

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. If May 15th falls on a week end, the deadline is the Friday closest to that date. Any proposals received after May 15th will be considered in the review process for the following year.

(Please Print or Type)

Date: May 13, 2016

Applicant: Robert Scully, Office of Planning and Community Development

Mailing Address: 700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000 / P.O. Box 34019

City: Seattle State: WA Zip: 98124-4019 Phone: (206)233-3854

Email: robert.scully@seattle.gov

Contact person (if not the applicant):

Mailing Address:

Email:

City: State: Zip: Phone:

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

Chinatown/International District Urban Center Village

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

Acceptance of this application does not guarantee final approval.

Applicant Signature: _____



Date: _____

MAY 13, 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.

Answer to question 1:

Proposed amendments to Cultural and Economic Vitality Policies for the Chinatown/International District Urban Center Village:

New ID-P1: This new policy responds to the Chinatown/International District's desire to use an integrative cultural ecodistrict framework to coordinate various plans, programs and projects by community and City departments in the neighborhood. The cultural ecodistrict framework is based on the EcoDistricts Protocol and Certification Standards. The cultural ecodistricts framework will complement the Chinatown/International District Neighborhood Plan responding to rapid change and development pressures occurring in Downtown and South Downtown. The policy will help establish the cultural ecodistrict framework as the organizing principle for implementation and will help the community and City advance equitable development goals for the neighborhood.

Revised ID-P6 (formerly ID-P5): A multipurpose community center has been built and is operated by Seattle Parks and Recreation. A branch library has also been built next door and is operated by Seattle Public Libraries. The revised policy responds to the community's desire for equitable access to these and other public amenities by all Chinatown/International District residents and employees, especially those who fall within lower income levels.

New ID-P8: This new policy will help strengthen equity and anti-displacement efforts in Chinatown/International District. The Comprehensive Plan's Growth and Equity analysis identifies Chinatown/International District as one of the highest displacement risk neighborhoods in Seattle. The proposed policy will provide direction for achieving strategies to increase availability of affordable commercial space for local businesses, organizations and institutions that help define the unique cultural character of the neighborhood.

New ID-P9: This new policy responds to the community's desire for urban design and business retention strategies to retain and strengthen Little Saigon's unique cultural identity that is crucial for its economic, social and cultural well-being.

a. If the amendment is to an existing Comprehensive Plan goal or policy, and you have specific language you would like to be considered, please show proposed amendments in "line in/line out" format with text to be added indicated by underlining, and text to be deleted indicated with strikeouts.

Answer to question 1a:

CULTURAL & ECONOMIC VITALITY POLICIES

ID-P1 Support the Chinatown/International District community's effort to develop a cultural ecodistrict framework to strategically coordinate plans, programs and projects to better support thriving businesses, organizations and cultural institutions in Chinatown, Japantown and Little Saigon areas.

ID-P1P2 Support marketing activities that promote neighborhood businesses, events, and cultural opportunities.

ID-P2P3 Work with the Chinatown/International District community to develop business improvement strategies to encourage greater customer patronage of individual businesses.

ID-P3P4 Encourage new business development and location within the neighborhood.

ID-P4P5 Emphasize nighttime activity to tap into a new market for businesses.

ID-P5P6 ~~Support development of a~~ Enable greater access for Chinatown/International District residents and employees to the neighborhood's multipurpose community recreation center, library with space for community programs and associations and other public amenities.

ID-P6P7 Improve utility infrastructure, when appropriate, to support community needs.

ID-P8 Work with the Chinatown/International District to develop strategies to ensure availability of affordable commercial space in Chinatown, Japantown and Little Saigon areas.

ID-P9 Work with the Little Saigon community on strategies to strengthen its culturally based neighborhood identity.

b. If the proposed amendment would also require a change to the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC), please indicate the SMC section(s) needing amendment. If you have specific language you would like to be considered, please show proposed edits to the SMC in "line in/line out" format as described above.

Answer to question 1b: N/A

c. If the amendment is to the Future Land Use Map, please provide a map that clearly outlines the area proposed to be changed.

Answer to question 1c: N/A

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

Answer to question 2:

New ID-P1: Not adequately addressed in Comprehensive Plan. Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon community development organizations are in need of an organizing framework to help them achieve a more coordinated and integrated approach to implementation of plans, programs and projects that are consistent with the other Comprehensive Plan goals and policies for the neighborhood. The cultural ecodistricts framework provides a structured approach for coordinated action.

Revised ID-P6 (formerly ID-P5): Not adequately addressed in Comprehensive Plan. The policy needs to be updated to reflect completion of the community center and to address community concerns about equitable access to this and other public amenities in the neighborhood. Existing Accessibility Goal (ID-G4) and Policies (ID-P15, ID-P16, ID-P17, ID-P18) address transportation access and not equitable access to public amenities.

New ID-P8: Not adequately addressed in Comprehensive Plan. Affordable commercial space is an important factor in preventing displacement of local businesses that define the cultural character of Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon and serve a citywide and regional Asian American population.

New ID-P9: Not adequately addressed in Comprehensive Plan. There are no Comprehensive Plan policies that address Little Saigon including its culturally based neighborhood identity which is important in the business district's social life and economic development.

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?

Answer to question 3:

The proposed change described in this application meet the criteria of Resolution 30662 and consists of amendments to existing Comprehensive Plan policies from the Chinatown/International District Neighborhood Plan completed in 1999. The amendments are newly proposed and have not been previously rejected. City staff is currently working with the Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon on the issues addressed by the proposed policy amendments. This is an appropriate time to update the Chinatown/International District Goals & Policies and the community and City Staff will be able to provide the City Council with sufficient information in the coming year to make their decision. The proposed amendments support the Four Core Values of the Comprehensive Plan, especially Race and Social Equity, Economic Opportunity & Security, and Community. The proposed policy amendments are also consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Equity Analysis and Equitable Development Implementation Plan. The proposed policy amendments are not regulatory measures, requests for budget allocations or decisions on existing programs. The proposed policy amendments are could provide direction for future zoning and other regulatory amendments, technical assistance

and budget decisions that would help advance equitable community development in Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon.

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?

Answer to question 4:

New ID-P1: The net benefit of this policy will be more effective and strategic implementation by coordinated community development organizations and the City of Seattle

Revised ID-P6 (formerly ID-P5): The net benefit will be equitable access of the community center, library and other amenities by Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon residents, employees and others.

New ID-P8: The net benefit will be less displacement of local businesses that help define the cultural character of Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon.

New ID-P9: The net benefit will be a Little Saigon with a stronger physical, social and cultural character that could also improve its economic viability and public safety.

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.

Answer to question 5:

New ID-P1: The proposed policy will help strengthen the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies for Cultural & Economic Vitality, Safe & Dynamic Public Spaces, Accessibility by providing a policy base for coordinated implementation by community development organizations and the City of Seattle.

Revised ID-P6 (formerly ID-P5): The revision to this policy is an update and also addresses current community concerns gathered by the Seattle Chinatown International District PDA about equitable access to the Chinatown/International District Community Center, Library and other public amenities.

New ID-P8: The proposed policy is consistent with the findings of the "Little Saigon & Chinatown/International District, Impacts on Local Businesses from the Proposed Land Use/Zoning Changes and Dearborn Street Mixed-Use Shopping Center" study conducted in 2007 that included extensive input by Chinatown/ID/Little Saigon businesses and community members on the need for affordable commercial space in the neighborhood.

New ID-P9: The proposed policy is consistent with the goals of the Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan and was also expressed during the community engagement process for the Livable South Downtown Planning Study. The proposed policy also reflects input from the Friends of Little

Saigon and community members during the course of OPCD's ongoing Little Saigon Business District Planning project.

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.

Answer to question 6:

New ID-P1: OPCD staff has worked with staff from Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation & Development Authority and Interlm CDA on preliminary analysis and scoping for the cultural ecodistrict framework. SCIDpda and Interlm are convening Chinatown/International District/Little Saigon community based organizations to refine the scope and process.

Revised ID-P6 (formerly ID-P5): The revision to this policy is an update and also addresses current community concerns gathered by the Seattle Chinatown International District PDA about equitable access to the Chinatown/International District Community Center, Library and other public amenities.

New ID-P8: The proposed policy is consistent with the findings of the "Little Saigon & Chinatown/International District, Impacts on Local Businesses from the Proposed Land Use/Zoning Changes and Dearborn Street Mixed-Use Shopping Center" study conducted in 2007 that included extensive input by Chinatown/ID/Little Saigon businesses and community members on the need for affordable commercial space in the neighborhood.

New ID-P9: The proposed policy reflects input from the Friends of Little Saigon and community members during the course of OPCD's ongoing Little Saigon Business District Planning project.

Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendment Selection (from Resolution 30662)

The following criteria will be used in determining which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will be given further consideration:

A. The amendment or policy is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan because:

- The amendment is not appropriate as a regulatory measure, and warrants a Comprehensive Plan amendment;
- The amendment is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision;
- The amendment is not better addressed through another planning process, such as neighborhood planning; or
- The Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates the amendment as part of the 10-year update.

B. The amendment is legal the amendment meets existing state and local laws.

C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:

- The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information necessary to make an informed decision;
- City staff will be able to conduct sufficient analysis and to develop policy and any related development regulations within the available time frame;
- The proposed amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council is interested in significantly changing existing policy;
- The amendment has not been recently rejected; and

D. If the proposed change is to neighborhood plan policies, there has been a neighborhood review process to develop the proposal, or a neighborhood review process can be conducted prior to final Council consideration of the amendment

E. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.