From: DVNPCoalition
To: PCD_OneSeattleCompPlan
Subject: Fwd: One Seattle Plan
Date: Saturday, May 4, 2024 10:54:23 PM

CAUTION: External Email

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **DVNPCoalition** <dvnpcoalition@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, May 4, 2024 at 6:13 PM
Subject: One Seattle Plan
To: Councilmember Rob Saka <rob.saka@seattle.gov>, <Elaine.ko@seattle.gov>, Holmes, Jim <jim.holmes@seattle.gov>, <Michael.Hubnore@seattle.gov>, Nelson, Sara <sara.nelson@seattle.gov>, <tanya.woo@seattle.gov>
CC: Bonnie Williams <williamsniki@aol.com>, Cedar Bushue <cedar.bushue92@gmail.com>, Claudia M. Newman Henry <newman@bnd-law.com>, David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>, IRA APPELMAN <ibappelman@comcast.net>, Iskra Johnson <iskra@iskradesign.com>, Janet Way <janetway@yahoo.com>, Jennifer Scarlett <trentjen@yahoo.com>, Jessica Marden <jessica.marden@runbox.com>, Jon Lisbin <me@jonlisbin.com>, June BlueSpruce <jbluespruce@gmail.com>, Kari Thoreen <kat@karithoreen.com>, Lois Martin <lamartin1@me.com>, Nancy Bocek <nancybocek@gmail.com>, Sandy Shettler <SSHETTLER@msn.com>, Sarajane Siegfriedt <sarajane3h@comcast.net>, Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>, Toby Thaler <toby@thaler.org>, aileen langhans <aileenmargaret@yahoo.com>, <christopher.m.miller@protonmail.com>, <davidbyrnemcdonaldiii@gmail.com>, joelle king <joellemarieking@yahoo.com>, michaeloxman@comcast.net <michaeloxman@comcast.net>, <mimistewarthomes@gmail.com>, tina bueche <tinainsma@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Hubner:

We are a nonprofit neighborhood housing organization with primary interest in the greater Duwamish Valley, which includes the Seattle neighborhood of South Park. We appreciate the opportunity to make comments about the One Seattle Plan for that neighborhood and wish to bring the following issues and questions about the proposed plan to the attention of you and your staff.

(1). The One Seattle Plan classifies South Park as an Urban Center. Up to now, it has been classified as a Seattle Residential Urban Village, emphasis on "Residential". We do not believe that it meets the classification of either an Urban Village or an Urban Center for several reasons. Under GS4.1, p 24, it does not have a wide range of shops, services, access to transit or future light rail mass transit. It also is surrounded by industrial zoning which limits growth in this area and makes it more of a heat island than the rest of Seattle. The residences and businesses here are in a liquefaction zone, which should prohibit and discourage the construction of taller (3-8 story) buildings. In fact, Seattle requires developers to sign an agreement to limit liability when they put a building in a liquefaction zone such as the Duwamish Valley. South Park infrastructure must be considered with respect to both future development and potential climate change issues. South Park should not be considered an

Urban Center under the new plan, nor an Urban Village under the current plan.

(2). South Park should not be subject to RSL zoning. When the CIty of Seattle applied RSL zoning to the bulk of neighborhoods in Seattle, it failed to notice that South Park had smaller plats than most Seattle neighborhoods. The City incorrectly treats it as having RS-5000 zoning in its planning documents. Most lots in South Park are 2500 square feet. Density in this neighborhood should be no more than the rest of Seattle. We have requested the City Council correct this oversight over the last few years. Why has this issue been ignored and not dealt with? Is this neighborhood being redlined again by the very people it has elected to represent it?

(3) The One Seattle Plan states that it "introduces a Climate and Environmental element" that redoubles the cities efforts to "reduce our carbon footprint and build resiliency; in frontline communities most vulnerable to climate impacts". We point out that the life expectancy of South Park residents is acknowledged to be many years shorter than the life expectancy of other residents of Seattle. This community is on a river that is a major superfund site, is surrounded by industry with little or no greenery, is close to both Boeing Field and SeaTac Airport and subject to airport air pollution. This community, of all the neighborhoods in Seattle, deserves to be populated less densely with people and more densely with greenery and trees. Were these environmental issues dealt with when the plan was formulated? The plan (LU13.29) also discusses an Industrial Buffer Zone to "protect the livability of neighborhood areas". This needs to be dealt with for South Park, Georgetown, and future expansion into areas outside of South Park. One Seattle Plan also fails to show that all the jurisdictions in South Park are planning together.

(4). Historic Preservation is a big issue in South Park. Our organization did a survey of over 400 structures in the neighborhood during early COVID. The survey showed that it has more 1890s or earlier homes than in any other part of Seattle. Several of its buildings likely qualify for Seattle Landmark status. In fact, its current neighborhood center, located in South Park's original town center, was recently qualified as such. This neighborhood should be comprehensively studied with respect to its historic assets before much future development occurs. Lisa Herbold made a resolution for a historic assets survey for the Dept of Neighborhoods to complete. Has this issue been considered with respect to South Park?

(5). The Comprehensive Plan obviously attempts to incentivize home affordability. The current plans appear to reward density, expensive home ownership, and developer profits with the demise of more affordable family and rental housing. Why isn't the city using the Community Reinvestment Act, encouraging Section 8 usage, and encouraging down payment assistance programs in its quest for affordability? We suggest more community involvement will result in better results.

(6). Parks and Open Space considerations. Seattle has been known as the "Emerald City". The extreme density of HB 1110 which allows duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, sixplexes, stacked flats and courtyard apartments to encourage affordability will likely not happen under this plan. It seems recent development has occurred, especially under MHA, by for-profit infill developers who need economy of scale for their construction and staffing, by building homes for sale. In either case, what will happen to Seattle's tree canopy, which has been decreasing in recent years?

(7). We hope that you have consulted various environmental and cultural experts when you

say there will be no significant adverse environmental and cultural impacts from enactment of the One Seattle Plan in th DEIS. Has the EPA, Washington State Dept of Ecology, Federal Fish and WIldlife, NOAH, King Conservation, the Duwamish Tribe and other Indigenous Peoples of the Region, United Arborists, Birds Connect, Professional Engineer and Architect Associations, Washington Dept of Archeology and Historic Preservation, Urban Forestry Commission, US Geologic Assessment and Surveys, US Army Corps of Engineers, etc. etc. etc. been consulted? Do the experts agree with your assessments?

(8) What is the current status of Urban Farms in Seattle? Is everything green going to have to be on a rooftop to get sunlight or does it have to be in a cemetery?

Duwamish Valley Neighborhood Preservation Coalition

Penni Cocking, President
Nadine Morgan, Secretary