



## City of Seattle

Seattle Planning Commission

Xio Alvarez and Matt Hutchins, Co-Chairs  
Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director

### SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, February 12, 2026

Approved Meeting Minutes

---

**Commissioners Present:** Xio Alvarez, Cecelia Black, Rebecca Brunn, McCaela Daffern, Andrew Dannenberg, Dylan Glosecki, Matt Hutchins, Julia Jannon-Shields, Rose Lew Tsai-Le Whitson, Radhika Nair, Dhyana Quintanar, Margaret Szeles, Kelabe Tewolde, Nick Whipple

**Commissioners Absent:** Monika Sharma, Dylan Stevenson

**Commission Staff:** Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director; John Hoey, Senior Policy Analyst; Olivia Baker, Policy Analyst; Robin Magonegil, Commission Coordinator

*Seattle Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion.*

---

Referenced Documents discussed at the meeting can be viewed here:

<https://www.seattle.gov/planningcommission/meetings>

#### Chair's Report & Minutes Approval

Co-Chair Xio Alvarez called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Co-Chair Alvarez offered the following land acknowledgement:

*'As we begin our meeting, we respectfully acknowledge that our meeting today is taking place on occupied Coast Salish land. We pay respect to Coast Salish Elders past and present and extend that respect to their descendants and to all Indigenous people. To acknowledge this land is to recognize the history of physical and cultural genocide and settler colonialism, which continues to displace Indigenous people today. It is to also recognize these lands, waters, and their significance for the resilient and wise peoples who continue to thrive in this region despite the consequences of displacement and broken treaties. Those who hold settler privilege in this city must work towards supporting the Coast Salish people and all Indigenous people using the various forms of wealth and privilege they reap due to it.'*

Co-Chair Alvarez noted that this meeting is a hybrid meeting with some Commissioners and staff participating remotely while other Commissioners and staff are participating in the Boards and Commissions Room at Seattle City Hall. She asked fellow Commissioners to review the Color Brave

Space norms and asked for volunteers to select one or more of the norms to read aloud. She suggested to Commissioners that they collectively agree to abide by these norms.

### **Announcements**

Vanessa Murdock, Seattle Planning Commission Executive Director, announced several upcoming Commission meetings and reviewed the format of this meeting.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Murdock noted that public comment may be provided in person at City Hall, submitted in writing via email at least eight hours before the meeting, or offered on the hybrid meeting platform MS Teams. Public comment must be able to be given in two minutes or less.

The following individuals provided public comment in person:

Scott Roberts stated that he lives on 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW. He supports concentrating density but is concerned about a targeted revision in his neighborhood. Low Rise zoning is out of scale with the rest of the neighborhood and will lead to displacement. 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue should maintain a residential zone. He suggested that the City should conduct thoughtful, scale-appropriate planning.

Gary Lee stated that the Downtown Regional Center Plan is great, However, there are no policies to evaluate those that conflict with the vision. He stated that there is an overconcentration of human services in South Downtown. Policies to allow these human services could be included in the other Regional Centers plans.

Sabrina Knowles stated that she moved to Capitol Hill twenty-three years ago. She wanted to live in a traditional neighborhood. She and her partners are makers and benefit from living in a traditional neighborhood.

### **Briefing: Centers and Corridors Legislation**

Brennon Staley, Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD)

Mr. Staley stated that the One Seattle Plan was adopted on December 16, 2025, representing a twenty-year plan for growth and vision for the future of Seattle. He described the Growth Strategy and its five key place types:

- 7 Regional Centers
- 26 Urban Centers
- 30 Neighborhood Centers
- Urban Neighborhood
- 2 Manufacturing & Industrial Centers

He stated that the place types describe the types of development and zoning that are appropriate in each area. The Growth Strategy is implemented through changes to zoning. The Neighborhood Residential update was also adopted December 16, 2025. This zoning update implements new state

middle housing (HB 1110) requirements and supports the development of primarily attached and detached homes throughout Seattle

Mr. Staley introduced the Centers and Corridors legislation, which is meant to provide new opportunities to add apartments and condos near transit, retail, services, and public amenities. This is intended to help meet citywide housing needs and improve housing choice and affordability across all neighborhoods. Increasing supply and diversity of housing:

- Supports economic opportunity and mobility
- Helps address one of the root causes of homelessness
- Creates inclusive neighborhoods
- Reduces regional sprawl and greenhouse gas emissions
- Helps business attract and retain employees

He shared OPCD's public engagement timeline and highlights from the engagement process, including:

- Broad agreement on the need for more housing
- Concerns about the proposal focused on:
  - Scale of buildings, particularly proximity of five-story development to existing homes
  - Localized factors such as topography, historic districts, and adequacy of transit or services
  - Adequacy of infrastructure including stormwater and streets
  - Impact on trees with redevelopment
- Comments supporting the proposal tended to focus on:
  - Scale of housing need and affordability crisis
  - Desire to address exclusivity of many areas
  - Desire to increase housing choices, especially stacked flats on quiet streets

Mr. Staley provided the following overview of the proposal:

- Implements rezones to allow for more apartments and condos in:
  - ✓ 30 new Neighborhood Centers
  - ✓ 6 new or expanded Urban Centers
  - ✓ Locations along frequent transit corridors
- Modifies development standards in Lowrise (LR) and Midrise (MR) zones to encourage more apartments and condos

#### Rezone Areas

- Boundaries for centers are established in the Comprehensive Plan (Future Land Use Map)
- Zoning on corridors generally limited to parcels adjacent to frequent transit routes

#### Zoning

- Mostly five- or six-story zoning where apartments and condos may be feasible
- Some four-story zoning at edges or on slopes

#### Online Map

[Zoning Update website](#) provides detailed maps

Mr. Staley provided a comparison of the legislation to OPCD's October 2024 proposal

- Reflects updated center boundaries
- Incorporates local knowledge about specific circumstances in different locations
- Selected removals and height reductions along frequent transit routes
- Addresses split-zoned lots

He stated that the proposed Center boundary changes reflect the approved Comprehensive Plan, including:

- Smaller expansions in urban centers without light rail and bus rapid transit
- Council amendments in 10 urban and neighborhood centers
- Shifting Phinney Ridge to East Ballard

Local circumstances

- Topography
- Environmentally Critical Areas
- Undeveloped rights-of-way
- Isolated or irregular lot shapes

Frequent Transit Routes

- Steep streets (ex. Madrona Drive)
- Changes in transit service (SE Magnolia, 10th Ave East)
- Historic Boulevards (10th Ave West)

Split Zoned Lots

- Split zoning means a lot with multiple zoning designations
- Changes generally involve increasing lower-density zone rather than decreasing the higher-density zone

He stated that, in aggregate, most of the changes were reductions to the changes originally proposed in 2024. All were based on on-the-ground conditions.

Mr. Staley described the following proposed changes to development standards:

- Implements stacked flat bonus in Lowrise 1 and Lowrise 2 zones similar to recently adopted bonus in Neighborhood Residential
- Applies height and FAR for Lowrise 3 zones inside centers to Lowrise 3 zones outside centers
- Increases FAR in Lowrise 3 zones from 2.3 to 2.5
- Creates a new six-story residential zone (Midrise 1)
- Updates setback, building width, and building depth in Midrise zones
- Changes to screening and FAR measurement

He stated that the Centers and Corridors legislation has been transmitted to the City Council. They will create a Select Committee that will meet on dates to be determined in the near future.

Mr. Staley stated that Phase 3 will consider existing Urban Centers, three Regional Centers (Downtown, Northgate, and Capitol/First Hill), and additional Neighborhood Centers. Phase 4 will consider additional Regional Centers, new light rail station areas, and transit-oriented development.

#### Commission Discussion

- Commissioners commented on the proposed changes to development standards, stating that the Lowrise 1 (LR1) and Lowrise 2 (LR2) zones are obsolete. Commissioners recommended eliminating side setbacks.
- Commissioners questioned whether it makes sense to provide feedback on legislation that has already been transmitted to the City Council. Commissioners expressed frustration with policy decisions that the Planning Commission is not consulted on. Mr. Staley stated that the City Council needs to hear from the public at this point. This legislation was developed under the previous Mayor's administration. OPCD wanted to move this legislation forward so to move on to other work. The Comprehensive Plan is adopted, and the City needs to be in compliance.
- Commissioners stated that their previous comments have included expanding opportunities for housing to a full block away from frequent transit routes. Development standard should encourage courtyards as social spaces for residents to get to know their neighbors.
- Commissioners asked for clarification on the LR1 and LR2 zones. Mr. Staley stated that there is no LR 1 zoning in this proposal. The vast majority of the proposed change is Lowrise 3 (LR3) zoning. LR2 is used as a transition from Neighborhood Residential zones and when there are topography issues. Areas with LR2 zoning will likely be developed with townhouses, not stacked flats. He stated that there are a lot of ongoing changes at the state and local level that will make it more attractive and feasible to build apartments.
- Michael Hubner, OPCD Long-Range Planning Manager, encouraged further dialogue with the Commission during the next phases of the Comprehensive Plan implementation.

#### **Briefing: Manufacturing/Industrial Center Plans**

Jim Holmes, OPCD

Mr. Holmes stated that Manufacturing and Industrial Center (MIC) Plans are being prepared for both the Greater Duwamish MIC and the Ballard-Interbay-Northend MIC (BINMIC). These plans are required by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and provide continued eligibility for federal transportation funds. The following chapters are required by the PSRC:

- Vision Statement
- Land Use
- Transportation
- Economic Development
- Environment
- Public Services

Mr. Holmes listed PSRC's certification requirements:

- Descriptive Information
- Goal/Policy Requirements
- Part of the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan

He provided an overview of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy:

- SODO-focused workgroup 2016-2017
- Citywide Strategy Council convened in fall 2019
  - Interdepartmental team
  - 60+ community stakeholder representatives
  - Professionally facilitated meetings
  - 4 Neighborhood sub-groups
  - Engagement with BIPOC youth
- Consensus Recommendations in June 2021
- Early implementation in 2022 budget (Workforce Development and Environmental Strategies)
- New Industrial Zoning Framework adopted 2023
- New Industrial Comprehensive Plan Policies adopted 2023
- Manufacturing and Industrial Center Plans 2026

Mr. Holmes stated that the Advisory Council recommended a package of eleven strategies, with 85% consensus in June 2021.

#### Investment Strategies

1. Workforce Investments
2. Public Safety Partnerships
3. Transportation Investments
4. Environmental Initiatives

#### Land Use Strategies

5. Stronger Protections
6. Dense Industrial Development
7. Healthy Transitional Areas
8. No New Residential Uses
9. Georgetown and South Park

#### Action Strategies

10. WOSCA and Armory
11. Stewardship Entities

He listed the key features of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy proposal:

- Land use protections for core industrial areas.
- Zoning for Industrial Transit Oriented Development (TOD) near light rail.
- New capacity for 3,000+ units of new housing, focusing on workforce/middle-income housing.
- Improve livability and environmental justice in edge neighborhoods.

Mr. Holmes described the structure of the MIC Subarea Plans as follows:

#### Element Background

- Overview and background information
- Key Challenges and Opportunities
- Sets context for planning in the MIC and identifies potential policy interventions.

#### Goals and Policies

- MIC Goal
  - Citywide Comprehensive Plan Policies
    - Growth Strategy Element
    - Land Use Element
    - Transportation Element
    - Shoreline Areas Element
    - Container Port Element
    - Climate Element
    - Economic Development Element
  - Other City Policy Documents
  - Existing Regulations
  - MIC Specific Policy

He summarized the main points of the following elements:

#### Land Use – Key Opportunities and Challenges

##### BINMIC

- Irreplicable Water Dependent Uses
- Dravus Light Rail Station
- Ballard Light Rail Station
- Residential Encroachment
- Interbay Armory

##### Greater Duwamish MIC

- Sound Transit Light Rail Stations
- Residential Encroachment
- Reconnect South Park
- Seattle's Container Port

##### Goals for both MICs

- Strong presence of industrial activity
- Predictable land use policies
- Transit that supports and is compatible with industrial activity.
- Healthy transition between industrial and non-industrial areas.

#### Transportation – Key Opportunities and Challenges

#### BINMIC

- Maintaining Freight Network
- Integrating Sound Transit Stations
- 15th Ave W Corridor including Ballard Bridge.
- East-west connectivity in Dravus
- Safe active transportation network
- Freight and Bus (FAB) lanes

#### Greater Duwamish MIC

- Maintaining Freight Network
- Integrating Sound Transit Stations
- Reconnect South Park
- Safe active transportation network
- FAB lanes

#### Goals for both MICs

- Address freight network constraints
- High-efficiency use of limited rights of way
- Strong intermodal connections
- Active transportation network safely coexisting with freight network

#### Economy – Key Opportunities and Challenges

#### BINMIC

- Brewery District
- Interbay Armory
- Encroaching Land Uses
- Light Rail
- Climate Change
- Maritime Innovations

#### Greater Duwamish MIC

- Light Rail
- Encroaching Land uses
- Maritime Innovation
- Seattle's Container Port

#### Goals for both MICs

- Strong presence of industrial/maritime sectors and the living-wage jobs they provide
- Equitable access to living-wage jobs
- Home to emerging subsectors of the industrial/maritime economy
- A blend of ICT and traditional industrial/maritime employers near high-capacity transit

#### Environment and Open Space – Key Opportunities and Challenges

#### BINMIC

- Contamination and Fill
- Interbay Armory
- Combined Sewer Overflow
- Sea Level Rise
- Bike Trail Connectivity

#### Greater Duwamish MIC

- Environmental Justice
- Water Quality
- Contamination and Fill
- Sea Level Rise
- Bike Trail Connectivity

#### Goals for both MICs

- Rehabilitation of environmentally critical areas
- Innovative Stormwater Management
- High-quality network of open spaces and trails
- Avoidance of environmental impacts on vulnerable populations
- Reduction in greenhouse gasses
- Innovative green building practices

Mr. Holmes provided the following timeline for the MIC Subarea Plans:

Draft Plan: March 2026

Public Review: March/April 2026

Proposed Plan: May 2026

Council Consideration: Summer/Fall 2026

He highlighted other implementation actions:

- Ordinance to fine tune Industrial and Maritime Strategy Legislation based on lessons learned
- Bi-annual report on development trends in MICs
- Update to Streets Illustrated Manual for Industry and Innovation (II) and Urban Industrial (UI) zone street improvements

#### Commission Discussion

- Commissioners expressed disappointment that legislation passed by the City Council in 2026 to allow workforce housing in the Stadium District did not respect the intent of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy.
- Commissioners stated that the Downtown Regional Center Plan made an intentional effort to weave indigenous themes throughout. The MICs have a lot of waterfront property that is meaningful to indigenous people. Mr. Holmes stated that indigenous history is included in the narrative, but the plans do not have any specific policies related to indigenous people. He stated that the project team did not get much input on the implementation policies from the tribes.

- Commissioners expressed enthusiasm for the inclusion of street designs that include both freight and pedestrian safety. This is a representation of complete industrial and economic communities.

## Commission Business

**ACTION: Commissioner Julia Jannon-Shields moved to approve the January 22, 2026 meeting minutes. Commissioner McCaela Daffern seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes passed.**

Olivia Baker, Seattle Planning Commission staff, provided a brief overview of the Planning Commission's comments on the Draft Downtown Regional Center Plan.

## Public Comment

Ms. Murdock read the following public comments, which were submitted by email:

*Dear Planning Commission,*

*In City Council's review of the Draft One Seattle Plan (Comp Plan Update) last year, they adopted an amendment to address the over-concentration of homeless shelters and human service facilities Downtown, including the CID and Pioneer Square, new Policy CF. 5.5.*

*I both stand with and have worked with Gary Lee and the CID on many over-concentration issues in both of our neighborhoods. (Pioneer Square and the CID). While Pioneer Square supports the city's need to address the housing crisis, these historic neighborhoods are currently carrying a disproportionate share of the city's low-income housing and service-intense units.*

*I call for geographic equity. Our neighborhoods host a significantly higher percentage of social housing compared to most other Seattle districts. This over-concentration creates an imbalance. This imbalance strains local resources. Our infrastructure and public services are stretched very thin. This impacts the quality of life for ALL residents.*

*Over-concentration threatens our neighborhood's cultural vitality. Small businesses and cultural institutions in PS/CID are already struggling to recover from economic shifts face unique challenges when the residential mix lacks diversity. Over-concentration impairs long term recovery. For our neighborhoods to thrive, we require a mix of residential, commercial, workforce, and market rate housing.*

*We need to adopt a FAIR SHARE housing policy. Rather than adding more density to areas already at capacity, the city should prioritize new social housing in neighborhoods that have historically seen very little of this development. This would ensure every community contributes to the city's growth while allowing Pioneer Square and the CID breathing room for healthy and sustainable recoveries.*

*Perhaps a formal cumulative impact study of low-income housing in the 98104 zip code could happen before further projects are approved or expansion of current social housing is allowed.*

*Pioneer Square and the CID deserve a future defined by balance, not burden.*

*Thank you,  
Tija (Tia) Petrovich  
Chair-Pioneer Square Residents' Council  
pioneersquare.us*

*Dear Co-Chairs Alvarez and Hutchins, Executive Director Murdock, and Members of the Seattle Planning Commission,*

*I am writing as a resident of the Morgan Junction in West Seattle to provide formal public testimony regarding the Centers and Corridors legislation currently before the City Council. I request that this statement be entered into the public record for the One Seattle Plan.*

*Specifically, I am asking the Committee to maintain the Neighborhood Residential (NR) zoning on 39th Avenue Southwest within the Morgan Junction Neighborhood Center. The proposed Lowrise 2 (LR2) zoning designation is inappropriate for this street.*

*My wife and I have proudly called this neighborhood home for 26 years. We raised our children here, volunteered in local public schools, and coached youth sports. Our daughter now teaches at Lafayette Elementary, and our son hopes to return after finishing his studies at Washington State University. We are deeply invested in this community and want to see it grow in a way that strengthens what makes it special.*

*I support adding housing and fostering growth in a vibrant, walkable Morgan Junction. However, LR2 on this particular block is a planning mismatch that undermines the goals of the One Seattle Plan rather than advancing them.*

*39th Avenue SW is not a transit corridor, a commercial street, or a redevelopment spine. It is a narrow, tree lined residential street outside the Morgan Junction core, with limited parking and a noticeable slope that makes full LR2 buildout difficult. This is not where mid scale zoning belongs.*

*LR2 here does not meaningfully advance affordability. The first buildings torn down under LR2 are the older, naturally affordable homes and small multifamily buildings that provide the neighborhood's lowest cost housing. They are replaced with expensive new construction out of reach for most working families. We gain theoretical capacity on paper, but we lose real affordability on the ground.*

*Morgan Junction core and arterials already have the capacity to absorb growth.*

*California Avenue, Fauntleroy, 35th Ave SW, and the designated Neighborhood Center can support LR2, LR3, and MR zoning. They have transit, commercial activity, and infrastructure. 39th Avenue SW is the residential buffer that protects the livability of the center. Over zoning the buffer undermines the center.*

*Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) offer a better alternative that aligns with both state law and neighborhood stability. ADUs add gentle density without triggering teardowns. They preserve affordability, maintain the character of the street, and support incremental growth, exactly the kind of "missing middle" housing the state intended, without the displacement pressure that LR2 brings.*

*Rezoning the west side of 39th Ave SW introduces uncertainty that discourages long term investment. Today, people improve their homes because they see them as places they will stay forever. LR2 zoning across the street raises questions about whether the block will remain livable and predictable. When residents no longer feel confident about the future of their street, they defer improvements or leave. Stability, stewardship, and community cohesion depend on zoning that matches the block's character, not zoning that undermines it.*

*I encourage us to put growth where it works, not where it harms. We can meet our housing goals without destabilizing a quiet residential street that lacks the infrastructure for mid-scale development. We can support Morgan Junction's evolution without erasing the qualities that make it a great place to live.*

*I respectfully ask the committee to remove LR2 zoning from the west side of 39th Avenue SW and focus growth in the Morgan Junction core and along true transit corridors.*

*Thank you for your time and your commitment to thoughtful, equitable planning.*

*Sincerely,  
Scott Roberts*

*Dear Vanessa and Planning Commission Members,*

*My comment on Transportation has to do with plans by Sound Transit to build an inefficient system for all by choosing preferred alternatives North and South of CID, eliminating the future one seat ride from Tacoma to Everett.*

*People coming from the south (Tacoma, Federal Way, Skyway, Beacon Hill) will have to stop at SODO and walk/wheelchair uphill to Pioneer Square to get a line to continue going north. People on the Eastside will get off in Chinatown and have to walk/wheelchair uphill north to get a line to go south or walk/wheelchair from Chinatown to SODO (6th and Royal Brougham) to go to Federal Way, other points south, including the airport.*

*Seattle needs to figure out a way to repair this forever damage to the light rail system that will discourage ridership in favor of cars. Maybe it's the Planning Commission's job.*

*The other main comment is regarding Wayfinding and the document's mentions of repair of past harms. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of following City Ordinance 119297 which gives the official name*

*of one neighborhood as Chinatown International District, which has generated much confusion among local people, visitors, tourists and even city and Sound Transit staff. It's particularly confusing for the disabled communities taking light rail to ID Chinatown and finding themselves on maps as being in Chinatown International District.*

*Repair past harms: collaborate with Sound Transit to correct the station name from International District Chinatown to align with the city ordinance name of Chinatown International District in City Ordinance 119297. Further, to repair past and ongoing harms, the city needs to correct: 1) International District Chinatown library to Chinatown International District Library and 2) International District Chinatown Community Center to Chinatown International District Community Center [Note: library naming policies also support correction; the policy rule calls for branches to be named for the geographic area.]*

*My comments on the Plan:*

*1. Must include "fair share" policy so that no one neighborhood is overburdened with shelters and services for clients, such as Pioneer Square and Chinatown International District.*

- CID is surrounded by 20+ shelters and only recently the city ended its Navigation Center in Little Saigon*
- Pioneer Square serves 800 day clients in work release, human services, and temporary shelter. Open human service centers in the new Regional Centers.*

*2. Restrict or eliminate non-conforming businesses in favor of more retail.*

*3. Historic South Downtown has surveyed the CID and found 200,000 square feet of unused space that could be converted to low income senior housing, for which there is a wait list of non-English speakers.*

*4. URM—include an amendment to provide assistance for the many historic buildings in CID and Pioneer Square.*

*5. Planners must be cognizant of cultural sensitivities and characteristics of Pioneer Square and CID. Plans must reflect the cultures of these two historic districts.*

*Thank you.*

*Betty Lau*

*I am writing as a resident of the Morgan Junction in West Seattle to provide formal public testimony regarding the Centers and Corridors legislation currently before the City Council. I request that this statement be entered into the public record for the One Seattle Plan.*

*We purchased our home specifically with the understanding that we live on a residential street, not a high density commercial building area impacting the daylight and views, and we love our slower pace of the residential streets to enjoy sunset walks and sunshine in the neighborhood and our homes.*

*We are surprised to find that the potential impact of zoning changes allowing a 4-story wall extending from SW Holly St to SW Juneau St, which would effectively block all views west of 35th (affecting 16 city blocks). This will have a huge impact on our daily life and quality of our neighborhood day to day life will be significantly compromised. This will potentially create an unattractive valley zone (which includes my house on 39th Ave) with compromised sun exposure (critical value for houses living in Seattle) between these newly zoned 4-6 story streets.*

*We understand the change on California Ave and Fauntleroy Way, as those are already high density zones, however extending out the higher building zones to the other residential streets is so unfair for all the current residents.*

*Please re-consider and please do not allow higher buildings structure in our peaceful neighborhood street - please keep our West Seattle charm intact.*

*Masako Wada*

*To: Co-Chairs Alvarez and Hutchins, Executive Director Murdock, and Members of the Seattle Planning Commission,*

*I am writing as a concerned resident of the Morgan Junction Neighborhood in West Seattle to formally express my opposition to the proposed Centers & Corridors legislation. While the plan aims to address housing affordability, I believe it does so at an unacceptable personal cost to existing homeowners and the long-term stability of our neighborhoods.*

*My opposition is based on the following critical concerns:*

- Threats to Homeowner Stability and Well-Being: Many of us have invested our life savings and decades of care into our homes. The significant up-zoning of residential areas—which comprise about two-thirds of Seattle—threatens to drive up property values and taxes, creating immense financial pressure that could displace long-term, fixed-income residents.*
- Loss of Privacy and Quality of Life: The proposed changes to development standards, such as increasing height limits for stacked flats to 42 feet in LR1 zones and removing upper-level setbacks in Midrise zones, will allow massive, 5 to 6-story structures to loom directly over existing homes. This results in a direct and invasive loss of sunlight, territorial views, and personal privacy.*
- Impractical Transportation and Parking Expectations: The push to move residents toward "walking, biking, and rolling" does not reflect the daily realities of families who require vehicles for school, medical appointments, and essential errands. Removing parking requirements without adequate alternatives compromises the ability of residents to manage their lives effectively.*

- *Strained Community Infrastructure: Rapidly increasing density along frequent transit corridors ignores local topography and places an unsustainable burden on our aging utility services and residential street capacity.*

*This proposal forces an incompatible scale of development onto established neighborhoods, destroying the unique social fabric that makes Seattle home. I urge you to reconsider these broad zoning changes and instead pursue housing solutions that do not come at the expense of current residents' well-being and security.*

*Sincerely,  
John Jermain*

*Dear Co-Chairs Alvarez and Hutchins, Executive Director Murdock, and Members of the Seattle Planning Commission,*

*I am writing as a resident of the Morgan Junction in West Seattle to provide formal public testimony regarding the Centers and Corridors legislation currently before the City Council. I request that this statement be entered into the public record for the One Seattle Plan.*

*Every day as I walk from my house on 39th Street towards Holly Street, I breathe in the wonders of the myriad of architecturally different homes, the trees, the gardens, the water views, the Olympics. My soul gets replenished here.*

*LR2 housing on 39th Street would kill my soul and the soul and character of West Seattle. 39th Street is a narrow residential Street with barely enough parking for those of us who live here. The character and charm of a quiet residential street that so many of us bought into to raise our children will cease to exist.*

*The question is:*

*Who will pay the price in dollars? Who will stand to gain in dollars? Who will stand to lose?*

*The reality is:*

*Middle income will stand to lose. Middle income will pay the price in dollars. The winner is obvious.*

*Sincerely,  
Joan Miley*

*To Chair Lin and the Select Committee on the Comprehensive Plan:*

*I am writing as a resident of 39th Ave SW to provide formal public testimony regarding the Centers and Corridors legislation currently before the City Council. I request that this statement be entered into the public record for the One Seattle Plan.*

*My family has lived on 39th Ave SW for 16 years. I grew up in Seattle, and my partner Erin and I have built our life here, investing everything we have into our neighborhood and the greater Seattle community. As Erin said in the letters she sent our City Councilmembers: we love this City, and we're asking the City to love us back.*

*This re-zoning proposal isn't about affordable housing; it's business interests trying to steamroll the middle class once again. We know what's driving this proposal because we were receiving so many unwanted phone calls from developers trying to buy our home because of "exciting new zoning opportunities" that we took out our phone line.*

*And while folks who've never seen our street might imagine something different, it's a middle-class neighborhood of mostly modest homes. When residents of our street have invested in their homes, they haven't torn down and started over or taken their houses down to the studs; they've made thoughtful, sustainable choices that consider their neighbors and the environment.*

*Allowing four-story buildings on this street won't result in affordable housing, it will result in the most affordable homes to buy or rent on the street being torn down and replaced with new, unaffordable construction because developers want to build condos and townhouses with views, and they don't care if they need to move far from the main arterials and cores to do it. They don't care if they cast a shadow over an entire neighborhood to do it. Many people on this street have lived here for decades, never anticipating that the zoning would be changed so drastically.*

*The changes that HB 1110 will bring are already major; there is absolutely no reason to expand the rezoning even further, except for greed. There is plenty of space in the main corridor to add more housing; ask why builders aren't content with that? Because it's not on a hill where they can put buildings that tower over the area and claim the only views, creating a scarcity effect that pushes out existing community members to make way for wealthier ones.*

*Our neighbors are mail carriers, public health workers, small business employees, educators, and public interest lawyers, they're not rich Seattleites. Families are being pushed out of Seattle, including in neighborhoods like this one, and it's so disheartening to see it done under the false guise of affordable housing.*

*These are our objections and the reasons we sincerely hope you will take them to heart:*

- 1) The required changes that HB 1110 will introduce are already significant, approving additional upzoning on a quiet residential street like 39th Ave SW won't advance the bill's goals or the needs of the community.*
- 2) Allowing for the construction of four-story LR2 housing on 39th Ave SW is not required by HB 1110 and would be a local policy decision that would cause harm to the community.*
- 3) LR2 on this particular block is a planning mismatch that undermines the goals of the One Seattle Plan rather than advancing them:*

- a. *This is a neighborhood of mostly modest homes where kids ride their bikes down the street; a wall of four-story buildings would make the street unrecognizable and unlivable for the middle-class families who've built their lives here.*
  - b. *39th Avenue SW is a quiet residential street that sits outside the Morgan Junction core. It is a narrow street that has limited street parking and a significant slope that makes a full LR2 buildout problematic.*
  - c. *39th Ave SW is not a transit corridor, a commercial street, or a redevelopment spine. It's not realistic to think people who move to 39th won't bring one or two cars along, and as is, there is barely enough street parking. Further, traffic is at capacity for children to safely ride their bikes and walk to the school bus stop.*
  - d. *If the street were to become further crowded, it's not realistic that families with young kids would sell their cars; many of these children aren't old enough to take public transit, and other residents, like my spouse, work late hours and don't feel safe on the bus alone at night.*
  - e. *As SPS enrollment declines because families are leaving the district, it is important to consider the needs of families who want to continue living in and contributing to Seattle, including those living in neighborhoods like 39th Ave SW that are safe for their kids and conducive to family life.*
  - f. *Quite simply, this is not where mid-scale zoning belongs, and it would be a sign of giving up on Seattle's middle class. This isn't a neighborhood full of wealthy people, but rather folks who've bought and invested in "forever homes" instead of tearing down the houses to build mini mansions. It's a place where kids still play outside on the sidewalks and yards.*
  - g. *Allowing construction of a 4-story wall of apartments extending from SW Holly Street to SW Juneau Street (overshadowing 16 city blocks) would push current residents out.*
- 4) *LR2 here does not meaningfully advance affordability.*
- a. *The buildings that will be torn down under LR2 are the older, more affordable homes and small multifamily buildings that make up the neighborhood's lowest cost housing. They'll then be replaced with expensive new construction that is out of reach for most working families. We see this happening elsewhere in Seattle, and we all get letters and calls from developers all the time, hoping that we're distressed homeowners looking to sell our property for their gain so that they can do it on our street too.*
  - b. *Townhouses, walk-ups, and larger apartment/condo buildings aren't the ideal housing for larger families or elders; this kind of development only caters to the young, high-earning professionals that developers continually seek to profit from at the expense of middle class families; 39th Ave SW should not be treated as collateral in the plans of developers who already try to harass homeowners into selling the homes that mean the world to them.*
  - c. *39th Ave SW is the residential buffer that protects the livability of the center; over zoning the buffer would undermine the center and harm the lives of all residents.*
- 5) *Morgan Junction's core is the appropriate place to focus this type of development, not quiet streets like 39th Ave SW.*
- a. *The Morgan Junction core and arterials already have the capacity to absorb growth. California Avenue, Fauntleroy, and the designated Neighborhood Center can support LR2, LR3, and MR zoning. They have transit, commercial activity, and infrastructure. 39th Avenue SW does not. The only reason to extend beyond this is that developers see more money to be made by building further up the hill – this is not affordable housing.*

- b. *For 39th Ave SW, accessory dwelling units are a better alternative, and they align with both state law and neighborhood stability. My family's plan has been to build an ADU to allow for multi-generational family living. ADUs add gentle density without tearing down existing homes, and they enable multi-generational families to thrive while preserving affordability, maintaining neighborhood character and distinctiveness, and supporting incremental growth. This is the kind of "missing middle" housing the state intended for places like 39th Ave SW, not the displacement pressure that LR2 would bring.*
- c. *We can meet our housing goals without destabilizing a quiet residential street that lacks the infrastructure for mid-scale development.*
- d. *We can support Morgan Junction's evolution without erasing the qualities that make it livable.*
- e. *When Erin and I bought our small, older home, we loved it, but knew we'd need to update it as our family grew. That's what we've done. We didn't move out of the neighborhood or tear the house down to build a large new construction; we followed the most sustainable path of keeping the existing building and just added the additional room we needed while considering our neighbors and our neighborhood. In doing so, we also invested all of our savings and equity into the home. A home we never want to leave, but that we will have to leave if the livability of our neighborhood is destroyed.*

*Putting large buildings on a sleepy family street that isn't close to public transit and isn't on a main arterial will not solve affordable housing problems or improve the quality of life for existing or new residents. It's an unnecessary and inappropriate plan that will cause significant harm to residents who badly want to stay in Seattle. Please don't push families out of the community we love.*

*Sincerely,  
Sean McCready*

**The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.**