

Ordinance No. 121020

Council Bill No. 114373

All ordinances amending the Seattle Comprehensive Plan to include the amendments proposed as part of the 2002 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment process.

The City of Seattle - Legislative Department

Council Bill/Ordinance sponsored by: [Signature]

CF No. _____

Date Introduced:	<u>10-14-02</u>	
Date 1st Referred:	<u>10-14-02</u>	To: (committee) <u>Land Use</u>
Date Re - Referred:		To: (committee)
Date Re - Referred:		To: (committee)
Date of Final Passage:	<u>12-9-02</u>	Full Council Vote: <u>9-0</u>
Date Presented to Mayor:	<u>12-10-02</u>	Date Approved: <u>12-20-02</u>
Date Returned to City Clerk:	<u>12-20-02</u>	Date Published: <u>MP</u>
Date Vetoes by Mayor:		Date Veto Published:
Date Passed Over Veto:		Veto Sustained:

Committee Action:

12-3-02 Pass as amended 2-0 (ON, RC) [Signature]
12-9-02 Passed As Amended 9-0 [Signature]

This file is complete and ready for presentation to Full Council. Comm

Law Department

Law Dept. Review

OMP Review

[Signature]
City Clerk Review

ORDINANCE 121020

AN ORDINANCE amending the Seattle Comprehensive Plan to incorporate amendments proposed as part of the 2002 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment process.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Council Resolution 30412 establishing procedures for amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, a number of proposals for Plan amendments were submitted for Council consideration, both from within the City and from the public; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution 28969 identifying continuing efforts to augment the Comprehensive Plan through work on additional plan elements and amendments; and

WHEREAS, proposed amendments were submitted by individuals or citizen organizations and by the City for consideration during 2002; and

WHEREAS, in April 2002, the City Council considered these proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and determined, pursuant to Council Resolution 30446, that eight amendments would be further reviewed and analyzed; and

WHEREAS, these proposed amendments have been reviewed and analyzed by the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use and considered by the Council; and

WHEREAS, the City has provided for public participation in the development and review of these proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Council has reviewed and considered the executive staff's report and recommendation, and public testimony made at the public hearings and other pertinent material regarding the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Council finds that the amendments to be adopted are consistent with the Growth Management Act, and will protect and promote the health, safety and welfare of the general public; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Seattle Comprehensive Plan, as adopted by Ordinance 117221 and subsequently amended, is hereby amended as follows:

- A. The Land Use Element is amended as shown in Attachment 1 to this ordinance.


NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


- B. The Transportation Element is amended as shown in Attachment 2 to this ordinance.
- C. The Housing Element is amended as shown in Attachment 3 to this ordinance.
- D. The Capital Facilities Element is amended as shown in Attachment 4 to this ordinance.
- E. The Environment Element is amended as shown in Attachment 5 to this ordinance.
- F. Capital Facilities Appendix D is amended as shown in Attachment 6 to this ordinance.

Passed by the City Council the 9th day of December, 2002, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 9th day of December, 2002.



President of the City Council

Approved by me this 20 day of December, 2002.



Mayor

Filed by me this 20th day of December, 2002.



City Clerk

(SEAL)



NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm/tr
December 4, 2002
version #4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT LIST:

- Attachment 1: Land Use Element Amendments
- Attachment 2: Transportation Element Amendments
- Attachment 3: Housing Element Amendments
- Attachment 4: Capital Facilities Element Amendments
- Attachment 5: Environment Element Amendments
- Attachment 6: Capital Facilities Appendix D

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



ATTACHMENT 1

Land Use Element

* * *

L53 Use the Future Land Use Map and the goals and policies included in this plan to identify general locations where broad categories of land uses are preferred. Use the City's Official Land Use Map and rezone criteria included in the Land Use Code to identify the location of specific zones, which implement the goals and policies of this plan. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map.

* * *

L303 Include the following considerations in the design of trails:

* * *

3. Seek to protect existing trails and publicly owned stairways from encroachment by private development, including motor vehicle crossings, especially in residential neighborhoods where safety and aesthetic issues are paramount.

* * *

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT 2

Transportation Element

* * *

T47a Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment.

* * *

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



ATTACHMENT 3

Housing Element

* * *

H37 Allocate public funds administered by the City to and used for the purposes of develop and preserve affordable rental housing for low-income, very low-income and extremely low-income households may be used only to serve income groups consistent with in conformity with applicable income limits in City ordinances, as in effect from time to time, that govern the use of each fund source, following criteria:

- At least 50% of rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of median income;
- Remaining rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households earning between 31 and 50% of median income consistent with fund source program affordability requirements;
- Renter households at or below 80% of median income may be served in the Central Area SOA, the Southeast SOA, the Southwest SOA, and the Pioneer Square and International District of the Downtown SOA for the purposes allowed in the SOA policies, or within half a mile of a light rail station or major transit center located outside downtown. CDBG and HOME funds may be used for this purpose.

The Rental Affordability Policy applies to all applicable Office of Housing administered capital fund sources combined and not to individual fund sources. The Policy applies to

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm/tr
December 4, 2002
version #4

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

~~funding available in the City of Seattle biennial budget cycles (i.e. 2001-2002; 2003-2004).~~

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

~~Funding that does not meet the Rental Affordability Policy in the first year of a biennium must be brought into compliance by the end of the second year. The Rental Affordability Policy does not apply to programs where the City leverages other funds through credit enhancement strategies; and Housing Levy rental production program, 50-65% of median set-aside.~~

H38 Help maintain the City's owner-occupancy rate and encourage Seek to promote home ownership in the City in a variety of housing types by:

- a. Using a portion of local discretionary housing subsidy resources to provide home ownership opportunities to low-income households ~~incomes below 80% of median income, in conformity with applicable income limits in City ordinances, as in effect from time to time, that govern the use of each fund source. Target funds primarily to neighborhoods with average household incomes below 80% of the City average; neighborhoods with high concentrations of assisted rental housing; and areas where upward pressure on prices may result in the displacement of existing residents.~~
- b. Considering setting a set-aside of a substantial portion of any new-discretionary funding sources for assisted housing such as a new housing levy, (to) that would provide homeownership opportunities to for low-income households, with incomes below 80% of median income. Also, consider alternative approaches to increase the development of affordable homeownership housing, including but not limited to greater use of land trusts and limited equity cooperatives.

* * *



NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 4

Capital Facilities Element

* * *

CFG8 Incorporate sustainability principles and practices into the design and construction of City buildings and other types of capital facilities.

* * *

~~CF13~~ Strive to use resource-efficient building materials and techniques in new and refurbished City facilities and encourage other public agencies to follow similar sustainable building practices.

* * *

5. Sustainable Design and Construction

CF19 Assess the sustainability of choices in developing capital projects, including finance, planning, design, construction, management, renovation, maintenance, and decommissioning.

CF20 Consider environmental health in capital facilities development, including efficient use of energy, water, and materials; waste reduction; protection of environmental quality; and ecologically sensitive site selection and development.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CF21 Consider social and human health in capital facilities development, including protection of worker health, improved indoor environmental quality, and access to alternative transportation modes (e.g., public transit, bicycling, walking, etc.) and social services.

CF22 Consider economic health in capital facilities development, including purchase of products and services from locally owned businesses and support for local manufacture of sustainable products.

CF23 Consider life-cycle cost analysis as a method to better understand the relative costs and benefits over time of alternative approaches to the design and construction of City buildings and capital facilities.

CF24 Encourage the public and private-sector use of third-party sustainable building rating and certification systems, such as the Master Builder Association's BuiltGreen system and the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system.

* * *



NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

ATTACHMENT 5

Environment Element

H. Additional Resources

Longfellow Creek Watershed Action Plan

Pipers Creek Watershed Action Plan

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



ATTACHMENT 6

Capital Facilities Appendix D:
Potential Future Discretionary Projects

Besides the facilities that are included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), there are a number of prospective capital projects that the City might undertake or fund in the future. They are listed below in alphabetical order to provide a broad view of the City's potential future capital spending. Projects are not listed in any priority order. Funding for these projects is not yet identified, and no decisions have been made to go forward with funding these projects.

- ◆ African-American Heritage Museum*
- ◆ Animal Control Shelter Expansion
- ◆ ~~Aquarium Redevelopment~~
- ◆ Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)
- ◆ Bus Barn Site Soil Remediation (Seattle Center)
- ◆ ~~Chinese Garden at South Seattle Community College*~~
- ◆ City projects included in a potential new Countywide Parks Bond Issue
- ◆ ~~Citywide Training Campus~~
- ◆ ~~Comorant Cove development~~
- ◆ Downtown Circulator
- ◆ Emergency Operations Center Replacement
- ◆ Fiber Optic Expansion
- ◆ Fire Station Upgrades and Expansions
- ◆ ~~Gas Works Park Environmental Clean-up (will be 2000 supplemental)~~
- ◆ High Point*
- ◆ ~~Holly Park Phase III*~~

- 1
- 2 ♦ Homeless Day Center*
- 3 ♦ Memorial Stadium Relocation*
- 4 ♦ ~~Memorial Stadium Site Development*~~
- 5 ♦ ~~Mercer Arena Renovation~~
- 6 ♦ Monorail Expansion*
- 7 ♦ Monorail Platform Expansion
- 8 ♦ ~~Museum of History and Industry*~~
- 9 ♦ Neighborhood Planning Capital Projects
- 10 ♦ Neighborhood Service Centers
- 11 ♦ North Police Precinct Expansion
- 12 ♦ Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000 (will potentially be updated in 2005-2006)
- 13 ♦ PC-1 Lot at Pike Place Market*
- 14 ♦ ~~Potlatch Trail~~
- 15 ♦ ~~Roy Street Shops Replacement (in CIP)~~
- 16 ♦ Sand Point Redevelopment
- 17 ♦ ~~Sculpture Garden at Elliott and Broad~~
- 18 ♦ Seattle Center 5th Avenue Parking Lot Development
- 19 ♦ ~~Seattle Center Bus Barn Clean-up (Next Phase)~~
- 20 ♦ Seattle Center Master Plan Updates
- 21 ♦ Seattle Transit Initiative
- 22 ♦ South Downtown Study Area Improvements
- 23 ♦ ~~South Lake Union City property redevelopment~~
- 24 ♦ South Lake Union Transportation Improvements
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- ◆ Southwest Harbor Project *
- ◆ Telecommunications Improvements
- ◆ TransLake* (includes early action items)
- ◆ Urban Trails Plan Implementation
- ◆ West Seattle Stadium
- ◆ Zoo Improvements

* At the time of publication, projects with an * are not under the jurisdiction of the City, but are owned or sponsored by another government agency or private organization. The City might participate in funding these project

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



**2002 Proposed
Comprehensive Plan
Amendments
Executive's Report and
Recommendations**



City of Seattle

Department of Design, Construction & Land Use

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000

Seattle, WA 98104-5070

(206) 684-8850 • FAX (206) 233-7883



NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

2002 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments Executive's Report and Recommendations

October 2, 2002

Introduction	1
Analysis of Proposed Amendments	5
1. Future Land Use Map	5
2. "Urban Center-Oriented Development/Urban Village-Oriented Development"	7
3. Function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Residential Urban Villages	11
4. Sustainable Building Policy	17
5. Sustainability Policies	19
6. Public Stairways	21
7. Housing Policies	25
8. Watershed Plans	29
9. Capital Facilities Appendix D – Not included in legislation	31

ATTACHMENT

- A. City Council Resolution 30446, identifying proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments to be considered for possible Adoption in 2002

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Executive's Recommended 2002 Annual Amendments to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, including an evaluation and recommendation for each proposed amendment. The Growth Management Act limits amending the Comprehensive Plan to once each year except for specific actions. Resolution 30412 outlines the process for the submittal and review of proposed amendments to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. Resolution 30412 establishes a two-step process to consider annual amendments.

The first step was the initial determination of which proposed amendments to consider further in 2002. This determination was made by the City Council in May after public notice, a hearing and Committee consideration. The City Council approved Resolution 30446 identifying eight proposals to be considered as potential amendments to the Comprehensive Plan this year and three proposals to be considered in 2003.

The 2002 proposals are:

Land Use Element

- Amend Land Use Policy L53 to clarify the intent of the Future Land Use Map
- Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages

Land Use and Transportation Elements

- Review the proposal concerning public stairways.

Housing Element

- Review Housing Element policies (including but not limited to H37, H38 and H40) for possible changes, including but not limited to policies governing the allocation of rental housing funding by income levels served, the scope of programmatic and geographic exceptions to those policies, the City's objectives regarding owner-occupancy, and the geographic targeting of assistance for both rental housing and home ownership, as well as technical clarification.

Housing and Neighborhood Planning Elements

- Consider substituting terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for "transit-oriented development".

Capital Facilities Element

- Develop language more clearly embodying the City's sustainable building policy

Environmental

- Review the City's sustainability policies (to be done by the Office of Sustainability and Environment)
- Examine existing watershed plans and investigate the legal ramifications of recognizing a watershed plan in the Comprehensive Plan. Clarify exactly what type of watershed plans could be subject to such recognition.

Over the summer, these proposals have been reviewed and analyzed. For this second stage of the process, the Executive is now recommending amendments to the City Council for its consideration.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

As part of the 2002 budget process, potential amendments to Capital Facilities Appendix D were identified. These potential amendments were included in the public hearing notice, but were not included in the legislation forwarded to the City Council by the Executive. City Councilmembers may introduce these proposed amendments as part of their deliberation.

In response to the eight proposals currently under consideration, the following amendments are recommended for adoption this year:

Land Use Element

- Amend Policy L53 to clarify the intent of the Future Land Use Map, the Official Land Use Map and the rezone criteria in the Land Use Code.
- Amend Policy L303's existing language regarding protecting urban trails from encroachment to include publicly owned stairways.

Transportation Element

- Add a new policy T47a to recognize the importance of public stairways in the City's pedestrian transportation network.

Housing Element

- Take specific affordability and geographic focus standards out of Comprehensive Plan policies H37 and H38 and refer to the Consolidated Plan for these specifics.
- Substitute the word "maintain" relating to the City's owner-occupancy rate with "increase" in Policy H38 and change other wording to better reflect the City's current efforts to increase homeownership.

Capital Facilities Element

- Add a new goal, CFG8, to clearly state the City's sustainable building goals as they relate to capital facilities development and maintenance. Remove policy CF13 and replace it with a new section 5: "Sustainable Building Practices" and add six new policies (CF19-CF24) to flesh out the City's policies regarding sustainable building.

Environment Element

- Add a new section to the Environment Element, containing a list of "Additional Resources" including the City's plans for the Piper's Creek and Longfellow Creek watersheds.

The Executive recommends that the City Council pursue future work programs for two proposed amendments:

Land Use Element

- Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages.

Environment Element

- Review by the City's Office of Sustainability and the Environment of the City's sustainability policies in 2003 with proposed amendments in late 2003 and/or early 2004.

One amendment is not recommended for adoption.

Housing and Neighborhood Planning Elements

- Consider substituting terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for "transit-oriented development".

Next Steps

A public hearing on the proposed amendments is scheduled for **4:30, November 4, 2002**. The City Council Land Use Committee will discuss and make recommendations on the recommended amendments in meetings in November. The full City Council will consider the Committee's report and take action later in the fall. All meetings will be held in City Council Chambers, 11th Floor, Municipal Building, 600 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104. Notice of the meetings has been placed in the Daily Journal of Commerce and the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU) Land Use Information Bulletin, and in the Department of Neighborhoods' Community Calendar.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

1. Future Land Use Map

Proposed amendment:

Amend Land Use Policy L53 to read as follows:

L53 ~~The Future Land Use Map shows categories of land use that are preferred for generalized geographic areas across the city. Location of specific zones are shown on the City's zoning map. The criteria for siting those zones, which are found in the Land Use Code, are intended to reflect the policies of this plan and the general direction shown on the Future Land Use Map. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map.~~

Element: Land Use

Submitted by: Strategic Planning Office/DCLU

Description of the proposed amendment:

Existing language regarding the role of the Future Land Use Map and the role of the land use criteria has proved to be confusing to analysts considering proposed rezones. The conditions under which an amendment to the Future Land Use Map would be required have not been clearly drawn within the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment would help to clarify the role of the Future Land Use Map in directing the location of zones and land use categories.

All rezones require that the proposed new zone be consistent with the City's rezone criteria contained within the Land Use Code. The City has viewed the Future Land Use Map as a generalized vision of the future configuration of different land use categories throughout the City. Rather than showing where land use categories are to be located at a parcel level, the map is intended to show the general mix and configuration of land uses within areas. Therefore, where a single property is proposed to be rezoned to an adjacent zone, an amendment to the map is generally not required. When considering rezones of small areas from one land use category to a land use category abutting the area, the City has not required an amendment to the Future Land Use Map. However, where proposed rezones would change an area from one general land use category to another, and the rezoned area would not abut areas having the same general land use category, future land use map amendments are required.

The proposed land use code amendment helps to clarify that the zoning criteria in the land use code drive most rezones. However, it is not entirely clear about when one would use the future land use map. The recommended language, below, would provide clearer direction in when to use the Comprehensive Plan for rezones and when to use the rezone criteria.

Recommended action:

Replace the proposed amendment with the following recommended language, which provides a set of directions for when to use the Future Land Use Map and when to use the Land Use Code and zoning map:
L53: Use the Future Land Use Map and the goals and policies included in this plan to identify general locations where broad categories of land uses are preferred. Use the City's Official Land Use Map and rezone criteria included in the Land Use Code to identify the location of specific zones, which implement the goals and policies of this plan. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

Clearer language is desired regarding when the Future Land Use Map is used. The recommended language would identify when the future land use map is used and when rezone criteria and the City's zoning map are used when considering a request for a rezone.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

2. "Urban center-oriented development/urban village-oriented development"

Proposed Amendment:

Substitute the terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for the too narrow term "transit-oriented development" in any city policy relating to Urban Centers and urban villages

Elements: Housing, Neighborhood Planning

Submitted by: Thomas Heller

Description of the proposed amendment:

The proposed amendment would change the words "transit-oriented" to "urban center-oriented" or "urban village-oriented" in two goals and five policies in six adopted neighborhood plans. In addition, the phrase appears in one Housing Element policy. These goals and policies are listed below.

The phrase "transit-oriented development" refers to development that is centered around and coordinated with a transit station in its use and design. The intent of TOD is to establish land uses and to design structures and public areas that will encourage people to ride transit more often. Typically, a TOD project has the following physical characteristics: a mix of uses, compact development, all locations within walking distance of transit, neighborhood focal points at a transit station, and a pedestrian orientation.

There are a number of similarities between TOD development as it has been envisioned nationwide and the City of Seattle's Urban Village strategy. Urban villages, like TODs, are intended to be mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented areas, often with densities and designs that encourage people to reduce their use of automobiles. The key difference between TODs and urban villages is one of orientation to transit facilities. TODs are always envisioned as new development that is specifically designed to relate to transit stations. Urban villages may or may not focus development and services at a transit station. Existing urban villages are often served by networks of bus lines, without a concentration of development at a transit station.

Each of the neighborhood plans using the phrase "transit-oriented development" refers specifically to how development occurs in relation to proposed transit improvements. All of the neighborhood plan goals and policies which use the phrase "transit-oriented development" are for neighborhoods which will contain a light rail station. These neighborhoods, planning for major new transit facilities, used the term "transit-oriented development" to refer to development that is planned for and built in relation to light rail stations proposed for their neighborhoods.

The Housing element policy is less explicit about the relationship between potential zoning changes and transit systems than are the neighborhood plans' policies. However, this policy was amended in 2000, in the context of the 5-year Comprehensive Plan update. As part of this update, Council directed:

"Include in the Housing Element policies that describe the City's housing role within the regional context; incentives for housing production and *the coordination of housing development with planning focused on identified light rail stations.*" (italics added)

In response to this direction the sentence "Consider expanding the use of incentive zoning for affordable housing in neighborhoods outside downtown, particularly in relation to transit-oriented development." was added to Housing Policy H30. This policy, thus, was amended with development focused on transit stations in mind.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Recommended action: Do not adopt the proposed amendment.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The existing language appears to more clearly reflect the intention to focus development or incentives at high-capacity transit stations than the broader terms "urban village-oriented development" would. Changing the language in these policies could significantly broaden the focus of the goals and policies, potentially beyond the neighborhoods' or City's intention.

The Executive would be concerned about changing the language in six neighborhood plans without neighborhood involvement in the change. However, if the Council does want to propose a change to the language in these neighborhood policies, removing the phrase "transit-oriented" from each of these policies would retain the meaning of most of the policies, while removing the focus on transit systems.

If the Council wants to clarify the language in Policy H30, the Executive recommends substituting the phrase "particularly in areas near high-capacity transit stations" for the phrase "particularly in relation to transit-oriented development."

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Goals and Policies Using the Term "Transit-Oriented Development"

HOUSING ELEMENT

- H30 Promote the continued production and preservation of low-income housing through existing incentive zoning mechanisms, which include density and height bonuses and the transfer of development rights. Consider expanding the use of incentive zoning for affordable housing in neighborhoods outside downtown, particularly in relation to transit-oriented development. Allow for new or different incentive zoning provisions designed to produce or preserve low-income housing in downtown if they are adopted as part of neighborhood or subarea plans or where needed to achieve housing development goals.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING ELEMENT

CAPITOL HILL

- CH-P6 Support integration of transit-oriented development with local transportation and open space improvements.

COLUMBIA CITY

- CC-G2 A community served by a light rail transit system which also is a catalyst for transit-oriented housing and commercial development within the station area.
- CC-P15 Strive to maintain existing neighborhood scale and character and promote transit-oriented development, where appropriate.

MLK@HOLLY

- MLK-G3 The Sound Transit light rail station forms the heart of a transit-oriented, mixed-use town center.

NORTH RAINIER

- NR-P1 Recognize the "Town Center" as the area where the neighborhood would like to use land use and zoning designations that facilitate transit-oriented development to assemble and finance the type of development envisioned by the neighborhood around the light rail station, and strive to facilitate the vitality of existing businesses that help meet the neighborhood's employment goals.

RAINIER BEACH

- RB-P2 Seek to promote transit-oriented development around Rainier Beach's proposed light rail station at Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and South Henderson Street.

ROOSEVELT

- R-P29 Encourage development of a light rail station and transit links that will support transit oriented development within the zoned capacity of the neighborhood's commercial core.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



3. Function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Residential Urban Villages

Proposed amendment:

Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages – and clarify their intended inter-relationship(s), from the stand point of a) economic function (residential, commercial, employment) and b) physical interconnectedness by transportation facilities.

Elements: Land Use

Submitted by: Thomas Heller

Description of the proposed amendment:

The City has five different designations for areas expected to accommodate significant housing and/or employment growth over the 20 years covered by the Comprehensive Plan. Two of these designations (Urban Center and Manufacturing/Industrial Center) are countywide designations. Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers were first designated through the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the Comprehensive Plan's discussion of these designations follows the language in the CPPs. The other three designations are Seattle-specific designations (Urban Center Villages within Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Residential Urban Villages). These designations are intended to identify these areas' expected levels of residential and employment growth over the life of the Comprehensive Plan and their relationship to regional transportation networks.

In submitting this proposed amendment, Mr. Heller noted that when asked, "just exactly what IS an urban village?" Seattle planning officials were not able to provide a clear answer. He anticipates that clarity regarding the intended function of urban villages will help guide review of proposed projects, bring the City's zoning code better in line with the Comprehensive Plan, and "aid in communicating to the general public 'what the big picture' is as it happens in their communities."

The most concise description of the different designations' intended economic function can be found in Policy L4:

Recognize and promote appropriate mixes of activity and intensities of development within areas accommodating growth and indicate whether residential or employment related activities are to be emphasized according to the intended function of the following urban village designations:

- Urban centers, and the urban villages within them, are intended to be the densest areas with the widest range of land uses
- Hub urban villages are also intended to accommodate a broad mix of uses, but at lower densities than center villages, at intensities appropriate to the stage of development of the area.
- Residential urban villages are intended for concentrations of low to moderate densities of predominantly residential development with a compatible mix of support services and employment.

In addition to this description of their intended function, Urban Center Villages are assigned "functional designations" under policy L23. These functional designations indicate whether uses in a particular urban center village are intended to be primarily residential, mixed with a residential emphasis, mixed residential and employment, or mixed with an employment emphasis.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Descriptions of the areas' intended relationships to the regional and local transportation networks is found in the descriptions of the criteria to be used in designating the different types of urban centers and villages:

Designation as an **Urban Center** is appropriate for areas with "Accessibility to the existing regional transportation network, with access to the regional high capacity transit system to be provided in the future." (Policy L18)

Hub Urban Villages are designated in areas that are generally characterized by "A strategic location in relation to both the local and regional transportation network, including: a high level of transit service, with the possibility of improved connections to future high capacity transit stations, connections to regional transportation facilities, routes accommodating goods movement, and connections to adjacent areas by pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities." (Policy L29)

A **Residential Urban Village** designation is considered for areas where: "2. The area is presently on the city's arterial network and is served by a transit route providing direct transit service to at least one center or hub village... 4. The area has the opportunity to be connected by bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities to adjacent areas and nearby public amenities." (Policy L34)

These policies appear to clearly enunciate the difference between the economic function of the different types of urban village. In addition, within the designation criteria are clear descriptions of how the different urban village categories are to be connected through the transportation network. Other policies, which discuss the differences among the urban village designations, are listed below.

More clarity and better communication about the function of urban villages and the urban village strategy appear to be needed. Since the neighborhood planning process was completed, the City has published a citizen's guide to the Comprehensive Plan. The Executive will work to enhance clarity in its communications about the urban village strategy and the role and function of urban villages.

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends taking another look at the role and function of urban centers and villages in 2004 as part of the 10-year Comprehensive Plan update process. At that time, the City will be considering how to accommodate an additional ten years worth of development, covering the period between 2014 and 2024. Amendment of policies describing the role and function of urban centers and villages as the primary tool for accommodating growth under the Comprehensive Plan would be most appropriate at that time.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The Comprehensive Plan currently contains a number of explanations of the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages, their intended economic function and their interconnectedness by transportation facilities. Additional language about the function of the various levels of urban villages would add redundancies to the Comprehensive Plan. If new language was not redundant to existing language, the new language could unintentionally result in a change in the nature and definition of urban centers and villages. This new language would not have had sufficient public discussion and input. That level of public discussion over the role of urban villages is appropriate for the 2004 update process.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Existing Goals and Policies Relating to the different Roles and Functions of Urban Centers and Villages

	Urban Center Villages	Hub Urban Villages	Residential Urban Villages
Goals for Areas	Identify and reinforce concentrations of employment and housing in locations that would support and have direct access to the regional high capacity transit system. (LG18)	Accommodate concentrations of housing and employment at strategic locations in the transportation system conveniently accessible to the City's residential population, thereby reducing work trip commutes. (LG22) Provide convenient locations for commercial services that serve the populations of the village, surrounding neighborhoods, the city and the region. (LG23) Accommodate concentrations of employment and housing at densities that support pedestrian and transit use and increase opportunities within the City for people to live close to where they work. (LG24)	Promote urban villages that function primarily as compact residential neighborhoods providing opportunities for a wide range of housing types and a mix of activities that support the residential population. Support densities in residential urban villages that support transit use. (LG25) Allow employment activity to the extent that it does not conflict with the overall residential function and character of the village, provided that a different mix of uses may be established through a neighborhood plan adopted by the City Council. (LG26)
Mix of Uses Appropriate to the Area	Each Urban Center Village is assigned a "functional designation." Functional designations are: 1. Primarily residential; 2. Mixed, with a residential emphasis; 3. Mixed residential and employment; and 4. Mixed, with an employment emphasis." (L23)	See goals, above.	See goals, above.
Share of job growth	The greatest share of job growth will be accommodated in Urban Centers – areas that already function as high density, concentrated employment centers with the greatest access to the	Additional job growth will also be distributed to hub urban villages throughout the city to promote additional employment concentrations in areas easily accessible to the surrounding residential population, thereby locating jobs closer to where people live. (Discussion, Page LU-27)	No job growth targeted to these areas.

100

100



	Urban Center Villages	Hub Urban Villages	Residential Urban Villages
	regional network. (Discussion, Page LU-27)		
Share of residential growth	The greatest share of residential growth will also be accommodated in Urban Centers, increasing opportunities for people to live close to work. (Discussion Page LU-27)	The next most significant share of residential growth will be distributed among the various hub and residential urban villages throughout the city in amounts compatible with the existing development characteristics of individual areas. (Discussion Page LU-27)	
Criteria For Designation			
Size of Area Appropriate for Designation	Area not exceeding one and one-half square miles (960 acres).(L18)	Permit the size of hub urban villages to vary according to local conditions, but limit their size so that most areas within the village are within a walkable distance of employment and service concentrations in the village.(L31)	Permit the size of residential villages to vary according to local conditions, but consider it generally desirable that any location within the village be within easy walking distance of at least one center of activity and services.(L38)
Neighborhood/ Land Uses	Clearly defined geographic boundaries that reflect existing development patterns, functional characteristics of the area and recognized neighborhood boundaries.(L18)	<p>Surroundings comprised primarily of residential areas that allow a mix of densities, and non-residential activities that support residential use.(L29)</p> <p>A broad range of housing types and commercial and retail support services either existing or allowed under current zoning to serve a local, citywide or regional market.(L29)</p> <p>Open space amenities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Direct access to either existing or potential public open spaces in the immediate vicinity, and > Accessibility to major open space resources in the general area via either existing or potential urban trails, boulevards, or other open space links, or anticipated major public investment in open space.(L29) <p>Consider for designation as hub urban villages</p>	<p>A broad range of retail services to serve the residential population either already exists or can be accommodated in the area at a central location generally accessible on foot.(L34)</p> <p>The area presently includes, or is adjacent to, open space available for public use, or opportunities exist to provide public open space in the future.(L34)</p> <p>Require that a residential urban village surround one or more centers of activity and services.(L37)</p> <p>Include among areas considered suitable for designation as residential urban villages those areas that possess the desired characteristics and infrastructure to support a moderately dense residential population and those areas that, while lacking infrastructure or other</p>



	Urban Center Villages	Hub Urban Villages	Residential Urban Villages
		areas ranging from those able to accommodate growth with minor changes and public investment to those requiring more extensive public investment where the potential exists to achieve desired village conditions through redevelopment over time. (L32)	characteristics of a residential urban village, warrant public investment to address inadequacies in order to promote a transition to a higher density residential neighborhood. (L39)
Zoning Characteristics	Zoning that permits the amount of new development needed to meet the following minimum density targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A minimum of 15,000 jobs located within a half mile of a possible future high capacity transit station; ➤ An overall employment density of 50 jobs per acre; and ➤ An overall residential density of 15 households per acre.(L18) 	Zoning that allows a mix of uses to accommodate concentrations of employment and housing. It may be appropriate to limit the mix of uses in some areas to provide for concentrations of either employment or housing.(L29) A minimum of one-third of the land area currently zoned to accommodate employment activity and/or mixed-use.(L29) Opportunities for redevelopment because of a substantial amount of vacant or under-utilized land.(L29)	The area presently supports, or can accommodate under current zoning, a concentration and mix of residential development, at 8 to 15 units per gross acre on average, and at a small to moderate scale.(L34)
Transportation	Accessibility to the existing regional transportation network, with access to the regional high capacity transit system to be provided in the future.(L18)	A strategic location in relation to both the local and regional transportation network, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ a high level of transit service, with the possibility of improved connections to future high capacity transit stations, ➤ connections to regional transportation facilities, ➤ routes accommodating goods movement, and ➤ connections to adjacent areas by pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.(L29) 	The area is presently on the city's arterial network and is served by a transit route providing direct transit service to at least one center or hub village.(L34) The area has the opportunity to be connected by bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities to adjacent areas and nearby public amenities.(L34)

4. Sustainable Building Policy

Proposed amendment:

Develop language more clearly embodying the City's sustainable building policy.

Elements: Capital Facilities (This was originally proposed as part of the Environmental Element.)

Submitted by: Resolution 30273/ 30446

Description of the proposed amendment:

Sustainable building is currently mentioned in two places in the Comprehensive Plan. Capital Facilities policy CF 13 currently states:

CF13 Strive to use resource-efficient building materials and techniques in new and refurbished City facilities and encourage other public agencies to follow similar sustainable building practices.

Environment Policy E6 currently states:

E6 Strive to design, construct, and operate City facilities to limit environmental impacts, such as by incorporating energy efficiency, water conservation, waste minimization, pollution prevention, or resource-efficient materials throughout a facility's life.

This language could be strengthened and improved in at least three ways.

- The existing language speaks only to the environmental components and benefits of sustainable building (e.g. energy and water efficiency, use of recycled products, etc.), but leaves out important social and economic benefits (e.g., cost savings, improved indoor environment, enhanced productivity, etc.)
- The existing language does not indicate the City's interest in (and efforts toward) promoting sustainable building practices in non-City projects (e.g., private development, low-income/affordable housing development, etc.)
- The existing language does not indicate the City's intention to apply sustainable building principles and practices to the design and construction of City-funded capital facilities that are not buildings, per se (e.g., roads/bridges, parks, drainage systems, etc.)

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends adding a new Capital Facilities goal, CFG8, as follows:

CFG8 Incorporate sustainability principles and practices into the design and construction of City buildings and other types of capital facilities.

The Executive recommends deleting Capital Facilities Policy CF13 and replacing it with a new section in the Capital Facilities Element, containing 5 new policies related to the sustainable design and construction of the City's Capital Facilities, as follows:

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

5. Sustainable Design and Construction

- CF19 Assess the sustainability of choices in developing capital projects, including finance, planning, design, construction, management, renovation, maintenance, and decommissioning.
- CF20 Consider environmental health in capital facilities development, including efficient use of energy, water, and materials; waste reduction; protection of environmental quality; and ecologically sensitive site selection and development.
- CF21 Consider social and human health in capital facilities development, including protection of worker health, improved indoor environmental quality, and access to alternative transportation modes (e.g., public transit, bicycling, walking, etc.) and social services.
- CF22 Consider economic health in capital facilities development, including purchase of products and services from locally owned businesses and support for local manufacture of sustainable products.
- CF23 Consider life-cycle cost analysis as a method to better understand the relative costs and benefits over time of alternative approaches to the design and construction of City buildings and capital facilities.
- CF24 Encourage public and private sector use of third-party sustainable building rating and certification systems, such as the Master Builder Association's BuiltGreen system and the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The proposed set of a new goal and new policies do a better job of enunciating the City's sustainable building policy. These new policies clarify the broad scope of issues that are encompassed in the concept of sustainable building. They indicate the City's interest in promoting sustainable building for non-City projects. Finally, they indicate the City's intention to incorporate sustainable building concepts into the broad range of Capital Facilities that the City develops and manages.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



5. Sustainability Policies

Proposed amendment:

Review by the Office of Sustainability and Environment of the City's sustainability policies, with the goal of recommending any appropriate Comprehensive Plan Amendments in 2002.

Elements: All elements as appropriate

Submitted by: Resolution 30273

Description of the proposed amendment:

The proposal requests that the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) review the Comprehensive Plan in order to identify any amendments that would enhance the existing policies surrounding sustainability.

Recommended action:

Pursue a thorough review of sustainability concepts in the Comprehensive Plan through 2003 with recommendations to be considered as part of the 10-year Comprehensive Plan update in 2004.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan update process will constitute the 10-year review of the Comprehensive Plan. This major review of the Comprehensive Plan is expected to incorporate a broader review of the Comprehensive Plan and its goals and policies.

Completing this project in 2004 will ensure that the concept of sustainability provides a framework for the 10-year update of the Comprehensive Plan. Including a review of sustainability in the Plan as part of that process will provide an opportunity to undertake a more holistic review of the Plan and the concept of sustainability in it.

In 2004, a broader public process is expected to occur which would allow for a broader community discussion of the concepts of sustainability in the Plan than could be expected as part of the 2002 process.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

6. Public Stairways

Proposed amendment:

To the Land Use Element's section D, "Open Space Network," add the following new section, "Public Stairways" after the section on "Urban Trails": Preserve the public outdoor stairways as valuable pedestrian connections and points of access to Seattle's open spaces and views. Public stairways may exist on land managed by Seattle Transportation, the Parks Department, City Light, and other City agencies; on land managed by WSDOT, the Port, and other public agencies; and on private land through easement and permit conditions. The City will maintain the public stairways, discourage vacations of their right-of-way, and consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, will seek to add or expand public stairways in desirable locations.

To the Transportation Element's Section H, "Pedestrians and Bicycles," add a new Public Stairways map (after the existing Transportation Figure 5, "Seattle Urban Trails System"). After Policy T44 (which deals with Urban Trails) add the following new policy: Designate the public outdoor stairways shown in the Public Staircases Map to facilitate walking as a viable transportation choice, link neighborhoods, walkways, trails, and open spaces, and provide access to views. Although most stairways are on City rights-of-way, some are on other public agencies' land, and some are on private land, with public access to them by easements, cooperative agreements or permit conditions. The City will maintain or restore the existing public stairways to good conditions. The City will control vegetation so that it does not block or damage the public stairways. The City will protect public stairways from private encroachments and will discourage vacations of public right-of-way occupied by public stairways. Consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City will seek to add or expand public stairways in desirable locations.

Elements: Land Use, Transportation

Submitted by: Chris Leman

Description of the proposed amendment:

This proposal seeks to amend the Land Use Element and the Transportation Element to recognize and establish policies for public stairways.

This proposal contains many elements:

- a proposed definition of "public stairways" that includes properties owned and managed by various entities;
- language addressing maintenance and restoration of stairways;
- policies to add or expand stairways and protect stairways from encroachment, and
- documentation of stairways through the development of a map similar to that which portrays the City's urban trail system.

Recommended action:

Transportation Element: Pedestrians and Bicycles

The Executive recommends the adoption of a new policy, T47a, as follows:

T47a Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment.

Land Use Element: Open Space Network

The Executive recommends inserting the following language (underlined) to L303.3:

L303 Include the following considerations in the design of trails:

3. Seek to protect existing trails and publicly owned stairways from encroachment by private development, including motor vehicle crossings, especially in residential neighborhoods where safety and aesthetic issues are paramount.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

While Seattle's stairways are part of Seattle's transportation infrastructure, they also are unique features of Seattle's hilly topography. Stairways located within City of Seattle rights-of-way are maintained and developed as part of the City's sidewalk system. Like all public rights-of-way, many stairways provide access to views and provide a pedestrian link between neighborhoods for those who are capable of navigating them. Seattle's stairways are also a unique feature of the city's urban landscape. Many stairways are located within forested areas, providing limited access to Seattle's informal open spaces.

As part of the city's transportation system, the inclusion of language in the Transportation Element makes sense. As a point of access into open spaces, references within the Open Space Network of the Land Use Element is logical.

The following table further discusses why and how various elements of the proposed amendment should/should not be adopted:

<u>Proposed Language</u>	<u>Reasons for adopting/ not adopting specific proposed language</u>
Stairways located on private property and land owned by other agencies	The Comprehensive Plan should cite only stairways owned and controlled by the City of Seattle. Most existing stairways are located within the street right of way. The City can broadly "encourage" the maintenance of stairways that are owned by other agencies. However, the City should not use the Comprehensive Plan to assert blanket control over property owned by other entities.
City to maintain or restore existing public stairways / control vegetation	Identifying the maintenance that should occur on specific pieces of City right-of-way is a work program item not appropriate to the Comprehensive Plan.
City to discourage vacations	This proposed language is consistent with the level of discussion addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.
Protect public stairways from private encroachment	This proposed language is consistent with the level of discussion addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.
Add or expand stairways in desirable locations	The design of pedestrian amenities is site-specific and may include stairways, as in the Wallingford Steps project. Specifying creating new stairways in the Comprehensive Plan could potentially lead to the City being required to create new stairways when resources for construction and/or demand for new facilities do not exist.
Stairways map	Do not include a stairways map. Data on the existence of stairways is very

	limited and would require constant updating. A map would be a separate work program, which currently is not funded.
Land Use Element or Transportation Element	If stairways are identified as part of the City's sidewalk system—and therefore maintained by Seattle's transportation department—they should be addressed in the Transportation element and their relationship to the open space network referenced in the Land Use Element.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

7. Housing Policies

Proposed amendment:

Review Housing Element policies (including but not limited to H37, H38 and H40) for possible changes, including but not limited to policies governing the allocation of rental housing funding by income levels served, the scope of programmatic and geographic exceptions to those policies, the City's objectives regarding owner-occupancy, and the geographic targeting of assistance for both rental housing and home ownership, as well as technical clarification.

Elements: Housing

Submitted by: Resolution 30446

Description of the proposed amendment:

Two amendments to the Housing Policies H37 and H38 are recommended in response to this proposal:

1. Take specific affordability and geographic focus standards out of the Comprehensive Plan and refer to the Consolidated Plan for these specifics.
2. Substitute the word "maintain" the City's owner-occupancy rate with "increase" the City's owner-occupancy rate, and change other wording to better reflect the City's current efforts to increase homeownership.

Policy H40 is not proposed to be amended.

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends amending Policy H37 as follows:

H37 Public funds administered by the City and used for the purposes of affordable rental housing may be used only to serve income groups consistent with criteria contained in the Consolidated Plan, the following criteria:

- ~~At least 50% of rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of median income;~~
- ~~Remaining rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households earning between 31 and 50% of median income consistent with fund source program affordability requirements;~~
- ~~Renter households at or below 80% of median income may be served in the Central Area SOA, the Southeast SOA, the Southwest SOA, and the Pioneer Square and International District of the Downtown SOA for the purposes allowed in the SOA policies, or within half a mile of a light rail station or major transit center located outside downtown. CDBG and HOME funds may be used for this purpose.~~

~~The Rental Affordability Policy applies to all applicable Office of Housing administered capital fund sources combined and not to individual fund sources. The Policy applies to funding available in the City of Seattle biennial budget cycles (i.e. 2001-2002; 2003-2004).~~

~~Funding that does not meet the Rental Affordability Policy in the first year of a biennium must be brought into compliance by the end of the second year. The Rental Affordability Policy does not apply to programs where the City leverages other funds through credit~~

enhancement strategies; and Housing Levy rental production program, 50-65% of median set-aside.

The Executive recommends amending Policy H38 as follows:

- H38 Help ~~maintain~~ increase the City's owner-occupancy rate and encourage home ownership in a variety of housing types by:
- a. Using a portion of local discretionary housing subsidy resources to provide home ownership opportunities to households ~~consistent with affordability targets and geographic focus included in the City's Consolidated Plan, with incomes below 80% of median income. Target funds primarily to neighborhoods with average household incomes below 80% of the City average, neighborhoods with high concentrations of assisted rental housing, and areas where upward pressure on prices may result in the displacement of existing residents.~~
 - b. Consider-Setting aside a substantial portion of any new discretionary funding sources for assisted housing, such as a new housing levy, to provide homeownership opportunities to households with incomes below 80% of median income. Also, consider alternative approaches to increase the development of affordable homeownership housing, including but not limited to greater use of land trusts and limited equity cooperatives.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended actions:

Currently, the City has language describing the affordability levels to be targeted with City funds in two different locations: the Comprehensive Plan and the City's Consolidated Plan. This language has been identical in both documents, and is thus redundant. The Executive recommends using the Consolidated Plan as the document containing the affordability criteria for the use of City funds.

The Consolidated Plan provides a coordinated approach to addressing Seattle's human services, housing and community development needs. The goal of the Consolidated Plan is to integrate economic, physical and human development in a comprehensive fashion so that families and communities can thrive together. The Consolidated Plan is approved by the City Council and receives sufficient public review to ensure that the affordability criteria remain consistent with the community's goals and City Council established affordability criteria.

Policy H37 would be amended to delete the specific affordability policy language that is also contained in the Consolidated Plan. The language currently in the Consolidated plan would be changed to reflect recent Council adjustments to affordability made in the 2002 Housing Levy Ordinance. Comprehensive Plan language would refer to the Consolidated Plan for specific language on affordability. It is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan to acknowledge that there are affordability requirements and alert readers to their existence and location. Specific criteria, however, are detailed in the Consolidated Plan and do not need to be repeated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy H38 would be amended to say that the City intends to help "increase" the owner-occupancy rate as opposed to "maintain" the rate. "Increase" is more consistent with the City's goals as described in Goal HG8. The affordability level language and the geographic targeting language would be replaced with a reference to the Consolidated Plan where affordability and geographic areas for specific focus would be described.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

8. Watershed Plans

Proposal:

Examine existing watershed plans and investigate the legal ramifications of recognizing a watershed plan in the Comprehensive Plan. Clarify exactly what type of watershed plans could be subject to such recognition.

Elements: Land Use, Environment, Neighborhood Planning

Submitted by: Resolution 30723

Description of the proposed amendment:

The principal purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide policies that guide the development of the City in the context of regional growth management. The plan is intended to be used by the City to help make decisions about proposed ordinances, policies, and programs. Under State law, the City must "... perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its Comprehensive Plan." Consequently, the City looks very carefully at the policies and language that it incorporates into the Comprehensive Plan.

Other plans adopted by the City Council by resolution are not held to the same high legal standard. Consequently, the City needs to be careful before incorporating them into the Comprehensive Plan. This is particularly true for "action plans" that set out a set of activities to meet City or community goals. Often these plans are to be implemented by a broad range of actors. Incorporating them into the Comprehensive Plan without careful review and editing could require the City to take actions that it could not either legally or financially undertake, or that are already being implemented by another party.

Plans that the City Council has not formally reviewed and adopted have generally not had sufficient review by the City's elected officials to ensure that they represent the City's goals or policies. For plans that the City wants to recognize, the first step would be City Council review and, if appropriate, adoption or recognition by resolution.

Three different types of watershed plans have been created that effect City activities have been identified.

1. Plans covering the largest areas are the Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) plans being developed by King County, with City participation. Seattle fits within two WRIsAs: WRIA 8, the Cedar River-Lake Washington Watershed, and WRIA 9, the Green-Duwamish River Watershed. WRIA 8 includes Lake Washington, Lake Union, Seattle's Puget Sound shoreline north of Elliott Bay, and the hillsides that drain into those waterways. WRIA 9 includes the Duwamish waterway, Seattle's Puget Sound Shoreline south of Elliott Bay and the hillsides that drain into those waterways. Both WRIsAs cover areas within the City of Seattle limits and in broad areas outside of the City.

The WRIA 9 Steering Committee published a *Final Near-Term Action Agenda* in May 2002. A *Draft Near-Term Action Agenda* was published by the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed Steering Committee for WRIA 8 in February 2002. These action agendas recommend near-term actions to help restore and protect habitat for chinook salmon and bull trout, which were listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act in 1999. The City has not officially recognized these action agendas. The action agendas are intended to provide guidance to local governments and interested organizations and citizens

on interim measures that can be undertaken while long-term conservation plans for salmon habitat in the watersheds are being developed. These long-term conservation plans have not yet been developed, and are not recommended for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan until they have been completed and the City Council has endorsed their proposals.

2. The City has developed a Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan. This plan covers the City-owned 90,545-acre Cedar River Municipal Watershed and the City's water supply and hydroelectric operations on the Cedar River. It does not include any area within the City limits. It was developed to comply with the federal Endangered Species Act and to address a variety of related natural resource issues. This plan is a set of mitigation and conservation commitments related to ongoing water supply, hydroelectric power supply, and watershed management activities for an area owned by the City outside of the City's boundaries. Because this plan covers areas outside of the City's boundaries, it is not recommended that it be referenced in the Comprehensive Plan.
3. In the early 1990s, the City adopted Creek Watershed Action Plans for Longfellow Creek and Pipers Creek. The City, the State and community members developed these plans. These plans only affect areas within the City of Seattle. The purpose these plans is to develop strategies to reduce pollutant loading from nonpoint sources, prevent new sources from being created, enhance water quality and protect beneficial uses. Development of a Watershed Action Plan for Thornton Creek began a few years ago. The Creek Watershed Plans, which apply specifically to Seattle and have been adopted by the City Council, are most appropriate for referencing in the Comprehensive Plan.
4. In 1997, the City endorsed the Lower Duwamish Watershed Habitat Restoration Plan. This plan was developed in conjunction with the State, the City of Tukwila and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. The Duwamish is a "Shoreline of Statewide Significance." This means that the area covered by the Lower Duwamish is covered by the City's Shoreline Management Program, which is included in the Comprehensive Plan. Consequently, the Comprehensive Plan currently references the Lower Duwamish plan in relation to the City's Shoreline Policies. The relationship between the City's shoreline regulations and the watershed plan presents a clear difference from the plans for the City's urban creeks.

All of these Watershed plans are action plans rather than policy plans. Their general intent is to identify a set of actions to meet identified goals, rather than to guide City policy. The City has adopted a number of other action plans. Some of these action plans are referenced in the Comprehensive Plan as "Additional Resources," including:

- Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000
- 2001-2004 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development
- Libraries for All Capital Projects
- Seattle Center 2000 Plan
- Seattle Water Supply Plan
- Seattle Comprehensive Drainage Plan; and
- "On the Path to Sustainability," the City's solid waste plan

These plans are referenced to point the reader to sources of additional information about City activities. They are not incorporated into the Plan itself and the Comprehensive Plan is silent on the consistency of these plans with the Comprehensive Plan or their weight in decision-making. Each of these plans has been adopted by the City Council by resolution (or in one case, by ordinance).

The City has three options for including the watershed plans in the Comprehensive Plan.

1. The Comprehensive Plan's Environment Element could contain a list of "Additional References", similar to the references in the Utilities and Capital Facilities Elements. These references would serve to aid the reader who wants to find out more about the City's environmental activities. Such a list of references could include any environmental action plans adopted by the City Council affecting activities within the city, including the plans for Longfellow and Pipers Creek. Under this alternative, the Comprehensive Plan would act as a reference for the reader interested in learning more about the City's environmental activities, but would not comment on the plans themselves or their relationship to the City's growth management strategy.
2. A second alternative would be to reference the fact that the City may develop plans for watersheds, and describe their relationship to the Comprehensive Plan. Under this option, individual plans would not be referenced. Instead, the City would have a policy that states that the City may work with other parties to develop plans for watersheds that are intended to identify strategies for surface water quality. Individual plans would not be referenced. This alternative would not provide the same level of information to the reader about the existing watershed plans.
3. The City could incorporate the goals of the watershed plans into the Comprehensive Plan, just as the City incorporated the goals of the neighborhood plans into the Comprehensive Plan. As with the neighborhood goals and policies, this process would require extensive outreach to the effected communities, and extensive review of the watershed plans' goals and policies in order to ensure their conformity with the legal standards regarding language included in the Comprehensive Plan. Assuming funding and staff time are available to staff such a project, new goals and/or policies could be ready for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan review process.

None of these options would necessarily increase the speed or effectiveness of the implementation of City-developed watershed plans. Implementation of any City action plan relies of community and City commitment to ensure the implementation of the plan, an ongoing commitment to fund the projects identified in the plan, and monitoring of the effectiveness of the plan's recommendations.

This type of monitoring and implementation is occurring, in both the Longfellow and Pipers creek watersheds. In 2000 a report published on implementation of the 1990 Pipers Creek Watershed Plan found, in part, that "the plan put in place in 1990 has helped to bring about significant progress in protecting and enhancing the watershed, the creek, and the amazing salmon that are now an important part of our neighborhood... the majority of the originally proposed actions has been completed." The 2000 report then identifies additional activities that would further enhance the creek's environment. Continuing the implementation and monitoring through the continued dedication of staff and fiscal resources is the best way of ensuring that the plans will be recognized and implemented.

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends incorporating a list of "Additional Resources" into the Environment Element. Include the Longfellow Creek Watershed Action Plan and the Pipers Creek Watershed Action Plan as plans that affect actions within the City limits.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

Identifying adopted watershed plans as "Additional Resources" for the reader of the Comprehensive Plan will provide additional value to the reader. Identifying them as resources does not carry any additional legal weight, nor would it require extensive City and community review to develop new policies that would be consistent with legal standards. The plans would be recognized as important information for the community and important documents to the City.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

9. Capital Facilities Appendix D – Not Currently Part of the Legislation

Proposal: Amend Capital Facilities Appendix D: "Potential Future Discretionary Projects" to reflect projects that have been included in the City's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) or other new projects.

Elements: Capital Facilities Appendix

Submitted by: Department of Finance

Description of the proposed amendment: Amend the list of potential future discretionary projects as follows:

Changes to the names of projects:

- ◆ Fire Station Upgrades and Expansions
- ◆ Seattle-Center-Bus Barn Clean-up Site Soil Remediation (Next-Phase Seattle Center)

Projects to be added:

- ◆ Animal Control Shelter Expansion
- ◆ Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)
- ◆ Emergency Operations Center Replacement
- ◆ High Point*
- ◆ PC-1 Lot at Pike Place Market*

Projects to be removed:

- ◆ Aquarium Redevelopment
- ◆ Chinese Garden at South Seattle Community College
- ◆ Citywide Training Campus
- ◆ Cormorant Cove Development
- ◆ Gas Works Park Environmental Clean Up
- ◆ Holly Park Phase III
- ◆ Memorial Stadium Site Development
- ◆ Mercer Arena Renovation
- ◆ Museum of History and Industry
- ◆ Potlatch Trail
- ◆ Roy Street Shops Replacement
- ◆ Sculpture Garden at Elliott and Broad
- ◆ South Lake Union City property redevelopment

Recommended action:

The Executive recommends adopting the proposed amendments.

Reasons for pursuing the recommended action:

The proposed name changes would clarify the projects being referred to, and the potential scope of those projects.

The projects that would be removed from the Appendix are all included in the 2003-2008 Proposed Capital Improvement Program, or have commitment for other funding sources that are not included in the CIP, and no longer need to be incorporated in the Capital Facilities Appendix

as "Potential Future Discretionary Projects." Appendix D is reserved for those projects not currently in the CIP that the City may become involved with in the future. As projects are included in the CIP, the Comprehensive Plan is generally updated.

The projects proposed to be added to the list in Appendix D are described below:

Animal Control Shelter Expansion

The potential project would expand the existing Animal Control Shelter located at 2061 15th Ave West, Seattle, WA 98119. Fleets and Facilities would be the department managing the project on behalf of the Department of Executive Administration that operates the Shelter.

Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)

The Blue Spruce is a pre-World's Fair apartment building dating from the early 1950's and located on the Seattle Center campus adjacent to the Seattle Center Pavilion, just south of KeyArena. This 50 year-old building is used for Seattle Center offices and offices for the Folklife and the International Children's Festivals. The building is in very poor condition, is well past its useful life, and is inefficient for its uses. It is likely that replacement of this building and redevelopment of the site would be the most cost-effective option. Seattle Center intends to examine opportunities for partnering with a private developer, one of the Center's tenants, and/or another public entity in redeveloping the Blue Spruce site.

Emergency Operations Center Replacement

The potential project would replace the existing Emergency Operations Center at a new location that has not been determined. Fleets and Facilities would be the department managing the project on behalf of numerous City departments and the Police Department that operates the Center.

High Point*

High Point is the latest in a series of Hope VI redevelopment projects (mostly funded by the federal department of Housing and Urban Development, but with some City funding) which are intended to rebuild and transform Seattle's public housing garden communities. Holly Park and Rainier Vista are already underway and High Point is the most recent to receive federal funding. The Seattle Housing Authority, not the city, is in charge of these projects.

PC-1 Lot at Pike Place Market*

The potential project would redevelop the PC-1 North parking lot at the Pike Place Market. The Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority (PDA) intends to present a preferred design for the redevelopment of the PC-1 North lot in the 3rd quarter of 2003. Options for the site are focused on construction of a multi-use building to expand and supplement existing programs and space needs within the Market. The Market will be the lead on development of the project.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

2002 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

ATTACHMENT A

**City Council Resolution 30446, identifying proposed Comprehensive
Plan Amendments to be considered for possible Adoption in 2002**

**NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.**

RESOLUTION 30446

1
2 A RESOLUTION identifying proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to be considered
3 for possible adoption in 2002, and approving a work plan for DCLU reviewing,
4 considering and recommending to the Mayor and Council potential amendments to
5 the Comprehensive Plan.

6 WHEREAS, the City of Seattle adopted a Comprehensive Plan (Ordinance 117221) in 1994;
7 and

8 WHEREAS, the City Council adopted procedures in Resolution 30261 as amended by
9 Resolution 30412 for amending the Comprehensive Plan, consistent with the
10 requirements for amendment prescribed by the Growth Management Act, RCW
11 36.70A; and

12 WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution 28969 identifying continuing efforts to
13 augment the Comprehensive Plan through work on additional plan elements and
14 amendments; and

15 WHEREAS, proposed amendments were submitted by individuals or citizen organizations
16 and by the City for consideration during 2002; and

17 WHEREAS, the Mayor and the Planning Commission reviewed and made recommendations
18 in a report to the City Council dated March 18, 2002 as to which proposals to further
19 consider and review during 2002; and

20 WHEREAS, the Council's Land Use Committee held a public hearing on April 2, 2002, to
21 take public testimony on the amendments proposed for consideration;

22 BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS
23 FOLLOWS:

1. The following proposed amendments should be further developed for review and consideration by the Executive and Council as possible 2002 amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendments are referenced by number. The reference number corresponds to the assigned number on the list in Attachment A, entitled 2002 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments Threshold Analysis.
 - a) 1 - Amend Land Use Policy L53 to clarify the intent of the Future Land Use Map
 - b) 2 - Consider substituting terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for "transit-oriented development".
 - c) 3 - Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

- d) 4 - Develop language more clearly embodying the City's sustainable building policy
 - e) 5 - Review the City's sustainability policies (to be done by the Office of Sustainability and Environment)
 - f) 6 - Review the proposal concerning public stairways. Note: portions of the proposal may not be appropriate for Comprehensive Plan policy.
 - g) Added item - Review Housing Element policies (including but not limited to H37, H38 and H40) for possible changes, including but not limited to policies governing the allocation of rental housing funding by income levels served, the scope of programmatic and geographic exceptions to those policies, the City's objectives regarding owner-occupancy, and the geographic targeting of assistance for both rental housing and home ownership, as well as technical clarification.
 - h) 8 - Examine existing watershed plans and investigate the legal ramifications of recognizing a watershed plan in the Comprehensive Plan. Clarify exactly what type of watershed plans could be subject to such recognition.
2. The following proposed amendments should be referred for consideration as Comprehensive Plan amendments for 2003:
- a) 7 - Explore policy tools to encourage or require that capital facilities improvements keep up with the growth in population and employment.
 - b) 9 - Amend the Transit section of the Transportation Element to reflect the recommendation of the Seattle Transit Study to designate corridors across the City for intermediate capacity transit and regional light rail improvements.
 - c) 15 - Amendment for map change to allow zoning changes from IC to NCR/NC in ID Urban Center Village.
3. The following proposed amendment should be referred for consideration as Comprehensive Plan amendments as part of the Shoreline Master Program Update:
- a) 22 - Protect views by establishing a maximum number of days and hours of the day in which cruiseships taller than 8 stories can block the views when tied up at Bell St. Pier.
 - b) 23 - Amendments to shoreline height limits for view and shoreline protection.
 - c) 24 - Simplify the definition of Puget Sound and Elliott Bay.
4. The Executive shall report to the City Council by July 30, 2002 on the scope of work and schedule for considering in the 2003 Comprehensive Plan amendment process amendments concerning transit and other non-motorized modes level-of-service level-of-


NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



service screenline definitions.


- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
5. The remaining amendments on the list in Attachment A should not be considered further as Comprehensive Plan amendments for 2002.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Seattle this 29th day of April,
2002, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 29th
day of April, 2002.




President of the City Council

Filed by me this 5th day of May, 2002.



City Clerk

THE MAYOR CONCURRING:



Greg Nickels, Mayor

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A – 2002 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments Threshold Analysis

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



**2002 PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS
THRESHOLD ANALYSIS**

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by	Background	Recommendation
1.	Amend Land Use Policy L53 to read as follows: "L53 The Future Land Use Map shows categories of land use that are preferred for generalized geographic areas across the city. Locations of specific zones are shown on the City's zoning map. The criteria for siting those zones, which are found in the Land Use Code, are intended to reflect the policies of this plan and the general direction shown on the Future Land Use Map. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map."	SPO (Tom Hauger)		Proceed for further analysis with date for actual amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.
2.	Substitute the terms "urban center-oriented development" and "urban village-oriented development" for the too narrow term "transit-oriented development" in any city policy pertaining to Urban Center and urban villages.	Thomas Heller	Holdover from 2001 process	Proceed for further analysis with date for actual amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.
3.	Clarify the role and function of Urban Centers, Hub Urban Villages and Urban Villages – and clarify their intended inter-relationship(s), from the stand point of a) economic function (residential, commercial, employment) and b) physical interconnectedness by transportation facilities.	Thomas Heller	Holdover from 2001 process	Proceed for further analysis with date for actual amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.
4.	Developing language more clearly embodying the City's sustainable building policy	Resolution 30273	Holdover from 2001 process	Proceed for further analysis with date for actual amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
5.	Review by the Office of Sustainability and Environment of the City's sustainability policies, with the goal of recommending any appropriate Comprehensive Plan Amendments in 2002	Resolution 30273	Holdover from 2001 process	Proceed for further analysis with date for actual amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.
6.	To the Land Use Element's section D, "Open Space Network," add the following new section, "Public Stairways" after the section on "Urban Trails": Preserve the public outdoor stairways as valuable pedestrian connections and points of access to Seattle's open spaces and views. Public stairways may exist on land managed by SeaTran, the Parks Department, City Light, and other City agencies; on land managed by WSDOT, the Port, and other public agencies; and on private land through easements and permit conditions. The City will maintain the public stairways, discourage vacations of their right-of-way, and consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, will seek to add or expand public stairways in desirable locations.	Chris Leman		<p>Proceed for further analysis on only the portion highlighted below with date for actual amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.</p> <p>"Recognize public outdoor stairways as valuable pedestrian connections and points of access to Seattle's open spaces and views."</p> <p>The remainder of this proposal is at a level of detail inappropriate for the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
7.	Explore policy tools to encourage or require that capital facilities improvements keep up with the growth in population and employment.	CNC	Holdover from 2001 process	Proceed for further analysis with potential amendments to be determined through consensus with Council.
8.	Referencing Watershed Plans in the Environment Element	Resolution 30273	Holdover from 2001 process	<p>Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment.</p> <p>The City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan cannot bind other jurisdictions. Watershed plans stretch over multiple jurisdictions. The watershed plans should be reviewed to make sure effects on the City of Seattle are consistent with our Comprehensive Plan.</p>



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
9.	Amend the Transit Section of the Transportation Element to reflect the recommendation of the Seattle Transit Study to designate corridors across the city for intermediate capacity transit and regional light rail improvements. Specifically, this may include augmenting the Transit Priority Network map (Transportation Figure 4) or adding a new figure, as well as possible minor text revisions to policies T34, T35, T36 and T37 to reference the inclusion of such corridors.	SPO (Eric Chipps)		Refer to 2003 for further analysis and consideration. Staff requires more time to consult with the Mayor's office over the impact of this amendment.
10.	Modify Transit Level-Of-Service ("LOS") methodology, to take transit service capacity into account.	CNC	Holdover from 2001 process	Work is underway on areawide studies that will inform modifications of Transit Level-Of-Service, however this issue is not expected to be ready for specific Comprehensive Plan amendments until 2003.
11.	Modify definitions of screenlines to insure that multiple arterials comprising a single screenline continue to serve as viable alternate routes to one another for a majority of the peak-hour traffic crossing the screenline (e.g., define all arterial bridges crossing the Lake Washington Ship Canal and Duwamish Waterway as individual screenlines for the purpose of determining Transportation Concurrency).	CNC	Holdover from 2001 process	Work is underway on areawide studies that will inform modifications of Transit Level-Of-Service, however this issue is not expected to be ready for specific Comprehensive Plan amendments until 2003.



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
12.	To the Transportation Element's section B, "Changing and Managing Travel," add the following new section, "Parking Cashout," after policy T8: The City will consider requiring parking cashout, and in any case will provide positive incentives for it, with employers and building owners and managers that offer free or subsidized parking to their employees. Parking cashout ensures provides the same benefit to those who do not drive to work as to those who chose to drive and park for free or at reduced rates. Those who choose not to drive to work receive an equivalent cash payment that they are free to spend on alternative means of commuting or on housing closer to work.	Chris Leman		Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment. This issue is programmatic detail and is discussed within the Transportation Strategic Plan (Transportation Demand Management, Strategy DM5)
13.	To section C, "Utility Policies," subsection 6 on "Utility Relationships" will have another policy added, as follows: "Reduce unnecessary excavation, burdens on poles and vaults, destruction of trees, and expensive duplication by requiring telecommunications franchisees and permittees on City rights-of-way to combine certain facilities and utility lines."	Chris Leman		Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment. This is a work program item and not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. The City's Utility Coordinating Committee (UCC) reviews and coordinates the plans of those requesting permits for excavation. The UCC can place conditions on permits and requires permittees to consult with competing operators to make sure duplication does not occur.



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
14.	<p>Wants a change that will allow lodging in the IG1 zone in the Duwamish M/I Center by a permitted use or administrative conditional use. Subject area is located at 1550 – 1562 4th Ave. So (4th Ave South & Massachusetts St.)</p> <p>Statement: The issue is not addressed in the Comp Plan. The plan calls for maintaining an industrial use in the area. However, proximity to the districts housing public facilities (SafeCo Field, Seahawk Stadium and the Exhibition Hall) and impact made by transportation improvements by the SR 510 Intermodel Project, make maintaining the use suggested by the Comp Plan challenging. The Comp Plan should recognize broadening the uses within this district to allow uses consistent with the improvements impacting the area.</p>	Stanley Piha, Agent for Raymond Galante		<p>Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment.</p> <p>The Countywide Planning Policies, Comprehensive Plan and Duwamish Neighborhood Plan all have policies that designate this area for industrial use. Residential use is inconsistent with these policies.</p>
15.	<p>Amendment or map change to allow the following:</p> <p>1a. Change IC-65 (east boundary - Rainier Avenue; south boundary – Dearborn; west boundary – 12th; north boundary - King St./Jackson St alleyway) with the exception of properties on 12th avenue South and Rainier Avenue to NCR 65/85' (look at even higher heights in this area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine the possibility of allowing new residential on top of light industrial (artist lofts) <p>1b. Change IC-65 for properties on 12th avenue South and Rainier Avenue to NC3 65-85 with a P1 overlay</p>	DON (John Eskelin)/Interim		<p>Refer to 2003 for further analysis and consideration.</p> <p>In order to coordinate this proposed amendment with the required rezone analysis needed to accomplish this change, the neighborhood will need time to discuss possible land use changes in this area.</p>



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
16.	<p>An amendment to create consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map in order to implement certain goals and policies within the Comprehensive Plan and be consistent with the vision of the Tomorrow's Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan. There are areas of zoning as shown on the Future Land Use Map, specifically a two-block area located within the Roosevelt Neighborhood, that are clearly inconsistent with both vision and goals. An amendment to the land use map from multifamily residential L-2 to Commercial/Mixed NC2-40 for the southern half and south west quarter of the two blocks immediately west of 15th Ave and north of NE 65th Street, will implement Policy R-P12 (among others) by promoting a pedestrian oriented, mixed-use environment on Roosevelt District's commercial streets (NE 65th St.).</p>	<p>R.W. Thorpe & Associates for Jerry & Karen Jandacka</p>		<p>Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment.</p> <p>A map amendment is not necessary for a rezone in this area.</p>
17.	<p>Recognize that Seattle has many stunning views and vistas, and that the commonwealth is benefited by the sharing of those views, and that as the city grows more dense, that the access to views becomes more precious. Therefore, the city will take steps to insure that no one building can completely block the views of its neighbors.</p>	<p>Greg Hill</p>	<p>Holdover from 2001 process.</p>	<p>Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment.</p> <p>The City's existing policy on private views is expressed through the City's SEPA ordinance (related section is below). This proposal is inconsistent with current policy.</p> <p>SEPA – SMC Section 25.05.675 (P)(1)(f). Adopted Land Use Codes attempt to protect private views through height and bulk controls and other zoning regulations but it is impractical to protect private views through project-specific review.</p>



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
18.	The city shall take steps to preserve and enhance the quality of life for all citizens by requiring building setbacks equal to 20% of the lot width along all view corridors and scenic routes. The city shall establish view corridors in neighborhood plans.	Greg Hill		Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment. This proposal is a regulatory proposal and not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. This issue will be referred to the existing view protection work program.
19.	Conduct a baseline inventory and description of visual resources, public views and vistas from the City of Seattle and establish appropriate land use regulations to protect these resources from encroachment or degradation. This baseline inventory shall be established by a panel of citizens in conjunction with representatives from appropriate City departments. This inventory shall be periodically reviewed and updated by a similarly constituted panel.	Irene Wall	Holdover from 2001 process	Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment. This proposal is a work program item and not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. A view inventory is complete and awaiting final editing, layout and printing. DCLU will not recommend appropriate regulatory changes until a scoping meeting has been held and the department conducts a full and public analysis inventory results.
20.	Establish and map protected view corridors from all locations indicated in SEPA (SMC 25.05) Attachment 1; from scenic routes as currently identified in Exhibit I in SMC 25.05, and from limited segments of Interstate 5 with views across Lake Union to the Space Needle, toward Elliott Bay and Mount Rainier.	CNC	Holdover from 2001 process	Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment. The work described in this proposed amendment is a follow-up work item based on inventory discussed in item #19. It is not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. The results of the baseline inventory analysis will determine any follow-up on this item.



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
21.	Explore policy measures to better protect public and private views. (Note: intent is to encourage broad review of view-protection measures across the city, while recognizing that it may be appropriate to provide different standards for neighborhoods intended for high-density development.)	CNC	Holdover from 2001 process	Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment. The work described in this proposed amendment is a follow-up work item based on inventory discussed in item #19. It is not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. The results of the baseline inventory analysis will determine any follow-up on this item.
22.	Views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound, Magnolia, and the Olympic Mountains from Victor Steinbrueck Park, the Lenora Pedestrian Overpass, the Alaskan Way Viaduct, Pier 62/63 and the Seattle Aquarium outdoor public access areas shall be available for the majority of spring and summer days by establishing a maximum number of days and hours of the day in which cruiseships taller than 8 stories can block the views when tied up at the Bell St. Pier.	Irene Wall	Holdover from 2001 process	This item can be considered as a Comprehensive Plan amendment through the Shoreline Master Program Update process currently underway and future SEPA work.
23.	Proposal of Irene Wall (originally referred for consideration in 2001 by resolution 30156) to consider amendments to shoreline height limits for view and shoreline protection. (This proposal should be considered in both the City's view policy review and the shoreline program review.)	Irene Wall	Holdover from 2000 process	This item can be considered as a Comprehensive Plan amendment through the Shoreline Master Program Update process currently underway and future SEPA work.

AP

JAN



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by:	Background	Recommendation
24.	<p>L585a. Area Objectives for Shorelines of Statewide Significance Para 1. Simplify the definition of Puget Sound to read: "The Puget Sound area includes all the of the shorelines on Puget Sound within the City limits."</p> <p>Puget Sound does in fact include Shilshole, Elliott Bay, the Harborfront, and the Duwamish waterways so there is not a good reason to exclude them from the definition, and it is not consistent with the Shoreline Management Act's definition of statewide significance to exclude them.</p> <p>Also same section Para 2. Definition of Elliott Bay. Amend to read "Elliott Bay area is all shoreline areas from 24th Ave West to SW Atlantic Street." Similarly, the Harborfront IS part of Elliott Bay and should not be excluded form this definition. In addition, add the sentence, "The shorelines and waters of Elliott Bay are natural in accordance with the Shoreline Management Act."</p>	Irene Wall	Holdover from 2001 process	This item can be considered as a Comprehensive Plan amendment through the Shoreline Master Program Update process currently underway and future SEPA work.

IMP

HA



ATTACHMENT A

	Proposal (as submitted)	Submitted by	Background	Recommendation
25.	The city should not grant street or alley vacations when the result will be full block developments or developments of incompatible bulk and scale with the surrounding properties and adjacent blocks.	Irene Wall	Holdover from 2001 process	<p>Does not meet threshold for Comprehensive Plan amendment.</p> <p>This proposal conflicts with existing policy and is inappropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. Existing street vacation policies specifically state that the Council can impose conditions on a project to mitigate the land use impacts, including density, etc. This suggested condition is unnecessary because the policies already make specific provision for addressing land use impacts.</p>



From: Bob Tobin
To: Bob Morgan; Theresa Dunbar
Date: 10/10/2002 9:37AM
Subject: Re: Comp Plan Amendments legislation

Theresa,

Thanks for catching this change. I have now reviewed the new version, #3, and don't have any concerns. If you would like me to send up a new yellow sheet I can do that, or you can simply replace version "2" with "3" on the yellow sheet that you already have. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Please note that my e-mail address has changed to Bob.Tobin@seattle.gov. (The old address should work for several more months)

Bob Tobin
(206)-684-8249

>>> Bob Morgan 10/09/02 03:38PM >>>

Well, .. Lish Whitson just sent version 3 to Bob Tobin at law. The only difference is that we added amendment #6. If need be I could try get a second yellow sheet from Law.

>>> Theresa Dunbar 10/09/02 02:57PM >>>

From: Theresa Dunbar
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 2:57 PM
To: Lish Whitson
CC: Bob Morgan; Bob Tobin; Jill Berkey
Subject: Comp Plan Amendments legislation
Priority: Normal

Hi Lish:

Question about the correct version of the Comp Plan Amendment legislation.....

The version of the CB in the jacket is version 3. The version signed off by everyone (on the yellow legislation check-off list) is version 2. If version 3 is the correct version, has the Law Department signed off?

Thanks

Theresa

CC: Lish Whitson

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



From: Lish Whitson
To: Bob Tobin
Date: 10/9/02 3:24PM
Subject: Re: Comp Plan Amendments legislation

Hi Bob,

I'm not sure you actually saw version 3 of the Comp Plan amendments legislation. At the last minute, we received a budget-related amendment (We were scrambling around last week to pull this together in time to make the hearing notice deadline of last Thursday the 3rd). I'm sorry you weren't in the loop on this.

The change between the two versions is a new attachment 6, relating to our list of "potential future discretionary projects." We're taking out the projects that are in the proposed CIP and adding in some other projects that the City might get involved in in the future.

Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,
Lish, 3-0079

>>> Theresa Dunbar 10/09/02 02:57PM >>>

Hi Lish:

Question about the correct version of the Comp Plan Amendment legislation.....

The version of the CB in the jacket is version 3. The version signed off by everyone (on the yellow legislation check-off list) is version 2. If version 3 is the correct version, has the Law Department signed off?

Thanks

Theresa

CC: Berkey, Jill; Dunbar, Theresa; Hauger, Tom; Morgan, Bob; Tobin, Bob

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.





City of Seattle

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

Office of the Mayor

August 14, 2002

Honorable Peter Steinbrueck
President
Seattle City Council
Municipal Building, 11th Floor

Dear Council President Steinbrueck:


The attached ordinance would amend the Comprehensive Plan in response to the City's annual amendment process. Five sets of amendments are recommended for adoption. These amendments would:

- Clarify the use of the City's Future Land Use Map to remove confusion between the Future Land Use Map and the City's Official Land Use Map and rezone criteria;
- Add new language to recognize the importance of public stairways in the City's pedestrian transportation network;
- Amend the Housing Element to remove details currently also contained in the City's Consolidated Plan;
- Clearly state the City's sustainable building policies as they relate to capital facilities development and maintenance; and
- Recognize the City's adopted plans for the Piper's Creek and Longfellow Creek watershed.

An additional three proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are currently not proposed for adoption. The attached Executive's Report and Recommendations goes into more detail regarding each of these proposals.

Thank you for your consideration of this legislation. Should you have questions please contact Lish Whitson at 206-233-0079.

Sincerely,



GREG NICKELS
Mayor of Seattle

cc Honorable Members of the Seattle City Council

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDINANCE _____

AN ORDINANCE amending the Seattle Comprehensive Plan to incorporate amendments proposed as part of the 2002 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment process.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Council Resolution 30412 establishing procedures for amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, a number of proposals for Plan amendments were submitted for Council consideration, both from within the City and from the public; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution 28969 identifying continuing efforts to augment the Comprehensive Plan through work on additional plan elements and amendments; and

WHEREAS, proposed amendments were submitted by individuals or citizen organizations and by the City for consideration during 2002; and

WHEREAS, in April 2002, the City Council considered these proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and determined, pursuant to Council Resolution 30446, that eight amendments would be further reviewed and analyzed; and

WHEREAS, these proposed amendments have been reviewed and analyzed by the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use and considered by the Council; and

WHEREAS, the City has provided for public participation in the development and review of these proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Council has reviewed and considered the executive staff's report and recommendation, and public testimony made at the public hearings and other pertinent material regarding the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Council finds that the amendments to be adopted are consistent with the Growth Management Act, and will protect and promote the health, safety and welfare of the general public; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Seattle Comprehensive Plan, as adopted by Ordinance 117221 and subsequently amended, is hereby amended as follows:

- A. The Land Use Element is amended as shown in Attachment 1 to this ordinance.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm
CP ord 2002v3
October 3, 2002
version #3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

B. The Transportation Element is amended as shown in Attachment 2 to this ordinance.

C. The Housing Element is amended as shown in Attachment 3 to this ordinance.

D. The Capital Facilities Element is amended as shown in Attachment 4 to this ordinance.

E. The Environment Element is amended as shown in Attachment 5 to this ordinance.

F. Capital Facilities Appendix D is amended as shown in Attachment 6 to this ordinance.

Passed by the City Council the ____ day of _____, 2002, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this ____ day of _____, 2002.

President of the City Council

Approved by me this ____ day of _____, 2002.

Mayor

Filed by me this ____ day of _____, 2002.

City Clerk

(SEAL)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm
CP ord 2002v3
October 3, 2002
version #3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT LIST:

- Attachment 1: Land Use Element Amendments
- Attachment 2: Transportation Element Amendments
- Attachment 3: Housing Element Amendments
- Attachment 4: Capital Facilities Element Amendments
- Attachment 5: Environment Element Amendments
- Attachment 6: Capital Facilities Appendix D

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT 1

Land Use Element

L53 Use the Future Land Use Map and the goals and policies included in this plan to identify general locations where broad categories of land uses are preferred. Use the City's Official Land Use Map and rezone criteria included in the Land Use Code to identify the location of specific zones, which implement the goals and policies of this plan. Use zoning designations to establish the mix of uses and intensity of development desired within each of the general areas shown on the Future Land Use Map.

L303 Include the following considerations in the design of trails:

3. Seek to protect existing trails and publicly owned stairways from encroachment by private development, including motor vehicle crossings, especially in residential neighborhoods where safety and aesthetic issues are paramount.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm
CP ord 2002v3
October 3, 2002
version #3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT 2

Transportation Element

T47a Recognize that stairways located within Seattle's public rights-of-way serve as a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Discourage the vacation of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways, and protect publicly-owned stairways from private encroachment.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 3

Housing Element

H37 Public funds administered by the City and used for the purposes of affordable rental housing may be used only to serve income groups consistent with the criteria contained in the Consolidated Plan, following criteria:

- At least 50% of rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of median income;
- Remaining rental program funds shall be used for housing affordable to households earning between 31 and 50% of median income consistent with fund source program affordability requirements;
- Renter households at or below 80% of median income may be served in the Central Area SOA, the Southeast SOA, the Southwest SOA, and the Pioneer Square and International District of the Downtown SOA for the purposes allowed in the SOA policies, or within half a mile of a light rail station or major transit center located outside downtown. CDBG and HOME funds may be used for this purpose.

The Rental Affordability Policy applies to all applicable Office of Housing administered capital fund sources combined and not to individual fund sources. The Policy applies to funding available in the City of Seattle biennial budget cycles (i.e. 2001-2002; 2003-2004).

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Funding that does not meet the Rental Affordability Policy in the first year of a biennium must be brought into compliance by the end of the second year. The Rental Affordability Policy does not apply to programs where the City leverages other funds through credit enhancement strategies; and Housing Levy rental production program, 50-65% of median set-aside.

H38 Help maintain increase the City's owner-occupancy rate and encourage home ownership in a variety of housing types by:

- a. Using a portion of local discretionary housing subsidy resources to provide home ownership opportunities to households consistent with affordability targets and geographic focuses included in the City's Consolidated Plan, with incomes below 80% of median income. Target funds primarily to neighborhoods with average household incomes below 80% of the City average; neighborhoods with high concentrations of assisted rental housing; and areas where upward pressure on prices may result in the displacement of existing residents.
- b. ~~Consider~~ Setting aside a substantial portion of any new discretionary funding sources for assisted housing, such as a new housing levy, to provide homeownership opportunities to households with incomes below 80% of median income. Also, consider alternative approaches to increase the development of affordable homeownership housing, including but not limited to greater use of land trusts and limited equity cooperatives.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 4

Capital Facilities Element

CF8 Incorporate sustainability principles and practices into the design and construction of City buildings and other types of capital facilities.

~~CF13~~ Strive to use resource-efficient building materials and techniques in new and refurbished City facilities and encourage other public agencies to follow similar sustainable building practices.

5. Sustainable Design and Construction

CF19 Assess the sustainability of choices in developing capital projects, including finance, planning, design, construction, management, renovation, maintenance, and decommissioning.

CF20 Consider environmental health in capital facilities development, including efficient use of energy, water, and materials; waste reduction; protection of environmental quality; and ecologically sensitive site selection and development.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CF21 Consider social and human health in capital facilities development, including protection of worker health, improved indoor environmental quality, and access to alternative transportation modes (e.g., public transit, bicycling, walking, etc.) and social services.

CF22 Consider economic health in capital facilities development, including purchase of products and services from locally owned businesses and support for local manufacture of sustainable products.

CF23 Consider life-cycle cost analysis as a method to better understand the relative costs and benefits over time of alternative approaches to the design and construction of City buildings and capital facilities.

CF24 Encourage the public and private-sector use of third-party sustainable building rating and certification systems, such as the Master Builder Association's BuiltGreen system and the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system.

* : *

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm
CP ord 2002v3
October 3, 2002
version #3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTACHMENT 5

Environment Element

H. Additional Resources

Longfellow Creek Watershed Action Plan

Pipers Creek Watershed Action Plan

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 6

Capital Facilities Appendix D:
Potential Future Discretionary Projects

Besides the facilities that are included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), there are a number of prospective capital projects that the City might undertake or fund in the future. They are listed below in alphabetical order to provide a broad view of the City's potential future capital spending. Projects are not listed in any priority order. Funding for these projects is not yet identified, and no decisions have been made to go forward with funding these projects.

- ◆ African-American Heritage Museum*
- ◆ Animal Control Shelter Expansion
- ◆ ~~Aquarium Redevelopment~~
- ◆ Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)
- ◆ Bus Barn Site Soil Remediation (Seattle Center)
- ◆ ~~Chinese Garden at South Seattle Community College*~~
- ◆ City projects included in a potential new Countywide Parks Bond Issue
- ◆ ~~Citywide Training Campus~~
- ◆ ~~Comorant Cove development~~
- ◆ Downtown Circulator
- ◆ Emergency Operations Center Replacement
- ◆ Fiber Optic Expansion
- ◆ Fire Station Upgrades and Expansions
- ◆ ~~Gas Works Park Environmental Clean-up (will be 2000 supplemental)~~
- ◆ High Point*

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm
CP ord 2002v3
October 3, 2002
version #3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- ◆ ~~Holly Park Phase III*~~
- ◆ Homeless Day Center*
- ◆ Memorial Stadium Relocation*
- ◆ ~~Memorial Stadium Site Development*~~
- ◆ ~~Mercer Arena Renovation~~
- ◆ Monorail Expansion*
- ◆ Monorail Platform Expansion
- ◆ ~~Museum of History and Industry*~~
- ◆ Neighborhood Planning Capital Projects
- ◆ Neighborhood Service Centers
- ◆ North Police Precinct Expansion
- ◆ Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000 (will potentially be updated in 2005-2006)
- ◆ PC-1 Lot at Pike Place Market*
- ◆ ~~Potlatch Trail~~
- ◆ ~~Roy Street Shops Replacement (in CIP)~~
- ◆ Sand Point Redevelopment
- ◆ ~~Sculpture Garden at Elliott and Broad~~
- ◆ Seattle Center 5th Avenue Parking Lot Development
- ◆ ~~Seattle Center Bus Barn Clean-up (Next Phase)~~
- ◆ Seattle Center Master Plan Updates
- ◆ Seattle Transit Initiative
- ◆ South Downtown Study Area Improvements
- ◆ ~~South Lake Union City property redevelopment~~

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Lish Whitson/LW/BM/bm
CP ord 2002v3
October 3, 2002
version #3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- ◆ South Lake Union Transportation Improvements
- ◆ Southwest Harbor Project *
- ◆ Telecommunications Improvements
- ◆ TransLake* (includes early action items)
- ◆ Urban Trails Plan Implementation
- ◆ West Seattle Stadium
- ◆ Zoo Improvements

* At the time of publication, projects with an * are not under the jurisdiction of the City, but are owned or sponsored by another government agency or private organization. The City might participate in funding these project

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

STATE OF WASHINGTON - KING COUNTY

--SS.

153108
City of Seattle, Clerk's Office

No. ORDINANCE IN FULL

Affidavit of Publication

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a

CT:ORDINANCE 121020

was published on

1/6/2003

J. Stedman


Subscribed and sworn to before me on

1/6/2003

Michael Fisher

Notary public for the State of Washington,
residing in Seattle

Affidavit of Publication



NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

State of Washington, King

City of Seattle

ORDINANCE 121030

AN ORDINANCE amending the Seattle Comprehensive Plan to incorporate amendments proposed as part of the 2002 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment process.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Council Resolution 30412 establishing procedures for amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, a number of proposals for Plan amendments were submitted for Council consideration, both from within the City and from the public; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution 28959 identifying continuing efforts to augment the Comprehensive Plan through work on additional plan elements and amendments; and

WHEREAS, proposed amendments were submitted by individuals or citizen organizations and by the City for consideration during 2002; and

WHEREAS, in April 2002, the City Council considered these proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments and determined, pursuant to Council Resolution 30446, that eight amendments would be further reviewed and analyzed; and

WHEREAS, these proposed amendments have been reviewed and analyzed by the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use and considered by the Council; and

WHEREAS, the City has provided for public participation in the development and review of these proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Council has reviewed and considered the executive staff report and recommendation, and public testimony made at the public hearings and other pertinent material regarding the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Council finds that the amendments to be adopted are consistent with the Growth Management Act, and will protect and promote the health, safety and welfare of the general public; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Seattle Comprehensive Plan, as adopted by Ordinance 11724 and subsequently amended, is hereby amended as follows:

- A. The Land Use Element is amended as shown in Attachment 1 to this ordinance.
B. The Transportation Element is amended as shown in Attachment 2 to this ordinance.
C. The Housing Element is amended as shown in Attachment 3 to this ordinance.
D. The Capital Facilities Element is amended as shown in Attachment 4 to this ordinance.
E. The Environment Element is amended as shown in Attachment 5 to this ordinance.
F. Capital Facilities Appendix D is amended as shown in Attachment 6 to this ordinance.

Passed by the City Council the 9th day of December, 2002, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 9th day of December, 2002.

PETER STEINBUECK, President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 20th day of December, 2002.

GREGORY J. NICKELS, Mayor.

Filed by me this 20th day of December, 2002.

(Seal) SCOTT CLINE, Acting City Clerk.

Publication ordered by Judith Pippin, City Clerk.

ATTACHMENT LIST

- Attachment 1: Land Use Element Amendments
Attachment 2: Transportation Element Amendments
Attachment 3: Housing Element Amendments
Attachment 4: Capital Facilities Element Amendments
Attachment 5: Environment Element Amendments
Attachment 6: Capital Facilities Appendix D

ATTACHMENT 1

Land Use Element

L33 Use the Future Land Use Map and the goals and policies included in this plan to identify general locations where broad categories of land uses are preferred. Use the Official Land Use Map and zoning criteria included in the Land Use Code to identify the location of specific zones, which implement the goals and policies of this plan. Use zoning designations to establish the amount of use and intensity of development desired within each site general location shown on the Future Land Use Map.

L303 Include the following considerations in the design of trails:

- 3. Seek to protect existing trails and public transit preferences from encroachment by private development, including motor vehicle crossings, especially in residential neighborhoods where safety and aesthetic issues are paramount.

ATTACHMENT 2

Transportation Element

T17a Recognize that stairways located within Seattle public rights-of-way serve a unique and valuable pedestrian resource in some areas of the City. Preserve the character of public rights-of-way occupied by stairways and protect publicly-owned stairways from encroachment.

median income, in conformity with applicable income limits in City ordinances, as in effect from time to time, that require the use of such fund source, except funds primarily for neighborhood-level programs. Income levels below 50% of the City average may be used for high-cost construction of assisted housing, except housing for persons with disabilities, and for persons with disabilities in the development of existing projects.

b. Considering setting a set-aside of a substantial portion of any new discretionary funding source for assisted housing needs as a housing levy that would provide homeownership opportunities for low-income households, with income below 50% of median income. Also, consider alternative approaches to increase the development of affordable homeownership housing, including but not limited to greater use of land trusts and limited equity cooperatives.

ATTACHMENT 4

Capital Facilities Element

CF20 Incorporate sustainability principles and practices into the design and construction of City buildings and other types of capital facilities.

CF19 Create longer-renting-official buildings and other techniques to increase the use of City facilities and encourage other public agencies to follow similar sustainable building practices.

6. Sustainable Design and Construction

CF18 Assess the sustainability of choices in developing capital projects, including finance, planning, design, construction, maintenance, renovation, maintenance, and decommissioning.

CF20 Consider environmental health in capital facilities development, including efficient use of energy, water, and materials; and protection of environmental quality and ecological and sensitive site selection and development.

CF21 Consider social and human health in capital facilities development, including protection of worker health, improved indoor environmental quality, and access to alternative transportation modes (e.g., public transit, bicycling, walking, etc.) and social services.

CF22 Consider economic health in capital facilities development, including purchase of products and services from local businesses and support for local manufacture of sustainable products.

CF23 Consider life-cycle cost analysis as a method to better understand the relative costs and benefits, over time, of alternative approaches to the design and construction of City buildings and capital facilities.

CF24 Encourage the public and private sectors to implement sustainable building rating and certification systems, such as the Green Building Association's Building Green system and the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system.

ATTACHMENT 5

Environment Element

H. Additional Resources
Longfellow Creek Watershed Action Plan
Pigeon Creek Watershed Action Plan

ATTACHMENT 6

Capital Facilities Appendix D:

Potential Future Discretionary Projects

Besides the facilities that are included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), there are a number of prospective capital projects that the City might undertake or fund in the future. They are listed below in alphabetical order to provide a broad view of the City's potential future capital spending. Projects are not listed in any priority order. Funding for these projects is not yet identified, and no decisions have been made to go forward with funding these projects.

- African-American Heritage Museum*
Animal Control Shelter Expansion
Aquarium Redevelopment
Blue Spruce Site Redevelopment (Seattle Center)
Bus Barn Site Soil Remediation (Seattle Center)
Chinese Garden at South Seattle Community College
City projects included in a potential new Countywide Parks Bond Issue
Citywide Training Campus
Convention Center Redevelopment
Downtown Circulator
Emergency Operations Center Replacement
Fiber Optic Expansion
Fire Station Upgrades and Expansions
Gas Works Park Environmental Cleanup (with a 2000 supplemental)
High Point
Holly Park (Seattle)
Homeless Day Center*
Memorial Stadium Relocation*
Memorial Stadium Site Development
Huron-Arson Redevelopment
Monorail Expansion*
Monorail Platform Expansion
Museum of History and Industry*
Neighborhood Planning Capital Projects
Neighborhood Service Centers
North Police Precinct Expansion
Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000 (will potentially be updated in 2008-2009)
PCC Lot at Pike Place Market*
Pike Place Front
Pike Street Bridge Replacement for CIP
Sand Point Redevelopment
Seaplane Condominiums and Boat
Seattle Center 5th Avenue Parking Lot Development
Seattle Center Bus Barn Clean-up/Reuse Project
Seattle Center Master Plan Updates
Seattle Transit Initiative
South Downtown Study Area Improvements
South Lake Union City property redvelopment

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

