



## 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.

The procedures by which Seattle's "share" of new housing and job targets are determined and subsequently approved is not transparent and not well understood by Seattle citizens. These target numbers are the foundation for significant changes in the environmental, physical, and cultural landscape of the city and its individual neighborhoods. The process of reviewing and updating growth targets should become part of a predictable and more frequent process that is open to public comment and influence. Public involvement is a cornerstone of the *Growth Management Act* and this new policy would improve citizen access to information and involvement in key decisions that implement regional growth management policies.

### **New Policy in the Urban Village Element Section B. Distribution of Growth**

**Total city wide jobs and housing targets and neighborhood-level allocations shall be adopted or adjusted as a part of each annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment cycle.**

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

Policy UV 43 currently calls for adjustments of growth targets "at least" every ten years to reflect state and county 20-year growth estimates but in practice the process of review is not open to public involvement. This policy is insufficient since *adjusting* growth targets once a decade is not adequate to keep pace with growth related impacts, and this policy does not provide for sufficient public input into **determining** the growth targets initially. Since these targets reflect a negotiated allocation among regional centers (per the PSRC Vision 2040 Plan) the Seattle officials responsible for this negotiation should benefit from public consultation and input before the targets are set or adjustments made at the regional level.

Policy UV44 requires monitoring the effects of growth or lack thereof every three years and broadly communicating the results of that monitoring. This does not occur. The process of updating all neighborhood plans on a regular basis as a means of monitoring and adjusting for growth has fallen by the wayside. When citizens seek out information about growth trends they are surprised to learn that new growth targets are

Attachment A

periodically added to the baseline for urban villages and centers with no corresponding citizen consultation.

The proposed amendment does not conflict with either of these policies but would enhance compliance with both by linking their implementation to the established annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment process.

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?

The proposal sets policy level direction on par with other technical policies in the Distribution of Growth section of the Comprehensive Plan.

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?

The proposed change would foster broad citizen input into a significant policy decision on growth targets to which they are currently excluded. It would have the beneficial effect of broadening the scope of the City Council's responsibility in setting reviewing and adjusting growth targets rather than merely accepting the results of another jurisdiction's decision (King County.)

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 Seattle Comprehensive Plan includes many goals and policies about accommodating growth in a way that respects citizen choices, is consistent with our ability to fund the necessary infrastructure, and enhances the quality of life in Seattle's many and diverse neighborhoods. The likelihood of realizing these goals would be greatly increased if Seattle citizens had a process for influencing the growth targets and their regional allocation rather than reacting to them after the fact. Seattle's current population is 608,660. The PSRC forecasts an additional 550,000 population by 2040 to be allocated between the 5 regional centers of Bellevue, Bremerton, Everett, Seattle and Tacoma. If the growth among these centers continues at the same percent distribution as the last 10 years, Seattle would have to make room for 330,000 new residents. This will have profound impacts and Seattle citizens should have the opportunity to address these regional growth targets. Since the 7-year Comprehensive Plan Update process remains largely a mystery at this point, the CNC strongly urges the Council to accept a review of these numbers in the 2011-2012 update cycle and not postpone discussion any longer. Our amendment fosters this objective.

Attachment A

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.

The City Neighborhood Council (CNC), consisting of representatives of the city's 13 District Councils, authorized this amendment proposal at their April 25, 2011 meeting on the recommendation of the CNC Neighborhood Planning Committee.

END

### **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
  - 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.

Attachment A