

## SEATTLE'S CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROVISIONS ON LAND USE COMPARED WITH THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY MAYOR MURRAY

Current Comprehensive Plan (the exact words are quoted)	Mayor's Recommended Change (the exact words are quoted)	Effect of the Change
<p><b>LUG2</b></p> <p><b>Foster neighborhoods</b> in which current and future residents and business owners will want to live, shop, work, and locate their businesses. Provide for a range of housing types and commercial and industrial spaces in order to accommodate a broad range of families and individuals, income groups, and businesses.</p>	<p><b>Provide zoning and accompanying land use regulations that:</b> Allow for a variety of housing types to accommodate housing choices for households of all types and income levels; Support a wide diversity of employment-generating activities providing jobs for a diverse residential population, as well as a variety of services for residents and businesses; Accommodate the full range of public services, institutions, and amenities needed to support a fully developed, diverse, and economically sustainable urban community</p>	<p><b>Eliminates the Neighborhood focus in favor of a variety pack of uses.</b></p>
<p><b>LUG6</b></p> <p><b>Encourage the use of alternatives</b> to single-occupant vehicles and the use of smaller, more energy efficient automobiles through the City's regulation of parking, including the amount of parking required, design of parking, location of parking, and access to parking.</p>	<p><b>LUG6.1 (see also LU 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6)</b></p> <p><b>Establish parking requirements</b> where appropriate at levels for both single-occupant vehicles and their alternatives <b>to further this Plan's goal to increase</b> the use of public transit, carpools, walking, and bicycles as <b>alternatives to the use of single-occupancy vehicles..</b></p> <p><b>LU 6.3 Rely on Market forces to determine the amount of parking required.</b></p>	<p><b>The "Parking Myth": eliminating parking requirements will make cars evaporate [while increasing developer profits].</b></p>
<p><b>LUG36</b></p> <p>Protect the ecological functions and values of wetlands, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; prevent erosion from development on steep slopes; and protect the public health, safety and welfare in landslide-prone, liquefaction-prone</p>	<p><b>LUG15</b></p> <p>Protect the ecological functions and value of wetlands, and fish and wildlife conservation areas; prevent erosion caused by development on steep slopes; and protect public health, safety and welfare in areas prone to landslides, liquefaction or</p>	<p><b>Encourages development in critical areas</b></p>

and flood-prone areas.	floods, while permitting development that is reasonable in light of these constraints.	
<b>LU1</b>	<b>LU1.1</b>	
Use the goals and policies included in this Plan to identify on the Future Land Use Map the general locations where broad categories of land uses are preferred. Use rezone criteria which implement the goals and policies of this Plan to identify on the City's Official Land Use Map where the specific zones are located.	Use the Future Land Use Map to identify where different types of development are planned to achieve a development pattern that supports the urban village strategy	<b>Eliminates clear definition of SF for the FUZZY Map with no distinct boundaries.</b>
<b>LU3</b>	<b>LU1.2 &amp; LU1.4</b>	
Establish rezone evaluation criteria and procedures to guide decisions about which zone will provide the best match for the characteristics of an area and will most clearly further City goals.	Use the Future Land Use Map, the land-use policies in this land use element, and criteria in the Land Use Code to determine the appropriate zoning designation for property in the city.  Promote this plan's overall desired land-use pattern through appropriate zoning.	<b>Change neighborhood zoning to suit the Mayor's (developers) plan for bigger buildings.</b>
<b>LU5</b>	<b>Deleted in the Mayor's proposal</b>	
1. Consider, through neighborhood planning processes, recommendations for the revision of zoning to better reflect community preferences for the development of an area, provided that consistency between the zoning and this Plan is maintained. Consider relevant goals and policies in adopted neighborhood plans when evaluating a rezone proposal.	<b>Delete all</b>	<b>Eliminates neighborhood planning process</b>
<b>LU11</b>	<b>Deleted in the Mayor's proposal</b>	
In order to maintain the character of Seattle's neighborhoods and retain existing affordable housing, discourage the demolition of residences and displacement of	<b>Delete all</b>	<b>If you are not discouraging the loss of affordable housing, you</b>

<p>residents, while supporting redevelopment that enhances its community and furthers the goals of this Plan.</p>		<p><b>must be ok with destroying it.</b></p>
<p><b>LU41</b></p>	<p><b>Deleted in the Mayor's proposal</b></p>	
<p>Because of the many benefits that street trees provide to both property owners and the general public, <b>encourage the preservation or planting of street trees</b> as development occurs, except in locations where it is not possible to meet City standards intended to preserve public safety and utility networks.</p>	<p><b>Delete all</b></p>	<p><b>Trees are no longer specifically identified as important.</b></p>
<p><b>LU 59</b></p>	<p><b>Deleted in the Mayor's proposal</b></p>	
<p>Permit upzones of land designated single-family and meeting <b>single-family rezone criteria</b>, only when all of the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.</li> <li>• <b>The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.</b></li> <li>• The rezone is to a low-scale single-family, multifamily or mixed-use zone, compatible with single-family areas.</li> <li>• The rezone procedures are followed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Delete all</b></p>	<p><b>Eliminates SF criteria, removing an obstacle to eliminating SF zoning and removing reference to neighborhood plans</b></p>
<p><b>LU 60</b></p>	<p><b>Deleted in the Mayor's proposal</b></p>	
<p>Apply small lot single-family zones to single-family property meeting single-family rezone criteria only when all of the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is within an urban center or urban village boundary.</li> <li>• The rezone is provided for in an adopted neighborhood plan.</li> <li>• The rezone procedures are followed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Delete all</b></p>	<p><b>Removes SF criteria, removing an obstacle to eliminating SF zoning</b></p>

<b>LU67</b>	<b>LU8.9</b>	
<p><b>Permit exceptions</b> to minimum lot size requirements to recognize building sites created in the public records under previous codes, to allow the consolidation of very small lots into larger lots, to adjust lot lines to permit more orderly development patterns, and to provide housing opportunity through the creation of additional buildable sites which are <b>compatible</b> with surrounding lots and do not result in the demolition of existing housing.</p>	<p><b>Allow exceptions</b> to minimum lot size requirements to recognize building sites created under earlier regulations and historic platting patterns, to allow the consolidation of very small lots into larger lots, to adjust lot lines to permit more orderly development patterns, and to provide more housing opportunities by creating additional buildable sites that <b>integrate</b> well with surrounding lots and do not result in the demolition of existing housing.</p>	<p><b>The return of ultra small lot development</b></p>

This analysis is contributed as a public service by volunteers from many neighborhoods who are concerned that the proposed “update” of the Comprehensive Plan amounts to a revolutionary new plan that would eliminate many of the current plan’s protections for neighborhood character and its guarantees for community involvement. The Mayor’s changes listed in this table are only regarding the Comprehensive Plan’s land use goals (LUG) and land use policies (LU). The Mayor has proposed many equally worrisome changes in other parts of the Comprehensive Plan, which are summarized at <http://eastlakeseattle.org/?page=CompPlan>. To make matters worse, the Mayor and his agencies are not telling the public about the many proposed deletions and changes from the current Comp Plan and their consequences for neighborhoods. For more information: [cleman@oo.net](mailto:cleman@oo.net).

Please e-mail your views to [2035@seattle.gov](mailto:2035@seattle.gov) or send them by U.S. mail to the Seattle Department of Planning and Development, Attn: Seattle 2035, 700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000, P.O. Box 34019, Seattle WA 98124-4019. Mayor Ed Murray does not accept comments from the public by e-mail, requiring electronic communication via a web site, <http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/get-involved/contact-the-mayor>. You can also reach Mayor Murray by letter at 600 Fourth Avenue, 7th floor, P.O. Box 94749, Seattle, WA 98124-4749, or by fax at 206-684-5360.

But as the Mayor and his agencies are probably wedded to these changes, be sure to send your views to the City Councilmembers, who will make the final decision. All City Councilmembers should be asked what their position is on the Mayor’s dramatic departures from past commitments in the Comprehensive Plan. The City Council e-mail addresses are currently as follows: [sally.bagshaw@seattle.gov](mailto:sally.bagshaw@seattle.gov), [tim.burgess@seattle.gov](mailto:tim.burgess@seattle.gov), [jean.godden@seattle.gov](mailto:jean.godden@seattle.gov), [bruce.harrell@seattle.gov](mailto:bruce.harrell@seattle.gov), [nick.licata@seattle.gov](mailto:nick.licata@seattle.gov), [mike.obrien@seattle.gov](mailto:mike.obrien@seattle.gov), [john.okamoto@seattle.gov](mailto:john.okamoto@seattle.gov), [tom.rasmussen@seattle.gov](mailto:tom.rasmussen@seattle.gov) and [kshama.sawant@seattle.gov](mailto:kshama.sawant@seattle.gov).

As of Jan. 1, Godden, Licata, Okamoto, and Rasmussen leave the Council and will be replaced by the following: [lorena.gonzalez@seattle.gov](mailto:lorena.gonzalez@seattle.gov), [rob.johnson@seattle.gov](mailto:rob.johnson@seattle.gov); [shannon.braddock@seattle.gov](mailto:shannon.braddock@seattle.gov), and [debora.juarez@seattle.gov](mailto:debora.juarez@seattle.gov). On a courtesy basis, the City will probably accept e-mails to these addresses well before Jan. 1. You can also reach the current and newly elected City Councilmembers by letter at 600 Fourth Avenue, 2nd floor, P.O. Box 34025, Seattle, WA 98124-4025, or by fax at 206-684-8587.