

#5

**CITY OF SEATTLE**  
**RESOLUTION 31451**

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

A RESOLUTION calling for a revised schedule for the mandated periodic review and update of the City's Comprehensive Plan; and amending Resolution 31370.

WHEREAS, Resolution 31370, adopted in May 2012, stated that the Executive should generally adhere to a schedule for the state-mandated periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan (also known as the "major update") that reflected a phased approach to the update; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle Planning Commission ("Commission") has argued that the phased approach may result in the need to revisit much of what is adopted in the first phase, and therefore the phased approach may be inefficient in achieving important objectives of the update, namely, increasing clarity, removing redundancy and ensuring relevance to the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Commission therefore recommended that the Mayor and Council reconsider the phased approach to the major update and provide resources and staff for a more appropriate approach to reviewing and, if needed, updating this vital policy framework; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Planning and Development has also proposed to redirect staff resources for a consolidated rather than phased approach to the major update of the Comprehensive Plan; NOW, THEREFORE,

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE, THE  
MAYOR CONCURRING, THAT:**

Section 1. Section 5 of Resolution 31370 is amended as follows:

To facilitate review by the public and the Council, the Executive should generally adhere to the following schedule:

Fall 2012: Recommend for early 2013 City Council action, as part of the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process, amendments adding more explicit urban design considerations; policies related to the City's Climate Action Plan; policies regarding appropriate development types and densities near existing and planned transit investments; and policies that encourage equitable access to healthy food.



1           2013: Develop background analysis, ~~((identify particular issues,))~~ work with City  
2 departments to identify citywide policy issues requiring further review~~((;))~~, and request public  
3 comments on key issues. ~~((Reconfigure online Plan format to improve readability, cross-~~  
4 ~~references and topical searching. Develop appropriate recommendations for further amendments~~  
5 ~~resulting from the Executive's review and recommend those to City Council as part of the annual~~  
6 ~~amendment cycle, as appropriate, for Council consideration in early 2014.))~~ Identify alternative  
7 approaches to planning for growth and assess the need to prepare an environmental impact  
8 statement (EIS). If needed, determine the appropriate scope of that EIS, seek public comment on  
9 it and engage a consultant to assist in its preparation.

10           ~~((Spring 2014: Publish draft revised Comprehensive Plan, including new citywide~~  
11 ~~growth expectations and appropriate policy revisions, for public review and comment; begin~~  
12 ~~environmental review of proposed changes to the Plan not already adopted by Council as part of~~  
13 ~~the 2013 and 2014 annual amendments.~~

14           ~~Fall 2014: Submit Recommended Comprehensive Plan to Council.))~~

15           2014: Continue public outreach. Develop a set of draft revisions to the Plan. In the spring,  
16 if an EIS is needed, publish a draft EIS for public review and comment. In the fall, issue the  
17 preferred Plan and, if an EIS was needed, publish the final EIS.

18           Late 2014 or early 2015: Submit Recommended Comprehensive Plan to Council.

19           2015: Council consideration of updated Plan in first half of year and vote by June 30.

20  
21           Section 2. Section 6 of Resolution 31370 is amended as follows:

22           ~~((The Executive and City Council should review amendments suggested as part of the~~  
23 ~~annual Comprehensive Plan processes for 2013 and 2014 to determine whether those~~  
24 ~~amendments fit with the schedule and guidance described in this resolution.))~~



1           Adopted by the City Council the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013, and  
2 signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this \_\_\_\_\_ day  
3 of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.

4 \_\_\_\_\_  
5 President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

6  
7 THE MAYOR CONCURRING:

8  
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 Michael McGinn, Mayor

11  
12 Filed by me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.

13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

16  
17 (Seal)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



**FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Contact Person/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Analyst/Phone:</b>
Legislative	Peter Harris / 684-8368	n.a.

**Legislation Title:**

A RESOLUTION calling for a revised schedule for the mandated periodic review and update of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

**Summary of the Legislation:**

This resolution amends Resolution 31370, which stated that the Executive should generally adhere to a schedule for a major update of the Comprehensive Plan that reflected a phased approach to the update. This resolution would call for a new schedule reflecting a consolidated approach, following the recommendations of the Seattle Planning Commission.

**Background:**

Please check one of the following:

**This legislation does not have any financial implications.**

**Other Implications:**

a) **Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?**

If the new schedule for the update leads to different Comprehensive Plan goals and policies than otherwise would have been the case, there may be indirect financial implications and other long-term implications, but these cannot be known now.

b) **What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?**

None.

c) **Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**

No.

d) **What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?**



None.

**e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

No.

**f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**

No.

**g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

No.

**h) Other Issues:**

**List attachments to the fiscal note below:**