

July 23, 2014

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Committee Recommendation - Would suggest calling it something other than Urban Village element such as “How We Grow” so that areas outside and urban design can find a home here.

Committee Comment – “intended to see growth and change over time” This statement within the discussion, may be helpful in describing what it is that make the Urban Village Strategy different than other types of growth strategies.

Committee Recommendation - light rail stations exist, or where light rail stations are planned and funded, and the Places where two corridors that currently provide frequent transit service intersect, as shown in either red, orange, or yellow on the Frequent Transit Network map (Figure 4-1 in the Seattle Transit Master Plan), as updated to show actual 2012 frequent transit service levels; or where Existing multimodal hubs and transportation centers exist as shown in Figure 5-5 in the Seattle Transit Master Plan.

Committee Recommendation - , at minimum, fully encompass a 10-minute walkshed . Where existing boundaries do not include the full 10-minute walkshed, expand the boundary to include this area. Additionally, boundaries may be expanded to

Recommendation - Need to provide link to definition for walkshed and the methodology for creating it – network analysis, etc.

Committee Recommendation - There should be no single family on the Future Land Use Map in Urban Villages. Does the updated Future Land Use Map concept help us to accomplish this?

Committee Comment – Could remove or reinforce in the discussion/introduction.

Committee Comment – May be a redundant policy. Already prioritize in Capital Facilities as Urban Village.

Committee Comment - Zoned capacity, existing or future, should not be the driver. Transportation first then density of housing and jobs available. Would recommend eliminating per the Comp Plan Task Force discussion.

Committee Comment - In addition to the list above, Transit Communities Report reclassifies the following list also to Mixed Use Centers – Ballard, Mt. Baker, and West Seattle Junction.

Committee Question – Do we have verification that these goals are being met in our existing Urban Villages? How will these goals affect which new villages might be selected?

Committee Recommendation – Remove distance from the center and begin to talk about proximity to transit.

Committee Comment - Consider redundancy when talking about typology. Would it be beneficial to state that all Villages regardless of type should have essential components of livability that include parks, schools, and access to a broad range of services?

Committee Comment – Reinforce walkshed.

Permit the size of hub urban villages to vary according to local conditions and walkshed, but limit their size so that most areas within the village are within a walkable distance of employment and service concentrations in the village.