

City of Seattle
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION

Use this application to propose an amendment to the goals, 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 (sent electronically to: compplan@seattle.gov) 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: 5/15/20

Email: cleman@oo.net

Street Address: 2370 Yale Avenue East

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip: 98102-3310

Phone: 206-322-5463

Contact person (if not the applicant): none

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

Seattle as a whole

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: 5/15/20

REQUIRED QUESTIONNAIRE: Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application

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.*

In the Land Use section of the Citywide Planning element, adopt the following two Land Use Policies:

- “Establish zone and rezone criteria and procedures that will guide decisions about which zone will provide the best match for the characteristics of an area and will most clearly further City goals.”
 - “Ensure that zoning, rezones and conditional uses are done with public notice, outreach, and inclusiveness; and with a regard for local conditions, community preferences and neighborhood plans.”
2. *For amendments to goals and policies only: Describe how the issue is currently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. Why is a change needed?*

From its adoption in 1994 until the 2016 amendments, the Comp Plan contained guidance regarding zoning and rezoning criteria and for conditional uses. However, in the 2016 amendments, this guidance was repealed by, for example, the deletion of policies LU1, LU3, LU5, LU76, and LU164. In their place, the Comp Plan’s process and substance guidance is mainly limited to the following definitions (pp. 191-98):

Zones: Designations adopted by City ordinance and applied to areas of land to specify allowable

Rezone criteria: A set of considerations specified in the Land Use Code that helps determine the appropriate locations for applying the City’s various zoning designations.

Conditional use: A use that may locate within a zone only upon taking measures to address issues that may make the use detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare, or issues that may impair the integrity and character of the zoned district.

These definitions do not provide meaningful guidance in the process and substance of zoning, rezone, and conditional use decisions. Such guidance is now lacking in the Comprehensive Plan. This lack of guidance is not sustainable, and invites public distrust of the City’s decisions on zoning, rezones, and conditional uses. The proposed policy amendment would restore guidance for the process and substance of decisions on zones, rezones and conditional uses.

3. *Describe why the proposed change meets the criteria adopted in Resolution 31807 which sets criteria for Council to consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.*

This proposed policy amendment fully meets all of the criteria of Res. 31807. It is consistent with the Growth Management Act, with state and local law, and with countywide and multicounty policies; it cannot be addressed through regulations, budgets, programs, or neighborhood planning; it meets the four elements of practicality; and it is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.

4. *What other options are there for meeting the goal or objectives of the amendment? Why is a Comprehensive Plan amendment needed to meet the goals or objectives?*

The current problem is precisely that the Comprehensive Plan lacks guidance for the process and substance of zoning, rezones, and conditional uses. Addressing this problem in any way other than amending the Comp Plan is therefore impossible. From its first adoption in 1994 until its revision in 2016, the Comp Plan included specific policies and goals to guide the process and substance of zones, rezones and conditional uses. The proposed policy amendment is needed in order to restore to the Comp Plan its central role in guiding the process and substance for how the Land Use Code addresses zoning, rezones, and conditional uses.

Adopting this policy amendment into the Comp Plan provides unique and irreplaceable stability to the City and to the public because the Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) provides for any local Comprehensive Plan certain procedural protections that are present in no other City legislation. The Comp Plan by state law can be amended only once a year, and then only under legally enforceable process requirements.

5. *What do you anticipate will be the impacts of the proposed amendment, including impacts to the geographic area affected? Why will the proposed change result in a net benefit to the community? Please include any data, research, or analysis that supports the proposed amendments.*

The proposed policy will restore to the Comp Plan its role of providing process and substantive guidance in zoning, rezone and conditional uses decisions. In doing so, it will restore the Comp Plan to its rightful place of guiding these decisions. The result will be better land use decisions, and greater public trust in these decisions.

6. *How does the proposed amendment support the existing goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan? If the proposal would change existing goals and policies or add new goals and policies to the Comprehensive Plan, describe how the proposed amendment is consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act (<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=36.70A>), the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 (<http://www.psrc.org/growth/vision2040/>), and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (<http://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/executive/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/CPPs.aspx>).*

The proposed policy amendment gives meaning to the Comprehensive Plan as a document that truly governs the City's process and substantive decisions on land use. It is completely consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act, the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies.

7. *Is there public support for this proposed amendment? If the amendment would change the Future Land Use Map or a Neighborhood Plan, please list any meetings that you have held with the community about the amendment. If the amendment would have a citywide impact, please list any organizations that you have discussed the amendment with. Notes: You may attach letters of support for the amendment. The City will provide public notice and opportunity for public comment, 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 and that these officials are more solicitous of the wishes of developers than of the welfare of their own constituents. Over many years, an important contributor to public trust has been the Comp Plan's process and substantive guidance for decisions on zones, rezones, and conditional uses. It was a step backward in this trust relationship that the 2016 amendments removed this policy guidance. 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.

8. *Has the proposed amendment been considered before by the Council? If so, when was it considered and what was the outcome? If the amendment has been previously rejected, please explain either:*

- *How the proposal has changed since it was last rejected, or*
- *Changed circumstances since the proposal was last considered that support reconsideration of the proposal*

The proposed amendment was proposed to the City Council in the 2017 and 2019 amendment cycles. It was not docketed for study, and we have been unable to find any evidence that this decision involved any analysis or discussion by City Councilmembers or staff, the Executive Branch, or the Planning Commission.

- end -