

January 4, 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Select Committee on Mandatory Housing Affordability
From: Council Central Staff
Subject: Mandatory Housing Affordability: Preliminary Issue Identification

On Monday, January 7, the Select Committee on Citywide Mandatory Housing Affordability will initiate its consideration of specific amendments to legislation to implement the Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) program. This memorandum discusses the Council's process related to the MHA legislation to date and identifies specific issues that Council may want to address as it considers the legislation.

This memo has two attachments:

- Attachment 1 discusses issues Councilmembers may want to consider in reviewing the Mandatory Housing Affordability legislation.
- Attachment 2 identifies draft amendments to the Seattle Comprehensive Plan's neighborhood plan goals and policies related to the Mandatory Housing Affordability legislation

Issues included in this memo were identified by Councilmembers, through comments at public hearings and correspondence from constituents, Central Staff review and analysis of the proposal, and City Department recommendations. This is not an exhaustive list of issues. Other issues may be identified in the course of the Committee's review and discussion. Inclusion in this memo does not imply that there is a Councilmember sponsoring any change suggested.

Background

In November 2017, Mayor Burgess transmitted [Council Bill 119814](#) to implement the Mandatory Housing Affordability program citywide. The legislation would rezone the City's commercial and multifamily areas, urban villages, and areas on the edges of urban villages within a ten-minute walk of frequent transit. In exchange for the ability to build additional floors, floor area or units, areas rezoned under the proposal would be required to include affordable housing units on site or make a payment in lieu to build affordable housing off-site. The legislation would also amend development standards for zoning districts subject to the MHA regulations and update the requirements for contributions toward MHA. A full description of the proposal is available in the [Director's Report and Recommendation](#) on MHA Citywide Implementation.

In 2018, the Council held nine meetings of the Select Committee on MHA to receive briefings on the proposal and held five public hearings to receive input on the proposal from members of the public. Following those briefings and hearings, Central Staff, working with staff from the

Office of Planning and Community Development, the Office of Housing, and the Office of the City Attorney, have identified a number of technical changes that will be incorporated into a revised version of Council Bill 119814. That bill will be introduced in the coming weeks, prior to notice of an additional public hearing. Substantive issues related to the bill are listed in Attachment 1 to this memorandum.

Two other pieces of legislation will be considered alongside the bill rezoning property and amending the land use code. The first would amend the Comprehensive Plan, increasing the boundaries of some urban villages to encompass a ten-minute walk to frequent transit service. This bill would also amend neighborhood plan goals and policies to be consistent with the City's implementation of the MHA program. The second is a resolution, which would identify additional activities that the City intends to undertake in order to implement the MHA program and mitigate impacts from additional growth.

Attachments

There are two attachments to this memorandum. Attachment 1 lists issues identified by Central Staff that Councilmembers should consider as they review the MHA-related legislation. Attachment 2 lists draft amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, which would make policy changes to be consistent with the proposed rezones and changes to development standards.

Next Steps

At the January 14 Select Committee meeting, the Committee will begin the discussion of amendments specific to Districts. This discussion will focus on specific locations where Councilmembers and members of the public have recommended changes to the proposal. This discussion will be continued at the January 16 Select committee meeting.

Also, a revised bill will be introduced in January, incorporating technical amendments identified through preliminary review and public comment.

Concurrent with those discussions, we will be drafting a notice for a public hearing to receive input on all potential changes to the MHA legislation. Please notify Central Staff as soon as possible of any amendments that you intend to move forward, so that they can be identified in the public hearing notice. Depending on their scope and impact, under the Washington State Growth Management Act, the Council may be limited in their ability to amend the bill regarding issues not included in the public hearing notice.

cc: Kirstan Arestad, Central Staff Director
Ketil Freeman, Supervising Analyst

Attachments

Attachment 1: Issues identified in Council Bill 119814

Attachment 2: Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

Table 1: Table of Potential Areas for Amendments

The following table includes an initial discussion of potential changes to the Executive’s proposal to implement MHA citywide based on Councilmember and Council Staff review of the proposal (including some issues raised during public comment at the Select Committee on Citywide MHA meetings and public hearings held in 2018). The areas identified for potential changes are presented here for public review and comment and discussion among Councilmembers. The Council may decide to pursue some, all, or no changes to the proposal, and may decide to approach these topics in a different manner than presented here.

Any issues identified that may result in an amendment to the Citywide MHA legislation or Comprehensive Plan Amendments legislation will need to be reviewed for consistency with the MHA Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Central Staff will work with Councilmembers to determine whether proposed amendments are consistent. Changes that are outside the scope of the FEIS, or represent other policy work that responds to community interest in additional work on key issues beyond changes to the Land Use Code, may be included in a companion resolution that will be introduced in February, and considered concurrently with the Citywide MHA legislation and Comprehensive Plan Amendments legislation.

Topic/Issue	Discussion
<p>A. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</p>	
<p>To implement MHA, the Executive has proposed development capacity increases in two ways: (1) through a change in the zone designation (e.g., a property zoned NC2-40 that is rezoned to NC2-55); or (2) through changes to the development standards for a zone that increase its capacity (e.g., a property zoned LR2 remains LR2, but the development standards for LR2 zones change). Some properties may be affected by both types of changes. The proposed changes to development standards vary by zone and generally include increases in the maximum height and the floor area ratio (FAR) limits. In addition to changes to development standards that increase development capacity, some changes are proposed to address other urban design objectives (e.g. applying a maximum FAR of 0.75 in RSL zones). Listed below are development standards Councilmembers may want to consider modifying to ensure that the development capacity increase can practically be achieved and/or to address urban design objectives.</p>	
<p>Development Standards in RSL Zones (SMC Chapter 23.44)</p>	
<p>A1. Maximum Unit Size for Existing Dwelling Units (23.44.018)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Apply a maximum size of 2,200 square feet for a principal dwelling unit in RSL zones. This standard is meant to prohibit construction of very large, high-cost detached single-family homes in the RSL zone and encourage a mix of moderately sized homes.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Applying this standard to existing structures may prevent additions to existing homes. Consider providing an exception for existing units to accommodate a second story addition to an existing single-story</p>

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
	<p>home or allow small additions for existing two-story homes (i.e. allowing a second story that does not increase the footprint of the existing structure or allowing a percent increase of existing floor area). This would accommodate moderate additions to existing structures that furthers protections against tear-downs.</p>
<p>A2. Apartments in RSL zones (23.44.006.C and 23.44.017.B)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Limit the number of units in an apartment development to three dwelling units or less, regardless of lot size, in addition to applying a density limit on one dwelling unit per 2,200 square feet of lot area for all development types.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> The combination of the absolute limit on the number of units in an apartment structure and the density limit could result in some lots being underbuilt or prioritizing other structure types, such as cottage housing development, rowhouse development, and townhouse developments. Consider removing the absolute limit on the number of units in a development that could allow, on larger lots, apartment development of more than three units, such as a two-story structure that contains four units. The density limits would still apply, along with regulations on the height, yard requirements, FAR, etc. that would address other urban design objectives.</p>
<p>A3. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) (23.44.041.A.6)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Apply ADU standards from multifamily zones to RSL zones. This includes requiring that a detached ADU (DADU) must be located directly behind the principal structure and limits on the height of exterior stairs to ADUs.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Consider whether these additional limits on ADUs in RSL zones are necessary and consider removing or modifying the proposed standards. Alternatively, consider whether accessory units should be encouraged in RSL zones.</p>
<p>A4. Garage design standards (23.44.016.G)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> This section includes design standards for garages currently in place for multifamily zones and applies them to RSL zones. This includes allowing garages to face the street, provided the garage entrance is set back at least 18 feet from the street lot line and the total combined horizontal width of all garage entrances located on all street-facing facades are not more than 10 feet times the number of principal dwelling units located on the lot.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> The requirements for garage entrances may result in a row of garage doors along the street. Consider if this is an urban design outcome that is preferred.</p>
<p>Development Standards in Multifamily Zones (SMC Chapter 23.45)</p>	

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
<p>A5. Density limits in Lowrise 1 (LR1) zones (23.45.412.A)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Remove density limits for cottage housing and apartment developments and reduce the existing density limits from 1 unit per 1,600 square feet of lot area for rowhouses on lots less than 3,000 square feet in size, and for all townhouse development to 1 unit per 1,350 square feet of lot area.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> The proposed density limits may incentivize development of cottage housing, apartments, and rowhouses on lots with more than 3,000 square feet of lot area. Consider if that is the preferred development outcome.</p>
<p>A6. FAR Limits</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Simplify FAR limits for each Lowrise zone by removing separate FAR limits for apartment, rowhouse, townhouse and cottage housing development in the lowrise zones.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> The code currently uses different FAR limits to encourage different types of development in each zone. For example, in the Lowrise 1 zone, townhouses are permitted to have up to 1.2 FAR, rowhouses are permitted to have up to 1.1 FAR and apartments are permitted to have up to 1.0 FAR. Under the proposed code, all of these development types would be permitted to have 1.3 FAR. Similarly, under the current code, apartment structures have higher FAR limits than rowhouses or townhouses. Under the proposed code, all of these development types would have an FAR limit of 2.3 inside urban centers and villages, and 1.8 outside urban centers and villages. Consider continuing to incentivize different development types in different zones by permitting different FAR limits by development type by zone.</p>
<p>A7. Pitched roofs in LR1 (23.48.514.D.1)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Currently, pitched roofs may extend up to 5 feet above the maximum height limit in LR zones if it does not exceed a pitch of 6:12. The Executive’s proposal maintains the requirement that the roof not exceed a pitch of 6:12.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Most townhouses are 30 to 40 feet wide; a 6:12 roof pitch would require a roof that is 7.5 to 10 feet in height, which is more than the 5-foot bonus. A 3:12 roof pitch would require a roof that is 3.75 to 5 feet height. Projects providing pitched roofs today are generally either in LR3 zones (which have a height limit of 40 feet) or have substandard floor to ceiling heights. Consider allowing pitched roofs with a slope of 3:12 to ensure that projects have a more realistic choice between pitched or flat roofs.</p>
<p>A8. Incentive zoning in Highrise (HR) zones</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Projects would fulfill requirements to achieve the additional floor area provided through incentive zoning (IZ) entirely through MHA and the option to meet the IZ requirement by providing open space, Green Street improvements, or transfer of development rights, rather than through affordable housing, would no longer be available. Under the existing IZ program, developers in the HR zone can achieve all their extra floor area by contributing to affordable housing. However, they also have the option of achieving up to 40 percent of</p>

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
	<p>their extra floor area by providing any combination of public open space, implementing a Green Street improvement, or purchasing Transferrable Development Potential (TDP) from historic landmark sites.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> The sale or transfer of TDP for landmarked buildings in the First Hill High Rise (HR) zone provides a potential source of revenue for owners of landmarked buildings to use for preservation efforts. The other options to gain the extra floor area through the IZ program acknowledge a priority for open space and Green Streets in this area. Councilmembers could consider modifying the proposed legislation to maintain the voluntary option of achieving up to 40 percent of extra floor area through open space, Green Street improvements, or TDP by exempting the portion of extra floor earned through these options from MHA requirements. This approach would allow developments to maximize their capacity to provide open space, Green Street improvements, or TDP, but it would ensure that smaller-scale structures or structures choosing not to use this option would still be subject to MHA requirements as currently proposed. Alternatively, Councilmembers could consider requiring all projects achieve up to 40 percent of extra floor area through open space, Green Street improvements, or TDP without exempting this portion from MHA, However, under this option, the cost for this requirement and MHA would be additive.</p>
<p>Development Standards in Commercial and Seattle Mixed (SM) Zones (SMC Chapter 23.47A and 23.48)</p>	
<p>A9. Support for small businesses</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> In certain areas, such as the Pike/Pine Conservation Overlay District, there are development standards in place to ensure that new development includes spaces for small commercial uses.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Development standards that require that new development include spaces designed for small commercial uses is one potential strategy to support commercial affordability and limit the potential displacement of small, locally-owned businesses. Consider applying these standards in areas where ground floor commercial use is required or desired. This could include, for example, limiting the maximum façade width for all commercial spaces at street-level, or requiring inclusion of spaces for individual small businesses that would vary based on the total commercial floor area proposed at the street level. These strategies could apply in Pedestrian-designated areas – the areas with the most commercial intensity – or in all Neighborhood Commercial areas depending on the Council’s intent.</p>
<p>A10. Parking and loading in SM-Rainier Beach (SM-RB) zones (23.48.945)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> The proposal for parking and loading in the SM-RB zone would allow surface parking in front of buildings at the street, allow for two-way curb cuts, and allows for as much as 50 percent of the total lot area to be covered by surface parking. The SM-RB zone is proposed for the Rainier Beach light rail station area.</p>

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
	<p><i>Discussion:</i> The development standards proposed would allow for auto-oriented development next to a light rail station. Consider modifying the proposed standards to require more pedestrian-oriented development adjacent to a transit station.</p>
<p>Other Development Standards</p>	
<p>A11. Nonconformities</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> The Executive’s proposal does not include changes to development standards for nonconforming structures. Under existing regulations (SMC Section 23.42.112 and 114) there are specific standards for how a nonconforming structure can be modified or expanded. For example, in 23.42.112.A there are exceptions that allow expansion of a principal structure in a single-family zone that is nonconforming to front and/or rear yard requirements. Absent additional changes, this exception would apply to structures in RSL zones.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Councilmembers may want to consider if the protections for nonconforming structures in single-family and multifamily zones are appropriate in combination with the other changes proposed to development standards for structures in these zones.</p>
<p>A12. Preschool uses (23.47A.008.C.5.2c; 23.47A.009.G.1.c.4; 23.48.040.D.3.1.c.3; 23.48.B.2.g.3.)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> In several sections, there are certain benefits granted to projects that include preschools that do not apply to child care centers. In the Land Use Code, "Child care center" is a broader term that includes preschools.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> To encourage inclusion of child care centers in new development rather than just preschools, consider replacing the term “preschools” with “child care centers” in parts of the code where benefits are granted to projects that include preschools.</p>
<p>A13. Exceptions to floor area limit for affordable housing (23.73.010.B.1.c)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Under the existing code, projects in the Pike/Pine Conservation Overlay District can gain a 15 percent increase in the floor area limit if the project retains character structures on the lot and includes uses that contribute to the area’s recognized character as an arts district, or if the project includes at least 50 percent of total gross floor area for housing that is affordable to income eligible households. The Executive’s proposal would remove the option that allows the increase for projects that include affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Removing this option would prioritize retaining character structures and uses that contribute to the arts district. Councilmembers may want to maintain the existing option to also encourage inclusion of affordable units in new development.</p>
<p>A14. Solid waste, recycling and compost facilities</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> The Executive’s proposal includes changes to requirements for ramps to accommodate access to solid waste and recycling containers during collection. It does not include changes to how residents or tenants of a development access these containers.</p>

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
(23.54.040)	<i>Discussion:</i> Councilmembers could consider adding requirements to ensure that containers for compost are equally accessible compared to garbage and recycling in multi-family buildings.
A15. Design Review Exceptions	<p><i>Proposal:</i> The Executive’s proposal does not include any changes to the Design Review program. However, during discussions of CB 119269 (the 2018 Land Use Omnibus bill), the Executive proposed an incentive for rowhouse development by applying a higher threshold for when rowhouse development would be required to go through Design Review. In the Fall of 2017, the Council adopted changes to the Design Review program that applied thresholds based on the size of the project rather than varying thresholds by zone and by development type. Because the proposal in the Omnibus bill would have been a change to that policy direction, Councilmembers deferred that decision on modifying Design Review thresholds to incentive certain types of development, such as rowhouses, until amendments to the Citywide MHA Legislation discussions were underway.</p> <p><i>Discussion.</i> Consider modifying Design Review thresholds for certain types of development. Note that one of the goals of the changes made to the Design Review program in 2017 was to simplify the thresholds; introducing this type of exception may undermine that intent.</p>
<p>B. MANDATORY HOUSING AFFORDABILITY PROGRAM The Executive’s proposal establishes payment and performance amounts for all zones with an (M), (M1), or (M2) suffix. Other requirements for the implementation and application of MHA that have been previously adopted in the framework legislation will generally remain as previously proposed.</p>	
B1. Payment and performance amounts (23.58C and 23.58B)	<p><i>Proposal:</i> In the legislation that was introduced in January 2018, no adjustments for inflation or other modifications, such as changes based on more current market rents and capitalization rates, were made. Section 1 of Ordinance 125108 addresses the Council's intent for amendments to the payment and performance amounts, and the establishment of additional processes for modifying dimensional development standards and/or payment and performance amounts. This includes a request that the Office of Housing compare changes in the Consumer Price Index, All Urban Consumers, Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA, All Items (1982-1984 = 100), with changes in multifamily residential rents and other housing market variables used to determine initial payment amounts and determine if the Consumer Price Index has lagged or exceeded rents or other housing market variables. The Council requested the Director of Housing to propose an alternative measure or index upon which to base changes in program requirements.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Consider adjustments to the payment amounts based on the Office of Housing and the Office of Planning and Community Development’s analysis and recommendations regarding alternative measures or</p>

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
	<p>indexes upon which to base changes to program requirements. Consider modifying proposed payment amounts based on housing market changes.</p> <p>In addition, when reviewing this information, Councilmembers may want to consider adjusting the boundaries of high, medium and low MHA- implementation areas based on changed market conditions or in recognition of potential displacement risk. In the past, the Council applied these higher payment and performance amounts in the Chinatown/International District and the Central Area in recognition of increasing rents in those areas leading to an increased threat of displacement.</p>
<p>B2. Off-site performance for projects partnering with a non-profit developer (23.58C and 23.58B)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Under the existing MHA requirements, if a developer selects the performance option, units must be included within the development and cannot be provided off-site. No changes are proposed to this requirement.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Under existing incentive zoning provisions, off-site performance is permitted in some instances. There have been some challenges with this provision. For example, a for-profit developer may partner with a non-profit developer with a project or site that would not compete well for other sources of subsidy. This can result in the provision of fewer affordable units or a lag in development of affordable units.</p>
<p>B3. Timing of MHA Payments (23.58.025.B; 23.58C.030.B)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Under the existing MHA requirements, MHA payments must be made prior to issuance of the first building permit. No changes are proposed to this requirement.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Builders have raised concerned that the timing of the payment will contribute to higher sales prices, particularly for smaller scale development, such as townhomes and rowhouses. Councilmembers could consider if, for some development types, the MHA payment could be delayed or amortized.</p>
<p>B4. Approved and vested projects – election to participate. (23.58B.055; 23.58C.055)</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Under the existing MHA requirements, there are provisions that specify the process under which a proposed project located in a Downtown or SM-SLU zone, that had a Master Use Permit or vested prior to the effective date of Ordinance 125291 (the ordinance implementing MHA in the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers), can modify the proposal to (1) incorporate the additional capacity implemented by that Ordinance and (2) participate in the MHA program, without requiring additional review by the Design Review Board. In addition to that provision, SDCI has a process in place that allows applicants that are in the Design Review process to include an option that assumes the Citywide MHA legislation is adopted; this will allow projects to have the option considered as they move through the process and if the legislation is adopted, move forward with that option (see SDCI’s handout on planning for the MHA upzones here).</p>

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
	<p><i>Discussion:</i> Councilmembers may want to consider if additional direction is needed in the Land Use Code or through a Director’s Rule to ensure that projects that are somewhere in the review process have a simple path forward to incorporate the additional capacity that would be implemented by the City MHA Legislation and participate in the MHA program.</p>
<p>C. REZONE CRITERIA The Executive’s proposal includes changes to Chapter 23.41 of the Seattle Municipal Code to update the criteria that the City uses to evaluate whether a rezone is appropriate. These changes include a new section regarding the application of the MHA program when property is being rezoned, and changes to reflect the policy choice to increase the use of the RSL zone and multifamily zones in urban centers, urban villages and light rail station areas.</p>	
<p>C1. Consideration of transit service in rezoning areas</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> Use the terms “high frequency transit access” and “where transit service is good to excellent” to qualitatively assess transit access that can support higher-density development.</p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Last spring as part of a suite of changes related to off-street parking requirements, the Council adopted a new standard for “frequent transit service” that quantitatively measures the frequency of transit to a particular location. Consider using this term in the rezone criteria to clarify where rezones to the RSL zone or the Midrise zone may be most appropriate.</p>
<p>D. CHANGES TO ZONE DESIGNATIONS ON THE OFFICIAL LAND USE MAP (i.e. REZONES) As described previously, one of the ways that the Executive’s proposal implements MHA is increase development capacity through a change in the zone designation (e.g., a property zoned NC2-40 that is rezoned to NC2-55). Councilmembers have had several requests for parcel specific or area-wide adjustments to the proposed zoning changes. Those specific requests will be presented and discussed at the Select Committee on Citywide MHA meetings on January 14 and January 16.</p>	
<p>Councilmembers have received several requests for parcel-specific or area-wide adjustments to the proposed zoning changes. Those specific requests will be presented and discussed at the MHA Select Committee meetings on January 14 and January 16. Through the MHA Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), OPCD contemplated several options for zoning changes throughout the study area. Changes that are requested that are consistent with the options studied in the FEIS may be considered as an amendment to the proposed bill. After publication of additional analyses required by the Hearing Examiner related to Historic Resources, Councilmembers may consider adjustments to initial amendment proposals or additional amendments.</p> <p>Changes that are beyond the options studied in the FEIS or changes to property that fall outside of the study area, may be included in the companion resolution with a request to the Executive to conduct a planning process, including additional environmental review, to determine if those changes are appropriate.</p>	

Attachment 1: Table of potential areas for amendments

Topic/Issue	Discussion
E. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS	
<p>E1. Comp Plan policy F-P13</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> F-P13 ((In the area where the Wallingford Urban Village and the Fremont Planning Area overlap (the area bounded by Stone Way on the east, N. 45th Street on the north, Aurora Avenue North on the west, and N. 40th Street on the south) maintain)) <u>Maintain the physical character ((and integrity)) of ((the existing single-family zoned)) historically lower-density areas of the urban village by ((maintaining current single-family zoning on properties meeting the locational criteria for single-family zones)) encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Encourage primarily residential uses in these areas while allowing for small scale commercial and retail services for the urban village and surrounding area, generally at a lower scale than in hub urban villages and urban centers.</u></p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> The proposals changes the policy focus from the area that overlaps between Fremont and Wallingford to being just focused on the Fremont Urban Village. Councilmembers should consider if this change is consistent with the character of the Fremont urban village (which is not particularly “historically lower-density.”) The policy could be modified to focus on the area that was the original focus of the policy, or just delete it because having policies that in multiple plans that provide direction about development in particular areas may lead to inconsistencies in the application.</p>
<p>E2. Comp Plan policy MJ-P23.1</p>	<p><i>Proposal:</i> <u>Add a new Policy MJ-P23.1 Consider community planning to address land use, housing and other issues if the growth rate in the urban village accelerates to become significantly higher than anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan.</u></p> <p><i>Discussion:</i> Representatives of the Morgan Community Association have requested that the word “consider” be replaced with “conduct” and that the word “significantly” be deleted.</p>
F. Technical Changes to the base bill	
<p>F1. Staff are compiling a list of technical or clarifying changes to: (1) maintain consistency between the Citywide MHA legislation and other legislation; (2) fix typos and other drafting errors identified by Central Staff or Executive staff; and (3) incorporate changes requested by the Committee chair. These changes will be presented at the Select Committee on Citywide MHA meeting on January 16, 2019 and incorporated into a new bill that will be introduced on January 21, 2019. This new bill will replace CB 119184 that was introduced on January 29, 2018.</p>	

POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN'S NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES

Neighborhood Plans

Adopted Neighborhood Plans

* * *

Aurora-Licton

* * *

DESIGNATION OF THE AURORA-LICTON

RESIDENTIAL URBAN VILLAGE POLICIES

* * *

AL-P2 ~~((Protect))~~ Maintain the physical character ~~((and integrity))~~ of ~~((Aurora-Licton's single-family))~~ historically lower-density areas ~~((within the boundaries))~~ of the ~~((Aurora-Licton))~~ urban village by encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Encourage primarily residential uses in these areas while allowing for small scale commercial and retail services for the urban village and surrounding area, generally at a lower scale than in hub urban villages and urban centers.

* * *

Fremont

* * *

COMMUNITY CHARACTER POLICIES

* * *

F-P13 ~~((In the area where the Wallingford Urban Village and the Fremont Planning Area overlap (the area bounded by Stone Way on the east, N. 45th Street on the north, Aurora Avenue North on the west, and N. 40th Street on the south) maintain))~~ Maintain the physical character ((and integrity)) of ((the existing single family zoned)) historically lower-density areas of the urban village by ((maintaining current single-family zoning on properties meeting the locational criteria for single family zones)) encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Encourage primarily residential uses in these areas while allowing for small scale commercial and retail services for the urban village and surrounding area, generally at a lower scale than in hub urban villages and urban centers.

* * *

Morgan Junction

* * *

HOUSING AND LAND USE POLICIES

MJ-P13 Maintain the physical character and ~~((integrity))~~ scale of ~~((the existing))~~ historically single-family ~~((designated))~~ housing areas within the urban village by ~~((maintaining current single family zoning both inside and outside the urban village on properties meeting the locational criteria for single family zones, except where, as part of a development proposal, a long-standing neighborhood institution is maintained and existing adjacent community gathering places are activated, helping to meet MJ-P6))~~ encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments, in these areas.

MJ-P14 ~~((Ensure that use and development regulations are the same for single family zones within the Morgan Junction Urban Village as those in corresponding single-family zones in the remainder of the Morgan Junction Planning Area.))~~ Encourage a mix of housing stock including the retention of affordable, family-sized housing in the historically single-family housing areas of the urban village.

* * *

MJ-P23.1 Consider community planning to address land use, housing and other issues if the growth rate in the urban village accelerates to become significantly higher than anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan.

* * *

North Rainier

* * *

HOUSING POLICIES

* * *

NR-P9 (~~Seek to maintain single-family zoned areas within the urban village, but allow rezones to Residential Small Lot to encourage cluster housing developments and bungalow courts. Any single-family zoned area within the urban village is appropriate for any of the small lot single-family designations, provided that the area meets other requirements of the land use code rezone evaluation criteria for rezones of single-family land.~~) Maintain the physical character of historically lower-density areas of the urban village by encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Encourage primarily residential uses in these areas while allowing for commercial and retail services for the urban village and surrounding area, generally at a lower scale than in urban centers.

* * *

Northgate

* * *

LAND USE & HOUSING POLICIES

* * *

NG-P8 Maintain the physical character ~~((and integrity))~~ of ~~((the existing single-family zoned))~~ historically lower-density areas of the urban village by ~~((maintaining current single-family zoning on properties meeting the locational criteria for single-family zones.))~~ encouraging housing choices such as rowhouses, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Encourage primarily residential uses in these areas while allowing for commercial and retail services for the village and surrounding area.

* * *

Roosevelt

LAND USE GOAL

R-LUG1 ~~((Foster development in a way that preserves single family residentially zoned enclaves and provides))~~ Maintain the physical character of historically lower-density areas of the urban village by encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Provide appropriate transitions from these areas to more dense ((, or incompatible,)) uses.

* * *

Wallingford

* * *

URBAN VILLAGES POLICIES

W-P1 (~~(Protect the character and integrity of Wallingford's single family areas.)~~) Maintain the physical character of historically lower-density areas of the urban village by encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Encourage primarily residential uses in these areas while allowing for small scale commercial and retail services for the urban village and surrounding area, generally at a lower scale than in hub urban villages and urban centers.

* * *

West Seattle Junction

* * *

HOUSING & LAND USE POLICIES

WSJ-P13 Maintain ~~((the))~~ a character and ~~((integrity))~~ scale in historically single-family areas similar to ~~((of))~~ the existing single-family housing ~~((areas))~~.

* * *

Westwood/Highland Park

* * *

COMMUNITY CHARACTER POLICIES

* * *

W/HP-P3 ~~((Strive to preserve existing single-family areas and increase))~~ Maintain the physical character of historically lower-density areas of the urban village by encouraging housing choices such as cottages, townhouses, and low-rise apartments. Increase the attractiveness of multifamily residential areas that offer a range of attractive and safe housing choices affordable to a broad spectrum of the entire community.

* * *

W/HP-P18 Seek to maintain a the character and ~~((integrity))~~ scale in historically single-family areas similar to ~~((of))~~ the existing single-family areas.
