City of Seattle
2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Use this application to propose a change in the policies, future land use map, appendices, or other components of the adopted City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Applications are due to the Seattle City Council no later than **5:00 p.m. on May 15th** for consideration in the next annual review cycle. Any proposals received after May 15th will be considered in the review process for the following year.

(Please Print or Type)

Applicant: Chris Leman

Date: May 15, 2016

Street Address: 2370 Yale Avenue East

City: Seattle *State*: WA Zip: 98102-3310 *Phone*: (206) 322-5463

E-mail: cleman@oo.net

Name of general area, location, or site that would be affected by this proposed change in text (attach additional sheets if necessary): Throughout the city.

If the application is approved for further consideration by the City Council, the applicant may be required to submit a Sate Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) checklist.

Acceptance of this application does not guarantee final approval.

Applicant Signature:

Date: May 15, 2016

REQUIRED QUESTIONNAIRE: Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application

Please answer the following questions in text and attach them to the application. Supporting maps or graphics may be included. Please answer all questions separately and reference the question number in your answer. The Council will consider an application incomplete unless all the questions are answered. When proposing an amendment, you must show that a change to the Comprehensive Plan is required.

1. *Provide a detailed description of the proposed amendment and a clear statement of what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish. Include the name(s) of the Comprehensive Plan Element(s) (Land Use, Transportation, etc) you propose to amend.*

   This amendment would simply restore to today's Comprehensive Plan the original section L61 that was in the first Comprehensive Plan as adopted in 1994. The City originally committed, and with this reinstatement would again commit, to do the following (slightly shortened here, and with underlining to show what is proposed):

   1. <u>Monitor development activity annually to identify situations where the rate of growth is different from that anticipated by growth targets, either because: (a) it is occurring too rapidly and may be disruptive; or (b) there is insufficient growth to achieve planned conditions in designated villages.</u>
   2. <u>Initiate a special review procedure which should include a review process with the affected community that shall consider the following, or other appropriate actions, if a determination is made that action is needed to address the rate of growth:</u>

      a. <u>Provide resources to ensure rapid completion or revision of a neighborhood plan to better address how growth is to be attracted or discouraged;</u>
      b. <u>Propose rezone actions or changes to development standards to reduce development activity, or, depending on the circumstances, increase development opportunities;</u>
      c. <u>Make commitments for specific public improvements to mitigate the impacts of added growth or as incentives to attract desired growth; and/or</u>
      d. <u>Establish annual development targets to more closely monitor the rate of growth in the affected area.</u>

[Note on source: The City Council passed Seattle's original Comprehensive Plan on July 25, 1994 as Ordinance #117221. The only on-line version of the ordinance is a PDF scan: http://clerk.seattle.gov/~archives/Ordinances/Ord_117221.pdf (not searchable). Within the document, Section L-61 can be found on the original pages 29-30, or pages 35-36 as assigned by the PDF format.]

2. *Describe how the issue is currently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. If the issue is not adequately addressed, describe the need for it.*

   Reinstating section L-61 from the original Comprehensive Plan is urgently needed now because its repeal in the late 1990s--done by the Mayor and City Council of that era without real notice to or consultation with the public--upset the balance between growth and livability that made the urban villages approach widely acceptable.

   The 37 neighborhoods that the 1994 Comprehensive Plan designated as urban villages and urban centers were promised that, via neighborhood planning, they could take or leave their urban village or urban center classification. All accepted to remain as urban villages or urban centers, largely on the promise that while growth would come, it was to be at no more than a level consistent with livability; that public investments would bring public investments in amenities; and that growth expectations for some urban villages would be scaled back and others increased if growth turned out to be poorly distributed across Seattle and if livability were under threat.

   The most important part of the promise made to the urban villages by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan ordinance was its section L-61 which established a strong process whereby areas that had met their growth targets could count on City officials to pause further growth to ensure that sufficient amenities were mitigating the impacts felt so far. If further growth in a particular urban village or urban center proved not acceptable or sustainable, that neighborhood could count on City officials to call a halt to further growth there and to direct it elsewhere.

   Unfortunately, in one of the baldest “bait and switch” maneuvers in Seattle history, the then Mayor and City Council within years gutted section L-61, leaving the urban villages with unbalanced growth and little faith that livability would be more than a slogan. In an Orwellian reversal of meaning, the “urban village strategy” increasingly became a way to deny to urban villages and urban centers the balancing protections for village-like livability that they were promised by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and especially its now-lost section L-61.

3. *Describe why the proposed change meets the criteria adopted in Resolution 30662 for considering an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. (The criteria are listed at the end of this application form.) Is a Comprehensive Plan amendment the best means for meeting the identified public need? What other options are there for meeting the identified public need?*

   Section L-61 was a promise crucial to passage of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and its quiet repeal was a broken promise of biblical proportions. Reinstating section L-61 is essential to save the Comprehensive Plan from being just a growth program and from the division that stems from it being recognized as such. Attempts outside the Comprehensive Plan to balance growth with livability and to reassure the public that its concerns are heard have not worked and will not work; only by reinstating section L-61 in the Plan can the Mayor and City

Council restore the balance and trust under which the urban centers and urban villages were originally established.

Of course, that section L-61 was once in the Comprehensive Plan means that it has already been fully vetted by the Law Department, so is available to be quickly reinstated after being so unwisely and unfairly removed.

4. *What do you anticipate will be the impacts caused by the change in text, including the geographic area affected and the issues presented? Why will the proposed change result in a net benefit to the community?*

   Amending the Comprehensive Plan as proposed here--not adding something new, but restoring the values and the checks and balances that inspired the Plan's original 1994 adoption--will ensure that growth is made livable and acceptable for those who live or work in the urban villages and urban centers. Producing more balanced and sustainable development via section L-61 will increase the public's buy-in. By thus reversing the backlash against growth, the proposed amendment will make growth truly sustainable.

5. *How would the proposed change comply with the community vision statements, goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan? Please include any data, research, or reasoning that supports the proposed amendments*.

   The Comprehensive Plan's statements of vision, goals, objectives, and policies still widely speak about livability and public involvement, but too often they now are only words that are contradicted on the ground by rapacious growth, by government's deafness to public concerns, and by the lack of current tools to balance growth with livability. Restoring the balance and assurance of the section L-61 process will redeem the current Comp Plan's best claims to livability and democracy and will rescue them from empty irrelevance.

6. *Is there public support for this proposed text amendments (i.e. have you conducted community meetings, etc.)? Note: The City will provide a public participation process, public notice, and environmental review for all applications*.

   Growth will not be sustained for long if those most affected by it, in urban villages and urban centers, believe (as increasing numbers do) that public officials aren't serious about balancing growth with livability nor do these officials have their welfare at heart. The public yearns for the true, open, and voluntary compromise struck by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and by the promise in section L-61 of fair treatment that was so unjustly snatched back within a few years of the Plan's first adoption. Reinstating the previous balance and trust into today's Comprehensive Plan is not only widely supported by the public; it is the only way to avert a worsening backlash against growth and a loss of faith in officialdom.