Laurelhurst Community Club

Serving.Seattle's.Laurelhurst.Community.since.7586

May 5, 2024

Jim Holmes, Office of Planning & Community Development
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 94788, Seattle, WA, 98124-7088
PCD_CompPlan_EIS@seattle.gov

cc. Michael Hubner, Councilmember Maritza Rivera and Mayor Bruce Harrel

From: Laurelhurst Community Club

RE: One Seattle Comprehensive Plan 2040 Comments

Dear Mr. Holmes and the Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development:

The great cities of both the US and the World have experienced many of the same challenges in planning for future growth. The DRAFT One Seattle Plan document is lengthy but provides a good workable framework for the City to set goals and enact the policies to achieve them over the next 10-year planning cycle.

The Laurelhurst Community Club Council (LCC) represents over 5,000 residents and small businesses in north Seattle, and has examined the One Seattle draft, attended the OPCD outreach meetings and shared input from many non-profit organizations.

LCC has also studied how other large cities in a growth trajectory plan to supply housing units for a range of incomes amidst their housing stock of high cost of market rate homes. Solutions vary from New York City, Vienna, Singapore and Hong Kong in building maximum units on government owned land and/buildings, partnering with private developers to build affordable units within the city (Seattle÷s primary model), offering federal, State and local tax cut exemptions to build more affordable units and building efficient, low cost transportation systems to enable their City÷s work force to live outside city limits at a lower cost of land and housing.

In keeping with One Seattle÷s goals, the best example of transparency for planning and inclusion processes is the City-State of Singapore which does is publicly with a 3-D display of an updated master plan model of the entire city. As it updates development and planning, it delineates its old and new neighborhoods, location of subsidized units, and plans for ”reclamation‘ of new land owned by the government added to its shores. ***How can Seattle÷s OPCD become a more open planning process to all?***

The One Seattle Comprehensive Plan contains noble goals and policies for the next 10+ years. ***However, many of them are very general and should be based upon the***

effectiveness of the positive outcomes of policies of the past 15 years, as well as identify the unintended consequences, and better addressing emerging trends.

Our comments below are focused on: General Goals, Growth Strategy, Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Climate and Environment, Parks and Open Space, Arts and Culture and Community Involvement:

Growth Strategy

The GS G1 Goal of creating complete communities for the inclusive needs of all ages and abilities is the overarching One Seattle Comprehensive Plan.

GS 1.2 Encourages a variety of housing types is lofty to be inclusive and age-in-place but is not specific. ***Has a real estate tax cap for seniors been studied to help predict and manage elders÷tax bills so they can truly age in place?***

GS 1.3 Accommodate non-residential uses in neighborhoods seems counter-productive to building housing stock when many office and commercial buildings sit empty. ***How would this policy prioritize and preserve housing units?***

LCC agrees with building density along existing transit routes, avoiding ECA areas and better planning for transportation, parks and recreation for new planned density areas.

The 2015 Comp Plan was deficient in requiring adequate infrastructure support for density. How does One Seattle plan to finance the needed new infrastructure?

The U District area including the University Village now has over 4,000 new residents and receive almost no City amenity funds, the developments ***and actually closed NE 41st St community center*** nearest because it did not meet a body mass and racial profile. ***How can the City meet the increased facility needs with its plans for adding 100,000 more residents?***

LCC supports GS 1.4 and GS 1.9 which calls for the City policy to match dense housing in Regional and Urban centers with MORE public amenities.

LCC supports GS G2 Seattle÷s development pattern that results in a range of vibrant places that all play a role in housing and jobs.

LCC supports GS 2.1 Use the FLUM to guide land use regulation (adding no exceptions)

GS 2.2 Require FLUM amendments only intended to change the intended function.

How can FLUM amendments be prohibited from piecemeal projects by developers looking for exceptions and departures that cause the overarching plan to disintegrate?

LCC agrees with the description of the place types (page 19, figure 1). Renaming Urban Centers that serve the NW Region and State should be Regional Centers.

Urban Centers utilized by County and City residents and employees fit the new name. LCC strongly supports more Regional and Urban Centers proposed at Northgate and 130th adjacent to the new Light Rail stations and for future ones in West Seattle Junction and adjacent to Light Rail stations through the Rainier Valley. ***Should Aurora Ave be a***

designated Urban Center with a Master Plan for dense housing with commercial and support service amenities e.g grocery stores and pharmacies, that also retains its light industrial and commercial small businesses?

LCC supports GS 4.3 allowing a wide range of housing types, and again would like to add: ***GS 4.6 Do Urban Centers require retaining or anchoring essential large grocers and a child care facility in these zones to make walkable neighborhoods÷?***

Neighborhood Centers (figure 7) would be a new zoning type option to add density and comply with State bill HB 1110 which requires "middle housing' type options with 4-6 units within 1/2-mile walking distance of a major transit center.

GS 5.1 "designate Neighborhood Centers with a commercial core, diverse housing options within walking distance to shops, services and transit'. LCC agrees that this best complies with HB 1110.

GS5.2 Allow all types of diverse housing types and services. LCC disagrees that it should be centered on institutional services. Larger-scale services should be in Urban Centers.

GS 5.3-Zoning heights 3-6 stories. ***Why are 5-6 stories the goal for Neighborhood Centers, which double the existing height limits? LCC suggests heights should be 2-4 stories maximum as suggested in HB 1110 to conform to existing heights. These denser units that would better transition to existing while doubling housing units.***

Add: GS 5.6 Why isn÷t there an OPCD and/or SDCI code change that Neighborhood Centers require a "Master Plan' to ensure context sensitive scale and aesthetic compatibility to adjacent existing buildings, especially residences?

Urban Neighborhoods- Seattle÷s neighborhoods are the heart of the City. People ask "what÷s your neighborhood' to start a fun conversation, and they support community building throughout the City.

GS 6.1 Designate Urban Neighborhoods primarily for residential development. LCC agrees that some areas need to be designated as quiet places to rest and enjoy, away from the noise and traffic in urban cities.

GS 6.2 Allow 4-6 stories near frequent transit. LCC disagrees and that is covered in all of the other zones, especially in Neighborhood Centers. ***Building 4-6 stories is out-of-scale and lacks the adequate infrastructure to build heavy density in this low density area. HB 1110 requires building more units in existing zoning to add "Middle housing' and does not call for adding heights or changing setbacks in those zones and better transitions at its edges.***

Major Institutions

LCC agrees with using the Major Institutions GS 8 Master Plan processes for managing their growth and uses that are needed within those boundaries as approved.

Parks and Open Space

Because the Park and open Space lands are not expanding with the rapid population growth.

GS 9.3 ”Allow housing in the parks and open space …only where it is located within a community center or pool‘. ***What statute in the City codes allow Seattle to change parklands to housing? LCC rejects this hijacking public open spaces and converting it to private residences, even if City owned. It is not compatible and removes limited public space when housing can be built elsewhere.***

GS 9.4 Allow limited commercial use to activate existing buildings. LCC supports this as operating some recreational uses require expertise from commercial operators.

Area Planning

GS G10 .4 and GS 10.8 ”Prioritize City resources for area planning for Regional and Urban Centers with a higher risk of displacement‘ ***What policies in the City~~s~~ Land Use code provide long-term housing displacement for vulnerable elders, handicapped and low income residents? LCC agrees to protect existing residents from displacement whose housing costs could be now affordable, but later is too expensive.***

Annexation

GS G11 ”Seattle has established a process for potential annexation of three areas‘.

GS 11.1 ”Designate unincorporated land for potential annexation where it can be easily connected to City services‘. ***LCC agrees*** but cautions that any new annexation should be in similar condition to the levels of Seattle so that annexation does not cause an excess outflow of resources from the City of Seattle.

Add: GS 11.2 ***Is permanent affordable prioritized when creating ”new land‘ from potential”lids‘ over transportation corridors?*** Singapore does with proportionally when ”reclaimed‘ land is developed from the sea.

Land Use

LCC agrees with the statement that new zoning and development regulations intended to produce one result can also have unintended consequences, and in particular, displacement of existing residents and small businesses who can be ”priced out‘ of existing locations that they call home.

LCC supports the lofty goals in LU G1, specifically ***”create housing that works for various income levels, ”encourage high quality, well designed and sustainable buildings, protect and enhance the natural environment and mitigate impacts of new construction.***

These are similar to the lofty goals of the 2015 Comp Plan but policies were rarely enforced resulting in rapid infill and increased zoning ”departures‘ from the planned Comp Plan and MHA policies. Many of those projects failed the ”quality, sustainability enhancement of the natural environment and mitigating impacts of new construction‘.

How will projects be considered "high quality÷if SEPA and Design Review are not part of the regulatory process?

Many MHA titled housing units were built with no context to existing structures and zoning, displaced existing residents and small businesses, destroyed existing trees. Developers just wrote a check "in-lieu' into the affordable housing fund to build units far away from existing locations. "Stick trees' were planted onto right of ways and many died which deteriorated the City÷s tree canopy. How can Seattle prevent these unintended outcomes and ensure "stewardship' practices for the replacement trees viability?

The 2021 City of Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment (page 37) chart noted that in ***"Citywide redeveloped parcels', there was a loss of -39.8% in tree canopy***, (and only a -1.4% in undeveloped parcels) which resulted in 33% of the City÷s declining tree canopy of 1.7% from 2016-2021. Which City policies in One Seattle will "protect and enhance the natural environment "? ***How will SDCI define "high quality÷standards and mitigation goals?***

LCC supports:

LU 1.2 Neighborhood business variety nearer to residents

LU 1.3 Apply development standards to protect public health and safety (NO WAIVING Design review)

LU1.5 Balance development standards vs preventing displacement.

LU1.6 Develop residences away from air pollutants.

LU 1.7 Protect displacement in legislative re-zone policies, especially low income and marginalized populations.

LCC has concerns about LU1.1 "a wide variety of housing types in all neighborhoods'. The infrastructure in the City was not built for all densities (eg width of streets, sewer) This was also mentioned as a concern in HB. 1110

Urban Design

LCC strongly supports the goals and policies of the natural environment:

LU G2' Seattle÷s unique character and sense of place, etc and the policies that recognize the importance of retaining Seattle÷s native vegetation, waterways, forests and visual public views of Mt Rainier, the Olympic Mountains and the Cascade Range, as well as lakes, waterways and public shoreline access points.

What new regulatory land use codes will protect public view corridors as developers try to "outview the next one?

And LCC supports polices :LU2.1, LU2.2, LU2.3, LU 2.4, LU2.5. LU 2.6, LU 2.7, LU 2.8.

Built Environnement

LCC strongly supports:

LU 2.9 Encourage preservation of characteristics and features that contribute to communities÷multiple identities including areas of historic, architectural, cultural and social significance.

LU 2.10 creating walkable cultural scapes

LU 2.12 Will the City SDOT have designated ownership and operating plans to develop highway lids and other pathways to reunite neighborhoods?

LU 2.13 and LU 2 .14 Design walkable connections and add natural lighting and rain protection.

LU 2.15 Rooftop production of fresh food is a terrific way to provide local food sources.

LU2.19. Plan to cascade heights to allow for more lower-to-higher views of water and mountains. This is a much better approach than SDCI continuing to allow view blocking with the newest buildings in the 2015 Com Plan.

LU 2.20 Prioritize not allowing negative impacts of tall buildings to block sun and views in public parks and spaces

LCC does not support:

LU 2 16-18. Clustering of tall buildings, which can create ***"built mountains'*** and block public views. ***Which regulatory land use codes and agency define what is a good cluster of tall buildings?***

Public Spaces

LCC supports LU 2.21- LU 2.24 that encourages public spaces designed for a range of users.

USES Goal: LU G3 Allows every use everywhere

Will the City require Master Plans for allowing a variety of uses and some defined use areas to prevent the "Aurora Ave "lack of character and confusing zoning mess?

LCC does not support policies LU 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.6 but supports 3.5 retaining existing nonconforming use.

General Development standards

LU G4 Development standards that match each zone÷s function, protect health and safety and add housing and commercial spaces.

LCC Supports these policies:

LU 4.2-Standards that provide predictability for each zoned

LU 4.3 -Control of massing for compatibility for planned scale and provide open space

LU 4.7 Use setbacks to allow for light air and sunlight

LU 4.8 Use tree preservation requirements to enhance aesthetics, prevent heat islands

LU 4.9-LU 4.14

LU 4.*15 LCC supports protecting the public views through setbacks and establishing zoning blocks that protects key City views.*

LU 4.17 *LCC supports Seismic retrofitting to minimize health risks and retain historic buildings.*

LU 4.18 Can OneSeattle reinstate the use of Design Review to enhance the quality of City development by applying these best practices to "Middle Housing' and to "Affordable Housing' to minimize the stigma of "cheap housing' among its residents?

LU 4.4 and 4.5 —allowing use of maximum heights in the name of limiting *view blockage How does this curb more view blocking throughout the city scape?*

LU 4.16 -*Why are higher heights required when current regulatory codes already provide land use code exceptions to preserve land marks?* Requirement for higher density to preserve landmarks-too broad and not necessarily commensurate with designating a landmark.

Off Street Parking

LU G5 to *plan for alternative transportation modes*

The reality check is that an estimated 80% of Seattle's residents own a car which is the second highest urban car owners in the US. While there has been a small decrease in car ownership as the City becomes more renters than home owners, the OneSeattle must plan for their existence, especially for attracting families..

LCC supports LU 5 5.4, LU 5.5, LU5.6, LU5.7, LU5.8, LU 5.9, and LU 5.11 (for bikes)

LCC has concerns on the LU 5.1, LU 5.2 and LU 5.3 which set limits on parking. Has the City's traffic improved due to fewer cars owned? The free-market system will best sort it out and since it expensive to build, developers will find the number of spaces to meet the needs of the residents of its housing and commercial users.

Public Facilities and Small Institutions

LCC supports LU G6 that public facilities and small institutions must grow to meet the needs of the population if their "mission is compatible with the function and scale of the surrounding area'.

LCC supports LU 6.1 through 6.4

LU 6.5 What is the process for siting essential public facilities and a policy needs to be made in One Seattle as 6.5 is too general?

Telecommunications Facilities

LCC supports LU G7 that allows telecommunication utilities but also requires that they be vetted for public health issues.

LCC supports LU G 7.1- LU 7.5 -restrictions on the location size, mitigation of visual, noise and proximity to communities, and prohibiting locating them in residential zones.

Downtown Zones

LCC supports LU G8 to promote downtown Seattle as its densest neighborhood promoting vitality, tourism and arts and entertainment.

LCC supports all policies e.g. LU 8.4 to encourage a vital 24/7 environment.

Seattle Mixed Zones

LCC supports LU. G9 ***How will the policies of LU 9.1 and LU 9.2 promote density in mixed use zones outside of the downtown core?***

Multifamily Zones

LCC supports ***LU G 10 multifamily zones to provide a variety of scale of household with a mix of incomes and support local walkable neighborhoods where they are located***.

LCC supports LU 10.1 through 10.6, especially requiring "***high quality housing*** and development standards that promote livability and a sense of community, including landscaping and amenities.'. This approach will enable Multifamily zones to be desirable and affordable in forming new desirable neighborhoods of the future.

Commercial Zones

LCC supports LU G 11 -the creation of Commercial zones that support surrounding neighborhoods and encourage long term stable businesses. Robust businesses serve both residents and employees and add to the vibrancy and into the City's tax coffers.

LU 11.1 In the statement "range of commercial zones'. ***What is in the range of commercial activities? More clarity is needed to prevent incompatible development.***

LU11.4 Assigns outright height limits to commercial but then allows different height limits within the zone. Are these lower height limits for transitions to existing 2-3 stories or does it mean grant higher height limits of 4-6 stories?

LU 11.2, and 11.5 state "compatible blend' of housing and commercial and suggest Neighborhood commercial limits on size and heights but does not require the necessary commercial anchor of a grocer with access to fresh produce and protein. How can access to fresh food be incentivized in OneSeattle? Over the past 10 years, NE Seattle has lost two QCF grocery stores (Roosevelt and Wedgwood), and a major Safeway on NE 45th Street while density in residential units exceeded 10,000 more residents with at least 4,000 more units awaiting permits at SDCI. Neighborhood Commercial should only occur where a significant food outlet is a key component because residents cannot live on coffee alone. Requiring a type of Master Plan for these new Neighborhood Centers would help to guide a balanced result in services.

Neighborhood Residential Zones

LU G 12 LCC agrees with this goal to have places in the City for residential zones, which contain various housing options and accommodate a variety of households and income.

LU 12.1, and LU 12.2

LU 12.5 height limits of LR 2 -LR3 to this policy and require to be within 1/2 mile of frequent transit service.)

LU 12.3 -LCC mostly supports these uses. ***How does SDCI prevent and monitor adverse impacts from small institutions and at-home businesses*** to ***protect the livability of residential zones and avoid unintended consequences?*** Dense residential areas should be primarily a refuge from loud City noise and traffic and must be the primary goal.

LU12.4 LCC opposes this vague "development capacity allowance' as it can create out-of-scale buildings with simply adding 4 units of somewhat affordable housing into a general affordable housing pool but leaves negative impacts from excess heights that change the entire character, sunlight and natural public views on existing residences who are compliant with the zone heights.

Industrial Zones

LU G13.1-LU G13.3 LCC supports all of the goals and policies (LU 13.1-LU 13 .39) in the Industrial zoning section, and especially agrees with LU 13.29 and LU 13.30 which requires buffer zones and compatible scale along its edges, particularly to neighborhoods.

LU 13.35 ***How will new building heights should be limited to "protect distinct natural water views, shoreline areas and nearby neighborhoods?'***

Local Specific Regulations

LU G 14 Local regulations supporting unique conditions. LCC agrees with this goal to preserve the City=s character and support special areas of interest and special needs.

LU 14.2 and LU 14.3 Can implementation of the Master Plan process help create a variety of residential and commercial development that "use a cohesive urban design and promote high levels of environmental sustainability, housing affordability and publicly available open space'?

This approach is far superior to many of the piecemeal apartment projects that were surgically inserted into NE Seattle, on Union Bay and NE Blakeley streets. The "residential density' result is a row of cluttered market price housing units, with dumping cars on the two small side streets with no City safe and continuous sidewalks and no crosswalks for pedestrians. A "Master Plan' would have resulted in a less cluttered and poor-quality aesthetic, required developers to pay in for transportation impacts and perhaps provided better car storage, delivery truck access.

Major Institutions

LU G15 LCC agrees that the Major Institutions are regionally important, but they must be regulated to avoid traffic, displacement and housing shortage impacts.

LCC agrees with the policies LU 15.1- LU 15.10 which are the using the tools of the Major Institution Master Plans and Major Institution Overlays. The City of Seattle is a nexus of health care and education and its needs will grow as the surrounding populations grow.

LU 15.3 LCC supports "Balance the need for the major institution to grow with the need to maintain the livability and vitality of neighboring areas'. LU 156 " Locate major institutions where their activities are compatible with the surrounding land uses.. and where impacts associated with future development can be appropriately mitigated'.

LU 15.10 addresses housing units. ***LCC supports these recommendations not to allow any housing on, or nearby the institutions to be torn down and re-used for non-residential purposes***. The City allowed Seattle Childrens Hospital to demolish 136 units Laurelon Terrace garden condominiums with affordable rents, but allowed SCH to replace the family units with dorm room style units in the U District which went up to market price and alter divided into single room rentals and displaced families.

In assesshe Major Institutions÷Master plans, will SDCI :Require the Major Institution to include an inventory of their space used in their facilities by hours used?. The goal is to first identify surplus spaces already underutilized for every institution instead of continuing to add more buildings.

Require Major Institutions to identify capacity for expansion in their satellite locations? With enhanced technology, and virtual tools they could expand capacity using other locations linked to a main campus or medical center effectively and economically.

Require Major Institutions to declare all of their facilities (research, housing, offices, billing, etc) inside or outside their Master Plan and quantify their total Seattle footprint as part of the Master Plan process?

Acknowledging that many Major Institutions are tax exempt, has the City considered imposing fees to support infrastructure or operational services provided to them?

Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources

LU G 16 ***LCC supports the City÷s goals to preserve its historic and cultural resources*** and encourages adaptive use of its buildings and sites. The landmarks in Seattle tell the story (good and not-so good) of Seattle÷s colorful history. Cultural resources in conjunction with the City÷s First Nations history are the rudder guiding all people today how to live in balance with the City÷s natural surroundings.

Policies LU 16.1- LU 16.18 are all supported by LCC with special emphasis on using outreach to educate all citizens about the preservation processes and why they add value to the city÷s livability. .

As the City grows in landmarks to preserve, how has it allocated adequate resources to adequately manage the current landmarked properties and future designations needing resources to approve any modifications? Volunteers on these technical boards should have access to independent experts in historic architecture.

LCC supports LU 16.18 but would also add more incentives:
For expensive landmarked buildings seismic retrofits, the ***City should grant owners of a real estate tax credit or deferral to protect these vulnerable assets form earthquakes.***

LU 16.19 ***How have the US Department of the Interiors÷Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties been applied by the City to ensure that meet the guidelines for the Seattle Landmark Preservation Board÷s approval decisions for any major changes or demolition of any landmarked buildings or sites?***

Environmentally Critical Areas

LU G17 LCC agrees that environmentally critical areas need regulations to protect the ecological functions, wetlands and fish and wildlife conservation.

LCC supports most of the policies of LU 17.1-LU 17.17 with emphasis on LU 17.8, LU 17.9 and LU 17.9 requiring new development in liquefaction and peat settlement areas to be designed to limit damage during earthquake and the construction processes.

LCC supports LU 17 .12-14 Wetland protection with no net loss to protect fish and wildlife habitat.

LCC ***supports fish and wildlife regulations*** in LU 17.15 as well as LU 17.16

How does One Seattle incentivize the daylighting of streams that are now in pipes? Specifically, Yesler Creek has been buried under the Battelle site in NE Seattle and it should be required to be daylighted with any new development on the landmarked site.

LU 17.18 Abandoned landfills. ***Does SDCI prohibit development within 1000 feet of an abandoned landfill?*** The Laurelhurst neighborhood borders such a landfill and has strong concerns about the proposed dense development within 1000 feet and its impact on the existing residential areas that border the landfill.

TRANSPORTATION

T G.1 ”Transportation decisions, strategies and investments support the growth strategy for the City and the Region‘. LCC agrees with this goal. The 2015 Comp Plan expected Light Rail to be developed more quickly and expansively than it delivered. In 2 years Light Rail will finally connect to major employment locations on the Eastside and later to other Seattle outer neighborhoods.

T 1.1 through T 1.4. LCC supports these policies which prescribe planning now for regional connectivity considering the long planning and execution timeline.

T 1.1 ***Do transit facilities need to include public restroom access as travel times are lengthened by new service routes. In addition? Is Transit security planned and funded to make these regional systems safe to ride at all hours?***

TG 2 Street use including right-of -way use for community***. LCC opposes dedicating the ever-dieting Seattle streets for ”inviting spaces for community‘ within the right of way. LCC has concerns that pedestrian safety is endangered with cars, and not safe. LCC has concerns that users will be exposed to vehicular emissions. Who decides which***

City streets are "closed' and causes confusion and resentment of entitlement among neighbors?

T 2.3 , T 2.7 ,T 2 .8 and T 2.9 LCC agrees that the City needs to plan for emerging delivery devices as residents often get 1-3 various types of food, and Amazon/ UPS packages delivered daily. Freight mobility is critical to commercial use throughout the City

T 2 .11 Resolving conflicts with using right-of -way spaces. LCC agrees that some street frontage space needs to be dedicated for shorter duration use and use off street parking and transit layovers.

T 2.13 and T2 14 LCC supports enhancing boulevards and alleys for all transportation modes, and alleys may be utilized for public space is not heavily trafficked.

T 2 15 and T2 .17 LCC supports creating public space (if large enough) in right of ways for children and non-motorized egress (bikers, skaters).

T2.18 *How and who decides to reallocate street space from parking for people ?* People are intended to walk on the sidewalks rather than on the streets, and *SDOT routinely issues temporary "street closure' permits for special gatherings. Thus, the appropriate Transportation Policy here should be that SDOT promote the accessibility to these street closure permits, but not close the streets permanently?*

T2.19 *Will SDOT build and maintain street use primarily for all forms of transportation modes or will the streets be designed or allocated as parks?*

TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

T G 3 Expand equitable access to multiple transportation options*. LCC agrees that "one size does not fit all' for a successful transportation system.*

The policies in this section are well thought out and LCC supports:

T 3.1- T 3.23, except T 3.9. "Prioritize transit Investments on the basis of current or potential ridership, etc'. *How will SDOT change its transportation resources within its regional transportation links to address the dramatic shift in commuter demand from 5 days a week to 3 days with heavy users on Tues/ Weds/ Thurs as employers continue to offer flexible work schedules for employees to be "in the office*'? While there may be a slow return of employees, Seattle should plan for varying capacity needs based upon the day of the week to ensure there is adequate space for transit users as well as other modes including trips via cars be they shared, electric, etc. this is why converting roads into "gathering places' would be in conflict.

What plans are in place to install and maintain the missing and broken City sidewalks?

T 3. 10 and T3.21 is supported by LCC. Potential users in the residential neighborhoods have a 40 minute walk to the Montlake Light Rail. The "last mile' or two is offered instead at another Light Rail station in the U District where most neighbors do not enjoy connecting there for safety reasons so they do not use it at all. These same issues are

important for bike and pedestrian safety for the ”last mile‘ which really matter. Safe intermodal connectivity should be a top priority.

Building a Green Transportation System

TG 4 LCC supports transportation systems that improves the environment and air quality

T4 .1- T4-12. ***LCC supports these policies*** for adding new electric vehicles, adding public charging infrastructure, enhancing the street tree canopy and improving fish passage and better capturing of storm water.

T 4.3 ***How does reducing general purpose lanes all day reduce drive alone cars?*** This really does not work because drivers will find other streets to use, or their vehicles will sit in traffic spewing out more emissions than they should due to squeezed capacity. ***Should SDOT restrict transit-only lanes during am and pm peak, then open them to all users after non-peak hours?***

Supporting a vibrant Economy

TG 5The transportation system improves mobility … and promotes economic opportunities throughout the City. LCC agrees that without reliable roads, freight will not be able to provide competitive services for residents and businesses.

T 5.1-through T 5.10 LCC supports these policies which support the movement of goods throughout Seattle and Region by vehicles, rail and connectivity to air and drone devices.

T 5.11 activating right of ways for the public is a departure from the core transportation goals and LCC does not support it.

Promoting Safe Travel for All

TG 6 Ensure Seattle÷s transportation is safe for all ages and abilities. LCC strongly supports this keystone goal. Without safety, SOV increases, and transit can fail.

T 6 .1-T6.9 Policies are good and LCC supports them, especially T 6.9 on improving lighting near transit stops.

T6.12 How can the City of Seattle ensure and co-fund if necessary adequate Transit Police throughout the Light Rail system in Seattle and work with King County Metro for funding that provides King County security/police for its bus services?

Connecting to the Region

TG 7 LCC agrees that Seattle and Regional projects should be consistent among goals.

T 7.1 through T 7.11 are policies between local and regional entities and LCC supports these connectivity efforts that ensure the transportation corridors work seamlessly.

LCC add:

T 7.12 How can the City of Seattle require WSOT to ensure that the Washington State Ferry System has adequate service and well maintained boats to service the work force commuters from Bremerton, Vashon, Bainbridge, Whidbey and the San Juan Islands?

Operating and Maintaining the Transportation System

TG 8 Transportation assets should be maintained and renewed is strongly supported by LCC especially bascule bridges, State and Federal highways and local bridges, roads.

T8.1 through T 8.7 work to operate a solid transportation system but falls short on maintenance.

Add T 8.8 LCC proposes that the City utilizes the recent comprehensive audit of bridges and roads with the requirement it be used to prioritize their repairs and maintenance.

Funding the Investment that we Need

TG 9 states, "Transportation funding is sufficient to operate, maintain, and improve the transportation system that supports the City...'

Since the public transportation system is an essential City service, how can its Budget~~s~~ meet operating and capital budgets without relying on tax levies exclusively on property owners to fund all of its expenses? This can be applied to the T 9.9 policy.

T 9.1, T 9.2, T 9.3, T9.4, T9.5 and T 9.6 discuss partnering with other local agencies and governments for inter-funding regional transportation and LCC agrees with that approach.

T 9.10 Considers use of transportation impact fees to fund the transportation needs. ***Should the City collect impact fees from all developers to pay for the Transportation Budget capital expenses to reduce the tax burden on property owners?***

T 9.12 Planning for 6-year capital improvements. ***How will the City of Seattle Bridge and Road audits be used to prioritize projects?***

T 9.13 Identify alternative funding sources. ***Which transportation priorities can be funded by federal, state and regional sources for its capital improvement projects***?

Because all transportation modes have capital and operating expenses should users "pay a fair share' back to the City? Should everyone pay an affordable fare for bus service, Light Rail, ferries, shared bikes, scooters, and a portion of tolled roads into the Seattle and Regional transportation budgets?

HOUSING

The OneSeattle Plan notes that job growth in the City grew by 38%, its housing stock grew by only 19% which has led to supply/demand price increases for its residents. Of course, not all of the employees in Seattle want to live in the City, but the pricetag of regional housing has climbed as well. The King County Growth Management Council target for Seattle is to produce 112,000 units over 25 years (2018-2044) in each of the

Area Median Income (AMI) level, which translates to over 43,000 units of units for income earners below 30% of AMI. Because the costs of providing the land and structures also have climbed, subsidies from every source is essential.

H G1 and H G 2 Expand Seattle÷s housing supply to meet current and projected needs for all economic groups. LCC agrees that more stock will help stabilize housing needs.

H 2.1- H2.3-LCC ***What percentages of the 112,000 units produced will be less than 69% of AMI for renters and less than 89% for owner occupied units?***

HG 2.1 through HG 2.2 LCC agrees expanding capacity of all types of housing are important, and monitoring the inventory by price and type is essential for planning.

HG 2.3 Removing regulatory "barriers' for less expensive housing. ***LCC disagrees for 2 reasons. Even if units take longer and a bit more money to build, why don÷t affordable housing residents of all incomes deserve the benefit of Design Review, vegetation and saving trees? How can SDCI and the Office of Sustainability enforce existing tree preservation to prevent concrete "heat islands' in Settles÷neighborhoods?***

HG 2.4 LCC agrees that small landlords can often produce less expensive housing units and should be supported. ***What legislation passed by City Council should be re-evaluated as anti-landlord regulations which may be creating obstacles for small landlords from increasing small scale rental housing units?***

HG 3 Seattle should supply affordable housing to all who want to live there.

LCC questions whether the City can/should supply housing for all since its land value is high and people (e.g. with large families) may need/want to live somewhere else. This works when the City has a frequent and reliable transportation system network, and Seattle is just a few years away from the Light Rail extensions to the Eastside, Lynnwood and points north. This will open up greater land space for those who work in Seattle but can afford and want to live outside the City. ***Should Seattle be the only entity to produce all of the types of housing to house everyone working within its City limits?*** With improved Light Rail regional network, HB 1110 requires adjacent "bedroom communities to also build a "fair share' of housing for all income levels.

HG 3.1-***How can Seattle source more federal funding for permanent affordable housing? Seattle is a employment hub but high tax levies for housing and transportation have placed a heavy tax burden on property owners, leading to higher housing costs***.

HG 3.2 LCC agrees to expand more long term affordable (<30% AMI)

H 3.4 LCC agrees that the City should build in more affordable housing units near frequent transit to save total cost of living savings for low income residents

H3.6 LCC "***When and how will comprehensive "audits' be compiled for measuring the actual inventory of affordable housing and check on their health and safety compliance?***

H 3.9 LCC ***supports building long-term housing on publicly owned sites (not parkland)***

H 3.10 Waive development standards for affordable housing. ***LCC objects to this because people with less income DESERVE trees, sidewalks and the other benefits of good urban planning , and it will enable these units to "fit in' and last longer, preventing future displacement..***

H 3 11- H 3.21 ***What policies can be formed that lead to own ownership for residents and tax incentive saving for developers of lower income units especially < 60% and 30% of AMI?***

EQUITABLE ACCESS to HOUSING

Goal H G 4 Housing should be available for all . LCC agrees

H 4.1 -H 4.5 LCC supports policies to promote access to housing of all types throughout the City

H 4.5 Remove zoning to add low income housing-***Why would Seattle add more building heights and setbacks as existing housing units when that is not required by HB 1110?.***

H G4.7-4.10 LCC supports open and educated process of finding appropriate housing

HOUSING SECURITY and STABLE COMMUNITIES

H G 5 Residents should be able to remain in place and thrive without fear of displacement and housing discrimination

H 5.1 ***LCC agrees that vulnerable populations, especially seniors from displacement.***

H 5.2 through H 5.12 ***What city regulations can be added to prevent displacement of existing residents, and providing pathways for more home ownership?***

H 5.13 Property tax relief for low and fixed income residents. ***What programs enable seniors to 'age in place' without getting "taxed out' of their home?***

Diversity of Housing Types

H G6- ***Seattle can produce a full range of housing types that fit into existing heights. Should more duplexes, tri-plexes and small low rise muti unit apartments be encouraged rather than townhouses that are difficult for seniors and families?***

H 6.1-H 6 Policies that promote all types of housing units from small to large which accommodates multi-generational and large families,

H 6.7 Advocate for State legislation to encourage the production of ***What changed in the State will incentivize production of more condominiums and co-ops? LCC supports this action to enable first time buyers to build equity as they pay for housing. This can lead to wealth building for individuals and families.***

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, QUALITY and DESIGN

H G7 LCC agrees that Seattle's housing units should be carbon neutral healthy and safe

H 7.1 LCC agrees with regulations and enforcement of safe and healthy housing stock

H 7.2 ***Why is the City incentivizing the use of CLT building material exclusively ?*** While it is fast growing, the quality of this wood aging over time should be assessed before recommending it. (e.g. Burke Museum use of CLT may not be the desired outcome)

H 7..3- and H 7.9 and H 7.10 ***Which policies are applied to affordable housing units making them more livable and using sustainable materials that reduce carbon footprint and are healthy with open space that promote light and social spaces?***

To survive the potential rising temperatures of Climate Change what resources will the City retrofit HVAC systems to convert to provide air conditioning and more energy efficient systems that reduce use of carbon fuels?

H 7.5 LCC supports re-purposing historic buildings for residential uses

H 7.6 ***What criteria and incentives can the City provide for converting non-residential buildings to housing use, considering the overbuilt supply of office spaces?***

Homelessness

The two main reasons for chronic homelessness are drug addiction and behavior health issues. Seattle has tried just about every type of approach to find permanent solutions for housing those who are unsheltered and has learned some things about what may work to achieve a reduction in homelessness.

H G 8 Homelessness is rare and brief, and there is a need for emergency housing as a step for permanent housing. LCC agrees for the need for emergency housing but does not agree that it is necessarily brief, and rather can also be chronic.

HG.8.1 -H 8.2 Implement programs to secure emergency housing units to meet needs. ***LCC agrees. How many shelter beds will be available for drug users with services to detox? How will the State and County partner with Seattle to supply adequate behavioral health facilities for unhoused mentally ill individuals.***

HG 8.4 Collaborate with other jurisdictions to provide permanent housing and services LCC agrees that Seattle can/ should provide resources for those who are homeless in the City, but other regional area governments can share in responding to emergency housing and services.

HG 8.7 ***As a component of a solution for homelessness, do all services provide "a path home' to reunite families around the country for a permanent housing solution?***

H 8.6 "Remove regulatory barriers' to allow homes on properties for homeless people. LCC does not know of any "regulatory barrier' that precludes occupation of housing units on owner occupied property.

Climate and Environment

Seattle aka, The Emerald City, has been impacted by rapid growth, Climate Changes in weather and the lack of City codes that have accelerated tree canopy loss since the 2015 Comprehensive Plan. Carbon Pollution Reduction has been helped by the Climate Action Plan of 2006, but much more needs to be implemented.

CE G1 ***Which climate resiliency goals must be met to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050?*** LCC strongly supports this goal to keep our City and world sustainable.

CE 1.1 -1.***3 LCC agrees that using data to track our actual GHG output and which City office will ensure that the targets are met?*** Seattle needs to develop new policies and practices to meet the targets in partnership with the Green New Deal will enable Seattle to help reach a net neutral position.by 2050.

CE 1.4 LCC supports partnerships with other local jurisdictions and academic institutions to build science-based programs to reduce GHG, and analyze actual data points to assess Seattle's position towards those goals.

Transportation

CE G 2 LCC supports the goal of reducing GHG from transportation modes.

CE 2.1 through CE8. 5 ***LCC agrees*** with these policies to achieve lower emission by enabling more local services that are walkable in a City-wide equitable way.

When and how can Seattle require all delivery vehicles to be carbon neutral by 2035?

Extreme Heat and Wildfire Smoke

CE G9 LCC supports the goal to be prepared for excess heat and wildfires

CE 9.2. Design and retrofit City capital facilities. LCC supports this and was pleased that the City libraries are being retrofitted for air conditioning as a refuge for extreme heat.

CE 8.5 and 8.5 Mitigate economic impacts of transitioning to carbon neutral on low-income individuals and fixed income seniors.

When will the SPD North Precinct SPD be replaced with two new buildings -one near Ballard, and one near the U District to protect growing populations and the SPD officers to ensure adequate Public Safety coverage and a healthy facility for officers?

CE 9.3 Expand tree canopy and greenspace. ***When will a separate City Tree department be established to track the status of the state of the Tree Canopy policies to prior legislation which may have adverse outcomes on the tree canopy and open space preservation?***

CE 9.5-CE 9.7 ***What City policies will protect urban critters, outdoor workers, and owners on how to protect all Seattleites from extreme heat in their buildings?***

Sea Level Rise and Flooding

Seattle must be prepared to face the reality of rising sea levels due to ice melting from Global warming.

CE G10 LCC agrees that Seattle needs plans for adapting to rising sea levels

CE 10.1 through 10.4 ***What are the City's planning and education policies to prepare for high sea levels and focus on restoration of resilient ecosystems, including an annual assessment of Seattle's Seawall condition?***

Tree Canopy

LCC agrees with the overarching statement that the Tree Canopy is fundamental to Seattle's quality of life.

Trees perform functions such as "cleaning the air' and removing carbon. Trees provide shelter for an intricate ecosystem of urban critters and provide shade for people on hot days, and mature trees "mother' other smaller or distressed trees to maintain their health. Tree clusters prevent "heat islands' from forming and absorb storm water run-off. Seattleites espouse to be tree protectionists, but the tree canopy shrunk from 2019-2021 by 1.7%, mainly from neighborhood residential developed lots and in its Parks natural areas. Together, those 2 categories caused 78% of the canopy reduction (data taken from the City of Seattle Tree Canopy Assessment Report published 2023)

CE G 12 ***Seattle has a goal of 30% tree canopy (used to be by 2030??) LCC agrees that increasing the tree caonopy will buffer Seattle from the adverse impacts of Climate Change. The City unfortunately lost 1.7% from 2018-2021.***

LCC ***supports polices CE 12.1- CE 12. 9 to preserve and expand the tree canopy to 30%.***LCC would also add:

CE 12.10. When will the Seattle City Council review the tree canopy data yearly to evaluate if its tree protection ordinances are ensuring that mature trees are being preserved? If the City loses more tree canopy, the Council should amend tree regulations to better preserve and meet the City's tree canopy coverage of 30%,

WATER

CE G13 LCC agrees that water is an essential resource that must be sustainably managed. ***How are the City's reservoirs being protected and maintained?***

CW 13.1-CE 13.9 ***LCC supports all of the recommended policies to protect the pure water that Seattle has and find ways to clean contaminants and or reuse waste.***

Healthy Food System -Food is essential for the health and well-being of our communities and healthy food options must be available to all ages and income levels throughout the City.

CE G 14 Goal that Seattle has accessibility to healthy food. LCC agrees.

CE 14.2 Support convenient access to nutritious food from a variety of sources.

What requirements and incentives will the City enact to incentivize the retention of grocery stores that supply fresh produce and protein?

CE 14.3 Not clear about ”settler colonialism and racism‘ concerning access to food‘ ***”Can the City offer tax credits to maintain large grocers and add indigenous sources and public safety measures to prevent retail theft‘ ?.***

CE 14.4 through 14.8 LCC agrees with policies to increase food access and reduce food waste.

ARTS and CULTURE

Cultural Spaces Place making and Place Keeping

The description (p 166) states that by 2044 Seattle÷s neighborhoods will have cultural spaces including theaters, galleries, cinemas, museums, music venues and art studios that reflect the rich cultural diversity in the City.

AC G ***1 LCC supports the goal for all neighborhoods to have affordable cultural spaces…*** for people of all ages and abilities. ***How will the City decide with*** be ***conflict between allocating surplus public land for cultural uses when the goal of more housing is paramount?***

AC 1.1-AC 1.3 LCC supports maintaining spaces for performing arts and artist studios and their housing.

AC 1.4, AC 15, AC 1.6 Encourage re-purposing of historic community buildings such as surplus schools to adapt for performance arts as well as in parks, libraries and community centers. LCC supports these policies for broad use for musicians, dance, etc., but cautions against the exclusive use of public recreational buildings exclusively dedicated long term for only one user.

AC 1.7 , AC 1.9, AC 1.10, AC 1.11, AC 1.12 and AC 1. 13 LCC supports the City grants to help local communities to preserve their cultural arts, and encourage a sense of community with murals or artwork. As those funds grow, in 20 more years, more art will be funded to install in most neighborhoods.

Public Art

Seattle was a forward-looking city and allocated 1% of its budget to support the arts including art installations.

AC G 2 LCC supports this goal of funding neighborhoods creative expression through its publicly displayed artwork to reflect a variety of cultural backgrounds.

LCC supports policies AC 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 which encourages public participation in acquiring or commissioning artwork in the recipient communities. ***How will this process of procuring public art be open to the general public for their comments and focus on pieces that is easily identified as an icon or artform that represents a significant place?***

Creative Economy

Seattle÷s downtown has a long-storied history offering a wide variety of performing arts, the Seattle Symphony, SIFF theaters, Climate Pledge Arena concerts, art galleries and

world class museums. The impact of these art and cultural businesses fuel a vital the downtown night life as well as attract tourists that fuel the City economy.

AC G3 How ***can artists and performers who are vital to Seattle÷s economy be provided with affordable venue opportunities to thrive so the arts can also thrive?***

AC3.1-through AC 3.11 ***When the City offers subsidized affordable housing units can several be allocated to provide housing and studio space for a wide range of artists?***

AC 3.11 ***LCC supports the City÷s policies to reduce the risk of displacement of performers, artists and their venues as the City grows its developed footprint.***

Youth Development and Arts Education

The access to all types of arts education is not guaranteed for Seattle÷s young students It is outreach, special parent PTA funding and City funding that makes it possible for the City÷s youth to participate in the arts. The seeds of creative performing expression and creating artwork is an important outlet for many students and LCC supports funding to make that accessible for EVERY child in Seattle.

AC G 4 ***What financial resources from Seattle can support this policy to have arts and music education in every Seattle public school?***

AC 4.1, AC 4.2 and AC 4.3. LCC strongly supports forming partnerships within its resources to support access to arts for all youth.

PARKS and OPEN SPACE

Seattle÷s residents often define their neighborhood and favorite activities by their favorite park or Public Space. WIth the past 10 years growth of 38% in employment, and the 12-year population increase of 23.5% from 2010 to 2022, local residents are feeling the ”squeeze‘! Fortunately, the City owned park and recreation lands are protected from conversion and a new tax for parks in 2014 adds to the City÷s budget allocation to more than adequately funds their capital improvements and operations. Access to Parks and Recreation and Open Space saved the sanity of many residents during the Covid-19 pandemic and mitigates the impacts of Climate Change in the future.

Equitable Provision of Public Space

P G 1 LCC supports the goal of expansion and enhanced access to public spaces as the City grows, and provide residents access to a full range of recreation for all residents

P 1.1 through P 1.18 LCC supports these general policies to serve the many needs for all ages, abilities and locations throughout the City in an equitable way.

P1 .116 ***”Consider the use of open space impact fees to support public space‘.***

Who will pay these fees? It is not defined, and should developers pay for some amount as a public benefit when they displace natural open space with developments?

P!..17 ***How can SP& R continue and expand partnering with Seattle Public Schools to including use of after school gym facilities to be run by SP&R‘?***

P1.19 Mitigate noise and pollution on public space is an excellent goal. ***How can SPR prevent nuisance noise from Seattle parks and open spaces impacts onto residential neighborhoods from the SPR activities when changing uses? Specifically what SEPA process is utilized when siting pickleball courts which emit 70 decibels of noise onto nearby homes which detracts from the restorative quieting function of the parks?***

P 1.20-P1.25 LCC agrees -SP&R should restore contaminated spaces and develop new and weather protected covered spaces in an equitable way throughout the City.

P1.26 Joint use developments- ***How can public use mixing housing with SP&R community centers ensure public access to facilities?***

Recreation, Activation and Programming

P G2 ***LCC supports this goal to provide a wide variety of recreational, social, activities and events for all ages and abilities***

P2.1 "develop activities based on the needs of each community they serve' LCC supports this general concept but "who decides' is unclear.

When will the City re-establish "all-City' community representation using local 5- 8 person Advisory Boards with 7 city-wide District boards? Which groups now give feedback and are accountable for the recreational, social and events planned to be sure resources are distributed more equitably?

P 2.4 and 2.5 LCC supports the use of parks for nature play and use for all ages.

P 2.6 ***Why is the City even considering the sale of alcoholic beverages in the City's parks and Open Spaces? The impact of marijuana use and smells is already detrimental, and adding alcohol will create drinking parties which can lead to untoward behaviors in the parks and discourage families use. Has the City considered expanding non-alcoholic drink sales such as bubble teas?***

When will SP&R build more public pool access to support the City's Initiative of "Swim Seattle'.? The City is surrounded by water and every person who lives here should know the basics of how to swim for their safety.

Operations and Maintenance

P G 3 LCC supports maintenance of public space operations with eco-friendly methodology.

P 3.1 -3.7 and P 4.4 Agree with environmental sustainability practices and use the positions to train youth and homeless in skilled employment.

Partnering with Communities

P G 4 Empower community members and organoztions to help shape facilities. ***LCC supports this as "part "of design and use but prefers that there be a broader scale public input to design permanent public park facilities to include all ages and abilities.***

P 5.1- 5.3 LCC agrees to enhance the parks÷health and protect its trees, and mitigate the adverse effects of Climate Change.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Engaging all Seattle Residents Equitably

CI G 1 . LCC supports the City has numerous boards for many aspects of City life from the formal Design and Planning Commission Boards to numerous advisory boards to specific historic preservation and transportation boards which represent a significant amount of community involvement in decision making. The process is open to the public and there is a vetting process for its members diversity and relevance.

CI 1.1- 1.1.6 LCC supports inclusion of community involvement in its decision making and planning. LCC adds these comments: ***How does Seattle ensure transparency of access to broad community input and educate how "it works' for giving feedback in decision making. How did OPCD and SDOT "Move Seattle' proposed levy, and THIS OneSeattle Comp Plan, decide to do outreach only with the small eight groups who are all located in the south half of Seattle with one in West Seattle to shape it***?

Which groups or non-profit organizations are being contacted in the explosive growth areas of downtown, South Lake Union and the dense Urban Villages north of the Ship Canal?

How can the City be more inclusive and "balance' its outreach approach to hear from more than the same "eight small group inputs' or street fair folks to capture the diverse input from all who live and work here?

Engagement Partnerships

CI G 2 LCC supports community engagement from community based partners.

LCC supports C1 2.1-CI 2.5 ***and adds:***

When will the City re-instate funding for the Department of Neighborhoods to establish inclusive community councils and/or City Council District advisory boards? What criteria should be required to ensure these councils be open and accountable to their membership to capture input from every part of the City as a sounding board?

Building Community Capacity

CI G3 LCC supports the goal of engaging all people in the community to participate in how their city is making decisions.

C 3 3.1through C 3 3.4 LCC supports developing skill sets for all community members to participate in the City÷s decision making, especially in underrepresented communities.

How does City weigh "comment stuffing' as it reports about City project feedback from one-minded groups which can result in skewed influence on City policies. How does the City respect and report on the minority participants to consider the merit of all inputs?

Indigenous Engagement

CI G4 The City should include the Indigenous tribes in all major decisions about planning for the City÷s future needs and sustainability. LCC supports this relationship and wisdom.

CI 4.1 - CI 4.9 ***What systematic outreach maintains treaty rights and utilizes the Tribes best practices to keep the land and ecosystem viable for the future generations?***

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen McAleer

President of Laurelhurst Community Club

Exhibits:

Density with context sensitive design and respecting Seattles÷neighborhood character can work, with tree retention and natural materials and design standards:

6- Plexes in traditional neighborhoods

NO-No vegetation but 24 garbage cans Yes-retain mature trees and natural pallet

YES - Tri-plex with vegetation and natural community character

YES Townhomes and tripexes in traditional neighborhood with natural materials