



3.6 Land Use Patterns & Urban Form



Source: City of Seattle, 2023.

This section summarizes the affected environment—including the current policy and regulatory frameworks, current land and shoreline uses, physical form, and views—and compares impacts of the alternatives on land use patterns and urban form in the city. The analysis focuses on changes in activity levels and compatibility of change in land use and shoreline patterns, as well as potential changes to physical conditions and views. This includes a review of land use patterns and compatibility, urban form (height, bulk scale, transitions, and tree canopy), shadows, and views in the study area and at the analysis area level (where applicable) as well as resulting equity and climate vulnerability considerations. Details of the thresholds of significance are shared in [Section 3.6.2](#). Mitigation measures and a summary of any significant unavoidable adverse impacts are included following the impacts analysis.

3.6.1 Affected Environment

This section begins with a discussion of the historical context of planning and land use decisions in Seattle. This is followed by a summary of the existing policy and regulatory frameworks—including policies and regulations regarding the height, bulk, and scale of development as well as shadows, and public views—and the resulting general development patterns citywide and by analysis area. The summary addresses land use patterns and development character in Seattle and provides a baseline for analyzing the impacts of the alternative growth scenarios. [Section 3.7 Relationship to Plans, Policies, & Regulations](#) addresses related topics in greater detail, including the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), PSRC’s VISION 2050 and Multi-County Planning Policies (MPPs), King County’s County-Wide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the City’s current Comprehensive Plan.

Overview of Historical Planning & Land Use Decisions

The study area was inhabited extensively by Coast Salish peoples for thousands of years prior to the presence of White settlers in the region. Before European contact, the region was one of the most populated centers in North America. The Indians of the Eastern Puget Sound lived in relatively small, autonomous villages and spoke variations of Lushootseed (*tx^wəlšucid*, *dx^wləšucid*), one of the Coast Salish languages. Many tribes were affiliated through intermarriage, political agreement, trade, and material culture. Indigenous people lived in permanent villages of longhouses or winter houses, and traditionally left their winter residences in the spring, summer, and early fall in family canoes to travel to temporary camps at fishing, hunting, and gathering grounds. At the time of the first White settlements around 1850, natives were living in more than 90 longhouses in at least 17 villages in modern-day Seattle.

This section incorporates evaluation written by City staff from the 2022 [Seattle Industrial and Maritime Strategy Final EIS](#). Additional context was added here to expand the discussion citywide beyond industrial and maritime areas.

See [Section 3.9 Cultural Resources](#) for a more detailed history of indigenous and non-indigenous people in Seattle as well as an overview of historic, archaeological, and other cultural resources in the study area.


Waterways were central to the cultures and livelihoods of native people. "Duwamish" is the Anglo-Europeanized word which meant "people of the inside", *dxʷdəwʔabš*, referencing the interior waters of the Duwamish, Black and Cedar rivers. The Suquamish take their name from the Lushootseed phrase for "people of the clear salt water", and the people living around Lake Washington were collectively known as *hah-choo-AHBSH* or *hah-chu-AHBSH* or *Xacuabš*, People of *HAH-choo* or *Xachu*, "People of a Large Lake" or "Lake People."

Early Alterations to Seattle's Lands & Waterways

Seattle was incorporated in 1869, eighteen years after the first white settlers arrived. Physical alteration of the land and waterways by white settlers is important context for a discussion of land use today. Seattle's land and waterways looked very different prior to construction of the Lake Washington ship canal and other alterations. A series of separate lakes that natives transited with over-land portages, for example, were previously in the location of present day Lake Union. The Lushootseed name for present day Lake Union was *tenas Chuck* or *XáXu7cHoo* ("small great-amount-of-water"), present day Lake Washington was called *hyas Chuck* or *Xacuabš* ("great-amount-of-water"), and the present-day area of the Montlake Cut was called "Carry a Canoe."

Early development viewed Seattle's topography as an obstacle to growth. Construction on a system of locks and cut waterways connecting east to west began in 1911 and culminated in 1916 (see [Exhibit 3.6-1](#)). Waters were connected from Lake Washington's Union Bay to Lake Union to Salmon Bay through a series of locks to Shilshole Bay. Lake Washington's waters were partially drained as a result, lowering the level of the lake by 8.8 feet and drying up more than 1,000 acres of wetlands. Construction of the ship canal and locks resulted in further changes to rivers flows at the south end of Lake Washington. Prior to the alterations, Lake Washington emptied from its south end into the Black River (which no longer exists). The Black River is connected to the Duwamish River, which outlets as it does today to Elliott Bay. The Cedar River—which had previously flowed into the Black River in Renton—was diverted in 1912 directly into the south end of Lake Washington to reduce flooding in Renton. The remaining portion of the Black River dried up in 1916 when Lake Washington's level dropped. Several Indigenous villages were located near the confluence of the Black and Duwamish rivers and the area was long used as a place of refuge. When the Black River vanished, native people were displaced from the area.

Exhibit 3.6-1. Seattle's Shoreline Over Time



Source: Burke Museum, [The Waterlines Project](#), 2009.

The Great Seattle Fire of 1889 prompted a vigorous period of rebuilding with more substantial, and fire-resistant materials like brick and stone. In an effort to create more buildable land for the expanding city, Seattle's city engineers began to regrade large chunks of land with hydraulic hoses. The Denny Hill regrade was one of the single largest efforts in reshaping Seattle's landscape, taking place between 1897 and 1930. Denny Hill originally topped out at about 220 feet in elevation, about half the height of hills such as Queen Anne, Capitol, and Magnolia; by the time regrading ended, the hill's high point had been lowered by more than 100 feet to create the mostly flat land now known as the Denny Regrade ([Exhibit 3.6-2](#)). Runoff and sediment from the Denny Regrade were primarily funneled west into Elliott Bay with some transported to the area around Pine and Olive Streets (creating the smoothed out, relatively gentle slope that now ascends past the Paramount Theater to Capitol Hill).


Exhibit 3.6-2. Denny Regrade Before and After, 1907-1909

Note: Regrade before and after, 2nd Avenue looking north from Pine Street, Seattle, 1907-1909

Sources: Courtesy Washington State Historical Society (1994.1.1.42) via [HistoryLink.org Essay 21204](https://www.historylink.org/essay/21204).

Hundreds of acres of tide flats were filled in during the first decades of the 20th century to create dry land. After completion of the man-made Harbor Island in 1909, the mouth of the Duwamish River was divided into two channels. A subsequent series of major public works projects straightened and dredged the Duwamish riverbed, both to open the area to commercial use and to alleviate flooding. Beginning in 1913, the river was altered to remove oxbows and meanders to maintain high water flows and turning ships and by 1920, 4.5 miles of the Duwamish Waterway had been dredged to a depth of 50 feet, with 20 million cubic feet of mud and sand going into the expansion of Harbor Island. The shallow, meandering, 9-mile-long river became a 5-mile engineered waterway capable of handling ocean-going vessels and the Duwamish basin transitioned into Seattle's industrial and commercial core area. See [Exhibit 3.6-3](#).

Exhibit 3.6-3. The Transformation of the Duwamish Estuary and River



Source: Burke Museum, [The Waterlines Project](#), 2009.

Native villages on the Duwamish were completely supplanted by white settlement and commercial use through the massive alterations of the land and waterways, the destruction of wildlife and fish habitats it caused, and by the occupation of land. White settlers also deliberately removed native settlements as evidenced by burning of Indian longhouses in 1893. Duwamish people continued to work and fish in the area, using man-made "Ballast Island" on the Seattle waterfront as a canoe haul-out and informal market, but by the mid-1920s, most remnants of traditional life along the river had disappeared.

Racially Restrictive Covenants & Zoning Laws

Racially restrictive covenants came into popular use in Seattle after 1920. Covenants were used by property owners, subdivision developers, or realtors to bar the sale or rental of property to specified racial or ethnic groups. Property deeds in predominantly White neighborhoods or desirable areas of new housing development often explicitly stated that no Asian, Black, and Indian people shall be permitted to occupy the property. Seattle residential areas with restrictive covenants include but are not limited to Victory Heights, Queen Anne, Capitol Hill, Blue Ridge, and Hawthorne Hills. Such neighborhoods are located away from the city's industrial areas. By excluding all but White households from covenant-restricted residential areas, eligible locations for homes for Black, Asian, and Indigenous households were more likely to be in close proximity to industrial areas, such as Delridge, South Park, and South Beacon Hill (Honig, 2021; University of Washington, 2020).


In the late 1930s the practice of redlining was used to discriminate against racial minorities as the federal Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC) evaluated mortgage risks in cities across the country. It rated neighborhoods as "best," "still desirable," "definitely declining," and "hazardous" ([Exhibit 3.6-4](#)). Neighborhoods with concentrations of Black, Asian, and Indian households were deemed financially risky and were marked in red so that mortgage lenders were discouraged from financing property there. The HOLC maps promoted racial inequality because it made mortgages difficult to obtain and expensive for minority households who sought to buy homes where they lived, preventing them from accumulating wealth. Additionally, lenders refused to provide mortgages for Black, Asian, and Indian households in predominantly White neighborhoods rated "best" or "still desirable." On the 1936 HOLC map of Seattle, neighborhoods adjacent to the Duwamish industrial areas including Delridge, South Park, and South Beacon Hill were rated "hazardous," while neighborhoods closely adjacent to the Ballard and Interbay industrial areas including the lower slopes of Magnolia, Queen Anne, and portions of Ballard were rated "definitely declining."

See also [Section 3.8 Population, Housing, & Employment](#) and the Seattle Municipal Archives ([Redlining in Seattle](#)) for more discussion of redlining and displacement.

Prior to Seattle's first zoning ordinances, multifamily land uses were allowed broadly throughout the city, with no areas reserved exclusively for single-dwelling housing. Seattle's first ordinance was adopted in 1923, with a major update in 1956. Multi-family residential districts were located at the edges of rail lines, industrial districts, and manufacturing districts

as part of the 1956 update and caused environmental justice harms. These ordinances prevent new development in large areas of the city, particularly more affluent areas, and pushed multifamily to less desirable areas. The effect of this zoning was that Black, Asian, Indian, and relatively less affluent renters were exposed to noise and air quality and other impacts, while single family districts further from industrial areas were not. This pattern of multi-family housing and zoning districts bordering MICs continues to be evident today in areas including Interbay and the northeast edge of Ballard.

Exhibit 3.6-4. Commercial Map of Greater Seattle With “Grade Of Security” Designations, 1936



Source: Honig, 2021 (HistoryLink Essay No. 21296).

Annexation & Regional Transportation Corridors

Many of the City’s early connections to the region and nation and resulting land use decisions were dependent on water access. This dependency shifted in the late 1800s with expansion of the roadway and rail network. Seattle’s first electric streetcars opened in 1889 and by 1892, the city had 48 miles of electric streetcars and 22 miles of cable railway. In 1902, the Seattle-

Tacoma Interurban Railway opened—which included stops in Rainier Beach, Renton, and Kent—and a Mount Vernon-to-Bellingham line opened by 1910. Street cars exposed new territory to speculative commercial and residential development and the city expanded through extensive annexation during the first part of the 20th century. As of 1891, the city extended from present-day Beacon Hill to the University District (then known as Brooklyn). Between 1905 and 1910, eight small towns (Ballard, Columbia, Georgetown, Laurelhurst, Rainier Beach, Ravenna, South Park, and West Seattle) were annexed to the City of Seattle, nearly doubling the physical area of the city. After Georgetown was annexed in 1910, no large annexations were made until the early 1950s. Much of the city north of N 85th Street was added during postwar annexation as major road networks accelerated the decentralization of the city.

Major transportation corridors constructed during the 20th century fundamentally changed Seattle's land use patterns and the neighborhoods bisected by them. These included the Pacific Highway built in the 1920s (later renamed US 99 and then SR 99 after construction of I-5), the George Washington Memorial Bridge (the Aurora Bridge) completed in 1932, the elevated Alaskan Way completed in 1936 and subsequent double-deck Alaskan Way Viaduct built in three phases from 1949 through 1959, and the Seattle Freeway (now I-5) constructed in the 1960s.

When the viaduct opened in 1953, it offered the first route around Seattle's congested central business district. The expressway relieved traffic on city streets, eased the movement of through traffic, and improved connections between growing southwest Seattle neighborhoods and downtown. Despite its utility, the viaduct was long viewed as a physical and visual barrier between downtown and the city's waterfront. Various groups and individuals argued and planned for its demise over several decades but the lack of a viable alternative for handling the tens of thousands of daily users stymied their efforts. The 2001 Nisqually earthquake significantly damaged the viaduct's joints and foundations and furthered the discussion. After a decade of studying, planning, and public discussion, the idea for a deep-bore tunnel garnered enough support to move forward. The southern end of the viaduct was demolished in October 2011 and tunnel boring took place from 2013-2017. The viaduct closed to traffic in January 2019, the new tunnel opened in February, and the remaining span of the viaduct was demolished later that year. New development along the waterfront in downtown Seattle—including a park promenade—are scheduled to be completed in 2025.

The Seattle Freeway, now known as I-5, also altered the landscape of Seattle's neighborhoods when it was constructed in the 1960s. Due to unique geographical and topographical constraints, the freeway's route was ultimately drawn directly through the center of the city, breaking east to avoid Green Lake and then bending west around Beacon Hill before continuing south (see [Exhibit 3.6-5](#)). Communities within or adjacent to the future construction path were sliced in half and severely impacted by the resulting displacement while communities on the western and eastern shores of the city remained intact. For example, eight square blocks of land demolished in the heart of the Chinese International District left the district divided and with an unpleasant edge condition for future redevelopment to contend with. In all, 20.5 miles of the route—or about 4,500 parcels of land (most of which were improved with homes, apartment buildings, or businesses)—were cleared for the construction.

Exhibit 3.6-5. I-5 Construction Through Seattle and the Planned Seattle Freeway System



Top left: Construction of I-5, 1964; Courtesy of the [Seattle Municipal Archives](#). Bottom left: Apartment building being moved due to I-5 construction, 1960; [HistoryLink Essay 4168](#) via MOHAI (1986.5.4007). Right: City of Seattle 1957 Comprehensive Plan; Seattle Public Libraries Special Collection.

Seattle's Freeway Revolt—one of a number of such uprisings across the U.S. in the 1960s and 70s—halted two other major freeways in the city and significantly downsized a third. Along with I-5, the City's Comprehensive Plan called for a parallel freeway on the Lake Washington side (the RH Thomson Expressway) that would have run from the Duwamish neighborhood in the south to Bothell in the north, and the Bay Freeway that would have connected Seattle Center to I-5 with a highway via a massive viaduct that cut through South Lake Union (see [Exhibit 3.6-5](#)). If built as planned, the RH Thompson Expressway would have cut through the

heart of the largely Black Central District Neighborhood, demolished as many as 3,000 homes, and displaced up to 8,000 people. The planned 14-lane interchange with I-90 alone (via an open trench on Mount Baker Ridge) would have displaced an estimated 4,000 residents and many businesses (as opposed to the existing tunnels that currently connect I-90 to I-5). A diverse consortium of activists faced the Seattle City Council and Highway Department head on to stop both of the planned freeways, which were eventually removed from the City's Comprehensive Plan in the 1970s and struck down by public referendum.

Century 21: the Seattle World's Fair and post-Exposition Civic Center

The Century 21 Exposition, also known as the Seattle World's Fair, was held between April 21 and October 21, 1962, and drew almost 10 million visitors. The 1962 Seattle World's Fair gave visitors a glimpse of the future and left Seattle with a lasting legacy, giving Seattle world-wide recognition and effectively "putting it on the map." Though the fair was primarily administered by the non-profit private Century 21 Exposition, Inc., substantial efforts were made to integrate the planning of the municipal, state, and private entities involved. In addition, the City of Seattle was deeply involved in development and execution. The City oversaw a number of fair-based building projects both within and beyond the fairgrounds, including the Monorail line, the International Fountain, and a 1,500-car garage along Mercer Street. Ultimately, the fair left the city a permanent legacy in the Seattle Center and its complex of performance, sports, and entertainment halls, as well as the Pacific Science Center, the Monorail, and the Space Needle.

The Modern Comprehensive Plan: Land Use Policies & Implementation

In 1957, Seattle adopted its first Comprehensive Plan "in principle" presented in the form of an [illustrated map](#) (see [Exhibit 3.6-5](#)). The Plan focused primarily on transportation, specifically the automobile, and protecting single-family homes. Per the adopting resolution, the Plan addressed "the most appropriate use of land, lessening traffic congestion and accidents, making provision for adequate light and air, avoiding undue concentration of population, promoting a coordinated development of vacant areas, encouraging the formation of neighborhood and community units, and the conservation and restoration of natural resources ([Resolution 17488](#))." Various amendments were made to the 1957 Comprehensive Plan until 1978 when the City started relying instead on land use policies. The last major revision was made in 1965 and the City stopped issuing its own comprehensive plan in 1978, relying instead on land use policies, until the State adopted the 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA). Those land use policies drove a significant review of the City's land use regulations, resulting in the adoption of new zoning policies and regulations that supported mixed-use development through the 1980s.

The GMA was adopted in 1990 to address concerns about the impacts of uncoordinated growth on Washington communities and the environment and provides a framework for land use planning and development regulations in the state. As part of the GMA, most cities and counties in Washington (including Seattle) are required to adopt

See also [Section 3.8 Population, Housing, & Employment](#).

comprehensive plans coordinated with regional and countywide planning. In 1994, the City adopted its first GMA mandated comprehensive plan developed around an “urban village strategy.” This strategy focuses growth in walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods with good access to jobs, transit, and services. The City Council also adopted 37 neighborhood plans during the 1990s as part of this planning effort in response to concerns regarding the impact of the urban village strategy on neighborhoods.

The Comprehensive Plan and many neighborhood plans have been revised since the 1990s, but the City’s overall urban village growth strategy has remained consistent. Growth has largely adhered to the plan with 83% of new homes built in urban centers or villages over the last 10 years (half of all housing was built in Downtown, South Lake Union, First Hill, and Capitol Hill). Substantial public and private investments have further supported the growth strategy in several villages, including Sound Transit’s expansion of the light rail system and bio-tech sector growth in South Lake Union. Overall, the urban village strategy has guided residential, office, and retail development into a small number of compact, walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods linked by transit.

At the same time, the city’s growth has led many neighborhoods to become increasingly exclusive and has contributed to a dearth of affordable housing for its working population, while endemic issues of racism, social injustice, and a warming planet continue to inspire demands for change. Many neighborhoods outside urban center and village boundaries have few housing options beyond detached homes. With the cost of these homes rising dramatically in the last 10 years, these neighborhoods are out of reach for most people who don’t already own a home. The urban village strategy has also resulted in few new homeownership opportunities inside centers and villages since it focuses development in areas zoned primarily for apartments and retail.

Current Policy & Regulatory Frameworks

This section describes the future land use and zoning framework (including overlay districts), policies and regulations regarding urban form and aesthetics (height, bulk, and scale, transitions, tree canopy, shadows, and views), and current land use conditions. Current policy and regulatory framework regulating land use in the City of Seattle flows from the GMA, the PSRC’s VISION 2050 and MPPs, King County’s CPPs, the City’s current Comprehensive Plan, and implementation actions including development standards in the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) and the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Several other regulatory measures affect land use including localized overlay districts and design guidelines. Most state, regional, and local land use policies are reviewed and evaluated in [Section 3.7 Relationship to Plans, Policies, & Regulations](#) with policies and regulations specific to urban form and aesthetics discussed below.

Future Land Use & Zoning

The City of Seattle’s Future Land Use Map (FLUM) is part of the Comprehensive Plan and expresses spatially the 20-year vision of preferred land use patterns to guide development within the city. Four land use area types implement the urban village strategy—urban centers, hub urban villages, residential urban villages, and manufacturing/industrial centers (MICs). Four other land use types—neighborhood residential areas, multi-family residential areas, commercial/mixed-use areas, and industrial areas—are meant to suggest specific uses outside of the urban villages. The FLUM also designates major institutions, cemeteries, and city-owned open space.

The future land use designations are implemented by a corresponding range of zoning districts and development regulations established in [Title 23 of the Seattle Municipal Code](#) (SMC). There may be different levels of zoning within each land use area that provide more detail about what can be built. Zoning overlays also exist in certain locations, such as around major institution overlay districts and in master planned communities. Property located within an overlay district is subject both to its zone classification regulations and to additional requirements imposed for the overlay district. The overlay district provisions apply if they conflict with the provisions of the underlying zone. [Exhibit 3.6-6](#) summarizes future land use designations and corresponding implementing zones. See also [Appendix G.1](#) for a summary of general zoning categories and overlay districts detailed in [SMC Title 23](#).

Exhibit 3.6-6. Existing Future Land Use Designations and Typical Implementing Zones

Future Land Use Designation	Typical Implementing Zones ¹
Urban Centers² Urban centers are the densest Seattle neighborhoods. They act as both regional centers and local neighborhoods that offer a diverse mix of uses, housing, and employment opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Downtown (DH1, DH2, DMC, DMR, DOC1, DOC2, and DRC) ▪ Pike Market Mixed (PMM), Pioneer Square Mixed (PSM), and International District Mixed and Residential (IDM and IDR) ▪ Seattle Mixed (SM) ▪ Lowrise, Midrise, and Highrise Multifamily (LR3, MR, and HR) ▪ Neighborhood Commercial (NC2, and NC3) ▪ Commercial (C1 and C2)
Hub Urban Villages² Hub villages are communities that offer a balance of housing and employment but are generally less dense than urban centers. These areas provide a mix of goods, services, and employment for their residents and surrounding neighborhoods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential Small Lot (RSL) ▪ Lowrise Multifamily (LR1, LR2, and LR3) ▪ Midrise Multifamily (MR) ▪ Neighborhood Commercial (NC1, NC2, and NC3) ▪ Commercial (C1 and C2)
Residential Urban Villages² Residential villages are areas of residential development, generally at lower densities than urban centers or hub urban villages. While they are also sources of goods and services for residents and surrounding communities, for the most part they do not offer many employment opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential Small Lot (RSL) ▪ Lowrise Multifamily (LR1, LR2, and LR3) ▪ Midrise Multifamily (MR) ▪ Neighborhood Commercial (NC1, NC2, and NC3)

Future Land Use Designation	Typical Implementing Zones ¹
Manufacturing Industrial Centers (MICs) Manufacturing industrial centers are home to the city's thriving industrial businesses. Like urban centers, they are important regional resources for retaining and attracting jobs and for maintaining a diversified economy. Most of the city's shipping, manufacturing, and freight-distribution activities take place in the city's two manufacturing/industrial centers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial (MML, II, UI, IC)
Neighborhood Residential Areas Neighborhood residential areas provide opportunities for detached single-family and other compatible housing options that have low height, bulk, and scale in order to serve a broad array of households and incomes and to maintain an intensity of development that is appropriate for areas with limited access to services, infrastructure constraints, fragile environmental conditions, or that are otherwise not conducive to more intensive development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood Residential (NR1, NR2, and NR3)
Multi-Family Residential Areas The city's multi-family areas contain a variety of housing types. You might find duplexes or townhouses, walk-up apartments, or highrise towers. Overall, these areas offer more choices for people with different living styles and a wider range of incomes than single-family zones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowrise Multifamily (LR1, LR2, and LR3) Midrise Multifamily (MR)
Commercial / Mixed Use Areas Commercial/mixed-use areas are places meant to provide jobs and services. Most of these areas also allow housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood Commercial (NC1, NC2, and NC3) Commercial (C1 and C2)
Industrial Areas In limited industrial areas outside the two MICs, City zoning rules allow industrial activity such as manufacturing, warehousing, and shipping of goods through waterways, railways, and highways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial (MML, II, UI, IC)
Major Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Institution Overlay District. Underlying zoning varies depending on the surrounding community.
Cemetery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood Residential (NR2 and NR3) Lowrise Multifamily (LR3)
City-Owned Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood Residential (NR1, NR2, and NR3)

1 See [Appendix G.1](#) for more detailed summaries of general zoning categories and overlay districts, respectively.

2 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Sources: [City of Seattle Future Land Use Map](#), 2022; BERK, 2023.

Shoreline Master Program

The Washington State Shoreline Management Act (SMA) requires all counties and most towns and cities to plan for how shorelines in their jurisdiction will develop through a Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Seattle’s SMP applies to the shorelines and all waters of the state, as document in the City’s Official Land Use Map ([SMC 23.32](#)). The Shoreline District includes all land within 200 feet of the city’s major water bodies—Puget Sound, Lake Washington, Lake Union, the Lake Washington Ship Canal, and the Duwamish River—as well as hydrologically connected wetlands and all submerged land. The adopted Seattle SMP is comprised of the goals and policies in the Shoreline Areas Element of the Comprehensive Plan, SMP regulations in the Land Use Code ([SMC 23.60A](#)), maps of the locations of shoreline environments, and the Shoreline Restoration and Enhancement Plan.

The SMP must address a wide range of physical conditions and development settings along areas of the shoreline. Seattle’s SMP prescribes different environmental protection measures, allowable use provisions, development standards, and other policy and regulatory measures based on the environmental designation of each area in the Shoreline District. Shoreline environment designations within Seattle’s Shoreline District are divided into two broad categories—Conservancy and Urban—and then subdivided further within these two categories. The conservancy shoreline environments are less developed and provide for areas of navigation, recreation, and habitat protection. The urban shoreline environments are areas that are more developed and provide for single-family houses and water-dependent and water-related uses. [SMC 23.60A.220\(D\)](#) details the purpose and locational criteria of each environment designation.

Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale

Development regulations govern what uses are permitted, as well as the physical form (such as heights and setbacks) of development, which influences urban character. Policies guiding height, bulk, and scale in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan include:

LU 5.3 Control the massing of structures to make them compatible with the area’s planned scale, provide a reasonable ratio of open to occupied space on a site, and allow the building to receive adequate natural light.

LU 5.4 Use maximum height limits to maintain the desired scale relationship between new structures, existing development, and the street environment; address varied topographic conditions; and limit public view blockage. In certain Downtown zones and in industrial zones, heights for certain types of development uniquely suited to those zones may be unlimited.

LU 5.5 Provide for residents’ recreational needs on development sites by establishing standards for private or shared amenity areas such as rooftop decks, balconies, ground-level open spaces, or enclosed spaces.

LU 5.6 Establish setbacks in residential areas as needed to allow for adequate light, air, and ground-level open space; help provide privacy; promote compatibility with the existing development pattern; and separate residential uses from more intensive uses.

These policies are reiterated in [SMC 25.05.675.G](#) Specific Environmental Policies – Height, bulk, and scale, which set environmental review policies to provide for “smooth transition between industrial, commercial, and residential areas, to preserve the character of individual City neighborhoods, and to reinforce natural topography by controlling the height, bulk, and scale of development.” Specifically, [SMC 25.05.675.G.2](#) includes height, bulk, positioning, design, and other mitigation techniques and states the following intent:


It is the City's policy that the height, bulk, and scale of development projects should be reasonably compatible with the general character of development anticipated by the goals and policies set forth in the Land Use Element, Growth Strategy Element, and Shoreline Element of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan; the procedures and locational criteria for shoreline environment redesignations set forth in Sections 23.60A.060 and 23.60A.220; and the adopted land use regulations for the area in which they are located, and to provide for a reasonable transition between areas of less intensive zoning and more intensive zoning.

The height, bulk, scale, and character of development vary considerably across Seattle. Seattle’s zoning regulations include limits on building height, as well as other characteristics, including density, floor area ratio (FAR), minimum setbacks, and maximum lot coverage. All of these qualities contribute to the overall intensity of development at any given location. Building height and FAR limits are two of the most important code elements that directly influence how intense a development feels in a given location. FAR is the ratio of a building’s floor area to the size of the lot where it is located. For most zoning districts, the City of Seattle has established both a maximum allowed height and a maximum allowed FAR. The relationship between building height and FAR can be viewed as a shorthand for assessing the “bulkiness” of building. For example, a tall building with a low FAR will take up a smaller proportion of its building site than a relatively short building with a higher FAR (see [Exhibit 3.6-7](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-8](#)).

Exhibit 3.6-7. Zoning Envelopes and Floor Area Ratios

Gray: hypothetical "zoning envelopes" established by setbacks, height limits, tower floorplate limits, minimum tower separation and other development standards.

Blue: possible building configurations within the allowed zoning envelope, limited by a floor area ratio (FAR) of 12. All three buildings have the same amount of floor area but they configure the space differently.



Note: A floor plate is the horizontal plane of the floor of a building, measured to the inside surface of exterior walls. Floor area ratio is the ratio of the total square feet of a building to the total square feet of the property on which it is located. Building floor area / Lot size = Floor Area Ratio


Source: City of Seattle, 2013.

Exhibit 3.6-8. Understanding Floor Area Ratios and Lot Coverage

What is Floor Area Ratio?

Floor area ratio (FAR) is the relationship between a structure's total floor area and the size of the lot on which it was built. The FAR limit ensures new structures are similar in bulk and scale to existing structures in the neighborhood.

0.5 FAR



1 story
(50% lot coverage)

2 stories
(25% lot coverage)

3 stories
(17% lot coverage)

Source: City of Seattle, 2019.

In neighborhood residential zones, Seattle limits FAR to (SMC 23.44.011.B):

1. *The FAR limit on lots developed with a single-family dwelling unit as the principal use in NR1, NR2, and NR3 zones, is 0.5, except that lots with less than 5,000 square feet of lot area can include up to 2,500 square feet of total chargeable floor area. The applicable FAR limit applies to the total chargeable floor area of all structures on the lot.*
2. *The FAR limit in RSL zones is 0.75. The applicable FAR limit applies to the total chargeable floor area of all structures on the lot.*

Transitions

The Growth Strategy Element of the Comprehensive Plan includes the following policy on urban design transitions:

***GS 3.11** Use zoning tools and natural features to ease the transitions from the building intensities of urban villages and commercial arterials to lower-density developments of surrounding areas.*

Other elements of the Comprehensive Plan also mention the importance of smooth transitions around urban villages and industrial areas. Smooth transitions are also mentioned in [SMC 25.05.675.G](#) Specific Environmental Policies (see **Height, Bulk, & Scale** above).

While transitions are achieved primarily through decisions about where different zones are applied, there are also some existing development code regulations that are intended to limit the impacts of zone transitions, including regulations regarding setbacks and upper-story step backs and appurtenances and nuisances. These are described in more detail below.


Setbacks & Upper-Story Setbacks (by Zone)

Multifamily zones. [SMC 23.45.518](#) regulates setbacks in multifamily zones and requires a 12-foot setback required for all portions of development in the lowrise zones above 34 feet that abut a neighborhood residential zone. For religious organizations building affordable housing, [SMC 23.45.550](#) establishes FAR and height bonuses and requires a 10-foot setback on sites adjacent to neighborhood residential zones.

Commercial zones. [SMC 23.47A.014](#) regulates setbacks in commercial zones, with the following provisions:

- Required corner setbacks of 15 feet, but not side setbacks, in commercial zones where they abut residentially zoned parcels. See **Exhibit 3.6-9**.


Exhibit 3.6-9. Corner Setbacks Required in Residential/Commercial Transitions



Source: Seattle Municipal Code Exhibit A for 23.47A.014.

- Required 10-foot setbacks for all portions of development above 13 feet, up to 65 feet, on parcels abutting residential or commercially zoned lots. Above 65 feet, an additional one-foot setback is required for each additional 10 feet of height to 165 feet, at which point no further setbacks are required. See [Exhibit 3.6-10](#).


Exhibit 3.6-10. Upper Setbacks Required on Commercial Lots



Source: Seattle Municipal Code Exhibit B for 23.47A.014.

- Required 15-foot setbacks for all portions of development above 13 feet, up to 40 feet, on parcels abutting lots zoned neighborhood residential. Above 40 feet, an additional 3-foot setback is required for each additional 10 feet of height. See [Exhibit 3.6-11](#).

Exhibit 3.6-11. Upper Setbacks Required: Commercial Adjacent to Neighborhood Residential



Note: Upper setbacks required on commercial lots adjacent to neighborhood residential lots
Source: Seattle Municipal Code Exhibit C for 23.47A.014.

Appurtenances & Nuisances

[SMC 23.45.570](#) ensures that institutions located in Lowrise (LR) zones do not site noisy or visually harsh infrastructure like HVAC units, game courts, or kitchen ventilation within 20 feet from properties zoned neighborhood residential. In commercial zones, [street-level use restrictions](#), setbacks, [conditional use restrictions](#), and/or [landscape screening](#) requirements apply to specific uses or site elements like warehouses, drive-throughs, dumpsters, and drinking establishments near residential zones.

Tree Canopy

See [Section 3.3 Plants & Animals](#) for information about existing regulations and tree canopy patterns.

Tree protection. Seattle's tree code protects existing trees through rules established in Seattle Municipal Code 25.11.

Street trees. In most zones, Seattle also requires existing street trees to be retained unless the Director of SDOT approves their removal and for street trees to be planted with redevelopment, with some exceptions ([SMC 23.45.524.B](#)). Green Factor requirements are also required to be met for most new development in multi-family and commercial zones.

In the 130th/145th Station Area, street designations, which set standards for street tree planting areas, for key streets include:

- NE 130th St (east of Roosevelt Way NE): Neighborhood Yield Street—5-8-foot green stormwater infrastructure landscape strip

- Roosevelt Way NE, 15th Ave NE, NE 125th St, and NE 145th St: Urban Center Connector, Principal Arterial—6-12-foot landscape/furniture zone

Maximum lot coverage regulations are relevant to tree canopy because they have limited building mass in Seattle’s lowest density zones for decades, leaving more space for vegetation. [Exhibit 3.6-12](#) lists maximum lot coverage limitations in Seattle’s neighborhood residential zones.

Exhibit 3.6-12. Neighborhood Residential Maximum Lot Coverage

Zone	Lot Size	Maximum Lot Coverage
NR1, NR2, and NR3	Less than 5,000 square feet	1,000 square feet plus 15 percent of lot area
	5,000 square feet or more	35 percent of lot area
RSL	All lots	50 percent of lot area

Source: SMC 23.44.010.

Shadows

Seattle’s environmental policies address shadows on public open spaces. Specific environmental policies – Shadows on Open Spaces ([SMC 25.05.675.Q.2](#)) states:

It is the City's policy to minimize or prevent light blockage and the creation of shadows on open spaces most used by the public.

- a. *Areas outside of downtown to be protected are as follows:*
 - 1) *Publicly owned parks;*
 - 2) *Public schoolyards;*
 - 3) *Private schools which allow public use of schoolyards during non-school hours; and*
 - 4) *Publicly owned street ends in shoreline areas.*
- b. *Areas in downtown where shadow impacts may be mitigated are:*
 - 1) *Freeway Park;*
 - 2) *Westlake Park and Plaza;*
 - 3) *Market (Steinbrueck) Park;*
 - 4) *Convention Center Park; and*
 - 5) *Kobe Terrace Park and the publicly owned portions of the International District Community Garden.*

However, the policies also include, “due to the scale of development permitted in downtown, it is not practical to prevent such blockage at all public open spaces downtown” and “it is impractical to protect private properties from shadows through project-specific review” ([SMC 25.05.675.Q.1](#)).

Views

The Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Code establish policies and regulations for the protection of public views of important landmarks and natural features, as well as views from

specific designated viewpoints within the city and scenic qualities along mapped scenic routes. The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan establishes the importance of public view preservation:

LU 5.15 Address view protection through

- *zoning that considers views, with special emphasis on shoreline views;*
- *development standards that help to reduce impacts on views, including height, bulk, scale, and view corridor provisions, as well as design review guidelines; and*
- *environmental policies that protect specified public views, including views of mountains, major bodies of water, designated landmarks, and the Downtown skyline.*

The Land Use Element contains policies to regulate alteration and use of the shorelines in the City to provide substantial public access through visual or physical means and to promote interest and preservation of the physical and aesthetic qualities of the shorelines of the city. The Land Use Element also encourages the protection of views through policies related to building height limits and minimization of building bulk.

The Comprehensive Plan lists the following as important landmarks for public views:

- Downtown skyline
- Major bodies of water
- Shoreline areas
- Elliott Bay
- West Seattle
- Mount Rainier
- Olympic Mountains
- Space Needle
- Puget Sound
- Lake Washington
- Lake Union
- Portage Bay

SMC [25.05.675.P](#) establishes environmental review policies for public view protection, specifically:

*It is the City's policy to protect public views of significant **natural and human-made features**: Mount Rainier, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, the downtown skyline, and major bodies of water including Puget Sound, Lake Washington, Lake Union and the Ship Canal, from public places consisting of... [a lengthy list of] specified viewpoints, parks, scenic routes, and view corridors....*

*It is the City's policy to protect public views of **historic landmarks** designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board that, because of their prominence of location or contrasts of siting, age, or scale, are easily identifiable visual features of their neighborhood or the City and contribute to the distinctive quality or identity of their neighborhood or the City.*

Additional policies protect views of the Space Needle ([25.05.675.P.2.c](#)) from:

- Alki Beach Park (Duwamish Head)
- Bhy Kracke Park
- Gasworks Park
- Hamilton View Point
- Kerry Park
- Myrtle Edwards Park
- Olympic Sculpture Park
- Seacrest Park
- Seattle Center
- Volunteer Park

In Downtown, there are also view corridors to be protected through upper-level building setbacks in future development along the following streets ([SMC 23.49.024](#)):

- Broad, Clay, Vine, Wall, Battery, and Bell Streets west of First Avenue; and
- University, Seneca, Spring, Madison, and Marion Streets west of Third Avenue.

While the Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Municipal Code establish the importance of view corridors and view preservation, in many cases the precise requirements for individual development projects are not strictly defined in the development regulations and protection of public views is deferred to consideration during project reviews and the design review process.

Major Land Use Policy Changes Currently Under Consideration

Seattle Transportation Plan Update & EIS

The City of Seattle is currently updating its long-term vision for the future of transportation in Seattle. The Seattle Transportation Plan (STP) and associated EIS address mobility, access, and public space needs in a single document as a unified system. This effort will incorporate several city initiatives like Seattle's Vision Zero, the Race and Social Justice Initiative, the Climate Action Plan, the Transportation Electrification Blueprint, and others. Additionally, it will reference plans created by other regional transportation agencies.

Seattle Parks and Open Space Plan Update

The City of Seattle's Parks and Open Space Plan (POS) was adopted in 2017 and is updated every 6 years, with the next major update planned for 2024. It provides an inventory of existing parks and open space, objectives for future actions, demand and need analysis including demographic and recreation trends, and recommended capital projects.

Current Conditions

Citywide

Future Land Use & Zoning

Land area in the City of Seattle encompasses approximately 83.83 square miles (53,651 acres).¹⁶ The largest future land use designation category in the city is neighborhood residential, accounting for 52% of the city. Another one-quarter of the city is designated as a center or village (28%) with 6% in urban centers, 3% in hub urban villages, 8% in residential urban villages, and 11% in MICs. Of the remaining quarter of the city, 10% is designated as city-owned open space, 5% is designated as multi-family residential, 3% is designated as commercial/mixed-use, 1% is designated as major institution, and land designated as cemeteries or industrial areas outside the MICs account for less than 1% each. See [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Appendix G.1](#).

There are currently six urban centers, six hub urban villages, 18 residential urban villages, and two manufacturing industrial centers (MICs) in the city. The six urban centers (Downtown, Uptown, South Lake Union, First Hill/Capitol Hill, University Community, and Northgate) and two MICs (Greater Duwamish MIC and Ballard–Interbay–Northend MIC (BINMIC)) are also designated PSRC Metro Regional Growth Centers (RGCs) and Employment MICs, respectively. These regionally designated centers are part of the regional growth strategy in VISION 2050 to focus growth in urban areas with access to transit.

Countywide Planning Policies were amended in 2021 to allow for designation of countywide centers based partially on size and activity levels. The City has not formally proposed countywide centers but may do so with the Comprehensive Plan Update. Thus, the size and activity units for both regional and countywide level centers are described below. Existing acreage and activity units per acre in each center and village are listed in [Exhibit 3.6-13](#). Locations where the acreage or densities fall outside King County’s countywide center

Section 3 of PSRC’s 2018 Regional Centers Framework Update includes designation criteria for Metro RGCs. Among other criteria, this includes a minimum density of 30 existing activity units and 85 planned activity units. Metro RGCs are also expected to be between 320–640 acres in size (or larger if served by an internal, high-capacity transit system).

Appendix 6 of the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) includes designation criteria for countywide growth centers although none are currently designated in King County. The criteria include an existing density of at least 18 activity units and planned density of at least 30 activity units. Countywide growth centers are also expected to be between 160–500 acres in size.

See also [Section 3.7 Relationship to Plans, Policies, & Regulations](#) for more discussion of PSRC Metro Regional Growth Centers and King County Countywide Centers.

¹⁶ [OFM Estimates of April 1 Population Density and Land Area by City and Town](#), 2022.

designation criteria of 160–500 acres or below the minimum existing 18 activity units per acre are highlighted. All existing urban villages except the South Park Residential Urban Village in Area 7 meet the King County threshold of 18 existing activity units per acre. Several urban villages are below the minimum size threshold of 160 acres (the Lake City Hub Urban Village and the Admiral, Green Lake, Greenwood–Phinney Ridge, Madison–Miller, Morgan Junction, and Upper Queen Anne residential urban villages) and one is above the maximum size threshold of 500 acres (the 23rd & Union Jackson Residential Urban Villages). Note that PSRC’s MIC designation criteria do not include an activity unit density threshold and so existing activity units per acre are not calculated for the two MICs.

Adopted aggregate Future Land Use designations in Seattle are mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-15](#). Outside of centers and villages, commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family designations generally follow main arterials such as Holman Rd NW/15th Ave NW/15th Ave W, SR 99, Greenwood/Phinney Ave N, 15th Ave NE, Lake City Way NE, Sand Point Way NE, Westlake Ave N, E Madison St, Alki Ave SW, California Ave SW, Delridge Way SW, MLK Jr Way S, and Rainier Ave S. Neighborhood residential areas fill the intervening areas, along with city-owned open space and major institutions. This is consistent with existing land use patterns (discussed below). Industrial designations outside the MICs are typically adjacent to the MICs or other major roadways (e.g., the north shore of Lake Union, near Smith Cove, and near the I-5/I-90 interchange).

Exhibit 3.6-13. Centers and Villages—Existing Location, Size, and Activity Units


Center/Village	Analysis Area	Existing Acres	Existing AU	Existing AU/Ac.
Urban Centers¹				
Downtown	4	952	359,361	377.4
First Hill/Capitol Hill	5	916	127,812	139.5
University Community	2	753	41,085	54.5
South Lake Union	4	340	80,456	236.7
Uptown	3	333	43,759	131.3
Northgate	2	412	23,611	57.3
Hub Urban Villages¹				
Ballard	1	495	33,565	67.7
Bitter Lake Village	1	364	16,015	44.0
Fremont	1	214	15,431	71.9
Lake City	2	142	8,197	57.6
Mt Baker	8	491	17,689	36.0
West Seattle Junction	6	269	18,972	70.4
Residential Urban Villages¹				
23rd & Union–Jackson	5	625	24,348	38.9
Admiral	6	98	4,842	49.2
Aurora–Licton Springs	1	327	14,428	44.1
Columbia City	8	335	11,352	33.9
Crown Hill	1	271	6,863	25.3
Eastlake	4	199	13,986	70.2
Green Lake	1	109	7,675	70.6
Greenwood–Phinney Ridge	1	94	7,956	84.5
Madison–Miller	5	145	9,488	65.3
Morgan Junction	6	113	3,865	34.1
North Beacon Hill	8	267	7,506	28.1
Othello	8	499	11,824	23.7
Rainier Beach	8	346	7,967	23.0
Roosevelt	2	170	10,448	61.4
South Park	7	263	3,879	14.7
Upper Queen Anne	3	53	4,709	89.5
Wallingford	1	258	10,868	42.2
Westwood–Highland Park	6	275	7,668	27.9
MICs				
Ballard–Interbay–Northend	3	932	17,660	NA
Greater Duwamish	7	4,953	62,335	NA

1 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.


Note: Activity units (AU) is the sum of residential population and jobs. Assumes an average household size of 2.05 per the King County Growth Management Planning Council. Highlighted densities or size fall outside King County's countywide center designation criteria of 160-500 acres or below the minimum 18 existing AU per acre (note PSRC's MIC designation criteria does not include an activity unit density threshold).

Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-14. Future Land Use Designations—Percent Citywide and by EIS Analysis Area (Acres)




Seattle 2035 Future Land Use



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-15. Citywide Future Land Use Designations




Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

About three-quarters of the city is zoned for residential development, of which 61% is zoned Neighborhood Residential, 2% Residential Small Lot, and 12% zoned Multi-family. About 12% of the city is zoned industrial, 5% neighborhood commercial, and 3% commercial. The remaining zones account for about 5% of land in the city. See [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and [Appendix G.1](#).

Exhibit 3.6-16. Generalized Zoning—Percent Citywide and by EIS Analysis Area (Acres)



Generalized Zones




Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Generalized zoning in Seattle is mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-17](#). Most areas designated and zoned for commercial/mixed-use or multifamily residential uses are located in centers or villages. The general commercial zones tend to be found on major arterials and are more auto-oriented. Neighborhood Commercial and Seattle Mixed zones use development standards intended to produce more walkable environments and are better for housing development. Commercial and multifamily zoning outside centers or villages tends to be concentrated around major arterials. Industrial zoning is concentrated in the two MICs. City zoning rules in these areas allow industrial activity such as manufacturing, warehousing, and shipping of goods through waterways, railways, and highways.

Most areas outside center, village, and MIC boundaries are zoned for neighborhood residential use. Neighborhood Residential zones cover much of the city. While these areas are commonly considered residential neighborhoods, they also include various uses beyond housing. For instance, most of the public park land is found in these zones, as are many schools, cemeteries, and fire stations. In most of these areas, houses are usually three stories or less in height and typically have yards and open space around them. Much of the land in these areas has been built to the densities allowed under current zoning rules.

Exhibit 3.6-17. Citywide Generalized Zoning



Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Shorelines

Shorelines designations overlay the primary future land use designations and zoning regulations. The Shoreline District encompasses 7,447 acres in the study area citywide and is regulated through zoning and shoreline environment designations. A little less than two-thirds of the shoreline citywide is within a conservancy shoreline environment (61%) and a little more than one-third is within an urban shoreline environment (39%). About 25% of the shoreline is designated Conservancy Recreation (CR), 22% is designated Conservancy Preservation (CP), and 10% is designated Conservancy Management (CM). Conservancy environments are typically located in waterways and on shorelines bordering neighborhood residential areas and city-owned open space. The other conservancy shoreline environments are concentrated in waterways such as Green Lake, Lake Union, the Lake Washington Ship Canal, and Smith Cove. About 19% of the shoreline is designated Urban Industrial (UI), primarily within the Greater Duwamish MIC and BINMIC. Urban Residential accounts for another 10% of the shoreline and is mostly located on the inland 200 feet of neighborhood residential areas. The other urban shoreline environments are concentrated around the Downtown waterfront and on the borders of Lake Union and the Lake Washington Ship Canal. **Exhibit 3.6-18** summarizes the acreage of each designation citywide and within each EIS Analysis Area. See also the **Shoreline Master Program** section for more detail about the SMP and the purpose of each environment designation.

Exhibit 3.6-18. Shoreline Environment Designations—Acres Citywide and by EIS Analysis Area


Shoreline Designation	EIS Analysis Area								Citywide
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Conservancy Management	339 ac. (32.4%)	80 ac. (10.5%)	168 ac. (9.5%)	5 ac. (1.2%)	61 ac. (11.9%)	44 ac. (4.0%)	1 ac. (0.1%)	57 ac. (8.4%)	754 ac. (10.1%)
Conservancy Navigation	82 ac. (7.9%)	3 ac. (0.4%)	140 ac. (7.9%)	3 ac. (0.9%)	2 ac. (0.4%)	0.2 ac. (0.0%)	0.2 ac. (0.0%)	2 ac. (0.4%)	234 ac. (3.1%)
Conservancy Preservation	150 ac. (14.3%)	199 ac. (26.1%)	615 ac. (34.7%)	—	160 ac. (31.2%)	337 ac. (30.6%)	58 ac. (4.9%)	112 ac. (16.5%)	1,632 ac. (21.9%)
Conservancy Recreation	132 ac. (12.7%)	293 ac. (38.5%)	336 ac. (19.0%)	6 ac. (1.5%)	164 ac. (31.9%)	548 ac. (49.7%)	12 ac. (1.0%)	402 ac. (59.3%)	1,894 ac. (25.4%)
Conservancy Waterway	13 ac. (1.3%)	1 ac. (0.1%)	—	22 ac. (5.7%)	—	—	—	—	36 ac. (0.5%)
Urban Commercial	182 ac. (17.4%)	32 ac. (4.1%)	—	160 ac. (41.0%)	3 ac. (0.6%)	11 ac. (1.0%)	—	8 ac. (1.1%)	395 ac. (5.3%)
Urban General	20 ac. (1.9%)	—	21 ac. (1.2%)	0.3 ac. (0.1%)	—	—	4 ac. (0.3%)	—	44 ac. (0.6%)
Urban Harborfront	—	—	—	130 ac. (33.3%)	—	—	—	—	130 ac. (1.7%)
Urban Maritime	56 ac. (5.3%)	3 ac. (0.4%)	97 ac. (5.5%)	35 ac. (9.0%)	—	—	—	—	191 ac. (2.6%)
Urban Residential	70 ac. (6.7%)	151 ac. (19.8%)	86 ac. (4.8%)	28 ac. (7.3%)	123 ac. (23.9%)	162 ac. (14.7%)	—	97 ac. (14.3%)	716 ac. (9.6%)
Urban Industrial	2 ac. (0.2%)	—	309 ac. (17.4%)	0.2 ac. (0.1%)	—	0.1 ac. (0.0%)	1,110 ac. (93.7%)	—	1,421 ac. (19.1%)
Total Acres & Percent of Citywide Total	1,045 ac. (14%)	761 ac. (10%)	1,772 ac. (24%)	390 ac. (5%)	513 ac. (7%)	1,102 ac. (15%)	1,185 ac. (16%)	678 ac. (9%)	7,447 ac. (100%)

Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use Pattern

Exhibit 3.6-19 summarizes percent of existing land use acreage citywide and by analysis area, excluding water bodies and public right-of-way. Citywide, the largest existing land use category is single family residential, which comprises about 48% of existing land uses. Parks and open space/cemeteries account for about 14% and major institutions and public facilities and utilities account for about 11% of existing land uses. Multi-family and commercial/mixed-use comprise 9% and 8%, respectively, while industrial and vacant land uses each comprise 5% of total existing uses in Seattle.

Exhibit 3.6-19. Current Land Use—Percent Citywide and by EIS Analysis Area (Acres)




Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-20 maps existing land use distribution across the city. The highest concentrations of commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family development are in the four urban centers that constitute the area sometimes called the “center city” (Downtown, First Hill/Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, and Uptown). Housing in these areas might be built as a stand-alone structure or along with commercial space. Mixed-use areas or projects contain residential and commercial uses and often have offices or stores on the ground floor with housing above. Other centers, villages, and smaller nodes around the city also contain varying levels of commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family development.

Outside of the centers and villages, concentrations of commercial, mixed-use, and multifamily development generally follow main arterials such as Holman Rd NW/15th Ave NW/15th Ave W, SR 99, Greenwood/Phinney Ave N, 15th Ave NE, Lake City Way NE, Sand Point Way NE, Westlake Ave N, E Madison St, Alki Ave SW, California Ave SW, Delridge Way SW, MLK Jr Way S, and Rainier Ave S.

Single-family residential neighborhoods fill the intervening areas, along with parks, open space, and major institutional uses. Industrial development is concentrated in the Greater Duwamish MIC in south central Seattle and in the BINMIC northwest of Downtown (along the Duwamish River’s historic meandering flood plain, Elliott Bay, Lake Union, and Salmon Bay). Only 5% of land is vacant, most of which is located near industrial areas or rail lines, along shorelines with critical areas, or adjacent to major utility easements or trails (such as the Chief Sealth Trail in Area 8). Some additional vacant lands are scattered throughout the single family areas.

Exhibit 3.6-20. Citywide Current Land Use



Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Height, Bulk, & Scale

The FLUM ([Exhibit 3.6-15](#)) illustrates the general building massing pattern across the city. Greater allowed height, bulk, and mass are generally concentrated in centers and villages. The manufacturing/industrial areas allow a range of heights, but most new development doesn't maximize the height allowance. Most of the city is zoned neighborhood residential with most of the buildings being 1- and 2-story detached homes.

Transitions

Existing development patterns for transitions between scales—both from one zone to another and within a single zone—vary across the city. Many areas with long established zone boundaries exhibit stark transitions between multi-family or commercial buildings and low-density residential areas. This is especially true in relatively recently developed areas of the city and areas that have seen intense development in recent decades, like Ballard. See [Exhibit 3.6-21](#).

Exhibit 3.6-21. Urban Village Boundary (Black Dashed Line) In Ballard



Source: Image: Landsat/ Copernicus. Data: SI, NOAA, US Navy, NGA, GEBCO Data LDEO-Columbia, NSF, NOAA.


Some older areas exhibit gradual transitions from more to less intensive development types based on pre-zoning development patterns, with more intensive uses more likely to be developed near transit routes and amenities like parks and views. More and less intense buildings within a single zone intermingle more in older neighborhoods, where a variety of apartment/condo developments are regularly found adjacent to single family houses. See [Exhibit 3.6-22](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-23](#).

Exhibit 3.6-22. Intermingling Development Types



Source: MAKERS, 2022.

Exhibit 3.6-23. Gradual Transition of Residential Uses In Capitol Hill



Note: Shows gradual transition from multi-family (blue) to single family (pink) uses in Capitol Hill.

Source: King County Assessor, 2021; MAKERS, 2023.

In recent years, development in centers and villages where parking is not required (primarily close to transit service) has created less disruptive transitions to the low-density residential scale, compared to areas where abundant car parking is required. Parking infrastructure like garages and surface parking presents a visual contrast with typical building design in low-density residential areas, where parking is visible, but not visually prominent. See [Exhibit 3.6-24](#).

Exhibit 3.6-24. Driveways and Garages Visual Impacts



Note: Left: Infill development with new driveways and garages. Right: Nearby low-density neighborhood. Parking is visible, but less prominent.

Source: Google Maps Streetview. © Google 2023.

Tree Canopy

Seattle's residential lots currently provide much of Seattle's tree canopy. However, as Seattle becomes denser to meet the needs of a growing population, new buildings cover more ground, especially when surface parking is provided, causing removal of existing trees and/or reducing space available for new trees. Private property currently provides about 72% of tree canopy, while 28% is provided on public property including street rights-of-way, parks, and other City-owned land.¹⁷ Since 2016, the City of Seattle saw an overall net loss of urban tree canopy (255 acres, 1.7%) while the goal is to increase tree canopy. The biggest losses were in parks (111 acres, 5.1%) and Neighborhood Residential areas (87 acres, 1.2%). Seattle's *Canopy Cover Assessment* states, "Loss is not equitable—Neighborhoods impacted by racial and economic injustice started with less canopy and lost more than the citywide average."¹⁸

Shadows

Seattle's hilly topography plays a major role in the prevalence of shadows. Generally, the north side of a hill or areas within a valley experience shadows during longer periods of the day. Trees, especially large, dense evergreens, cast significant shadows year-round. Building heights

¹⁷ City of Seattle, Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment, 2016.

¹⁸ City of Seattle, Urban Forestry Results Summary *Seattle's Canopy Cover Assessment*, 2023.

also play a major role, with buildings over 2 stories typically casting shadows onto the sidewalk for most of the winter. Unique shadow conditions are noted in the Analysis Area descriptions.

Views

Viewpoints and scenic routes are found throughout the city. As to be expected, they concentrate along waterfronts and/or topographically high points. The Duwamish lacks SEPA-protected viewpoints (though it does have protected “shoreline viewpoints”), likely due to the area being at a low point and public access being discouraged in the industrial area. North Seattle also has fewer protected viewpoints, despite existing high point views such as from Phinney Ridge overlooking Ballard and the Puget Sound. Factors that may influence a lack of viewpoints in north Seattle may include a combination of topography with fewer natural viewpoints, large trees blocking views, and limited public space at high points. A similar situation may exist in Rainier Valley, where land is topographically lower.

Analysis Areas

Area 1: NW Seattle


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 1 includes the northwest portion of Seattle that is west of I-5 and north of the Lake Washington Ship Canal. It includes approximately 7,151 acres of buildable lands, or 18% of the buildable lands citywide, and includes three hub urban villages and five residential urban villages: the Ballard, Bitter Lake, and Fremont hub urban villages and the Aurora-Licton Springs, Crown Hill, Green Lake, Greenwood-Phinney Ridge, and Wallingford residential urban villages. Most commercial, mixed-use, and lowrise multi-family future land use and zoning designations are concentrated in the urban villages with commercial designations generally adjacent to major arterials and lowrise multi-family designations on the edges of the urban village boundaries.

Outside of the urban villages, commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family future land use and zoning designations generally follow major arterials including SR 99, Greenwood/Phinney Ave N, and 15th Ave NW/Holman Rd NW. A small portion of the land along the north shore of Lake Union is designated and zoned industrial. Major parks and open space in the area include Woodland Park Zoo, Green Lake Park, Golden Gardens, Carkeek Park, and Gas Works. North Seattle College is also located adjacent to I-5 in the central eastern portion of the analysis area. Neighborhood residential future land use and zoning designations fill in the intervening areas. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-25](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-26](#).


Area 1 includes about 14% of the city's designated shoreline district (1,045 acres). A little over two-thirds of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment, including Conservancy Management (32%) in Green Lake and a combination of Conservancy Preservation (14%) and Recreation (13%) on Puget Sound from Golden Gardens north to the city limit. Another 29% of this area is designated Urban Commercial (near Shilshole Bay), Urban Maritime (along the north shore of Lake Union), and Urban Residential (inland along Puget Sound north of Golden Gardens). Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-27](#).

Exhibit 3.6-25. Area 1: NW Seattle—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Exhibit 3.6-26. Area 1: NW Seattle—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-27. Area 1: NW Seattle—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use & Urban Form

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category is single family residential, which comprises about 57% of existing uses (versus 48% citywide). A slightly higher percentage of land uses are also multi-family residential (12% versus 9% citywide). Existing commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family uses as well as community assets are primarily within the urban village boundaries, with the densest concentrations in the Ballard, Bitter Lake, and Fremont hub urban villages. Commercial uses in Bitter Lake are typically larger-scale big-box retailers while those in Ballard and Fremont are smaller scale. Additional concentrations of commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family uses run adjacent to major roadways between the urban villages and along the Lake Washington Ship Canal and Shilshole Bay.

Most industrial uses in the analysis area are near Lake Washington Ship Canal in Ballard and along the north shore of Lake Union or on SR 99 in the Bitter Lake and Aurora-Licton Springs urban villages. The BNSF railway also runs along Puget Sound throughout the analysis area.

Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-28](#).


General Urban Form

Areas north of 85th St were largely developed prior to annexation to the City of Seattle in 1954. These areas tend to have a more automobile-oriented character than areas further south; in many places sidewalks are absent, and buildings are designed around automobile access. These trends are especially pronounced on Aurora Ave/SR-99 where pedestrian-hostile design is compounded by long-term disinvestment in buildings and public facilities, creating an environment that can feel unsafe for many people. However, this harsh environment can also serve as a haven for those who have been pushed out of other areas of the city due to high housing costs.

Height

The tallest buildings in Area 1 are found in the Ballard, Fremont, and Bitter Lake urban villages. These three urban villages have a significant number of 6- to 8-story buildings located along and south of NW 56th St in Ballard, along N 34th St and Stone Way in Fremont, and along Aurora Ave in Bitter Lake. Additionally, there are some 5- to 6-story buildings along Greenwood Ave, 3- to 5-story buildings in the Green Lake Residential Urban Village, and 3-story townhomes in Crown Hill. However, most of the area is zoned neighborhood residential and has building heights of 1 to 2 floors.

Exhibit 3.6-28. Area 1: NW Seattle—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Area 2: NE Seattle


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 2 includes the northeast portion of Seattle east of Interstate 5, south of NE 145th Street (Seattle's northern most boundary), and north of Portage Bay and the Montlake Cut. It includes approximately 8,087 acres of buildable land, or 20% of the buildable lands citywide. Additionally, Area 2 includes the Northgate and University Community Urban Centers, the Lake City Hub Urban Village, and the Roosevelt Residential Urban Village. A majority of the commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family future land use and zoning designations are concentrated in the centers and villages with commercial and multi-family designations adjacent to major arterials running between center and village boundaries.

Outside of the centers and villages, commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family future land use and zoning designations generally follow Sandpoint Way NE, Lake City Way NE, Roosevelt Way NE, 15th Ave E, and 35th Ave NE. Major parks and open space in the area include Cowen and Magnuson Parks, the Calvary Cemetery, Sand Point County Club, and Jackson Park Golf Course. The University of Washington is located within a major institution overlay, which is a key regulatory feature of this subarea. Neighborhood residential future land use and zoning designations fill in the intervening areas. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-29](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-30](#).


Area 2 includes about 10% of the city's designated shoreline district (761 acres). Nearly 75% of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment, including Conservancy Management (11%) on the northern shoreline of Magnuson Park, Conservancy Preservation (26%) across the extent of Union Bay just SW of Laurelhurst neighborhood, and Conservancy Recreation (39%) on the eastern and southern shoreline of Magnuson Park. Another 19% are designated as Urban Residential extending north from Magnuson Park to the NE 145th St and south of Magnuson Park to the western most boundary of Laurelhurst. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-31](#).

Exhibit 3.6-29. Area 2: NE Seattle—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-30. Area 2: NE Seattle—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-31. Area 2: NE Seattle—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use & Urban Form

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category is single family residential, which accounts for 59% of the land (versus 48% citywide). Existing commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family uses, as well as a majority of the community assets, are located within the existing center and village boundaries. Commercial and mixed uses found in the Roosevelt and Lake City urban villages are typically vertically dense apartment buildings with ground-floor commercial around a main commercial corridor that supports essential neighborhood amenities. In comparison, the University Community and Northgate urban centers have denser and more intensive land uses which are often at a greater scale than is found in urban villages. Outside of the center and village boundaries, commercial and multi-family development is concentrated along the extents of Sandpoint Way NE, Lake City Way NE, Roosevelt Way NE, 15th Ave E, and 35th Ave NE.

Major institutions and public facilities account for 13% of the existing land uses including the University of Washington and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Western Regional Center. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for another 13% of the analysis area consisting of Cowen and Magnuson Parks, the Calvary Cemetery, Sand Point County Club, and Jackson Park Golf Course. The share of industrial land uses in the analysis area is lower than the city overall (0.4% versus 5%).

Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-32](#).

General Urban Form

Areas north of NE 85th St (west of 20th Ave NE) and NE 65th St (east of 20th Ave NE) were largely developed prior to annexation to the City of Seattle in 1954. These areas tend to have a more automobile-oriented character than areas further south; in many places sidewalks are absent, and buildings are designed around automobile access. Lake City Way, a major arterial and designated state highway (SR 522), runs through the northern half of Area 2. The road has been upgraded and expanded continuously since it opened in 1909 and combines elements of separated highway, urban arterial, and commercial main street character. Because some segments have fewer design improvements to slow drivers, driver behavior can create a hostile and unpredictable pedestrian environment in Lake City Way's neighborhoods and business districts.


Heights

Building heights in the Northgate Urban Center, Lake City Hub Urban Village, and around the Roosevelt light rail station are between 6- to 8-stories, while the University Community Urban Center is experiencing high-rise development of buildings twenty stories or more. The rest of the analysis area is predominantly 1- to 2-story buildings.

Transitions

A major transition between intensities occurs between the University Community Urban Center and low-density residential areas to the north.

Exhibit 3.6-32. Area 2: NE Seattle—Current Land Use




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

130th/145th Station Area

Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines. Future land use and zoning in the 130th Station Area is primarily neighborhood residential with some commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family designations near 130th Street and Roosevelt Way to the east of I-5 and around 125th Street. Future land use and zoning in the 145th Station Area is primarily commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family along 15th Ave with some neighborhood residential on the station area perimeter. There are no designated shorelines in either station area. See [Exhibit 3.6-33](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-34](#).


Existing Land Use. Existing commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family uses are concentrated around 130th Street and Roosevelt Way to the east of I-5, around 125th Street and 15th Ave, and within the 145th Station Area. These generally consist of single-story commercial or 3-4 story multi-family development with a limited amount of mixed-use near Roosevelt and 125th Street. A portion of the Jackson Park Golf Course is within both station areas. Other parks and open space in the 130th Station Area include Northacres Park, the Flicker Haven and Licorice Fern Natural Areas on Thornton Creek, and the eastern edge of Haller Lake (which is surrounded by single family development but is accessible by a public street end on the west of the lake outside the Station Area). Billings Middle School, Lakeside Middle School, and several churches are also within the 130th Station Area. Single family uses fill in the intervening areas and comprise the majority of the 130th Station Area. See [Exhibit 3.6-35](#).

Exhibit 3.6-33. 130th/145th Station Area—Future Land Use Designations



Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-34. 130th/145th Station Area—Current Zoning



130th/145th: Current Zoning


- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Neighborhood Residential 2 | Midrise Multifamily | 130th/145th Alternatives Planning Area |
| Neighborhood Residential 3 | Neighborhood Commercial 1 | |
| Lowrise 1 | Neighborhood Commercial 2 | |
| Lowrise 2 | Neighborhood Commercial 3 | |
| Lowrise 3 | Commercial 1 | |



Map Date: March 2023

Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-35. 130th/145th Station Area—Current Land Use



Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Heights. Buildings around the 130th light rail station are mostly 1- and 2-story as much of the area is zoned neighborhood residential. At the 145th bus rapid transit station, building south of 145th are mostly 3-story apartments. Additionally, close to the 130th station is the Pinehurst area, where the tallest buildings are 3- and 4-story buildings. See [Exhibit 3.6-36](#).

Exhibit 3.6-36. Typical Buildings in the 130th/145th Station Area



Source: MAKERS, 2023.

Views. Although no SEPA-protected views exist in the area, the 8th Ave NE right-of-way/utility corridor provides a unique view looking north into Jackson Park. See [Exhibit 3.6-37](#).

Exhibit 3.6-37. 8th Ave NE View to Jackson Park



Source: MAKERS, 2023.

Area 3: Queen Anne/Magnolia


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 3 includes the portion of Seattle that is west of State Route 99, north of Denny Way, and south of the Lake Washington Ship Canal as well as the lands in the BINMIC that are north of the Lake Washington Ship Canal. It includes approximately 4,075 acres of buildable lands, or 10% of the buildable lands citywide. In addition to the BINMIC, Area 3 also includes the Uptown Urban Center and the Upper Queen Anne Residential Urban Village.

Topography plays a role in future land use designations within this analysis area. The crest of the Magnolia and Queen Anne neighborhoods support commercial/mixed-use and multi-family residential uses along a primary commercial corridor. Commercial/mixed-use designations are centered at the intersection of 32nd Ave W and W McGraw St in Magnolia, organized along Queen Anne Ave N in Upper Queen Anne Residential Urban Village, and along Mercer St in the Uptown Urban Center. Multi-family residential designations are located at the foot of both hills, lying between the neighborhood residential areas and the industrial uses in the BINMIC. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-38](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-39](#).


Area 3 includes about 24% of the city's designated shoreline district (1,772 acres). Nearly three-quarters of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment, including Conservancy Management (10%) east of the Ballard Locks and on both sides of the Smith Cove Waterway, Conservancy Navigation (8%) along the Lake Washington Ship Canal, and a mix of Conservancy Preservation (35%) and Conservancy Recreation (19%) following the shoreline along the Magnolia neighborhood. Another 17% is designated Urban Industrial on the north shore of the Lake Washington Ship Canal and surrounding Smith Cove Waterway and 6% is designated as Urban Maritime near Fisherman's Terminal. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-40](#).

Exhibit 3.6-38. Area 3: Queen Anne/Magnolia—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-39. Area 3: Queen Anne/Magnolia—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-40. Area 3: Queen Anne/Magnolia—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category is single family residential which accounts for 35% of existing uses versus 48% citywide. A higher share of commercial/mixed-use land uses are present in the study area (13%) compared to the 8% citywide. Commercial/mixed-use land uses are centered in the Uptown Urban Center and the Upper Queen Anne Residential Urban Village with a smaller portion allocated in the Magnolia Village along the W McGraw St commercial corridor. Mixed-use buildings in the centers and villages are typically organized around a liner commercial corridor and consist of 4- to 5-story residential buildings with ground floor retail.

Major institutions, public facilities, and utilities account for 12% of the existing uses primarily due to the presence of the BINMIC and Seattle Pacific University. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for another 20% of the land uses in the analysis area. The largest uses in this category include Discovery Park, Interbay Athletic Complex, Mt. Pleasant Cemetery, and neighborhood parks including David Rodgers, Smith Cove, and Ella Bailey Parks.

Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-41](#).

Heights

Area 3 has a pocket of taller 5- to 7-story buildings in the Uptown Urban Center and along Queen Anne Avenue. However, most of the area is zoned neighborhood residential and has building heights of 1 to 2 floors.


Transitions

The shift from the greater Downtown Urban Center north to lower density residential areas is a major transition in building intensity. However, this is likely to be mitigated by the steep south slope of Queen Anne hill, providing good access to light and views for even low-scale buildings. In Interbay, industrial uses abut residential areas that have seen increasing moderate density housing construction in recent years.

Shadows

The north side of Queen Anne Hill and Magnolia experience a shadier environment because of topography blocking southern sun exposure.

Exhibit 3.6-41. Area 3: Queen Anne/Magnolia—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Area 4: Downtown/Lake Union


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Analysis Area 4 includes the portion of Seattle east of State Route 99, west of Interstate 5, and north of Interstate 90. The study area is also bounded by its shoreline fronting Elliott Bay and Lake Union. It includes approximately 1,033 acres of buildable lands, or 3% of the buildable lands citywide including the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers and the Eastlake Residential Urban Village.

Four distinct future land use designations are present in the analysis area. The Downtown Urban Center, South Lake Union Urban Centers, and Eastlake Residential Urban Village account for nearly 90% of planned uses. Denny Way separates the Downtown Urban Center from the South Lake Union Urban Center. The remaining commercial/mixed use and multi-family designations are located east of Aurora Ave N and north of Galer Street in the Westlake neighborhood. Commercial/mixed-use designations are concentrated along Westlake Ave N and Aurora Ave N with multi-family residential future land use and zoning designations filling in the intervening areas. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-42](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-43](#).


Analysis Area 4 includes about 5% of the city's designated shoreline district (390 acres). Less than 10% of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment. A majority of the shoreline is designated as Urban including: Urban Commercial (41%) lining a majority of Lake Union from the Aurora Bridge to Lake Union Drydocks, followed by Urban Harborfront (33%) fronting Elliott Bay, Urban Marine (9%) in the southeastern corner of Lake Union, and Urban Residential (7%) on the eastside of Lake Union. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-44](#).

Exhibit 3.6-42. Area 4: Downtown/Lake Union—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-43. Area 4: Downtown/Lake Union—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Exhibit 3.6-44. Area 4: Downtown/Lake Union—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category is commercial/mixed-use which accounts for 62.1% of existing uses versus 8.4% citywide. The analysis area includes the commercial and financial center of Seattle and houses its densest and tallest commercial and mixed-use buildings. Commercial/mixed-use land uses are centered in the Downtown and South Lake Union urban centers with a smaller portion of multi-family uses centered in the Belltown and Eastlake neighborhoods. The Eastlake Residential Urban Village has a main commercial corridor along Eastlake Ave E, which is buffered by multi-family and single family uses.

Major institutions, public facilities, and utilities account for 9% of existing uses in the analysis area, including the Seattle City Light Denny Substation, King County Courthouse, Administration and Detention facilities, and the Washington State Convention Center. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for only 4% of current land uses in the analysis area compared to 14% citywide. The largest uses in this category include Lake Union Park, Denny Park, Cascade Playground, and part of the newly rehabilitated waterfront along Elliot Bay.

Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-45](#).

General Urban Form


The urban form of Area 4 has deep roots, stretching back to the early days of Euro-American settlement, when settlers with different land claims laid out separate street grids, each oriented to the shoreline along their land claim. Today, most land in the area is heavily built out, and the dense grid of streets creates a well-connected, if automobile-dominated, dense urban environment.

During early settlement, the land claim south of Yesler Way emerged as a lively, diverse, rough-and-tumble neighborhood. Non-White communities were better able to find a foothold here than in other areas and Asian and Black communities established in Pioneer Square but were pushed east to areas that later became Chinatown, Japantown, and Little Saigon, (together Chinatown-International District or “CID”) and the Central District.¹⁹

Chinatown-International District emerged with a unique urban form combining elements of western boomtown urbanism, with large, externally ornamented but internally utilitarian brick buildings replacing wooden structures, and Chinese and Japanese influences in decorative style and internal layout of buildings. Some of these buildings were developed by transcontinental mutual aid societies such as the Kong Yick Investment Company. Many Japanese people lost their homes and businesses in Japantown (bounded by 4th Ave S, S Jackson St, Yesler Way, and then as far east as 23rd Ave) during Japanese internment in the 1940s.

¹⁹ The Forging of a Black Community, Quintard Taylor, 1994


Exhibit 3.6-45. Area 4: Downtown/Lake Union—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

The area—with complex and changing demographics including Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Black, and White communities—was significantly altered by the construction of I-5 in the 1960's, which involved the partial or complete demolition of 16 city blocks between Yesler Way and S Dearborn St and created a major sensory barrier between uphill and downhill parts of the neighborhood. Uphill portions of the neighborhood (now known as Little Saigon) were largely redeveloped with lower-density, auto-oriented buildings in the mid-20th century. These became a foothold for Vietnamese immigrant communities beginning in the late 1970's, where investments by Chinese-American and Vietnamese-American property owners and developers helped create a lively shopping district featuring semi-outdoor markets and repurposed strip mall-style buildings. See [Exhibit 3.6-46](#), [Exhibit 3.6-47](#), and the [Annexation & Regional Transportation Corridors](#) discussion above.

Exhibit 3.6-46. Proposed Path of I-5 Freeway in Chinatown-International District, 1958



Note: This map was used by the Jackson Street Community Council to raise awareness of businesses and homes that would be displaced by freeway construction.

Source: Wing Luke Museum.

Exhibit 3.6-47. Interstate 5 Construction through Chinatown-International District, 1966



Source: Washington State Archives.

Heights

Area 4 includes the densest area of Seattle, where Belltown, Denny Triangle, South Lake Union, and the Business District have a range of high-rises to skyscrapers. Area 4 also includes Westlake, with 5- to 7-story buildings throughout, and Eastlake, which has a mix of 4- and 5-story buildings, 3-story townhouses, and 2-story houseboats.

Area 5: Capitol Hill/Central District


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 5 includes the portion of Seattle east of Interstate 5, north of Interstate 90, and south of the Montlake Cut. The analysis area is also bounded by its shoreline fronting Portage Bay and Lake Washington. It includes approximately 3,332 acres of buildable lands or 8% of the buildable lands city wide including the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center and the 23rd & Union-Jackson and Madison-Miller Residential Urban Villages.

The urban center and urban village designations indicate where growth is to be concentrated in the future land use map including the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center and the 23rd & Union-Jackson and Madison-Miller residential urban. Outside of the center and village boundaries, future multi-family residential and commercial/mixed-use areas are also planned along these streets. Seattle University accounts for a small pocket of major institution designation between the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center and the 23rd and Union-Jackson Residential Urban Village. Neighborhood residential future land use designations fill in the other intervening areas. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-48](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-49](#).


Area 5 includes about 7% of the city's designated shoreline district (513 acres). Nearly three-quarters of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment, including Conservancy Management (12%) within the inner harbor of Portage Bay, Conservancy Preservation (31%) where Foster Island meets Union Bay, and Conservancy Recreation (32%) along the eastern frontage of the study area along Lake Washington. Another 24% is designated Urban Residential, predominantly along the shoreline of Lake Washington. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-50](#).

Exhibit 3.6-48. Area 5: Capitol Hill/Central District—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-49. Area 5: Capitol Hill/Central District—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-50. Area 5: Capitol Hill/Central District—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category is single family residential which accounts for 46% of existing uses versus 48% citywide. Commercial/mixed-use areas are centered in the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center and the 23rd & Union-Jackson and Madison-Miller residential urban villages. Approximately 18% of the analysis area is currently multi-family residential which is slightly more than double the proportion citywide (9%).

Major institutions, public facilities, and utilities account for 7% of the existing land uses in the analysis area. These uses include Seattle University, Seattle Central College, Garfield Highschool, Bailey Gatzert Elementary, Thurgood Marshall Elementary, and the King County Juvenile Detention Center. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for 18% of the land uses in the analysis area compared to 14% citywide. The largest uses in this category include the Washington Park Arboretum, Volunteer Park, Cal Anderson Park, Frink Park, and Powell Barnett Park.


Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-51](#).

General Urban Form

Area 5 was developed early in Seattle's post-colonial history as the city grew outward from the settlement on Elliott Bay. The well-connected street grid is complemented by organic growth patterns with larger, more intense buildings near downtown scaling gradually down to smaller buildings toward the lake, a pattern which was later locked in place through zoning.


In the twentieth century, the southern portion of the area, generally south of E Madison St and east of 12th Ave, known as the Central Area or Central District was redlined by banks and government institutions, making it nearly impossible for Black residents to live elsewhere in the city (see the [Racially Restrictive Covenants & Zoning Laws](#) discussion above). This racist practice resulted in high population density with severely limited investment in infrastructure and building stock. Community-supported investments in and construction of vernacular housing, churches, stores, and institutions such as banks still play an important role in the built form of the district, though many have been redeveloped in recent decades. During the late 1980s, construction of the long planned I-90 connection across Lake Washington and through the Central District resulted in the demolition of several blocks of homes and businesses in the Atlantic neighborhood, the southern part of Area 5. This project, long stalled by community advocates who successfully sued under environmental protection laws, ultimately led to the construction of a freeway lid with 15 acres of parkland. Highway construction created a significant gap in the built fabric between the Central District and Rainier Valley and Mount Baker neighborhoods to the south. See [Exhibit 3.6-52](#) and the [Annexation & Regional Transportation Corridors](#) discussion above.

Exhibit 3.6-51. Area 5: Capitol Hill/Central District—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Exhibit 3.6-52. Left: High-Density Vernacular Housing in the Central District Circa 1951. Right: I-90 Immediately After Construction in 1991




Sources: Left: University of Washington Manuscript Division. Right: Nakano Associates.

At the heart of the Central District, a few blocks around 23rd and Union have redeveloped with greater intensity mixed-use development over the last 5 years. An OPCD-led planning effort to establish community-created Central Area Design Guidelines, as well as a Community Roots Housing-led (then Capitol Hill Housing) design process for the Liberty Bank (the first Black-owned bank in the Pacific Northwest) redevelopment, has led to place-based architecture and public art that feels connected to the neighborhood's historical roots as a Black cultural hub.

In 2013, Seattle Housing Authority began redeveloping its 30-acre Yesler Terrace public housing site in the southwestern corner of Area 5. When completed, the new development will have around 5,000 mixed-income units (including a one-for-one replacement of the former subsidized units) as well as a community center, commercial space, parks, and parking. Its design includes view corridors to Mt Rainier and downtown, a trail, transit access, hillclimb to Chinatown-International District, and public art. See [Exhibit 3.6-53](#).

Exhibit 3.6-53. Yesler Terrace Redevelopment



Source: [Seattle Housing Authority, 2022](https://seattlehousing.org).

Heights

The tallest buildings in Area 5 are in First Hill, where there are several high-rises. Capitol Hill, Yesler Terrace, and the Central District along 23rd Avenue have many buildings in the 4- to 7-story range. There are 3-story townhouses scattered around the Central District and Judkins Park. However, most of the rest of the area is zoned neighborhood residential and has building heights of 1 to 2 floors.

Transitions

The border between the greater Downtown and First Hill/Capitol Hill urban centers and less intense neighborhoods to the east and northeast is a major transition from greater to lesser intensity.

Area 6: West Seattle


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 6 includes the portion of Seattle west of the Duwamish Waterway and State Route 509, north of SW Roxbury St, and is bounded by the Puget Sound at its western and northern extents. It includes approximately 6,411 acres of buildable land, or 16% of the buildable lands city wide. Additionally, Area 6 includes the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village as well as the Westwood-Highland Park, Morgan Junction, and Admiral residential urban villages.

About 8% of the analysis area is designated as an urban village. Outside of the urban villages, commercial/mixed-use and multi-family designations generally follow California Ave SW, Alki Ave SW, Delridge Way SW, and Fauntleroy Way SW. Neighborhood residential designations fill in the intervening areas accounting for 63% of future land use designations in the analysis area. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-54](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-55](#).


Area 6 includes about 15% of the city's designated shoreline district (1,102 acres). Nearly 85% of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment, including Conservancy Management (4%) on the northeastern shoreline fronting Elliott Bay, Conservancy Preservation (31%) on the northern edge of Alki Beach and surrounding Lincoln Park, and Conservancy Recreation (50%) on a majority of the eastern shoreline fronting the Puget Sound. Another 15% is designated as Urban Residential infilling between the public lands of Lincoln Park and Alki Beach. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-56](#).

Exhibit 3.6-54. Area 6: West Seattle—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-55. Area 6: West Seattle—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-56. Area 6: West Seattle—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use & Urban Form

Existing Uses


The largest existing land use category is single family residential, which accounts for 59% of the land (versus 48% citywide). Existing commercial/mixed-use and multi-family uses, as well as a majority of the community assets, are located within the existing urban village boundaries oriented along California Ave SW. Commercial/mixed-use land uses found within the urban village boundaries are typically medium-density apartment buildings with ground floor commercial around a main commercial corridor that supports essential neighborhood amenities. California Ave SW still maintains a majority of its historic urban fabric supporting single-story retail uses whereas the Westwood-Highland Park Residential Urban Village is comprised of newer, master-planned big box development. Outside of the urban village boundaries, multi-family development is concentrated around the Alki Beach, Highpoint neighborhoods, and along California Ave SW.

Major institutions and public facilities account for 5% of the existing land uses versus 11% citywide. The largest uses in this category are educational institutions including South Seattle College, Pathfinder K-8 School, Denny International Middle School, Madison Middle School, and West Seattle Highschool. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for an additional 18% consisting primarily of West Duwamish Greenbelt, West Seattle Golf Course, and Lincoln, Schmitz Preserve, and Fauntleroy Parks.

The share of industrial land uses in the analysis area is lower than the city overall (0.3% versus 5%) and consist primarily of a public storage facility on the southern border of Seattle.

Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-57](#).

Exhibit 3.6-57. Area 6: West Seattle—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

General Urban Form

Most of Area 6 was developed in the first half of the twentieth century following streetcar suburb development patterns, featuring commercial and mixed-use main streets surrounded by rectangular lower-density residential blocks. By contrast, in the east part of the area, industrial uses expanded up the Delridge valley from the Duwamish area, notably including the Youngstown steel plant, which attracted workers who settled in the valley. The legacy of mixed industrial commercial and residential uses, relatively dense working-class dwellings, and racial diversity continues to shape the neighborhood's built form.

Heights

The tallest buildings in Area 6 are found in the northern part of the analysis area. Buildings in the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village are generally 5- to 7-stories, while buildings in the Admiral and Morgan Junction residential urban villages and along the strip on Alki Beach are 3- to 5-stories. The rest of the analysis area consists mainly of 1- and 2-story buildings.

Transitions

The central location of part of the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village at the top of the hill accentuates building height and creates a potential risk for stark transitions in building scale to adjacent low-density residential areas.

Shadows

The West Seattle Junction Urban Village's northeastern portion is in a small valley. Tall, wide buildings combined with slopes to the south and west create abundant shade during winter months.

Area 7: Duwamish


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 7 includes a portion of Seattle bordering the Duwamish Waterway west of Interstate 5, east of W Marginal Way SW, sharing its northern boundary with the Elliott Bay. It includes approximately 4,056 acres of buildable land, or 10% of buildable lands citywide. Additionally, Area 7 includes the South Park Residential Urban Village and the Greater Duwamish MIC.

Nearly 92% of Area 7 is designated as a manufacturing industrial center on the future land use map. The remainder is allocated towards the South Park Urban Village at the southeastern corner of the analysis area, and the residential/commercial mix around the Van Asselt neighborhood in Georgetown. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped [Exhibit 3.6-58](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-59](#).


Area 7 includes about 16% of the city's designated shoreline district (1,185 acres). Nearly 95% of this area is within the Urban Industrial designation surrounding Harbor Island and spanning both side of the shoreline along the Duwamish Waterway. The reminder is within the Conservancy Preservation designation on the western shoreline adjacent to Kellogg Island. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-60](#).

Exhibit 3.6-58. Area 7: Duwamish—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-59. Area 7: Duwamish—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-60. Area 7: Duwamish—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use & Urban Form

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category within Area 7 is industrial, which accounts for 37% of the land (versus 5% citywide). The analysis area contains the entirety of the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center and supports the Port of Seattle's primary marine shipping area. Vacant land accounts for nearly 14% of the land use as compared to 5% citywide. This is largely because of unbuildable land adjacent to railway corridors running throughout the analysis area and parcels paved for staging and storage uses including the First Study Bus Yard.

Existing commercial/mixed-use land uses account for 7% of existing land uses in the analysis area. These are located throughout the analysis area as a result of specific commercial uses currently allowed in industrial zoned areas of the city. Commercial/mixed use land uses found in the South Park Residential Urban Village follow a more traditional pattern—these are spatially organized along 14th Ave S and support at-grade commercial uses. In comparison, commercial/mixed use land use located throughout the MIC are not organized by any spatial logic and support a variety of more intense and less pedestrian friendly uses such as auto dealerships and wholesale retailers.

Major institutions and public facilities account for an additional 35% of existing uses consisting primarily of Port of Seattle, King County International Airport, and Sound Transit properties. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for only 1% of existing land uses, primarily attributed to the Georgetown and South Park Playfields as well as Marra-Desimone Park. This is the lowest allocation of parks, open space, and cemetery uses across the eight analysis areas.

Single family and multi-family uses account for 5% of the existing land use, centered exclusively within the South Park Residential Urban Village and the Van Asselt neighborhood.


Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-61](#).

General Urban Form

Area 7 is almost entirely composed of land that was formerly part of the Duwamish River floodplain and tidal flats. This was a rich, constantly shifting landscape with abundant plant and animal life that was essential to the lifeways of the Duwamish people, who lived in villages near the water.

During the first century of Seattle settlement, American settlers gradually straightened, dredged, hardened, and diverted the river and filled in tide flats to create developable land near the harbor (see the [Overview of Historical Planning & Land Use Decisions](#) discussion above). Changes to the river initially unlocked agriculture in the rich alluvial soils of the valley surrounding the small agricultural/industrial towns of Georgetown and South Park. Industrial growth spread southwards from Seattle, converting the large open parcels of farmland to industrial uses, and leaving these two neighborhoods isolated in a largely industrial landscape with near total hardscape coverage and large, freight-oriented roadways.


Exhibit 3.6-61. Area 7: Duwamish—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Development of Highway 99 and I-5 through the neighborhoods resulted in demolition of existing homes and businesses and created physical and sensory barriers within the neighborhoods. In 2023, the community group Reconnect South Park was awarded \$1.6 million to study removing part of Highway 99 to reconnect the neighborhood. See [Exhibit 3.6-62](#) and the [Annexation & Regional Transportation Corridors](#) discussion above.

Exhibit 3.6-62. Left: Aerial View of South Park in 1936. Right: Aerial View of South Park in 2021



Sources: Left: King County Public Works; Right: Eagleview Technologies © 2022

Heights

Area 7 consists mainly of 1- and 2-story buildings although zoning currently allows taller buildings.

Transitions

In general, potential transition impacts in Area 7 are limited due to nearly uniform industrial zoning and geographic barriers like I-5 and the Duwamish Waterway. Two exceptions to this are the South Park and Georgetown neighborhoods, which are surrounded by industrial zoning and currently exhibit a stark contrast in lot and building size between residential and industrial areas. Elements like street trees, sidewalks, and small public parks help to soften these transitions. Steep forested slopes and major roadways to the east and west of Area 7 generally provide ample buffers between industrial areas and residential areas in Beacon Hill and West Seattle. However, industrial uses intrude into north Delridge in an area where median household income is lower than the citywide median.²⁰

²⁰ Median household income in Census tract 99 (which includes North Delridge) was \$86,663 versus the citywide median of \$105,391 in 2021. Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (2017-2021): S1901 Income in the past 12 months (in 2021 inflation-adjusted dollars).

Area 8: SE Seattle


Future Land Use, Zoning, & Shorelines

Area 8 includes the portion of Seattle east of Interstate 5, south of Interstate 90, and shares its eastern frontage with Lake Washington. It includes approximately 5,656 acres of buildable land, or 14% of the buildable land citywide. Additionally, the analysis area includes the Mt Baker Hub Urban Village and the North Beacon Hill, Columbia City, Othello, and Rainier Beach Residential Urban Villages. Nearly 23% of Area 8 is designated as either a residential or hub urban village.

Outside of these urban village boundaries, a majority of the commercial/mixed-use and multi-family future land use and zoning designations are concentrated adjacent to major arterials running between urban village boundaries. Outside of the urban villages, commercial/mixed-use and multi-family designations generally follow Beacon Ave S, Rainier Ave S, and MLK Jr Way S. Neighborhood residential designations fill in the intervening areas. Future land use and zoning acreage within the analysis area are detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-14](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-16](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-63](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-64](#).


Area 8 includes about 9% of the city's designated shoreline district (678 acres). Nearly 85% of this area is within a conservancy shoreline environment including Conservancy Management (8%) around the Stan Sayres Boat Launch, Lakewood Marina, and Parkshore Arena, Conservancy Preservation (17%) surrounding Seward Park, and Conservancy Recreation (59%) spanning the remainder of the shoreline. Another 14% is designated as Urban Residential covering the lakefront properties south of I-90 and north of Coleman Beach, and lakefront properties between Seward Park and the southern extent of the City of Seattle. Designated shoreline acreage within the analysis area is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-18](#) and mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-65](#).

Exhibit 3.6-63. Area 8: SE Seattle—Future Land Use Designations




Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-64. Area 8: SE Seattle—Zoning



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-65. Area 8: SE Seattle—Shoreline Designations



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Existing Land Use & Urban Form

Existing Uses

The largest existing land use category is single family residential, which accounts for 57% of the land (versus 48% citywide). Existing commercial/mixed-use and multi-family uses, as well as a majority of the community assets, are located within the existing urban village boundaries.

Major institutions and public facilities account for 6% of the existing land uses consisting primarily of the Veterans Administration Campus and Hospital, the high voltage power easement running NW to SE diagonally through the analysis area, and public schools including Emerson Elementary, Kimball Elementary, Mercer Middle School, Rainier Beach Highschool, Cleveland Highschool, and Franklin Highschool. Parks, open space, and cemeteries account for an additional 17% of current land uses and consist of mostly large urban parks including Seward Park, Jefferson Park and the Jefferson Park Golf Course, the Cheasty Natural Area, and Kubota Garden.

Vacant land accounts for a higher share of current use in the analysis area versus vacant use citywide (7% versus 5%). This is largely because of the high voltage power easement running through the analysis area as well as unused lands adjacent to the Sound Transit Light Rail line.

Current land use acreage is detailed in [Exhibit 3.6-19](#) and mapped [Exhibit 3.6-66](#).


General Urban Form

Urban form in the Rainier Valley is relatively disjointed and more auto-oriented compared to most areas of the city. This is likely a result of multiple factors including:

- Topography that cuts against the standard north-south street grid in most places.
- Historic disinvestment.
- The legacy of redlining and racist real estate practices.
- Construction of I-90 through the Atlantic neighborhood in the late 20th century.

Redevelopment of the light rail station areas over the last decade has and continues to dramatically change urban form. Notably, five large sites in the immediate Othello station area redeveloped with 6- to 7-story mixed-use buildings. Rainier Beach is also seeing multiple 4- to 6-story apartment/condo buildings and 3-story townhouses constructed and/or in the development process. See [Exhibit 3.6-67](#).

Exhibit 3.6-66. Area 8: SE Seattle—Current Land Use



Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Exhibit 3.6-67. Five Major Redevelopments at Othello, 2009-2022



Source: Google Earth, Image US Geological Survey, Imagery Date 4/30/2009 and 8/21/2022.

Heights

The tallest buildings in Area 8 are found along the light rail alignment near stations and in the North Rainier, North Beacon Hill, and Columbia City urban villages. Building heights in these areas are generally 5- to 7-stories right off of Rainier Avenue, Martin Luther King Jr Way, and next to light rail stations. Heights drop to 3- and 4-story buildings 1 to 2 blocks from the major arterials. However, most of the rest of the analysis area is zoned Neighborhood Residential and has building heights of 1 to 2 floors.

Shadows

The location of Mt Baker, Columbia City, Othello (east side), and Rainier Beach (north side) urban villages in a valley with slopes to the south and west creates a relatively shady environment in winter months.

3.6.2 Impacts

Local land development patterns and zoning policies fundamentally affect many of the critical factors that shape the form and character of Seattle and the neighborhoods within, directly affecting people's access to housing, jobs, schools, open space, public services, and transportation. Restrictions on density or large-lot requirements, for example, affect housing supply and price, while limiting where families with low incomes can afford to live and attend school. Overly restrictive land use regulations can also narrow economic opportunities for workers or encourage expansion outward, increasing travel by car and greenhouse gas emissions (GHSs). This section focuses on the potential impacts—including equity and climate vulnerability considerations—of changes in land use patterns, permitted uses, or development intensities. Impacts are discussed based on the following categories:

- **Land use patterns** consider the distribution of growth and intensity of planned uses as well as resulting activity levels.
- **Land use compatibility** considers changes in use type between adjacent areas and any likely incompatibilities. Land use incompatibilities could be related to health and safety (such as noise levels or odors), activity levels at various times of day/night, or conflicting movement patterns.
- **Height, bulk, and scale** considers the physical form, aesthetic, and character of development (such as massing, setbacks, height, and FAR).
- **Transitions** consider visual changes in physical form between adjacent areas.
- **Tree canopy** considers how urban form affects tree canopy.
- **Shadows** consider shading of public open space or rights-of-way as a result of allowed development and the possible implications related to health, urban heat, and the human experience.
- **Views** consider the protection of public views of important landmarks and natural features, as well as views from specific designated viewpoints within the city and scenic qualities along mapped scenic routes.

Impacts Common to All Alternatives

Land Use Patterns

Seattle will likely continue to experience housing and employment growth under all alternatives consistent with the planning estimates described in [Chapter 2](#). Activity levels would increase across the city with new residents, businesses, and employees. The alternatives differ primarily in the distribution and intensity of growth across the city and the projected land use patterns. The actual pace and distribution of future growth would be influenced in part by the implementation of comprehensive plan policies, related regulations and actions, and decisions made by individual property owners and developers.

In general, all alternatives would focus most future growth into centers currently characterized by higher densities, more compact building forms, and a more diverse mix of uses than other areas of the city. Under all alternatives, 80,000 new housing units would be distributed based on past growth and Comprehensive Plan targets, resulting in growth primarily in existing centers and villages. In the action alternatives, 20,000 or 40,000 additional housing units would be accommodated in new place types or expanded center boundaries located throughout the city depending on the alternative. All alternatives assume the same overall growth in jobs with a little over half of job growth in Downtown/South Lake Union (Area 4) and about 9% in the Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center (Area 7). Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 assume a small job shift from the larger centers towards other place types to reflect local demand with the distribution of new housing. The distribution of jobs and housing under Alternative 5 would be a combination of the other alternatives after accounting for expanded urban village boundaries and potential changes to place type designations.

The six urban centers and two MICs are currently designated PSRC Metro Regional Growth Centers and Employment MICs, respectively, and would retain these designations under all alternatives. The City could also seek to designate the other urban villages as countywide growth centers under King County CPP framework. Activity units per acre would increase in all of the centers under Alternatives 1-4 and in most centers under Alternative 5. The boundary of some regional and urban centers (currently called urban centers and urban villages) would be expanded under Alternative 5 to meet the minimum size threshold resulting in a decrease in activity units per acre within the boundaries of West Seattle Junction, Admiral, Greenwood–Phinney Ridge, Morgan Junction, and Upper Queen Anne. Future activity units per acre are discussed in more detail under each alternative.

See also **Section 3.7 Relationship to Plans, Policies, & Regulations** for more discussion of PSRC Metro Regional Growth Centers and King County Countywide Centers.

As a result of these growth distributions, Seattle’s land use pattern—broadly defined—would continue to emphasize:

- Growth leading to a denser and more continuous pattern of intensive land uses in the city’s geographic center (Downtown plus the surrounding neighborhood districts including Uptown, South Lake Union, Capitol Hill, and First Hill).
- Business and port-related activity and employment growth within two central Port and industrial-use centers (Greater Duwamish MIC and BINMIC). All alternatives studied in this EIS include changes implemented as part of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy.
-
- Growth in a wide range of other mixed-use centers such as Fremont, Columbia City and West Seattle Junction distributed through the various sectors of the city, including centers located along major transportation corridors (such as Aurora Avenue, Lake City Way, MLK Jr Way, Rainier Avenue, and California Avenue) that radiate through the various geographic sectors and industrial-use centers.
- More residents, employees, and buildings would be exposed to increased climate risks in many of the centers without additional mitigation. For example, the Downtown/South Lake

Union (Area 4) and Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center (Area 7) are generally “heat islands” with more pavement and almost no areas with more than 10% tree canopy cover (see [Section 3.3 Plants & Animals](#) and [Section 3.11 Public Services](#)).

Land use patterns in areas outside of the centers would vary depending on the alternative as discussed below.

Land Use Compatibility

Housing and employment growth under all alternatives will result in additional development and redevelopment activity citywide. Future growth under all alternatives is likely to increase the frequency of different land use types locating close to one another, and similarly likely to increase the frequency of land use patterns that contain mixes of land uses with differing levels of intensity, both within the centers and, to a varying extent, in other areas of the city. Mixing uses in centers is a goal of the current Comprehensive Plan because having a variety of uses near one another allows people to conduct more of their daily business without driving and reduce GHG emissions; however, some adjacencies could potentially cause adverse compatibility impacts on less intense uses. Over time, infill development and redevelopment would occur throughout the city to accommodate increased growth under all alternatives, gradually increasing the intensity of development in areas not currently developed to their full zoning capacity. The extent of these conflicts varies by alternative and would continue to be mitigated through the application of existing development regulations.

New mixed-use development may also be introduced under any of the alternatives to areas originally developed under zones which previously allowed only one type of use. This could occur in centers where zoning has already changed since original construction, or where zoning could potentially change under an alternative if rezones to mixed use zones occur in the future. More mixing of uses increases the likelihood of localized adverse spillover effects (such as residential or commercial activities that might lead to increased noise). These compatibility challenges would not be an uncommon or new phenomenon within Seattle’s more urbanized centers, but they would represent a potential adverse land use impact of future growth under any alternative. Such impacts can be avoided or mitigated by continuing to implement land use policies and zoning patterns that consider the potential for land use incompatibilities and avoid them through use of transitions in intensity, use restrictions, and/or avoiding proximity of certain kinds of zones. Noise, nuisance, and public safety codes would also continue to provide protection against some of the potential impacts.

Ballard Urban Village & Ballard-Interbay MIC: Land Use Compatibility Conflicts

Most of the southern boundary of the Ballard Urban Village is adjacent to the Ballard-Interbay MIC. Land use compatibility conflicts near this boundary are anticipated under all alternatives and would be similar to those already occurring. Existing land uses in the Ballard MIC north of Leary Way, for example, include a diverse array of industrial, commercial/retail (including a high concentration of breweries and tap rooms), office storage, and some residential uses in

blocks flanking 14th Ave NW. These currently abut larger multifamily development on the south side of NW Market St, commercial development on 15th Ave NW, and 1- to 3-story residential east of 11th Ave NW outside the MIC (in the Ballard Urban Village and in multifamily residential areas).


Redevelopment under all alternatives in the urban village and portions of the MIC are expected to be fueled by proximity to light rail. Within the MIC, blocks recently rezoned Industry and Innovation (II) as part of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy legislation (effective on October 23, 2023) would likely be developed with a significant amount of dense employment in multistory structures, including some towers, with dedicated space for ground floor light industry. This generally includes the area between 15th Ave NW and 11th Ave NW north of Leary Way adjacent to the Ballard Urban Village (the 14th Ave corridor). Per the [Industrial and Maritime Strategy Final EIS](#), redevelopment in the 14th Ave corridor would contribute to an agglomeration of daytime employment uses in conjunction with nearby activity in the Ballard Urban Village that would generate higher volumes of daytime workers unrelated to industrial operations.

Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale

Future growth and development directed into existing centers under all alternatives would result in a moderate amount of additional height and bulk in these commercial and mixed-use nodes. The overall height, bulk, and scale implications from such development would likely be consistent with that experienced during growth over the last 20 years (e.g., mid- and high-rise buildings for both housing and employment uses in urban centers and low- and mid-rise buildings in urban villages). Residential areas will see limited changes to height, but more development of ADUs will add more buildings to these areas.

The present combination of height, FAR, and setback regulations with small to regular sized lots generally leads to bulky buildings that take up most of the lot (see [Exhibit 3.6-68](#)). Some characteristics that can be found in bulkier buildings include windows that primarily face neighboring properties, thin strips of outdoor space that struggle to be functional, and spots of semi-permanent shade (The Coalition for More Homes, 2021).

Exhibit 3.6-68. Bulky Buildings

Note: Bulkier buildings are sometimes referred to as sausage flats. Image is an illustration of some of the characteristics found with bulky buildings.

Source: The Coalition for More Homes—New Zealand, 2021

Transitions

Gradual redevelopment of new buildings that are larger than those they replace is likely to occur under all alternatives, especially in urban centers and villages. This redevelopment could lead to starker transitions between individual properties and between different zones and place types.


Redevelopment would create a potential for localized adverse compatibility issues as existing, lower-intensity uses transition to higher-intensity development forms. For example, areas predominately composed of detached homes may experience more occurrences of sharper transitions in urban form as new, more intensive forms—such as townhomes and apartments—could be built alongside existing structures.

Redevelopment could also result in sharper transitions between zones and place types. The urban centers and villages typically include a range of zones with mixed-use zones (usually Neighborhood Commercial (NC)) at the core, surrounded by residential zones at progressively lower densities (Midrise (MR), Lowrise (LR), and Residential Small Lot (RSL)). **Exhibit 3.6-69** shows a typical zoning pattern. This arrangement of zones moderates transitions in height and

bulk from the core to the rest of the infill area, and from the infill area boundary to surrounding low-density areas.

Over time, edges between low-density areas and centers may become increasingly stark depending on the alternative. Alternatives with little or no expansion of infill areas may see more concentrated infill and starker contrasts in transitional areas between growth and surrounding areas. Alternatives that expand urban centers or villages may see more gradual transitions. The border between the Downtown and First Hill/Capitol Hill urban centers and less intense neighborhoods to the east and northeast will continue to be a major transition from greater to lesser intensity under all alternatives.

Exhibit 3.6-69. Typical Urban Village Zones



Notes: The map shows a typical progression of zones from the edge (dashed line), with lower height and intensity zones, to the core of the village, with the greater intensity zones. See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: [City of Seattle](#), 2023.

Tree Canopy

Bulkier development under all alternatives would likely displace some trees on private property, especially in residential zones. At the same time, the number of street trees may increase where they are required with redevelopment. See [Exhibit 3.6-70](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-71](#). The City's ownership of rights of way, community facilities, and parks also offer great opportunity to add trees to meet the City's 30% tree canopy goal and reduce heat islands.²¹

²¹ Trees in public rights-of-way play an important role in contributing to canopy cover citywide—rights-of-way currently make up 27% of the city's land area and trees in the rights-of-way contribute 23% toward the city's canopy cover. See [Section 3.3 Plants & Animals](#).

Exhibit 3.6-70. Street Trees with Redevelopment



Note: Recent townhouse developments in Seattle with street trees provided, even when it means shifting the sidewalk onto private property. Two photos on left have alley access, while the photo on the right has driveways. Sources: MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-71. Townhouses with Retained Tree



Sources: MAKERS, 2023.


Shadows

Under any alternative, redevelopment will generally be taller and often bulkier than the existing building. Taller buildings cast longer shadows, and bulkier buildings cast wider shadows. A combination of tall and wide can mean large areas become shaded during much or all of the day, especially during winter.

In addition, shadows falling downhill cover greater distances, meaning that buildings toward the top of a north-facing hill can be especially impactful in casting shadows downhill. Likewise, buildings on east-facing hills have strong impacts on afternoon solar access downhill, and buildings on west-facing hills have strong impacts on morning sunlight downhill. [Exhibit 3.6-72](#) show the topography of Seattle with warmer colors representing higher elevations and cooler colors representing lower elevations. Several hills, combined with taller buildings, would have greater shadow impacts on their generally north sides, such as Crown Hill, Maple Leaf, View Ridge, Wallingford/Tangletown, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Capitol Hill, Washington Park, First Hill, Madrona, West Seattle, High Point, Highland Park, Beacon Hill, Graham Hill, and Rainier View.

Existing trees accustomed to full sun, whether in public right-of-way or on private property, may be harmed if their solar access is reduced which could limit growth or reduce the health of the tree. For streets already shaded, new street trees are selected for their tolerance to lower direct sunlight levels (Seattle Right-of-Way Improvements Manual [3.7 Street Trees](#)). Building shadows may fall on existing solar panels or sites of future panels, but the buildings themselves may provide new opportunities for solar. Given the citywide scale, this analysis does not address this potential impact.

Exhibit 3.6-72. Seattle Topographic Map




Source: World Topographic Map, TessaDEM, and Open Street Map, 2023 ([CC-BY-SA 3.0](#)).

Shadows on Public Parks

Some development would likely occur adjacent to parks under all alternatives. As [Exhibit 3.6-73](#) illustrates, an adjacent southern building is most impactful throughout the day. For afternoon sunlight (which is often a desired time to visit plazas and parks), adjacent southern and western buildings cast long shadows into a park. Winter solar access can be limited when buildings are 5 or more stories.

Exhibit 3.6-73 Building Height Impact on Shadows over Example Park on Winter Solstice




Note: The diagram shows “worst-case” shadows taking place on winter solstice. The illustration shows an example park approximately 200 feet by 300 feet, buildings with a 15-foot ground floor and 10-foot upper stories, and buildings approximately 60 feet wide.

Source: MAKERS, 2022

Shadows on Rights-of-Way


Height limits and street widths vary throughout Seattle, but in all cases, east-west-oriented streets are challenging for solar access, especially during wintertime. In most cases, the 3-story and taller buildings on the south side would shade the southern side of the street throughout the year except summertime and may shade both sides of the street throughout a winter day. Other street orientations would also experience increased shadows with taller redevelopment, but to a lesser degree. See [Exhibit 3.6-74](#), [Exhibit 3.6-75](#), and [Exhibit 3.6-76](#).

Exhibit 3.6-74. 1-Story Building's Shadows on Street




Sources: MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-75. 3-Story Building's Shadows on Street



Sources: MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-76. 5-Story Building's Shadows on Street

Sources: MAKERS, 2023.

Views

Under all alternatives, new buildings would develop with greater height and bulk, and, with these increases, development may interfere with publicly protected views. Because these views are protected under current regulations, views would remain unobstructed as long as potential impacts are identified during permit review. Of note, the number of SEPA-protected viewpoints, scenic routes, and Seattle-designated historic landmarks means that view corridors impact development capacity on many sites.

Impacts to protected views in many places would likely be fairly minor because most, although not all, SEPA-protected public viewpoints are located away from centers and villages instead capturing scenic views at edges of hillsides, parks, beaches, and schools. Likewise, many shoreline viewpoints are nestled on the coastlines within semi-secluded sites, providing uninterrupted view of the Puget Sound, Lake Washington, and Lake Union.

Views from defined scenic routes are more difficult to generalize but are often views down corridors to distant features (such as Mount Rainier or the Seattle skyline) and/or are episodic in nature, meaning only certain places along the routes have the best scenic qualities that might be adversely affected by future development. The precise nature and degree of potential future view disruptions along scenic routes would depend upon specific locational view qualities and individual project designs.

Landmarks are generally clustered in urban centers with some in urban villages and some dispersed elsewhere. There is no meaningful relationship between the protected viewpoints/scenic routes and the landmarks. Each historic landmark and site has unique conditions and would need to be evaluated at the project, not programmatic, scale.

130th/145th Station Area

The 130th/145th Station Areas will likely redevelop under all alternatives, although the scale, location, and intensity of that development would vary by alternative. Some commonalities include:

- **Height/bulk/scale.** Large superblocks (longer than 600 feet) lacking a connected internal path or street network mean that direct routes to access the station will be challenging without regulations to encourage or require through-connections with redevelopment. Redevelopment at the light rail station would occur in a physically bifurcated, uncomfortable human environment (at 5th Ave NE, Roosevelt Way, and I-5) and could miss an opportunity to celebrate and activate the station entry.
- **Tree canopy.** Plentiful evergreens, steep slopes, Thornton Creek, and environmentally critical areas near the 130th Station Area make development here unique, and perhaps more constrained, than many other Seattle areas. Existing large evergreen trees make residential areas feel set in hillside woods. Tree preservation could impact development capacity, and redevelopment with a loss of existing trees would have a noticeable effect on the human experience and sense of being set in nature.
- **Shadows.** In general, the existing tall evergreens, combined with steep slopes, significantly shade many residential areas. Shadow impacts from increases in building heights would be less noticeable in these residential areas because of those existing shadows. The north-south orientation of 15th Ave NE, as well as to a lesser extent the diagonal orientation of Roosevelt Way NE, allows for greater solar access for longer hours throughout the year, even with increases in building heights.

Specific land use and urban form impacts in the station areas are described under each alternative below.

Equity & Climate Vulnerability Considerations

Housing policy and zoning laws have a history of causing harm to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color in Seattle (see [Racially Restrictive Covenants & Zoning Laws](#) above). Additionally, the high cost of housing makes it very difficult for people to find housing near jobs, schools, friends, and family and perpetuates existing inequalities. The land use patterns proposed under each alternative, as well as potential resulting compatibility conflicts, are evaluated below for their likelihood to intensify or lessen these historical inequities.

Height and Density: Relationship to Housing Supply & Affordability


The height of a residential building is an important indicator of how many housing units can fit in one building and is strongly correlated with density. Taller buildings are generally denser and have more units than shorter buildings. Dense housing splits the cost of housing development among more households meaning the cost per household is more economical than low density housing.

The large area (about 80%) of Seattle’s residential land being zoned for shorter, low-density housing constricts the choices people have on where they can live in Seattle. A broad, citywide approach to allowing increased density with taller buildings would likely have more equitable impacts to housing choice, a more varied urban form, and more opportunity for vibrant neighborhoods.

See also [Section 3.8 Population, Housing, & Employment](#) for more discussion of the relationship between housing and equity and climate vulnerability considerations.

The present combinations of allowed height, FAR, and setbacks found in Seattle’s zoning regulations generally led to denser housing with many studio and 1-bedroom units over the last 20 years. As [Exhibit 3.6-77](#) indicates, 2% of apartments and 5% of condominiums in Seattle have 3+ bedrooms (City of Seattle & King County Department of Assessments, 2019). This has meant family size housing or units large enough for households with children is consistently scarce in Seattle and also unaffordable to most households with children or looking to have children. The lack of 3+ bedroom multi-family housing means that children and families are limited in housing choices in the city limits or means that families crowd into smaller units. However, allowing a wide variety of housing types may open up opportunities for more multi-family housing that is child and family friendly.

Exhibit 3.6-77. Bedroom Unit Diversity in Seattle Housing Stock



Source: City of Seattle, Housing Choices Background Report, 2019.

Relationship to Active Transportation

In general, the regional center, urban center, and neighborhood center place types, as well as increased density overall, would allow more people to live in walkable/bikeable/rollable communities with improved access to transit. This would mitigate climate impacts and improve chances at social connectedness:

See also [Section 3.10 Transportation](#).

- Density decreases reliance on cars, enables easier mode shift, and lowers vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (IPCC, 2022). A broad, citywide approach to allowing increased density would likely improve Seattle’s response to climate change. See [Section 3.2 Air Quality & GHG Emissions](#).
- Development that improves conditions for active, human-powered travel and public transportation use decreases social isolation and increases chances for social interaction and wellbeing ([Mattison et al., 2015](#); [Holt-Lunstad, 2020](#); National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2020). A broad, citywide approach to allowing increased density would likely have more equitable impacts to human health and wellbeing.

Relationship to Street-level Community-building Spaces

A lively, vibrant neighborhood center is dependent on having a robust residential population nearby. The expected patterns of development, with increased height, bulk, and scale, could improve the ability to gather in public places and cultural anchors (i.e., culturally relevant businesses, services, religious institutions, arts, etc.), as long as commercial space displacement is mitigated and appropriate gathering spaces are provided. Upzones in high displacement risk areas may have a greater immediate impact on the street-level experience with construction impacts and potential displacement of cultural anchors. However, in the long term, with appropriate mitigation, equitable development could improve conditions. The Africatown development at 23rd and Union in the Central District is an example of this, where the Liberty Bank Building honors Black resilience to redlining, affordable housing is marketed to Black people who had been displaced from the Central District, and affordable commercial space for Black-owned businesses and services and a plaza for community gathering are provided.

Residential Design for Social Wellbeing & Sociability

A lack of social connections increases the risk of many health issues and chronic stress (CDC, 2021). Loneliness is most prevalent in low-density areas where commuting by car reduces opportunities for social interactions and high-rise buildings if residential design does not promote community and relationship building ([Mattisson et al., 2015](#); [Kalantari and Shepley, 2021](#)).

To promote social connection, Health Affairs recommends policies such as, “Diversify housing design to incorporate communal and workspaces to encourage social interaction and reduce commute times, urban design that balances public and private space, housing to better serve changing demographics” (Health Affairs, 2020). A broad, citywide approach to allowing increased density would likely support policy recommendations from Health Affairs.

Happy Cities' *Designed to Engage* report and *Happy Homes Interactive Toolkit* offer policy and development standard recommendations for designing multi-family housing to promote sociability, such as missing middle and diverse housing types, social corridors in multi-family buildings, open/amenity space open only to residents, and breaking down the number of households using a shared entrance or corridor (Happy Cities, 2020). Taller, thin, small lot, dense multi-family housing, such as point access block apartments, are building types that align well with residential design for sociability. Seattle's building code allows up to four units off of one stairwell, allowing for opportunities for social interaction with neighbors and the ability to build trust with neighbors. Thinner buildings allow for more open space. A broad, citywide approach to allowing increased density with taller buildings would likely improve residential design for sociability and social wellbeing.

Climate Change

Like the greater Puget Sound region, Seattle is already experiencing extreme climate events consistent with climate change projections. Areas of the city that could pose greater risks to residents and businesses include sea level rise particularly along the Duwamish River as well as along marine waters of Areas 1, 3, 4, and 6. Along the edges of the city and water bodies are geologic hazard areas like landslides or erosion hazard areas where extreme precipitation could increase the land affected (see [Section 3.1 Earth & Water Quality](#)). Locations where there could be greater exposure to extreme heat include places with more impervious area and less tree canopy. Tree canopy, for example, is largely absent from Downtown and major industrial areas along the Duwamish Waterway and in Interbay (see [Section 3.3 Plants & Animals](#)). The alternatives vary in their proposed concentration of growth in areas vulnerable to climate risks or in their level of opportunity to incorporate additional climate resilience strategies. Most population will be concentrated in centers or corridors away from most hazards, especially under Alternatives 1, 2, and 4. Distributing more growth in urban neighborhoods under Alternatives 3 and 5 could increase the potential for populations to be closer to hazards or affected by interruptions in access to their neighborhoods. All action alternatives include a new Environment and Climate Element that incorporate mitigation and adaptation strategies and include policies regarding tree canopy protection or enhancement and critical area regulations. Utility providers are also developing system plans that anticipate climate change effects (e.g., stormwater plans) to help reduce effects.

Impacts of Alternative 1: No Action

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Alternative 1 No Action would maintain the status quo of focusing most housing and jobs within existing centers and villages with limited change to land use patterns outside of those proposed as part of the recent Industrial and Maritime Strategy EIS. See [Exhibit 2.4-4](#).

Homes and jobs would be distributed across the city based on observed growth between 2010 and 2020 and the distribution of growth in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan (current future land use designations are mapped citywide in [Exhibit 3.6-15](#)). New housing would continue to be primarily rental apartments concentrated in existing mixed-use areas with land outside the centers and villages limited primarily to high-cost detached houses. Most new housing would be in Area 4 encompassing the Downtown and South Lake Union urban centers, followed by Area 1 which contains the Ballard Urban Village and Area 5 which contains the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center. New jobs would continue to be located primarily in existing centers and villages. Over time, infill development and redevelopment would occur throughout the city to accommodate increased growth, gradually increasing the intensity of development in areas not currently developed to their full zoning capacity. Growth would continue to be limited by existing zoned capacity (current generalized zoning is mapped citywide in [Exhibit 3.6-16](#)).

Future planned activity units per acre in each center and village under the No Action Alternative are listed in [Exhibit 3.6-78](#). Like all alternatives, the six urban centers and two MICs would retain their designations as PSRC Metro Regional Growth Centers (RGCs) and Employment MICs, respectively, under the No Action Alternative. Most of the urban villages would meet King County's threshold of 30 future activity units per acre with the exception of Othello and Rainier Beach in Area 8 and South Park in Area 7. No center or village boundary changes are proposed as part of the No Action Alternative—several urban villages would continue to be outside the 160–500 acre size thresholds as described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#).

Land use incompatibilities would be similar to those observed today and described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#) but could become more severe over time with continuing trends. Mixing of new and existing uses could generate adverse localized incompatibilities, either within centers and villages or at their periphery where more intense development could occur adjacent to low-intensity uses outside the center or village (see also the [Transitions](#) section below). Increased development intensity and the pace of change may result in localized compatibility conflicts. These conflicts would continue to be managed by the application of existing development regulations and design standards. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated with respect to land use compatibility under the No Action Alternative.

Exhibit 3.6-78. Future Activity Units (AU)—Alternative 1: No Action

Center/Village	Existing AU/Ac.	Alt 1. Acres	Alt. 1 AU	Alt. 1 AU/Ac.
Urban Centers¹				
Downtown	377.4	952	450,509	473.2
First Hill/Capitol Hill	139.5	916	149,746	163.4
University Community	54.5	753	52,890	70.2
South Lake Union	236.7	340	116,965	344.1
Uptown	131.3	333	53,775	161.3
Northgate	57.3	412	30,946	75.1
Hub Urban Villages¹				
Ballard	67.7	495	48,030	96.9
Bitter Lake Village	44.0	364	20,147	55.4
Fremont	71.9	214	18,892	88.1
Lake City	57.6	142	10,719	75.4
Mt Baker	36.0	491	23,288	47.4
West Seattle Junction	70.4	269	26,981	100.2
Residential Urban Villages¹				
23 rd & Union-Jackson	38.9	625	29,080	46.5
Admiral	49.2	98	5,943	60.4
Aurora-Liction Springs	44.1	327	16,796	51.4
Columbia City	33.9	335	15,442	46.1
Crown Hill	25.3	271	8,509	31.4
Eastlake	70.2	199	16,337	82.0
Green Lake	70.6	109	9,500	87.4
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	84.5	94	9,566	101.6
Madison-Miller	65.3	145	12,368	85.1
Morgan Junction	34.1	113	4,711	41.6
North Beacon Hill	28.1	267	9,196	34.5
Othello	23.7	499	14,480	29.0
Rainier Beach	23.0	346	9,015	26.0
Roosevelt	61.4	170	13,819	81.2
South Park	14.7	263]	4,860	18.5
Upper Queen Anne	89.5	53	5,814	110.5
Wallingford	42.2	258	13,274	51.5
Westwood-Highland Park	27.9	275	8,962	32.6

1 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Note: Activity units (AU) is the sum of residential population and jobs. Assumes an average household size of 2.05 per the King County Growth Management Planning Council. Highlighted densities or size fall outside King County's countywide center designation criteria of 160–500 acres or below the minimum 18 existing AU or 30 future AU per acre. MIC designation criteria from PSRC does not include an AU density threshold.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale


Impacts to height, bulk, and scale under Alternative 1 would be similar to the existing pattern described under Citywide Affected Environment. As growth is directed into existing centers and villages, a moderate amount of additional height and bulk would result from future development in these commercial and mixed-use nodes. The overall height, bulk, and scale implications from such future development would likely be consistent with that experienced during growth over the last twenty years.

As shown on [Exhibit 3.6-79](#), urban centers allow the greatest building heights, particularly Downtown and South Lake Union, which results in mid- and high-rise buildings for both housing and employment uses. Urban villages allow a range of moderate and medium scale buildings, with building heights ranging from 30 feet to 85 feet, which results in low- and mid-rise buildings. Areas surrounding centers and villages are primarily zoned neighborhood residential which has a maximum height of 30 feet. Neighborhood residential zones would likely see more development of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) over the next 20 years. [Exhibit 3.6-80](#) shows 1-4 unit development that could happen in Neighborhood Residential zones under Alternative 1.

Related to the height of buildings, the bulk and size of building are influenced by zoned FAR. Urban centers allow the greatest FARs, followed by urban villages, and neighborhood residential. The relationship between height and FAR in many of Seattle's zones have led to a significant number of buildings developed during the last 20 years to be larger lot developments, which result in bulkier buildings than smaller lot developments. However, the City's existing development regulations and design review process are anticipated to be sufficient to reduce impacts to height, bulk, and scale to less than significant levels.

[Exhibit 3.6-80](#), [Exhibit 3.6-81](#), and [Exhibit 3.6-82](#) illustrate likely amounts and types of development in Neighborhood Residential zones over the next 20 years. Building types already allowed in these zones include attached and detached accessory dwelling units and in Residential Small Lot zones, multiple detached houses. The models show prototypical Seattle neighborhood blocks (no precise location) that include alleys, no alleys, and steeper terrain (with and without alleys).


Exhibit 3.6-79. Current Maximum Height Limits—Alternative 1: No Action



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.


**Exhibit 3.6-80. Example Neighborhood Residential Block with an Alley Redevelopment—
Alternative 1: No Action**



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years under current Neighborhood Residential zoning. It is not intended to show the exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023


**Exhibit 3.6-81. Example Neighborhood Residential Block without an Alley Redevelopment—
Alternative 1: No Action**



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years under current zoning. It is not intended to show the exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023

Exhibit 3.6-82. Example Hilly Neighborhood Residential Block Redevelopment—Alternative 1: No Action



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years under current zoning. It is not intended to show the exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023

Transitions

Continued infill development in established centers and villages would likely create increasingly stark contrasts with surrounding lower-scale areas. In villages with existing RSL and low-rise transition zones, the effect may be less pronounced, but widespread development of townhouses and cottage clusters may show an abrupt shift as one crosses the urban village boundary. Development in centers and villages where parking is required would likely create more abrupt transitions to the low-density residential scale compared to areas where parking is not required.

Tree Canopy

No additional impacts to tree canopy are anticipated under Alternative 1 above those described under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**.


Shadows

Redevelopment in centers and villages would likely have taller heights than existing buildings, and thus cast longer shadows. Urban villages that sit on the north side of a hill, which could then cast shadows further, include northern Queen Anne, Admiral, and Othello. Nearly every center or village contains or is adjacent to parks, so redevelopment may cast longer shadows on parks. Also, urban villages with east-west-oriented main streets will see greater shadows on their central street and any associated public spaces. Most urban villages have north-south orientations, but a few have at least one central street running east-west, including Ballard (Market St) in Area 1, Wallingford (45th St) in Area 1, 23rd and Union-Jackson (Union St) in Area 5, Othello (Othello St and Graham St) in Area 8, and Rainier Beach (Henderson St) in Area 8.

Views

Future development under Alternative 1 would present limited disruptions to public views as growth would continue to concentrate in centers and villages, which tend to contain few viewpoints. Some exceptions include three viewpoints in Downtown that are not along the waterfront, one in Othello, two near West Seattle Junction, one at Ballard High School on the north side of Ballard, one in Bitter Lake, and Rainbow Point north of Green Lake-Roosevelt. See **Exhibit 3.6-83**.

Exhibit 3.6-83. Seattle Views Map—Alternative 1: No Action



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

130th/145th Station Area

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Current Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations would be retained under the No Action Alternative in the 130th/145th Station Area. Zoning would continue to allow 3-story single-purpose residential development around the future light rail station at 130th and some 4- to 8-story multi-family uses near the 145th BRT station. Housing and job growth around both station areas would be modest and based on existing land use and zoning designations—194 housing units and 109 jobs would be added around NE 130th St and 646 housing units and 607 jobs would be added around 145th. Existing future land use and zoning designations in the station areas are mapped in [Exhibit 3.6-33](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-34](#). Growth would increase activity unit density from 18.4 (existing) to 20.7 around NE 130th Street and from 35.3 (existing) to 64.9 around 15th and 145th. See [Exhibit 3.6-84](#).

Exhibit 3.6-84. Station Area Share of Targets 2024-2044—Alternative 1

Location	New Housing Units*	New Jobs*	Existing AU/Ac.	Future AU/Ac.
NE 130 th Street	194	109	18.4	20.7
15 th & 145 th	646	607	35.3	64.9

* The growth estimates consider the growth concept under the No Action Alternative within a common maximum boundary (Alternative 5).

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Urban Form

As seen in [Exhibit 3.6-79](#), [Exhibit 3.6-85](#), and [Exhibit 3.6-86](#), the height around the 130th station would continue to be mostly 1- and 2-story buildings under Alternative 1, with the potential for some residential lots to see 3 stories. Under the existing zoning that offers limited capacity for development, few parcels would be likely to fully redevelop, though more may see additions (e.g., ADUs) and rebuilds. Though a light rail station would sit at the confluence of NE 130th St, Roosevelt Way NE, 5th Ave NE, and I-5, the station area would continue to feel like a low-density residential area and not like an active urban area. Few people would be within walking/biking/rolling distance of the station. Streets would not be activated with commercial uses, many streets would continue to lack sidewalks, and connectivity within the block bounded by 5th Ave NE, NE 130th St, 8th Ave NE, and Jackson Park would continue to be disjointed. In addition, 5th Ave NE would remain an uncelebrated public entry to a major transit investment (see [Exhibit 3.6-87](#)). [Exhibit 3.6-85](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-86](#) illustrate potential redevelopment over 20 years; exact amount, locations, and design of redevelopment may vary. It would likely happen incrementally (i.e., site by site) as property owners choose to develop their property and/or aggregate properties for larger redevelopments.

Exhibit 3.6-85. 130th/145th Station Area Allowed Building Heights—Alternative 1: No Action



Note: This model illustrates allowed building heights under existing zoning. Building envelopes would also be influenced by FAR, setback, and upper story step back regulations.

Source: MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-86. 130th Station Area Massing Illustration—Alternative 1: No Action



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years and building massings that maximize allowed FAR and heights while adhering to setback and zone transition regulations. Possible redevelopment is shown in pale yellow on an approximate amount of parcels likely to fully redevelop and is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur. Additional modest changes (e.g., additions of ADUs, rehabilitation/remodels, and rebuilds) may occur under existing zoning. Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-87. 5th Ave NE and 130th Station under Construction



Source: MAKERS, 2023.

Greater change would occur in the areas currently zoned for more intense development, including the 145th BRT station area and Pinehurst area. The 145th BRT station could incentivize further development in the area. The apartments southwest of the BRT station could redevelop from 3-story buildings to 5- to 8-story buildings. This area includes many established trees (see [Exhibit 3.6-88](#)). The east side of 15th Ave NE could redevelop with 75-foot tall buildings.

Exhibit 3.6-88. Existing 3-story Apartments Southwest of the 145th BRT Station



Source: MAKERS, 2023.

The Pinehurst area around 15th Avenue NE and NE 125th Street would continue to see similar development of 5-story mixed-use buildings in the NC3 zone along the main streets and 3- to 5-story residential buildings in the LR zones ([Exhibit 3.6-89](#)). With an urban center connector street designation on 15th Ave NE and NE 125th St, these streets would likely see street tree gaps filled with redevelopment, although trees may be in small landscape strips or grates with more space given to bus and pedestrian furniture, a protected bike lane, and street parking (if

remaining). Smaller streets off of the main arterials would meet Neighborhood Yield Streets standards, likely adding consistent landscape strips (6-8 feet wide) and street trees.

Exhibit 3.6-89. Pinehurst Massing Illustration—Alternative 1: No Action



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years and building massings that maximize allowed FAR and heights while adhering to setback and zone transition regulations. Possible NC redevelopment is shown in orange and LR redevelopment in beige. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Equity & Climate Vulnerability Considerations

Housing Type Variety and Choice

The housing type variety and housing choice under Alternative 1 would be similar to the existing pattern described under Citywide Affected Environment and **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**. Although there would continue to be new housing built over the next 20 years, the mix of housing types under Alternative 1 would likely continue to struggle serving a broad range of households.

Relationship to Active Transportation

Alternative 1's increase in density around transit and amenities would continue to support opportunities for active transportation as described in **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**.

Relationship to Social Wellbeing & Sociability

No additional impacts to social wellbeing and sociability are anticipated under Alternative 1 above those described under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**. The focus on higher densities in select places could result in more high-rise buildings (as opposed to a greater variety of building types in Alternative 3, 4, and 5) to meet housing needs. This could result in small areas of apartments with small, less expensive units surrounded by large areas with high-cost detached homes. This division could limit social wellbeing and sociability. At the same time, these higher densities close to transit and amenities increase opportunities for active living, which in turn increases chances for sociability and wellbeing.

Climate Change

No additional impacts to climate change are anticipated under Alternative 1 above those described under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**. Growth under the No Action Alternative would be concentrated in existing centers and villages away from most hazards. The No Action Alternative would not include the new Environment and Climate Element with mitigation and adaptation strategies or policies regarding tree canopy protection or enhancement and critical area regulations.

Impacts of Alternative 2: Focused

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Alternative 2 would designate additional areas of focused growth called neighborhood centers to create more housing around shops and services (see [Exhibit 2.4-10](#)). Neighborhood centers would be similar to urban centers in that they would allow a wide range of housing types and commercial uses with more compact building forms, but with a smaller geographic size and lower intensity of allowed development. About 3,000 acres currently in neighborhood residential zoning would be designated as neighborhood centers.

Alternative 2 studies total housing growth of 100,000 housing units (20,000 more than the No Action Alternative) to account for potential additional housing demand that could be met within the neighborhood centers. As described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#), most new growth would be focused within the regional and urban centers currently characterized by higher densities and a more diverse mix of uses than other areas of the city. Housing growth within the regional and urban centers would be the same as the No Action Alternative. Activity levels and activity units per acre would be similar to those described under the No Action Alternative, although future activity units per acre would be marginally lower under Alternative 2 as a result of the slight jobs shift to neighborhood centers (see [Exhibit 3.6-90](#)). Land use patterns and potential compatibility impacts within the regional and urban centers and at their periphery (where more intense development could occur adjacent to low-intensity uses outside the center) would be similar to those described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#). Compared to the No Action Alternative, adverse compatibility impacts at the periphery of regional and urban centers could be lessened where a new neighborhood center with moderate-scale development abuts an existing center designation (see also the [Transitions](#) section below).

Under Alternative 2, neighborhood centers would accommodate the second highest share of anticipated housing growth behind regional centers (see [Chapter 2](#)). About half (49%) of housing growth in neighborhood centers would be directed into neighborhood centers with low displacement risk in areas 1 and 2. Area 4 would still receive the greatest overall share of new housing growth (19%) followed by Area 1 and Area 2 (about 18% each). A small number of jobs and commercial space would also shift from the larger centers towards the new neighborhood centers to reflect local demand consistent with the distribution of new housing. All neighborhood centers already contain areas zoned for commercial or mixed-use development. Additional jobs and commercial space in these areas, however, could increase more quickly due to the local demand from new housing.

Over time, overall land use patterns within the neighborhood centers would become more dense and mixed use. This could result in localized land use compatibility impacts within the neighborhood centers or with adjacent urban neighborhood areas where newer development is of greater height and intensity than existing development (see also the [Urban Form](#) section below). Such impacts would be mitigated through application of the City's existing development regulations and design review process. The SMP would also continue to apply where new neighborhood centers overlap the shoreline jurisdiction (e.g., north of Green Lake in Area 1, on Alki in Area 6, and on Lake Washington in Area 5).

Exhibit 3.6-90. Future Activity Units (AU)—Alternative 2

Center	Existing AU/Ac.	Alt. 1 AU/Ac.	Alt. 2 Acres	Alt. 2 AU	Alt. 2 AU/Ac.
Regional Centers¹					
Downtown	377.4	473.2	952	448,614	471.2
First Hill/Capitol Hill	139.5	163.4	916	149,645	163.3
University Community	54.5	70.2	753	52,773	70.0
South Lake Union	236.7	344.1	340	116,153	341.8
Uptown	131.3	161.3	333	53,695	161.1
Northgate	57.3	75.1	412	30,860	74.9
Hub Urban Centers¹					
Ballard	67.7	96.9	495	47,906	96.7
Bitter Lake Village	44.0	55.4	364	20,086	55.2
Fremont	71.9	88.1	214	18,883	88.0
Lake City	57.6	75.4	142	10,700	75.2
Mt Baker	36.0	47.4	491	23,196	47.2
West Seattle Junction	70.4	100.2	269	26,927	100.0
Residential Urban Centers¹					
23 rd & Union-Jackson	38.9	46.5	625	29,059	46.5
Admiral	49.2	60.4	98	5,935	60.3
Aurora-Licton Springs	44.1	51.4	327	16,784	51.3
Columbia City	33.9	46.1	335	15,411	46.0
Crown Hill	25.3	31.4	271	8,499	31.4
Eastlake	70.2	82.0	199	16,329	82.0
Green Lake	70.6	87.4	109	9,495	87.3
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	84.5	101.6	94	9,548	101.4
Madison-Miller	65.3	85.1	145	12,357	85.0
Morgan Junction	34.1	41.6	113	4,706	41.5
North Beacon Hill	28.1	34.5	267	9,175	34.4
Othello	23.7	29.0	499	14,503	29.1
Rainier Beach	23.0	26.0	346	9,007	26.0
Roosevelt	61.4	81.2	170	13,808	81.2
South Park	14.7	18.5	263	4,847	18.4
Upper Queen Anne	89.5	110.5	53	5,806	110.3
Wallingford	42.2	51.5	258	13,258	51.4
Westwood-Highland Park	27.9	32.6	275	8,948	32.5

1 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Note: Activity units (AU) is the sum of residential population and jobs. Assumes an average household size of 2.05 per the King County Growth Management Planning Council. Highlighted urban villages fall outside King County's countywide center designation criteria of 160–500 acres or below the minimum 18 existing AU or 30 future AU per acre. MIC designation criteria from PSRC does not include an AU density threshold.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.


Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale

Neighborhood centers could contain a mix of residential and mixed-use development from townhouses to 7-story apartments and mixed-use buildings. See [Exhibit 3.6-91](#). Over time, overall building height and bulk in the new neighborhood center areas would likely increase with new development. Areas that are currently primarily 1- and 2-story buildings would be allowed to develop up to 5- to 8-story buildings. Localized impacts could occur as the areas transition to a more intense development pattern, with this conflict most likely being more pronounced in areas where neighborhood centers are being added.

Alternative 2 could also result in height, bulk, and scale impacts between properties in neighborhood centers where areas that are predominately 1- and 2-story detached houses might experience gradual redevelopment with multifamily homes as tall as 7 stories. Differences in massing on adjacent properties are not likely to be significantly more intense than those already occurring in many regional and urban centers but would occur in new areas.

Exhibit 3.6-91. Proposed Height Limit Changes—Alternative 2



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.
Source: City of Seattle and MAKERS, 2023.

Transitions

Alternative 2 introduces a new kind of infill area: neighborhood centers. These will bring some moderate-scale development at neighborhood locations where it is not currently allowed, reducing the existing contrast between regional and urban centers (that see widespread development of large buildings) and surrounding areas (with broad areas that see minimal development). Designating neighborhood centers could create new contrasts in building heights and intensity with surrounding areas in the places where they are applied.

Tree Canopy

Increased development pressure in previously low-density residential zones may displace trees on private property faster, while adding street trees.

Shadows

In neighborhood centers, the increase in height limits from 30 feet to 75 feet would mean that existing single-story buildings could be replaced with taller and wider buildings. These would cast longer shadows over a greater portion of the day. As noted in the [Affected Environment](#), building shadows can be considered positive for climate adaptation to reduce summertime heat, but can be negative for human health and wellbeing (especially during winter) and the health of existing trees if accustomed to full sun.

Shadows on Public Parks

Neighborhood center upzones that increase height limits above 30 feet that could result in increased shadows on public parks including:

- NE 145th and 15th Ave NE on Jackson Park
- 130th Station Area on Jackson Park
- Holman Rd NW and 3rd Ave NW on Carkeek Park
- 15th Ave NE and Lake City Way on Maple Leaf Reservoir Park
- Sand Point Way and 50th Ave NE on Burke-Gilman Trail and Playground Park
- NE 45th St/Sand Point Way and 36th Ave NE on Burke-Gilman Trail
- Tangletown on Keystone Place
- Lawton Park on Discovery Park
- Magnolia on Magnolia Playfield
- Madison Park on Madison Park and Madison Park Beach
- Washington Park/Broadmoor on Broadmoor Golf Club
- Madrona on Madrona Playground and Alvin Larkins Park
- Alki on Alki Beach Park
- North Delridge on Dragonfly Garden and Pavilion

- Delridge Way SW and SW Brandon St on Cottage Grove Park, Delridge P-Patch Community Gardens, and Greg Davis Park
- Delridge Way SW and Sylvan Way SW on Delridge and Myrtle
- 9th Ave SW and SW Henderson St on Highland Park Playground and Westcrest Park
- Beacon Ave S and S Columbian Way on Jefferson Park Golf Course

Shadows on the Delridge P-Patch are important to note because of their potential impact to plant productivity.


Shadows on Public Rights-of-Way

Impacts would be greatest along east-west-oriented neighborhood main streets with taller developments on the south side, though they would impact any orientation to varying degrees. See [Exhibit 3.6-74](#), [Exhibit 3.6-75](#), and [Exhibit 3.6-76](#) for shadow patterns at various times and seasons with different building heights. Many neighborhood main streets have 1-story existing buildings, so the increase to 3- or 5-stories would have noticeable impacts on shadows to the sidewalks. Street trees accustomed to full sun, especially if shorter than new buildings, may be impacted. Selection of future street trees and vegetation would need to consider future solar impacts.

Views

The expected development pattern in neighborhood centers is unlikely to significantly impact protected views beyond the potential impacts of the No Action Alternative. Most public viewpoints, including shorelines and landmarks, are not located within the neighborhood centers, and no zoning changes are proposed between most viewpoints and the landmark view. See [Exhibit 3.6-92](#).

Exhibit 3.6-92. Seattle Views Map—Alternative 2



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

130th/145th Station Area

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Under Alternative 2, there would be three neighborhood centers designated in the station area near 130th Street and Roosevelt Way to the east of I-5, 125th Street and 15th Ave (Pinehurst), and 145th Street and 15th Ave. Zoning to implement the centers would include a combination of Low-rise Residential, Midrise Residential, and Neighborhood Commercial (NC3). Future development would be more mixed use near the 145th Station Area (with NC3) compared to the No Action Alternative and heights would be greater at up to 7 stories, particularly along the 145th Station Area.

Both stations areas would see more growth clustered in the newly designated neighborhood centers under Alternative 2 compared to the No Action Alternative. However, housing and job growth would be relatively modest—1,049 housing units and 284 jobs would be added around 130th Street and 1,159 housing units and 695 jobs would be added around 145th Street. Growth would increase activity unit density from 18.6 (existing) to 29.9 around NE 130th Street and from 35.7 (existing) to 83.3 around 15th and 145th. Land use patterns and compatibility impacts would be similar to those described above within other neighborhood centers.

See [Exhibit 3.6-93](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-94](#).

Exhibit 3.6-93. Station Area Share of Targets 2024-2044—Alternative 2


Location	Place Type*	New Place Acres**	New Housing Units**	New Jobs**	Existing AU/Ac.	Future AU/Ac.
NE 130 th Street	Neighborhood Center	52	1,049	284	18.4	29.6
15 th & 145 th	Neighborhood Center	65	1,159	695	35.3	82.4

* See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

** New place acres are the total acres within the neighborhood center boundary under Alternative 2. The growth estimates consider the proposed growth concept under Alternative 2 within a common maximum boundary (Alternative 5). The 130th Street and Pinehurst Neighborhood Centers in Alternative 2 are both part of the 130th Street Urban Center in Alternative 5 and so are listed under NE 130th Street in this table.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-94. 130th/145th Station Area Zoning Concept—Alternative 2



130th/145th Alternative 2: Focused

Zoning Category

- Lowrise 1
- Midrise Multifamily
- Lowrise 2
- Neighborhood Commercial 3
- Lowrise 3



Map Date: July 2023

Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Urban Form

Height, bulk, and scale. The station areas could see extensive changes to height, bulk, and scale as a result of proposed zoning capacity increases combined with proximity to the new light rail station. Building heights immediately next to the 130th light rail station would likely redevelop from primarily 1- and 2-story buildings up to 7 stories. The heights of buildings surrounding the 130th station would develop into a mix of 3-story townhomes and 4- and 5-story buildings. [Exhibit 3.6-95](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-96](#) illustrate potential redevelopment over 20 years; exact amount, locations, and design of redevelopment may vary. It would likely happen incrementally (i.e., site by site) as property owners choose to develop their property and/or aggregate properties for larger redevelopments.


The core of the 145th station area would likely redevelop into a mixed-use node with buildings up to 7 stories, while heights in the surrounding area would be similar to the No Action Alternative. Zoning around Pinehurst would allow for more multi-family than the No Action Alternative but new development would likely continue to see a mix of 3- to 5-story buildings.

Specific impacts include:

- **Urban design and active transportation: Intersite connectivity.** The block bounded by 5th Ave NE, NE 130th St, 8th Ave NE, and Jackson Park is approximately 660 feet by 690 feet and currently has no through access; NE 131st Place is a private access drive and 8th Ct NE is a short dead-end right-of-way. With redevelopment, the lack of an existing finer-grained and connected network of streets means that redevelopment, without requirements for greater connectivity, could result in development that is fractured and doesn't have great connections to existing streets and the light rail station.
- **Street-level community building: Lack of focused public realm.** Similarly, because of the limited street grid, piecemeal redevelopment could result in individual, unrelated, disconnected developments lacking a cohesive orientation toward public streets, a focused public realm, or opportunities for shared social gathering. Building entries could be hidden or facing different directions within a block accessed by long, private driveways.
- **Street level community building: Affordable commercial space.** 15th Ave NE, both in the 145th station area and Pinehurst, as well as NE 125th St at 15th Ave NE and Roosevelt Way NE south of NE 125th St, would likely see greater levels of activity, enlivening the street level experience. However, many small commercial spaces currently exist in strip malls or in adapted houses in these areas. With redevelopment, maintaining affordable commercial space in the area for local and BIPOC-owned businesses may be challenging, impacting the social and cultural ties to these neighborhood centers.

Transitions. Development of high-intensity buildings in the immediate vicinity of the 130th station area under Alternative 2 may create abrupt local transitions in scale between existing detached houses and new larger construction. Over time, an evolution of the station area into more consistently intensely used land, combined with smaller scale redevelopment in surrounding low-rise zones would likely soften these transitions. See [Exhibit 3.6-96](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-97](#).

Exhibit 3.6-95. Proposed 130th/145th Station Area Allowed Building Heights—Alternative 2



Note: This model illustrates proposed building height limits in proposed neighborhood centers. Building envelopes would also be influenced by FAR, setback, and upper story step back regulations.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-96. 130th Station Area Massing Illustration—Alternative 2



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years and building massings that maximize allowed FAR and heights while adhering to setback and zone transition regulations. Possible NC redevelopment is shown in orange and LR redevelopment in beige. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-97. Pinehurst Massing Illustration—Alternative 2

Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years and building massings that maximize allowed FAR and heights while adhering to setback and zone transition regulations. Possible NC redevelopment is shown in orange and LR redevelopment in beige. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Tree Canopy. Similar to the No Action Alternative, any redevelopment would fill gaps in street trees along the frontage. In the station areas, large-scale redevelopment would significantly impact the existing tree canopy. Alternatively, if trees are protected “exceptional” trees, development capacity would be constrained.

Shadows on Public Parks. Increased height limits above 30 feet in the NE 145th and 15th Ave NE and 130th Station Area neighborhood centers could result in increased shadows on Jackson Park. However, the human experience of the park would not significantly change as tall evergreens already shade the park boundaries.

Views. The I-5 scenic corridor traverses the 130th Station Area. However, I-5 in this area is below grade and/or has noise barrier walls blocking much of the view. In addition, the light rail infrastructure (above ground) is visually prominent and blocks or impacts much of the eastward views. More buildings would be visible, especially on the east side of I-5 at NE 130th St/Roosevelt Way NE, but they would be a minor part of the view.

Equity & Climate Vulnerability Considerations

Housing Type Variety and Choice

The housing type variety and housing choice under Alternative 2 would be similar to the existing pattern described under **Affected Environment** and **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**.

Relationship to Active Transportation

Alternative 2 would introduce neighborhood centers, which are similar to urban centers but are smaller geographically. The increase in housing types and commercial uses in a more compact urban form could increase the amount of people walking and rolling to their destinations, both in the neighborhood center and to those adjacent to it, helping mitigate climate change.

Relationship to Social Wellbeing & Sociability

Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1, but an increase in compact urban form of more housing and commercial uses could provide more spaces and locations where social interactions can happen than under Alternative 1. See also **Section 3.8 Population, Housing, & Employment** for a discussion of cultural displacement risk and its potential impact on wellbeing.

Climate Change

No additional impacts to climate change are anticipated under Alternative 2 above those described under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**. Growth under Alternative 2 would be concentrated in existing centers and the new neighborhood centers away from most hazards. Like the other action alternatives, Alternative 2 would include a new Environment and Climate Element with mitigation and adaptation strategies as well as policies regarding tree canopy protection or enhancement and critical area regulations. See Alternative 2's **Tree Canopy** section for impacts related to trees, which would influence urban heat and potentially flooding.

Impacts of Alternative 3: Broad

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Alternative 3 would allow a wider range of low-scale housing options—like triplexes and fourplexes—in all urban neighborhood areas (see [Exhibit 2.4-16](#)). This alternative studies total housing growth of 100,000 housing units (20,000 more than the No Action Alternative) to account for the potential additional housing demand that could be met with broad zoning changes. As described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#), most new growth would be focused within the regional and urban centers currently characterized by higher densities and a more diverse mix of uses than other areas of the city. Housing growth within the regional and urban centers would be the same as the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2. Activity levels and activity units per acre would be similar to those described under Alternative 2 as a result of the slight jobs shift to urban neighborhood areas (see [Exhibit 3.6-98](#)). Land use patterns and potential compatibility impacts within the regional and urban centers would be similar to those described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#). Compared to the No Action Alternative, adverse compatibility impacts at the periphery of most centers could be minimized as the abutting urban neighborhood areas redevelop with denser development patterns (see also the [Transitions](#) section below).

Under Alternative 3, urban neighborhood areas would accommodate the second highest share of anticipated housing growth behind regional centers (see [Chapter 2](#)). More than half (53%) of the additional new housing growth in urban neighborhood areas would be directed into areas 1 and 2. However, this growth would be more spread throughout the analysis areas rather than into the focused neighborhood center nodes of Alternative 2. Area 2 would receive the greatest overall share of new housing growth under Alternative 3 (20%), followed by Area 4 (19%) and Area 1 (18%). A small number of jobs and commercial space would shift from the larger centers towards urban neighborhood areas to reflect local demand consistent with the distribution of new housing. Alternative 3 also allows more flexibility for commercial space in these areas (such as allowing corner stores or making it easier to operate at-home businesses) to support the development of neighborhoods where more people can walk to everyday needs.

Over time, overall land use patterns would become denser within the urban neighborhood areas. Most of this development would continue to be residential in nature with limited additional local retail and commercial activity. This could result in localized land use compatibility impacts within the urban neighborhood areas where the height or intensity of new development exceeds existing development (although the maximum height allowed for market-rate development in these zones would remain 30 feet; see also the [Urban Form](#) section below). Additional flexibility for commercial spaces could also result in localized land use compatibility impacts where commercial uses result in noise, traffic, or other impact due to deliveries, customer traffic, outdoor cafes, or other activities associated with commercial use. Such impacts would be mitigated through application of the City's development regulations.

Exhibit 3.6-98. Future Activity Units (AU)—Alternative 3

Center ¹	Existing AU/Ac.	Alt. 1 AU/Ac.	Alt. 3 Acres	Alt. 3 AU	Alt. 3 AU/Ac.
Regional Centers¹					
Downtown	377.4	473.2	952	448,614	471.2
First Hill/Capitol Hill	139.5	163.4	916	149,645	163.3
University Community	54.5	70.2	753	52,773	70.0
South Lake Union	236.7	344.1	340	116,153	341.8
Uptown	131.3	161.3	333	53,696	161.1
Northgate	57.3	75.1	412	30,860	74.9
Hub Urban Centers¹					
Ballard	67.7	96.9	495	47,906	96.7
Bitter Lake Village	44.0	55.4	364	20,086	55.2
Fremont	71.9	88.1	214	18,883	88.0
Lake City	57.6	75.4	142	10,700	75.2
Mt Baker	36.0	47.4	491	23,196	47.2
West Seattle Junction	70.4	100.2	269	26,927	100.0
Residential Urban Centers¹					
23 rd & Union-Jackson	38.9	46.5	625	29,059	46.5
Admiral	49.2	60.4	98	5,935	60.3
Aurora-Licton Springs	44.1	51.4	327	16,784	51.3
Columbia City	33.9	46.1	335	15,411	46.0
Crown Hill	25.3	31.4	271	8,499	31.4
Eastlake	70.2	82.0	199	16,329	82.0
Green Lake	70.6	87.4	109	9,495	87.3
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	84.5	101.6	94	9,546	101.3
Madison-Miller	65.3	85.1	145	12,357	85.0
Morgan Junction	34.1	41.6	113	4,706	41.5
North Beacon Hill	28.1	34.5	267	9,175	34.4
Othello	23.7	29.0	499	14,503	29.1
Rainier Beach	23.0	26.0	346	9,007	26.0
Roosevelt	61.4	81.2	170	13,808	81.2
South Park	14.7	18.5	263	4,847	18.4
Upper Queen Anne	89.5	110.5	53	5,806	110.3
Wallingford	42.2	51.5	258	13,258	51.4
Westwood-Highland Park	27.9	32.6	275	8,948	32.5

1 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Note: Activity units (AU) is the sum of residential population and jobs. Assumes an average household size of 2.05 per the King County Growth Management Planning Council. Highlighted urban villages fall outside King County's countywide center designation criteria of 160–500 acres or below the minimum 18 existing AU or 30 future AU per acre. MIC designation criteria from PSRC does not include an AU density threshold.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale

Alternative 3 would allow missing middle housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, sixplexes, and three-story stacked flats in urban neighborhood areas. Seattle is exploring various zoning concepts for middle housing including some focused more on detached and attached housing and others on stacked flats.

While additional housing typologies would be allowed compared to the No Action Alternative, the maximum height allowed for market-rate development in these zones would remain 3-stories for market-rate development. Slight increases in FAR could also allow for slightly bigger buildings and could encourage taller buildings if building taller makes it easier to maximize FAR. See [Exhibit 3.6-99](#).


Height, bulk, and scale impacts between buildings on adjacent parcels would be minimal as market-rate development would continue to have a 3-story height limit. However, changes to allow additional housing types could encourage redevelopment in these areas and increase the number of 3-story buildings located next to existing 1- and 2-story buildings. See [Exhibit 3.6-99](#).

Alternative 3 would also allow potential height, floor area, or density bonuses for affordable housing projects. This means that some redevelopment may be up to 4 stories, such as 4-story stacked flats.

Middle housing street-level experience. The broad allowances for middle housing proposed in Alternative 3 would change some aspects of how people currently experience neighborhoods, from the street-level/sidewalk experience to how neighbors interact within a development and the larger community. [Exhibit 3.6-100](#) to [Exhibit 3.6-105](#) illustrate the types of middle housing expected under a range of concepts. For any middle housing types that would replace existing houses, the increased allowances would likely result in more buildings closer to the street and taller than exist today, which could change the relationship of the building to the sidewalk. When an existing house is preserved and units are added behind it, less change would be experienced from the sidewalk.


Building-to-street relationship. Existing front setbacks in urban neighborhood areas are generally about 20 feet from the front lot line. The updated Neighborhood Residential zones would require front setbacks of 10 feet. A 10- to 15-foot distance from the sidewalk improves chances for social interactions, providing adequate distance for people to feel comfortable using their front stoop and ground-level rooms facing the street. That distance also keeps upper-story windows and balconies close enough to the street for passive surveillance. Ground-related units with entries facing the street also increase the chances for social interaction at the sidewalk. However, for lots without alleys, an increase in driveways and garages facing the street would reduce these chances (as well as impact general aesthetics). Reduced parking requirements could improve this situation.

Exhibit 3.6-99. Proposed Height Limit Changes—Alternative 3




Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

**Exhibit 3.6-100. Example Neighborhood Residential Block with an Alley Redevelopment—
Detached/Attached Units Focus**




Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years with greater allowances for detached unit middle housing types. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

**Exhibit 3.6-101. Example Neighborhood Residential Block with an Alley Redevelopment—
Stacked Flats Focus**




Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years with greater allowances for stacked flat middle housing types. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

**Exhibit 3.6-102. Example Neighborhood Residential Block without an Alley Redevelopment—
Detached/Attached Units Focus**




Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years with greater allowances for detached unit middle housing types. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-103. Example Neighborhood Residential Block without an Alley Redevelopment—Stacked Flats Focus




Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years with greater allowances for stacked flat middle housing types. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

**Exhibit 3.6-104. Example Hilly Neighborhood Residential Block Redevelopment—
Detached/Attached Units Focus**



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years with greater allowances for detached unit middle housing types. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-105. Example Hilly Neighborhood Residential Block Redevelopment—Stacked Flats Focus



Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years with greater allowances for stacked flat middle housing types. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.
Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Privacy. With more buildings redeveloping up to 3 stories, often stretching further along the side lot lines than existing houses, modest changes to sense of privacy may occur. Because side setbacks would be required, builders would likely include windows along the side lot line, and some balconies may face neighboring properties. Neighbors may feel that more people can look towards their yard or house. This may be mitigated with landscaping and window placement, and impacts would not likely be more significant or adverse than development already allowed in Neighborhood Residential zones.

Usable open space. Greater allowances for the height, bulk, and scale of middle housing buildings in Alternative 3 could impact the amount of usable open space on neighborhood residential lots. For purposes of our analysis, “useable” open space was defined as open space that meets a minimum of 10 feet in both directions or 13 feet in both directions when the open space includes a path leading to multiple units. Existing detached houses often have fairly large rear yards and sometimes large front yards. The usable open space of development prototypes allowed in existing Neighborhood Residential zones that were studied ranged from 21% to 72% of the lot. The useable open space of the middle housing prototypes studied ranged from 22% to 45% of the lot.

The open space configurations vary with some sites having opportunities for shared common outdoor space amongst neighbors and others having smaller outdoor spaces accessible to individual units. In general, attached units and stacked flat types, especially when combined with alley parking and/or low parking ratios, allow for greater contiguous open spaces (as shown in [Exhibit 3.6-101](#), [Exhibit 3.6-103](#), and [Exhibit 3.6-105](#)). These could serve as shared spaces amongst neighbors and provide enough space for a variety of activities, such as children’s play and larger group socializing. Detached types generally separate the open space into smaller areas that would provide enough space for activities like barbecues and small group socializing (as shown in [Exhibit 3.6-100](#), [Exhibit 3.6-102](#), and [Exhibit 3.6-104](#)). See [Exhibit 3.6-106](#) for example open space layouts.

Mixed-use environment. Allowing small commercial uses only on corner lots (as illustrated in [Exhibit 3.6-100](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-101](#)) could result in modest visual changes from a residential character to a slightly more mixed-use environment. This change would likely enhance the street level experience with ground floor activities and building design that is more public in nature than private homes, adding visual interest and attractions and allowing for stronger building-to-street relationships.

The following diagrams illustrate likely amounts and types of development over the next 20 years with greater allowances for a range of middle housing types. The models show prototypical Seattle neighborhood blocks (no precise location) that include alleys, no alleys, and steeper terrain (with and without alleys). For each block type, the first model shows concepts focused more on detached units, and the second model shows more detached/attached and stacked flats concepts.

Transitions

Alternative 3 would increase intensity in currently low-intensity neighborhood residential zones but would retain a height gap between neighborhood residential zones and most zoning

in regional and urban centers. In general, transitions under Alternative 3 are likely to be less intense between urban neighborhood areas and regional and urban centers than under the No Action Alternative. Depending on development outcomes, new middle housing may help soften transitions to existing neighborhood commercial zones or in areas with pre-zoning non-conforming uses.

Tree Canopy

The increase in size and number of buildings allowed on a lot in Alternative 3 will likely decrease the amount of space available for trees on neighborhood residential lots. Prototypes that preserve contiguous open space (e.g., stacked flats, small apartments, or attached units) are likely better able to avoid impacts to existing trees and retain more contiguous planting areas for new trees. Detached and semi-attached prototypes tended to have most of their open space in the front, rear, and side setbacks. The narrow (5-foot) side setbacks have limited value for plantings or performing stormwater functions. See [Exhibit 3.6-106](#).

Existing trees may also be impacted by construction activities outside of the building and parking area footprints (grading, utility locations, etc.). Prototypes with multiple detached buildings are likely to be more impactful on existing trees due to excavation and foundation construction, multiple utility connections, and other construction impacts.

Impacts to impervious surface coverage is also an important consideration. In the middle housing types studied, we identified the impervious surfaces of structures, surface parking, driveways, outside trash storage areas, and pathways. Of the types studied, the impervious surface area ranged from 47 to 78% percent. In other words, between 22% and 53% of the site remained pervious area to help with water absorption and stormwater runoff. Several prototypes would surpass the existing lot coverage maximum of 35% in Neighborhood Residential zones. Parking areas increased the total impervious surfaces significantly for most prototypes. Requiring new paved surfaces to be permeable, reducing or eliminating parking requirements, and encouraging parking solutions that minimize impervious surface could mitigate some of the additional impervious surface cover change.

Shadows


Height limits do not increase (or only increase modestly with an affordability bonus) under Alternative 3, so shadow impacts would not likely increase significantly over the No Action Alternative. However, greater bulk on more sites may cast shadows on more places.

Views


Alternative 3 is unlikely to have impacts on views beyond the No Action Alternative as it would have no height increase for market-rate development and a minimal height increase for affordable housing. The potential for more people to live near the viewpoints may increase awareness and recognition of these public amenities and neighborhood parks. See [Exhibit 3.6-107](#).

Exhibit 3.6-106. Relationship of Middle Housing Types and Useable Open Space


Current Neighborhood Residential Zone



Middle Housing 3 Units per Lot



Middle Housing 4 Units per Lot




Middle Housing 6 Units per Lot



Source: MAKERS, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-107. Seattle Views Map—Alternative 3



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle and MAKERS, 2023

Equity & Climate Vulnerability Considerations

Housing Type Variety and Choice

Alternative 3 would allow middle housing types such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, sixplexes, and stacked flats in all Neighborhood Residential zones. The likely increase in housing type variety would provide more options for people to stay in their community over a lifetime and across generations as their needs change. Housing configurations that cluster more units together on a site provide more opportunities for intergenerational families to live near each other. Increasing the amount and types of housing allowed across the city also lets more people live in areas from which they are economically excluded in Alternative 1.

Relationship to Active Transportation

Alternative 3 could slightly increase density throughout the city but could also introduce commercial spaces and corner stores into more areas of the city. Nearby commercial spots provide locations where people can walk and roll for their shopping and leisure needs. Such a change would help mitigate climate impacts and improve chances at social connectedness.

Relationship to Social Wellbeing & Sociability

Alternative 3 could change some aspects of how neighborhoods are currently experienced, from the street level/sidewalk experience as described in Alternative 3's **Height, Bulk, & Scale** section and illustrated in **Exhibit 3.6-100** through **Exhibit 3.6-105**. In general, social interaction opportunities would likely increase.

Although possible future development of middle housing may lead to less open space on lots than under Alternative 1, more units would surround and share the available open space, which would increase opportunities for sociability amongst neighbors. See Alternative 3's **Height, Bulk, & Scale** section.

Climate Change

Most growth under Alternative 3 would continue to be concentrated in existing centers, away from most hazards, with additional growth spread throughout the urban neighborhood place type. Compared to the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2, distributing more growth in urban neighborhoods could increase the potential for populations to be closer to areas susceptible to flooding, sea-level rise, or landslides or affected by interruptions in access to their neighborhoods. Alternative 3 may also decrease pervious area and space for tree planting in neighborhood residential zoned areas, which may have impacts on flooding and urban heat (see **Tree Canopy**). Like the other action alternatives, Alternative 3 would include a new Environment and Climate Element with mitigation and adaptation strategies as well as policies regarding tree canopy protection or enhancement and critical area regulations. See also the discussion under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**.

Impacts of Alternative 4: Corridor

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Alternative 4 would introduce corridors as a new place type that focuses a wider range of housing options and growth near transit and amenities (see [Exhibit 2.4-19](#)). Corridors are defined as areas within a 10-minute walk from a light rail station and a 5-minute walk from frequent bus transit service and entrances to large parks. Under this definition, corridors include about 50% of areas currently zoned Neighborhood Residential, excluding parks. These areas could allow a wide range of housing types ranging from detached homes to duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes or 5-story buildings closer to transit and limited 6- and 7-story buildings in or adjacent to areas already zoned multifamily or commercial. Corridors also include some areas already zoned for multi-family and commercial use.

Alternative 4 studies total housing growth of 100,000 housing units (20,000 more than the No Action Alternative) to account for potential additional housing demand that could be met within corridors. As described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#), most new growth would be focused within existing centers currently characterized by higher densities and a more diverse mix of uses than other areas of the city. Housing growth within the centers would be the same as the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 2 and 3. Activity levels and activity units per acre would be similar to those described under Alternatives 2 and 3 as a result of the slight jobs shift to corridors (see [Exhibit 3.6-108](#)). Land use patterns and potential compatibility impacts within the centers would be similar to those described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#). Compared to the No Action Alternative, adverse compatibility impacts at the periphery of most centers could be minimized as the abutting corridors redevelop with moderate-scale development (see also the [Transitions](#) section below).

Under Alternative 4, corridors would accommodate the second highest share of anticipated housing growth behind regional centers (see [Chapter 2](#)). More than half (57%) of the additional new housing growth in corridors would be directed into areas 1 and 2. However, compared to Alternative 3, this growth would be focused to densify corridors rather than all neighborhood residential zones. Area 2 would receive the greatest overall share of new housing growth under Alternative 4 (21%), followed by Area 4 (19%) and Area 1 (17%). A small number of jobs and commercial space would shift from the larger centers towards corridors to reflect local demand with the distribution of new housing.

Over time, overall land use patterns would become denser within the corridors. This could result in localized land use compatibility impacts within the corridors or on the border with adjacent residential areas where newer development is of greater height and intensity than existing development (see also the [Urban Form](#) section below). Such impacts would be mitigated through application of the City's development regulations (including shoreline regulations) and design review process where applicable.

Exhibit 3.6-108. Future Activity Units (AU)—Alternative 4

Center	Existing AU/Ac.	Alt. 1 AU/Ac.	Alt. 4 Acres	Alt. 4 AU	Alt. 4 AU/Ac.
Regional Centers¹					
Downtown	377.4	473.2	952	448,614	471.2
First Hill/Capitol Hill	139.5	163.4	916	149,645	163.3
University Community	54.5	70.2	753	52,773	70.0
South Lake Union	236.7	344.1	340	116,153	341.8
Uptown	131.3	161.3	333	53,696	161.1
Northgate	57.3	75.1	412	30,860	74.9
Hub Urban Centers¹					
Ballard	67.7	96.9	495	47,906	96.7
Bitter Lake Village	44.0	55.4	364	20,086	55.2
Fremont	71.9	88.1	214	18,883	88.0
Lake City	57.6	75.4	142	10,700	75.2
Mt Baker	36.0	47.4	491	23,196	47.2
West Seattle Junction	70.4	100.2	269	26,927	100.0
Residential Urban Centers¹					
23 rd & Union-Jackson	38.9	46.5	625	29,059	46.5
Admiral	49.2	60.4	98	5,935	60.3
Aurora-Licton Springs	44.1	51.4	327	16,784	51.3
Columbia City	33.9	46.1	335	15,411	46.0
Crown Hill	25.3	31.4	271	8,499	31.4
Eastlake	70.2	82.0	199	16,329	82.0
Green Lake	70.6	87.4	109	9,495	87.3
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge	84.5	101.6	94	9,546	101.3
Madison-Miller	65.3	85.1	145	12,357	85.0
Morgan Junction	34.1	41.6	113	4,706	41.5
North Beacon Hill	28.1	34.5	267	9,175	34.4
Othello	23.7	29.0	499	14,503	29.1
Rainier Beach	23.0	26.0	346	9,007	26.0
Roosevelt	61.4	81.2	170	13,808	81.2
South Park	14.7	18.5	263	4,847	18.4
Upper Queen Anne	89.5	110.5	53	5,806	110.3
Wallingford	42.2	51.5	258	13,258	51.4
Westwood-Highland Park	27.9	32.6	275	8,948	32.5

1 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Note: Activity units (AU) is the sum of residential population and jobs. Assumes an average household size of 2.05 per the King County Growth Management Planning Council. Highlighted urban villages fall outside King County's countywide center designation criteria of 160–500 acres or below the minimum 18 existing AU or 30 future AU per acre. MIC designation criteria from PSRC does not include an AU density threshold.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale


Corridors could contain a mix of residential and mixed-use development from duplex, triplex, and fourplexes to 5-story apartments and mixed-use buildings. Corridors also include some areas already zoned for multi-family and commercial development where height limits could be up to 6- or 7-stories. See [Exhibit 3.6-109](#). Over time, overall building height and bulk in the new corridor areas would likely increase with new development. Similar to Alternative 2, urban neighborhood areas that are currently primarily 1- and 2-story buildings would be allowed to develop up to 4- to 5-story buildings. The scale of the area where changes in height and bulk would be allowed is similar to Alternative 3, as about 50% of urban neighborhood area would become a corridor place type. Localized impacts could occur as the areas transition to a more intense development pattern. However, future development in corridors adjacent to regional and urban centers would likely be more similar to current development happening in those areas and register as less stark impacts.

Alternative 4 could also result in height, bulk, and scale impact between properties in corridors where areas that are predominately 1- and 2-story detached homes might experience gradual redevelopment with multifamily homes of 4- and 5-stories on a site-by-site basis. Differences in massing on adjacent properties could be especially larger on sites with existing multifamily and commercial zones where new development could be as high as 7-stories. These transitions between parcels are not likely to be significantly more intense than those already occurring in many regional and urban centers but would occur in new areas.

Like Alternatives 2 and 3, Alternative 4 would introduce a new type of infill area (corridors) on the low end, potentially reducing contrast between regional and urban centers and other areas. Corridor areas already differ from most parts of low-intensity neighborhoods in terms of traffic, noise, impervious surfaces, and in many cases building scale. As a result, Alternative 4 would likely heighten contrasts between corridor areas and adjacent lower intensity areas, especially in parts of the city where few transit corridors are present, like West Seattle. In areas where a high number of transit corridors are already present—like the Central District and Ravenna—the overall effect may be to create smoother transitions because overlapping corridors will create continuous areas of zoning at the scale of 4-6 stories.

Alternative 4 could also lessen transitions along arterial streets where Neighborhood Commercial zoning occupies a half-block along the arterial and Neighborhood Residential zoning exists on the other half of the block. New zoning under this alternative could result in a more gradual transition from Neighborhood Commercial zoning to lower-density areas.

Exhibit 3.6-109. Proposed Height Limit Changes—Alternative 4



Source: City of Seattle and MAKERS, 2023

Transitions

Tree Canopy

With more widespread redevelopment than No Action, private property may see a greater loss of existing tree canopy than No Action. At the same time, street frontage improvements with redevelopment would likely include street tree plantings.

Shadows

Height limits would increase from 30 feet to 55 feet in the corridor areas under Alternative 4. Height limits in areas currently zoned multifamily or commercial could increase to a higher overall height, although the change may be less since these areas are generally zoned for higher heights today. Because corridors cover large swaths of the city, shadow impacts would be widespread.

Shadows on Public Parks

Corridor areas are found on the south, west, and east sides (the sides most impactful to casting long-lasting shadows on the park) of nearly every park in Seattle under Alternative 4. Most parks would likely see increased shadows.


Shadows on Public Rights-of-Way

Taller buildings would likely develop in more areas in Seattle under Alternative 4, increasing the streets that would experience more time in shade. Shadows would particularly impact east-west streets (especially when development is on the south side) and the north faces of hills, with lesser impacts throughout.

Views

Most of the protected viewpoints and scenic routes are within or adjacent to the more intense development expected in the corridor place type. Thus, Alternative 4, with height increases from 30 feet to 45-55 feet may impact protected views. Only limited viewpoints will have minor degrees of potential future view disruptions. The low-impacted sites depend upon specific locational qualities such as along rights-of-way, near bodies of water, and at naturally high elevations. See [Exhibit 3.6-110](#).

Exhibit 3.6-110. Seattle Views Map—Alternative 4



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Equity & Climate Vulnerability Considerations

Housing Type Variety and Choice

Alternative 4 offers a wider range of housing types ranging from detached homes, middle housing (e.g., duplexes, fourplexes, etc.), and 5-story buildings close to transit and parks. The likely increase in housing type variety would provide more options for people to stay in their community over a lifetime and across generations as their needs change. Increasing housing type options across half of neighborhood residential zones in the city also increases the opportunities for people to live in parts of the city economically closed off to them in Alternative 1.

Relationship to Active Transportation

Alternative 4 could moderately increase density near transit and large parks. Nearby parks provide locations where people can walk and roll for their play and leisure needs. More people living within a 10-minute walk from light rail and a 5-minute walk from frequent bus transit likely increases the number of people walking, rolling, and using transit. Such a change would help mitigate climate impacts and improve chances at social connectedness.

Relationship to Social Wellbeing & Sociability

More housing within a 5-minute walk to large parks under Alternative 4 would likely increase opportunities for social interactions and social wellbeing. At the same time, the number of people living along inhospitable arterials, where social interactions can be inhibited by traffic's impact on sense of safety, air quality, and noise would likely increase.

Climate Change

Growth under Alternative 4 would be concentrated in existing centers and in corridors away from most hazards. More people living within a 10-minute walk from light rail and a 5-minute walk from frequent bus transit likely increases the number of people walking, rolling, and using transit. Such a change would help mitigate climate impacts. Like the other action alternatives, Alternative 4 would include a new Environment and Climate Element with mitigation and adaptation strategies as well as policies regarding tree canopy protection or enhancement and critical area regulations. Also see Alternative 4's **Tree Canopy** section for potential tree-related impacts, which could impact urban heat and flooding, and the discussion under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**.

Impacts of Alternative 5: Combined


Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Alternative 5 anticipates the largest increase in supply and diversity of housing across Seattle. It includes the strategies for encouraging housing growth in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 plus some additional changes to existing center boundaries and changes to place type designations (see [Exhibit 2.4-22](#)). Alternative 5 also expands the boundaries of seven centers (the Uptown Regional Center, West Seattle Junction, Admiral, Greenwood-Phinney Ridge, Morgan Junction, Othello, and Upper Queen Anne Urban Centers), designates the NE 130th Street Station Area as a new urban center, and re-designates Ballard as a regional center (see [Exhibit 3.6-111](#)).

Alternative 5 studies total housing growth of 120,000 housing units (40,000 more than the No Action Alternative and 20,000 more than Alternatives 2, 3, or 4) to account for potential additional housing demand that could be met within the areas of change. As described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#), most new growth would still be focused within the centers currently characterized by higher densities, more compact building forms, and a more diverse mix of uses than other areas of the city. Housing growth within the centers, however, would be higher under Alternative 5 than the other alternatives. Residential urban centers would accommodate the second highest share of anticipated housing growth behind regional centers (see [Chapter 2](#)).

Land use patterns and potential compatibility impacts within most of the centers would be similar to those described under [Impacts Common to All Alternatives](#). The six expanded center boundaries consist primarily of single-family residential areas neighboring mixed-use and commercial development nodes within the existing center boundaries. Over time, these areas would gradually convert to denser multifamily residential and mixed-use patterns of development. The Uptown Regional Center expansion area primarily consists of existing multifamily development—as a result, future land use patterns would likely be similar in scale and intensity to the No Action Alternative even if the area redevelops with more mixed use. Adverse compatibility impacts at the periphery of most centers would be minimized the most under Alternative 5 as the abutting neighborhood center, corridors, and urban neighborhood areas redevelop (see also the [Transitions](#) section below).

Exhibit 3.6-111. Expanded, Redesignated, and New Regional and Urban Centers—Alternative 5



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a crosswalk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Activity levels and activity units per acre would vary from the other alternatives as a result of the increased overall growth and change in center boundaries. Under Alternative 5, the redesignated Ballard Regional Center would meet PSRC's Metro Regional Growth Center size and activity unit density criteria. Unlike the other alternatives, Othello, Rainier Beach, and South Park would also meet King County's minimum density criteria for Countywide Centers. However, Admiral, Morgan Junction, and Upper Queen Anne would fall below planned density criteria and Othello would be above the size threshold as a result of their increased size. 23rd & Union-Jackson, Green Lake, Lake City, and Madison-Miller would also still be outside the size threshold. See [Exhibit 3.6-112](#).

PSRC Metro RGCs require a minimum density of 30 existing activity units and 85 planned activity units and are expected to be between 320–640 acres in size (or larger if served by an internal, high-capacity transit system). King County countywide centers require an existing density of at least 18 activity units and planned density of at least 30 activity units and are expected to be between 160–500 acres in size. See also [Section 3.7 Relationship to Plans, Policies, & Regulations](#).

Under Alternative 5, neighborhood centers would accommodate the third highest share of anticipated housing growth behind regional centers and urban centers (see [Chapter 2](#)). Like Alternative 2, about half (49%) of housing growth in neighborhood centers would be directed into those with low displacement risk in areas 1 and 2 and about 11% would be directed into neighborhood centers with high displacement risk (notably in Area 6). Housing growth in the corridors and urban neighborhood areas would be focused in Area 2 followed by Areas 8, 6, and 1. Land use patterns and potential adverse compatibility impacts within the new place types would be similar to those described under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.

Overall, Alternative 5 distributes more growth to a greater number of locations than any other alternative. This is likely to result in a denser land use pattern citywide with focused growth in the centers and smaller mixed-use nodes in the new neighborhood centers and along corridors with frequent transit. Impacts would be mitigated through application of the City's development regulations (including shoreline regulations) and design review process.

Exhibit 3.6-112. Future Activity Units (AU)—Alternative 5

Center	Existing AU/Ac.	Alt. 1 AU/Ac.	Alt. 5 Acres	Alt. 5 AU	Alt. 5 AU/Ac.
Regional Centers¹					
Downtown	377.4	473.2	952	447,351	469.9
First Hill/Capitol Hill	139.5	163.4	916	149,578	163.3
University Community	54.5	70.2	753	52,695	69.9
South Lake Union	236.7	344.1	340	115,612	340.2
Uptown ²	131.3	161.3	391	53,723	137.2
Northgate	57.3	75.1	412	30,803	74.7
Ballard ²	67.7	96.9	495	50,047	101.0
Hub Urban Centers¹					
Bitter Lake Village	44.0	55.4	364	20,044	55.1
Fremont	71.9	88.1	214	18,877	88.0
Lake City	57.6	75.4	142	10,688	75.1
Mt Baker	36.0	47.4	491	23,135	47.1
West Seattle Junction ²	70.4	100.2	449	26,934	59.9
Residential Urban Centers¹					
130 th Street ²	18.4	20.7	218	7,733	35.5
23 rd & Union-Jackson	38.9	46.5	625	29,046	46.5
Admiral ²	49.2	60.4	288	6,886	23.9
Aurora-Licton Springs	44.1	51.4	327	16,775	51.3
Columbia City	33.9	46.1	335	15,390	46.0
Crown Hill	25.3	31.4	271	8,492	31.3
Eastlake	70.2	82.0	199	16,323	81.9
Green Lake	70.6	87.4	109	9,492	87.3
Greenwood-Phinney Ridge ²	84.5	101.6	315	9,579	30.4
Madison-Miller	65.3	85.1	145	12,349	85.0
Morgan Junction ²	34.1	41.6	281	7,169	25.5
North Beacon Hill	28.1	34.5	267	9,161	34.3
Othello ²	23.7	29.0	584	17,894	30.6
Rainier Beach	23.0	26.0	346	12,893	37.3
Roosevelt	61.4	81.2	170	13,801	81.1
South Park	14.7	18.5	263	7,951	30.2
Upper Queen Anne ²	89.5	110.5	329	5,857	17.8
Wallingford	42.2	51.5	258	13,248	51.4
Westwood-Highland Park	27.9	32.6	275	9,386	34.1

1 See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

2 Proposed new center, redesignated center, or boundary expansion.

Note: Activity units (AU) is the sum of residential population and jobs. Assumes an average household size of 2.05 per the King County Growth Management Planning Council. Highlighted urban villages fall outside King County's countywide center designation criteria of 160–500 acres or below the minimum 18 existing AU or 30 future AU per acre. MIC designation criteria from PSRC does not include an AU density threshold.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.


Urban Form

Height, Bulk, & Scale

Alternative 5 is a combination of Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, meaning no residential area in the city would be zoned exclusively for detached housing. Over time, overall building height and bulk in the city would likely increase with new development under Alternative 5 (see [Exhibit 3.6-113](#)). Under its new designation as a regional center, Ballard could be considered for heights above the current maximum of eight stories as part of future planning work since the Comprehensive Plan designates regional centers as appropriate for high-rise development. Expanded urban centers—such as the three in West Seattle, Greenwood-Phinney Ridge, Othello, and Upper Queen Anne—would allow higher development in areas that are currently zoned neighborhood residential with existing buildings that are predominately 1- and 2-story. Under Alternative 5, localized conflicts could occur as areas transition to a more intense development pattern. However, unlike other alternatives, the changes in height, bulk, and scale under Alternative 5 would occur over a larger area. Consequently, localized impacts may be more distributed throughout the city.

Alternative 5 could also result in height, bulk, and scale impacts between properties in neighborhood centers, corridors, and expanded regional and urban centers where areas that are predominately 1- and 2-story detached homes might experience gradual redevelopment with larger multifamily homes on a site-by-site basis. Differences in massing could be especially larger where affordable housing projects use potential height and floor area bonuses. Differences in massing on adjacent properties are not likely to be significantly more intense than those already occurring in many regional and urban centers, but the area in which they might occur would be the largest among the alternatives.

Exhibit 3.6-113. Proposed Height Limit Changes—Alternative 5



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.
Sources: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Transitions

The addition of two new types of infill areas (neighborhood centers and corridors) as well as middle housing in urban neighborhood areas will overall create smoother and more varied transitions in intensity throughout the city. As development occurs piecemeal, stark contrasts in building scale may appear, but over time feathered gradations of intensity will fill in around corridors, nodes of activity, neighborhood amenities, and urban villages.

Tree Canopy

With the most redevelopment potential, losses to existing tree canopy on private property could be greatest under Alternative 5. However, required frontage improvements may increase street tree plantings.


Shadows

Shadow impacts under Alternative 5 would include all the impacts discussed under the other alternatives. In addition, expanded regional and urban center boundaries under Alternative 5 would increase areas with potential shadows on public rights-of-way and parks.

Views

Impacts to views under Alternative 5 would be similar to those described under Alternative 4, with additional effects on scenic and landmark view sites captured in potential expansion and designation of regional and urban centers, such as the proposed extension of three urban centers in West Seattle and newly defined Ballard Regional Center. Allowing additional height for affordable housing development citywide could also create additional view impacts but would be limited by the number of affordable housing projects that are expected to be developed. Adverse impacts to Seattle's view corridors would likely occur under Alternative 5 due to substantial increased growth and development citywide. See [Exhibit 3.6-114](#).

Exhibit 3.6-114. Seattle Views Map—Alternative 5



Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

130th/145th Station Area

Land Use Patterns & Compatibility

Under Alternative 5, a new urban center would be designated on both the west and east sides of I-5 at the Sound Transit light rail station, with zoning including Low-rise Residential, Midrise Multifamily, and Neighborhood Commercial (2 and 3). This area would include an existing commercial node around Pinehurst and an expanded residential mixed-use area closer to the station. Housing and job growth in the new 130th Street Residential Urban Village would be greatest under Alternative 5, with more growth clustered in the newly designated urban village.

Growth in the 145th Station Area would be similar to Alternative 2. Buildings would be denser than Alternative 2 with more mixed-use buildings and a wider variety of housing types allowed.

Over time, the station areas would likely redevelop into mixed-use nodes with a greater intensity of development than any of the other alternatives. Growth would increase activity unit density from 18.6 (existing) to 35.9 around NE 130th Street and from 35.7 (existing) to 79.4 around 15th and 145th. This increased density would represent a potential adverse land use impact of future growth in the station areas under Alternative 5. Such impacts would be mitigated through application of the City's development regulations and design review process. In addition, increased density citywide would lessen potential adverse compatibility impacts on the periphery of all new urban centers and neighborhood centers, including the station areas (see also the [Transitions](#) section below).

See [Exhibit 3.6-115](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-116](#).

Exhibit 3.6-115. Station Area Share of Targets, 2024-2044—Alternative 5


Location	Place Type	Acres	New Housing Units	New Jobs	Existing AU/Ac.	Future AU/Ac.
NE 130 th Street	Urban Center	218	1,644	356	18.4	35.5
15 th & 145 th	Neighborhood Center—Low Risk*	65	1,059	648	35.3	78.5

Note: The 130th Street and Pinehurst Neighborhood Centers from Alternative 2 are both part of the 130th Street Urban Center in Alternative 5. See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

*Risk of displacement.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; BERK, 2023.

Exhibit 3.6-116. 130th/145th Station Area Zoning Concepts—Alternative 5: Combined



130th/145th Alternative 5: Combined

Zoning Category

- | | |
|---|---|
|  Lowrise 1 |  Midrise Multifamily |
|  Lowrise 2 |  Neighborhood Commercial 2 |
|  Lowrise 3 |  Neighborhood Commercial 3 |



Map Date: July 2023

Note: See [Exhibit 2.1-1](#) in [Chapter 2](#) for a cross-walk of existing place types (existing and Alternative 1) versus proposed place type names under Alternatives 2-5.

Sources: City of Seattle, 2022; BERK, 2022.

Urban Form

Height, bulk, and scale. Under Alternative 5, the area immediately next to the 130th light rail station could transition from primarily 1- and 2-story buildings up to 7- and 8-story buildings. The heights of buildings surrounding the 130th station, both to the east and the first block west of I-5 along 130th Street, could also develop over time into 6- to 8-story buildings. The core of the 145th station area would likely redevelop into a mixed-use node with buildings up to 7- and 8-stories, while heights in the surrounding area would be similar to the No Action Alternative. In the rest of the new urban center area, many existing 1- and 2-story buildings would likely develop over time into 3- to 5-story buildings. [Exhibit 3.6-117](#) and [Exhibit 3.6-118](#) illustrate potential redevelopment over 20 years; exact amount, locations, and design of redevelopment may vary. It would likely happen incrementally (i.e., site by site) as property owners choose to develop their property and/or aggregate properties for larger redevelopments.


Like Alternative 2, specific height/bulk/scale impacts would include:

- **Urban design and active transportation: Intersite connectivity.** This challenge may be more pronounced than Alternative 2 as even greater intensities develop near the station without direct routes.
- **Street-level community building: Lack of focused public realm.** Similarly, with more areas expected to redevelop, this challenge may be more widespread as more parcels redevelop without a cohesive street/path network.
- **Street level community building: Affordable commercial space.** With even greater redevelopment expected, the potential displacement of small and BIPOC-owned businesses may impact cultural and social gathering spaces more than Alternative 2.

Exhibit 3.6-117. Proposed 130th/145th Station Area Allowed Building Heights—Alternative 5



Note: These model views illustrate proposed building height limits in proposed neighborhood centers and urban centers. Building envelopes would also be influenced by FAR, setback, and upper story step back regulations.
Source: MAKERS, 2023.


Exhibit 3.6-118. 130th Station Area Massing Illustration—Alternative 5

Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years and building massings that maximize allowed FAR and heights while adhering to setback and zone transition regulations. Possible NC redevelopment is shown in orange, MR in brown, and LR in beige. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Transitions. Under Alternative 5, development of high-intensity buildings in the immediate vicinity of the 130th station area (proposed NC zone), as well as the larger proposed MR area, may create abrupt local transitions in scale between existing detached houses and new larger construction, even more so than Alternative 2. Over time, an evolution of the station area into more consistently intensely used land, combined with smaller scale development in surrounding low-rise zones would result in a more gradual transition. See [Exhibit 3.6-119](#).

Views. Changes to views along the I-5 scenic corridor, which are mostly blocked because of noise walls and/or I-5 being below grade, would be similar to Alternative 2. More buildings would be visible on both sides of I-5, but they would be a minor part of the view.

Exhibit 3.6-119. Pinehurst Massing Illustration—Alternative 5

Note: This model illustrates potential redevelopment over the next 20 years and building massings that maximize allowed FAR and heights while adhering to setback and zone transition regulations. Possible NC redevelopment is shown in orange and LR in beige. It is not intended to show exact locations of development but that market-driven, incremental redevelopment over time would occur.

Source: City of Seattle, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Equity & Climate Vulnerability Considerations

Housing Type Variety and Choice

Alternative 5 combines the place types found in Alternatives 2-4 and therefore could provide the most housing type variety and choice amongst all the alternatives. The likely increase in variety would provide more options for people to stay in their community over a lifetime and across generations as their needs change. Housing configurations that cluster more units together on a site could provide more opportunities for intergenerational families to live near each other. Increasing housing type options across the city also increases the opportunities for people to live in parts of the city economically closed off to them in Alternative 1.

Relationship to Active Transportation

Among all alternatives, Alternative 5 could increase density the most across the city, near transit, and near large parks. Nearby parks, commercial, and office areas provide locations where people can walk and roll for their work, shopping, play, and leisure needs. More people

living within a 10-minute walk from light rail and a 5-minute walk from frequent bus transit likely increases the number of people walking, rolling, and using transit. Such a change would help mitigate climate impacts and improve chances at social connectedness.

Relationship to Social Wellbeing & Sociability

Alternative 5, with the increase in middle housing types and variety throughout the city and fewer concentrated extremes of higher and lower density areas, would likely have overall positive impacts on social wellbeing and social interactions, similar to Alternative 3. Impacts described in Alternative 4's **Relationship to Social Wellbeing & Sociability** section related sociability along arterials would also pertain to Alternative 5, but perhaps to a lesser degree with development opportunities more dispersed in Alternative 5.

Climate Change

No additional impacts to climate change are anticipated under Alternative 5 above those described under the other action alternatives. Growth under Alternative 5 would be concentrated in centers and corridors, away from most hazards, with additional growth spread throughout the urban neighborhoods. Like Alternative 3, distributing more growth in urban neighborhoods could increase the potential for populations to be closer to hazards or affected by interruptions in access to their neighborhoods. Like the other action alternatives, Alternative 5 would include a new Environment and Climate Element with mitigation and adaptation strategies as well as policies regarding tree canopy protection or enhancement and critical area regulations. See also the discussion under **Impacts Common to All Alternatives**.

Summary of Impacts

Exhibit 3.6-120, **Exhibit 3.6-121**, and the following text summarize and compare adverse land use impacts citywide and within the 130th/145th station areas under each alternative.

Citywide

Exhibit 3.6-120. Summary of Land Use and Urban Form Impacts by Alternative—Citywide

Impact	No Action	Alt. 2	Alt. 3	Alt. 4	Alt. 5
Land Use Patterns	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Land Use Compatibility	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Height, Bulk, & Scale	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Transitions	▼	▼	▲	▲	▲
Tree Canopy	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Shadows	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Views	—	—	—	▼	▼

Note: Impacts are considered either unavoidable adverse (▼▼), adverse but able to be mitigated (▼), impact but less than adverse (▼), limited or none (—), moderately positive (▲), or positive (▲).

Sources: BERK, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Land use patterns. Growth under all alternatives would increase activity levels and land use intensities across the city resulting in likely adverse impacts to land use patterns. All alternatives focus most future growth into centers currently characterized by higher densities, more compact building forms, and a more diverse mix of uses than other areas of the city. Land use patterns in the neighborhood centers and corridors would intensify more under Alternatives 2 and 4, respectively, than under the No Action Alternative. Under Alternative 3, overall land use patterns would become denser over time within the Neighborhood Residential zones but most of this development would continue to be residential in nature and would be more spread throughout the analysis areas than the other action alternatives. Alternative 5 includes the most growth overall and incorporates elements of the other action alternatives—the intensity of land use patterns would shift most dramatically under Alternative 5 as activity levels increase over time.

Land use compatibility. Future growth under all alternatives is likely to increase the frequency of different land use types locating close to one another, and similarly likely to increase the frequency of land use patterns that contain mixes of land uses with differing levels of intensity, both within the centers and, to a varying extent, in other areas of the city. Land use incompatibilities under the No Action Alternative would be similar to those observed today but could become more severe over time with continuing trends. Under the action alternatives, denser and more mixed-use land use patterns in the new place types could result in localized

land use compatibility impacts within the place types or on the border with adjacent residential areas. All neighborhood centers, for instance, already contain areas zoned for commercial or mixed-use development but additional jobs and commercial space could increase more quickly in these areas due to the local demand from new housing. However, adverse compatibility impacts at the periphery of most existing centers would also be minimized as the new place types redevelop with denser development—this would be most noticeable over the long term under Alternative 5 as the abutting neighborhood center, corridors, and urban neighborhood areas redevelop. See also the summary of transitions below.

Height, bulk, and scale. Height, bulk, and scale impacts would likely occur under all alternatives as development occurs. Future growth and development directed into existing centers under all alternatives would result in a moderate amount of additional height and bulk in these commercial and mixed-use nodes generally consistent with that experienced during growth over the last 20 years. Under the action alternatives, building heights, bulk, and/or scale in the new place types would likely increase with new development. These impacts would be more pronounced in the neighborhood centers and corridors where height limits would be increased up to 5-7 stories. Where middle housing is allowed in urban neighborhood areas, more properties may develop with 3-story (or 4-story if affordable) buildings adjacent to 1- and 2-story buildings. The alternatives vary in the likelihood of localized impacts (Alternative 1, 2, and to some extent 4) versus more distributed impacts (Alternative 3 and 5).

Transitions. Continued infill development in established centers and villages under the No Action Alternative would likely create increasingly stark contrasts with surrounding lower-scale areas. The new place types introduced under the action alternatives would generally reduce existing contrasts between centers (that see widespread development of large buildings) and surrounding areas (with broad areas that see minimal development). Over time, edges under Alternatives 3 and 5 would be softened the most as feathered gradations of intensity fill in around nodes of activity, neighborhood amenities, and existing centers.

Tree canopy. Bulkier development under all alternatives would likely displace some trees on private property, especially in residential zones. At the same time, the number of street trees may increase where they are required with redevelopment. Private property may see a greater loss of existing tree canopy under the action alternatives with more widespread redevelopment. For example, the increase in size and number of buildings allowed on a lot in Alternatives 3 and 5 will likely decrease the amount of space available for trees on neighborhood residential lots.

Shadows. Under any alternative, taller and often bulkier redevelopment will cast longer and/or wider shadows than existing development. Building shadows can be considered positive for climate adaptation to reduce summertime heat but can be negative for human health and wellbeing (especially during winter) and the health of existing trees if accustomed to full sun. Over time, increased height limits in the neighborhood centers under Alternatives 2, 4, and 5 would likely result in longer shadows over a greater portion of the day compared to the other

alternatives and may be most impactful where shadows would fall downhill or on east-west oriented neighborhood main streets.

Views. Future development under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would present limited disruptions to public views. Growth would continue to concentrate in centers (which tend to contain few viewpoints). Most public viewpoints are outside the neighborhood centers in Alternative 2. There would be no height increase for market-rate development and a minimal height increase for affordable housing in the Neighborhood Residential zones under Alternative 3. Most of the protected viewpoints and scenic routes are within or adjacent to the more intense development expected in the corridor place type under Alternatives 4 and 5, and a few are in or near the expanded regional and urban centers in Alternative 5. Development under these alternatives may disrupt views in more places.

130th/145th Station Areas

Exhibit 3.6-121. Summary of Land Use and Urban Form Impacts by Alternative—130th/145th Station Areas

Impact	No Action	Alt. 2	Alt. 5
Land Use Patterns	—	▼	▼
Land Use Compatibility	▼	▼	▽
Height, Bulk, & Scale	▽	▼	▼
Transitions	▼	▽	▲
Tree Canopy	▽	▽	▼
Shadows	▽	▼	▼
Views	—	—	▽

Note: Impacts are considered either unavoidable adverse (▼▼), adverse but able to be mitigated (▼), impact but less than adverse (▽), limited or none (—), moderately positive (▲), or positive (▲).

Sources: BERK, 2023; MAKERS, 2023.

Land use patterns and compatibility. No adverse impacts to land use patterns are expected in the station areas under the No Action Alternative. Under this alternative, no new areas would be designated for mixed-use or higher density and building types outside existing commercial zoning would remain primarily single purpose with some multi-family uses near the 145th BRT station. Few parcels around 130th would be likely to fully redevelop under the No Action Alternative, though more may see additions (e.g., ADUs) and rebuilds consistent with the existing land use patterns. However, the area may still see increased activity under the No Action Alternative over time as people seek to access the light rail station which could result in compatibility impacts with surrounding lower density residential development. Greater change would occur in the areas currently zoned for more intense development, including the 145th BRT station area and Pinehurst area.

Under Alternatives 2 and 5, both station areas would likely redevelop into mixed-use nodes with more growth at greater heights clustered in the newly designated neighborhood centers (Alternatives 2 and 5) and urban center (Alternative 5). Activity levels and land use intensities would increase resulting in greater impacts to land use patterns than the No Action Alternative. Compatibility impacts would be similar to those described citywide for neighborhood and urban centers.

Height, bulk, and scale. Changes to height, bulk, and scale would be limited under the No Action Alternative and primarily within the 145th station area. Under Alternatives 2 and 5, the station areas could see extensive changes to height, bulk, and scale as a result of proposed zoning capacity increases combined with proximity to the new light rail station. Heights could reach up to 7-8 stories immediately adjacent to the 130th light rail station and in the core of the 145th station area. 15th Ave NE (both in the 145th station area and Pinehurst) as well as NE 125th St at 15th Ave NE and Roosevelt Way NE south of NE 125th St would likely see greater levels of activity, enlivening the street level experience. However, many small commercial spaces currently exist in strip malls or in adapted houses in these areas.

Under all alternatives, large superblocks (longer than 600 feet) lacking a connected internal path or street network also mean that direct routes to access the station will be challenging without regulations to encourage or require through connections with redevelopment. Redevelopment at the light rail station would occur in a physically bifurcated, uncomfortable human environment (at 5th Ave NE, Roosevelt Way, and I-5) and could miss an opportunity to celebrate and activate the station entry.

Transitions. Transitions impacts in the station areas would be similar to those described citywide for the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 2 and 5. Under Alternatives 2 and 5, development of high-intensity buildings in the immediate vicinity of the 130th station area may create abrupt local transitions in scale between existing detached houses and new larger construction. Over time, an evolution of the station area into more consistently intensely used land, combined with smaller scale redevelopment in surrounding low-rise zones, would likely soften these transitions.

Tree canopy. Numerous evergreens, steep slopes, Thornton Creek, and environmentally critical areas near the 130th Station Area make development here unique, and perhaps more constrained, than many other Seattle areas. Existing large evergreen trees make residential areas feel set in hillside woods. Tree preservation could impact development capacity, and redevelopment with a loss of existing trees would have a noticeable effect on the human experience and sense of being set in nature. Under all alternatives, any redevelopment would fill gaps in street trees along the frontage. Large-scale redevelopment under Alternatives 2 and 5 in the station areas (more so under Alternative 5) would significantly impact the existing tree canopy.

Shadows. Under all alternatives, the existing tall evergreens, combined with steep slopes, significantly shade many residential areas. Shadow impacts from increases in building heights would be less noticeable in these residential areas because of those existing shadows. The

north-south orientation of 15th Ave NE, as well as to a lesser extent the diagonal orientation of Roosevelt Way NE, allows for greater solar access for longer hours throughout the year, even with increases in building heights. Under Alternatives 2 and 5, increased height limits could result in increased shadows on Jackson Park. However, the human experience of the park would not significantly change as tall evergreens already shade the park boundaries.

Views. Impacts to public views in the station areas under the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2 would be limited. Increased height limits near the 130th light rail station under Alternatives 2 and 5 could have limited impacts on the adjacent I-5 scenic corridor.

3.6.3 Mitigation Measures

Incorporated Plan Features

All alternatives would focus most future growth into the existing urban centers and villages. Compatibility challenges would not be an uncommon or new phenomenon in these areas and can be avoided or mitigated by continuing to implement the Land Use Code ([Title 23](#)). New place types and/or expanded housing options in existing Neighborhood Residential zones proposed as part of the action alternatives would introduce localized land use and urban form impacts where newer development is of greater height and intensity than existing development. These impacts, if they occur, are likely temporary and will be resolved over time or reduced by the application of existing or new development regulations and design standards. Overall, the new place types would create smoother and more varied transitions in intensity throughout the city (especially adjacent to urban center and village boundaries).

Existing building and land use policies, programs, and codes that promote compact building forms and energy efficient, low-carbon, green building techniques—such as the City’s green building permit incentives for private development and the Sustainable Buildings and Sites policy for City-development—would continue to apply under all alternatives as discussed below under [Regulations & Commitments](#).

Under the action alternatives, the City could also update Comprehensive Plan policies to further address the effects of climate change, particularly for communities more vulnerable to the effects of climate stress than others or located in areas in the city that may experience larger effects from climate change (including “heat islands” with more pavement and fewer trees, floodplain and landslide hazard areas, and areas with limited access to transit). For example, the action alternatives focus additional residential growth in areas 1, 2, and 6 which have relatively high levels of existing tree canopy cover. Required frontage improvements could increase the number of street trees with redevelopment, though more and bulkier development under all alternatives would likely displace some trees on private property and reduce tree canopy coverage overall. Potential mitigation measures to minimize tree canopy loss are described in [Section 3.3 Plants & Animals](#) and could include shared open space (see [Other](#)

Potential Mitigation Measures below) or adding open space requirements in Neighborhood Residential zones (see also **Section 3.11 Public Services**).

Regulations & Commitments

Seattle’s municipal code contains regulations for land use and urban form. Below is a summary of these regulations as well as existing supporting policies and programs which would serve to mitigate impacts associated with the alternatives.

SEPA Policies. [Title 25](#) of the Seattle Municipal Code contains policies governing the issues to be addressed during development review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). [SMC 25.05.675](#) contains policies related to specific environmental issues, including land use compatibility, noise, height, bulk, and scale, shadows, and views.

Development Regulations. The Seattle Municipal Code contains zoning and development regulations for the city. These development regulations contain provisions governing the design of buildings, site planning, restrictions within the shoreline jurisdiction, and provisions to minimize land use incompatibilities and impacts associated with height, bulk, and scale. Each zone contains unique provisions for urban design such as setbacks, upper-story setbacks, open space requirements, building height, FAR, screening, and landscaping, etc. They also contain standards for landscaping, tree protection, and stormwater which support the retention and planting of trees and vegetation.

Seattle Design Review Program. The Seattle Design Review Program provides oversight of private development projects in Seattle that meet certain criteria in terms of development size or where a departure from a development standard is requested. Design Review Boards are designated for eight areas of the city; each board is responsible for reviewing larger development projects in their defined area for compliance with Seattle’s adopted Design Guidelines and recommending design changes to make projects more consistent with the guidelines. Smaller projects are reviewed administratively. The Design Guidelines define desirable qualities with regard to architecture, urban design, and public space, and the overall goal of the program is to encourage excellence in the design of new commercial and multi-family development in Seattle. In addition to citywide standards, several sets of neighborhood-specific design guidelines supplement the Citywide and Downtown design guidelines.

Design Standards. Projects below the threshold for Design Review are subject to more prescriptive design standard regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that smaller projects still meet the City’s design objectives without imposing a level of delay and uncertainty that might be inappropriate for small projects.

Streets Illustrated, Seattle’s Right-of-Way Improvements Manual. Streets Illustrated establishes and documents the policies, procedures, and practices for how the City manages physical improvements in the street right-of-way. It attempts to provide a comprehensive resource for all procedures, standards, and guidelines affecting physical changes in the street

right-of-way. The manual also designates streets throughout Seattle for their modal priorities and purpose in their context, provides design guidance and standards to be implemented with redevelopment, and guides street tree selection and provision.

Green Building Incentives. The City's green building incentives aim to create more efficient buildings that center around clean electric energy, water, and resource conservation with a focus on human health. Projects can gain additional height, floor area, or a faster building permit in exchange for meeting specific green building goals and certification. Incentives include:

- *Priority Green Expedited:* Available for all new construction projects. Offers faster building permit review and processing for projects that meet green building requirements with a focus on clean energy, resource conservation, indoor air quality, and lead hazard reduction.
- *Green Building Standard:* Gives additional development capacity in specific zones in exchange for meeting green building requirements.
- *Living Building Pilot Program:* Offers additional height, floor area ratio (FAR), and Design Review departure requests for projects that meet aggressive energy and water requirements and Living Building Petal Certification.
- *2030 Challenge:* Offers additional height, FAR, and Design Review departure requests for projects that meet the 2030 Challenge.
- *Innovation Advisory Committee:* This group of experts reviews energy efficient proposals not covered in the technical codes.

Sustainable Buildings and Sites Policy. The City's [Sustainable Buildings and Sites Policy](#) for municipal facilities aims to maximize the environmental quality, economic vitality, and social health of the city through the design, construction, operation, maintenance, renovation, and decommissioning of City-owned buildings and sites. Sustainable buildings and sites support overall City objectives by making efficient use of energy, water, and material resources; reducing climate change; minimizing pollution and hazardous materials; creating healthy indoor environments; reinforcing natural systems; providing habitat; creating vibrant spaces for people; and contributing to Seattle's neighborhoods. The Policy sets the following goals for City-owned properties:

- New construction and major renovations 5,000 ft² or greater must meet LEED Gold as well as key performance requirements for energy and water efficiency, waste diversion, and bicycle facilities.
- Tenant Improvements 5,000 ft² or greater with a scope of work that includes mechanical, electrical, and plumbing must meet LEED Gold as well as water efficiency and waste diversion requirements.
- Small projects—either new construction, renovations, or tenant improvements—are to utilize Capital GREEN, a green design and construction evaluation tool developed by FAS, in project planning and development.
- All new and existing sites projects shall follow best management practices.

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

Although not required to address identified impacts, the City could pursue the following kinds of actions if it wishes to address possible future land use and urban form conditions.

Urban Form

In addition to the changes to policies and regulations described in [Chapter 2](#) relevant to urban form (development standards for balconies, roofs, tree protection, ground floor open space, shared open space, reduced residential parking and more), the City could further expand or extend the concepts as follows:

Changes to Development Standards. Changes to development standards such as updated design standards, allowances for porches and balconies, and bonuses for pitched roofs could improve the design of future development and mitigate the impact of new buildings.

Trees on private property. Options for mitigating potential tree loss in Neighborhood residential zones include updating existing requirements for planting trees on private property.

Funding for Trees. Invest in efforts to plant, maintain, and preserve of trees such as:

- Increasing funding to maintain and steward City-owned trees.
- Develop a tree stewardship program to provide expertise to residents on the care and maintenance of their trees.
- Increase stewardship and active management of forested parks through the Green Seattle Partnership.
- Expand partnership approaches to plant and maintain trees on private property like the Trees for Neighborhoods program.
- Plant more trees in the right of way and parks.
- Test technologies like flexible surfaces and expanded tree pits and explore creative uses of the right of way for trees and green infrastructure.

Incentives for Ground Floor Open Space. Allowing additional height (but not FAR) for projects that provide more ground level open space could create more space for trees and make the ground floor environment more open and inviting.

Point access blocks to achieve narrower building footprints. Seattle's building code allows up to 6-story point access block buildings (i.e., each building has just one staircase/elevator core instead of units surrounding a double-loaded corridor) which can support dense housing using narrow floorplates. Raising awareness about this type of housing, as well as allowing more than two per lot, could provide the flexibility for incremental development over time to achieve community needs and urban design goals better and more quickly than traditional processes of parcel assembly and development of large, bulky buildings.

Additionally, tall point access block buildings allow for housing development to have the necessary density to pencil while also allowing for greater unit diversity in the building. This means 3+ bedroom units are more viable to develop and multifamily housing is friendlier to children and families.

New combinations of allowed height, FAR, and setbacks found in Seattle’s zoning regulations could lead to denser housing that is taller but still improves wellbeing, livability, and sociability for those living in the housing, while also easing some aesthetic, size, and shade concerns from neighbors. New or adjusted zones that allow 5- to 8-story midrise buildings, while having FARs closer to current low-rise 3- and 4-story buildings, and that relax side and front setbacks, could allow for point access block or single stair buildings.

Shadows

Shadows on street trees. Select future trees and vegetation with future shadow conditions in mind.

Views

Investments to support public viewpoints. Additional funding for viewpoints on public property to draw attention to key viewpoints could help make better use of existing views.

Street trees. Select future trees and vegetation with existing viewpoints in mind.

130th/145th Station Area

- **Urban design and active transportation: Transit celebration.** Incentivize or require development to relate to, enhance, celebrate, and activate the station entry with transit-oriented commercial and public space.
- **Urban design and active transportation: Intersite connectivity.** Incentivize or require new development to provide new paths or streets to break down large blocks and provide direct, short routes to the station.
- **Street-level community building: Lack of focused public realm.** Undertake a community design effort to develop a cohesive approach toward development of public streets, public realm, or opportunities for shared social gathering that could be implemented through a combination of private development and public projects.
- **Street-level community building: Affordable commercial space.** Implement the 130th & 145th Station Area Planning Plan displacement mitigation strategies.
- **Child-friendly city and social wellbeing: Shared open space.** Incentivize or require outdoor gathering spaces, especially children’s play areas, that are oriented away from air and noise pollutants. Consider allowing zero-lot line development to allow for incremental development of interlocking buildings that create an active and varied street front—that can also block air and noise—while consolidating privately shared gathering space internally.

- **Sociability: Small social spaces.** Incentivize or require social corridors and/or shared entries amongst a small group of units in residential development to promote trust-building and social connections. Consider allowing more than 2 single-stair buildings per lot to maximize opportunities for shared entries amongst smaller groups of neighbors.

3.6.4 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Over time, additional growth and development will occur in Seattle and a generalized increase in development intensity, height, bulk, and scale is expected under all alternatives—this gradual conversion of lower-intensity uses to higher-intensity development patterns is unavoidable but an expected characteristic of urban population and employment growth. No significant unavoidable adverse impacts to land use patterns, compatibility, or urban form are expected under any alternative.

Future growth is likely to result in temporary or localized land use impacts as development occurs. The potential impacts related to these changes may differ in intensity and location in each of the alternatives and many are expected to resolve over time. Application of the City's adopted or new development regulations, zoning requirements, and design guidelines are anticipated to sufficiently mitigate these impacts.

Intentionally blank