

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in track changes.

**A. Council Bill (CB) 118469 – Annual Amendments and State Requirements**

1. Amend CB 118469 to add a new section 3 with findings recommended by the state Department of Commerce.

\*\*\*

Section 3. Legislative findings. The Seattle City Council makes the following legislative findings:

1. The State of Washington Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.130, requires that the City of Seattle conduct a periodic review and evaluation of its Comprehensive Plan and development regulations and to take action to revise that plan and regulations, as necessary, by June 2015; and
2. The City of Seattle engaged in a comprehensive review of its Comprehensive Plan and development regulations over the last [eighteen months]. This ordinance constitutes the conclusion of the city's review process and it was completed in accordance with GMA update requirements, including RCW 36.70A.130

Section ~~34~~. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force 30 days after its approval by the Mayor, but if not approved and returned by the Mayor within ten days after presentation, it shall take effect as provided by Seattle Municipal Code Section 1.04.020.

\*\*\*

2. Amend Attachment 2 to CB 118469 (Urban Village Element Amendments) to replace references to growth **targets** with growth **estimates**.

**B. Distribution of Growth discussion**

The urban village strategy directs Seattle's future growth primarily to areas designated as centers and villages. The greatest share of job growth will be accommodated in urban centers – areas that already function as high density, concentrated employment centers with the greatest access to the regional transit network. Growth in industrial sector jobs will continue to be accommodated primarily within the two manufacturing/industrial centers where this activity is already securely established. Job growth will also occur in hub urban villages, which are distributed throughout the city to promote additional employment concentrations in areas easily accessible to the surrounding residential population, thereby locating jobs and services near where people live.

The greatest share of residential growth will also be accommodated in urban centers, increasing opportunities for people to live close to work. The next most significant share of residential growth will be distributed among the various hub and residential urban villages throughout the city in amounts compatible with the existing development characteristics of individual areas.

Modest growth will also be dispersed, generally at low density, in various areas outside centers and villages.

Growth ~~((targets))~~estimates at the citywide level represent the city's share of King County's projected 20-year population and employment growth. The City plans its zoning and infrastructure to accommodate ~~((these targets))~~estimated growth citywide as well as estimated growth in~~((for))~~ the individual urban centers~~((and villages))~~.

\*\*\*

~~UVG((36))33~~ UVG((36))33 Allow limited amounts of development in areas of the city outside urban centers and villages to maintain the general intensity of development that already characterizes these areas and to promote the ~~((targeted))~~level of growth ~~((in village and))~~estimated for centers~~((locations))~~.

\*\*\*

~~UV((41))40~~ UV((41))40 Base 20-year growth ~~((targets))~~estimates for each urban center~~((,))~~ and manufacturing/industrial~~((manufacturing/ industrial))~~ center ~~((and urban village contained in Urban Village Appendix A))~~ on:

1. Citywide ~~((targets))~~estimates for housing and job growth over 20 years from the Countywide

Attachment A to Central Staff Memo

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in track changes.

Planning Policies

2. The center's ~~((or village's))~~ role in regional growth management planning
3. Accessibility to transit
4. Existing zoning, including capacity for ~~((commercial))~~ employment and residential development
5. Existing densities
6. Current development conditions, recent development trends and plans for development by public or private sector developers, such as major institution plans
7. Density goals for each type of center ~~((or village))~~
8. Plans for infrastructure and public amenities and services necessary to support additional growth
9. The relationship of the center ~~((or village))~~ to the regional transportation network

~~UV((42))~~ 41 Promote the concentration of development within centers ~~((and villages))~~ over the 20-year timeframe of this ~~((p))~~ Plan, by:

1. Establishing 20-year growth ~~((targets))~~ estimates that do not exceed 80 percent of zoned capacity for development, as calculated by the City
2. Maintaining the 80 percent capacity margin in each center ~~((or village ))~~ whenever zoning is modified
3. Making reasonable efforts to provide services, facilities, and incentives to accommodate the ~~((targeted-))~~ estimated growth ~~((-))~~

\*\*\*

~~UV((45))~~ 42 Review, monitor and publish ~~((situations where ))~~ the rate of growth ~~((is significantly faster or slower than anticipated ((in the growth targets contained in Appendix UV-A-))~~ in centers and villages ~~((or where))~~ along with other measures that indicate ~~((significant))~~ changes in the center or village over ~~((#))~~ an extended period of time. Evaluate the significance of the changes with center or village residents, business owners, and other community stakeholders in light of the expectations underlying the neighborhood plan for the area, the actual level of growth, progress toward neighborhood plan implementation, and the relative maturity (level of mixed-use development, the pedestrian environment, infrastructure, and public facilities) of the area as an urban center or village.

Establish by resolution, percentage threshold criteria to identify growth conditions over an extended period of time that ~~((are at variance with growth targets-))~~ indicate a need to initiate a neighborhood review process. ~~((when the established threshold criteria are exceeded, or when there are significant changes in the other growth monitoring measures-))~~ In the neighborhood review process, identify appropriate responses to significant growth or changes, including, but not limited to:

- community-led activities;
- additional planning for, or re-prioritization of, City programs or infrastructure improvements;
- partially or entirely updating a neighborhood plan;
- amending growth ~~((targets))~~ estimates; or
- working with other public agencies to address community goals.

\*\*\*

~~UV((53))~~ 50 Direct efforts to expand the open space network according to the following considerations:

1. Locations for new facilities:
  - a. Urban centers and villages ~~((targeted for))~~ with the largest share of estimated residential growth; especially those existing high density residential areas presently not served according to the population-based or distribution goals for urban village open space;

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in track changes.

- b. Other urban village locations where an adopted subarea plan or recognized neighborhood plan includes open space recommendations consistent with these policies; and
  - c. Specific locations enumerated in the Parks functional plan outside urban centers or villages.
2. Types of open space acquisitions and facility development:
- a. Village open space sites, urban center indoor recreation facilities, village commons sites, and community gardens;
  - b. Critical open space linkages, connectors, and corridors that are highly accessible for active use within or directly serving urban villages, high density and/or high pedestrian, bicycle, or transit use areas;
  - c. Open space linkages, connectors, and corridors that are highly accessible for active use serving other high pedestrian, bicycle, or transit use areas; and
  - d. Other types of open space within or adjacent to urban villages that is accessible from adjacent urban villages.

\*\*\*

3. Amend attachment 4 to CB 118469 (Transportation Element Amendments) to clarify arterial classifications and correct a reference.

B Make the Best Use of the Streets We Have to Move People (&) and Goods

\*\*\*

T7 Designate ~~(, in the)~~ a series of arterials as defined below and, consistent with such designations, identify these arterials in Transportation Appendix Figure A-1. ~~((Strategic Plan, a traffic network that defines Interstate Freeways, Regional, Principal, Minor and Collector Arterial streets, Commercial and Residential Access streets and Alleys as follows:~~

- ~~Interstate Freeways:~~ roadways that provide the highest capacity and least impeded traffic flow for longer vehicle trips.
- ~~Regional Arterials:~~ roadways that provide for intra-regional travel and carry traffic through the city or serve important traffic generators, such as regional shopping centers, a major university, or sports stadia.
- **Principal (Major) Arterials:** roadways that are intended to serve as the primary routes for moving traffic through the city connecting urban centers and urban villages to one another, or to the regional transportation network.
- **Minor (Secondary) Arterials:** roadways that distribute traffic from principal arterials to collector arterials and access streets.
- **Collector Arterials:** roadways that collect and distribute traffic from principal and minor arterials to local access streets or provide direct access to destinations.
- ~~Commercial Access Streets:~~ roadways that directly serve commercial and industrial land uses and provide localized traffic circulation.
- ~~Residential Access Streets:~~ roadways that provide access to neighborhood land uses and access to higher level traffic streets.
- **Alleys:** travelways that provide access to the rear of residences and businesses that are not intended for the movement of through trips. ~~Where a continuous alley network exists, it is the preferred corridor for utility facilities.)~~

\*\*\*

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in [track changes](#).

T12 Designate, [in the Right-of-Way Improvement Manual](#), ~~((in the Transportation Strategic Plan,))~~ a network of boulevards that provides for circulation and access in a manner that enhances the appreciation or use of adjacent major parklands and vistas and preserves the historic character of the boulevards.

\*\*\*

4. Amend Attachment 6 to CB 118469 (Economic Development Element Amendments) to clarify a job growth goal.

EDG1 ~~((Add))~~ [Accommodate](#) approximately ~~((84,000))~~ [115,000](#) jobs in the city over the 20-year period covered by this Plan, in order to ensure long-term economic security and social equity to all Seattle residents.

\*\*\*

5. Amend attachment 12 to CB 118469 to reformat and relocated text and remove references to completed processes.

Housing Appendix

\*\*\*

A Introduction

\*\*\*

~~Sections near the end of the appendix describe the City's strategies for addressing affordable housing, inventory rent- and income-restricted housing within Seattle, and provide rough projections for continued production of income and rent-restricted housing. The Housing Appendix concludes with a summary of key findings on existing and projected affordable Housing Needs. Information on the data sources employed may be found after the summary of key findings.~~

Data Sources

~~Findings presented in this appendix regarding housing supply and housing needs in Seattle are based on a variety of data sources. One of the main sources used is the "CHAS" special tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); otherwise known as the Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data.~~

~~Certain aspects of the ACS CHAS data are important to note. As sample based estimates, the ACS CHAS estimates carry margins of error. These margins of error can be substantial, particularly for small groups of households. Margins of error are not reported on the ACS CHAS tabulations. To provide reasonably reliable statistics at the local level, HUD obtains CHAS tabulations based on ACS data pooled over a period of five years.~~

~~The 5-year CHAS estimates from the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS) provide the main data source for analyses in this appendix regarding household income, housing cost burden, and affordability of Seattle's housing supply. These were the most recent CHAS data available at the time the analysis for this appendix began. The CHAS data, like other ACS data, do not distinguish whether housing units are income- and rent-restricted. Other key sources of data reported and analyzed in this appendix include the following:~~

- ~~• Standard tabulations of Decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS) published by the U.S. Census Bureau.~~
- ~~• Rental market data from Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors, Inc. and home sales data from the Northwest Multiple Listing Service.~~
- ~~• Department of Planning and Development's permit database and development capacity model provide information on recent housing growth and estimated capacity for additional residential growth under~~

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in track changes.

current zoning:

- Seattle's Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development.
- Information from the Office of Housing on income and rent restricted housing.

Data reported from these sources vary with respect to time periods covered due to availability and other considerations:

\*\*\*

**B Residential Capacity**

\*\*\*

Housing Figure A-1

**Seattle Residential Development Capacity Model Estimates**

	<u>Existing Single-Family Housing Units*</u>	<u>Existing Multifamily Housing Units*</u>	<u>Total Existing Housing Units*</u>	<u>Residential Development Capacity (Housing Units)**</u>	<u>Share of City's Total Residential Growth Capacity</u>
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<u>133,982</u>	<u>174,075</u>	<u>308,057</u>	<u>223,713</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
<b>By zoning classification</b>					
<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>125,164</u>	<u>9,383</u>	<u>134,547</u>	<u>10,959</u>	<u>4.9%</u>
<u>Lowrise 1</u>	<u>2,931</u>	<u>9,382</u>	<u>12,313</u>	<u>4,791</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
<u>Lowrise 2</u>	<u>2,575</u>	<u>19,873</u>	<u>22,448</u>	<u>8,547</u>	<u>3.8%</u>
<u>Lowrise 3</u>	<u>1,753</u>	<u>52,693</u>	<u>54,446</u>	<u>14,397</u>	<u>6.4%</u>
<u>Midrise</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>16,766</u>	<u>16,982</u>	<u>10,328</u>	<u>4.6%</u>
<u>Highrise</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,326</u>	<u>5,326</u>	<u>8,740</u>	<u>3.9%</u>
<u>Neighborhood Commercial</u>	<u>522</u>	<u>26,903</u>	<u>27,425</u>	<u>66,872</u>	<u>29.9%</u>
<u>Commercial</u>	<u>302</u>	<u>13,012</u>	<u>13,314</u>	<u>65,567</u>	<u>29.3%</u>
<u>Downtown</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>18,532</u>	<u>18,859</u>	<u>33,512</u>	<u>15.0%</u>
<u>Master Planned Community</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>561</u>	<u>561</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<u>Major Institution</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>1,386</u>	<u>1,432</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<u>Industrial</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>258</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<b>By location inside or outside of Seattle's Urban Center and Villages</b>					
<b>Urban Centers:</b>	<u>1,007</u>	<u>64,405</u>	<u>65,412</u>	<u>96,862</u>	<u>43.3%</u>
<u>Downtown</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>18,532</u>	<u>18,859</u>	<u>33,512</u>	<u>15.0%</u>
<u>First Hill/Capitol Hill</u>	<u>370</u>	<u>26,265</u>	<u>26,635</u>	<u>19,009</u>	<u>8.5%</u>
<u>Northgate</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>4,346</u>	<u>4,377</u>	<u>10,966</u>	<u>4.9%</u>
<u>South Lake Union</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,692</u>	<u>2,692</u>	<u>20,277</u>	<u>9.1%</u>
<u>Uptown</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>5,917</u>	<u>5,956</u>	<u>4,165</u>	<u>1.9%</u>
<u>University</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>6,653</u>	<u>6,893</u>	<u>8,933</u>	<u>4.0%</u>
<b>Hub Urban Villages:</b>	<u>1,877</u>	<u>19,009</u>	<u>20,886</u>	<u>36,227</u>	<u>16.2%</u>
<u>Ballard</u>	<u>515</u>	<u>6,653</u>	<u>7,168</u>	<u>5,314</u>	<u>2.4%</u>
<u>Bitter Lake Village</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>2,970</u>	<u>3,059</u>	<u>10,521</u>	<u>4.7%</u>
<u>Lake City</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>2,277</u>	<u>2,311</u>	<u>4,282</u>	<u>1.9%</u>
<u>North Rainier</u>	<u>720</u>	<u>1,748</u>	<u>2,468</u>	<u>9,276</u>	<u>4.1%</u>
<u>West Seattle Junction</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>2,994</u>	<u>3,320</u>	<u>5,157</u>	<u>2.3%</u>
<b>Residential Urban Villages (in aggregate)</b>	<u>8,556</u>	<u>29,821</u>	<u>38,377</u>	<u>39,386</u>	<u>17.6%</u>
<b>Manuf. Industrial Centers</b>	<u>136</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>345</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<b>Outside Villages</b>	<u>122,406</u>	<u>60,631</u>	<u>183,037</u>	<u>51,207</u>	<u>22.9%</u>

Attachment A to Central Staff Memo

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in [track changes](#).

Sources: Seattle City Department of Planning & Development, Development Capacity Model (Model Run Date: January 2014).

\* Existing housing units from King County Assessor's database, January 2014. (Yields somewhat lower estimates than other sources.)

\*\* These are adjusted residential capacity estimates from the model: in all mixed-use zones, commercial, neighborhood commercial and most downtown zones, all future development is considered mixed-use with the mix of residential and other uses varying by zone based on completed projects from 1995-2005.

	<u>Existing Single-Family Housing Units*</u>	<u>Existing Multifamily Housing Units*</u>	<u>Total Existing Housing Units*</u>	<u>Residential Development Capacity (Housing Units)**</u>	<u>Share of City's Total Residential Growth Capacity</u>
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<u>133,980</u>	<u>174,080</u>	<u>308,060</u>	<u>223,710</u>	<u>100%</u>
<b><u>By Future Land Use classification</u></b>					
<u>Single Family</u>	<u>125,160</u>	<u>9,380</u>	<u>134,550</u>	<u>10,960</u>	<u>5%</u>
<u>Multifamily</u>	<u>7,480</u>	<u>104,040</u>	<u>111,520</u>	<u>46,800</u>	<u>21%</u>
<u>Commercial/Mixed-Use</u>	<u>820</u>	<u>39,920</u>	<u>40,740</u>	<u>132,440</u>	<u>59%</u>
<u>Downtown</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>18,530</u>	<u>18,860</u>	<u>33,510</u>	<u>15%</u>
<u>Industrial</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>260</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
<u>Master Planned Community</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>560</u>	<u>560</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Major Institution</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>1,390</u>	<u>1,430</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>City-Owned Open Space</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
<b><u>By location inside or outside of Seattle's Urban Center and Villages</u></b>					
<b><u>Urban Centers</u></b>	<u>1,010</u>	<u>64,410</u>	<u>65,410</u>	<u>96,860</u>	<u>43%</u>
<u>Downtown</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>18,530</u>	<u>18,860</u>	<u>33,510</u>	<u>15%</u>
<u>First Hill/Capitol Hill</u>	<u>370</u>	<u>26,270</u>	<u>26,640</u>	<u>19,010</u>	<u>9%</u>
<u>Northgate</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>4,350</u>	<u>4,380</u>	<u>10,970</u>	<u>5%</u>
<u>South Lake Union</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,690</u>	<u>2,690</u>	<u>20,280</u>	<u>9%</u>
<u>Uptown</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>5,920</u>	<u>5,960</u>	<u>4,170</u>	<u>2%</u>
<u>University</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>6,650</u>	<u>6,890</u>	<u>8,930</u>	<u>4%</u>
<b><u>Hub Urban Villages</u></b>	<u>1,880</u>	<u>19,010</u>	<u>20,890</u>	<u>36,230</u>	<u>16%</u>
<b><u>Residential Urban Villages</u></b>	<u>8,560</u>	<u>29,820</u>	<u>38,380</u>	<u>39,390</u>	<u>18%</u>
<b><u>Manuf. Industrial Centers</u></b>	<u>140</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>350</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0%</u>
<b><u>Outside Villages</u></b>	<u>122,410</u>	<u>60,630</u>	<u>183,040</u>	<u>51,210</u>	<u>23%</u>

Sources: Seattle City Department of Planning & Development, Development Capacity Model (Model Run Date: January 2014).

\* Existing housing units from King County Assessor's database, January 2014. (Yields somewhat lower estimates than other sources.)

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in [track changes](#).

\*\* These are adjusted residential capacity estimates from the model: in all mixed-use zones, commercial, neighborhood commercial and most downtown zones, all future development is considered mixed-use with the mix of residential and other uses varying by zone based on completed projects from 1995-2005. Master Planned Communities and Major Institutions are not included in the Development Capacity model.

\*\*\*

I Seattle's Rent and Income Restricted Housing Inventory

\*\*\*

In September 2014, the City Council and Mayor Murray approved Resolution 31546 calling for the creation of a Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) and convening a HALA Advisory Committee. The purpose of the HALA is to chart a course for the next 10 years for ensuring the development and preservation of housing that addresses the wide diversity of housing needs of people across the income spectrum. As stated in the resolution, "existing programs and policies alone are unlikely to provide and preserve the number of affordable units that will be required to meet the future affordable housing needs of households across the City." The HALA will include "recommendations for new or revised programs and policies designed to meet the City's projected housing needs; and estimate gaps in meeting housing needs that may remain."<sup>4</sup>

J Concluding Summary: Key Findings on Existing and Projected Affordable Housing Needs

\*\*\*

As this appendix is being written, City of Seattle policymakers, staff and stakeholders are engaged in crafting a Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda and are pursuing additional efforts to more fully address affordability challenges that limit households' ability to come to, and remain in, Seattle. The City is also engaging the public to help identify how best to mitigate potential risks of displacement and foster equitable development and access to opportunity as the city grows. The outcomes of these processes will guide the strategies necessary for addressing Seattle's housing needs into the future.

Data Sources

Findings presented in this appendix regarding housing supply and housing needs in Seattle are based on a variety of data sources. One of the main sources used is the "CHAS" special tabulation of American Community Survey (ACS) prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), otherwise known as the Consolidated Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data.

Certain aspects of the ACS CHAS data are important to note. As sample-based estimates, the ACS CHAS estimates carry margins of error. These margins of error can be substantial, particularly for small groups of households. Margins of error are not reported on the ACS CHAS tabulations. To provide reasonably reliable statistics at the local level, HUD obtains CHAS tabulations based on ACS data pooled over a period of five years.

The 5-year CHAS estimates from the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS) provide the main data source for analyses in this appendix regarding household income, housing cost burden, and affordability of Seattle's housing supply. These were the most recent CHAS data available at the time the analysis for this appendix began. The CHAS data, like other ACS data, do not distinguish whether housing units are income- and rent-restricted. Other key sources of data reported and analyzed in this appendix include the following.

- Standard tabulations of Decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS) published by the U.S. Census Bureau.
- Rental market data from Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors, Inc. and home sales data from the Northwest Multiple Listing Service.
- Department of Planning and Development's permit database and development capacity model provide information on recent housing growth and estimated capacity for additional residential growth under

<sup>4</sup> Seattle City Council Resolution Number: 31546, Adopted by Full Council: September 22, 2014 and signed by Mayor Murray, September 23, 2014.

Attachment A to Central Staff Memo

Housekeeping Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Amendment Bills, changes are shown in [track changes](#).

[current zoning.](#)

- [Seattle's Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development.](#)
- [Information from the Office of Housing on income- and rent-restricted housing.](#)

[Data reported from these sources vary with respect to time periods covered due to availability and other considerations.](#)

**B. Council Bill (CB) 118470 – University Community Urban Center**

1. Amend Attachment 2 to CB 118470 to clarify a housing policy and an open space policy.

\*\*\*

UC-P((15))12 Employ a variety of ((housing types and development-))strategies to [preserve existing housing while supporting new residential growth that diversifies unit types, sizes, and affordability.](#) ((effectively provide for identified [housing](#) needs, including ((-existing housing-)) preservation [of some existing housing while accommodating growth with a diversity of unit types, sizes and affordability.](#) ~~code enforcement, accessory units, new ground-related housing, and mixed-use mid-rise residential development.~~))

\*\*\*

UC-P((22))18 Provide better physical connections from the University District to [the UW campus-, with particular emphasis on the campus entrance at NE 43rd St and, more broadly, opening the west edge of central campus along 15th Ave NE](#) ~~that takes into consideration the U-District Urban Design Framework, the UW Landscape Plan, and the UW Master Plan.~~ ((In Lower Brooklyn (the area generally south of NE 43rd Street between Roosevelt Avenue NE and the UW campus), provide open space for the large population including residents, workers, and students and strengthen physical connections to the waterfront and campus. Encourage better physical integration between the campus and the community.))