully. 1. Quality of Public Spaces: Housing is necessary but also the space around the housing for a better universal quality of life. --Green spaces are critical and increased green throughout the city would benefit physical and mental health of all citizens. The percentage of available park space in Seattle relative to other leading cities is quite low. Higher availability can be achieved on many scales - street trees, pocket parks, neighborhood parks/plazas in new developments, rooftops, green infill on and around buildings. Some cities encourage tenants/owners to plant on and around buildings in dense urban environments through funding grants and relaxed permit requirements. --Open spaces for gathering beyond retail. Plazas with seating, communal residential spaces within and outside multi-family developments, courtyards all encourage positive human interaction. These can be included with new residential development. --Walkable neighborhoods and cities: Developments should all require consideration of the human scale to make access easy for pedestrians and cycles over cars. This means continuous, safe travel from house to school to services and pleasant paths of transition. --Improved Public Transport throughout the city. The lightrail is exciting with every new station but so limited for most travelers by location. Increasing crosstown (east-west) transit options and expediting these trips through transit-only corridors and bike lanes will make usage much easier. Reducing parking only works if people can stop having cars. --Better, Continuous and more Cycling lanes: these are improving very slowly and with major gaps in every corridor. One should be able to travel from one neighborhood to the next without jumping into a car lane or sidewalk with pedestrians. Younger people should be able to navigate a bike trip on their own. This is not realistic now. 2. Good Design of housing and urban planning makes for attractive and inclusive cities: --Places like Vancouver	8/17/2022
Colin Szechy	Abundance of housing, access to greenery, and growing the city	We need an abundance of housing, an abundance of access to green spaces and park spaces, and an abundance of access to businesses to enable everyone in Seattle to live in a 15-minute city. We can do it by removing restrictions and red tape on how land can be used and developed throughout the city, allowing people to use the land to further develop and grow the city we love, and we should do it!	8/17/2022
Alice Lockhart	We can have affordable housing and trees too	Scoping analysis of impacts of trees shouldn't hold everything else constant -- analysis should include how to mitigate small tree removal by planting more trees, and assume a tree ordinance that protects large trees. Climate change means we need more shade -- city wide, not just in single-family neighborhoods. Housing versus trees is a false dichotomy. We can protect forests (trees!) and farms from sprawl by creating more affordable multifamily housing in Seattle, and we can grow Seattle's tree canopy at the same time. Protect landmark trees, plant more trees everywhere, and where building multifamily housing takes out smaller trees, remove a parking strip to plant trees, as was done on 100th St. North, just north of Aurora just this week! And fast track building designs like courtyard apartments or tree lined plazas. Allow more height in return for designs that include open space with trees.	8/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Florence Williams	We Need An Alternative 6	<p>I am a renter in Wedgwood and in my day job I work with people affected by homelessness. Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining</p> <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/18/2022
Ginger Woo	More housing, more housing diversity	<p>I am delighted to see such overwhelming support for housing affordability/availability, for walkability and transit, as well as sustainability. I agree with many who are calling for more progress than alternative 5 offers and for serious consideration to be given to alternative 6 proposed by Real Change. I want all kinds of housing to be buildable across Seattle to improve access, affordability, and our social fabric. Other places in the US and across the globe have shown it is attainable. I would also encourage measures to decrease car dependence and to create car free zones which can counteract the problem of the densest housing being built in the most unsafe and polluted areas. The pollution is from the cars. Walkability and transit are the answer.</p>	8/18/2022
Jennifer Zwick	Alternative 6, please	<p>While this comment was generated, it was also carefully thought out. I honestly don't know the perfect way to phrase things to get you specifically to care about social justice, environmental impacts, quality of life for those who aren't exceedingly wealthy, people in general, etc. Here's desperately hoping that this combination of data will somehow get whoever is reading this to make the right choice. I am a homeowner in Beacon Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Increase walkability The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Su Liu	Alternative 6	<p>I am a Technical Program Manager, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow light industry and commercial uses in current single-family neighborhoods - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation 	8/18/2022
W. Rogers	We need SIGNIFICANTLY more housing	<p>Things that need to be taken into account when creating the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Best and worst case reasonable scenarios for each alternative, not just expected. (Is what's currently happening what was expected from the last plan?) Use the growth patterns of the last 10 years or so -- including homelessness and inequality of incomes -- to predict the future; don't hope things will go back to how they were in 1980. * More people with less yard space means more people will be interested in public green spaces for recreation. How will this be accommodated? * Relatedly, my nearest park has two major sections. One is a fenced dog park, the other is a large grass field adjacent to a baseball field. Despite signs discouraging pets from using the grassy field, I see people taking their pets there more often than children. It seems like we are in dire need of more dog parks, and that is likely to increase with higher density, a smaller percentage of whom will have a yard for their dog. Are we planning to make more neighborhood dog parks? * I've heard several people say they tried using (or going back to using) public transportation after the pandemic eased up, only to find they did not feel the conditions were hygienic, reliable, or even safe due to large numbers of drug users and mentally ill people using public transport as shelter. Additionally, human waste is often spotted in quieter corners of lightrail stations. How are we going to encourage more people to use public transportation, given these issues? * We have wonderful wildlife near Lake Washington, but a lot of higher-density areas have only insects and 'nuisance' birds. What can we do to welcome more desirable wildlife into areas where the working class lives? * With climate change, the Seattle area is heating up, but we don't want to contribute further to climate change by having the whole city run AC in the summer. Yet many new apartments have limited ability to open windows for airflow, due to regulations that were originally created with the laudable goal of preventing children from falling out windows. What can we do to build housing that will stay comfortable as our climate continues to warm? <p>My preferred alternative of those proposed? #5: Combined</p> <p>There is zero doubt in my mind that limited-use, single-family-homes-only, and urban center-focused development has created profound desperation for housing in this city. If things were less dire, I'd prefer the 'broad' housing that allows plexes and cottage clusters as ways of expanding home ownership or non-corporate-</p>	8/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Shauna Otto	Please consider an Alternative 6	I am a scientist, a mother, and a renter, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Create a more affordable city for everyone The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/18/2022
Jamie Alls	Alternative 5 (and 6!)	The entire city needs to be zoned for multi family housing of some sort. Duplexes, 6 unit buildings are totally compatible with historically single family housing neighborhoods (see Twin Cities). I'm disappointed not to see an alternative for rezoning the entire city. (alternative 6?), but alternative 5 is the best of those on offer. Please study it. The housing crisis is all over and Seattle has the infrastructure to take more housing. We need to do this. Thanks, - Jamie	8/18/2022
Heidi Willis	Please study the impact of the tree ordinance on multi-family placement citywide	To what extent will the new tree ordinance affect each alternative regarding multi-family being built in existing leafy single family neighborhoods. Also to what degree will it cause further exploitation/gentrification of areas without said "tree canopy". (Guess where) Sadly NIMBYism at its finest with a new mask. Cannot and will not build it in my backyard as some trees would have to be felled. Instead, build them down south where there aren't trees anyway and we'll just plant a few when we are done.	8/18/2022
Blake Larimer	Alternative 5	Although I don't think alternative 5 goes far enough it is the best choice. We need to allow for more residential housing density across the city. We should also reduce administrative red tape for new construction to allow for a quicker permitting process, thus in incentivizing developers to build. This would include limiting the onerous design review process. Better yet, just get rid of the design review boards! I feel people care more about affordable, abundant housing than setbacks and facade materials.	8/18/2022
Adrienne Dorf	Housing options in the 130th and 145th neighborhoods	After reading the alternatives for the neighborhoods around the 130th and 145th Street stations I noticed an assumption that the City is making that is not accurate. The City routinely states that single family homes are "high" cost alternatives. This is not an accurate assumption about the housing in the neighborhoods right around those two stations. In my Haller Lake neighborhood single family homes are more affordable than the newer townhomes being built in the Shoreline area just off of 145th. Additionally most of the newer townhomes are at least 3 stories tall and include 6 units on one single family lot. Is the City proposing to limit multi-family residences in what are now single family neighborhoods to only duplexes or triplexes no taller than 2 stories? I think many neighbors might find that option acceptable. Most of us do not want to live next to 6 townhomes that are 3 stories tall. That is what the developers are currently building. The newer 3 story townhomes are not an option for older Seattleites who are trying to age in place in a one story home. I have heard City staff offer up disabled units in apartments as options for seniors. Many seniors want to age in place, which means continuing to live in a one story home that they own. I encourage the City to reach out to diverse groups to gain input. Offering online options for comments might not be the best option for many seniors who are not tech savvy. Thank you!	8/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Andrew Rueckert	Beyond Alternative 5	<p>Of the proposed options, Alternative 5 seems to be the least that we can do. However, if we want to ensure that Seattle meets the needs of its growing population, we need to go further to create affordable housing for all. First and foremost, we need to remove prohibitive "luxury zoning" rules from the vast majority of Seattle's land. A common refrain is that single-family home ownership is a vehicle for upwards mobility for Seattle's BIPOC community; however true that may have been in the past, it is certainly not true today. There are no affordable single-family homes within Seattle. The market "starts" around \$800k-1m, which is simply out of reach for a huge portion of the people who work within Seattle. We cannot allow Seattle to become a place where rich tech-workers live, and poor service-workers commute. In order to accomplish this, we must allow for denser, less-expensive housing in every neighborhood. In service of these goals, we should also abolish design review for any residential structures, and seriously consider reigning it in for non-residential structures. The Seattle Design Review process adds 15% cost and 3 years to the average project, and there is little evidence that it provides a commensurate benefit. We have already done studies that show these things to be true; we now need to act on their results. The design review process doesn't allow the community to approve or expedite a project in any way; at every meeting, we see the board highlight concerns about the color of brick, or setback length, and simply ignore any comments in support of the current design. Lastly, we must seriously consider upzoning the land around the 135th & 145th light rail station. It is absurd that we are planning high-capacity public transit to a vast swath of land that cannot be enjoyed by a high density of Seattle's residents. Forget whether the average Seattleite enjoys golfing; the game of golf simply does not work unless the course is mostly empty. It is a poor use of scarce public land!</p>	8/18/2022
David Corliss	We need housing solutions that actually meet the problem	<p>I am a renter in Ravenna, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. <p>The city of Singapore, where 80% of the city's residents live in housing developed and managed by the government and parks/gardens occupy 47% of the land even while accommodating almost 6 million people, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Share The Cities Action Fund	Share The Cities: Broadband, Bathrooms, Industrial Lands, Trees & more!	Share The Cities Action Fund's scoping concerns: * Industrial Lands * Seattle's Equitable Development Initiative * Displacement & Gentrification * Racial Equity * Seattle's Urban Tree Canopy * Public Bathrooms * Public Broadband * A City for Everyone? Share The Cities Action Fund, Seattle Comprehensive Plan, Scoping Phase Comments, Dark Blue Background, Round Circles with Issues Priorities The comprehensive plan is a long term planning document; we want to recognize up front that it will stop the next major housing crisis, but is not a policy tool to address our current one. With several years of budget shortfalls ahead of us, outreach to entrenched and wealthy community councils should be deprioritized in favor of meaningful connections to communities long left out of our city's planning processes. We support many comments that have already been submitted to this engagement hub, but ask that people pay particular attention to three: Real Change (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/real-change-alternative-6-social-communities-for-all) (engagement hub) Futurewise (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/increase-the-growth-targets-and-add-a-sixth-alternative?utm_source=share_idea&utm_campaign=share_content&utm_medium=twitter&utm_content=e8dcaf5c-35c7-4463-804c-908265f8e057) (engagement hub); Futurewise (http://www.futurewise.org/blog/2022/seattles-plan-for-the-next-20-years-and-what-futurewise-thinks-must-be-considered) (website) Affordable Talaris (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/seattle-needs-an-alternative-6) (engagement hub) Industrial Lands ----- We are concerned that the Seattle Industrial & Maritime Strategy Draft Environmental Impact Statement (https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/OPCD/OngoingInitiatives/IndustrialMaritimeStrategy/Seattle%20Industrial%20DEIS%20Executive%20Summary%202021_12.pdf) preceded this plan and that the two plans do not work together in a coordinated manner. Our previous comments (https://sharethecitiesactionfund.org/updates) about Seattle's Industrial Lands are applicable yet again, and we ask they be included in the analysis of this phase of the Comprehensive Plan. This includes addressing the following issues, slightly revised to address this Comprehensive Plan: * Engage communities to more clearly explain the	8/18/2022
M McCauley	End the apartment ban in all alternatives	The MLK Labor Council has passed the resolution put forward by my union local advocating ending the apartment ban in Seattle, in order to ensure affordable workforce housing throughout the city. The text of the resolution states: Whereas, the population of King County continues to grow; and Whereas, the land available for housing does not; and Whereas, the bans on building apartments and other multifamily homes that Seattle and other cities in King County have enacted push working families further and further out of the metro area and further from job centers; and Whereas the bans on building apartments have increased the pressure to convert industrial areas; and Whereas, zoning and design review are used to exclude working families; and Whereas, renters are valuable members of our communities just as homeowners are; and Whereas, local governments are under intense pressure to provide services with limited funds and these services are exponentially more expensive as housing sprawls; now, therefore MLK labor council calls on the City of Seattle to allow all forms of housing in residential areas. Toward that end, MLK labor council calls on the City of Seattle to have the Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Statement incorporate an alternative that allows all forms of housing in all residential areas including those zoned Neighborhood Residential.	8/18/2022
Paula Birchman	More density everywhere, option 5	I live in a one story 8-unit absolutely wonderful apartment building, Tudor Court, in the Upper Queen Anne neighborhood. Currently, new construction is always a huge, modern box, single-family and over 2 million dollars to buy. My place is affordable and feels like a home. I'm told these can no longer be built in our neighborhood due to zoning issues, which is too bad. People comment on the beauty of the building and we are attached to the community here. The transportation options available here mean I no longer need a car, another bonus to density. I think Option 5 best suits what I believe should be done to make the city more livable, affordable and hopefully, integrated.	8/18/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
greta treistman	Alternative 6: Towards ending legacies of racist, anti-poor housing policies	I am a renter in Wallingford. I was born on Capitol Hill and have lived in Seattle for most of my life. As a community college librarian, I earn around \$35,000 a year. The only feasible means I've found to be able to afford to live comfortably here is to rent a large single-family home with a group of friends and fill every bedroom with wage-earning adults. This option happens to work for me, but it doesn't make sense for many others with different lifestyles, family situations, and needs; nor are there enough single-family homes available for rent to fulfill the need... Exploring cities in other parts of world has led me to feel frustrated with the difficulty of living in Seattle. It feels more like an amalgamation of suburbs than an actual city with infrastructure to support housing, transit, and food needs, along with natural beauty and pleasant neighborhood walking experience. We have these things in *some* areas, but not enough! I want to uplift & support the "Alternative 6" grassroots proposal (the following text is their wording): I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: * Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed * Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household * Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials * Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas * Upzone the entire city * Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city * Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods * Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household * Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: * Promote racial justice * Promote environmental justice * Create a more affordable city for everyone * Create a more vibrant and thriving economy The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including: Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current	8/18/2022
Sandy S	Big trees and more housing — we can and should have both	We need every option in the One Seattle survey to include protection and support for urban trees. Countless studies have clearly established that urban trees give us cleaner air, cooler summers, and better outcomes on every measurable public health metric. Neighborhoods that lack trees can feel dystopian regardless of density. Conversely, neighborhoods with big trees create a sense of place, serenity and community even if extremely dense. Cohesive, canopied communities like these encourage people to put down roots in urban neighborhoods. People choosing to stay long-term in livable neighborhoods will help Seattle meet regional goals on growth management and transportation emissions. We can create these rooted neighborhoods by thoughtfully developing around existing big trees. Big trees are valuable because their sheer size enables them to provide the ecosystem and public health benefits we need right now. Developers know how to preserve large trees through creative design and partnering with arborists to ensure trees remain healthy through the construction process. Local government can help with financial incentives to preserve and care for trees ("treebates") as well as design flexibility for incorporating trees. Together with a stronger tree protection ordinance, programs like these would help remove incentives for developers to clearcut lots, and make tree retention the norm. We also need to invest in our future urban forest by planting trees now. Seattle's historically lax tree protection has stripped trees from all parts of the city, but especially in lower-income communities where people can't afford AC needed to mitigate heat. Our comprehensive plan should right this historical wrong and plan for a future where everyone can live among big trees and enjoy the health and connection to nature they provide.	8/19/2022
Jack Rouse	Alternative 6 Must-haves	I am a renter in the U District, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Suresh Chanmugam	Let's Build More Housing to Save the Planet and Lower Housing Costs	I am a software engineer , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow light industry and commercial uses in current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Promote racial justice The other options (Alternatives	8/19/2022
Zachary Kirshbaum	Option 6: Social Housing, Electric Transit, and Consult Indigenous Peoples	We need a 6th option that will address the climate and housing crises in a way that we will be happy about down the line. Additionally, this 6th option should do everything it can to support housing justice, include indigenous people's input, make us a "15 minute city", and accommodate electric transit for all. Housing Crisis * The method of sweeping unhoused people in crisis from place to place in an effort to "clean" the city is cruel and has obviously failed. Social housing needs to be provided if we actually want to help, and provide safe public spaces. * The other 5 plans create more sprawl, and those pushed to the edges would not be able to afford to commute to the city for work. * The multifamily units in the other 5 plans seem to be close to pollution and traffic, which would be a continuation of racist zoning. * "15 Minute Cities": all parks, schools, and transit hubs should be within a half mile of social housing, ensuring access for all. * Relax rules on design, allowing 6-8+ story buildings in all neighborhoods for social housing. Climate * Provide shelters for refuge from the heat, smog, and elements as climate events continue (I can't imagine being unhoused on the streets during a heat wave). * Ensure that all living spaces have easy access to public transit to avoid the enormous pollutive cost of far-away workers commuting individually every day. * Electric Transit: The transit that we develop MUST be electric. Building anything else is an investment in years of technology that we will have to scrap anyway, as we move toward unarmful fuels. I do not want to see another public vehicle telling me to "breathe clean" because it's running on "natural" (fracked) gas. This is something to think about as we develop the city. Consult Indigenous Peoples Make sure to have Native people at the table. The land we are doing so much work on belongs to its native population, and we can't passively continue policies that push them out or ignore them. Even in conservation efforts, researchers and developers often do more harm than good because they did not ask people native to the area for advice or permission before acting. On top of the fact that this land is theirs, Seattle's indigenous people have thousands of years of experience with this area, and their input is needed. Dr. Jessica Hernandez (https://www.jessicahernandez.com/) of the Urban Forestry Commission writes about this and explains it better than I can.	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Steven Liebig	I want a denser, greener Seattle	<p>I am a renter in Greenwood, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://www.pinterest.com/pin/5981411997387222/?mt=login <p>Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
Whiting Tennis	SOCIAL HOUSING FOR THE PEOPLE	<p>I am a renter in Fremont, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining 	8/19/2022
Rodney Brown	Study a more ambitious alternative	<p>Hello, I own a single-family house in Magnolia, and I wish that the City would allow denser "missing middle" development in my immediate neighborhood and even denser development near transit and commercial centers with shopping and other necessities. Seattle has done better than SF, but we're still falling behind. We need to move faster. Please add a more ambitious alternative to your study. Thanks. — Rod Brown</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
David Henry	Please explore better options	<p>I am a homeowner in Maple Leaf, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Increase walkability - Increase access to green space - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://images.app.goo.gl/aEXeUJjUge7DdGCD8 <p>Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
David Moehring	One acre of park land per 150 residents = 8,500 acres by 2035 (15% of land area)	<p>If WA State Legislation prohibits growth in rural areas, let's plan on 1,250,000 population in Seattle for 2035. This requires infilling vertically (like Vancouver BC) and leave at least 8,500 acres of park land. Park land could include pocket-park green spaces in European-style Regenerative Eco-Districts. Every Seattle Resident should have equitable access to 3/30/300: * sight at least 3 trees from inside the residence * 30-percent equitable city-wide canopy cover * 300 meters / yards to the nearest park. If just 850,000 is the expected 2035 population, adding park lands to achieve 8,500 acres of Seattle parks equates to the Seattle's prior stated goal of acre of park per 100 residents by 2035. If the population almost doubles from 2015, the new goal of an acre of park per 150 residents by 2035 is also achievable.</p> <p>2015 Crosscut on Parks areas per population: "As Seattle's population grows over, longstanding goals regarding park space are likely to fall by the wayside. At the least, people will need to get used to thinking of parks as something beyond big open spaces with grass and trees. The city has two goals with regard to the amount of parkland available to its residents in terms of raw acreage. The first is a baseline goal of 1 acre of parkland per 1,000 residents, which the city is well above. Seattle Parks owns about 6,200 acres (at 488 parks and other facilities), and we've got about 650,000 people. But the parks system also has an "aspirational goal" of one acre per 100 residents, first adopted in 1993. We're about 300 acres shy of that number, and it's going to be hard to catch up with 120,000 people predicted to move to Seattle by 2035. Part of the problem comes down to raw acreage. The city is adding new parkland all the time – since 2008, Seattle Parks has acquired about 23 acres, and had another 49 gifted by other city departments. But that's just a fraction of what would be needed to meet the city's goal, which would require 1,400 acres more of parkland by 2035. To put that in perspective, the total of 7,600 acres of parkland would equal about 14.3 percent of the city's land area." https://crosscut.com/2015/06/seattle-2035-as-city-grows-goals-for-parkland-slip-out-of-reach (https://deref-mail.com/mail/client/2CFZPsP_Axl/dereferrer/?redirectUri=https%3A%2F%2Fcrosscut.com%2F2015%2F06%2Fseattle-2035-as-city-grows-goals-for-parkland-slip-out-of-reach) King county has increased by 330,000 people in ten years. https://usafacts.org/data/topics/people-</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Caleb Barde	Make Seattle a dense, walkable, 15-minute city	First off, I just wanted to say thank you all for opening this up for scoping comments. I know a lot of hard work goes into setting this up, and reading all of these comments. I'd first say that if we are only picking from the proposed alternatives, then Option 5 is my favorite. This city is struggling with respect to affordable housing, socio-economic equality, and opportunities for creating small businesses. I'd like to see more details about the specifics with respect to option five, but we need to throw all solutions we have at this problem. I'd say that my personal preference though is that we should be aiming for a more holistic and ambitious vision. I think it is a true shame that people often don't live in the same places that they work and frequent. Having been fortunate enough to visit large cities in Asia and Europe (Seoul, Paris, Berlin), I am very jealous of their options. The lack of single family home specific zoning means that there are less cars and more pedestrian and foot traffic (as an aside, I'm also a large believer in accelerating a very strong public transit system). The plazas are made for relaxing and catching up with friends without road noise everywhere. People are able to live closer to where they work, relative to us, due to plentiful housing options. I strongly feel that focusing on the goal of being a 15 minute city is what we should be aiming for, and nothing less. I want people to be able to be healthy and live more cheaply because bikes become a safer and more reliable form of transportation. I want them to enjoy seeing their local friends more by being able to walk to meeting places. I want people to be able to start companies because of more affordable commercial spaces that are colocated within areas that people frequent (the holes in the walls are the best things about Seattle!). I think we can accomplish this by reviewing and removing burdensome design review processes, allowing multi-family housing/mixed-use zoning everywhere, and investing in parks, public spaces, and closing more side roads for bike use and local traffic only. Again, thanks for your time and effort in this process. I cannot wait to see what we can all come up with to put Seattle on the map as a shining example of what the PNW can offer people.	8/19/2022
Nicole Martin	Alternative 6 needed for an inclusive, sustainable city	I am a homeowner in Columbia City, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/19/2022
Constance Sidles	Keep Seattle green and livable	All of the alternatives suggested so far are really nothing more than zoning plans that place development in the hands of private commercial developers. Nowhere is there a mention of the critical need to retain - much less enhance - our urban forest or green spaces. This is a quality of life issue and should be incorporated into zoning requirements, regardless of which alternative is adopted. As a city, we should insist on having both affordable housing AND tree canopy. It is not enough to say that this issue will be handled in other parts of the plan. Because we have witnessed too much of the "right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing," we need to explicitly require in the actual zoning regulations themselves that heritage trees be retained, that green spaces be enhanced, that stormwater runoff be cleansed through good soil and habitat management, and that environmental equity be established.	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Emery Piper Black	Alternative 6	<p>I am a renter in Wallingford, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Create a more affordable city for everyone The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Singapore, where 80% of the city's residents live in housing developed and managed by the government and parks/gardens occupy 47% of the land even while accommodating almost 6 million people, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
Joseph Volk	Alternative 6 & Spokane plan	<p>We need a more realistic set of options to make this city affordable for everyone who works in it. There are many, many more people who would benefit from ending single family zoning than who currently benefit from the unsustainable status quo.</p>	8/19/2022
Kaitlyn Schroeder	Alternative 6	<p>I am an attorney renting in belltown, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
Billy Clark	Alternative 6	<p>I grew up in Florida and moved to Seattle a few years ago. I now consider Seattle home. I'm lucky that I have a good job to be able to afford an apartment. Having the opportunity to flee Florida shouldn't be dependent on having a tech job lined up. Build as much housing as possible so that other people can be as lucky as I've been. Support Option 6</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Frank Thompson	Please add a sixth alternative!	<p>I am a homeowner in Wallingford, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Increase walkability - Create climate resilience <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. 	8/19/2022
Sean O'Keefe	I support a sixth option: abundant housing in all neighborhoods	<p>I am a homeowner in High Point, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Upzone the entire city - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Improve mental health - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Create climate resilience - Reduce the urban heat island effect <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing 	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Erich Brown	Alternative 6	<p>I have been priced out of Seattle, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow light industry and commercial uses in current single-family neighborhoods - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks <p>The current options maintain Seattle's failed</p>	8/19/2022
Sydney Provence	Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in Ranier Valley, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. <p>The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
Denise Dahn	Plan for trees, too.	<p>Plan should include preserving big trees and planting many more new trees, both on private and public property. Climate change will mean more heat waves, and the city will need more big shade trees. Depending on street trees is not enough, because they typically can't accommodate trees large enough to make a difference in carbon or shade. More people will mean increased pressure on the environment, and on bird habitat as well as aquatic wildlife in Puget Sound. Trees are essential to mitigate the pressures of all this growth. People need more green spaces, too, and the plan should include acquiring more parks, not just further developing the ones we already have.</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Erin Murphy-Jarvis	Alternative 6 is the best option	<p>I am a renter in Northgate, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce rates of homelessness <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://assets3.thrillist.com/v1/image/2826011/381x254/crop;webp=auto;jpeg_quality=60.jpg <p>Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
Johanna Wilder	Alternative 6	<p>There is much activity and activism around an Alternative 6. I add my voice to theirs. We must be more bold with our vision for today and for the future. Half-measures got us where we are today.</p>	8/19/2022
Patricia Carroll	Comp Plan public comments	<p># 6 is the best. This city needs to move faster to help with condensing growth & saving trees/greenspace. Keep us the evergreen state!</p>	8/19/2022
Mary Keeler	Remember Our Tree Canopy Goal!	<p>Because of dense construction in Crown Hill, Ballard is beginning to look like those south Seattle "deserts" — please remember our 30% tree-canopy goal!</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Laura Loe	Station Area Planning for 130th and 145th - Study the 528 acres adjacent!	<p>Two core questions for station area planners and city officials for the 130th and 145th stations: * What would it look like to make this land near transit open to more people? * Is there a potential here to enact "land back" policies (https://grist.org/fix/justice/indigenous-landback-movement-can-it-help-climate/) that would acknowledge and honor Indigenous Sovereignty? Image from The Urbanist Article about 130th / 140th light rail. (Map from The Urbanist article here: https://www.theurbanist.org/2021/03/25/draft-plan-inches-toward-modest-upzones-around-130th-and-148th-street-link-stations/ ----- I hope that the City staff who are planning zoning changes near 130th and 145th stations, and elected officials who enact those changes into law, consider the impact of locking in so many acres of open space for one use, right next to two light rail stations. Here are excerpts from an opinion article from 2019 (https://southseattleemerald.com/2019/07/11/opinion-why-open-space-equity-priorities-matter-near-future-light-rail-stations/) that speak to the issues that should be considered for equitable station planning near 130th and 148th Sound Transit Stations. OPINION: Why Open Space Equity Priorities Matter Near Future Light Rail Stations JULY 11, 2019 (https://southseattleemerald.com/2019/07/11/opinion-why-open-space-equity-priorities-matter-near-future-light-rail-stations/) "Seattle's city-owned, privately managed (http://premiergc.com/), golf courses have come into the public eye as Mayor Jenny Durkan has questioned (https://www.seattletimes.com/sports/golf/seattle-considering-what-to-do-with-4-public-golf-courses-and-528-acres-of-green-space-they-cover/) whether golf courses are the best use of transit-adjacent public land. Seattle's 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan (https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/ParksAndRecreation/PoliciesPlanning/2017Plan/2017ParksandOpenSpacePlanFinal.pdf) states: "Over the past decade, the city of Seattle has grown rapidly, adding an average of about 4,000 housing units and 7,000 people each year. In the years to come, Seattle expects to accommodate a significant share of the region's growth. In 2016, Seattle's population was estimated to be 686,800, with projections that growth over the next 20 years will add an estimated 120,000 people to the city." As we face a crisis of houselessness (https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/homeless/), rising housing costs (https://www.thestranger.com/slog/2019/06/25/40574475/minimum-</p>	8/19/2022
Hilary Leonard	Make Seattle Sustainable with an Option 6	<p>I am a renter in Ballard at risk of being priced out of Seattle. To create a livable city for a diverse range of people, I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote environmental justice - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Create climate resilience The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions, stemming from massive population and job growth over the past decade-as well as from insufficient housing production and planning, for a much longer period. The current alternatives don't do nearly enough to make up for this past underproduction. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022
Abraham Epton	Much more housing, everywhere, faster	<p>I am a homeowner in Columbia city, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Joe Citizen	One Seattle Comprehensive Plan for 2024	Generally speaking, · Preserve single-family dwellings. They are the heart of Seattle. They are what makes Seattle. · If necessary, allow for increased density in urban villages and in major transit hubs. Also, allow for increased density along major transit routes: both bus transit rail transit. · Allowing developers to build with no off-street parking will NOT result in significantly fewer automobiles in the city. You are fooling yourself to think otherwise. · Bear in mind that increasing density does NOT necessarily result in greater affordability. Regrettably, the latter does not result from the former. Many areas in the city illustrate this point including the top of Queen Anne Hill. As to the alternatives, · In order I prefer Alternatives 1 (No Action), 2 (Focused), and 4 (Corridor). · In my opinion, the statements in the fact sheet (OneSeattlePlanEISScopingFactSheet.pdf) are clearly biased against Alternative 1. The staff is showing its bias. · Several recent comments mention Alternative 6. No Alternative 6 is mentioned in OneSeattlePlanEISScopingFactSheet.pdf or at https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/8c90f3a5e0704f8687213b669efa6fb0?item=6 . I don't know what they are talking about.	8/19/2022
Colbi Cannon	All of Seattle is a city, let's act like it.	All of Seattle is a city, and it's the largest city for hundreds of miles in any direction. Why did we ever call only a tiny subset of this place an urban village? Isn't that really just a synonym for a city? What part of our city shouldn't be a city? And then which parts of the city should have such intense development pressure that displacement is virtually guaranteed? If we do not create an abundance of housing throughout Seattle, we are maintaining a scarcity of housing here. That scarcity of housing is the root cause of so many of our region's largest problems. If Seattle doesn't create an abundance of housing, the true Environmental Impact is multiplied many times over as needed housing is added at lower densities in a patchwork of less-connected outlying areas. Knowing the current state of the world and our region, how could anyone conscientiously act as if prohibiting density in Seattle does not directly lead to more traffic, more pollution, more environmental destruction, more displacement, and more homelessness? With all of these very real impacts in mind, alternatives 2 and 4 – which do not increase housing abundance everywhere in the largest city in the region – are irresponsible and unethical. While alternative 3 seems to get closer to the right answer, it's not clear what happens in areas that already allow for anything more than the lowest levels of density in the city. If alternative 3 means "no action" in already slightly denser places, then that's still not enough action. I understand that we have to study a "no action" alternative, but do we really need to study 3 different versions of "not enough action"? Consider me one more voice shouting: Alternative 5 is the minimum level of action we should be considering in this EIS. Show us you get it by also studying alternatives that go a lot further.	8/19/2022
Susie Citizen	Comprehensive Plan Update Comments	Changes to the Comprehensive Plan need to be made responsibly, and with careful consideration for the impacts on our neighborhoods and the infrastructure needed to support such increases in density. The current requirement for Environmental Impact Studies is an important tool in evaluating the greater impacts of building denser housing in any Seattle neighborhood. I am in strong support of an EIS for any proposed approach to zoning changes, with these changes being made available to the public so the public can make informed comments before a plan is finalized. It is important that neighborhoods are given the opportunity to make thoughtful decisions about density changes and comment as to whether it is appropriate for the neighborhood. In addition, it is important to maintain critical environmental and infrastructure requirements and be clear about what the requirements are. Making broad-stroked changes would have negative impacts. In making any changes, two areas of concern: · It is important for infrastructure investment to align with increasing density · It is Important to hold developers accountable. As zoning changes and developers are able to develop lots from single family lots to rowhouses, townhouses, etc., developers need to be held accountable In addition, as density is increased in our neighborhoods, there is a need to invest in correlating enhancements in our infrastructure to accommodate growth, a short list of which includes: · Utility capacity such as sewers · Emergency services, including police and fire · Parking and traffic · Access and availability of parks and green spaces It is also important to offer an incremental approach rather than one size fits all. I support development and housing density where it makes sense, and as it is related to infrastructure and the environment. This should be done in conversation with the community and the individual neighborhoods.	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
David Foulke	Suggestions for a Sixth Alternative	<p>I moved to Seattle in 2020, shortly before the outbreak of COVID-19, from the Washington, DC area, and am currently a renter in Capitol Hill. I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. 	8/19/2022
Barbara B	Trees and density can go together in Seattle	<p>Trees and density can go together in Seattle. For too long, developers have used the argument that new construction alone can bring down prices. There has been plenty of time to measure the data and it all points that the building boom is not creating affordable housing opportunities for those in most immediate need. The city could require stricter regulations that force developers to build a certain amount of affordable units rather than paying a fee towards them for the future, (we need the housing now- not in a future to be determined project). However it is probable that developers would naturally be opposed to aggressive regulation that is needed to control costs, because it impacts their bottom line. However, it seems overlooked in this conversation, is whether existing buildings, the ones in the city that are already standing but un- or under-utilized, can be effectively transformed into residences, adding more units to the market without the ecological and social disruptions of building new construction. No need to remove trees when repurposing existing buildings. Seattle's downtown alone has so much space that could be converted. The climate crisis has made it clear that Seattle can no longer allow the removal of mature trees to build for density. There are ways to have the needed density while preserving trees, but it is almost never the approach of the developers simply because it impacts profits. Seattle must incentivize the developers to keep the existing trees, build smarter on existing lots and start to investigate on how adaptive reuse of existing structures is an ecologically smart approach. By not considering the preservation of our mature trees and the benefits they provide us, we are negatively impacting every living being long term, in the region permanently.</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Naishin F	Tech 4 Housing supports an Alternative 6!	<p>Comment submitted for the organization Tech 4 Housing, adapted from our op-ed in The Stranger (https://www.thestranger.com/guest-editorial/2022/08/18/77997043/join-seattles-movement-for-abundant-housing/) with the Sierra Club: The Comprehensive plan presents an opportunity to make huge strides in actually addressing our housing affordability (https://nlhdc.org/gap/state/wa), homelessness (https://kingcounty.gov/elected/executive/constantine/news/release/2015/November/02-homeless-emergency.aspx), and climate crises (https://www.seattle.gov/environment/climate-change), which is exciting! But our fear, as workers and as climate advocates, is that the City will not go far enough in the next plan and ultimately repeat the mistakes of the past. The previous plan did little to address climate or affordability, and failure to act now will make all of those problems worse as Seattle grows much faster (https://www.theurbanist.org/2022/03/28/seattles-comp-plan-expectations/) than projected. But right now, we can craft a plan that reduces carbon emissions while also creating bountiful housing for all who live here now and all who want to live here in the future. Since the first Comprehensive Plan in 1994 (https://www.theurbanist.org/2021/07/14/its-not-1994-anymore/), Seattle's Urban Village Strategy has confined apartments and condos to small areas of the city known as, well, "Urban Villages." These village barriers were influenced by racial redlining (https://www.knxx.org/post/walking-red-line-tour-seattles-discriminatory-housing-practices) and racial covenants (https://depts.washington.edu/civilr/covenants.htm), racist real estate practices that continued at least until the 1970s. The Seattle Planning Commission (https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SeattlePlanningCommission/SPCGSdigital01062020.pdf), Office of Planning and Community Development (https://www.scribd.com/document/515769588/City-of-Seattle-Racial-Equity-Analysis-Memo-and-Attachments-for-Comprehensive-Plan), The White House (https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2021/06/17/exclusionary-zoning-its-effect-on-racial-discrimination-in-the-housing-market/#:~:text=Exclusionary%20zoning%20laws%20place%20restrictions,on%20the%20heig</p>	8/19/2022
Sightline Institute	Sightline Institute Comment - Seattle 2044 needs expanded alternatives	<p>Sightline Institute is a regional sustainability think tank, based in Seattle. Our research has led us to conclude that when people get to live in cities, it's great for our society, our economy, and our environment. So we believe everyone who wants to live or remain in Seattle should have the opportunity to do so. In short, we request that OPCD expand the scope of the EIS alternatives to include scenarios that involve far greater increases in zoned capacity and housing growth than those currently proposed in the draft EIS scope. Sightline co-signed the EIS scoping comment letter submitted by the Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County. We also strongly support Futurewise's scoping comments. Both of those documents offer specific suggestions for revising the proposed growth alternatives, and we urge you to incorporate them. As proposed, the five draft alternatives are too similar to one another and lack imagination for what Seattle could be. We need to think bigger, bolder, and yes taller. This is a rare (once in ten years) opportunity for us to dream big and move beyond 1994's Urban Village strategy that, while successful in many ways, has allowed far too much of Seattle to remain exclusionary. Seattle's comprehensive plan process asks us to imagine the Seattle of 2044. This is not an easy task: much can change in twenty-two years. In 2000, South Lake Union was known for run-down warehouses and affordable rents. Alex Rodriguez hit 41 home runs for the Mariners. We watched movies on VHS. The typical home in Seattle was worth about \$232,000 (https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/SEXRNSA) (compared with \$961,000 today (https://www.zillow.com/seattle-wa/home-values/)). Our current growth strategy, Urban Villages, is now 28 years old. (That brings us back to when the SuperSonics won the western conference, the first website was published, and South Africa held its first multiracial elections.) Seattle had 185,000 fewer residents than we do today—an entire Bellevue. The Urban Village strategy succeeded in funneling nearly all of those new neighbors into the small portion of the city that allows apartments, while "protecting" most single-family neighborhoods from growth. According to the city's recent Racial Equity Analysis (http://seattle.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9611821&GUID=81FE334E-2E8E-4EDE-8CD1-4EB80458233E), the Urban Village strategy perpetuates racial and economic segregation by excluding low-income people of color from most of the city's residential land.</p>	8/19/2022
Jean Trent	Environmental justice for all	<p>I believe the language of every alternative must include preservation of tree canopy and green spaces for the health of all residents. Housing is being built rapidly but does not address the needs of middle and low income people. It's not affordable and not protected from heat and elements. "Complete" neighborhoods have trees, walkways, transportation, and affordable housing for all. Developers do not care about these things and continue to build without constraints written into permits. It is a myth that developers can't build and save trees. We all know it is just inconvenient. Stand up for us.</p>	8/19/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Andy P	End exclusionary zoning	Please focus on alternatives 3 (broad) and 5 (combined). Seattle has too many people to limit 70% of the city to homes with large yards. At some point, people need to accept that if that's what they want, a city growing this fast is not the place for them.	8/19/2022
Matt Hutchins	Alternative 5 is a start but we deserve more bold options to choose from.	The core question of the EIS alternatives should be how best to build the future city we want to live in. We face deep challenges with housing affordability, climate change and structural racism, and alternatives 2, 3 and 4 are only tweaks to the No Action Alternative 1. The EIS alternatives must be bold to meet these challenges with transformational solutions, rather than incremental measures. We are growing and this is an opportunity, not a crisis. OPCD should establish three fresh Alternatives to bring the '15 minute' neighborhood concept to life, repair the harm that segregated zoning has etched into communities, provide abundant/diverse/affordable housing options, integrate an urban form with more missing middle housing (up to 4 stories, with higher densities, with fewer side and front setbacks) and flexible uses so that neighborhoods will grow more organically and residents will have more access to essential daily services, jobs and housing they can afford. Every alternative should prioritize fewer cars and less driving, but analyze different mode shifts and transportation strategies. The right of way is where we come together as a city, with street life and cafes, street trees and bike lanes. It is a community resource that for too long has been selfishly hoarded by automobiles. Buildings and transportation are the biggest drivers of climate change, and a twenty year plan must 1) address building and transportation electrification, 2) the elimination of fossil fuels 3) the reduction of embodied and operational carbon and 4) assume the worst impacts of climate change are already in effect. The urban form can be a powerful agent in fighting climate change and I'd like to see much more compact neighborhoods with mandates for deep green building and support for adaptive reuse, and that we leverage our investments in mass transit by having densities within the Frequent Transit Area and light rail walksheds closer approaching 15,000 people per square mile (roughly double our current density). Finally, all the Alternatives must be paired with visual representations of the high-quality urban form and places we're hoping to achieve. Having accessible visuals and graphics is key to engaging the broad public.	8/20/2022
Eleanor Saxton	Alternate 6, Please!	I am a homeowner in a family of 5 (hopefully 6 soon!) who lives in the northern University District, a little south of Ravenna Park, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. My family bought a detached house because we have need more rooms than are available in any of the apartments we could find. We would have chosen to rent housing closer to more of our friends and family if the kind of housing we needed was available. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built across the city - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Foster true child-rearing villages of nearby friends and family - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Create a more affordable city for everyone The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
MacGregor Justice	Alternative 6, "New York Alki"!	I'm a third generation West Seattle resident, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. As it stands, even with a tech job, the support of my parents, and all the benefits of deep roots in my neighborhood, my family's continued residence in Seattle is tenuous. Buying a home is out of the question, and rent for family-sized homes, whether detached or multi-family, just keeps going up. Our current land use policies can't even accommodate native Seattlites, let alone the new neighbors we should be welcoming. I am only able to remain in Seattle by renting a house from my parents for below market rate. Most people aren't so lucky. My wife's family arrived here from Cambodia in the 80s, I have no idea how they would make it if they were in similar circumstances today. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Reduce rates of homelessness - Create a more affordable city for everyone Alternatives 1-5 maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this	8/20/2022
Robert Zahner	We must build WAY more housing or we'll end up like San Francisco	San Francisco used NIMBY-friendly regulations to fend off new housing for decades. Project-by-project, attempts to build new housing were smothered. The rationale was often something like "we need to keep our neighborhood character intact". What did it get them? It's now one of the least affordable places in the world. Only the richest <1% of Americans can afford rent. Everyone else had to move out. Sure, the neighborhoods physically look very similar...but is the character really the same if the original inhabitants all got priced out long ago? Given our rapid population growth in the last decade(s), we're starting down the same track as SF. We will keep following in their footsteps and become similarly unaffordable, or will we learn from their mistakes and do better? This plan is our chance to set a different course. Given the magnitude of the market pressure, we must take bold action. Even Alternative 5 isn't enough; we need an alternative 6 that opens up the city to even more housing. Our city is a beautiful place to live and work. Let's keep it that way! Let's learn from San Francisco's mistakes, take bold action, and make our city even better.	8/20/2022
Curtis Bonney	Alternative 6	I support this sixth alternative. End exclusionary neighborhoods and create a dense, walkable city that all can afford to live in. Let's think Barcelona. Not LA.	8/20/2022
Jeff Grimm	Option 1 is the best option.	It's a race right now by "leadership" to destroy Seattle and what makes it great - neighborhoods. First, homes are destroyed for unaffordable new multifamily builds. Rent goes up. Property taxes increase? Rent goes up. People move in, neighborhoods get more dense, homeless gets worse. Just look at Ballard. Maybe the citizens of Seattle would have more trust in leadership if they cleaned up the areas of Seattle as it stands today. The Seattle "leadership" has destroyed downtown. They're coming for our neighborhoods next.	8/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ben Mitchell	Create an Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in South Beacon Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Increase diversity throughout the city - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions, stemming from massive population and job growth over the past decade-as well as from insufficient housing production and planning, for a much longer period. The current alternatives don't do nearly enough to make up for this past underproduction. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the 	8/20/2022
Nancy Drummey	Option 1- No Action	<p>This city and its leadership continue to find new ways to disappoint me, my friends, family, neighbors and colleagues. Eliminating single-family zoning will destroy the neighborhoods that make this city such an incredibly unique, wonderful place to live, work and raise a family.</p>	8/20/2022
Jon Akira Doyle	Support for Alternatives 3 & 5	<p>Mr. Quirindongo, Mayor Harold, and most importantly, Seattle City staff, My name is Jon and I'm writing in support for Alternatives 5 and 3, with strong opposition to Alternative 1. I'm a condo owner in the Magnolia neighborhood in the only multi-family area on the whole hill, and have been studying, living, and working in Seattle for the past 7 years. While I love being such a short walk away from beautiful houses and landscapes and views, I'm disturbed to think that so few people will ever get a chance to live in this wonderful city and make it even better than it already is today and disappointed to see that Magnolia has not had to host any "urban villages" to the detriment of the rest of the city as noted within your own documents for this DEIS. I write in strongest support for Alternative 5 because this is Seattle's next best chance to get the coming decade right by everyone. If the City doesn't, we run the risk of deepening the pockets of the rich few at the expense of the many who are what make the City so rich. When my grandparents moved here from Yokohama in the 60s, they were redlined near the Chinatown International District and experienced a lot of physical and emotional hardship because of short-cited, class-oriented, and racist housing policies the City had at the time. Luckily my grandfather worked hard in spite of these challenges and became a Boeing engineer designing wings the rest of his life here in Seattle, and because of him, nearly half of his grandchildren still live in the city and it is the center of our dispersed family here in the States. That doesn't mean, however, that my grandparents' and parents' resilience in light of such policies didn't still detrimentally affect our family, and give way to emotional trauma passed down from one generation to the next. Living with the daily, incremental externalities resultant of poor housing policy does just that. What's even worse is that it's still going on in our lovely city. Concentrating development in the poorest areas in both green space and vibrant community space (areas like urban corridors that are jam packed with mostly expensive, hideous rentals that give no one the opportunity to build wealth or community that abut busy, loud, polluted, and dangerous streets) is not just gentrification, it's environmental racism. If the OPCD truly professes to have an equitable and just social lens that reflects the moral values and intellectual, entrepreneurial, and caring spirit that the people of Seattle both live and deserve, than Alternative 5 is really the only option, and if chosen, the City would</p>	8/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Nancy Woods	Homelessness, Education, and Health Care	Homelessness remains one of the most acute problems in the city and the plan addresses the need to avoid displacing people with low incomes as the city develops. Specifically addressing approaches to address existing homeless populations is not evident in the plan. Affordable housing for low income individuals and families requires city, state, and federal funding to make an impact on the lives of those who are homeless. Given the high cost of land in the city, addressing the city's role in purchasing plots of land or providing publicly owned properties that could be developed to truly serve low income populations and perhaps create pathways to home ownership seems highly desirable. In addition, increasing assistance for people to pursue education beyond high school, e.g. in the trades and also in occupations in which there are shortages of employment candidates with the appropriate skill sets and certifications, could help move people out of poverty. Finally, addressing access to health care, in particular behavioral health care, for populations who lack health insurance or financial resources to purchase care, should be part of any plan for community development that will have a significant effect on quality of life. Co-locating low-cost housing with resources that include access to education and health care should be included in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan.	8/20/2022
Donna Crist	Support for Alternative 5	I have lived in Seattle for over 40 years and have owned a home for over 25. As a college student and recent graduate in the 80's and early 90's I had great difficulty finding an apartment in Seattle that wasn't in a major corridor and that was located in quieter neighborhoods with green space. While proximity to major corridors, services and transit is important for many people, I believe renters should also have options to be away from corridors and in quieter neighborhoods. Expanding all options not only provides the most housing but also enhances the city by spreading the density and diversifying the neighborhoods. Limiting size in traditionally single family housing neighborhoods can still preserve the neighborhoods characteristics while allowing for more families to benefit from these quieter places. Bringing limited small commercial services closer to these areas can also mitigate the need to drive, need transit and build community as neighbors can meet and congregate at these shared service providers.	8/20/2022
Michael Mellini	Support Alternative 6	I am a renter in Capitol Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Singapore, where 80% of the city's residents live in housing developed and managed by the government and parks/gardens occupy 47% of the land even while accommodating almost 6 million people, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/20/2022
Melissa Neher	Start with Alternative 5, add more transformational alternatives	Seattle is evolving as it grows, and the core question of the EIS alternatives should be how best to build the future city we want to live in. We face deep challenges with housing affordability, climate change and structural racism. The EIS alternatives must be bold to meet these challenges with transformational solutions, rather than incremental measures. AIA Seattle's Comprehensive Plan Work Group has reviewed the proposed alternatives for EIS Scoping, and determined Alternative Five is the only viable option presented for study. To read the full comments from the AIA Seattle Comprehensive Plan Work Group, see the attached letter and supplemental materials submitted to OPCD.	8/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Rachael Otto	Alternative 6 - Deeply Affordable Housing & More	<p>I am writing in support of expanding the scope of this conversation to include Alternative 6, both in the details of how it has been proposed by Real Change and others, as well as just to conceptually expand beyond the narrow scope of Alternatives 1-5. The comments here have raised a plethora of concerns and solutions which should be incorporated into an Alternative for the city that adequately addresses the scale of the issues facing Seattle. Everyone can agree that the current situation in Seattle isn't working for anyone but the wealthiest. Seattle at its core is a rich, vibrant, wonderful place to live, and in order to ensure that Seattle is a place where everyone can thrive we need a bold vision for the future, rather than relying on what has continuously failed us in the past and led us to this point. There is no silver bullet to fix the housing crisis, the climate crisis, and all the other challenges facing us. We are at a point where we need to do everything we possibly can - the issues are too large, too intractable, to do anything else. Fortunately there are members of our community, both individuals and organizations, that are supplying this vision. Many of these proposed solutions are not in conflict. Social housing will not remove the private market, multi-family housing will not remove all single-family homes, improved public transportation will not remove all cars. There are a lot of very valid and genuine concerns surrounding these solutions that must be addressed, but just because a solution has nuance does not mean it is a bad solution. This is the beginning of the review process - it is not the time to decry transformative ideas as impractical or to preemptively limit their scope. I understand that it is easy to see a bold new idea as unfeasible because of our current context, to feel as though the outcomes that we can all agree we want (more affordable housing, better infrastructure, addressing the climate crisis) are out of reach because of this or that. However, limiting what we demand for the future of our city limits the future itself. Seattle has an opportunity to rise to the occasion, to address the crises facing us with transformative vision rather than letting the mistakes of the past define our future. We all want Seattle to be more affordable, more resilient, to be a better place to live tomorrow than it is today. Let's expand how we are working towards that to include a broader, bolder vision of what's possible.</p>	8/20/2022
Kate Macfarlane	130th/145th EIS Needs to Study Better Uses for Jackson Golf Course	<p>The EIS for the 130th/145th Station Areas needs to include alternatives that study the conversion of Jackson Golf Course into different uses, including housing. I live on Capitol Hill currently but grew up in Haller Lake, and my parents still live in the neighborhood. Their home is less than three-quarters of a mile from Jackson Golf Course. Despite the proximity, my main interaction with the golf course is as an inaccessible obstacle to traveling through the neighborhood. The vast majority of the so-called "park" is fenced off to all but paying customers. Contrast with the nearby Northacres Park, which provides a spray park, playground, picnic area, athletic fields, dog park, and natural area used by thousands of neighborhood families, many of them low-income. The addition of two light rail stations at 130th and 145th streets represents hundreds of millions of dollars of public investment in climate-friendly transportation. But the walksheds for both stations are extremely constrained by I-5 and Jackson Golf Course. In order to leverage this massive regional transportation investment, the City needs to study how to make best use of its publicly owned land. This EIS is the perfect opportunity to do so. At a minimum, the City should study the following options as part of the EIS alternatives for 130th and 145th Station Areas: * Conversion of Jackson Golf Course into a true park, with playgrounds, athletic fields, and mixed-use paths. This would open the park up to many more people, free of charge. It would also vastly improve neighborhood connectivity and multimodal access to the 130th and 145th stations. * Conversion of Jackson Golf Course into a transit-oriented mixed-use, mixed-income, climate-friendly community. This could anchor both the 130th and 145th station areas and provide tens of thousands of units of much-needed housing as well as daycare, services, and shops. The eco-districts being built throughout Europe (as described here: https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/climate-leaders-are-building-car-light-livable-ecodistricts-seattle-should-to) provide an excellent template for what OPCD should study. This alternative could preserve the forested portions as public parkland. And as with the previous option, this would dramatically improve neighborhood connectivity and transportation access. Initiative 42 prohibits removal of city-owned parkland unless it is replaced by equivalent parkland in the same neighborhood. But this is not an insurmountable obstacle,</p>	8/20/2022
David Dunneback	More housing and walkable mixed use neighborhoods	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Housing: Alternatives 2 and 5 provide a good start to address current housing crisis and future needs. Would like to see walkability and mixed use strengthened. Would like to see measurements and milestones for meeting housing goals such as "cost of housing should not exceed inflation". Alternatives 3 and 4 do not adequately address current housing shortfall and would only worsen the existing housing affordability and homeless crisis and fail to meet future housing needs. These alternates need to be adjusted significantly. Climate Change: This plan needs to strengthen addressing climate change. More walking, bicycling, tree canopy, and mixed use.</p>	8/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ross Macfarlane	Alternative 6 and Studying Alternatives to Continued Use of Jackson Golf Course	I am 67 years old and have lived in Seattle for 42 years. I own a house in the Haller Lake neighborhood, near to the 130th Street light rail station. I am also a climate and environmental justice advocate. * Alternative 6. The City of Seattle needs to adopt a land use plan that truly reflects our commitment to be a community leads in pioneering equitable solutions to our climate and housing crises. We need to minimize sprawl, provide housing for all our residents, promote equity, and dramatically cut climate pollution. Seattle's plan needs to recognize that the city is the primary urban center for a growing region that is adding a huge number of jobs and attracting new residents, while not meeting the needs for new housing. I recommend that Seattle study a new alternative, one that really reflects our needs to address climate, housing, and equity, and ensures that every neighborhood is doing its share. The City should study an alternative that resembles the grassroots Alternative 6 that is being proposed by many advocates. This alternative would envision a connected network of complete neighborhoods, allowing four- to six-story apartments in all neighborhoods, with incentives for affordable homes and commercial and community spaces to serve people's daily needs. The city must have an alternative that encourages green buildings. By requiring all neighborhoods to accomodate additional growth, it minimizes the issues of displacement that are created where new development is forced into areas that already have high percentages of lower-income, minority, and renting populations. The Alternatives currently being proposed for scoping are not adequate, therefore I encourage you to include an Alternative 6. #2. 130th/145th Station Areas The EIS for the 130th/145th Station Areas needs to include alternatives that study the conversion of Jackson Golf Course into different uses, including housing. As a resident of Haller Lake, I live close to the light rail stations that are being build at 130th and 145th streets. I am very excited about these stations, but their proximity to the Jackson Golf Course greatly limits the ability to use them as hubs for the types of transit oriented development that the city needs and which would greatly improve our neighborhood. I have golfed Jackson many times. While Jackson Golf course is classified as city parkland, it is lightly used and is available only to those who can pay. Use of the park for golfing is also subsidized by city taxpayers, most of whom get no benefit from this use and are	8/20/2022
Lisa Barnes	Keep it simple	A 15-minute city with abundant street trees/green spaces!	8/20/2022
Anna Rudd	GROW our urban forest	We must protect mature trees throughout the city and plant tomorrow's mature trees today, especially in areas with newer construction such as along Light Rail right of ways and around the large, new apartment buildings that come within feet of sidewalks. Do not sacrifice trees for housing. People need housing and trees in "The Emerald City." Trees provide cooling shade, visual relief from hard urban surfaces, absorb carbon dioxide and collect airborne particulate matter. While they may interfere with, or delay proposed construction projects, mature trees are not replaceable. Creative solutions to protect Seattle's urban forest are possible and must be incorporated into the One Seattle Plan. Thank you for your consideration, Anna Rudd	8/20/2022
Melanie Mazza	Alternative 6	The proposed plans outlined, while an improvement on Seattle's current zoning structure which has created an acute housing insufficiency, do not go far enough to meet the plan's goals to meet the plan's goals make the city more equitable, livable, sustainable, and resilient for today's communities and future residents. This opportunity to imagine Seattle's future comes infrequently and bold action now is needed to not only mitigate the current housing and affordability crises we are experiencing but to put Seattle on the cutting edge of equity and livability. I support the exploration of an alternative 6 as laid out by Real Change, including eliminating single family zoning and allowing apartments citywide to promote housing supply and affordability, focusing on walkability for all neighborhoods to reduce car trips and improve quality of life for Seattle residents, and to incorporate social housing. I want to live in a city that works for more than just the wealthy.	8/20/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Martha Baskin	Climate Adaptive Development - Trees are Natural Allies	Mature trees, saplings and other natural green assets need to be integrated into the city's comp plan. The 5 alternatives offered appear to largely be zoning changes with little recognition of the climate reality. As cities heat up due to climate change, many people, including a handful of city officials, recognize that trees are critical allies and critical infrastructure. Density and tree canopy can co-exist with creative design and landscaping. And where there isn't enough tree canopy, large saplings, must be planted. And where there are mature trees still standing, they must be protected. // David Nowak, a lead researcher at the US Forest Service, sums up 30 years of studying the economic value of forests to this: if you can only plant one tree, plant it in a city. Trees remove carbon. They filter air pollution and produce oxygen. They provide shade, which means less energy is needed to cool down. They absorb rainwater, UV radiation and noise. They slow down traffic, improve property values and reduce human stress and fatigue. What's not to like?	8/20/2022
Sarajane Siegfried	What about a no-growth alternative? Shouldn't we be prepared?	Seattle lost population last year, according to the Census. Much of Seattle's growth in the past 10 years, about 50,000 jobs, was high-tech hires by Amazon, which skewed housing toward high-end Downtown rentals to the exclusion of almost everything else. Amazon announced their next 10,000 tech jobs will be in Bellevue, so we can't base future planning on past performance. Shouldn't one alternative be No Growth? How do we achieve equity in a no-growth environment? How do we build the needed social housing? I'm not in favor of this, but let's not be blindsided.	8/21/2022
Mike Laurencelle	Provide more variety of housing - eliminate single family zoning	The city of Seattle has probably one of the most disproportionate spreads of zoning I've ever seen in a major city, with about 70% of its land reserved for single family homes. And Seattle is a major city! If you're serious about making the city accessible, creating jobs, and tackling the housing crisis - you would eliminate single family zoning and allow for a wide spread of low rise, high density development. Encouraging more duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, mixed-uses, adus, dadus. Literally anything other than 5,000sf plots of land for one family. Allow current Single family dwellers to remodel - adding units and space for new families or multigenerational homes. Keep the neighborhoods rich with character and expression, color and greenery. People fret a lot of the taller multi family buildings currently being built - but only because those buildings are concentrated into 30% of the land area - keep it mid-low rise and spread out! Create multiple pocket neighborhoods that feel charming and can be home to small locally owned businesses. Oh, and while you're at it - we really need to work on how our cities building department design review process works, it's far too timely, costly, and is a major factor effecting our ability to collectively make any dent in the housing crisis. Thank you for reading my comment turned rant!	8/21/2022
Lisa Macfarlane	Cancel Jackson: 130th & 145th need housing, not golf	I am a senior homeowner in the Haller Lake neighborhood and longtime (35+ year) Seattle resident. 130th/145th Station Areas: As a Haller Lake resident, I am very excited about the addition of light rail to the neighborhood, but I worry that this enormous public investment will be wasted unless the City makes major land use changes. I urge the City to study denser housing around the 130th and 145th stations. Specifically, the EIS should include an alternative with mid-rise apartments everywhere within the 1/2 mile walkshed and towers within the immediate 1/4 mile vicinity. This would allow for a new vibrant mixed-use community with affordable housing, day care, services, shops, restaurants, and cafes around a real park adjacent to the region's premier transit system. The city needs to study redevelopment of Jackson Golf Course into a park with housing. This golf course is a terrible use of public land and money, especially when we desperately need housing and public green space. Currently, the so-called "park" is surrounded by a chain link fence to keep out anyone who doesn't pay. I used to walk my dog around Jackson Golf Course, but it's not even a pleasant dog walk, looking through chain link fence at a watered, chemically treated lawn. It consumes 160 acres of land immediately adjacent to light rail. It's an environmental travesty for many reasons. We need to turn Jackson Golf Course into a true park surrounded by attractive, dense, transit-oriented housing. This would take better advantage of the public investment in light rail, help our climate crisis, and make it easier for neighbors to walk and bike to stations. Side note: Jackson Golf Course is named after Andrew Jackson, noted slaveowner and perpetrator of the genocidal Trail of Tears. Yuck. Citywide Comprehensive Plan: Like many commenters, I urge the city to add an Alternative 6 that allows mid-rise apartments citywide.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Kay OConnell	zoning changes around 147th street light rail station	I am a resident in this area, and would like to comment on zoning changes proposed for our area. Alternative 1 with minimal changes to the neighborhood would be ideal, but if that isn't possible, Alternative 2 with some multi-family and some shops close to stations but no development of more than 3 or 4 stories maximum would be fine, if it actually was affordable, unlike most of the developments going in in Shoreline since the zoning has changed there. We are already a very racially diverse area and most of us appreciate being able to have yards and gardens. We live in a area with lots of evergreen trees that are amazing, and are habitats for lots of birds and wildlife. We see eagles in our neighborhood often too. Most of those trees would be lost if large, tall complexes go in. They combat climate change, insulate us from some of the freeway noise also. With 145th street being a state highway, we are not a great site for an urban village with diverse shops and apartments that could be surrounded with public green spaces. The townhouse project that is going in on the other side of 145th in Shoreline on Meridian has taken down most all the trees in the block and is certainly not advertised as anything most of the residents of this area could afford, even if they wanted to live in homes with no yards for pets and kids, and no private outdoor spaces. Changes will need to come to make affordable housing available in Seattle in every neighborhood, but can't this be done in small steps instead of allowing 9 story buildings in residential areas that has some of the most affordable housing in Seattle already?	8/21/2022
Mary W	Option 5 - Diverse housing options EVERYWHERE	I live in a "single-family" neighborhood near a main corridor. There are numerous duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes (not sure if that's what they're called) in my neighborhood. These homes seem to occupy corner lots, so not sure if it's from past zoning or of those lots were just bigger to begin with. These midrise, multi-units fit in with the neighborhood and do not "ruin" the neighborhood. What's becoming an eyesore are the huge box units that are being built with 2-3 and 4 monstrosities on the lot that a single home used to occupy. There is no need for this. SPREAD out mid-rise multi-unit properties throughout the entire city. Create social-economically diverse neighborhoods and SCHOOLS! Let people in their swanky neighborhoods (with plenty of money) be the ones to move if they don't like increased density in their posh neighborhood. NIMBY attitudes are thing of the past!!	8/21/2022
Gayle Janzen	We Need to Save our Urban Canopy!	It's frustrating that none of the alternatives mention saving our trees to help combat climate chaos. Our large trees are already being rapidly cut down with all the construction that is going on right now. There needs to be a plan to creatively build housing AND save the trees. Mature trees are so valuable as they absorb CO2, help prevent heat islands, are homes to wildlife and make the city livable. Replacing mature trees with new trees sounds good on paper, but 30-50% of them die from lack of care and it will take those that do survive over 15 years to start providing the benefits of what our mature trees do now. Building everywhere without a plan to save our trees is unacceptable. Alternatives 3 through 5 will make the city denser and way hotter if most of the trees are cut down. And when they say ALL neighborhoods will be rezoned for massive development, does that include places with covenants like Broadmoor and Blue Ridge?	8/21/2022
Valentina warner	We need the trees	In our planning for the city, and specifically 130th and 145th Station Areas, we need to consider the trees. We need the trees to have a livable future in this city. They provide needed shade in summer for people to enjoy the city. They keep the cement cooler because of the shade. There are many studies showing that being in the presence of the natural world improves our mental health. Here is a link to support that statement. https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/hsph-in-the-news/the-health-benefits-of-trees/ But you only need to reflect on your own experience to know that being in the presence of the natural world improves our mood. We all know if we lay in a parking lot in the summer in the sun it's not a pleasant experience. But if we lay in the grass in the shade of a tree, it peaceful and calming. We feel good. Our citizens need to feel good, to have a place away from cement and screens to connect with the life force that is in the trees and in us. This is all the more important given the crisis in our mental health system and increasing suicide and addiction rates. Trees are the biggest most practical way to take carbon out of the atmosphere to avert climate catastrophe. See article: https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.aax0848 . Please protect the trees that are already here and make space for more to grow in the future.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Patricia Cannon	Don't underestimate the value of trees, for those who cannot get to forests	Please bear in mind, in any development moving forward, that it is not so hard to preserve and maintain older trees, and to plant new ones, making sure that they are cared for into maturity. This effort is a vital defense against global warming. People need their shelter and beauty and so do birds, and the combined effect is emotional sustenance which is in short supply nowadays. Urban dwellers may rarely see forests but they do see trees; for those who cannot afford to leave the city, it is their human right to have this pleasure.	8/21/2022
Marcia Mellinger	I support option 4 with a caveat	Option 4 would retain much of the city character while creating more affordable housing. There should be added a requirement that healthy trees are retained, so if a property has healthy trees, they have to be kept and development could occur around them, so long as it does not impact their root system.	8/21/2022
Mary Gwinn	Tree preservation	tree canopy is vital to battling climate change and preserving wildlife. Please make preserving trees a top priority in your plan	8/21/2022
Andra Bell	Save All the Trees	Development of more housing and supporting infrastructure is vital in Seattle. The housing is being built, but most of it is not affordable. Single lots are getting 3 units built on them and they all sell for 800,000 to 3 million apiece. AND existing big trees are removed or damaged in the process. It is imperative that Seattle maintain its tree canopy and that we do everything we can to plant more trees. Seattle City Light also needs to modify their drastic pruning practices as they remove half a tree's canopy when they prune, particularly along Aurora Avenue. Trees bring any living area a sense of peace, cooler temperatures, and urban wildlife. Do everything possible to protect trees that exist as the city and private developers modify and improve areas. Sidewalks can go around existing trees, it just takes a bit more planning and design. PLEASE SAVE THE TREES. ALL of THEM! Andra Bell, Greenwood Phinney Ridge Seattle resident & Washington born	8/21/2022
ken danis	Keep TREES! dont Believe the lies of the Master Builders Association	I'm sure the paid posters from the MBA are out in drives in this convoluted comment site you have created. They don't represent Seattle. Go up 12th Street in the U District or what is left of Ballard - is New York City's worst the best Seattle can do? INCREASE REGULATIONS ON TREE CUTTING AND PLANTING! Large buildings increase global warming - trees fight it.	8/21/2022
Sharon Ricci	Don't remove trees for development	I am a housing proponent. I would vote to require the city provide free housing for every person who cannot afford it with wrap around services much like the long term investment Houston has been implementing. But removing trees to build housing is not an option that can be allowed. We have ample space which has already been developed or removed trees that must be utilized in the best ways possible. An individual tree in a neighborhood, a grove of trees between developed areas, a swath of unfurling woods in critical terrain - all of these are invaluable and must be protected to provide a defense against the effects of climate change and nurture the people and animals that already exist living here. All development goals must include tree protection laws with harsh penalties and specific requirements to be Committee reviewed and publicly critiqued before any exception be provided. Do the right thing on all levels!	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Joan Bowers	Trees, trees, and more trees	Tree canopies are vital to battling climate change and preserving all of life. Please make preserving trees a top priority in the plan for Seattle.	8/21/2022
Jen Blume	Trees make a city Livable	Preserve our trees, they make our neighborhoods beautiful and livable. Housing and trees are not mutually exclusive and developers must get on board with this. It's in all of our interests to keep trees. No one wants to live in a barren area.	8/21/2022
STEPHEN MERLINO	Trees AND Density	I walk a lot. As we increase our density, more and more people will walk outside to light rail and busses. Much of our city is very comfortably walkable right now because of tree and green cover. Blissful shade and cool pockets. When forced to pass through areas of concrete and flat artificial surfaces, it's a slog to the next shaded area. But we need density. I love density in places near light rail, etc. It simply should not come at the expense of what shade cover we have. So work around the trees. The trees get grandfathered in, and the developers will deal with it. Creative people can do that. If they say they can't, find someone who will. My wife works in the UW school of built design and there are grad students in design ITCHING for creative opportunities and challenges like that. And it's that kind of zoning challenge that results in special and memorable creative urban spaces. If there are zoning laws that prevent that kind of creative mutual benefit, change the dang zoning laws. In Seattle, Trees and Density can and should coexist, and the result will be beautiful. We don't have to make the mistakes of every other sweltering concrete urban center in America.	8/21/2022
H-M Wilson	Preserving/growing tree canopy is possible with smart planning	I just visited Madrid, Spain during the hot heat of August. This city has managed to help mitigate the effects from heat by building housing upwards with enough space between the buildings to allow small parks packed with trees. It really helped keep temperatures down during the day by allowing shade and ventilation. It allowed cooling at night because of ventilation. With enough space between buildings, residents in the buildings all had access to cooling breezes. Having trees everywhere made the city walkable and liveable, even during the hottest part of the day. Please quit allowing clear-cutting of property to building wall-to-wall housing. Consider instead building up with a set percentage of property dedicated to green canopy. Trees near buildings have been documented to save up to 30% in cooling costs. They are cheap, they store carbon, they clean the air, they make an environment liveable, they help prevent/lower urban heat island effects. We should be including this natural infrastructure in every building project to make Seattle liveable again.	8/21/2022
Diedra Roesijadi	Save trees-More Green	Our trees and urban forest are a critical element in our Emerald City. They are important for reducing heat island impacts and stormwater runoff, our mental and physical health, animal and plant habitats, reducing air and water pollution, and for noise and stress reduction. how can we be a leader in creating a greener and more sustainable city? How can we make choices that will improve everyone's quality of life? How can buildings support our environment? green buildings! More plants! More trees! More green space! More trees! Treeeeeeees! We're literally burning up and these kinds of choices need to be prioritized.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jacob Lee	Alternative 6: Abundant housing & parks in all neighborhoods	All residential areas should support neighborhood-scale buildings. limiting units is backward, and not in line with the goal of appropriate land use, housing, and services. The base zoning in the city should be 7-12 stories. All residential neighborhoods should allow mixed daytime use, such as coffee shops, dentists, lawyers, and other small offices. All neighborhood arterials, think 23rd, MLK, Yesler, should allow mixed commercial use at street level. Upzone everywhere & build more housing. Social, public, market-rate, all of it everywhere. Don't listen to the NIMBYs who want the city frozen in amber. A city that doesn't change is a dead city. All cities change, it's up to us to decide if we're going to guide that change or just let it happen, which is what we've been doing for the last decade... Designate more, new parks for tree canopy; individual yards don't make up for the sprawl happening outside the city. Climate change is not a city-level problem, and it won't be saved with city-level decisions alone, but we should do our part. Don't miss the forest for the trees. We can have both abundant affordable housing and a nice green city, by building up. Look at any city in the world, they all manage to do it, why can't we? For a neighborhood to be walkable, it has to be dense enough for shops to have a client base in the walkshed. That means building up. Once it's walkable, people will drive less, needing fewer cars & the space to store the cars. Walking more, the citizens will be physically healthier, and engage with their neighbors more, increasing social health. Fewer cars means less particulate pollution, and less noise pollution. Smaller streets means more room for trees & buildings, and less street surface increasing our heat island effect. It's a binary choice. You can't make a neighborhood or a city that works for people and cars. Pick one. We need leadership that's willing to make drastic change toward an audacious goal. Trust me, you'll be rewarded if you do.	8/21/2022
T S	Require Tree Cover and Gardens	Alternative 1 or 4. We already have eliminated single family housing in Seattle. Every Seattle lot can currently be turned into a condo triplex under current zoning. A house behind me was demolished and will be turned into 3 condos. There is absolutely no green space on that lot. 2 60ft cedars were removed. No room for urban trees or the anything but the triplex. This condo development isn't affordable housing. Each one of those condos will cost over 1M dollars. It is a heat sink and the concrete, black roof top that covers the lot now soaks up all the heat and radiates it back into our neighborhood at night. Removing large trees from our parcels by requiring no green space/setbacks/gardens on lots will doom Seattle. It removes people from interacting with our natural environment. Large trees and gardens absorb and store carbon as well as keep neighborhoods cooler. They also provide habitat for native plants and animals .	8/21/2022
Carol Stewart	Green corridors	We need swaths of green corridors that can support the birds and small mammals so we have respite from all the cement and we can help support the environment. Right now we see big trees go down as housing increases but there is a middle ground that can support both. I urge you to make sure we are a livable city that supports the environment without giving in to the trash ridden homeless encampments. We can do better. Move encampments to places that are already vacant lots not in parks or on the streets. Support them with garbage pick up and toilets until we find better solutions.	8/21/2022
Jonathan Cameron	The choice is obvious if you listen to urban planners around the world	Alternative 4 or one similar is what urban planners in any city around the world would say is the smartest and most likely to succeed. What is the point of apartments or low-cost housing miles from transit?? Especially as climate change is ramping up and we need to abandon our individual cars. Furthermore, we need to preserve the tree canopy city wide. Allowing every residential lot to be occupied 70-90% with buildings is simply unwise urban planning: increasing heat and city temps, increasing pollution run off, and reducing bio diversity. Please keep density in urban cores and corridors along transit. And why is no one addressing the elephant in the room? As long as our city promotes growth, growth, growth w/ corporate tax breaks and other neo liberal policies there will be no end to these problems as long as we are actively encouraging more folks to move here. Without tackling the living wage problem, most people in the service sector whether a barista or a teacher, they'll never make it within city limits. And as long as we help upper class continue to get richer and we allow foreign investment in our real estate, prices will never come down!	8/21/2022
Patrick Hennessey	Option 4 - Smart Development that Protects the Environment	I think we need a plan that develops more housing options, but allows neighborhoods to be developed that protect the environment and especially our tree canopy. Option 4 does this by developing along transit corridors so that people have easy access to transportation to other places and still maintain our environment.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jonathan Cameron	2 economic elephants in the room: population growth & low wage jobs	Why is no one addressing the 2 elephants in the room? Most jobs are low wage or too low to afford housing unless radically subsidized and much of the next gen is saddled with student debt. No one talks about that -- and that my friends is the real issue. Number 2, our city actively promotes population growth w/ corporate tax breaks and other neo liberal policies. There will be no end to high cost housing, plain and simple economics, as long as we are actively encouraging more folks to move here, particularly high earners in tech. Without tackling the living wage problem and our exploding wealthy population working at Google, Facebook, Microsoft etc, most people in the service sector whether a barista or a teacher, will never make it within city limits. And as long as we help the upper class get richer with regressive taxation --and we allow foreign investment in our real estate-- prices will never come down! Side note: My neighbor owns 3 houses on our block, yes, on one block, 2 are vacant while he putters around on them. It's all legal people, many homes are off the market or investment properties, welcome to unregulated capitalism. Everyone is looking at symptoms not the system.	8/21/2022
Anna Pedroso	Making Nature Pay Because We Can't Get Along	Reading the comments and the vitriol against nature is interesting to me. Having grown up in poverty in a desert environment, it amazes me how angry many people are at the mere thought of wanting trees in Seattle. Interesting that the angriest are the ones that one would expect to understand there can be and should be a balance. Why the anger and all the down-votes against having the discussion? Instead the response to the suggestion of combining the two only leads to ideological battles and insults. "You are a racist and you are a NIMBY." I understand that there was redlining. That was wrong and that should be acknowledged. However, this is a City that is also on stolen indigenous lands and yet it is behaving like any colonizer, treating the land and its inhabitants (animals use trees for habitat too) as though we have earned the right to do whatever we want. Managing the land should not be a reactionary, knee-jerk response nor an opportunity for revenge. Short-term thinking has long-term consequences. This is what led to the deforestation of this planet and the subsequent warehousing and dehumanization of the poor. The more we separate from the care and consideration of our people and its integration with the environment, the poorer we will be as a community. People should have homes and green spaces, not just a warehouse to live in.	8/21/2022
A Reinhardt	Existing single family zoning should be retained	The existing single family zoning should not be changed.	8/21/2022
Mark Hammarlund	I favor equity, with use of Jackson Golf course for limited income housing	I am a homeowner on N. 143rd St. living just west of the two new stations at 145th and 130th. Like many north Seattle residents, in recent decades I have enjoyed the peace and quiet that affluence, property value appreciation, and convenient automobile travel has provided. Other parts of the city have had to endure increased density and congestion while our existence has been semi-rural in many respects. It is time for a more equitable distribution of the burden, and North Seattle should be asked to carry more of the equity burden. I would like to see more low-income housing generally, and I would like to see development of Jackson Golf course specifically for that purpose. I support Fantasy Option 6, as it has been described by several people, except that I do not favor a zoning change that favors "market value" redevelopment. We do not need more expensive town houses as the City of Shoreline has authorized. Let's not repeat the City of Shoreline's recent mistake. Finally, I would like to see fully-separated bike and pedestrian access to the new stations at 130th and 145th, not dangerous "Off-Corridor" (residential street) bike routes east and west of the two new stations. Congestion at the stations will only be avoided if access to them becomes truly multi-modal, and you can't get people out of their cars and onto bikes if the bike route to a light rail station isn't a safe route that is protected from vehicles. I envision a sea of commuter bikes parked at the 130th St. station, taking advantage of its level topography that invites cyclists and pedestrians to board a train at 130th, coming from Broadview, Shoreline, and Lake City, arriving at the stations on fully-protected, bikeways and walkways. Use the "ghost portion of Roosevelt Way" to connect the Interurban Trail to the new station at 130th St.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Matt Hutchins	Provide high quality examples of urban form so we can be excited about choices!	With the EIS please provide images of the kind of high quality urban form and places that each alternative is planning, so we have some context for making choices. This is not only about building type, but also the nature of the streetscape, the integration of non-automobile mobility and a plan to expand street trees everywhere. There are so many precedents for great cityscapes, and we should be aspiring to an urban fabric worthy of a world class city. I've modified the info sheet with great shopping streets, eco-districts, woonerfs, classic 6 plexes, rowhomes and some good recent design work from local architects. Enjoy!	8/21/2022
Ellen Kissman	Study Comp Plan impacts on local small business and BIPOC communities	Please see attached letter from the Crescent Collaborative which covers the following topics: The importance of certain neighborhoods as cultural and historic resources for diverse communities Neighborhood plans should inform the Comp Plan and EIS Land and building ownership as an anti-displacement strategy Examine displacement impacts of various growth scenarios on small businesses Choose public investments using an equity lens Examine the long-term impacts of COVID-19 and implications for land use, transportation and economic development Address homelessness compassionately Ensure language access to the planning process	8/21/2022
B Rulifson	Increase Tree Protection Dramatically	The City of Seattle needs to change its codes to radically improve protection for existing trees and actively incent planting and growth of trees. These improved protections shall include: incentives for tree growth, particularly for trees within 80-100% of protected tree sizes tree cutting moratorium pre- and post- property sales fees, penalties, and mitigation requirements for construction related tree removal	8/21/2022
Ronald Chase	Preserve Trees and Greenery by Preserving Family Neighborhoods	Alternatives 1 and 4 are the best alternatives, with a slight preference for alternative 4 depending on how wide the urban corridors are allowed to be. The problem with the build, build, build anywhere and everywhere approach advocated by some commenters is that it will result in a replay of the infamous Vietnam War comment, "that in order to save the village we had to destroy it". All neighborhoods in Seattle have already been rezoned to allow up to three housing units on a single property; allowing multistory apartment buildings in family neighborhoods would be a disaster in terms of preserving greenery and tree cover, and result in the long term in a diminished city for all. As has been shown in various neighborhoods where old zoning decisions allowed for townhouses and condos as existing family homes age and are torn down and replaced by developers, the replacements are housing units selling for far more than anyone would consider affordable for people other than a high income earners or with previously accumulated wealth. Subsidizing rents for low income workers is likely the only realistic solution to retaining a livable city and providing a place to live for essential workers.	8/21/2022
B Rulifson	Stop trivial densification in Single Family Automobile Ghettos	Seattle's residential land use should continue to revolve around an Urban Village model. Further infill development yielding trivial densification in Single Family Zones increases our city's reliance on automobiles. Stop this trivial densification in Seattle's Car Ghettos and focus on increasing density and size of our Urban Village model. Revert the current codes which allow Residence+ADU+DADU on small lots to disallow this kind of misguided city planning.	8/21/2022
Bonnie Bledsoe	protect and grow trees	I feel it is imperative that Seattle protect the trees it has, and grow more trees...the reasons are obvious: cooling, quality of life, aesthetics. Trees are friends for life, treat them as such.	8/21/2022
Martin Westerman	Seattle Green Spaces Coalition - Tree canopy, biodiversity and natural capital	We Support Council's Resolution 32059 prioritizing resilience: Section 1. reduce GhG emissions, build climate resiliency and adaptation, and environmental justice: Add a new section B. to resilience elements -- 5. Establish goals and strategies for holistic management and conservation of Seattle's urban biodiversity. Section 2. Add two sections to information the City should consider in Comp Plan revision -- I. Identification of trends in and projected climate impacts to Seattle's biodiversity, within city limits and within the natural areas and watersheds managed by the city that provide drinking water and utilities. J. Tree canopy assessment and trends in tree canopy cover across land use types and development patterns.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Vincent DeLuca	Permitting process	When people apply for permits to build or renovate residential or commercial buildings they should be required to plant trees in the areas adjacent to the sidewalks and streets that are next to said residential or commercial buildings if those areas are treeless.	8/21/2022
Nicola Green Whaley	Housing Crisis and Climate Crisis	It's important for Seattle to build more affordable housing to address the unsheltered crisis people are faced with. But at the same time we need to be doing something right now to address our climate crisis. There is no reason that the two can't go hand in hand and have some thoughtful planning that saves our much needed trees that reduce air and water pollution, provide shade so it lessens heat island, provides habitat for birds and animals, and reduces stress and noise. And this needs to be equitable throughout the city.	8/21/2022
Mrs. LaRoche	Trees save lives!	I have lived in Seattle all of my life, 67 years, from Queen Anne to now Victory Heights. We have never had less than 6 full grown trees on our property. We are alive because of trees. Please do all you can to protect our trees and our future. Thanks.	8/21/2022
Charles/Sally Weems	Pro and Con	PROS: Seattle is blessed with many small and large parks. Block size open space with trees and shrubs need to be in all residential areas. Large trees for shade and birds are essential in these areas. I am aware of the problems with homeless encampments and fault us all for not giving greater support for shelters. I am also aware of budgetary shortfalls making full maintenance to park upkeep impossible. However the presence of some really large trees on the streets should be encouraged and those here maintained.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Deirdre Wholly	Study Alternative 6 - the only climate-oriented plan	<p>I am a homeowner in Lake City, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of</p>	8/21/2022
Steve Dunnington	Trees and housing	<p>Just adding my voice to the obvious proposition that tree cover is an important component to urban housing in whatever form it takes. We need more housing and a strictly market-based approach under current zoning guarantees that income will be the determining factor of who can live in Seattle. This already-unworkable dynamic will just get worse without a change in zoning and incentives to build, Tree cover is vital to making the housing we build housing that we want to live in.</p>	8/21/2022
Lee Bruch	Seattle, Our Region, and the State Need an Alternative 6	<p>Seattle is currently failing to meet the intent behind the requirements for a Comprehensive Plan. None of the 5 proposed alternatives fixes that. That failure is exacerbating the current housing shortage crisis and the multitude of effects that crisis causes. It's past time to change our Comprehensive Plan and enact an Alternative 6 that not only allows, but actively encourages, more housing of all types to be created in more areas throughout the entirety of Seattle. Concept behind, and requirement for, a Comprehensive Plan ----- ----- The original concept and Requirement for Comprehensive Plans was part of the growth management structure of which SEPA was a part. The city's website explains the Comp[re]hensive Plan's history and its raison d'etre at https://www.seattle.gov/cityarchives/search-collections/research-tips-and-tools/guide-to-the-comprehensive-plan-in-seattle. This statement stands out: "The Comprehensive Plan 1994-Present The State of Washington passed the Growth Management Act in 1990, requiring the City to prepare a Comprehensive Plan. Regionally, the goal was to protect forested areas and create density policies in urban areas based on neighborhood plans. A required piece of the comprehensive Plan was a future land use map designating land use. This included a 20-year growth management plan as part of regional and county plan. Other State legislation passed in the early 1990s affecting land use policies were the State Environmental Protection Act (1970) and the Shoreline Management Act (1971)." The population of our region is continuing to grow rapidly ----- The population of our region and the Pacific Northwest is growing rapidly for a variety of reasons beyond our control, driven by our economy and increasingly in the future, by migration due to climate change and its water shortages in the southwest. In 2017 the demographers of the PSRC, in PSRC's Vision 2050 (https://www.psrc.org/planning-2050/vision-2050), forecast that by 2050 the population of its 4 counties (King, Snohomish, Pierce, & Kitsap) will be 5.8 million people by 2050. That's double what its population was in 1993, 1.8 million more than its population in 2017. Recent census figures have shown that over the last over the last 4 years growth was between 2% and 3% greater than their estimate. Where will all the people go? We have two choices: Either: Spread out suburban and exurban style into the surrounding land. That spread out</p>	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Colleen Weinstein	Retain Tree canopy	The current tree canopy within Seattle needs further protections for existing trees as well as stronger codes to require new plantings and successful establishment a minimum of 5 years post planting. We are losing canopy not only when a developer clear cuts a lot but also when those replacement trees fail to thrive.	8/21/2022
J. Sean Yeung	Alternative 5 isn't enough	I am a minority homeowner and small business owner in Lake City, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the absolute bare minimum, but will not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, convenient, and green place for myself and my family to live for the next 80+ years. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which among other things would ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household. The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. Obviously we want to maintain tree cover, but don't let the NIMBYs use this as an excuse to prevent housing density. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so we can all have nice things.	8/21/2022
Anthony Gill	Remove street parking on residential streets to add tree canopy.	If people want more tree canopy, the city should ensure that adding more trees will not reduce housing outcomes. It can easily do this by planting new trees in the street ROW, using planting strips and curb/parking lanes. In some places where homes have alley access, it could even replace stretches of street with new, pedestrian-only play/safe streets, with ample tree cover. This has multiple benefits, because it would also calm traffic and incentivize mode shift to public transportation and walking/rolling, all while growing the city's tree canopy for improved climate resilience.	8/21/2022
Shirley Leung	Better Land Use Means More Opportunity for My Family and Yours	My family and friends have been directly impacted by failed land use and housing policy in Seattle for decades. Though I didn't realize it until recently, it's no exaggeration to say that these land use policies have shaped almost every aspect of my life since my family immigrated to the U.S. from Hong Kong in the early '90s. Like many immigrant families, we came to the Greater Seattle area in part to seek out better job opportunities. Most of these job opportunities were in downtown Seattle, however, far from any affordable housing for a family of four. So we put down roots in Renton and after a few years, moved into a modest detached single-family home in a sprawling suburban neighborhood. For 30 years, my mom commuted over three hours per day from that suburb to downtown Seattle and Belltown for work (without a single complaint, mind you). That's over 2.5 years of her life spent trapped in a tiny box, breathing exhaust fumes in stop-and-go traffic. This took an enormous toll on her mental and physical health. It also cost us a lot of quality family time that we can never get back. These days, both she and my dad are finally retired. Their kids, nephews, and siblings have since moved out, and three of the four rooms in the house I grew up in have remained empty and devoid of the lively chatter, cozy warmth, and sometimes animated arguing that once filled them. Having surveyed my childhood friends, I've found that it is indeed common to have lonely suburban parents aging in place with multiple empty bedrooms, while neighbors in adjacent areas are pushed out onto the streets due to a lack of affordable bedrooms. I live in Lake City now, so visiting my parents requires a two-hour round trip by car. Because of this, I don't get to see them as often as I'd like (and therefore don't get to eat nearly as many delicious home-cooked Cantonese meals as I'd like). They aren't just far from me though; their sprawling suburban neighborhood also forces them to drive long distances to get to any shops, restaurants, services, or social activities. As they get older, more isolated, and progressively worse at driving (by their own admission), they want more and more to be part of a thriving, close-knit community with the ability to easily walk to all of their desired destinations. Their friends are also beginning to prefer more well-connected and walkable communities over lonely suburbs that hide all potential friends and connections down long-winding cul de sacs and behind soundproof windshields zooming by at 25 mph. Even though	8/21/2022
Shirley Leung	Apartment bans in wealthy areas are modern-day redlining	Image alt text: Seattle maps of redlined neighborhoods from the 1930s, percentage white population, zoning, and population growth since 1970. Racist redlining and covenants banned People of Color from many neighborhoods. These patterns of segregation persist to this day and are maintained by exclusionary zoning and apartment bans, which crowd growth into polluted, noisy areas near busy roads and industry. Higher resolution image here: https://twitter.com/shirleywirley/status/1452033619023646722/photo/1 We need an Alternative 6 that upzones and allows for housing of all types in all areas of Seattle, but especially the wealthy, white, exclusionary, underpopulated, semi-rural enclaves that are single family neighborhoods.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Alan Khan	Alternative 6 housing for all anywhere	I am a homeowner in Beacon Hill, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Enhance water quality and salmon survival via a reduction in car tire pollution - Increase diversity throughout the city -	8/21/2022
Sara Waterman	Trees and affordability	Build dense affordable housing surrounded by small pockets of trees/benches	8/21/2022
Barbara Gregory	Seattle needs to remain the Emerald City	I feel very strongly that Seattle must preserve our tree canopy. Currently it seems like mature established trees are too often destroyed and either replaced by tiny little trees that will take decades to provide the shade and CO2 exchange of the original tree, or they are not replaced at all. In many if not most cases, it would be possible to retain and protect the mature tree during re-development of the lot. There is the complaint that this decreases the profit that the developer would realize, but that says to me that we, the citizens of this community are subsidizing the developers' profit while our quality of life is diminishing due to loss of the many benefits of the beautiful trees that are valuable to us as residents of the city. There are actually laws in place now that mandate preservation of trees. They need to be strengthened and enforced.	8/21/2022
Shirley Leung	Apartment bans in Seattle force pollution on those who don't create it	Image alt text: Seattle maps of the average number of cars on roads per day (with zoning in the background where red is multi-family zoned and blue is single-family zoned), air pollution, percentage of car-owning households, and life expectancy. Almost all growth (red, multi-family zoned areas in the first map) is currently crammed into polluted and noisy areas near busy roads and industry. The car-dependent outer ring of the city drives through and pollutes these high-growth centers, sacrificing the wellbeing of climate-friendly, transit-oriented communities for their car-centric convenience. Higher resolution image here: https://twitter.com/shirleyswirley/status/1452033622144212993/photo/1 We need an Alternative 6 that upzones and allows for housing of all types in all areas of Seattle, but especially the wealthy, white, exclusionary, underpopulated, semi-rural enclaves that are single family neighborhoods.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Shirley Leung	Apartment bans in Seattle harm nature and worsen climate change	Image alt text: Compared to single family homes, apartments and multiplexes require less land, save more trees, and reduce energy use and car dependence. 65, 19, 9, and 6 square miles of land are needed to house everyone in Seattle if all homes were single family, rowhouse, sixplex, or 5 story apartment, respectively. Energy use of a single family home versus an apartment is almost double. Many more trees can be saved if we build 100 apartments versus 100 single family homes on the same plot of land. If we build 100 apartments, then the rest of the land can be preserved and made into a public park that everyone can access. Higher resolution image here: https://twitter.com/shirleyswirley/status/1452033626024013824/photo/1 We need an Alternative 6 that upzones and allows for housing of all types in all areas of Seattle, but especially the wealthy, white, exclusionary, underpopulated, semi-rural enclaves that are single family neighborhoods.	8/21/2022
Beth Fuget	Alternative 6 for an equitable, sustainable city	We need a city that's welcoming and accessible to everyone. I've lived in Seattle most of my life and the CD the past 20 years, and have seen our exclusionary zoning policies lead to a host of growing problems: the displacement of whole communities, increasing houselessness, skyrocketing costs, the transformation of middle- and working-class neighborhoods into enclaves for the wealthy, young people who grew up in this city leaving because they can't afford to live here, disparities in health outcomes and recreational opportunities, increased traffic and congestion with all their climate-related impacts, to name but a few. Restrictive "neighborhood residential" zoning, a legacy of racist policies and practices, has been a huge part of the problem. The "urban village" approach has contributed to displacement in neighborhoods like the CD. We need a new approach that fairly distributes growth across the city. Proposals that concentrate new housing primarily in neighborhoods with high displacement risk or along busy arterials are inconsistent with racial and social equity goals. New zoning alone won't be enough, but has to be accompanied by related programs to contribute to affordable housing and equitable opportunities, developed through both economic and racial justice lenses. For example, a fund to enable low-income homeowners to add ADUs and DADUs will increase density while reducing displacement, so wealthy homeowners and developers aren't the only ones who can take advantage of the new zoning. Social housing throughout the city will provide opportunities for people at all income levels to live near jobs, schools, parks, and other services and amenities, creating more diverse, vibrant, and sustainable neighborhoods.	8/21/2022
Shirley Leung	Apartment bans make housing unaffordable for those w/o generational wealth	Image alt text: Seattle median net worth is \$23,000 for black households and \$456,000 for white households. 2021 Seattle median house price is \$800,000. Black homeownership is 26%, white homeownership is 51%. A single family home costs \$2,000,000, while an apartment costs \$400,000. Adding more and different types of housing enables more diverse groups of people to become homeowners and reduces prices for everyone. Higher resolution image here: https://twitter.com/shirleyswirley/status/1452033634278391808/photo/1 We need an Alternative 6 that upzones and allows for housing of all types in all areas of Seattle, but especially the wealthy, white, exclusionary, underpopulated, semi-rural enclaves that are single family neighborhoods.	8/21/2022
Bobbie DeVore	Saving tree the tree canopy	I just read the Sunday Times story about the battle between developers and property owners and was appalled to learn that it is legal to cut down three trees each year on a parcel of property! Do we now need a conservation easement to protect the trees in this city???	8/21/2022
James Wing	Build 100,000 Homes Faster	How quickly could we add 100,000 homes? Seattle's job growth has been exemplary, but housing has fallen far behind. Estimates vary on the shortfall, but I believe 100,000 is supported by many public and private assessments, and makes a good round number for discussion. This is a shortage we already have, in addition to what we might want for distant future dates. Each of the proposed alternatives should be understood in context of their ability to address the scope of the housing problem. The current presentation does not capture this, it is left to the reader to mistakenly assume they might be equally effective.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
paul masterson	Option 1 or 2 with removal of onerous delaying tactics the city deploys.	The City would like us to decide how to fix the mess they created by their years long process they deploy against all development in Seattle. If we went with option 1 or 2, but had a six month permit/review process, with a cap on costs to developers and a removal of the absolutely absurd self defeating design requirements that take away available housing, we would be in a much better position. Stepped setbacks on residential developments because of a fear of "shade" which cost square footage. Delays and interminable meetings, feedback, blah blah blah while claiming there is a "housing emergency". The city needs to recognize that it's process is the problem, and stop being an impediment to housing through its weaponization of the administrative state. There is currently unbuilt land in areas that have already been upzoned, the concept that we need to allow dense development is all SFH zones is just a diversion from the fact that the city administration is itself the problem that needs to be solved. Remove the beam from your own eye, etc.	8/21/2022
Lisa Nitze	Northern Rainier Valley Partnership Group	Public private partnership in Northern Rainier seeking infrastructure, safety and security improvements and a robust economy to support livable, walkable, accessible and safe communities along Rainier Avenue from the Judkins Park Light Rail Station to the Mount Baker Light Rail Station.	8/21/2022
S Newl	Make Seattle a model green city in 2035	I love Seattle, even as I am disappointed about the increasing inequities. What makes Seattle a unique city are the urban green spaces where we can take a moment to reset and remember the wildness of our greater landscape. In the context of shaping the One Seattle Plan, I want Seattle to be seen in 2035 as a model green city, and that we will showcase the benefits (health, economic) of forward-looking urban planning that recognizes the health and environmental benefits of tree canopy, community gardens, and water conservation. Blind densification will only benefit developers and tax collectors. In my neighborhood, modest single family homes are replaced with unaffordable townhomes with no gardens. My neighbors want to remove mature trees and are only stopped by the Seattle tree protection laws. I think there are ways to increase affordable housing and also increase (not just maintain) green spaces, tree canopy, and connections to the larger PNW. But zoning and other laws will need to protect us from some of the developers and some of our neighbors. I hope we can trust our city planners as they develop the One Seattle Plan. I suspect Alternative 4 would most benefit a balance of housing density and preserve green spaces.	8/21/2022
Rachael Ludwick	What if every city did what Seattle plans to do?	Our Comprehensive Plan update should answer this question: if every city and region in the world did what Seattle plans to do, would we keep climate change to the least amount of warming and harm possible while also reducing inequity, poverty and exclusion? Seattle, as one of the wealthiest places on the planet, should strive to lead the way on all these fronts. We do not currently and have many examples of policy and plans in other places that we should consider and improve upon. We should adopt social housing and other de-commodified housing models that other cities follow because "the market" does not and cannot work for all – and currently in our regio pushes people further out into expensive commutes (expensive to people personally in time and money but also expensive to the environment through increased pollution). We should adopt the zoning systems of cities in the world where we do not separate the things people need or want everyday from the places they live and where the places people live are not determined by their wealth. We should build our city assuming that everyone can get around without compromise without having to own or use a car, since many people including disabled people (like myself) and less well off people should not be treated as lesser by not having access to a car. We should rebuild our streets to replace pavement (parking & driving lanes) with trees, bioswales and parklets, as many cities around the world are doing to reduce urban heat effects, increase open space for all and reduce the hostility and danger of their transportation systems. We should build more public and community amenities like public toilets, community centers, urban gardens, non-commercial sharing systems by supporting "tool" libraries and similar organizations. We should ensure that everyone can live within short and accessible trips to everything they need including shopping, parks, childcare, and more. Even the above does not answer the prompting question but I believe that should be our guiding question: not what is best for whatever each one of us thinks would make a better Seattle, but what would be better for everyone in the world. None of the offered alternatives currently would answer this questions satisfactorily -- they don't even match the achievements of existing cities around the world, never mind keeping global warming to the least harmful we can make it or reducing inequality or exclusion. This comment is explicitly in favor of the ideas in the following other comments	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Don M	Transportation	With the increase in population density in our future we need to have a better way of moving people around the city. Busses are great but they use the streets just like every car and truck in Seattle. One accident and the whole commute is thrown into chaos. If a bridge goes out., well just look at the West Seattle commute for the last two years. Light rail seems to be the only feasible short term answer. Yes, it is expensive. But we need a city wide comprehensive transportation system that is independent from the surface streets. If I can walk, bicycle, bus or use a street car in my neighborhood to take me to my local Link light rail station I'll happily leave my car home.	8/21/2022
Brian Gillespie	Option 6 for an affordable Seattle that lives up to its climate promises	I am a long-time Seattle resident, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this failure. The city of Singapore, where 80% of the city's residents live in housing developed and managed by the government and parks/gardens occupy 47% of the	8/21/2022
Magda Ashtok	Affordable Housing and Trees	Climate change is the unknown. We don't know what shifts await this area. We do know that reducing the number of trees we now have will tilt the climate scale in potentially devastating directions. Development must not be allowed to reduce the number of trees in Seattle. Nature's 'tree presence' in this area is for the well-being of all of us: the scaled, winged, two-, four-, 6-, and 8-leggeds, etc. Balance in development must be the factor that determines what is supported. We also need to prioritize providing affordable housing for everyone who wants it. To imitate models of urban growth from other areas shows a lack of creativity and will give developers further incentive to raze communities so that they can fill their coffers to over-flowing. Of course, all in the name of 'service to the community'. How about some innovation?	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Mathew Thomas	Seattle comprehensive plan alternative 6	I am a renter in Montlake , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Promote racial justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Slow gentrification and displacement - Increase access to green space The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can	8/21/2022
Robin Maynard-Dobbs	protect trees	Climate change is happening now and the results are catastrophic. We don't know what shifts await this area. We do know that reducing the number of trees we now have will tilt the climate scale in potentially devastating directions. Development must not be allowed to reduce the number of trees in Seattle. Nature's 'tree presence' in this area is for the well-being of all of us and all of nature. Balance in development must be the factor that determines what is supported. We also need to prioritize providing affordable housing for everyone who wants it. And it is urgent to protect the trees that are sheltering us providing shade and respite from increasing heat waves. Please plan to preserve the existing trees as they take years to grow to be big enough to provide shade.	8/21/2022
Tanu K	Alternative 6-Should be the clear choice.	I'm a long term resident of Seattle and have seen this city change significantly (for worse) in my time here with increase homelessness, unaffordability of housing, and lack of good transportation to name just a few. It's time for us to take aggressive action to solve these issues. Going with Alternative 6 can be the first step. It's not news to the residents that zoning laws are just insane and no one understands why it is like that. Perhaps, some racist and narrow thinking from the past. And with climate change, there is gonna be more problems to deal with. We need to reimagine Seattle now and access all solutions that are possible for us.	8/21/2022
Lee Bruch	The Comprehensive Plan Must Be Far-sighted	The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Regulations speak to the ALLOWABLE opportunities for land use over extensive periods of time. They do not, and cannot, respond to the actual land use of every parcel at any specific moment of time. There will ALWAYS be significant numbers of parcels that do not approach the highest land use available to them. There will ALWAYS be, and should always be, significant numbers of undeveloped/underdeveloped properties. If Comprehensive Plans and Zoning regulations didn't allow a large margin for the opportunity for changes and growth, the economics of supply and demand would simply skyrocket to unimaginable heights for the cost of property, the cost of doing business for all businesses – both new and existing businesses, and the cost of housing. Further and equally or more importantly, any change in the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning will not immediately result in all properties being developed to their full potential immediately or even the foreseeable future. Development will, by nature, be very slow and piecemeal and take decades, responding to the ebb and flow of both the general economy; the public's desires, tastes, and aspirations; and individual property owners' decisions. Visible and extensive change in any area will appear to occur quickly only if the opportunities for change are significantly restricted and change is forced into small areas. The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning regulations must be drawn to reflect and restrict not only what is now, but more importantly, the reality decades into the future.	8/21/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jennifer Mayer	Too Narrow a Vision	Wake up and smell the climate coffee. We need something far more aggressive and transformative to address the twin crises of climate and equity. This plan is just rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic - too little and too timid. We need an alternative 6 that will create homes for people, and finally create a climate and revenue friendly density that will also enhance affordability. I'm a single family homeowner in Columbia City. I would love to have more neighbors and fewer cars. This plan won't get us there. You need an alternative 6 that allows greater density in every part of Seattle, and that gives more of us the opportunity to live in walkable, car light areas with trees and low pollution.. Single family zoning is really resource gluttony. Single family homes cost more to serve with infrastructure and do not enhance the tax base as much as thoughtful mixed use. Cars and highways reduce property values: transit enhances them. We need to invest in density and high quality transit thar will provide a return in dollars, health, and well being. Please go back to the drawing board and come up with a more compelling vision for our future..	8/21/2022
Suzanne Rowen	We cannot afford to lose our urban forest	If this summer's heat and drought doesn't convince officials that we desperately need what remains of our urban canopy, I don't know what will. Uncontrolled high-rise development and density will NOT solve our housing affordability crisis nor save our city's health and quality of life for its citizens. Once this canopy is gone, it cannot be replaced for quick course correction. The current system must be re-thought to unify and consolidate urban canopy decision-making for private and public spaces - multiple agency jurisdictions is crazy and not workable! Engaging corporate subsidies in designated and limited urban zoning areas that incorporate green space is a minimum compromise. Leave what little urban canopy remains alone!	8/22/2022
Christine Ziemnik	Nature and growth	I am a 48 year Seattle resident. Growth in recent years seems to be for convenience of developers, covering near total footage of lots, completely eliminating mature trees, plopping in small arbovitae and a few grasses in a thin layer of soil covering the compacted clay of the building process. I refer to the multi-plex, around 8 unit boxes, distinguished from each other by different colored panels. Trees and vegetation which used to support birds and wildlife are gone. Case in point: Project #3038096-LU, 2124 17th Av So. Actually this is one quarter of the project which will take out an entire square block of trees including fruit and nut trees. There is one house on the site. All will be replaced by some 40 townhouses. SUGGEST: developers pay into a transit fund for better transportation since parking is being reduced so sharply. Build more large apartment complexes to provide more park space and retain greenbelts. Promote zero population growth, less family centric focus.	8/22/2022
Chase Cross	Get as many people out of their cars as quickly and as aggressively as possible	To mitigate the impact of climate change and create huge livability gains, the specific aspiration of the City should be to get as many people out of their cars as possible. The way to achieve this is by creating dense, affordable housing throughout the city, particularly in neighborhoods that have hitherto been segregated by racist, classist, ableist Single Family Zoning. New housing should also be coupled with complete street redesigns to facilitate safe bike, pedestrian, and transit travel. At present, there are three parking spaces in city limits for every one car -- that number should be reduced by 33% through taxation and development incentives. Every neighborhood should have housing for every budget, including and especially public and social housing options. Every neighborhood should also have retail amenities and necessities such as corner stores, which will harden communities against climate change-driven weather disasters and facilitate fewer car trips. These changes will also allow more seniors to age in place, as they'll be able to avoid isolation due to lack of car access, and be able to downsize housing while staying within their own neighborhoods. The greatest boon Seattle could enjoy from this process is a climate conscious attack on the present predominate housing mode that was developed around automobile transport -- it's climate denialist, it's expensive, it's segregationist, and it exists to the detriment of human flourishing. We need an Alternative 6 that allows dense, affordable development in every single Seattle neighborhood -- not just to make our city more livable, but to combat the calamities, present and predicted, of climate change.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Sarajane Siegfried	These 5 Alternatives are not acceptable	First, it's not a given that Seattle will grow as much as urbanist/Builder sources project. We know for sure that basing a projection on past performance would be a mistake. Seattle actually lost about 2,000 in population last year. Our middle class is being hollowed out. Amazon has announced its next 25,000 jobs will be in Bellevue. The 50,000 jobs Amazon brought to Seattle are the primary cause of Seattle's building boom and extreme rent escalation. Second, while we do have a housing crisis, we managed to build enough high-end apartments to house most of those new techies by building 35,000 units for 70,000 people over 10 years (average household size 2.04). The Missing Middle low-rise construction is almost all townhouses that are not helpful to seniors with potential knee problems or to young couples with potential babies. The Missing Middle duplexes, triplexes, quads, stacked apartments and courtyard buildings are still missing, because the Builders' business model is to sell, not to rent. Their business model is to maximize square footage on the lot, to maximize profit at the cost of our tree canopy. The real housing crisis is among those who can't afford the rent. Our planning must designate not only zoning, such as multifamily, but also the ages and demographics of who needs the housing. How much low-income senior housing do we need? How many units of subsidized 3-bedroom family apartments? How many units of permanent supportive housing would it take to house all those persons with disabilities sleeping in tents? What about zoning for inexpensive manufactured homes, the cheapest homeownership alternative? The task of the Comp Plan should be to identify where these and other groups actually fit within Seattle's neighborhoods. We have a parcel-by-parcel building capacity study that makes this feasible. A program to help homeowners build affordable ADUs was called for and is still needed. Third, building all types of housing everywhere is not planning. One criterion for siting low-income housing is always access to frequent transit. This is a must, not negotiable. We cannot afford to put frequent transit in remote neighborhoods. To gain efficiency, we must grow from the center to the branches. Fourth, this is a call for detailed local planning with community involvement, not this set of prepared alternatives. Contrary to the Missing Middle Housing bill, one size doesn't fit all. Yes, we need to think outside the lines. We need other scoping alternatives.	8/22/2022
Deborah Horn	Retaining and improving tree canopy for liveability	Trees need to be a protected resource and should be given special recognition in urban hubs and in the far south and other areas where there are fewer trees. The "either/or" discussions about housing density vs trees is one the developers have pushed so that they can get housing advocates to go against their best interests. It is typically the more diverse neighborhoods that have less tree canopy to start with. And we know that there are many benefits to having mature trees in one's neighborhood: They are important for reducing heat island impacts, our mental and physical health, reducing storm water runoff, animal and plant habitats, reducing air and water pollution, noise and stress reduction.	8/22/2022
Mark Brunson	Alternative 6: We need dense housing built around sustainable mobility	I recently moved to a housing cooperative in Capitol Hill. It is the fourth building I have called home after a decade of living in this neighborhood. These four buildings were built between 1909 - 1928. Comparing each of these buildings to their current zoning restrictions for height/FAR/density, it turns out that all of them are illegal to build today. Three of them are iconic buildings on non-arterial streets. As someone who doesn't drive, I really appreciated being able to live in an apartment that was somewhat insulated from the noise and pollution emitted by drivers. I could even walk to some shops and bus stops without crossing one of our dangerous arterials. Due to decades of Seattle downzones, these multifamily buildings are now rare gems throughout our city. According to our zoning code, only single-family homeowners deserve to live on a street that has reduced danger and noise from cars. The rest of us need to compete for homes in the few remaining multifamily buildings that survive on non-arterial streets. Fundamentally, this means that our neighbors who are least likely to drive are most likely to live on a more dangerous and polluted corridor while the people who drive the most are more insulated from the negative externalities of driving. I now live on an arterial. While there are many things I love about my new home, I can now say with experience that living on an arterial has been a major downgrade in my livelihood. We need to stop centering our communities around car sewers. In fact, we need to phase out the car sewers altogether. Nothing about this situation is the natural course of things. The city is the way it is because past leaders mandated it. There are examples in cities all over the world of livable neighborhoods that house lots of people, provide green space and tree canopies, and enable safe and sustainable mobility. Ultimately, none of the proposed alternatives offer much difference from our current trajectory. We need an Alternative 6 that actually enables our city to house all of our neighbors in a livable and sustainable manner. Once that is finally allowed, our upcoming social housing agency should start creating buildings and eco-districts that provide local examples of what a great built environment can be.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Eric Bronson	Alternative 6: The Seattle of Our Dreams	I am a longtime resident of Capitol Hill and I want to see an additional alternative 6 added to this Comp Plan EIS, as Alternatives 1-5 do not meet the minimum necessary changes to our zoning to combat climate change, end homelessness, and build the 15 minute city of the future. An alternative 6 should include: * Mid rise zoning city-wide * High rise zoning within 2 blocks of all major parks * Dispersed commercial zoning and ground-floor business spaces so small businesses can thrive and provide the needs for every Seattleite within 15 minutes walk/bike of their home * Reduction in the number of car lanes or parking lanes on the majority of streets in Seattle to be replaced by widened sidewalks or new tree canopy We can live in the kind of city that many of us dream of, one where our kids can afford to buy a home, where most people live just a walk away from a world-class park, and we can move about our city without the polluting restrictions imposed by cars. We can only do that with an improved Alternative 6, thank you.	8/22/2022
Don M	More Neighborhood Parks	The Seattle population and density is going to increase. How about some more parks so that everyone has a chance to see some greenery after being in their small house or apartment all day. Small neighborhood parks with some greenery, benches and maybe a drinking fountain would be great. There are two small city owned properties in my neighborhood that could be easily developed into nice small neighborhood pocket parks.	8/22/2022
Alicia Davinia	Alternate 6	I am a renter in Montlake, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Improve mental health The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this failure. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/22/2022
Cezanne Garcia	Protect trees and create housing	We need to retain trees or the value of Seattle's urban forest. Our community is facing a crisis in housing availability and affordability. At the same time, we are facing a climate crisis that we need to respond to and a glaring inequality in our urban natural environment and urban forest across the city. Our trees and urban forest are a critical element in our Emerald City. They are important for reducing heat island impacts and stormwater runoff, our mental and physical health, animal and plant habitats, reducing air and water pollution, and for noise and stress reduction. We need to both support increased housing and protect and enhance the city's urban forest at the same time. We need to plan for growth and build communities across the city that are healthy, equitable and livable for everyone.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Cezanne Garcia	Specific strategy ideas to save our urban forest and expand our urban housing	* Evaluate in all options the impacts on trees and urban forest canopy cover in the ability of Seattle to reach 30% tree canopy in Comprehensive Plan while also increasing density to meet housing needs. We need both more housing and trees to keep Seattle livable. * Evaluate the changing ratios of park and open space acres per 1000 residents as population and housing increases under the different proposals * Evaluate tree canopy impacts on neighborhoods near freeways and other major transit corridors, including SeaTac Airport and Port of Seattle that exist and how each proposal would address pollution and urban forests * Evaluate projected increase in urban heat domes and heat island impacts as building density and lot coverage increases and tree canopy decreases * Evaluate options to add trees to existing parking lots and other built areas * Evaluate loss of climate resiliency as trees are removed for denser building across the city * Evaluate possible new building guidelines and lot coverage that could increase retaining more trees during development. * Evaluate requiring setbacks on multifamily lots to require more trees and shrubs along sidewalks and roads to reduce heat impacts. * Calculate the ability to create more parks, including pocket parks in each scenario to provide more greenspace, tree covered areas and playgrounds for residents and families * Calculate the ecosystem services and natural capital currently provided to the city and the change that would occur under each different proposals * Calculate the potential loss or gain of habitat and biodiversity of plants and animals under the different proposals * Calculate potential economic, social, environmental and health impacts on BIPOC and other racial and ethnic minority communities under the proposals * Look at ways to increase street trees under the different proposals, including making street trees mandatory on all proposals in all zones and planting large trees where there is no overhead power lines. * Look at additional building alternatives and zoning that create space for residents to have trees and open green space on building sites. * Consider eliminating residential small lots and allowing multiplexes on the existing lots if they set aside a portion of the lot for a designated tree protection area. This could increase protection for larger form trees like exceptional trees or a tree grove. * Address how each plan would work to increase tree equity and environmental justice across the city	8/22/2022
Lynne Bates	Please also consider the importance of protecting the city's urban forest/health	Our trees and urban forest are a critical element in our Emerald City. They are important for reducing heat island impacts and stormwater runoff, our mental and physical health, animal and plant habitats, reducing air and water pollution, and for noise and stress reduction. We need to both support increased housing and protect and enhance the city's urban forest at the same time. We need to plan for growth and build communities across the city that are healthy, equitable and livable for everyone.	8/22/2022
Duncan Adelaide	Stop Pandering to Pearl-Clutchers and Let Our City Grow Already	I am a resident of the U District, and I work at Pike Place Market. I am making this comment out of extraordinary annoyance at the lack of action and forced constriction of our city's housing supply. Here are three points I would like to see in a future plan: 1. Preservation of trees and the planting of more, generally everywhere. 2. The removal of single-family restrictions on all residential land, to be replaced with nothing. A "residential-only" limit can make sense in some places, but to arbitrarily limit the number of households that can legally live there is ludicrous. 3. A three-story height minimum on all new buildings, with a maximum height limit based on distance to light rail stations, starting at 999 feet maximum within 100 yards of all stations, and tapering downward in steps to a maximum height of 55 feet for all locations more than one mile from light rail stations, including the new stations at 130th and 145th. I would also like to make it clear that, should the 2024 plan fail to deliver, I will begin campaigning viciously for the entirety of Queen Anne and Magnolia to be converted to thirty-five-story public housing blocks, in the hopes that perhaps at some point a compromise between that and the current status quo can be brokered.	8/22/2022
Margie Bone	Nodes around parks/green space/trees	Though increased development along transit corridors makes some sense as we try to get out of our cars, I prefer emphasizing options with nodes. Transit may have to figure out how to adapt. When I moved to Seattle from San Jose, CA in 1971, I was impressed with the neighborhood feel. I favor nodes that might strengthen neighborhood identity. We don't want the feel of Aurora N or Airport Way S, or any other unrelenting monotony, in neighborhoods. This nodal approach is in alignment with the goal of Community. Nodes should ideally be located close to areas with access to nature - parks, trees - as a higher priority than other services, as it is easier to bring in other services than to create parks. For equity, I think it is very important that density should be increased in all neighborhoods. Probably outside the scope of this planning stage, but I would like to see the expansion of community land trusts to increase home ownership.	8/22/2022
	Comments re: One Seattle Plan	Feedback/comments on 2022 One Seattle Master Plan	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
James Wu	save our urban trees, build more housing and green spaces for all	As a Seattle resident who cares deeply for trees, I am devastated to see the level of canopy loss in single-family zoned, detached single dwelling spaces. According to the Seattle Audubon society, the highest level of our city's tree and canopy loss in Seattle have been on single-family zoned land, where widespread flaunting of our tree protections mean that our rich canopy are chopped down for convenience, views, lawns, driveways, or storage sheds, while accommodating the housing needs of very few individuals. Not only that, but even where there are trees, unhealthy, dying canopy is everywhere in Seattle. Large single family property owners are frequently unable to single-handedly maintain a healthy canopy, and invasive plants and sprawling lawns are often overrunning and choking native plants, and preventing the growth of the next generation of healthy trees. We need more tree protections, and we need more housing. What we truly need are mandates for publicly accessible greenspaces within walking distance of all housing, and allowing the building of much more dense housing throughout the city. Allowing for dense housing wherever there are parks, and allowing for parks wherever there are housing, should go hand in hand. This is the only way to equitably develop the city so that everyone may enjoy the benefits of our urban canopy, and not just the wealthiest of Seattle. This requires an Alternative 6 as it is not part of any of the proposed alternatives. Not only would this mean greenspaces with healthy canopies that are both accessible and accountable to the public, but it also builds a robust housing infrastructure and addresses the root causes of homelessness. We can look to Singapore for an example. Singapore is a green city where public green space occupy 47% of land, whereas in Seattle it is only 7%. Because the urban tree canopy is a critical component of Seattle's environmental future, we need to plan our city like Singapore, with midrise and highrise multifamily housing and abundant public green spaces walkable for all, not just for the wealthiest in Seattle.	8/22/2022
Nathan Greenstein	Adopt Alternative 5, or Consider Anti-Displacement Expansion	I have lived in Seattle for 19 years and worked in homeless services in the city. We are experiencing a housing crisis, and I urge the city to commit to real action in response by building as many homes as possible. This is long overdue. I echo the comments of the HDC Coalition letter submitted here (https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/hdc-coalition-comment-expanding-scope-for-affordable-and-abundant-homes). A portion is copied below: "Of the options currently drafted, Alternative 5 is the only alternative to make a major positive impact on Seattle's housing costs by allowing for more housing growth to meet demand. Per the City's analysis, by promoting a greater range of rental and ownership housing, the Combined Growth Strategy would address past underproduction of housing and rising costs and support complete neighborhoods across the city. It furthers climate goals by allowing more people to live in walkable, transit-rich communities near jobs and amenities, and could help create transit-supporting densities throughout Neighborhood Residential zones. And finally, it goes furthest among the five drafted alternatives to correct the racial inequities of historically exclusionary zoning policies. "A new alternative, Alternative 6, should expand on the Combined Growth Strategy and be explicitly designed as the anti-displacement alternative requested by the Comprehensive Plan Racial Equity Analysis: it should "end the prevalence of single-family zoning" with a "racially inclusive approach." This includes anti-displacement overlays in areas of high displacement risk and allowing maximum growth of the most affordable housing types in areas of high opportunity. It could look like a connected network of complete neighborhoods, allowing 4-6 story apartments in all neighborhoods, with bonuses for affordable homes by right, and ground floor commercial and community spaces to serve people's daily needs. It should explore density bonuses and exemptions from setback requirements for green buildings, to encourage mass timber and passive house techniques." Thank you.	8/22/2022
Martin Westerman	View the environment on equal basis with equity and commercial issues	* Support the Urban Forestry Commission call to consider impacts on urban forests in all recommended analyses of urban growth strategies, specifically, * Incorporate ecosystem services monetary values and accounting into all analyses * Study how EcoDistrict planning can support low-carbon, climate-adapted growth and economic development goals, * Support Seattle City Council Resolution 32059 prioritizing resilience * Consider more diverse housing types than apartment blocks and rowhouses * Address the erosion of Seattle's natural capital * Require that all City departments and agencies use the Urban Forest Management Plan to accurately and wisely inform decisions on development * Increase setbacks from property lines, and make more spaces for urban flora * View the environment on an equal footing with equity and commercial concerns.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Hendrik de Kock	Go big, Seattle is a big city and should plan like it is one	All of the alternatives presented, except possibly alternative 5, are quite frankly inadequate, given Seattle's enormous growth both in the last 15 years, and the growth it is expected to continue to absorb. All alternatives should include midrise zoning up to at least 18 stories within each of their high activity nodes, including within 15 minutes of transit corridors (instead of the narrow corridors considered by option 4), and within all urban villages, and within the 15 minute neighborhoods proposed by alternative 2. For alternative 3, the zoning considered citywide should allow for 6-plexes and rowhouses (sans parking), so as to allow for a wide variety of housing typologies within Seattle's neighborhoods. In general, rather than focusing new housing "merely" in existing urban villages, the city should consider designating "nodes of activity" as centers for higher housing density (beyond the 6-plexes allowed city wide). Those nodes should include schools, parks, and transit stations (notably the upcoming 130th st transit station). Within a 15 minute walk of every node, as well as every transit corridor, should see enhanced zoning allowing 18 stories. This will ensure that future generations of Seattleites can affordably enjoy these urban amenities	8/22/2022
Skye S.	A More Dense, More Ambitious, Alternative 6 That Includes Social Housing	I am a long-time Seattle resident who grew up here and has chosen to stay here, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable place to live and grow into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city I'm a happy fiveplex resident, and I wish there were more housing options like mine in this city. Alternative 6, which would allow infill housing wherever it is safe, is one way to accomplish that. If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness, which is not and will not be solved by criminalizing our houseless neighbors - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining, an exclusionary policy tied to single family housing - Create a more affordable, desirable city for everyone - Slow gentrification and displacement The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. It's unfair and frankly cruel that rental properties are often concentrated on loud, polluted arterials—forcing renters to suffer the health impacts of living on busy streets just because they can't afford a mortgage. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of beautiful social housing this city: https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Hundertwasserhaus-Vienna-1977-1986-Photograph-by-Kurt-Pultar-C-2017-Hundertwasser_fig2_317027716 Please study this proposed Alternative 6	8/22/2022
Brian Reindel	Density, Mixed Use, Transit, and BIG OLD TREES	We need a plan for increased housing density that also prioritizes mixed zoning. Sufficient, dense, affordable housing is absolutely important, but housing isolated from meaningful organic community interaction and more-than-novelty commercial activity leaves our living spaces sterile and hostile, and also entrenches our reliance on cars, which in turn raises air and noise pollution, and increases the need for more parking. But in planning for this level of development, we must prioritize our urban tree canopy--specifically with regard to the preservation and care of large, old, established trees. Big Old Trees are often not immediately recognized as the foundation of safe, healthy, welcoming neighborhoods, but we all know a "nice area" when we walk, drive, or bike through one, and it's always the place with the big, old trees. Planting new, young trees on new development checks off a box, for sure, but new plantings will take decades to reach the level of shade cover, carbon capture, wildlife habitat, and human health benefits of existing, mature trees. Let's codify the preservation of a larger amount of this precious living infrastructure. Let's take care of our Big Old Trees!	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
martha tofferi	Doable alternatives	It looks like both #2 and #4 are doable. I've seen a number of requests for a #6 which does not exist and which appears to want to gut single family housing in the city any longer. To that I say that cities need a mix of housing to be successful. I also say that giving developers carte blanche to build anywhere does not mean that they will build what those requesting a #6 will get. Builders/developers will build what puts the most \$\$\$ in their pockets. So let's do the possible with either #2 and/or #4 and provide some real teeth so that the housing completed with these alternatives contains affordable units for every segment of society.	8/22/2022
Emily Johnson	Bold actions needed to address inequities	I am a renter in Greenwood , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Ensure that at least 25% of all newly built units are accessible - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Enhance water quality and salmon survival via a reduction in car tire pollution - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Improve mental health - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Slow gentrification and displacement - Create	8/22/2022
Joby Moore	Affect housing in every neighborhood	Affordable housing should be distributed through out the city equally in every neighborhood. Public green spaces should be part of subsidized housing development. Homeownership for low income workers should be encouraged through land trusts. This would allow inter generational wealth for those kept out of the housing market and keep workers in the city.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
mike eliason	Seattle's last chance to adapt a strategy that can adapt to a changing climate	The 2024 Comprehensive Plan Major Update is an opportunity for Seattle to become the climate leader that city officials routinely claim it is – by formally rejecting the 1994 Urban Village Strategy. This plan has been a complete and utter failure – a decades-long Masterclass in how to develop auto-centric cities prioritizing displacement, a poor quality of life, and negative public health outcomes. It is a plan that doubled down on an unsustainable and inequitable zoning map, and completely ignored Seattle's heinous history of redlining and other informal racist land use practices. OPCD's Alternative 1 (No Action) as a baseline is wholly insufficient to meet our housing crisis, and at a minimum must analyze all public health and climate impacts such a disastrous policy would cause, both within and beyond the city's limits. Alternatives 2, 3, and are inadequate visions for a sustainable and just Seattle that should be discarded. Alternative 4 concentrates new housing on toxic arterials and highways. They all exacerbate the negative outcomes of today's Plan and Urban Village strategy by perpetuating the racist roots of Seattle's land use, causing a poor quality of life and negative public health outcomes for the majority of residents. These auto-centric Alternatives will ensure carbon lock-in and that Seattle continues to miss its climate goals (https://www.kuow.org/stories/climate-leader-seattle-s-carbon-emissions-on-the-rise). They are also predicated on ignoring the extensive housing shortage that exists in Seattle today – where 1 in 6 households pays more than 50% of their income on housing, and that is somewhere between fifty-thousand (https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/OPCD/OngoingInitiatives/HousingChoices/SeattleMarketRateHousingNeedsAndSupplyAnalysis2021.pdf) and two hundred-thousand homes (https://news.microsoft.com/affordable-housing/phase/during-2-2/). The 2024 update is the city's last chance to adopt a strategy that can adapt to a rapidly changing climate while working towards a more affordable, sustainable, and equitable city. Alternate 5 (Broad) is a good baseline that moves beyond today's inequitable and unsustainable status quo. However, OPCD needs to be thinking bigger and faster to meet the city's intersecting climate, mobility, and housing crises. OPCD should analyze three transformational alternatives that build upon Alternative 5 (Broad) – allowing for low-carbon living; the city to	8/22/2022
Staci Imes	Single family-only zoning needs to go away	I understand this is highly unpopular among many homeowners in single-family zone areas...and we desperately need greater housing density in this city. Duplexes, small apartment buildings in otherwise single-family neighborhoods, small condo buildings, backyard cottages and above-garage apartments. These do not need to be behemoth buildings that stick out like sore thumbs in their neighborhoods. We need way more of the old school smaller apartment buildings and condos that would dramatically increase the inventory of housing if it was possible city-wide.	8/22/2022
Dr joanne Halverson	Density and trees	Dear people I live and work in Seattle as a psychologist and professor. We need careful urban planning and density that allows multifamily units and not the mega houses for wealthy people springing up. However, any plan must preserve green spaces and trees. We have seen how valuable trees are for heat reduction in recent heat waves. Heat islands and areas of air pollution need to be ended by planting more trees not fewer. Also trees and green spaces aid oxygen increase in the air and psychological well being. Any thought of decreasing trees or green spaces seems shortsighted and foolish given climate change. People must be more important than wealth for developers. We need more trees not fewer to combat climate change and development that is environmentally astute while serving the greatest number of all people especially low income people . best regards, Dr Halverson	8/22/2022
Benjamin Barber	mixed income, green community spaces	We need mixed-income, multi-unit buildings that work towards net zero energy. We also need these buildings to house spaces for local businesses, including essentials like a market with fresh food, and bio diverse green spaces. We need to encourage livability, community, and sustainability. Something rich people getting richer by collecting inflating equity in single-family homes certainly does not do.	8/22/2022
Jacob Dennis	Housing is Critical to Keep Rents Under Control	In accordance with many of the other comments, I also think that Alternative 5 is the bare minimum of what should be done. I'm a new renter in the city, and I'm terrified of whether I'll be able to keep living where I live as prices rise over the coming years. I like Seattle, and I want to keep living here, but I don't want to be dealing with massive rent hikes year after year - that just isn't sustainable. Alternative 5 is the plan that allows for the most new housing to be built, helping the city manage the inevitable growth rather than forcing people to the streets or out of Seattle entirely. At the same time, it is a bare minimum - an Alternative 6 that allows for even denser housing throughout the city and doesn't concentrate that housing so strongly along already-established corridors would be ideal. (As for the trees, trees are good, but you can have decent tree cover and high-density housing, and of the two housing is much more critical at this time.)	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Tyler Wong	More Bathrooms	Seattle needs more public restrooms that are open to the public year round and from at least dawn to dusk and preferably later into the evening. With our extensive trail network and recreation levels, finding places to use the restroom should be more intuitive, more accessible, and not just centered on large parks (e.g., volunteer park or gas works). Downtown and along the waterfront would also be a great place to add more public restrooms with the high volume of tourists, employees, and unhoused people.	8/22/2022
Annie Doubleday	Affordable housing across the city	Affordable housing should be distributed across all neighborhoods in Seattle, not just in a few. Single family zoning should be reduced, and more areas should allow for townhouses and multi-family units. This would help foster more diverse neighborhoods, and also help ensure affordability across the city, not just in a handful of areas. Growth should be considered carefully with access to transit and other services as well. Thank you for requesting feedback and engaging the community in shaping this plan.	8/22/2022
Tyler Wong	Calm arterials and connect neighborhoods	Look at finding ways to add more multimodal options to our arterial roads (Rainier, Airport, Mercer, Elliot Ave) to make them more inviting spaces and to restrung the network through these areas so that neighborhoods are cut off and pedestrian and bikes can comfortably travel along them.	8/22/2022
Tyler Wong	Rezone parts of SODO	With its proximity to downtown and other neighborhoods like beacon hill, georgetown, and west seattle, as well as its flat topography, it would be great to rezone some of SODO to provide more mixed use development with residential and commercial spaces to provide new housing stock along an area with 2 light rail stations, designated bus lanes, without affecting the existing residential population housing prices and gentrifying out an existing residential population	8/22/2022
Tyler Wong	Provide High Quality, Frequent, Mass Transit to new high density zones	In addition to the rezoning and focus on distributing housing density, work with local partners to continue expanding bus, bus rapid transit, and light rail on an expedited timeline so that new residents have reliable transportation to all areas of the city without just a car. Especially with topological changes where bikes and pedestrians have a harder time accessing like Magnolia, Phinney Ridge, Madison Valley, Lake City, and South Beacon Hill	8/22/2022
Glenn Ramsdell	Securing a healthy environment and development aren't mutually exclusive	Developers are aggressively denuding Seattle of its environmentally critical tree canopy. They claim that Seattle can have one or the other: affordable housing, or an environmentally sound plan to retain our precious natural urban forest. This is bunk. In my neighborhood, a majestic 100-year old+ tulip tree was chopped down to the ground for one reason and one reason only: greed. The developer sent a local resident to elicit sympathy, but the project was actually owned and developed by an investment firm with no ties whatsoever to Seattle. They made the argument that these townhouses would support affordable housing in Seattle. What a deeply cynical and specious ploy! They were priced at over \$1 million each, slapped together haphazardly (riddled with defects), and that amazing, century-old tree is no more, destroyed for SUV parking in the back. This is but one example of the shame that has beset Seattle for the benefit of greedy developers. Six city agencies (or more) own parts of solving the destruction of Seattle's tree canopy, and have done nothing for over a decade. When will we see a solution here? Must we wait until the last significant tree is chopped down and Seattle becomes a Los Angeles-like wasteland?	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Connie Sidles	AlternativesNeedTrees	<p>According to the 2016 Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment, 72% of Seattle's tree canopy was supplied by residential areas. Only 9% of the city's canopy cover was supplied by multifamily residential areas. This suggests that when multifamily buildings are put on the same lots as single-family residences, significant tree canopy is lost. The study compared tree canopy loss from 2007, 2010, and 2015 and found approximately 2% canopy loss over that period. Since then, Seattle has experienced explosive population growth. The population of Seattle was 608,660 in 2010; it grew to 741,251 in 2020 (Source: US Census Bureau). To house these new residents is a big issue. To house them in healthful conditions - for which tree canopy is critical - is not addressed by any of the alternatives. What will happen if upzoning occurs and development of housing is placed in the hands of private developers? According to Yardi Matrix's 2021 multifamily report ("Seattle's Recovery Makes Headway"), "Seattle had 25,255 rental units underway as of May, 74% of which are in upscale projects." When multifamily, upscale apartment/condo buildings are constructed, the developers seek to build as much square footage as possible. That is their financial interest, naturally. Most buildings include a little greenery, but any large trees or groves that existed on the site before construction are removed and not replaced. Attached is a typical example, a project on Bell Jackson Street. The design is built out as far as the law allows, which makes it impossible to include any tree canopy aside from a few sidewalk saplings. The 2016 Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment did a preliminary assessment of the impacts of development when single-family residential is upzoned to multifamily. As expected (see paragraphs above), canopy loss was significant: almost 10%. This is gravely concerning, as most of Seattle's tree canopy occurs on single-family lots, and all the alternatives recommend upzoning that would convert single-family lots to multifamily lots. Because Seattle's population has grown so substantially, it is clear that some upzoning must occur. What is unclear is: Must the upzoning *necessarily* reduce canopy cover? The answer clearly is no. We need to include tree canopy preservation and even enhancement in the zoning regulations so that developers are required to retain existing tree canopy. Simple mitigation requirements - which current planning in other departments recommends - will not be sufficient. It takes a deciduous tree such as big-leaf maple up to 30</p>	8/22/2022
Muriel Lawty	Comprehensive Plan options	<p>My big concerns are the challenge of maintaining our trees and green space (let's go for 40%); adding below market housing options that maximize keeping people in their neighborhoods -i.e. minimizing displacement; and creating spaces where people can legally camp as a step toward more permanent housing. Of course, the campgrounds need services to help people get a leg up - basic sanitation, health and mental health services, job training, food, clothing, and one I haven't seen mentioned - things to do so people don't get bored! Of course this needs to be what the people want and need, not just some pre-set program. To do this we need flexible building codes to allow customizing lot line set backs and height restriction - add in green roofs with mini parks and dog play space, more solar and wind energy capture, and mixed use neighborhoods.</p>	8/22/2022
Julie Tergliafera	Walkable Neighborhoods are Good for Us All	<p>The Comprehensive Plan is our time to create an American city that is walkable and creates fewer greenhouse gasses than typical American cities. The environmental impact statement should investigate: * How green spaces and public transportation affect climate change and mental health of those living in a city. * How the creation of the "missing middle" housing will affect family planning and creation of a Seattle "community" * The health affects of living in apartment buildings along transportation corridors. Planning apartment buildings only along dangerous and polluted transportation corridors reeks of environmental racism and displacements that harken back to redlining. Health, mental and physical, should be included when environmental impacts are studied. We know that a sense of community and the ability to plan long term greatly affect how happy people are living in a city. Seattle is a wealthy city. We should have enough wealth to ensure housing for all. Being sheltered makes mental and physical health issues much easier to address. Thank you.</p>	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Carl Seip	Seattle needs a visionary plan to become denser, more affordable, and walkable	The One Seattle Plan should be a bold, visionary plan to make Seattle denser, more affordable, and walkable. It should create an abundance of housing choices citywide. As a homeowner in Upper Fremont, I've seen how a mix of housing types – many of which are outlawed today – add vibrancy and create community. On the lot behind my house are townhomes. On one side, an apartment building. The other, a single-family home. Across the street, a mid-rise condo building. The diversity of options do not detract from the neighborhood character – in fact, they enhance it. (I'll add that I can always find on-street parking.) This abundance of housing choices also creates the density that helps support our small Upper Fremont commercial district of Marketime Foods, several restaurants, and retail. The alternatives considered in the One Seattle Plan should allow for and further expand this sort of density and housing choice citywide. Great cities around the world have embraced zoning and policies that create walkable, vibrant 15-minute neighborhoods which allow residents to walk and bike to everyday needs. Seattle should strive to be a Barcelona or a Paris – and the One Seattle Plan has every ability to help us move that direction. In particular, I support a so-called Alternative Six, or the expansion of Alternative Five, that: * Significantly increases density including mid- and high-rises over six floors in existing and new urban villages. * Expands the use of mid-rises throughout and within walking distance to smaller nodes and corridors. Density should not be constrained to arterials. * Eliminates exclusionary zoning and legalizes missing middle of all types, including three-story, point-access sixplexes, in neighborhood residential areas. * Legalizes commercial uses throughout the city. * Eliminates parking minimums, builds sidewalks, expands transit coverage, frequency, and reliability, and expands the bike lane and trail network. * Maximizes housing opportunities near planned light rail stations. The urban village strategy of the last two-plus decades is a proven failure. That strategy constrained development to such a degree that construction could not match job growth. This has led to an affordability crisis, dramatically increased rents, displaced long-time residents, exacerbated inequities, and pushed thousands of our neighbors into homelessness. We can and must do better. The One Seattle Plan should embrace the idea that housing growth can and should outpace the number of	8/22/2022
Matt Martin	End single family zoning!	We don't have enough housing and what we do have is too expensive. I am a renter in this city and I wonder all the time about when I will eventually be priced out and have to move away. We need more housing that is affordable. We just need more housing. We need to end single family zoning in the city so more apartments, duplex, etc can be built.	8/22/2022
Adam Berger	Trees and Forests	Please ensure that the plan protects existing trees and promotes planting of additional trees to the greatest extent possible. Urban trees are essential for temperature moderation, protecting clean air and water, providing habitat for birds and other wildlife, beautifying the city landscape, and promoting general quality of life within the city. Thank you.	8/22/2022
Sarajane Siegfried	How do you define "affordable"?	"Affordable" is so elastic a word that it's meaningless. The Comp Plan should eliminate it. We can look to the Multifamily Housing Affordability (MHA) ordinance, written by the downtown developers and Mayor Murray for their definition. It says the builders can't afford to include any units with renters' incomes less than 60% of Area Median Income per household (60% = about \$82,000 now), so that's where the market stops. Below that, subsidized social housing must fill the gap. Habitat for Humanity sets the range for low-income homeownership at 80% of AMI. Other than Habitat's sweat-equity land-bank model, there's no such thing as new housing that's affordable. Certainly no new \$750,000 townhouse is affordable. To be equitable, our plan must prioritize the needs of low-income and no-income people, that is, subsidized housing. We can't expect anyone to wait 40 years for the new stuff to "trickle down" to affordability. The Missing Middle Housing is being sold as duplexes, triplexes, quads, sixplexes, stacked apartments and courtyard buildings. Unfortunately our current method of zoning results in nothing but for-sale townhouses and for-rent apodments in low-rise zones. Since neither is useful for seniors or families with babies, the Missing Middle is--and will remain--largely missing. Our zoning is based on floor area ratio (FAR) and builders are intent on using every bit allowed, rather than zoning being based on these missing types of housing. Wouldn't we love more shady courtyard buildings? How do we zone for them? No low-income affordable rentals will result from this plan. It's bait-and-switch. Yes, our middle class is being squeezed out of Seattle. I'm particularly aware of those who wait on us and who clean up after us. They need to be able to live near those jobs, not two hours and three buses away in Kent.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ungjoon Lee	Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in The University District, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow high-rises in all existing urban villages and mid-rises across the entire rest of the city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses in current single-family neighborhoods - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://images.app.goo.gl/gT1UskMh1fUviYon6 <p>Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.</p>	8/22/2022
Don M	Small Neighborhood Nodes with Duplexes, Triplexes and Quadplexes	<p>Focused, small neighborhood nodes (alternative 2) is the best alternative with the addition of allowing duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes along transportation corridors. Being able to purchase a house, (single family, duplex, triplex or quadplex) builds strong communities with increased volunteerism, improved physical and physiological health, less crime and better owner financial situation (more equity buildup, tax benefits). Let the apartments stay mostly in the urban villages. More small neighborhood parks. Change that small piece of unused city property into a small pocket park.</p>	8/22/2022
Jeffrey McGrath	Save the Trees!	<p>As soon as an older home is purchased it is torn down and the property stripped of every living thing. The replacement is usually 6 tall town homes often lacking parking. Zoning does not seem to exist as these appear wherever the developer can sneak them in. These buildings are not "affordable" and increase "density" in a most unpleasant way. I don't understand why Seattle detests tree's which filter our air, shelter wildlife, and help protect us from the increasing heat..there is nothing like a nice shady tree! Meanwhile the surrounding area and services are trashed. Stores and restaurants have closed and in some cases burnt and remain a pile of rubble. Please protect our diverse neighborhood and the lovely old trees...houses too.</p>	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Rebecca Staffel	We need a sixth alternative	I am a homeowner in Whittier Heights, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. Thanks, Rebecca Staffel	8/22/2022
Brandon Bailey	Support SF residents	I think its important to keep SF residents in neighborhoods in many neighborhoods. This consideration for upzoning or rezoning area, only leads to gentrification and loss of community. How many homes has Sound Transit displaced with rail lines and stations, It's a nice tax grab for the city and county, but it is harmful for Seattle, its residents and the most vulnerable in our communities	8/22/2022
Cory Hawkraven	We need to treat housing like the base necessity it is – alternative 6 please!	I am very fortunate in life to be able to be a homeowner in Greenwood, however I believe that EVERYONE who makes Seattle their home deserves safe, stable, and affordable shelter. Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Tokyo, one of the densest cities in the world with a highly developed and advanced transit infrastructure, plentiful green spaces, and low crime rate, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Restricting density only serves to entrench moneyed individuals and does nothing to improve	8/22/2022
Blair Howe	Building Transit Communities	We are investing billions in light rail. To support our investment, it would be logical to increase densities around transit stations. There is a significant amount of land that is still zoned single family within one half mile of our transit stations. To fully realize our investment in transit, it is time to look at actions to increase density close to transit. This is the alternative that needs to be brought forward.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Sanders Lauture	Denser housing needs to be allowed in all neighborhoods	<p>I prefer the currently proposed alternative 5 because it allows for the greatest amount of choice in housing options in all areas across the city. My concern however would be that certain neighborhoods would be considered "off limits" for denser housing. Seattle is still growing according (https://seattlecitygis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/c8cfc827e564623a6fa3af636014fe) to the Washington State Office of Financial Management and according to one Axios poll from March of 2022, Seattle is the number 1 destination for new college grads (https://www.axios.com/2022/03/14/exclusive-poll-where-college-students-want-to-move-seattle) . In order to allow for population growth in the city while trying to keep housing affordable by increasing the number of available homes everywhere in the city, including historically single family zoned neighborhoods outside of urban villages, must be a top priority. I don't want historically marginalized areas to receive the brunt of new growth while housing costs are still increasing because historically protected areas continue to block growth in their neighborhoods.</p>	8/22/2022
David Hawkraven	Homeowners Win with Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in Greenwood, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create an equitable place to live into the future. Current homeowners always fear the unknown, but looking around, I already see how the current Urban Village plan is failing my neighborhood and others. By allowing more dense neighborhoods throughout Seattle, we'll address years of racist and white-centered development and begin addressing the problems that cause so many of our neighbors to become unhoused. While no single policy will fix all the underlying problems in Seattle (society) creating more equitable housing throughout Seattle is a much needed step in the process. Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: * Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed * Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials * Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: * Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times * Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods * Reduce rates of homelessness * Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. Scarcity makes our homes more valuable, but if more and more of our neighbors are forced on to the streets, what does that say about our</p>	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ray Dubicki	Seattle's Comp Plan must reflect reality to address the city's issues	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft environmental impact statement for Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. While it is still conceptual, there are some very troubling omissions from the comp plan. Without placing the comp plan concepts on an actual map of the city, it's impossible to address the real issues of segregation, access, and exposure that come from clustering density along highways and away from parks and water. This comment is adapted from my article in The Urbanist, available here (https://www.theurbanist.org/2022/08/17/rorschach-plans-one-seattle-comp-plan-is-just-a-mess-of-dots/) : https://www.theurbanist.org/2022/08/17/rorschach-plans-one-seattle-comp-plan-is-just-a-mess-of-dots/ . First, add industrial lands and water. The concepts need to show that the Comp Plan applies to a real city in a real space. That city has real issues with access and segregation. This Comp Plan update cannot back away from allowing dense neighborhoods to access water, parks, and public resources. Keeping these concepts floating in space just locks in Seattle's north-south divide. While I understand that these comp plan concepts are "conceptual" there are some deep problems with basing a comprehensive plan on ambiguous blotches. It is impossible to tell their scale. Zoom in and the diagram suddenly represents density and zoning in a single neighborhood. Or, zooming out, it could represent the Puget Sound region in its entirety. In blob diagrams, space is untethered. Such uncertainty is asking for fights were neighborhoods can contend they "met the concept" by focusing their allotted density into a single tiny blob or cluster. Further, Seattle has very specific geographic features that don't show up in these concepts. Start with the big one: water. No current urban village connects directly to water. Waterfront property is only available to single-family detached houses, industrial land, and Port facilities. These Comp Plan EIS concepts only show polluting roads. By failing to show any water, the Comprehensive Plan locks in that disparity and everything that goes with it. Through the offered Comp Plan text, access to parks and schools is only spoken in the most general terms. Exposure to pollution and racial equity are referred to other documents and toolkits. Water is just one piece omitted from these concepts, but Seattle's other painful divisions are absolutely linked to locations on a map. Here are seven different maps (8/22/2022
Brian Greggs	Alternative 5 + Affordable Homeownership	I support the selection of "Combined" Alternative 5, and would like to emphasize that we must do whatever we can to dramatically increase affordable homeownership opportunities, through zoning changes, developer incentives, and partnerships with organizations that provide such opportunities (such as HomeSight and Homestead Community Land Trust).	8/22/2022
Mitchell Brown	Density will help fight climate change	Seattle should legalize 4plexs on every lot. Adding density in Seattle will help to fight climate change by reducing the amount of energy used per unit and the amount of travel needed. Make the city more walkable, more bikeable. Reduce the restrictions on housing. Help create a more affordable city for the future by allowing for more housing growth of different types.	8/22/2022
Suzanne Grant	Trees are not in the way, trees ARE the way...	Build more housing around the trees that are currently in the ground protecting us from the effects of worsening climate change. Trees are not in the way, trees ARE the way to a better quality of life. Everyone deserves to live under trees and receive the well-documented health benefits that trees provide.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
John Rector	Let's build!	I am a homeowner in Queen Anne, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Allow light industry and commercial uses throughout the entire city - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/22/2022
Eric Fisk	We need a plan that redevelops the Broadmoor and Sand Point country clubs	It looks to me like all of these plans leave gated, exclusive areas of our city completely untouched. Invitation-only country clubs like Broadmoor and Sand Point and the Seattle Golf Club pay virtually no taxes while occupying several urban village-sized areas of land. Why are your plans leaving those places untouched while targeting walkable neighborhoods for redevelopment? Why is there no plan to fix unwalkable neighborhoods? Do you want to build a future where the richest 1% occupy most of the land while everyone else is clustered into apodments along transit lines? We need a plan that redevelops neighborhoods that are not walkable and have low density. Target those neighborhoods for new urban villages. Please don't advance another plan like HALA that doubles down on the demolition of the most affordable housing in our most walkable neighborhoods.	8/22/2022
Mireia Ravell Padial	Save the trees and iconic buildings	I'd like the city not to lose its essence. With so many new tall buildings and the disappearance of old buildings and trees, Seattle seems to be losing its identity and becoming just another big city. I would like to see respect for the iconic buildings in the community and the trees that do us so much good on so many levels. Lately, with so many trees being cut down it looks like a gray city. The trees, besides the many benefits they give us, give life to a great gray city. Thank you.	8/22/2022
Samuel Baker	PLEASE Option 5 (6) - the moral imperative	I am struggling to write this comment without sounding too critical or impatient, but I feel that the city has been dragging its feet for too long, lacking in vision. Option 5 is the LEAST we can and should do. Backdrop: · Median Seattle home price \$850K · 75% of city land restricted to single-family zoning ("neighborhood residential") · 50% population growth since 1980 Is it any wonder that we have tens of thousands of homeless people in the city? This is a city-wide problem that requires a city-wide response. As Seattleites, we all have a stake in this. Focusing development to corridors will no longer cut it. I am not a sociologist, but I feel that public goods are most successful when everyone participates and shares in the outcome (parks, roads, libraries, schools, transit, and yes – housing availability). When we allow housing to be accessible to only the most privileged, this leads conflict: "WE already have nice homes. Why should WE change to help THEM?" When we limit multifamily zoning to the most noisy and polluted arterials, we are teeing up conflict between the Haves and Have-Nots, and it also reinforces negative stereotypes people have of non-single-family housing as noisy, polluted – for "THEM". On the other hand, broadly up-zoning the entire city would allow for gentler "missing middle" housing that we so desperately need, more evenly distributed throughout the city (no more lecturing about where apartments "should" go). Besides the human cost of housing scarcity, I want to highlight a few more things: · Housing density / infill is amazingly environmentally friendly (lower carbon emissions) and allows for more healthy lifestyles (walking/biking/transit instead of car dependency) – "15-minute city" concept. Isn't this something we should want for the entire city? · Denser housing / mixed development brings in much more tax revenue compared to single-family. Also, there is less city infrastructure (e.g. roads) to maintain per unit. So, it is the fiscally responsible choice by FAR. · Design review is terribly broken. Please eliminate it. · Exempting single-family houses from the Mandatory Housing Affordability fund is vastly unfair and disincentivizes smaller multi-family units. Please require new single-family homes to pay into the fund like everyone else. Sam	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
William Seth Asch	Alternative 6 is the best choice	I vote for alternative 6. However, it has way too much private vehicle storage on public rights of way, and too much vehicle parking in buildings near high capacity transit zones. More bikes and more public restrooms and less car subsidies from my property taxes	8/22/2022
Ethan Schaffer	Support Alternative 3 for 130th and 145th Station Areas, or create an Alt 4	Seattle desperately needs more housing. I support the 3rd Alternative for the 130th and 145th St Stations. I would support even more density, if given a 4th Alternative. The proposal to create a new urban village near these future transit hubs is a good one. I support preserving the parkland in this area (Jackson Park). However, the City should study possible changes to the use of this public land to more equitably serve city residents, especially when projecting future growth as an Urban Village. Golf serves the fewest number of residents per unit of land than almost any other sport. It also requires green fees and expensive equipment, making it less equitably accessible. Golf has also been declining in popularity over the past decade. I encourage the City to study more efficient, equitable and environmental uses for Jackson Park.	8/22/2022
Nick Lopre	Seems inadequate	Existing plan does not seem like it will be sufficient to mitigate climate change. The commission should consider more dramatic actions.	8/22/2022
Ethan Schaffer	Make it harder for individuals to weaponize the legal system against housing	The majority of Seattle's residents support more dense housing in all areas of the city. It is clear in the comments on this website. It's been clear in almost every election and city poll for the past 20 years. However, whenever a major change to density is proposed powerful individuals and small groups are able to stop and delay those changes through endless lawsuits. A powerful minority is able to defeat the desires of the majority. The majority suffers from higher costs of housing, homelessness and displacement. It is anti-democratic. It may be outside the scope of this plan, but is it possible to study how we can change the legal challenge system to make it harder for wealthy individuals to abuse the legal system to fight majority opinion?	8/22/2022
DEREK DEXHEIMER	Only Alt 5 is the most minimum of baselines	Only alternative 5 is any kind of reasonable baseline. Please provide a 6th baseline that actually benefits a city, not a dumpier fishing hamlet/suburb that Seattle hasn't been for some time now.	8/22/2022
Carey Schafer	I support more housing in more neighborhoods (Alt 5: Combined)	I support the description outlined in "Alternative 5: Combined". I believe the city should zone for more types of housing in neighborhoods across the Seattle area, especially neighborhoods that are almost exclusively zoned for single family homes. In addition, new housing should be affordable and sustainably built.	8/22/2022
Doug Schwartz	Allow higher population density in all zonings	Allow multifamily housing in all neighborhoods.	8/22/2022
Margaret Sturdivant	Help create neighborhoods again	In using the Equity and Climate Analysis Framework it is crucial that all input be examined to determine if they speak to the greater good, applicable to all six components or simply of benefit to a biased group (such as Master Builders, and those already with power). The most successful areas of the city are those that have balanced growth, transit, affordability, etc. while considering the environment first. The Tree Ordinance needs to be applied and updated. Loss of tree canopy dooms any future plan. It is disingenuous to claim that affordable housing is incompatible with retaining trees. I would support Option 5 only if opening current SFR zones was for affordable housing, not single family residences that are oversized, and reduce tree canopy. Plus all districts deserve to be part of their own planning to balance the historic nature, provide access to parks and green spaces, transportation, and walkability. There needs to be planning that looks to the future, not just lot-to-lot. Approach it the way islands must, balancing all elements and including the community. What should the city be as a whole in the future, an emerald or a bleak landscape?	8/22/2022
Terrence Danysh	One Seattle Plan: Community Engagement Scoping Comments	Attached is my letter of 8/22/22 regarding the scope of the One Seattle Plan EIS.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Barry Lia	Architecture	Stop the utilitarian Hardie board box architecture. Less lawns, more trees. Fill property lots unless garden. More neighborhood centers and 115 minute walking range. Favor Alternatives 2 & 4	8/22/2022
Anna Nissen	Alternatives for Scoping Environmental Review	<p>https://crosscut.com/news/2022/07/how-seattle-planning-quarter-million-more-residents The slippery new version of "racial zoning"? "The urban village strategy, Hubner said, has not done enough to address "the legacy of exclusionary zoning in the city" which limited where Black residents and other residents of color (https://crosscut.com/2018/12/rectifying-seattles-racist-past-requires-denser-future-says-report) could live and shut them out of the wealth building opportunities of homeownership in many cases. " New Goal: "Hubner also said that while racial equity was an important part of the last comprehensive plan update in 2016, today the planning department is "more cognizant of the history of systemic racism in public policy and private practices such as real estate."" Objective: "Seattle has gotten much-needed apartments, though most are studios or one-bedrooms not suited for families. The strategy also doesn't produce many new opportunities for homeownership, since in single family zones you mostly get a one-to-one replacement of old houses with new houses." End of quote. Solution 1: expand urban village concept [Alternative 2] Problem?: "It would increase the number of apartments, but not add much new housing to buy." Check: study ratio rental to purchase and costs to consumer of new unit construction, Real problem: ignoring huge working class market (low side of income divide) in favor of high side of divide, unlike 1950-60s that filled the suburbs and made Boston's Beacon Hill a cheap heaven for young spats well into the 70s. Solution 2: allow new housing types across the city, including triplexes and quadplexes in neighborhoods that "currently only allow single homes on each lot" [already allow them,] and also including along arterials, bus and rail ways, and within walking distance of transit ways. [Alternatives 3, 4, & 5] Problem?: Birds pick cherries off trees all over town, problem continues. Check: study rents of new ADUs, triplexes, etc in formerly SF already relabeled city-wide for MF (rentable units); study ownership changes in these zones, and compare different neighborhoods, i.e displacement areas vs areas now branded elite and inequitable. Real problem see above. Solution 3: Call "Uncle." [Alternative 1] Problem? Enough seat-of-the pants regulation has already been adopted, both pre and post Defund the Police, and while in the midst of Covid to no avail. Check: the city and all others interested wade deep into the results of those regulations, seriously evaluate, predicate possible futures,</p>	8/22/2022
Frank Field	Frank Field	<p>I am a Communications professional with a major telecom employer in our area., and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Increase diversity throughout the city - Promote racial justice - Promote environmental justice - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Keep families together by enabling children and grandchildren to live closer to their parents and grandparents - Slow gentrification and displacement - Increase access to green space - Reduce the urban heat island effect - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - The current options entrench the status quo of allowing new housing in only a few select areas of the city, thus also continuing the status quo of segregating people into different neighborhoods by income and allowing new housing primarily along existing arterials, which has well documented negative health effects. This is especially salient in its consequences for child health, as most new families will need housing more affordable than what is currently available in Seattle. - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions, stemming from massive population and job growth over the past decade-as well as from insufficient housing production and planning, for a much longer period. The current alternatives don't do nearly enough to make up for this past 	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Whitney Rearick	Spread the multifamily love!	Why can't I rent a place on Lake Washington Boulevard or in Magnolia? I'd love to see more apartment buildings in rich neighborhoods! It's time for the wealthy to do their part. If folks in Capitol Hill and the CD can handle living next to a four-plex, surely people lucky enough to live in posh neighborhoods can, too. Change zoning (or eliminate it altogether!) to allow those former neighborhood stores and theaters to reopen, or to build more!	8/22/2022
Whitney Rearick	Require people to declare their monthly housing payment before commenting	I'm sick of people who bought their home decades ago and pay little or nothing every month blocking the construction of housing that people like me could afford. My proposed solution? We all declare our monthly housing payment when commenting on housing-related issues. Mine is \$3000 split two ways.	8/22/2022
Brenda Snyder	Urban Equity	Increasing housing types that allow for families of various sizes from different economic backgrounds should be a priority. Codes which have discouraged condo construction should be addressed/eliminated. Opportunities to buy (not just rent) should be increased. Street vendors should have a place to be. If there's a way to design new commercial spaces to be right-sized for smaller family businesses and not just large corporate chains, this would be helpful (and not the tiny live-work spaces which tend to just become live spaces due to space not being adequate for retail). Strip mall sized retail spaces seem to accommodate a great number of diverse businesses, but I rarely see this sized space for new lower floor retail in the city. I like the new node and corridor idea, though I'm sure single family home owners will complain.	8/22/2022
Bernice Maslan	Trees need to be a part of every plan	With global warming sending Seattle's temperatures soaring, it makes sense to prioritize trees as well as development and help increase the tree canopy especially in underserved areas. I oppose elimination of all single family neighborhoods (NR). Of the five options, at least alternative 2 and 4 will spare some of the NRs where it is more likely to still have sizable trees. Our current policy of infilling every possible space is leading to wholesale destruction of trees. With the majority of our trees actually on private land, it is imperative we prioritize trees. Private citizens are spending a lot of people to combat lawsuits by master builders to virtually eliminate trees. Saving of trees is crucial. They are a critical element in liveability, mental and physical health, animal and plant habitats, reducing pollution, storing water to prevent flooding and noise and stress reduction. Follow the model of cities like Portland which are increasing their canopy. Keep the canopy which benefits all in the forefront of your consciousness. It is not about density-density-density at all costs. Keep Seattle liveable!	8/22/2022
Matthew Mitnick	Multimodal Transit Options - Commuter Bike Paths and Bus Rapid Transit	Seattle needs far more extensive and connected transit options. Commuter bike paths should be expanded to encompass every neighborhood and route directly to one another. Having these bike paths reach light rail stations and transit hubs would not only increase ridership, but actually allow residents to more easily reach their local bus stops and/or light rail stations. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is another measure that would be a worthy endeavor to pursue. Following cities like Madison, Wisconsin (which is completing the initial phases of the planning process and set to be operational in 2024), BRT could immediately connect areas of the City without reliable bus service. Having dedicated bus only lanes with synchronized light systems will substantially improve transit times, providing a much needed upgrade over rapid lines. BRT vehicle types are more 1 ½ times the size of King County Metro's current vehicles. This will allow more folks to be transported by one individual vehicle and driver. Looking at schedules will be something of the past, as buses will always be available within minutes. BRT can also improve street safety by slowing down arterial streets with lane closures in favor of BRT (separated with vegetation in between car lanes), dedicated bike lanes, and one way routes for existing traffic. As a student who cannot afford to purchase a car and needs to travel across the City for work and class relatively quickly, these options will really help folks like myself, in addition to thousands of residents and visitors.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
adam kendall	Alternative Six	In cities like Seattle, only 50% of our built horizontal space and 25% of our vertical space is used. The vast majority of our urban space goes unused due to single family zoning. Yards, carports, setbacks, surface parking lots, on street parking etc all contribute to this waste of urban space. As such, I support a broad upzone of the entire city. All height restrictions abolished except for those that which allow planes to fly over on their way to the airport. Apartment bans abolished. Public golf courses turned into dense housing. We should use all of our available built space. If we did so, Seattle could support a population of over six million people without breaking a sweat. Upzoning alone won't result in housing being built though, or at the density we need, so I support three different taxes that compliment one another. A land value tax. A tax on unused horizontal space, and a tax on unused vertical space. The tax on unused vertical space should be set at 8 stories. The tax on unused horizontal space should be set at anything less than 90% of your plot being developed. The land value tax should be a 100% tax, to capture all unearned rent gained by increase in land values. When combined with a broad upzone, these three taxes would ensure that dense and affordable housing is built in Seattle at the necessary levels to accommodate the millions of climate refugees that will be coming to us as other parts of the U.S and the world, run out of water.	8/22/2022
Kathy Minsch	Comments on alternatives	While recognizing that some accommodations for new growth and a broader range of housing options are needed, I prefer limited and focused new development and therefore a lesser impact on losing the tree canopy which is invaluable for wildlife and cooler temperatures, as well as a lower impact on the city's creeks, lakes and shorelines. Therefore I support Alternatives 2 and 4, and am absolutely not in favor of 3 and 5. Let's keep Seattle the evergreen and emerald city it is known for.	8/22/2022
donald martin	Leave Jackson Park alone.	Use under utilized depressed spaces along Aurora, Greenwood Ave, 15th NE, Lake City Way etc, to build more housing. Please	8/22/2022
Stuart Jones	More housing everywhere, but keep the trees.	Please require developers to protect Large (greater than 18" DBH) mature canopy trees. Large mature canopy existing trees are an undervalued and almost irreplaceable resource in the Emerald City. Newly planted trees which are typically only 4-6" in caliper will take 30-60 years to reach the size of some of our existing street trees. Requiring developers to limit tree removals will have a huge impact on the aesthetics, property values, energy use, and ecology of our neighborhoods. Protecting existing trees may increase the cost of design and construction, but only in areas where there are already large trees. The long term benefit to protecting existing trees greatly outweighs the costs.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Joshua Morris	Establishing obligations and responsibilities to biodiversity and other comments	Seattle Audubon[*] advocates and organizes for cities where people and birds thrive. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan update process is an exciting opportunity for Seattle to clarify its vision for healthy communities, lands, and waters. In addition to supporting comments already submitted by many others (see below), we recommend and further elaborate on the following: 1. Establishing equitable biodiversity conservation as an intention of Comprehensive Plan update; 2. Assessing how EIS alternatives and climate change would impact biodiversity; and 3. Considering how climate change interventions might affect biodiversity, and vice versa. Seattle's biodiversity provides services and benefits to people. We love living and working in Seattle. The landscape is beautiful. The culture is vibrant. And the diversity of life we can experience every day is wild. From Orca off Alki to Bald Eagles over Ballard, our neighborhoods and waterways are peopled with more than people: at least 2,800 species of plants, fungi, birds, and other wildlife have been documented to-date within Seattle's municipal boundaries (iNaturalist.org, 2022). The plants, fungi, and animals we share our neighborhoods with make up our urban biodiversity. This biodiversity underpins the function of our urban ecosystem and provides services to the people who live in and visit Seattle—including food production, air purification, pest control, reduced need for cooling and heating, opportunities for recreation, and more. Nature also promotes human health and wellbeing (see Hartig et al., 2014 for a review). For many of us in Seattle, our daily contact with nature occurs in urban public green spaces. The degree to which green spaces provide people with physical and psychological benefits depends on many attributes, including park size, location, tree canopy, general quality, and amenities like bathrooms and benches (Konijnendijk et al., 2013). Higher levels of biodiversity in green spaces may also play a role in reducing stress and promoting feelings of restoration (Fuller et al., 2007; Wood et al., 2018, Schebella et al., 2019, Houlden, Jani & Hong, 2021). The benefits of Seattle's biodiversity are not equitably distributed and may be declining. The benefits of nature, biodiversity, and ecosystem services are not equitably distributed across Seattle. Generally, more affluent neighborhoods and those with predominantly white residents have greater vegetation cover, canopy cover, and biodiversity (Schell et al., 2020). This did not happen by accident.	8/22/2022
Heather Crandall	More housing options!	Please choose conceptual alternative #5. We need to expand not only affordable apartments but also affordable multi-family and single-family homes to start to counteract the historic redlining that reduced diversity. More affordable options all over the city hopefully will reduce gentrification of existing diverse neighborhoods. We can't keep doing more of the same!	8/22/2022
Johanne Kurfurst	No Neighborhood Can Be Exempt From Change	* NO NEIGHBORHOOD CAN BE EXEMPT FROM CHANGE. * NO NEIGHBORHOOD SHOULD EXPERIENCE SUDDEN, RADICAL CHANGE. Our zoning codes and development policies should be guided by these principles. And both pieces are essential and complement each other. Most of the proposals perpetuate the current broken model of concentrating new housing in specific areas of the city, which forces places like urban villages to bear the brunt of pollution, gentrification, displacement, and rapid character change. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum. I am a third-generation Seattleite and renter in Ballard, and I believe the city needs to create an Alternative 6 for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. A much better sixth option would, at a minimum: * Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods * Incentivize permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed * Allow more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted stroads * Convert underutilized golf courses and parking lots near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access * Kill parking minimums for both residential and commercial buildings * Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability, as well as bike and pedestrian infrastructure If Spokane can legalize missing middle housing, so can we.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Kelli Nichols	Biodiversity is our responsibility	By now we have a couple of decades of data to prove that we cannot build our way out of a housing crisis. We have been building like crazy and have not produced significant low-income housing or lowered housing costs; quite the contrary. We have ruined parts of the city and our environment and made developers rich. That's it. The fact is that urban and suburban gardens are playing a key role in sustaining pollinators, because our agricultural lands are toxic mono-crops. What we need is every inch of open space we can preserve, covered with diverse vegetation—not more infilling that maximizes square footage and profits. We need not only urban canopy but the underlying vegetation layers that go with it. We need to add wooded park spaces everywhere possible, with intense concentration on areas that are underserved by green space. We need this for physical and mental health, to cool the city, to clean our water before it enters the sound, but above all to create and preserve habitat for a maximum diversity of plants and animals, without whom we won't be alive much longer. "De-zone" is an idea that unfortunately has become a mantra, but it's a lie to pretend that we can just double down and keep living the way we have. Given the earth's population, the sustainable amount of square footage per person is 215 square feet (I looked it up). We cannot build our way out of this. We need to shrink our way out. Large houses can be divided to house 2-3 families. People who want to downsize can't find small footprint homes with small gardens because most of them have been knocked down to build very expensive townhomes—but there should be a place for green cottages in our city. Large apartment and condo buildings (in urban villages and along arterials) should contain right-sized units at truly affordable prices. There is great green design and small space design to take advantage of. No building should be built without balconies, roof gardens, green walls, and courtyards or allotment spaces. No one should live more than a ten-minute walk from a great park. We should find and reward developers who are willing to make a living, rather than a killing, and who will build what we need rather than maximize profits. We can offer benefits, low-interest loans, even property tax forgiveness to reward people who are willing to create and live in sustainable spaces. We can revive some old ideas such as boarding houses and residential hotels. And people who insist on living in large homes should be taxed accordingly. The	8/22/2022
donald martin	Leave Jackson Park alone.	Do not take historic Jackson Park for redevelopment. For more housing use under utilized spaces along Aurora, Greenwood Ave, 15th NE, Lake City Way, etc	8/22/2022
James Davis	We must plan for the heat island effect and preserve our large trees	Last June, 2021, in Washington State, 100 people died from extreme temperatures. Large trees increase climate community resiliency, protecting us from heat islands which are harmful. In Seattle, you can travel less than 7 miles and experience a 13-degree difference in temperature between an affluent, predominately white community and a predominately non-white community due to drastically smaller canopy coverage. Large trees in our city quite literally will save lives. We must plan to preserve our large trees remaining as well as plant new trees that will benefit us environmentally in 20 years. We can grow housing and have large trees and achieve climate resiliency.	8/22/2022
Erika Kretzmer	Tax credit for trees	Large trees are a public benefit. Property owners should receive a tax credit for registering their large/significant trees and maintaining them properly.	8/22/2022
Kathryn Gardow	Ensure adequate infrastructure for future development	As a 30+ year resident of Seattle, it is important that the infrastructure ability and capabilities are considered when adding new housing. This includes transportation, sewer, water, stormwater, and park infrastructure. It is important for Seattle to maintain adequate parks and water access. This helps with climate resiliency. When considering new housing, the capacity and health of the infrastructure must be evaluated before density is added. Density should be added near transit hubs and along frequent transit routes. Frequent transit routes are a bus or train every 10 minutes or less. Single family zoning in some neighborhoods should continue to be maintained. Single family zoning with tree cover is important to livability.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Melissa Taylor	Our kids need us to plan with the lifespan of buildings in mind	As I look at the building happening in the Roosevelt neighborhood where I grew up and near other light rail stations, I am disappointed that we have so substantially constrained the height of the new buildings that are going in. The lifespan of these buildings is likely 100 years and in fact, my childhood home in the Roosevelt neighborhood was built over 100 years ago. We should be building based on the capacity projections for 50-100 years out and instead, the capacity and height restrictions do not even reflect the 70,000 units of housing that Seattle is currently missing, let alone what needs to be built for future growth. The areas near our light rail stations should allow 30-story buildings that can house 1000s more people near each station. I also support the other aspects of Alternative 6 and hope to see it included as part of the study. Thank you!	8/22/2022
Michelle Yusuf	Alternative 5 is the best option offered, but we can do better.	At the very least, work towards implementing Alternative 5. We desperately need more housing options and opportunities for home ownership.	8/22/2022
Julia Shettler	Don't Ignore the Value of Urban Greenery	Please don't ignore the immense value of our urban forest when tackling important challenges such as housing density and climate change. As an engineer in the clean-energy field, I know that technology alone won't be able to solve our climate crisis. We desperately need to retain and grow our urban forest to augment other climate solutions. Moreover, studies have repeatedly shown that dense urban forests are correlated with better mental health metrics and lower rates of crime and violence: two places Seattle is already looking to . We need all the help we can get to face the housing and climate crises head-on, and trees are one easy part to this solution! Source: Green Cities: Good Health. https://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/ (https://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/) (Photo: NW Market St. Summer 2021). (Attached: Before & Afters of tree removals in Seattle. Credits to TimeWarp app and Google Street View).	8/22/2022
Will Urmston	Crises of housing affordability and climate change require the 6th Alternative	It's time to stop nibbling around the edges and start investing in solutions that meet the scale of the problems facing our city. Alternative 5 is barely adequate, and leaves the exclusionary Urban Village strategy in place. Are we a world-leading city or not? https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/real-change-alternative-6-social-communities-for-all	8/22/2022
Dorothy Gesick	Include specific climate mitigation measures to Alternative 5	Seattle must look to Alternative 5. Of the 5 alternatives this is the most aggressive (and necessary) if we want to achieve more equitable housing and transportation which will reduce our carbon footprint over time. We can achieve greater housing density by reviewing long established residential zoning i.e., single family. I believe we must consider social housing.	8/22/2022
Ethan Schaffer	More density = more trees	I've seen a number of comments that suggest we have to trade off either building more housing or preserving tree canopy. I think we can get both by allowing for more dense building throughout the city, as groups have articulated in Alternative 6. I don't think you have to oppose Alt 5 or 6 because you want more trees or parks etc. I want more trees, parks AND housing. Our current, low density zoning leads to more trees being cut down. If we can build up in more neighborhoods, that gives us the opportunity to preserve more trees both in and outside of the city. It also helps preserve farm and forest lands outside of the city that are eaten up by sprawl. There're a development in my North Beacon Hill neighborhood that is a good example of this, on 17th Ave S between Hill and Walker. A rare, undeveloped square block was recently sold to developers. They are planning a townhouse development that will almost certainly require cutting down the many mature trees. 3 story townhouses are the most dense option allowed in the zoning. They aren't allowed to build a 6 story apartment building with a public green space in the center, preserving some of the largest trees. It's also 1 block outside of the urban village. The urban village zones are supposed to be defined as a 10 minute walk to light rail stations and this is a 5 minute walk.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Kathryn Williams	Multifamily on Arterials	One natural way of increasing housing density while keeping single-family detached housing which is what most residents want is to put multifamily housing on the arterials. For example, I live on Capitol Hill on 16th Ave E., one block away from the arterial of 15th Ave. E. On our street and most of the streets around here, it is single-family detached homes, but on 15th Ave. E (bus line, etc.) it is mostly multifamily, both rental and home ownership. A change could be in Laurelhurst, using NE 45th (major arterial, bus line, etc.) for multifamily, but most of the area would remain zoned for single family detached. (I grew up there so I'm very familiar with the area.)	8/22/2022
Kyle P	Don't let the 130th and 145th stations be a disgusting waste of money	The 130th and 145th stations are currently a complete waste of funds, time, and labor. It's baffling that hundreds of millions were spent in such a low population area, while other projects in dense areas are pushed far out to the future. The tiny single family home population within walking distance of the stations will never make these worth building. They will be completely underutilized if there is not immediate and substantial growth in this area. We need a new urban village within walking distance now. At a bare minimum the area should be upzoned to resemble Roosevelt/Fremont. Preferably the area could and should resemble the density of Captiol Hill if the golf course is converted. Jackson park golf course should be bought out and redeveloped into an affordable, walkable, eco-centric, dense urban village. The massive amount of space the golf course takes up in such a crucial area is unacceptable. Housing for thousands needs to take priority over a recreational amenity for a few hundred.	8/22/2022
David Dorais	Final comments	Generally I am in favor of denser development in Alternatives 2 and 3. However I have some reservations. Rents/mortgages in the new urban villages near stations 9(not just 130th/145th but city-wide) should be based on ability to pay- at 30% of net income, with %s of each income demographic represented by latest city-wide census quota. Far from being a illegal taking via eminent domain subject to lawsuits and court action; this would end up requiring all property owners to assess the full 30% onto richer renters/mortgagees, thereby creating a multi-income neighborhood that directly subsidizes lower income earners w/out SHA or Section 8 buraeucracy, for any one building, complex or rebuilt/built Planned Unit Development style development. Property owners would still get full rentier bank assessment market value. Further, requiring smal businesses on ground floors of any development assures neighborhood creation and walkable convenience. I would also require all businesses to have open to the public restrooms. I repeat my suggestion that at every Link station location-especially north of the Ship Canal, multi-modal access and connection via west to east, Bay-to Lake BRTs along 145th, 125th/130th, 105th/Ngate WY, 85th and 65th and 45th be constructed and operated. Ideally all outdoor lighting-property and street-- should adhere to the anti light pollution model ordinances-primarily cowl shields on existing LED panels-- of the International Dark Sky Association, got to darksky.org for information and adoption of this suggestion.	8/22/2022
Niki Yonkow	Comprehensive Plan - save trees, greenery, open space, quality of life	Yes we need more houseing, but instead of making all of Seattle into another New York densify the selected urban areas (urban villages), make it easier to build small ADUs, allow modest duplexes in the single family zoned areas, don't allow developers to tear down small houses and replace with giant mansions when they could fit two smaller homes on the parcel. If the single family zoned areas are zoned for multifamily units you will lose all the trees which currently keep the urban areas cool, provide wildlife habitat and contribute to a high quality of life. If single family neighborhoods are zoned for high density it is the lower income neighborhoods that will suffer . It will not be as financially advantageous for a developer to buy a house in Magnolia or Laurelhurst and make a profit converting it to multifamily houseing. Unfortunately, upzoning to high density will not help with affordability unless it is coupled with other actions that aim towards sustainability. New York, one of the most dense cities in the world is not affordable. Perhaps we should stop encouraging unending growth by giving corporations incentives to continually expand. The idea that we must constantly grow is an outdated economic idea that will eventually bring ruin.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Eric Fisk	When large areas like Talaris are redeveloped, they should become urban villages	<p>Look at what is currently happening in Laurelhurst. The empty 18 acre Talaris site and the empty 22 acre Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus site are both slated to become brand new single family housing, where homes will cost over 2 million dollars each.</p> <p>Meanwhile, we are tearing down houses and apartments in urban villages to make way for HALA. Should we be building large tracts of new single-family housing while tearing it down in other places? Why not let new, large areas to be redeveloped become new urban villages? That sounds like common sense to me, yet none of the plans being put forward here would allow for new urban villages at those locations. That's because all of these plans commit the cardinal sin of focusing development on existing corridors and intersections. They treat bus stops like some monumental piece of infrastructure warranting the demolition of surrounding structures. In fact, bus stops are an indicator that a neighborhood is walkable, affordable, and diverse. Upzoning around bus stops maximizes displacement, particularly of minorities and low-income people. It also guarantees that unwalkable neighborhoods remain frozen in amber, never changing to become walkable and include urban villages. Instead of targeting bus stops, we should be putting urban villages in places where displacement will be minimal and where unwalkable neighborhoods will be made walkable. Here's a proposal: If people within 200 feet (about 1 block) of a low density zone (currently single-family) grant permission, then allow creation of new condos and apartments with ground floor commercial there. The real impact of this would come into play whenever large areas are redeveloped, such as shopping malls or country clubs or the places in Laurelhurst. The redeveloped area could transition to multifamily and then a core of condos and rental units that creates a new walkable destination. And you know what we can do when we create a new urban village? Run a bus line there!</p>	8/22/2022
matt Chadsey	Detailed Analysis of Climate Impacts of Alternatives Is Critical	<p>Growth can be productive or counter productive with respect to Seattle's resilience and ability to adapt to a changing climate. Each growth alternative requires a deep, systemic review to understand the impact on trees, water use, stormwater, carbon pollution, heat, and other parameters. Seattle is a complex system of people, infrastructure, and the environment. Without a systemic understanding of the proposed policies - the selected plan is likely to have many unintended consequences. Seattle will be faced with rapid growth in population AND climate effects over the coming decades. The magnitude of building anticipated presents a huge opportunity, but only if done correctly with the goals of INCREASING tree canopy throughout Seattle, treating stormwater ON SITE, REDUCING heat impacts, and reducing all forms of energy use for transportation, heating, and cooling. Cities around the world are spending billions of dollars to reverse changes made in the past while their cities broil and flood, and residents die - though we've already don't substantial damage to our resilience in construction-at-all-cost policies of the past 20 years, we have an opportunity to design a much better future starting with this plan. The limited economic impact on developers and landowners from related policies, IF ANY, will be more than offset but community benefits in equity, health, and overall well-being of ALL Seattle residents. A true ecosystem services evaluation and holistic benefit cost analysis of the proposed changes will identify the best path forward. Until that is done - decision makers will understand only a fraction of the data needed to make productive decisions regarding Seattle's future!</p>	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Gordon Padelford	We need to plan for an equitable, safe, and climate stable future	<p>General Comments The 2024 update to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan must address the overlapping homelessness/affordability crisis, climate crisis, and traffic safety crisis. Equity: All the EIS alternatives should center equity by seeking to reverse displacement and create housing for all by radically rethinking our land use policies to allow people of all incomes to live and thrive in Seattle. Furthermore, the plan should seek to foster affordable commercial and creative spaces so that it is easier for small local businesses and artists to get started or stay in town. Climate: All the EIS alternatives should seek to address our climate crisis by creating a city where everyone can easily walk or "roll" (by roll, we mean use a wheelchair, powerchair, or other mobility device) to their daily needs, and access to transit and bike routes for less frequent trips. Each alternative should create a city where people with disabilities, kids, and older adults have equal access to all aspects of daily life. Sometimes called the 15 Minute City, this concept should be a fundamental part of every alternative. Safety: All the EIS alternatives should allow dense housing away from dangerous and polluted multi-lane arterial streets. According to SDOT, these types of streets are where 80% of all fatalities happen. Continuing a strategy of concentrating growth along them, without completely redesigning the streets, will endanger people. To be clear, the city must aggressively work to completely redesign these streets and make them safe and healthy places, but this will take time. And housing for all types of people and families should be available on arterials and non-arterial streets. Furthermore, every alternative should analyze the increased exposure to dangerous and polluted (noise, particulates, and more) streets as outlined by Futurewise in their 8/11 EIS comment letter section labeled "assess the impacts on exposure to environmental harms." We also support their call for mitigation "We recommend that the City study appropriate mitigation measures for increased exposure to traffic emissions and hazards—including, a) establishing mandatory pedestrian/cyclist safety features for transit corridors, and b) establishing mandatory minimum requirements for the amount of transit corridor right of way space that must be reserved for emission-free transportation modes and non-transportation uses." Comments on the Proposed EIS Alternatives Alternative 2 Focused: Alternative 2 purports to be the 15 Minute City option, but</p>	8/22/2022
Dan McClaskey	I support Alternative 1	<p>Although I have concerns with all the proposals before the committee, I tend to believe the planning of Alternative 1 would best serve the existing residents of the North Seattle area, and future residents as well.</p>	8/22/2022
Audrey Livermore	Make Seattle home to more people and more trees	<p>Alternative #5 combines many ideas to make Seattle's density more diverse and promote healthy, liveable neighborhoods. Success is measured by thoughtful design choices. Seattle has traditionally been a "City of Neighborhoods." Local community involvement leads to better solutions. Unlike the current spate of "shoebox" development, when done right, increased density can be "hidden in plain sight." It can blend into, and reinvent, the current housing stock to increase density at an appropriate pace, for all income levels. Good public transit is essential to increased density. Local small businesses make complete neighborhoods. A priority must be placed on preserving and planting our urban forest in all parts of Seattle. Native plants and evergreen trees contribute to a healthy, more sustainable, city of the future.</p>	8/22/2022
John Brown	One Seattle	<p>We would like to see the development of Affordable Housing extend beyond Urban Villages. This is important for Racial Equity & the concept of One Seattle! Affordable Housing should be scattered through out Seattle Neighborhoods. Patricia Copeland & John Brown</p>	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Curt Warber	In Support of Alternative 4	Alternative 4 provides as much capacity for additional density as can reasonably be built, while taking advantage of existing infrastructure investments. Seattle's ability to handle increased density is critically shaped by the hills, waterways, major transportation corridors (I-5 and 99, primarily, but also corridors like Lake City Way), and similar fixed geographic realities that constrain connectivity and the provision of urban services. The corridors and centers identified for additional density in Alternative 4 provide access to transit, retail needs, services, and infrastructure like water and sewer that are simply not available in some of the City's less accessible neighborhoods. It does not make sense to do a blanket upzone of all of Seattle's single family neighborhoods. The recent strategy of adding capacity for ADU's and DADU's in SF zoned neighborhoods provides substantial opportunity for increased density throughout the City, and they are showing up at a reasonable rate. Unfortunately, transitioning housing capacity is a slow process. It is a structural feature of land use change. Anyone who remembers one of the previous attempts to jumpstart neighborhood density (although I suspect that developer revenue was the primary reason for the change) - the skinny lot proposal, will recall a disaster of high neighborhood impact with low benefit. The ADU and DADU change, by contrast, was thoughtfully implemented and I expect will result in a substantial increase in housing availability over time. The current urban centers model is also resulting in one of the higher rates of new housing unit development within an established urban area in the nation. This additional density is being delivered quickly and the basic premise of adding density where there is existing capacity seems to be functioning. Extending this model into connecting corridors makes sense and will add substantial new opportunities for growth. Please select a final alternative that provides a pathway to growth that fits Seattle's landscape and supports the creation of a city that people will continue to want to live in.	8/22/2022
Scott Meyer	Alternative 6 is a Bare Minimum of What Seattle Needs	Alternative 6 is the bare minimum Seattle needs for housing affordability, environmental sustainability, and social equity. We must do away with single family zoning entirely, and allow multi family dwellings as duplexes, triplexes, and more throughout residential zones. The current zoning has turned Seattle into an enclave for the wealthy. Make Seattle affordable for all with upzoning and increased density everywhere. Single-mode zoning types should be revised so that mixed small businesses and residential can also exist throughout the city, as in older Seattle neighborhoods and in much of urban Europe. Be creative and mix it up. Areas where different zoning types interact are the most productive and desirable, so expand these types massive. Urban villages and any area near regular transit need minimum (not maximum) FAR which supports density and walkability. For example, the Lowe's site on Rainier Avenue South is currently a single story big box store, and may be redeveloped into an Amazon fulfillment center. This should never happen in an urban village a block from light rail. Instead, the FAR or other requirements should be adjusted so that only structures which realize the full potential of the site can be built. Northgate is another failed example: it is being redeveloped as low and mid-rise, when it should be full of high-rise, given its proximity to transit. Don't allow redevelopment opportunities like this to be wasted in the future by underwhelming low-rise and even single-story commercial make-overs which do little to increase density or unaffordability. Reduce set-back requirements and minimum yard sizes in residential and commercial areas. Not everyone needs or wants a yard or sad, neglected planting strip. Include new and more appropriate planting guidelines and tree protections which make sense for each site instead of being blanket in nature. Allow for more mixed zoning types, such as allowing residential structures above all commercial structures. Seattle also needs to levy a steep tax per parking space on large parking lots to discourage suburban big-box style development with massive set-backs and acres of parking, to encourage density and walkability. Lift building heights downtown and in all urban villages. There is no reason why Seattle can't have slender residential high rises mixed with lower buildings and even single family structures. Look to Vancouver, BC and some of its suburbs as an example: dense and livable and desirable neighborhoods where zoning is more flexible. Use that as a	8/22/2022
Justin Zymbaluk	Seattle must be ambitious and think big	I urge the city of Seattle to be ambitious and think big with the goal of housing abundance in this process. I admire the city's dedication to the goal of housing equity, but the fact is that we can not equitably distribute our way out of a shortage. The city of Seattle has systemically underbuilt housing for more than 40 years and today we acutely feel the effects in the form of unlivably high rent and cost of living. Alternative 5 is the choice Seattle must take. For too long, rich and white homeowners have been able to control the process of where housing is built to ensure that new housing is built in majority-POC communities, instead of in their wealthy enclave neighborhoods, and that must not be allowed to happen again. Seattle must allow new housing to be built all throughout the city, instead of in small pockets. I urge the city of Seattle to consider in its environmental review the impact of not taking action and building dense urban housing: * Forest and natural land bulldozed to build new housing * families forced to live far away from jobs, ensuring long commutes and increased carbon emissions	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Jordan Tursi	Raise all zoning 1 level and let the market decide where density happens. Please	I am a homeowner who had to ask my father to borrow money to purchase a tiny house in a single family zone 5 years ago only to have the council change the zoning 2 years later because I'm within a new urban zone. Please stop concentrating the development to these tiny areas. If you want to be fair and equitable then across the board raise all zoning 1 level and let the market decide where the density goes. You are trying to force it into these tiny neighborhoods and you are destroying the small family feel along with significantly increasing congestion. Meanwhile just a block away it's still SFR and their values only skyrocket further. Take a look at 83rd and 13th NW. This area has been completely changed because it was "older housing stock" and other areas untouched. Aren't you just further taking advantage of the people with less money and resources? Why not spread the development around and let people choose where they want to live. Instead of overpopulating specific areas. I'd move to a single family zone, again, but I can no longer afford to. I'm now looking more towards Shoreline.	8/22/2022
K Stewart	What happened to Seattle's commitment to minimizing Light Pollution	When and why did the city decide we only needed Noise Pollution ordinances. I can't remember when I last saw a star in the sky here that didn't turn out to be a satellite... all the 'over-bright' LEDs certainly haven't made us any safer and there's that whole "Global Warming" thing... what are we doing!!	8/22/2022
Braeden Van Deynze	Let's pull our heads out of the sand and commit to a sustainable future!	Seattle is growing. Our county, state, and country continue to welcome more people, and Seattle will accept more residents in the coming years and decades. This is an undeniable fact. The only questions are where they will live and how they will get around. Denying that Seattle will grow is akin to climate change denial in that the evidence is now clear to anyone willing to look. All you have to do is look around and the results of this denial, continued over the past decade, are clear. Homelessness abounds. Rents and housing costs are soaring. Car traffic has ground to a halt and deaths and injuries resulting from traffic are rising. This will continue if Seattle does not change course. This is a simple geometry problem: There are not enough homes to house current and future Seattleites and there is not enough space to support a car-first transportation system. Seattle needs an Alternative 6 focused expanding housing options on all lots in the entire city. Orienting new development towards arterials or "urban villages" is unfair to new residents due to pollution along the arterials and to existing residents by privileging some residents' desire to maintain the status quo (often wealthy ones) over the needs of the many. Allowing property owners to develop their lots up-to (minimum) six-plexes would spread the burden, and joys, of new development across the city. This was the standard when many of our most popular neighborhoods (Fremont, Ballard, Capitol Hill) were developed, proving that density and single-family homes can co-exist. Indeed, this mix of land uses throughout the neighborhoods is key to their character. Spreading new density across the entire city will allow our new neighbors to choose the neighborhood that works for them and lead to a more gradual and natural transition towards a denser urban environment as density emerges where demand calls for it, rather than as planners choose. As the plans are further studied, please consider how impacts will be felt throughout the city and who bears those impacts. Who will be forced to bear the burdens of displacement? Why will some neighborhoods be exempt from changes? Who will instead be forced to pick up the "bill" to maintain their lifestyles? This lens must be applied to not just current residents, but future residents. Who are we inviting to our communities if new housing is constrained to only a select few areas of the city? Who are we excluding?	8/22/2022
Caleb L	End housing restrictions	End housing restrictions. People in this city are desperate for housing and our economy is desperate for people who can live and work here affordably. End single family minimums like SF5000, SF7200, SF9600. A growing city is stifled by these restrictions. Allow for smaller lots and more housing units per acre for every neighborhood all throughout the city. This city is short on housing and housing opportunities. Consider taxes policies, like a land value tax, that encourage more efficient use of land. Do not continue to subsidize areas of disbursed housing which are heavier burdens on the city's road and other infrastructure budgets. Make it easier to get around this city by walking, biking, and plan for the growing availability of small electronic alternatives like e-bikes. Allow for development that puts essentials like grocery stores, parks, community centers, and other commercial services at more of a walkable distance from all housing, not just select urban centers. Don't rely solely on light rail, make it easier to get what we need within a bike/walk/e-ride of where we live. Consider infrastructure that fosters the development of battery powered alternatives to cars. Improve access to water parks. Seattle's beaches and water parks are in need of expansion, investment, and improvement. Plan for infrastructure that will improve and bring more communications options among wired and wireless communications/internet providers.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Catherine Hinrichsen	More affordable housing would solve many problems	We already don't have enough housing for all our residents - much less enough affordable housing. Open up our city, get rid of single-family zoning, build more housing near transit, help prevent further climate damage, make Seattle accessible to people of all income levels. Alternative 5 would get us closest to this, but I also like the sound of an Alternative 6 that would be more productive. I say this as an aging homeowner who's been concerned for years that the cost of living in Seattle is too much for many younger people. It makes me sad that the opportunity I had, to live and raise my child in a walkable, convenient neighborhood, in a small but affordable home, is out of reach for so many families. The more that people are pushed out, the more burden we're putting on transportation, our climate and the well being of our people. We need to stop that slide and plan for our future, for today's generations and the many generations ahead.	8/22/2022
Meg Chadsey	We can have housing AND trees!	I urge the city to consider the importance of each and every tree in Seattle. Trees produce shade, reduce energy costs, and improve air quality FOR ALL RESIDENTS. In terms of mental health support and combating the effects of climate change (especially heat and stormwater runoff) you will find no more cost effective measure than preserving and enhancing our urban tree canopy (ESPECIALLY in lower-income neighborhoods). It's simply not true that trees present an either-or decision with respect to low income housing, developer rights, or the many other arguments used to avoid enhancing and enforcing tree protection. Seattle leaders have both the opportunity and responsibility to make changes to Seattle's building, zoning, and environmental regulations to protect and dramatically increase the City's diminishing tree canopy. All that is required is an honest and innovative mindset to making Seattle livable and a few knowledgeable experts to help. If you need a model for how to move forward – the Melbourne AU Urban Forest Strategy (https://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/community/greening-the-city/urban-forest/Pages/urban-forest-strategy.aspx) would be a good place to start.	8/22/2022
Samara Surface	Study an Alternative 6	I am a homeowner in Maple Leaf and I work for a company in SLU. I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a equitable, sustainable place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Upzone the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Incentivize and promote green-built housing - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Promote environmental justice - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. The city of Vienna, with almost 45% green space and where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to an article and pictures of this city: https://www.vienna.convention.at/en/sustainability/green-city/green-vienna At a minimum I want to see more mixed-use condo buildings throughout Seattle like the photo attached that's on Phinney & 60th. It provides denser housing that can be owned, builds a more vibrant neighborhood community, and allows for easy transportation hubs. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Joanna Cullen	Urban Villages and nearby areas have already taken their share of upzoning.	<p>Urban villages should not be expanded. Those areas have already been upzoned and are being rebuilt and disrupted. Expanding urban villages will not serve the interest of equity and only contribute to further displacement. I favor alternative 3 where housing choices will be expanded to all neighborhoods. This must also include good codes and design review in all areas with a thoughtful approach in all areas for the type of housing needed for renters and ownership opportunities and housing that is appealing to families with children and nice open space in all areas. This should also allow more residents to live near some of our great parks. Saving trees in all areas must be incentivized and required. Also incentivize saving of the current structures or at least current facades as new development or housing types are allowed. In the interest of climate change, and air quality insist on a high standard of construction. Construction and demolition dust only contribute to bad air and carbon production and, in the long term defeat goals of a livable city and planet. Seattle is in need of a good analysis of what will make our city appealing, more affordable and livable. Overall is there a need for more apartments? Where are the homes for families with children with ownership opportunities? Where are the homes for intergenerational living? Where are our trees? Ensuring that much housing in many areas still has some yard space is important along with ensuring parks and planting space is available to all. Do not create heat zones by further increasing density in areas that have already been upzoned. There are challenges to growth, and, when necessary, can be thoughtfully accomplished without destroying the livability of this city. Please be mindful of how to handle possible increases in land value. Alternative 3 is the best. No alternative will work if the city gives everything over to developers and investors. There is hard work to be done to thoughtfully implement this alternative.</p>	8/22/2022
Brian Patch	Trees make cities livable	<p>If you open Google Maps and zoom out from Seattle, you'll see an island of concrete-grey surrounded by miles natural greenery. Seattle is no longer what the Pacific Northwest looks like. Some neighborhoods, like SODO, look like a desert, stripped of all green. Lush greenery is why people choose to live here instead of Phoenix or Los Angeles. But it is no longer an Emerald City. Other cities plan, nurture and protect their urban canopy. Climate change makes this imperative. Seattle has neglected its natural advantages. It should lead the way in retaining urban canopy. Please include significant investment in trees in our urban planning.</p>	8/22/2022
Kurt Gruber	More housing without destroying what we have	<p>Seattle will need more housing in the future so, while Option 1 would be appealing, it's probably not realistic. I can't agree with the comments that want to burn it all down and build whatever, where ever. Single family neighborhoods and their residents are not evil, they are the backbone of this city; paying taxes, donating time, providing jobs and caring as only homeowners do. We need responsible growth that honors the spirit of expansion without destroying all the worthy characteristics of our beautiful neighborhoods. Consequently, I support the Corridor approach. We need to identify more corridors that already have significant existing retail and multi-family development and earmark them for greater density. This will provide potential renters with greater options and provide ownership opportunities for lower income residents in neighborhoods that can more easily accommodate this density. Thanks for asking. I look forward to tracking your deliberations.</p>	8/22/2022
John Samaras	Housing affordability, Climate Change, Species Extinction, etc. we need better	<p>We need to look in depth at the broader picture of all the Crises that we are already in.. There is no going back to "normal.." Zoo-notic pandemics are just beginning, in case we haven't noticed.. we are in a climate crisis. We cant keep doing the same things and expecting a different result.. These issues affect the poorest among us first. i agree with Alternative #6 and more as proposed here: https://engage.oneseattleplan.com/en/ideas/real-change-alternative-6-social-communities-for-all It covers many but not necessarily all of the issues.. we also need to start figuring out how to provide for energy sustainably (hydro is not "green" when it destroys salmon habitat), including how we feed ourselves (human energy) with urban agriculture and promoting more local peri-urban agriculture.. we need more affordable housing, we need more trees and more diversity of habitat within our city.. As an engineer, i am clear that Techno-fixes will not work.. we need to start looking at serious changes to both our culture and our economy to survive.. De-Growth and converting into a Caring Economy is a more reasonable than the insanity we've been living with since Adam Smith.. This Predatory Economy is trashing our planet. These are systemic issues that can only be met at the governmental level. Lets start leading with our City!!</p>	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
K Stewart	Seattle was always known for its 'innovation' - subsidize FREE public transporta	Busses, Light Rail, Monorail, Trolley - All FREE to everyone! * Tourist Friendly * Resident Friendly * Traffic Congestion Friendly * Global Warming Friendly * Noise Pollution Friendly * even Cost Friendly These methods of transportation are widely available and already heavily subsidized. If we want less cars, traffic, pollution, noise, and heat - let's be 'innovative'... make them FREE !!!	8/22/2022
Deejah Sherman-Peterson	Alternative 6 and then some	I support a plan for an Alternative 6 (Sightline Institute and many individuals). We need greater density throughout Seattle, not just along transportation corridors and in certain neighborhoods. We need increased density everywhere and many different levels of affordability. We can accomplish it in many different ways, but all those ways must include an increased tree canopy. I also want parks, community gardens, services (stores, libraries, post offices, restaurants, credit unions, etc.) available within walking distance; this would benefit not only people who cannot drive but also those who choose not to drive. We can have housing above commercial establishments, for example. Neighborhood plazas near parks can be gathering spaces. Tree-lined streets with lots of pedestrians (and fewer and slower-moving vehicles), business establishments with outside flower boxes and benches, places that are occupied during the evenings and nights so that everyone feels a sense of safety and mutual ownership--these would all be wonderful. I'd like all new buildings (including residences) to have roofs that are properly oriented for solar panels and to be wired to be solar-panel ready, to have plug-in capacity to charge electric vehicles, and to have heat and hot water provided by electricity (no fossil fuels!). I also want gray water to be used wherever it makes sense. Why flush toilets with potable water? Oh, and all buildings must be well insulated, of course! This means helping people retrofit existing buildings. All demolition materials should be required to be re-used or recycled to the fullest extent possible.	8/22/2022
kevin orme	Alternative evaluations	Alternative 1 is maintaining the status quo - this is not working for many reasons and only serves greedy developer interests first and foremost - it does nothing to enforce environmental and tree canopy protection nor does it provide TRUE 'affordable housing' because currently developers make all their money on expensive McMansions or multi-family expensive housing which is the same thing; Alternative 3 may have promise but no mention I see of tree canopy protection nor wildlife habitat and similar - we cannot afford (both climate, health and \$\$-wise) to just focusing on housing above all else, especially when we don't even have a workable definition of 'affordable' in the first place - ask the residents of Yesler Terrace? Alternative 3 - so you pit commercial interests vs. housing? Guess who wins that one? Note that also there are plenty of areas where that has already happened throughout the city, and when those commercial interests fail - they just move on or disappear leaving behind blight and pavement with no will from the city to make the changes needed to make that area clean, environmentally healthy and affordable for residents? Why not instead work with the "ounce of prevention rule" and do it NOW while we still can? Not this one. Alternative 4 sounds far better on paper BUT, I see no direct mention of environmental protection? Where is that priority? Or because it doesn't have a moneyed or commercial interest behind it, it's not important? Alternative 5 - no, for all the reasons above. Density doesn't necessarily mean 'affordable' - ask any dense east coast city? Nor does sprawl - ask Los Angeles and major Texas cities? And to the other comments saying some sort of Darwinian 'let the free market rule' approach - ever been to Houston? Never has had zoning, sprawl and unregulated commercial development everywhere and still same expensive housing as we are seeing here. It may be a friendly, liberal town (especially for the state it's in) but no thanks. so I ask again - where are the environmental priorities in all/any of these? Why are only commercial and 'housing' interests of importance, the latter of which without any true definition of 'affordable' anyway? If the developers define that word and not based on actual studies and economics, social information - it will continue get far worse than the status quo.	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Liz Gruber	Well Considered Growth Please!	I understand the need for additional housing in Seattle and, with thought, we can balance that need with what we have today, a highly desirable collection of neighborhoods and urban villages. The corridor option seems to best achieve that outcome - we add density and amenities, while also allowing for single family/small multifamily (duplex, triplex, small townhouse communities) neighborhoods. While I know many activists believe that we should build anything, anywhere, over time, I believe this will destroy the city. We need to retain some neighborhood cores that are owner occupied. This population (which has other alternatives ie the suburbs) provides both a civic and economic base for the city. I also know that activists believe that renters are just as committed to neighborhoods as owners and based on my experience of the last four years of living in the city, you'd have a very difficult time convincing me. My renting neighbors, in what would be considered a nice Seattle neighborhood, do not extend themselves to neighbors (ie don't build relationships), lend a hand to keep the neighborhood clean or invest in any way to improve the property. The property owners are absentee. Seattle has an amazing base on which to build. Please don't turn us into Houston or NYC. If we wanted to live there, we would!	8/22/2022
Eugene Shvets	Legalize housing	It's time to end single family zoning restrictions and legalize building housing by right everywhere in the city currently zoned residentially. Zoning liberalization is not a panacea but experience in Texas and Arizona, among others, show that increased supply of housing will decrease housing prices. This, in turn, will allow faster and cheaper construction of low income / public housing. It's time to build and help countless people who are struggling to afford housing in Seattle area.	8/22/2022
Thomas Kelly	Green space, trees, access to vegetation	The plan should call for increases in tree cover and access to green space and vegetation. These should be accessible from all areas. It is clear that giving people access to these has great psychosocial benefits--a literature search can verify that. It also increases physical health by leading to people going out for more exercise of various types such as walking, running, biking, and more. It also provides many ecosystem service benefits most of which can be quantified such as temperature moderation, reduction of heat island effects, shading buildings from sun in summer, reduction in storm water flows, water and air cleansing, wildlife habitat, etc. Providing more in some parts of the city can also provide increased environmental justice. There are many ways to provide this including minimizing building footprints to leave space for vegetation, increased street tree installation, increased park space, preventing loss of existing area. There will be need to be wary of effect of Accessory Dwelling Units on reduction of vegetated space and tree cover and should be a way to make up for reductions they may cause. Ideally this should factor in biodiversity by choosing species which benefit insects and other forms of life and provide corridors or refuges for urban wildlife.	8/22/2022
Peter Rees	Smart Growth for Seattle	For the most effective and equitable growth of housing opportunities for Seattle's future, a combination of Alternatives 2 and 4 seems wisest. More density associated with neighborhood nodes and efficient transportation will allow Seattle to grow organically. As the future arrives with more people, nodes will have room to grow and as our transportation infrastructure evolves, housing patterns will evolve with it. A 'Broad' approach, alternative 3, will undermine the co-evolution of density and infrastructure, which will have a serious economic downside for both. Where thoughtful patterns of growth are not encouraged, displacement will be a sad consequence. Alternative 1 is a start, but has shown that it is not enough, more is needed. Thank you	8/22/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Charlotte Dohrn	Transformative planning for an equitable, livable, and green city	Thank you to all the staff who are working on the City's Comprehensive Plan update. I would like to see the following topics considered during the EIS process and included in the draft alternatives. Equity: Racial equity must be centered in the analysis of the proposed alternatives, including preventing displacement of residents and BIPOC-owned businesses, addressing racial wealth gaps and ownership disparities, mitigating urban heat inequity and inequitable access to green space. Climate, ecosystem health, and green space: The summary graphics for each alternative show a network of development areas and roads - even though these are illustrative, they are glaringly missing the parks, forested natural areas, urban streams, and coastlines that must be prioritized and planned for at all stages of the Comprehensive Plan update. This update is an opportunity to look holistically at how our built environment and activities impact the climate and the health of the local and regional ecosystem. We must consider and pursue every opportunity to lower emissions through how we plan our housing, commercial development, and transit. Assessing the alternatives should consider how each will advance the protection and restoration of our urban ecosystem (e.g., canopy cover and stream and shoreline water quality and ecological function). We must plan for healthy salmon streams, urban forests, and protecting tree cover - just as we rapidly increase and diversify available housing. Alternatives should include increasing the amount of publicly accessible green space and shoreline parks that are so essential during heat events, managing storm water and other types of pollution, sequestering carbon, and improving the health of the urban ecosystem for people and animals. Diversity and abundance of housing options across the city: A sixth alternative is needed to plan for the growth this region will see and ensure that everyone is housed regardless of their income. Apartments, condos, cottages, and other types of housing should be considered across the city, with accompanying investment in transportation and environmental protection. Housing must have services and amenities nearby (e.g., businesses on the ground floor), access to parks, p-patches, roof gardens, courtyards, etc. We need to deploy all strategies to provide adequate quantities of quality housing and improve affordability. Where possible/appropriate, it would be great to see conversion of existing older, larger homes to apartments rather than tearing	8/22/2022
James Lewis	Alternative 5 at a minimum, consider Alternative 6	Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment. Seattle needs to permit more density to alleviate the crises of housing affordability, equitable transit access, homelessness and climate change. Alternative 5 should be considered the baseline for forward progress on these issues. I support the proposals made by others here to consider an Alternative 6, which would expand the scope of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan's to further accommodate housing density beyond what has already been outlined.	8/22/2022
Rainer Metzger	Choose Alternative 5 and Go Further	Seattle has become unaffordable due to a lack of housing options and exclusionary zoning laws. Alternative 5 does the most to open up a broad range of new housing types to all areas of the city in order to increase supply and affordability. The comprehensive plan should reduce red tape, streamline the permitting process, shorten turn around on pre-approved housing designs, and ban Design Review that only increases costs through unnecessary delays that do little to improve design quality. Pre-approve or streamline permits for 6-or 8-pack apartment blocks to quickly increase supply of family-sized units in areas formerly restricted to one family per lot (which is horribly exclusionary). Allow dense housing within a 15 min walk of all light rail stations. Such expensive, fast, and convenient transport should not be made exclusive to property owners protected by one family per lot laws (see Roosevelt, Montlake, Mount Baker, Beacon Hill, 130th, and many others). Seattle's Comprehensive Plan cannot be a tool to exclude non-wealthy and non-privileged people in our city. It must be a tool that allows everyone to access this beautiful corner of the world.	8/22/2022
MJ Davidson	Save trees/subsidize home ownership	A priority: all plans to save the healthy trees we have; for every tree removed, replace with 2 well-suited to site by professional, licensed arborist provide home ownership opportunities with supports and mentorship about upkeep and finances for all displaced low and lower income to live in neighborhood of their choosing	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Livermore Lagerquist	Increase density in a manner where everything looks like it fits.	Increase the tree canopy beyond just saving the exceptional trees on a site. The higher the density allowed on a site requires an increase in the tree canopy. Incorporate trees into the design of the building(s). Develop a financial model where a family could own a three or four or larger development. Especially in single family zoned neighborhoods.	8/23/2022
Sheri Newbold	Start with Alternative 5 and expand upon it for three bold alternatives	Seattle is evolving as it grows, and the core question of the EIS alternatives should be how best to build the future city we want to live in. We face deep challenges with housing affordability, climate change and structural racism. The EIS alternatives must be bold to meet these challenges with transformational solutions, rather than incremental measures or no change like what is proposed in Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4. Please study three EIS Alternatives which expand on Alternative 5. The Alternatives could be modeled in a variety of ways and should share six underlying principles: 1. Encourage '15 Minute' Neighborhoods 2. Provide Housing Diversity, Affordability and Abundance 3. Focus on Equity and Redressing Past Harms 4. Consider Mobility and Repurposing the Right of Way 5. Prioritize Growth Strategies that Reduce Climate Impacts 6. Champion Great Urban Design and Placemaking These alternatives ought to Incorporate important variables to differentiate them from each other: 1. Range of regulatory flexibility--most important--right now, there is a huge lack of flexibility 2. Housing types, locations, price range, feasibility--also a most important variable as there is a lack of choice of housing type and price. 3. Focus on resident and visitor experience 4. Creation of new neighborhood nodes 5. Concentration on human health 6. Contrast approaches to address climate change Finally, all the Alternatives must be paired with visual representations of the high-quality urban form and places we're hoping to achieve. Having accessible visuals and graphics is key to engaging the broad public.	8/23/2022
Jeremiah Surface	Alternative 6	I am a renter in Roosevelt , and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, equitable, sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce rates of homelessness - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Katy G	Tree Groves to Pocket Parks	As plans are made to redevelop the area around 130th, note that there are Bald Eagles and other birds nesting in the exceptional trees. Evaluate turning existing tree groves into pocket parks and building around exceptional trees. We should increase the ratio of park and open space acres per 1000 residents as human density increases and we increasingly rely on shared spaces rather than back yards.	8/23/2022
ANGELIQUE SANDERS	Community issues	Seattle has grown tremendously in the past 25 plus years. It has grown so much that affordable housing isn't affordable for those with low and/or fixed incomes any more. DSHS says a single person should be able to live on less than \$800 a month but where? Not in Seattle unless that single person is renting a room in someone's house and even then they may not be able to survive. Homelessness, crime, addiction, mental health issues have risen just as fast if not faster than the cost of living. I have lived in Seattle the majority of my life and I had never seen tents on the city streets, especially not in downtown until the last few years. What is going on in this city? There's a star law stating that housing needs to be provided for the new comers but what about those that already live here and have for most of not all of their life? Apartments, apodments, and tiny homes are being built with the latter two so small a person can barely make a step in costing over \$900 a month to live in. African Americans, Natives, and other people of color have been forced to move out of Seattle or to the streets because they can't afford the high costs of living. Services are limited for addiction and mental health. There are long waiting lists to get help. Crime has gone up so much that it's not safe to leave your home if you have one. The police force has been decreased so when a crime happens you can't even expect them to show up before it's too late. Seattle needs to be made safe again.	8/23/2022
Francesca Oaksford	Please study an Alternative 6	I am a renter in the Capitol Hill neighborhood, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create an equitable, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: * Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed * Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: * Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining * Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks * Increase diversity throughout the city * Promote environmental justice The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also greenest cities in the world with almost 30% green space and a population of almost 10 million, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Here is a link to a picture of this city: https://unsplash.com/photos/wNWxhHjdl6Q Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle. This comment was created with the aid of https://alternative6.org (https://alternative6.org/) --very grateful for this site!	8/23/2022
Braeden Van Deynze	Consider removing the golf course!	It's a no-brainer that an alternative under which the golf course is removed must be studied when it comes to land use change surrounding the 135th/145th St stations. Failure to do so would commit to wasting 1/4th of the already limited walkshed around these stations. The golf course represents one of the few undeveloped areas of the city where we can provide homes for new residents while immediately providing access to transportation options. Seattle must be a leader in accommodating the inevitable growth our region is experiencing. How can we expect our neighbors in the Sound Transit service area to continue to fund expanding and supporting our light rail system when we waste their investments on stations surrounded by fenced lawns?	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Joanna Cullen	One of the alternatives doesn't have a explanation	This seems a secret group that has certainly generated support. For those of you discussing some alternative 6, is there a website where I can see it?	8/23/2022
Justin Oaksford	Alternative 6: Everywhere Is Appropriate	<p>While reading the presented alternatives, the thing that sticks in my head is that the alternatives all contain within them the insinuation that "We can't just build mixed use, mid-rise housing anywhere. We must control where these larger multi-family buildings go." I do not know why this is the case. There is a completely unaddressed idea that these dense buildings have some kind of negative impact on the city that must be mitigated, but what those impacts might be are not stated. In alternative 5, the language "...more areas identified as appropriate for more housing and mixed-use development..."- Who identified those places as appropriate? What was their criteria? Where was that recorded? What makes areas inappropriate for more housing? Who gets to decide that? The future of this process can not proceed from a place where these undeclared perspectives are the foundation. We need to begin from a place without pre-conceived ideas of what is or isn't appropriate as defined by some invisible party of record- a place of lofty ideals that are not per-negotiated before they've even reached the public's desk. Alternatives 1-5 all *start* from a flawed foundation that assumes we *must* protect the wealthiest people in the city. That they are the most important. We must not let that be what we are bargaining against. We must ask the questions: * Who are we serving? * How do we measure how well we are delivering? * What tools do we have to adapt? * WHO ARE WE SERVING? Our current system has seen eye-popping home equity gains for homeowners thanks to an artificially limited housing supply. This same lack of supply which has driven up prices, squeezing the bottom half of the city further and further, driving many out of the city or into homelessness. We must make sure our comp plan's explicit goals are to create a city for all incomes, not just high incomes. Any bias that favors the approval of the home-owning class- a class that derives it's value on the scarcity of land- will inherently foster a continuation of our status quo. "Will home owners feel negatively affected" vs. "Will this further drive people into rental burden, displacement, and homelessness" are not equivalently weighted interests. * HOW DO WE MEASURE HOW WELL WE ARE DELIVERING? The comp plan should contain an awareness of when it is failing. One of the largest failures of previous comp plans were insufficient tools when it became clear that the status quo resulted in our current overlapping crises- which is why this</p>	8/23/2022
K Stewart	98118 was THE most ethnically diverse zip code in the 2010 US census	<p>... in one of the LEST ethnically diverse cities in the 2010 US census. If we are actually concerned about 'displacement' and 'equity' then we MUST find a stream of revenue that is not tied to property taxes! As someone who was lucky enough to buy a home in Seattle 30 years ago with a \$20,000 windfall inheritance and a bank loan, followed by a small refinance to remove asbestos, oil furnace, lead pipes and knob and tube wiring in my 900 sqft 1916 house, instead of paying off my 30yr mortgage this year, I was lucky enough to possibly default and force the refinance I couldn't get (even with 400% equity), I will now be paying off my mortgage when I am 90 years old, assuming the taxes and insurance on my McMansion don't continue to jump in 25 and 40% increments. Many of my neighbors are retired, or retiring soon, and most do not believe they can stay in their paid-off homes once they are on a fixed income. 'Of course they could sell their home and have plenty of money...' ... and go where? No one should have to leave their friends, family, place of worship, their entire support network, because someone with more money wants what they've worked their entire lives for. Through no fault of their own they now find they are outnumbered at the ballot box by a majority 'Renter's Market' who happily votes to 'let the property owners pay for it...' Sleepy little weird Seattle has a single income stream based on property taxes because housing was always affordable in this backward, and backwood, corner of nowhere. Interestingly, Tacoma has managed to attract both industry and density, without loosing it's soul, or the people who made it. Not ALL property owners in Seattle are well off. Some of us have just been here a long time and planned our future's here. The vast majority of us are happy to share. This is not sharing, its taking advantage.</p>	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Rick Mohler	Let's be true to the concept of "One Seattle"	I moved to Seattle from my native Philadelphia in the fall of 1986. I visited that summer to decide if I would move here and was struck by two things - the beauty of the natural environment surrounding the city and the astounding lack of housing diversity within it. I saw a limited number of apartment buildings downtown and in neighborhoods and a seemingly endless undulating grid of detached homes at suburban densities. Since that time more than 35 years ago, our growth strategy and land use and zoning codes have largely reinforced this dichotomy of housing types and, in the process, damaged our environment by inducing car dependency, segregated our city by race and class by limiting housing diversity in all neighborhoods, driven our neighbors out of their homes or out of the city by limiting housing quantity and created two cities - one for the homeowners "haves" and the other the renting "have-nots." We have an unprecedented opportunity to shift our trajectory in 2024 and be true to the concept of One Seattle. The only proposed alternative that does so is Alternative 5 - Combined. Although, even here we must ensure that the amount of housing allowed will prompt the development of the housing we desperately need in all neighborhoods now and not ten years from now. We should also allow a diversity of uses in all neighborhoods to ensure that everyone can live within a short walk, bike ride or bus ride of their essential daily needs. Some refer to this as the "15-Minute City" but I would simply call it The City.	8/23/2022
Matthew Fox	Keep the promises you made since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted	As someone who has watched DCLU/DPD/SDCI systematically break just about every promise it ever made to neighborhoods (growth will pay for growth, we will replace affordable housing, etc etc ad nauseum) to get the initial Comprehensive Plan adopted I urge SDCI and the City Council to reject any plans to allow upzoning anywhere and everywhere in Seattle. Some of the best deals in rental housing are in older single family homes throughout the City, and incentivizing their destruction will drive rents up, not down. But yeah, developers love those sweet sweet profits, and the City has a long history of doing whatever developers want, so I guess I'm not holding my breath that any of the promises that have been made over the years to get the camel's nose a bit further under the tent will ever be kept. The suburbs are looking better and better.	8/23/2022
Lester Thompson	I prefer option 5	After reviewing each of the proposed options I believe number 5 is the most equitable for everyone. We have to understand that life and circumstances change. We have to select the best housing alternative for all of us, not just a few of us. Thank you.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Steve Zemke	Address Trees, Urban Forest, Climate Resiliency, Environmental Equity & Housing	Need to evaluate in all proposals the benefits of trees and urban forest and the impact of the loss of trees, tree canopy and the urban forest. on climate resiliency, environmental equity and justice , housing density and affordably and health of people working and living in Seattle in all proposals evaluated. Additional concerns and issues noted below: * Evaluate benefits and options to create more equitable park and open space areas across the city, including pocket parks * Evaluate impacts of lack of tree canopy in industrial areas on workers and on surrounding homes and options to address * Evaluate in all housing options the benefits of trees and urban forest canopy cover and the impacts when tree canopy is lost * Evaluate the changing ratios of park and open space acres per 1000 residents * Report the projected increase in numbers of people who would lack sidewalks in their neighborhoods as density increases in areas without sidewalks * Evaluate lack of tree canopy impacts on neighborhoods near freeways and other major transit corridors * Evaluate transit availability in all zoning options proposed, including east/west corridors in relation to access to frequent transit * Evaluate projected increase in urban heat domes and heat island impacts as building density and lot coverage increases * Evaluate options and benefits to add trees and/or solar panels to existing parking lots * Evaluate loss of climate resiliency as trees are removed for denser building across the city * Evaluate impacts of increased air traffic at Sea TAC on Seattle neighborhoods affected * Evaluate possible new building guidelines and lot coverage that could increase retaking more trees during development. * Evaluate requiring setbacks on multifamily lots to require more trees and shrubs along sidewalks and roads to reduce heat impacts. * Calculate the ability to create more pocket parks in each scenario to provide more greenspace, tree covered areas and playgrounds for residents and families * Calculate infrastructure impacts and costs in different scenarios regarding sewers, water, electric, police and fire protection * Project with each option what sectors of jobs will be created and where people will work * Project what impact, including pollution, is expected with more electric cars and buses and trucks and rail and ships * Project impact with each option on families with children entering or leaving Seattle and impacts on school building, location, access and cost involved * Calculate potential small business impacts for each scenario as to their ability to	8/23/2022
T. Nguyen	Alternative 6 is a win for all of us	I grew up in Seattle, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Prioritize building many more affordable multi-family homes with 3+ bedrooms - Upzone the entire city - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Expand the bike lane and trail network - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Create a more affordable city for everyone - Increase walkability - Improve mental health - Create climate resilience - Reduce the urban heat island effect - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We	8/23/2022
Ruedi Risler	Multiple Thoughts for the Comprehensive Plan	in the attached file I have summarized my thoughts about items to be considered in the update of the comprehensive plan.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Chris Howell	Let's be a real city - support alternative 6	<p>I am a system engineer/administrator living in SLU; I lived in Tokyo for decades before returning to Seattle and have not owned a car since 1995 by choice and have loved living a car-free life in one of the densest, biggest cities in the world. I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow high-rises across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Upzone the entire city - Allow 12-plexes across the entire city - Allow sixplexes across the entire city - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow mid-rises across the entire city and high-rises near frequent transit - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Legalize missing middle housing, apartments, and condos in all current single-family neighborhoods - Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Eliminate parking minimums - Expand transit coverage, frequency, and reliability - Build accessible sidewalks throughout the entire city <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enable many more people to live closer to their jobs and reduce their commute times - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Reduce vehicle miles traveled - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Improve mental health - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seattle already faces a housing shortage of dire proportions and none of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle is decades behind having enough housing for everyone. None of the current options allow enough housing to be built throughout the city. - Seattle's current zoning has failed to create equitable growth, displacing people from historically marginalized communities and creating worse health outcomes. Alternatives 1-5 would perpetuate this failure. The city of Seoul, one of the densest but also 	8/23/2022
Catherine Ruha	Climate Housing "One" Seattle	<p>We must retain trees and plant more. Greenery cools. We will bake and be miserable if we don't foster Trees and other plant life. You think folks are unhappy with no affordable housing- they will be just as unhappy if there are no trees, birds, plants and flowers to settle their anxious hearts. Many people are facing a housing crisis in housing availability and affordability. At the same time, we are facing a climate crisis that we need to respond to and a glaring inequality in our urban natural environment across the city. Our trees and urban forest are a critical element in our Emerald City. They are important for reducing heat island impacts and stormwater runoff, our mental and physical health, animal and plant habitats, reducing air and water pollution, and for noise and stress reduction. We need to both support increased housing and protect and enhance the city's urban forest at the same time. We need to plan for growth and build communities across the city that are healthy, equitable and livable for everyone. Both, And.</p>	8/23/2022
Ryan Talen	Real Change Alternative 6	<p>Seattle needs to dramatically increase density and build a city where everyone can find their basic needs within a short walk. Real Change's proposal is the way to go.</p>	8/23/2022
Ann Stevens	Option to reduce allowed footprint on single family homes	<p>An additional option that should be considered: What if the allowed footprint of the primary building(impermeable surfaces) was reduced on single family zoned parcels? This would reduce the size of new homes, making them more affordable and allowing for the protection of more green infrastructure, including large trees. It would reduce all the livable modest homes that are destroyed, preserving affordable housing and eliminating large construction waste from torn down homes. It would make room for more DADUs. The constant new construction in my neighborhood does not increase density, in fact fewer people often live in the new dwelling than lived in the one that was torn down. Removal of large trees is permitted so that the developer can build the largest home allowed on the parcel. Many dumpsters of waste are hauled to landfills from each site. Very livable modest homes are destroyed. This doesn't make sense in an affordable housing and hotter climate crisis. Secondly, all of the options need to be viewed through a climate change lens as well as an equity lens. Both of these crises need urgent attention.</p>	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Matthew MacLean	Focused and Smart Growth	I'm a long-time resident having moved to Seattle 20 years ago and I am currently raising my family in one of our historic neighborhoods. One of the main reasons I originally chose to settle in Seattle is the character of its neighborhoods: The tree-lined streets, beautiful houses, parks, etc. I would strongly encourage to not to update the zoning laws in a manner that would change the character of our neighborhoods. I understand the need to build more housing in order to address housing affordability. I also understand the challenges we face because of space limitations. I do believe there is a compromise approach that would work to increase housing while maintaining the character of the city. I would advocate for a more focused approach that would allow the development of additional multi-family housing capacity in transit corridors and main thoroughfares throughout the city. I also advocate expanding current urban villages. However, I oppose rezoning all single-family home neighborhoods. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to weigh in.	8/23/2022
owen.pickford@gmail.com Pickford	Allow dense housing everywhere with a reasonable alternative 6	We know dense apartment buildings drive down housing cost, contribute to below market housing, improve environmental outcomes, support local businesses and increase tax revenue. None of the proposed acknowledge these facts. Which is why we need a much more bold alternative 6. Seattle is a city, not a suburb.	8/23/2022
Susan McGann	We are the human forest	We are the human forest Where all the trees are different Yes, we all share the same sun the same air the same rain the same soil where all our roots connect with each other WE ARE THE HUMAN FOREST See attachment Alternative 6: More Housing for Climate	8/23/2022
Walt Bubelis	Option 4 My Choice	I feel that Option 4 best allows for density to occur but also trees to co-exist. In times of climate change, saving mature trees is so important. Developers need to be restrained in clear-cutting plots with only a small fine attached to their disregard to existing rules regulating the number and size of what can be removed. I suggest that in the framework of either urban villages and/or city focus cores that buildings taller than 6 stories be allowed such as we are starting to see in the U-District. By this approach alone, surrounding neighborhoods don't have to give up the ghost. In this vein, I think the Sound Link station planned for 130th should be dropped; otherwise the residential neighborhood there will be destroyed. We desperately need more trees - specially large scale trees - for areas that already suffer from excess heat and low humidity right now. Developers need to have adequate spacing for such built into the planning regulations.	8/23/2022
Mark Onnen	Single family housing is unattainable and unsustainable	It is unconscionable that such a huge portion of our city is given over solely to single family housing, a form of housing that at this point only very wealthy people can afford. The Urban Village strategy has placed an enormous amount of development pressure on the few areas of the city where apartments are allowed, (overwhelmingly older, denser neighborhoods) reinforcing a false dichotomy between preserving history and improving density and our supply of housing. In order for housing to be affordable, in order for Seattle to be a 15 minute city, exclusionary zoning must end citywide.	8/23/2022
Billy Kerechek	Stick with 5 options and let's move faster	Public planning and public infrastructure projects take too long and try to make everyone happy. I suggest we spend less time trying to solve all the cities problems through the EIS process and zoning changes. I do not believe the homeless crisis or climate crisis were caused by or made worse by our current zoning. Housing affordability has been impacted and I think options 3 and 5 work to address that. I lived in NYC for 7 years and loved the density, but eventually got tired of it and moved back to Seattle to live in a single family home. We should keep some places as single family homes for the people that want to live in single family homes next to other single family homes.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Badar Ahmed	Climate Emergency needs bold action with an Alternative 6	<p>I am a homeowner in the Northeast Magnolia along the noisy Interbay train tracks. I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a sustainable, diverse place to live into the future. Seattle has a great opportunity to be an urban leader in the US with bold imagination. We are living in the midst of a new geological age (Anthropocene) caused by unprecedented Climate Change. Seattle must be ready for an influx of Climate refugees coming our way in the next 20 years. A recent Washington Post (https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/interactive/2022/extreme-heat-risk-map-us/) article spells out "By mid-century, nearly two-thirds of Americans will experience perilous heat waves, with some regions in the South expected to endure more than 70 consecutive days over 100 degrees". The Pacific Northwest is expected to fare better than many other parts of the country. Seattle being a major city in this geography must be ready for accelerated migration patterns that it has not seen before. 2053 Heat Model of US A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Allow mid-rises across the entire city * Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household. This means allow mixed use including storefronts for small businesses in every neighborhood * Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials * Allow public transportation investments to be more successful due to increased density <p>If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ensure the best health outcomes for children, which have been shown to occur inside mixed income neighborhoods * Reduce rates of homelessness * Reduce carbon emissions per capita * Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining <p>The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: The current options maintain Seattle's failed "arterial focused development" Urban Village strategies, which have forced almost all existing multi-family homes to be located on noisy, polluted roads. Equitable growth means the entire city can grow together, rather than concentrating narrow pockets of development. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of</p>	8/23/2022
Annie Fanning	Request for Option 4: Pedestrian Walkways between Corridors	<p>I prefer the Option 4 methodology to put the emphasis on developing the corridors, but to add new green space requirements to add more street trees, more pocket parks for larger trees, and better pedestrian safety. There should be an emphasis on increasing walkability between corridors with pleasant pedestrian routes. Wherever possible pedestrian loops should be planned so that people have options to walk different ways to use different transit options. Example: Consider what could be done at the public (and private property) at the north end of Beaver Pond Natural Area to create a walkway to link Roosevelt with 5th Avenue and ultimately the Northgate light rail station. Adding nice wide sidewalks along natural areas may not give total access, but it could provide a vantage point to view natural systems like the creek, forest and floodplain. Sidewalks with natural drainage systems should be employed and the City should think about creating a specialized department to manage the green spaces that exist outside of Parks that could function as green infrastructure for drainage as well as providing a vegetation buffer to clean the air and provide healthy canopy that cools the urban heat centers. Example: Walk along Lake City Way and notice the patchwork of unkempt green spaces. There is opportunity to create a network of pocket parks and pathways that could help people get their steps in while they make their transit connections. It is much nicer to walk in a long skinny park than to walk right next to traffic.</p>	8/23/2022
Ethan Schaffer	Consider larger population increase from climate refugees	<p>Each alternative assumes 132,000 new jobs over 20 years. While we're in the conceptual stage, we should consider the possibility of a large spike in growth from climate refugees. Seattle often ranks as one of the best cities to withstand climate change. We could experience a much larger influx as people flee areas with more intense impacts. We may also see an intensification of the tech boom we've already experienced.</p>	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Chris Machielse	We need a housing and climate emergency alternative	* Incorporate studying new or expanded urban villages into the "Focused Growth" Alternative 2. The existing urban village boundaries reflect patterns of inequitable development where high real estate areas full of detached single family homes were able to skirt becoming urban villages in spite of having frequent transit connections and short transit/bike/walking commutes to major employers * Adjust Alternative 3 to include more housing types than duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes. Small walk-up apartment buildings of 2-4 stories used to be common before single family zoning and should be permitted outright. Development codes should incentive building types with accessible home ownership formats like stacked flats. * Add a new Climate Emergency Alternative 6 that studies additional density, coordinated with other parts of the Seattle Transportation Plan to truly facilitate zero carbon transportation options. * Maximize housing production near new high capacity transit stops at 145th St, 130th St, Graham St. * Study each alternative to measure the impact of reduced or lower housing production in Seattle, specifically factors such as the deforestation, additional VMTs, permeable surface, etc that get built in the far flung suburbs due to Seattle's lack of housing production and high prices which push more housing, vehicle miles, etc into other areas of the region	8/23/2022
Lisa Pfeiffer	We desperately need complete zoning reform and a 15 minute city	I am a homeowner in Madison Valley, and I believe that Seattle needs to create an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the bare minimum, but will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create a vibrant, diverse place to live into the future. A much better option would be an Alternative 6, which at a minimum would: - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Allow quadplexes across the entire city - Allow apartments, condos, and missing middle housing to be built in current single-family neighborhoods - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access - Expand the bike lane and trail network If the city of Seattle adopted this proposed Alternative 6 option, then we would be able to: - Enhance housing security of renters and low-income folks - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions - Reduce segregation and begin to correct the legacy of redlining - Reduce reliance on cars and thereby enhance mobility for many disabled folks - Reduce harmful air pollution from cars - Enhance water quality and salmon survival via a reduction in car tire pollution - Increase diversity throughout the city - Increase walkability - Increase accessibility - Create a more vibrant and thriving economy - Allow for more opportunities for small businesses The other options (Alternatives 1-5) fall short for many reasons, including the following: - Seattle needs many more types of housing than currently exist or that the current alternatives allow for. We need a lot more denser housing that is close to green space, amenities, jobs, and transit. The city of Vienna, where more than 60% of the city's residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue, is a good example of what I would most like Seattle to become. Please study this proposed Alternative 6 so that we can truly begin to solve the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/23/2022
Matt Williamson	We need to do better. Zoning is the first step.	Our zoning needs to both allow and incentivize developers to build the housing we need in this region. For better or for worse, in this country housing gets built because someone is able to make enough money to justify the huge amount of risk it takes to do so. The home you live in was not built out of the kindness of someone's heart. People are going to keep moving here as long as there is plenty of opportunities and access to the great outdoors and good coffee and teriyaki and everything else that makes Seattle great. Housing units built have lagged new residents for the past decade, so we are already behind. If the incentives for development do not acknowledge this the issues that we are facing will keep getting worse. "Show me the incentive and I will show you the outcome." — Charlie Munger	8/23/2022
Callie Neylan	Trees, please.	I would love to see more robust, comprehensive, updated tree regulations in this plan. Our urban canopy is so important to the future of Seattle and its people. Under current regulations, I sometimes wonder if the city cares about our trees that much at all.	8/23/2022
Travis Kelly	We are thousands of dwelling short now	So I don't have any studies to link to or original research I can draw from, (and I am not sock puppeting like some of the comments here 😊), but Seattle needs to desperately increase the density within its city limits and ideally across the entire Puget sound region. Housing is extremely unaffordable for renters and middle income earners now, and at current rates of construction it will only get worse as demand continues to outstrip supply. Denser zoning and accelerated construction takes time, and the sooner we start the better. The best time to plant a tree was 20 years ago, the second best time is now.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Stephen P	Who is Seattle for? (We deserve better alternatives!)	It's unfortunate that the alternatives presented in this draft EIS are clearly derived from unimaginative, insular, and retrograde thinking that has contributed to the current housing crisis, even as the language used in the draft begins to articulate both the sources and scope of the problem. As Seattle rapidly continues to price out higher and higher income brackets with each passing year, the urgency and scope of the problem is clearly obvious to anyone who is not wealthy. Of the alternatives shown in the current draft, Alternative 5 is the only one that remotely begins to address the scope of the housing crisis that Seattle is facing. Even then---as others have pointed out---the language in the (intentionally) vague description of Alternative 5 implies that mixed uses is not 'appropriate' in certain areas. This is indicative of the backwards thinking that pervades urban development dialogs in the United States; I have yet to encounter any neighborhood in Seattle where mixed-use development with functions like corner stores, restaurants, and retail would not improve the liveliness, culture, community, and aesthetic of the local area to the benefit of those living nearby (even the ones who didn't want it built in the first place). Study an Alternative 6 that would take the situation we find ourselves in seriously. Include rowhouses, courtyard apartments, sixplexes, and other 'missing middle' housing types within the low-scale residential category in which they belong and drastically expand mid-rise and high-rise areas in a way that includes necessary allocations to shared urban greenspace and other important amenities. An alternative that takes solutions to the issues outlined in the draft seriously MUST deviate from previous approaches in tangible ways, not simply with the correct language. One on side: allowing for dramatically denser neighborhoods is a fundamental component of sustainable living, creates a more healthy, active, interesting, engaging, and connected community life, allows for working people to have a chance at accessing homeownership options, reduces displacement, increases efficient use of resources, encourages public stewardship of natural resources, and assists in addressing historical inequities. On the other side: those who already own their 'slice of Seattle' in the form of a single-family home watch their home values continue to increase while concentrating increasingly unaffordable development into a relatively small area of the city. The choice should be clear. For someone like me---a working	8/23/2022
forrest nu	Please consider an Alternative 6: Welcoming Communities Strategy	I have been renting in Seattle for 8 years and I ask Seattle to study an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 appears to be the bare minimum. Why not aim higher with an Alternative 6, which would address our housing crisis with a sense of urgency and grow us into a greener city? Alternative 6 would, at minimum: * Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from busy streets by allowing mid-rises across the entire city * Ensure public and free-to-access green space is within a 15 minute walk of every household * Streamline the permitting and review process for Affordable housing, and ideally for all housing, to reduce development time and costs. * Incentivize permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed If Seattle pursued this Alternative 6, we would be able to: * Enable more people to live closer to their jobs and have greener commutes * More quickly increase the supply of housing to accommodate both the people already living here (reducing homelessness), and those who will migrate here * Reduce segregation * Ensure better health outcomes from children (& everyone), by developing housing away from busy streets and closer to parks Alternatives 1 - 5 are inadequate for several reasons, including: * We are facing a dire housing shortage and need to respond at scale, quickly, by incentivizing the development of affordable housing throughout the city and streamlining the permitting and review process * The current strategy of 'arterial focused development' sucks. I have lived next to busy streets for the past 8 years, it's difficult to find affordable alternatives, and the constant traffic is stressful and dangerous for children and adults. * Allowing more density away from arterials could let us convert more streets to pedestrian and cycling paths, and green spaces Amsterdam is a great example of mid-rises throughout the city, with many quiet streets dominated by cyclists and pedestrians. Or Vienna where many residents live in social housing and homelessness is not an issue. Please study this Alternative 6 so that we can take impactful action to address the housing, homelessness, climate, inequality, and affordability crises in Seattle.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Mark Foltz	Welcoming Wallingford - Seattle Comprehensive Plan 2024 DEIS Scoping Comment	Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development OneSeattleCompPlan@seattle.gov August 22, 2022 Seattle is more than a decade into its housing crisis, where a combination of economic growth, housing underproduction, and housing over-regulation has resulted in massive displacement of those not fortunate enough to afford housing costs here. Some families have been able to relocate to regional suburbs. Many of those less fortunate are living in their cars or the street. Allowing the market to force people from their homes because they were outbid is unacceptable in a city that claims to be inclusive, diverse and progressive. Unfortunately, a status quo approach will result in the current crisis becoming ever deeper. The tech economy emerged from COVID even stronger than before and will continue to create high paying jobs in Seattle. In addition, the climate catastrophe will drive households from regions with even higher housing costs to relocate to Seattle, believing this region will avoid the worst impacts. Seattle must adopt a bold and transformative approach to housing with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan. In addition to stimulating the production of housing across the city, Seattle must use this opportunity to reckon with its legacy of racist housing policies including redlining, and the use of single-family zoning to segregate Seattle's families by class and exclude renters. In addition to the five alternatives proposed for the DEIS, Welcoming Wallingford asks the Office of Planning and Community Development to study an additional Alternative 6 that: * Expands on the Combined Growth Strategy with policies to create abundant, affordable housing throughout the entirety of Seattle; * Specifically states a goal of implementing anti-displacement strategies as requested by the Comprehensive Plan Racial Equity Analysis [1]; * Ends the prevalence of single-family zoning and replaces it with a racially inclusive approach that allows maximal growth of the most affordable housing types in areas of high opportunity; * Creates a connected network of complete neighborhoods that allow a variety of housing types, including not just homes but small businesses, community spaces, and social infrastructure; * Explores density bonuses and exemptions from setback requirements for green buildings, to encourage mass timber and passive house techniques. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan is a generational opportunity for Seattle to correct the mistakes of the past and lead the nation in building inclusive and sustainable housing	8/23/2022
Kayla F	Towards a Better Seattle	How is this city supporting the next generation who are actively stimulating our culture and future? I am a young professional who is finding it increasingly difficult to afford living in this city and I believe the Alternatives presented in this proposal are too vague and unimaginative. They allow for a little or a lot, even in their most extreme instance (Alternative 5). The graphics associated with each alternative are misleading and do not represent the wording alongside them. There is no commitment to eradicating single family zoning that is ultimately segregating our population and pricing people out. Wording such as 'more areas identified as appropriate for more housing and mixed use' in the most 'extreme' proposal, Alternative 5, are still limiting density. Not to mention that a reliance on car culture in these single family neighborhoods is hurting our environment. Urban centers should be wide spread and plentiful. Every home should have access to basic amenities within a 20 minute walk. That is how we create a thriving and healthy Seattle. Please study an Alternative 6.	8/23/2022
Jacob Read	Alternative 5 is good. An alternative 6 would be far better	Seattle must create a wide variety of new housing options that enable a car free or car-lite lifestyle, while making up for it's historical lack of housing production. I am a Seattle homeowner who grew up in the area, but my current home is too small for the family I want to have in the future, and is located on a loud busy street. I want to have children in this city and have my children grow up in a neighborhood that is vibrant and safe for them to play, and, crucially, where I can afford to live. Alternative 5 is the only option on this slate that comes anywhere close to offering this option, but the alternative 6 proposed by a number of grassroots community groups would be even better. I want to live a sustainable lifestyle with my family which does not require a car, and I want this lifestyle to be available and affordable to all who want it. Why does the city seem so hell-bent on making this type of choice illegal through things like apartment bans, or plans that force people like me to live on dangerous, heavily trafficked streets? There is a better option and it involves allowing multifamily housing anywhere a property owner wishes to build it. We can do this and ensure that Seattle is a city that continues to grow into the future.	8/23/2022
Carol Achtmeyer	Keep urban density core	Seattle should continue to increase density within the urban village areas and make it easier to allow small additional dwelling units or to allow a duplex. However if the single family areas are up zoned to high density we will loss trees, yards and open areas for us all to enjoy. Trees provide wildlife habitat and keep the city cooler. Parking will be awful as will traffic. Maybe we need to look towards a sustainable city density and stop giving tax breaks to large companies and encouraging unending growth.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Ram H	Safe, year-round comfortable bicycle paths	Bicycles, whether traditional or electric are more efficient than even Bus Rapid Transit. In what ways could we create more corridors for bicycle traffic that would invite more people to bicycle more days of the year? What if major new buildings, as part of their permitting, were required to contribute to covered streets that would have large, comfortable lanes for residents to bicycle with, perhaps, a central lane for bus rapid transit. These corridors will grow to connect dense neighborhood areas and transit hubs at the outskirts of the city where there is parking for people coming from out of town, or bringing their cars to the City. With newer technology like clear solar panels, these arches could potentially locally power lighting at night during a good part of the year (https://interestingengineering.com/innovation/transparent-solar-panels-replace-windows-in-the-future-heres-how). The novelty of this experience would certainly bring additional tourism to the City as people come from around the world to marvel at the city that bicycles through glass, solar-power generating tunnels.	8/23/2022
A S	Support Alternative 1 - Preserve Seattle's Single-Family Neighborhoods	I strongly prefer Alternative 1, which supports preserving Seattle's single-family zoned neighborhoods as one type of neighborhood in the city – one where many families prefer to live and raise their children. Many single-family zoned neighborhoods are beautiful, historic, and will attract people for generations to come who desire the strong communities they engender. Allowing developers to tear up such communities with cookie-cutter, box-like housing is short-sighted and unnecessary and will not solve Seattle's housing problem.	8/23/2022
Nolan Hibbard-Pelly	Investigate the effects of teargas from Seattle police	Both on people and the environment the particulate can remain in neighborhoods after months. Rainwater collects what's left from the explosions and takes it to the sewers and groundwater streams around the area.	8/23/2022
Christy Lewis	Urban development that fosters community cohesion	Regardless of the solution we choose, I would like us to include a consideration of the effect of our planning, development, transportation needs, green-spaces & climate issues on community-building and the feeling of community in our city. The development of our physical spaces should so foster our human health and connection with one another. I hope the Urban Planners are taking this into account. As well, I tend to lean toward the Alternative 6 solution, one that includes beauty, density and health of the citizenry.	8/23/2022
Michael Jones	Ideas for Seattle	I would like to see more trees planted across the City. I would like the City to preserve as many single family homes as possible and focus density in the commercial districts around the City. The City currently seems to be promoting public transit and limiting cars. However, public transit, as it currently is envisioned, is not sufficient to make up for people getting rid of their cars. Because of this, I'd like the City to continue to support reasonable access for cars, while building a better, more reliable public transit system. I would like the City to enforce the laws and guidelines that it has. This could be as simple as ticketing people who let their dogs off leash in a park to actually following the City's own building codes and guidelines. I would like to see the City limit growth to what it can actually handle given the resources we have available. The rate of growth has dramatically outstripped our resources to support it. This is making the City substantially less livable.	8/23/2022
Kate Rubin	Alternative 6: A Seattle that is accessible and affordable for everyone	Everyone should have a safe, affordable, accessible home. Single-family zoning is exclusionary and is no longer practical or suitable in Seattle. Owning a home is rapidly becoming a privilege for only the wealthy. No one should have to spend hours commuting because they cannot afford to live where they work. The minimum wage has fallen so far below a living wage that low-to-middle income earners are being pushed further and further out of the city, with Black and Indigenous communities being disproportionately displaced as the neighborhoods that they were forced into due to redlining are gentrifying. We need social housing in every single neighborhood in order for everyone to thrive. Social housing creates truly cross-class communities, giving folks in the 0-120% AMI range access to the same amenities and housing stability that homeowners experience.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Margaret Shield	much more affordable housing for a thriving, healthy city for all of us	Hello, and thanks so much for this process and the opportunity to comment. My husband and I are long-time residents of Seattle (30+ years), former renters in several different neighborhoods, and are now homeowners in Cedar Park. We love Seattle and believe that Seattle needs to reimagine itself as an affordable, livable city for people of all incomes in every community. Seattle needs a LOT more affordable housing that is truly affordable for people of every income level. Despite our good salaries, we know that we could never afford to buy a home again now in Seattle. We have been dismayed for years to see so many friends and colleagues who we value and need in our community being forced to live far away from Seattle because they cannot afford a home to rent or buy near where they work in the city. This is not fair. It's not sustainable for our society or our environment, and it is not something that should be accepted any more. Seattle can do better and it will make us a better and happier city - for everyone. Because of our experiences, I support creating an Alternative 6 option for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Of the current options, Alternative 5 is the best choice, but I do see it as the bare minimum that will still not be enough to resolve the many crises our city faces and will certainly not be enough to create an equitable and sustainable city with a place for all community members into the future. For a better Alternative 6, I would like to see the following minimums: - Upzone the entire city, including allowing more housing density options including mid-rises across the city, high rises near frequent transit, and quadplexes across the city. - Legalize missing middle housing of all types throughout the entire city, including in all current single-family neighborhoods - Allow much more multi-family housing to be built away from noisy, polluted arterials - Incentivize and enable permanently affordable, cross-class, social housing to be developed - Ensure all major services are within a 15-minute walk of every single household - Encourage tree cover by allowing multi-story housing everywhere as long as it incorporates open spaces such as courtyards and plazas - Add more neighborhood parks, particularly in low-income and non-white neighborhoods and areas currently underserved by parks - Convert underutilized golf courses near frequent transit into affordable housing and truly public parks that are free to access. I support this specifically near the new 145th Street light rail station to help increase	8/23/2022
mike eliason	Maximize Car-Light Ecodistricts and Opportunities near Frequent Transit	Seattle has unfortunately wasted numerous opportunities to build car-light neighborhoods and ecodistricts around frequent transit - including Rapid Ride and Light Rail stops. With several stations presently under construction, and many more that will open with Sound Transit 3 - Seattle is repeating those same mistakes. Cities that are actually leading on urban development and climate (Paris, Amsterdam, Vienna, Singapore) are turning brownfields, large lot redevelopments - and even existing neighborhoods - into sustainable ecodistricts (http://www.wohnfonds.wien.at/media/Website%20PDF-INFO%20Downloads/English%20Information/Broschure_Sonnwendviertel_2018_englisch_web.pdf), while maximizing public investment in high-capacity transit. These well-planned districts feature a broad mix of housing types and uses. They are compact, livable places with a high quality of life and a focus on sustainability and low-carbon living. Unlike anywhere in Seattle (or the U.S. for that matter), they feature strong concepts around urban form, sustainable mobility, open space, nature & biodiversity. They feature community amenities, ample space for jobs, affordable spaces for working, playgrounds, gardens, and abundant housing. The housing options are generally of a variety of types and tenure beyond what the status quo can deliver in Seattle - including cooperatives, various forms of self-developed urban co-housing, LGBTQIA-friendly housing, multigenerational housing, family-friendly housing. Affordable housing is naturally prioritized in these locations - with social housing achieving rates of 30% to 100% in these districts. It's *amazing* what other cities can do when they have better housing politics and land use policies. It doesn't stop there. Streets are either car-free or traffic calmed so that people are not inundated by noise and unsafe motorists. Ample bike and pedestrian connections, connections to transit and mobility hubs. Daycare facilities and schools are integrated into the district - and often can be accessed without crossing major streets. Can you imagine biking, walking, or rolling around your entire neighborhood - and never having to cross a street? This is a model we should be prioritizing around every place with frequent transit.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
mike eliason	Prioritize New Housing and Density Located off Toxic and Dangerous Arterials	The Urban Village strategy centers nearly every Urban Village on loud, polluted and dangerous arterials and even highways. Off of these arterials, few Urban Villages allow much multifamily housing or a mix of uses. It is a strategy that preserves the least sustainable form of housing by hyper-focusing density in the least environmentally friendly (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15234939/) and most unlivable parts of the city. In several Urban Villages, contrary to good urban planning practices, moderate and even low density is limited to one block deep or less, immediately stepping down to detached homes. This strategy is one that results in a very poor quality of life for those living on these streets, and effectively uses renters as buffers to absorb noise and sound pollution (https://www.sightline.org/2021/10/19/confining-rental-homes-to-busy-streets-is-a-devils-bargain/) for single family zoned areas off arterials. Environmental noise exposure can lead to annoyance, sleep disturbance (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4608916/), poor mental health (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7503511/), impaired cognitive function in children (https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1004001), negatively effects the cardiovascular system (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6541745/), and dementia (https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1954). Furthermore, by failing to integrate the Comprehensive Plan with a transformative sustainable mobility plan that deprioritizes private vehicles – the city is planning for a future with even more cars and significantly more traffic noise. The public health impacts of this will be very dire. Focusing dense, affordable housing on these toxic streets results in negative public health outcomes (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412022000861) including increased risk of cancer (https://www.eea.europa.eu/highlights/pollution-and-cancer). It is a malicious approach that divides neighborhoods with 4- and 6- lane arterials and literal highways, preventing these Urban Villages from being livable or walkable. OPCD's alternatives should analyze the public health impacts of the Comprehensive Plan's poor planning policies, and prioritize strategies to correct this egregious and harmful policy.	8/23/2022
Zachary Turcich	Live and Work in Your Neighborhood	I've lived and worked in Ballard for 6 years now. But Seattle's lack of action on housing development and community/transit connections are pricing my fiance and I out of our home. We want to stay here and continue to be a part of this wonderful neighborhood and city. We can only do that with bolder action and more multifamily housing options— especially multifamily housing options like condos and townhomes for residents to own. More paths to homeownership for more people of varied income streams will help bolster city funding of services and spread the costs so that we can all benefit by supporting one another, rather than just relying on single family homeowners to foot the bill in an unsustainable way. We have to also revisit our major arterials and figure out ways to reconnect communities that are split by roads like 15th Ave NW. These areas are noisy, polluting, and dangerous - redesigning these roads to be more multimodal and safer (rather than just posting signs) should be a priority along with density and transit. I'm also tired of comments prioritizing trees over housing. While I like trees and don't think that dense housing and green space are in opposition to one another (in fact quite the opposite!) I am not a bird or a squirrel. I cannot live in a tree. It is simply a rhetorical excuse to discourage new development and strategies that will get people housed and stabilize both city revenue and communities. I support an Alternative 6 that encourages density, walkability, and transit connections - along with more opportunities for light businesses so that people aren't burdened with having to travel as far to get things like home goods, groceries, medical supplies, or to socialize. There are so many excellent ideas and comments here like social housing, higher density city-wide, transit connectivity, and environmental sustainability (from Passivhaus to reducing vmt to greenspace). We should be going bold with our city plans to accommodate all of our residents and workers who keep Seattle thriving. Thanks for this engagement tool; it was straightforward to use and nice seeing the outpouring of support for improving our city.	8/23/2022
Susan Ward	Preserve affordable housing and the tree canopy	All around town we see affordable housing being destroyed and replaced by big new boxes that the former residents cannot afford. The relatively few affordable units that are constructed are usually not in those same neighborhoods, and are consolidated in large apartment buildings. Creating incentives for landlords to maintain affordable rents and preserve buildings, and helping non-profits buy older buildings (like The Arches), maintain them, and keep rents affordable, might keep neighborhoods intact and protect diversity. And stronger tree protections are absolutely essential for the health of our city and its residents. In our increasingly hot, dry summers, the urban canopy is a life-saver. With the intense development that has been going on and promised to continue, we must protect trees, which give us shade, cooler temperatures, oxygen, and better mental health. Street trees are critical and must be protected. Trees on private property also must be. Development must prioritize the preservation and increase of tree canopy.	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Lindsey Grad	healthcare workers demand housing for all, support end to exclusionary zoning	<p>The following is submitted on behalf of SEIU Healthcare 1199NW: Our union of 32,000 healthcare workers includes thousands of members who live and work in the City of Seattle. Too many of them, however, work but cannot live in the city they serve. We represent doctors, nurses, social workers, technicians, dietary and environmental services workers in clinics and hospitals across the city as well as workers in behavioral health, housing, homelessness, and human services—these workers are serving the people of Seattle at some of the most well-known and best-regarded institutions in their field. They are also good, union jobs with strong contracts that keep the healthcare industry in our region a reliable place to fight for economic security in an economy with vanishing options for securing a stable career. And yet despite laboring for their community's health and welfare and building a strong union to provide for themselves and their families too many are facing housing insecurity. The priced-out caregivers of Seattle often times commute from cities and counties more than an hour commute away or worse—this is despite a 24/7 work schedule and on call requirements that mandate they be within 30 minutes of their hospital workplace. People who worked for decades to build economic security find that their kids cannot find housing in the same city or county they were raised in, or that they cannot downsize within their neighborhood when they have an empty nest. Homelessness and housing workers find themselves qualifying for subsidized city housing that they work during business hours to try to enroll clients into. And wage increases are outstretched by rising housing costs. All of this is caused at least in part by inadequate and inappropriate land use in our City. The health impacts of the current land use plans are legion. Long commutes literally shorten lives either through automobile accidents or extra hours of sitting every day—to say nothing of the precious free time workers and their families lose. These commutes also increase particulate matter and carbon emissions which drive respiratory illness, heart disease, and cancers amongst impacted communities. Urban villages concentrate this pollution so that renters face a disproportionate amount of the negative impacts, as do BIPOC communities. The climate impacts of increased emissions are also a health crisis as weather-related disasters increase and diseases and pathogens grow in risk. There is arguably no greater health crisis affecting our city today than</p>	8/23/2022
J D	Hybrid of 2 and 4? + other considerations	<p>Combining options 2 and 4 seems like a logical setup, with expanded and new urban villages contributing to the unique neighborhood centers we know and love while making opportunities for new housing units in the "walk shed" of both services and transit routes to said services. More opportunities for duplexes rather than just ADUs would seem good as well. Since the plan only guides housing and job growth, and the request for comment is about the EIS, please give extra consideration to drainage runoff and tree canopy coverage affected by any changes made. A small setback with natural drainage and greenery and an extra story on the building can be healthier for the landscape than building right up to the sidewalk. And, while not strictly related to the GMA plan, it would be great to see the OPCD: -Encourage opportunities for ownership in some way, be it co-ops, condos, or rent to own schemes. Developers clearly have been focused on rentals because that's what brings in the \$\$\$\$. - Streamline the permitting process, from backyard ADUs to residential highrises. Builders need to be able to provide with units in these areas beyond just luxury ones, and the time and costs required by the permit process are exorbitant compared to peers, increasing build out costs and reducing final affordability. This is a neat platform to provide so thanks for that; unfortunately like so many other public comment situations is seems to have been co-opted by idealists with an agenda and form letters that go beyond the scope of a GMA plan and the city's control.</p>	8/23/2022
Brad Johnson	Preserve, connect & expand natural/park spaces; save the trees first	<p>Regardless of the plan selected, a growing, denser population will need more open spaces, both natural and "recreational". Unlike houses & apartments, which can be added in just a few years, you cannot simply build more 40, 60, or 80-year-old trees! Preserving what you already have needs to come first. Beyond that, parkland corridors/trails should be constructed to connect as many parks, recreational areas, natural areas, public shorelines, etc., together as possible. Focus on existing corridors, such as creeks. Re-purpose golf courses into a variety of park types, but never for housing!</p>	8/23/2022

author_name	title	description	published_at
Mark Stoner	Combine Alternatives 2 and 4 to have more nodes as well as more corridor density	Seattle needs way more small nodes. The "grandfathered-in" tiny nodes that we already have in some of the older neighborhoods are some of the most loved community spots in the city (and the most convenient). But in many newer neighborhoods, these nodes don't exist at all, because the misguided overly-compartmentalized zoning of the recent past didn't allow them. We also should have much higher density allowed along all of our transit corridors. We currently have so many bus routes that just go through expanses of NR zoned areas, which is a waste of our investment in bus service. To maximize the benefit of a transit corridor, there should be substantial upzoning several blocks on either side of that transit street, continuously (not just at nodes). I do not think that every NR zoned area needs to be rezoned for rowhouses and apartment buildings; however, I do think that smaller lot sizes should be allowed, especially in areas with alleys. We should turn a lot of alleys into named streets, so that the back half of a lot could be sold off and have its own address and access.	8/23/2022