



City of Seattle

# Seattle Planning Commission

July 17, 2017

Honorable Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair  
Planning, Land Use, and Zoning Committee  
*via e-mail*

RE: 2017/2018 Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan - Docket recommendations

Dear Councilmember Johnson,

The Seattle Planning Commission is pleased to provide our comments and recommendations on which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments should be placed on the docket for further analysis. Our recommendations are offered as stewards of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and based on the application of Council-adopted criteria, Guidelines for Amendment Selection, included in Resolution 31402 (Attachment A).

**The Planning Commission recommends moving forward the following amendment proposals to the docket for further analysis:**

## Future Land Use Map Amendments

### 7. Interbay Armory

The applicant is requesting to amend the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center (BINMIC) boundary to remove the Interbay Armory property and amend the Future Land Use Map from Industrial to Commercial/Mixed Use.

Consistent with the Commission's decision last year to docket amendments pertaining to industrial lands, the Commission is recommending this amendment for docketing, acknowledging the forthcoming recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Industrial Lands.

### 8. Fiorito Property

The applicant is requesting to amend the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center boundary to remove most of the block

## Commissioners

Grace Kim, *Chair*  
Tim Parham, *Vice-Chair*  
Michael Austin  
Keiko Budech  
Eileen Canola  
Sandra Fried  
David Goldberg  
Kara Martin  
Jake McKinstry  
Marj Press  
Julio Sanchez  
David Shelton  
Lauren Squires  
Jamie Stroble  
Patti Wilma

## Staff

Vanessa Murdock  
*Executive Director*  
John Hoey,  
*Senior Policy Analyst*  
Katy Haima  
*Policy Analyst*  
Robin Magonegil  
*Administrative Staff*

bounded by NW 49th Street, 8th Avenue NW, NW 48th Street, and 9th Avenue NW, and amend the Future Land Use Map from Industrial to Commercial/Mixed Use.

The Commission recommended this map change for the 2016-2017 docket. Consistent with the Commission's decision last year to docket amendments pertaining to industrial lands, the Commission is again recommending this amendment for docketing, acknowledging the forthcoming recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Industrial Lands.

#### 9. 1616 W Bertona St

The applicant is requesting to amend the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center boundary to remove one block and amend the Future Land Use Map from Industrial to Commercial/Mixed Use.

The Commission recommended this map change for the 2016-2017 docket. Consistent with the Commission's decision last year to docket amendments pertaining to industrial lands, the Commission is again recommending this amendment for docketing, acknowledging the forthcoming recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Industrial Lands.

#### 10. Whole Foods

The applicant is requesting to amend the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center to remove property located at 1819-1893 15th Avenue West and 1855-2033 15th Avenue West and amend the Future Land Use Map from Industrial to Commercial/Mixed Use.

Consistent with the Commission's decision last year to docket amendments pertaining to industrial lands, the Commission is recommending this amendment for docketing, acknowledging the forthcoming recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force on Industrial Lands.

#### 12. Pier One

The applicant is requesting to amend the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center to remove the Pier One property, located at 2130 Harbor Avenue SW, and amend the Future Land Use Map from Industrial to Commercial/Mixed Use.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

(The Planning Commission held a vote to determine whether the Pier One amendment should move forward to the docket for further analysis. The vote was eight Commissioners in favor, one opposed, and one abstention.)

## 20. Seattle Pacific University

The applicant is requesting to amend the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center and amend policies and the Seattle Municipal Code to allow for expansion of the Major Institution use onto industrial lands outside of the BINMIC and south of the ship canal.

Consistent with the Commission’s decision last year to docket amendments pertaining to industrial lands, the Commission is recommending this amendment for docketing, acknowledging the forthcoming recommendations from the Mayor’s Task Force on Industrial Lands.

### Text Amendments

#### 4. Parking Along the Boundaries of Urban Centers and Villages

The applicant is proposing to amend land use policies to reduce the spillover of parking from urban centers and villages into the surrounding community.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

#### 5. Definition of Concurrency

The applicant is proposing to amend the Glossary to add a definition of “Concurrency”.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

#### 6. Parking and Affordable Housing

The applicant is proposing to amend Land Use Goal 6 to state that increasing affordable housing is a goal in setting parking requirements, rather than lowering construction costs, as currently stated.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

#### 11. Family Housing

The applicant is proposing to amend the Land Use Element to add a new policy encouraging affordable housing designed for larger families in low-density multi-family areas.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

### 13. Yards and Trees

The applicant is proposing to amend policies in the Land Use Element to allow for yards and trees in multifamily areas.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

### 15. Discouraging Residential Demolition and Displacement

The applicant is proposing to amend the Land Use element to include a policy to discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of residents.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

### 16. Rezones and Conditional Uses

The applicant is proposing to amend the Land Use element to adopt policies related to establishing zone and rezone criteria to guide zoning decisions and ensuring that zoning decisions are done with public notice, outreach, and inclusiveness with a regard for local conditions, community preferences and neighborhood plans.

The Commission recommends this proposal for docketing. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study.

**The Planning Commission recommends the following amendment proposals not move forward to the docket for further analysis:**

#### Future Land Use Map Amendments

##### 1. Wallingford Residential Urban Village

The applicant is requesting to amend the boundaries of the Wallingford Residential Urban Village to remove single-family zoned properties from the urban village.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C3. This proposal is not consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy.

## 2. West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village

The applicant is requesting to amend the boundaries of the West Seattle Junction Hub Urban Village to remove single-family zoned properties from the urban village.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C3 and A5. This proposal is not consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, and would be better addressed through the public process associated with City Council's review and consideration of the citywide Mandatory Housing Affordability regulations.

### Text Amendments

## 3. Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village

The applicant is requesting to amend the Morgan Junction neighborhood plan policies so as to require formal community planning engagement as a pre-requisite for further amendments to neighborhood plan policies 13, 14 and 19.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria A5. This proposal would be better addressed through the public process associated with City Council's review and consideration of the citywide Mandatory Housing Affordability regulations.

(The Planning Commission held a vote to determine whether the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village amendment should move forward to the docket for further analysis. The vote was six opposed and four in favor. A subsequent vote was held to approve the rationale behind not docketing the amendment with seven Commissioners in favor and three opposed)

## 14. Growth Monitoring

The applicant is proposing to amend the Comprehensive Plan related to monitoring and responding to growth in urban centers and villages.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C4. This proposal has been previously considered and rejected by the City Council.

## 17. Skybridges, tramways and tunnels

The applicant is proposing to amend the Transportation Element to discourage pedestrian grade separations in all urban centers, not just the downtown.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C4. This proposal has been previously considered and rejected by the City Council.

18. Street Damage

The applicant is proposing to amend the Transportation Element related to impacts to roads and bridges from heavy vehicles.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C4. This proposal has been previously considered and rejected by the City Council.

19. Open and Participatory Government

The applicant is requesting to add an Open and Participatory Government Element to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria C4. This proposal has been previously considered and rejected by the City Council.

We appreciate the opportunity to review amendments for docket setting and provide our recommendations. If you have any further questions please call either myself or Vanessa Murdock, Seattle Planning Commission Executive Director at (206) 733-9271.

Sincerely,



Grace Kim, Chair  
Seattle Planning Commission

cc:

Mayor Edward Murray

Seattle City Councilmembers

Sam Assefa, David Driskell, Tom Hauger, Kristian Kofoed; Office of Planning and Community Development

Lish Whitson, Eric McConaghy, Ketil Freeman; Council Central Staff

<b>SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION RECORD OF DISCLOSURES &amp; RECUSALS:</b>
--

None
------

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **City of Seattle Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendment Selection (from Resolution 31402)**

- A. The amendment is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:
1. It is consistent with the role of the Comprehensive Plan under the State Growth Management Act;
  2. It is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy;
  3. Its intent cannot be accomplished by a change in regulations alone;
  4. It is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision; and;
  5. It is not better addressed through another process, such as neighborhood planning.
- B. The amendment is legal under state and local law.
- C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:
1. The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information to make an informed decision;
  2. City staff will be able to develop within the time available the text for the Comprehensive Plan and, if necessary, amendments to the Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review;
  3. The amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council wishes to consider changing the vision or established policy; and
  4. The amendment has not been recently rejected by the City Council.
- D. If the amendment would change a neighborhood plan, it either is the result of a neighborhood review process or can be reviewed by such a process prior to final Council consideration of the amendment.
- E. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.