



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Planning and Development

Diane M. Sugimura, Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Chair, PLUS Committee

FROM: Diane M. Sugimura

DATE: July 1, 2014

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Docketing Resolution: DPD Recommendation

DPD staff have reviewed all the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment suggestions submitted to the City Council for this year's annual amendment cycle and applied the docketing criteria from Council Resolution 31402 (attached) to guide their review. These criteria inform whether proposed amendments are appropriate and ripe for Council to consider. Of the eleven proposals received, four are recommended to move forward for further analysis. Seven are not recommended to move forward, based on the review criteria.

This is an unusual year for the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle because the City is currently engaged in Seattle 2035, a major update of the Comprehensive Plan. That process is considering substantive and format changes across many aspects of the Plan and is scheduled for Council consideration in June 2015. Since the state Growth Management Act limits the City to making amendments to the Comp Plan to once a year, items that Council includes on this year's docket will be reviewed by staff as part of the Seattle 2035 process, and the Executive will forward recommendations about those items to Council with other recommendations resulting from the major update.

Recommended to Move Forward This Year

The amendments we recommend for further analysis are summarized in the table below. Amendments proposed by DPD last year and deferred by the Council until this cycle, including those related to industrial land use, a new Stadium District designation, and changes to the University Community Urban Center Plan, will be considered as part of the Comprehensive Plan's major update. Other subarea plans currently in process in Ballard, Lake City and Uptown may produce recommended amendments to neighborhood plans for those areas in time to be included with the major update recommendations.

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments

| Proponent | Summary | Consistent with Docketing Criteria |
|--------------|---|---|
| Cindi Barker | Growth Monitoring and Evaluation Policies | It is appropriate to address the proposal through the Comprehensive Plan because the proposal concerns monitoring growth, the management of which is the primary focus of the Comprehensive Plan. |
| King County | Public Facilities | It is appropriate to address the proposal through the Comprehensive Plan because the proposal concerns a specific policy in the Plan. |

Future Land Use Map Amendments

| Proponent | Summary | Consistent with Docketing Criteria |
|---|---|---|
| Terry Mattson, West Seattle Nazarene Church | Modify FLUM designation of two parcels from single-family to multi-family | Proposals to change the Future Land Use Map are appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and cannot be accomplished through any other process. The proposal has strong community support. |
| Sue Sherbrooke, CEO, YWCA of Seattle | Change boundary of residential urban village to include adjacent parcel | Proposals to change the Future Land Use Map are appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and cannot be accomplished through any other process. The proposal is consistent with the recent changes to the community plan which was developed through an extensive community process. |

Recommendation NOT to Move Forward at This Time

DPD recommends that several proposals not move forward at this time. These proposals are identified below. The docketing criteria that they do not meet are identified.

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments

| Proponent | Summary | Consistent with Docketing Criteria |
|-------------|---|--|
| Greg Hill | Live-Work Policy. Would prohibit live-work development in certain locations in and near urban villages. | Better addressed through a Land Use Code amendment or DPD's sub-area planning processes |
| Chris Leman | Open and Participatory Government Element. Would add a new element to the Comp Plan with the purpose of maximizing "the possibility of public input before decisions are made." The element would specify processes for the Mayor, City Council, City Attorney, Municipal Court, Hearing Examiner, Seattle Channel, boards, commissions, City web sites and City documents. | This amendment has been considered and rejected for the last five annual amendment cycles. |
| Chris Leman | Congregate Housing Policies. Would limit the location of congregate housing to university major institution | Better addressed through a Land Use Code amendment or DPD's sub-area planning processes |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| | overlays, except for special needs populations, and would establish design criteria for these developments. | |
| Chris Leman | Skybridge Policies. Would discourage new pedestrian skybridges over City streets, except where approved by an adopted neighborhood plan. | This amendment has been considered and rejected in the 2012-2013 annual amendment cycle. Permitting of skybridges is governed by existing Code provisions in SMC 15.64, including review by the Seattle Design Commission. |

Future Land Use Map Amendments

| Proponent | Summary | Consistent with Docketing Criteria |
|--|--|---|
| Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance, Blessed Sacrament Parish, Judith Wirth and Nancy Bocek: co-applicants | University Playground/University Community Urban Center. Would add the Blessed Sacrament property to the Urban Center and would remove LR-1 zoned land south of NE 50 th from the Urban Center. | This is better addressed through DPD's ongoing sub-area planning process in the U District Urban Design work. |
| Jessica Clawson on behalf of Matthew Laase | East Ballard. Would remove approximately six blocks of industrial property located east of 15 th and south of Market St. from the Ballard/Interbay Manufacturing/Industrial Center and redesignate that land for mixed-use/commercial purposes. | This amendment is better addressed through the ongoing Ballard UDF and DPD's 2014 follow up to the 2013 Industrial Lands Study. |
| Jessica Clawson on behalf of AnMarCo | Pier One. Would remove the Pier 1 site (south of Salty's restaurant in West Seattle) from the Manufacturing/industrial Center and change the designation from industrial to mixed-use/commercial. | This amendment has been considered and rejected in the 2011-2012 cycle, as well as in earlier cycles. |

If you have questions about these recommendations, you may contact Kristian Kofoed of my staff at (206) 233-7191.

Attachment

Criteria for Amendment Selection, Resolution 31402. The City Council considers a variety of criteria in determining whether a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment will be placed on the amendment docket for a given year. Among those criteria are the following:

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

1. It is consistent with the role of the Comprehensive Plan under the State Growth Management Act;
2. It is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2040 strategy;
3. Its intent cannot be accomplished by a change in regulations alone;
4. It is not better addressed as a budgetary or programmatic decision; and
5. It is not better addressed through another process, such as neighborhood planning.

B. The amendment is legal under state and local law.

C. It is practical to consider the amendment because:

1. The timing of the amendment is appropriate and Council will have sufficient information to make an informed decision;
2. City staff will be able to develop within the time available the text for the Comprehensive Plan and, if necessary, amendments to the Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review;
3. The amendment is consistent with the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan and well-established Comprehensive Plan policy, or the Mayor or Council wishes to consider changing the vision or established policy; and
4. The amendment has not been recently rejected by the City Council.

D. If the amendment would change a neighborhood plan, it either is the result of a neighborhood review process or can be reviewed by such a process 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.