

July 12, 2021

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee  
**From:** Eric McConaghy and Lish Whitson, Analysts  
**Subject:** 2020-2021 Comprehensive Plan Docket

---

On Wednesday, July 14, the Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee (Committee) will hold a public hearing and discuss proposals to amend the [Seattle Comprehensive Plan](#). In May 2021, the Council received six proposals to amend the Comprehensive Plan from members of the public and one from Councilmember Lewis. Those proposals are included in [Clerk File 321977](#). In addition, there are a number of amendment proposals that were previously docketed by the City Council under [Resolution 31970](#), but have not been resolved.

The seven proposals were forwarded to the Seattle Planning Commission (SPC) and Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) for consideration and recommendation. The Seattle Planning Commission has transmitted its letter with recommendations on the proposals. We expect OPCD to transmit its letter in the coming weeks.

This memo (1) provides background on the Comprehensive Plan docketing process, including identification of previously docketed amendments that may carry over into the 2021-2022 process, (2) explains the criteria Council uses to determine whether proposed amendments should be selected for consideration, and (3) provides initial recommendations, discussion, and review of the applications in light of the criteria. There are three attachments:

- Attachment 1 summarizes recommendations from the SPC and Central Staff;
- Attachment 2 is the SPC letter to the Council; and
- Attachment 3 is a draft of the docketing resolution

Following the July 14 Committee meeting, Central Staff will work with Councilmember Strauss to prepare a 2020-2021 Comprehensive Plan docket resolution for introduction. The Committee is currently scheduled to make a recommendation on that resolution at its July 28 meeting.

### Background

Seattle 2035, Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, is the City's core policy document to guide the City's growth. Under the Washington State Growth Management Act, with a few limited exceptions, the City may only amend the Comprehensive Plan once a year. Most years, the City Council solicits proposals for amendments to the plan from members of the public and City Departments and develops a "docket" of amendments to be considered the following year.

The Comprehensive Plan is a foundational, long-term document that is intended to guide the City's growth over twenty years. Washington State law limits amendments to the plan and

requires a deliberative public process to amend the plan. The City's criteria are intended to limit potential amendments to those that are legal, can be accommodated within the time available, and are generally consistent with the City's overall policies for growth. Larger shifts in policy direction are generally considered as part of a "major update" which State Law requires every eight years. The next major update must be adopted by June 2024.

Generally, the docketing process occurs in four steps:

1. Spring: Council issues a call for amendment proposals. Anyone can submit a proposal.
2. Summer: Council reviews amendment applications and establishes by resolution a docket of the amendments the Council will consider. This is often referred to as the "docket setting" resolution.
3. Fall: OPCD reviews the amendments and conducts environmental analysis, making a recommendation to the Council regarding which amendments should be made.
4. Winter: Council receives recommendations from the SPC, and OPCD, considers the merits of proposed amendments, and acts on legislation amending the Comprehensive Plan.

This year, we anticipate that the Council will review the 2020-2021 amendments docketed under Resolution 31970 in September.

### **Criteria for Annual Comprehensive Plan Docketing**

The Council applies a variety of criteria in deciding whether to include a proposed amendment in the docket setting resolution. A decision to include a proposed amendment in the resolution does not constitute Council approval of a proposed amendment. Rather, a decision to include a proposed amendment means that the Council has determined that the subject matter is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan and consideration of the proposed amendment can be practically accomplished during the amendment cycle. Criteria applied by the Council included in Resolution 31807 are as follows:

- A. The amendment is legal under state and local law.
- B. 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 with the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's regional growth 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 activities identified in departmental work programs under way or expected soon, within which the suggested amendment can be considered alongside other related issues.

- 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 Seattle Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review; and
  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.
- D. If the amendment has previously been proposed, relevant circumstances have changed significantly so that there is sufficient cause for reconsidering the proposal.
- E. If the amendment would change a neighborhood plan, there is evidence that proponents of the amendment, or other persons, have effectively communicated the substance and purpose of the amendment with those who could be affected by the amendment and there is documentation provided of community support for the amendment.
- F. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.
- G. A proposal that would change the boundary of an urban center, urban village, or manufacturing/industrial center requires an amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), regardless of the area's size. However, an amendment that proposes to change the FLUM is not necessary and will not be considered when it would affect an area that is less than a full block in size and is located adjacent to other land designated on the FLUM for a use that is the same as - or is compatible with - the proposed designation.

#### Previously docketed items that may continue into 2021-2022

In addition to considering whether to docket newly proposed amendments as part of the 2021-2022 cycle, the Council may request the Executive to complete review of several items that were docketed under Resolution 31970 for potential consideration in 2021 by docketing them again for consideration in 2022:

- Designation of the South Park Urban Village;
- Designation of an urban village near the future light rail station at N 130th Street and Interstate 5;
- Amendments related to fossil fuels and public health;
- Updates to maritime and industrial lands policies resulting from the recommendations of the Mayor's Maritime and Industrial stakeholder process; and
- Impact fee amendments.

## **Discussion and Preliminary Recommendations**

The table in Attachment 1 summarizes the proposed amendments and the recommendations of the SPC and Central Staff. We will update the table with OPCD's recommendations as soon as they are available.

### Amendments recommended to move forward

Amendment 1 is recommended to move forward for more study by the SPC and Central Staff. Councilmember Lewis proposes this amendment to reclassify W Florentia Street between 3rd Avenue N and Queen Anne Avenue N and Nickerson Street as nonarterial streets. SPC and Central staff find that an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan's Transportation Appendix meets the criteria for further study. We find that an amendment to the Transportation Appendix Figure A-1 map would be necessary to accomplish the reclassification and its study is appropriate within the confines of the annual amendment cycle (Criteria B.3, C.1, C.3, and F). The reclassification would also require a change to the Seattle Municipal Code Exhibit 11.18.010A, to the arterial street map.

### Amendments not recommended to move forward

Amendment 2 is not recommended to move forward for more study by the SPC and Central Staff. In this amendment, Seattle Gospel Hall propose to amend the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the designation of property located at 9201-9215 3rd Avenue S from Single Family to Multifamily. We find that the amendment does not meet the location and size criteria for a FLUM amendment and is not consistent with established Comprehensive Plan policy (Criteria G and C.3).

Amendment 3 is not recommended to move forward for more study by the SPC and Central Staff. In this amendment, Jeffrey Hummel proposes to remove property located at 1511-1551 W Armory Way from the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing/Industrial Center and to amend the FLUM to change the designation of this area to Commercial/Mixed-Use. We find that this amendment is more appropriately considered as part of the potential changes to Comprehensive Plan industrial land policies as informed by the recommendations of the Mayor's Maritime and Industrial Stakeholder Committee (Criterion B.5).

Four proposed amendments (amendments 4-7 on Attachment 1) have been proposed in the past and have either been docketed and then not recommended for adoption or not docketed (Criterion D). The applicant, Chris Leman, has not indicated any changed circumstances that would warrant reconsideration of these amendments. SPC and Central Staff do not recommend docketing these amendments.

**Next Steps**

Following the July 14 Committee meeting, Central Staff will finalize the docketing resolution based on the Committee's direction for introduction and referral to the Committee for discussion and possible vote on July 28.

**Attachments:**

1. Summary of Recommendations on Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments
2. Letter from the Seattle Planning Commission to the Council
3. Draft Docketing Resolution

cc: Dan Eder, Interim Director  
Aly Pennucci, Policy and Budget Manager

Summary of Recommendations on Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments

#	Amendment Proposal	Short Description	Proposer	Recommendation		
				SPC	OPCD	CS
<b>A. Amendments proposed for the 2021-2022 Cycle (numbered consistent with list in <a href="#">Clerk File 321977</a>)</b>						
1	Florentia Street	Reclassify W Florentia Street between 3rd Avenue N and Queen Anne Avenue N and Nickerson Street as nonarterial streets	CM Lewis	Docket	TBD	Docket
2	3rd Avenue S	Amend the Future Land Use Map to change 9201-9215 3rd Avenue S in the south Seattle/South Park neighborhood from Single-Family to Multifamily	Seattle Gospel Hall	Do not docket	TBD	Do not docket
3	W Armory Way	Amend the Future Land Use Map to change 1511-1551 W Armory Way from Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing/ Industrial Center to Commercial/Mixed Use	Jeffery Hummel	Do not docket	TBD	Do not docket
4	Setbacks and Trees	Amend the Land Use element policies related to building setbacks and yards to allow for preservation and planting of trees	Chris Leman	Do not docket	TBD	Do not docket
5	Skybridges, Trams and Tunnels	Amend the Transportation element to add a policy that discourages pedestrian grade separations, including skybridges, trams and tunnels	Chris Leman	Do not docket	TBD	Do not docket
6	Open and Democratic Government	Add a new Open and Democratic Government element to the Comprehensive Plan	Chris Leman	Do not docket	TBD	Do not docket
7	Heavy Vehicles	Amend the Transportation element to reduce road and bridge damage from heavy vehicles	Chris Leman	Do not docket	TBD	Do not docket

**KEY:** SPC – Seattle Planning Commission | OPCD – Office of Planning and Community Development | CS – Central Staff



July 12, 2021

Honorable Councilmember Dan Strauss, Chair  
Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee  
via e-mail

RE: 2021-2022 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Dear Councilmember Strauss,

The Seattle Planning Commission is pleased to provide our comments and recommendations on which proposed 2021-2022 Comprehensive Plan amendments should be placed on the docket for further analysis. Our recommendations are offered as stewards of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and based on the application of Council-adopted criteria, Guidelines for Amendment Selection, included in Resolution 31807 (Attachment A).

**The Planning Commission recommends moving forward the following amendment proposals to the docket for further analysis:**

1. Florentia Street

The applicant is proposing to reclassify West Florentia Street (between 3rd Avenue North and Queen Anne Avenue North) and Florentia Street (between Queen Anne Avenue North and Nickerson Street) in the Queen Anne neighborhood as non-arterial streets.

The Commission recommends this proposal for the docket. The proposal meets the criteria and as such warrants further study. Arterial streets and non-arterial streets are included on the Comprehensive Plan's Transportation Appendix Figure A-1 map. Also, per docketing criterion F, this amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision, as this reclassification would influence future City budgetary decisions on physical improvements to the street.

**The Planning Commission recommends the following amendment proposals not move forward to the docket for further analysis:**

Commissioners

Rick Mohler, *Co-Chair*

Jamie Stroble, *Co-Chair*

Mark Braseth

McCaela Daffern

Roque Deherrera

David Goldberg

Matt Hutchins

Patience Malaba

Radhika Nair

Alanna Peterson

Dhyana Quintanar

Julio Sanchez

Lauren Squires

Kelabe Tewolde

Rose Lew Tsai-Le Whitson

Staff

Vanessa Murdock  
*Executive Director*

Olivia Baker  
*Policy Analyst*

John Hoey,  
*Senior Policy Analyst*

Robin Magonegil  
*Administrative Analyst*

Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Amendments

2. 9201-9215 3rd Avenue SW

The applicant is proposing to amend the FLUM designation of these parcels from Single-Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criterion G, which states “an amendment that proposes to change the FLUM is not necessary and will not be considered when it would affect an area that is less than a full block in size and is located adjacent to other land designated on the FLUM for a use that is the same as – or is compatible with – the proposed designation.” These parcels are in a Single-Family Residential area and are less than a full block. All adjacent parcels are also designated on the FLUM as Single-Family Residential.

3. 1511-1551 W Armory Way

The applicant is proposing to amend the FLUM designation of these parcels from Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing/Industrial Center to Commercial/Mixed Use.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criterion B5, which states that it would be “better addressed through a budgetary or programmatic decision or another process, such as activities identified in departmental work programs under way or expected in the near future, within which the suggested amendment can be considered alongside other related issues.” In this case, the appropriate process would be the ongoing work of the Mayor’s Industrial and Maritime Strategy.

Text Amendments

4. Setbacks and Trees

The applicant is proposing to amend the Land Use Element policies related to building setbacks and yards to allow for preservation and planting of trees.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria D. This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected. It was previously submitted and docketed in the 2017-2018 cycle but was not adopted by the City Council in 2018. The rationale for not adopting this proposal was that much of the proposed language is inconsistent with existing Comprehensive Plan policies or misunderstands the more general policy level at which the Plan operates. This proposal was most recently submitted and not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle. There is insufficient evidence that relevant circumstances have changed significantly to warrant reconsidering this proposal.

5. Skybridges, Trams and Tunnels

The applicant is proposing to amend the Transportation Element to add a policy that discourages pedestrian grade separations, including skybridges, trams and tunnels.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria D. This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected. It was previously submitted and docketed in the 2012-2013 cycle but was not adopted by the City Council in 2013. The rationale for not adopting this proposal was pedestrian grade separations are addressed in the Seattle Municipal Code and those regulations are consistent with the general policy intent of the Comprehensive Plan. This proposal was most recently submitted and not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle. There is insufficient evidence that relevant circumstances have changed significantly to warrant reconsidering this proposal.

6. Open and Democratic Government

The applicant is requesting to add an Open and Democratic Government Element to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria D. This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected. It was originally proposed as “Open and Participatory Government” in the 2008-2009 amendment cycle but was not docketed citing criteria that the content proposed in the application are best dealt with through the Seattle Municipal Code, the Seattle Ethics Code, or through budgetary and programmatic decision-making. This proposal was most recently submitted and not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle. There is insufficient evidence that relevant circumstances have changed significantly to warrant reconsidering this proposal.

7. Heavy Vehicles

The applicant is proposing to amend the Transportation Element to reduce road and bridge damage from heavy vehicles.

The Commission does not recommend this proposal for the docket citing criteria D. This proposal has been previously submitted and rejected. It was originally proposed in the 2016-2017 amendment cycle but was not docketed citing criteria that it would be better addressed through another process, specifically the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan update. This proposal was most recently submitted and not docketed in the 2020-2021 cycle. There is insufficient evidence that relevant circumstances have changed significantly to warrant reconsidering this proposal.

## Previously Docketed Amendments

Of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments that were docketed by the City Council in Resolution 31970 for further analysis, the following five were not analyzed as part of the 2020-2021 annual amendment cycle:

- Amendments related to the West Seattle Bridge
- Impact fee amendments
- A new name for Single-Family areas
- Designation of the South Park Urban Village
- Amendments related to fossil fuels and public health

At the time the proposed West Seattle Bridge amendments were docketed, the closure of the West Seattle Bridge was anticipated to be much longer than it ultimately will be. Shortly after docketing this amendment, it was announced that the bridge would only be closed for three years. The need to amend the Comprehensive Plan to identify mitigation related to the closure was determined to be unnecessary. The City Council originally proposed impact fee amendments but has not taken any additional action to pursue these amendments. The Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) has stated that the remaining three amendments above (Single-Family areas, South Park Urban Village, and fossil fuels) could be more appropriately addressed through the next Major Update to the Comprehensive Plan, with the rationale that these issues would require a bigger change to the Plan outside of the scope of the annual amendments. The Planning Commission has concerns about waiting until the next Major Update of the Comprehensive Plan in 2024 for consideration of these proposed amendments and encourages the City Council to move forward on them sooner where appropriate. We would like to call your attention to the Commission's specific comments on one of these docketed amendments below.

### Alternative Name for Single-Family Zones

As we noted in our docket recommendation letter last year, the City Council proposed an amendment that would recommend an alternative name for Single-Family zones, such as Neighborhood Residential, and amend the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan to implement this change. The name 'Single-Family' zoning has been a misnomer since 1994 when the city passed Accessory Dwelling Unit legislation allowing two households to live on a Single-Family zoned parcel and is not representative of the households that currently live in those zones. This name is also linked to Seattle's former use of race-based zoning as an exclusionary practice. The Commission applauds and supports the City Council in the proposed amendment that would recommend changing the name of the zoning earlier than the Major Update. This change could also serve to inform the policy process considering alternatives to Single-Family zoning.

The Planning Commission has been a consistent advocate for reexamining Seattle's land use policies to expand the range and affordability of housing choices. Our 2018 [\*Neighborhoods for All\*](#) and 2020 [\*A Racially Equitable & Resilient Recovery\*](#) reports both emphasized the benefits of allowing more housing and increasing housing choices in Single-Family zones. The Commission applauds the City Council for including funding

Attachment 2 - Letter from the Seattle Planning Commission to the Council

Seattle Planning Commission  
2021-2022 Comprehensive Plan Amendments  
Page 5

to analyze a variety of housing types in Single-Family zones in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Major Update to the Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to providing our input on this subject throughout the process to update the Comprehensive Plan. In the meantime, the Commission recommends moving the effort to rename Single-Family zoning forward sooner than the beginning of the Major Update.

We appreciate the opportunity to review amendments for docket setting and provide our recommendations. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us or our Executive Director, Vanessa Murdock, at [vanessa.murdock@seattle.gov](mailto:vanessa.murdock@seattle.gov)

Sincerely,

The image shows two handwritten signatures in black ink. The signature on the left is for Rick Mohler, and the signature on the right is for Jamie Stroble. Both signatures are written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rick Mohler and Jamie Stroble, Co-Chairs  
Seattle Planning Commission

cc: Mayor Jenny Durkan  
Seattle City Councilmembers  
Lish Whitson, Eric McConaghy; Council Central Staff  
Rico Quirindongo, Michael Hubner; Office of Planning and Community Development

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **City of Seattle Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendment Selection (from Resolution 31807)**

- A. The amendment is legal under state and local law.
- B. 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 with the multi-county policies contained in the Puget Sound Regional Council's regional growth 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 activities identified in departmental work programs under way or expected soon, within which the suggested amendment can be considered alongside other related issues.
- 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 Seattle Municipal Code, and to conduct sufficient analysis and public review; and
  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.
- D. If the amendment has previously been proposed, relevant circumstances have changed significantly so that there is sufficient cause for reconsidering the proposal.
- E. If the amendment would change a neighborhood plan, there is evidence that proponents of the amendment, or other persons, have effectively communicated the substance and purpose of the amendment with those who could be affected by the amendment and there is documentation provided of community support for the amendment.
- F. The amendment is likely to make a material difference in a future City regulatory or funding decision.
- G. A proposal that would change the boundary of an urban center, urban village, or manufacturing/industrial center requires an amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), regardless of the area's size. However, an amendment that proposes to change the FLUM is not necessary and will not be considered when it would affect an area that is less than a full block in size and is located adjacent to other land designated on the FLUM for a use that is the same as – or is compatible with – the proposed designation.

**CITY OF SEATTLE**

**RESOLUTION \_\_\_\_\_**

..title

A RESOLUTION identifying proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to be considered for possible adoption in 2022 and requesting that the Office of Planning and Community Development and the Seattle Planning Commission review and make recommendations about proposed amendments.

..body

WHEREAS, under the Washington State Growth Management Act, chapter 36.70A RCW, The

City of Seattle (“City”) is required to have a comprehensive land use plan

(“Comprehensive Plan”) and to review that plan on a regular schedule; and

WHEREAS, except in limited circumstances, the Growth Management Act allows the City to

amend the Comprehensive Plan only once a year; and

WHEREAS, the City adopted a Comprehensive Plan through Ordinance 117221 in 1994, and

most recently adopted amendments to its Comprehensive Plan in August 2020 through

Ordinance 126186; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 31807 prescribes the procedures and criteria by which proposals for

amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are solicited from the public and selected for

analysis and possible adoption, a process known as setting the Comprehensive Plan

docket; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

**Section 1. Comprehensive Plan docket of amendments to be considered in 2022.** The City Council (“Council”) requests that the Office of Planning and Community Development (“OPCD”) analyze the following as possible amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and make a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council whether these proposed amendments warrant

1 further consideration for possible adoption in 2022. The full texts of the proposals are contained  
2 in Clerk File 321977.

3 A. Application to remove the arterial classification from Florentia Street and West  
4 Florentia Street in the Queen Anne neighborhood.

5 **Section 2. Other amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.** The Council requests that  
6 OPCD analyze the following amendments as part of the Comprehensive Plan docket and either  
7 provide a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council for consideration in 2022 alongside  
8 the amendments in Section 1, or provide an update on the status of each of these items and work  
9 program and timeline for completing the analysis:

10 A. South Park. Assess whether the South Park neighborhood meets the criteria for urban  
11 village designation and provide a report to Council as described in Resolutions 31870, 31896 and  
12 31970.

13 B. N. 130th Street and I-5. Specific to the area surrounding the future light rail station at  
14 North 130th Street and Interstate 5, along with other City departments, complete community-  
15 based planning and provide a proposal to establish an urban village as described in Resolution  
16 31970.

17 C. Fossil fuels and public health. In consultation with the Seattle Department of  
18 Construction and Inspections, the Office of Sustainability, and the Environmental Justice  
19 Committee, draft, evaluate, undertake environmental review and provide recommendations for  
20 potential amendments to the Environment, Land Use, or Utilities elements of the Comprehensive  
21 Plan that would clarify the City’s intent to protect the public health and meet its climate goals by  
22 limiting fossil fuel production and storage as described in Resolutions 31896 and 31970.

1           D. Maritime and Industrial Policies. Analyze and make recommendations for changes to  
2 the Comprehensive Plan to implement the recommendations of the Mayor’s Maritime and  
3 Industrial Stakeholder Committee as described in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy Council  
4 Recommendations of June 2021.

5           **Section 3. Other Comprehensive Plan amendments that may be considered in 2022.**

6 The Council may also consider the following amendments in 2022:

7           A. Impact fee amendments. Consistent with Resolutions 31762 and 31970, the Council  
8 intends to consider potential amendments to the Comprehensive Plan necessary to support  
9 implementation of an impact fee program for public streets, roads, and other transportation  
10 improvements. This impact fee work may include amendments to update or replace level-of-  
11 service standards or to add impact fee project lists in the Capital Facilities Element and  
12 amendments to other elements or maps in the Comprehensive Plan, as appropriate. The Council  
13 may also consider impact fee amendments related to publicly owned parks, open space, and  
14 recreation facilities, and school facilities.

15           **Section 4. Request for review and recommendations.** The Council requests that OPCD  
16 review the amendments described and listed in sections 1 and 2 of this resolution; conduct public  
17 and environmental reviews of the amendments listed in Sections 1 and 2; and present its analyses  
18 and the Mayor’s recommendations to the Seattle Planning Commission and to the City Council  
19 on the schedule set by Resolution 31807 for review and consideration in 2022.

20           **Section 5. Comprehensive Plan amendments that will not be considered in 2022.** The  
21 Council rejects the following proposed amendments for docketing for the 2021-2022 timeframe,  
22 the full texts of which proposals are contained in Clerk File 321977.

1           A. Application to amend the Future Land Use Map (“FLUM”) for the property addressed  
2 as 9201-9215 3rd Avenue S.

3           B. Application to amend the FLUM for the property addressed as 1511-1551 W Armory  
4 Way.

5           C. Application to amend the Land Use Element to clarify policies related to yards and  
6 trees.

7           D. Application to amend the Transportation Element to discourage pedestrian grade  
8 separations such as skybridges, aerial trams, or tunnels.

9           E. Application to add an Open and Democratic Government element or appendix.

10          F. Application to amend the Transportation Element to minimize damage streets from  
11 heavy vehicles.

12

DRAFT

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

Adopted by the City Council the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021,  
and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

Filed by me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

(Seal)