



Community Feedback

Draft CHUV Rezone Maps

Overview

The Crown Hill Urban Village Committee for Smart Growth has compiled a summary of community feedback on Draft Re-zone maps of CHUV. These recommendations incorporate consistent themes and concerns of CHUV neighbors and specific representative comments from four community discussions on maps and rezones.

- **City Council Design Workshop, November 15, 2016.** This [workshop](#) was led by an architectural firm and focused specifically on the draft maps and the zoning changes proposed. Over 70 community members attended this workshop and participated in in-depth facilitated discussions within six workgroups (noted below as [Group 1 – 6](#)). CHUV Committee for Smart Growth placed volunteer note takers in all six workgroups, and specific feedback from each of the groups is included below. All of the points included here were significant discussion points in the Workshop. The city will be making their official notes from the workshop available in February, which will be incorporated into these notes?
- CHUV Committee for Smart Growth conducted a [Neighbor-to-Neighbor Conversation on the draft Rezone Maps](#) on November 5, 2016 attended by nearly 50 community members. A detailed summary of community comments and list of questions are [here](#). The [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page of our website will be updated with answers as we get them from the City.
- CHUV Committee for Smart Growth conducted a [Community Survey](#) in July, 2016. 575 residents responded, 61% lived in the urban village, 15% of responders were renters. This survey asked neighbors for guiding principles and priorities for rezoning and growth in our community.

Community Feedback Specific to the Draft Rezone Maps is below.

1) Create an Urban Village Neighborhood Center (or gathering place, or heart)

- [Group 1](#): Discussion of what tools would incentivize development to build neighborhood center open place? What zoning changes would be needed to support creation of an urban center? Question: How do we move forward on the zoning changes and concurrently plan for an urban center so there is a cohesive plan and the concept is not lost in the rezoning strategy?
- [Group 2](#): Moderator asked where we might like to see a gathering space: Soundview was mentioned. Pocket park on 20th, established by neighbors is a habitat stop for wildlife traveling from Carkeek and across Ballard. Need more of these refuges, pea patches, pocket parks, etc. Approval of Kirke Park in Whittier.
- [Group 3 – 4](#): Where is the heart of the urban village? 15th is currently a truck route. 85th and 15th not a good place for community center (heart). *CHUV Heart: Move it*

further up Holman near Crown Hill Park. Create small community centers along 15th/Holman

- Group 6: Vision was that a center was closer to 89th; When you think of a village you think of a center - what we have now and proposed is too linear
- August 2016 CHUV Committee for Smart Growth Community Meeting with OPCD planner Geoff Wentlandt and neighbors, “What is an Urban Village” identified interest from attendees in creating a community center between 85th and Holman Street.” [Meeting report here.](#)

2) Rezone, incentivize and maximize growth along the arterials first, where there is capacity for the largest housing gains included in development, opportunity for the most growth, and a need for neighborhood improvement. Note: Many community members want zoning to be phased in, to make sure areas with the greatest development capacity along arterials are maximized first, before phasing in broader zoning.

- Group 1: Phase in development. Improve the properties along arterials that need it first. Petco, etc. Build there at capacity first, at the same time fix the infrastructure problems such as drainage and sidewalks and walkways. Then build out further.
- Group 2: Interest in making rezoning a three part process: 1) maximize current zoning 2) improve infrastructure 3) rezone
- Group 3 – 4: There is a lot of undeveloped land on the arterials. Let’s get that developed. Don’t wipe out an entire residential neighborhood. It’s disingenuous to say that you don’t need to sell your house. You wouldn’t want to live there after your neighbors sell.
- Group 5: Make the development initially go on 15th Ave and Holman because if we don’t force it happening along these arterials then the adjacent neighborhoods will be the plums for developers to pick and start building up.
- Group 5: Phase in zoning changes instead of making one change that is supposed to last 20 years
- Group 6: Developers will go straight to RSL/SF, that’s where the \$\$’s are. It’s hard to assemble properties in the commercial areas.
- November 5th Neighbor-to-Nighbor Conversation: Affirmation of the community priority to re-zone arterials first, and clarification from many that 16th, Mary and 14th are residential streets, not arterials.
- CHUV Committee for Smart Growth Community Survey: 78% strongly agree: “*New development should center along arterials already zoned for growth to transform big box stores, empty parking lots and inefficiently used space into walkable, mixed-use residential/commercial property, before upzoning single family or expanding CHUV.*”

3) Keep Affordable Housing in Crown Hill Urban Village

- Group 1: What can the City do to help people buy and own affordable housing, instead of just rent? Questions and concerns about getting affordable housing here.

- Group 2: MHA fees seem too low, especially the (M) for RSL and LR. We want affordability and diversity. Developers should not be able to "buy" their way out of the neighborhood by paying.
- Group 3-4: The renter in the group noted that based on the development that is happening around her she will not be able to afford to live in CHUV. She works and is not eligible for housing assistance but will find it difficult to find another place.
- Group 3-4: People agreed that they liked the CHUV because it was diverse; multigenerational; a mix of people who drive, or ride bikes, families, single people. Concerned the apartments and condos that will come from the development will not encourage that kind of diversity.
- Group 6: If we want affordable growth on arterials, are we discouraging that with the M2 zones with higher requirements? Won't developers just pay, so we won't actually get any here?
- November 5th Neighbor to Neighbor Meeting: Many residents expressed concern about displacement of vulnerable neighbors and seniors during the growth, and what mitigations and support was planned to help residents stay in their homes or find affordable homes in the community.
- CHUV Community Survey: 67% agree and 13% somewhat agree: "Seattle needs more affordable housing. *"Policies that add new affordable housing must protect our existing affordable housing, so neighbors who rent homes are not displaced by expensive new town homes."*

4) Advance design guidelines and other appropriate planning simultaneously with re-zoning to guide growth and mitigate known problems

- Group 1: Group agreement: need for design guidelines: Adequate side setbacks, ground floors must be inviting – not windowless, etc.
- Group 2: Consider aesthetics, design codes, design elements, topography and setbacks. Do not believe "sidewalk to alley" lot coverage fits with existing housing. Requests to consider "living walls" and bike racks.
- Group 5: Let's think of a design aspect like Leavenworth to make Crown Hill have an identity. Not repeating the Bavarian theme, I'm only using that as an example of creating a visual identity.
- Group 5: Let's have requirements for art at new apartments and commercial buildings.
- Group 6: Create visual continuity along a street.
- CHUV Community Survey, 87% strongly agree: "City must engage in meaningful neighborhood planning before re-zoning so growth is informed by a plan that considers parks, open space, transit, walkability, schools, jobs, small businesses and other needs of a vibrant neighborhood."
- November 5th Neighbor to Neighbor meeting: "Attendees ... suggested that implementation be phased in to allow for adjustments, rather than enacted all at one time. Some attendees were concerned that zoning would just be changed again in the next few years, creating more instability for residents, and hoped for reassurances that the changes enacted in 2017 found be reliable for future planning as they made decisions for their future and their home."

5) Address community concerns, and refine zoning or mitigate impacts in the side-streets along arterials that are rezoned as transition areas and step-downs, particularly streets that would be rezoned from Single Family to Neighborhood Commercial 75 and 55.

- Group 1: 16th is a tiny residential street. Is the road going to be expanded? How would high density and commercial work on 16th, which is such a narrow street?
- Group 1: Implement design mitigations on side-streets adjacent to arterials that are slated for rezone to NC: Can we concentrate commercial so it faces 15th and not on 16th to limit impact? Is that a zoning change? Prohibit commercial deliveries on 16th?
- Group 1: Architect: Building high on arterials is hard to design to work well for neighbors in adjacent SF. Need transition zones and stepdowns
- Group 2: 16th & Mary should not be zoned commercial. This change should be only a neighborhood plan decision. 16th is too narrow and dead-ends
- Group 2: LR rezoning from 12 to 14th was more than a transition and partial block zoning should be sufficient here
- Group 3 – 4: We understand the need to build on the arterial, 15th & Holman, but we do not want building on 16th, 14th & Mary. If you give additional height along 15th, then it would add enough affordable housing. We like the development on the arterials only. Abrupt transitions are fine.
- Group 5: Impractical to have NC on adjacent neighborhood streets – neither Mary nor 16th Ave are wide enough for commercial vehicles nor for encouraging more people coming and going.
- Group 6: The back of NC buildings facing residential should be residential in nature.
- Neighbor to Neighbor meeting, November 5th: “The clearest feedback ... was offered around the proposed rezone of residential streets adjacent to our major arterials. ... While attendees still agreed that prioritizing density along arterials and areas already zoned for growth was still the right priority for new growth within CHUV, many felt that extending zoning to adjacent residential streets created too big an impact and requested that the City pursue alternatives to Full Block Zoning in those areas.”

6) Consider significant infrastructure limitations and growth in re-zoning, either with definitive plans and investments to address the problems, or by adjusting the zoning maps or phasing in the rezone to realistically accommodate the limitations.

- Group 1: No sidewalks north of 85th – how will that be considered and impact development? How does our school structure accept more density with overcrowded schools now? Answer from Spencer: Seattle Public schools evaluating boundaries, happening concurrently
- Group 2: Flooding is a problem. The “D” line is not sufficient. Sidewalks north of 85th. School improvements needed.
- Group 3-4: Limited capacity to get in and out of Crown Hill
- Group 5: More sidewalks, more infrastructure
- Group 6: Busses are full - need more busses on routes. Busses are slow - 50 minutes at least to down town. We want light rail NOW - Aurora is getting it. Livability means people can get to / from work in a reasonable amount of time. Require sidewalks for all new developments, including RSL

7) Evaluate whether NC 75 along arterials is the best alternative along arterials given the desire to concentrate density and create a core neighborhood center, and build buildings to include affordable housing in the Urban Village. Some see NC 75 as a detriment to light and air and “too downtown” while others as it as a preferred option to concentrate growth on arterials where re-development would provide the most housing – including on-site affordable housing-- improve the neighborhood business sector, and mitigate impacts on the broader surrounding neighborhood.

- Group 1: If we did NC75, what about the provision that allows NC75 buildings to be just office and commercial towers with no housing? Shouldn't we make sure the rezone is about housing?
- Group 2: 7 story will be like a wall, will interfere with afternoon breeze from Puget Sound. 7 story buildings will block the road from sunshine and create poor walking and driving conditions in the winter.
- Group 2: Heights of 75 or even 95 feet are okay, as long as it is not a continuous corridor or canyon (modulated). Heights could be extended further South on 15th. Living walls would be good.
- Group 3 - 4: The human scale of 7 stories is too tall for a village. 4 stories "feels" right
- Group 6 discussion: 75ft is way too high to back up to a neighborhood (no access to light); Topography in some places will make some of the buildings even higher; Nothing over 55ft anywhere in CH_I want to see 100ft . We want a height cap, so no future concessions of additional height for roof access, light stories etc. 75ft should be 75ft. Leave at 55ft or lower if there isn't room for transition (UV is not deep enough)

8) Proposed expansion and boundary changes drew relatively little debate.

The most common comment questioned whether the expansion was necessary given existing development capacity in areas that are already zoned and along arterials and the priority to upzone arterials first. *Representative summary comment of this sentiment:*

- Group 2: Why is our expansion zone substantially larger (125%) than other urban villages? The vision that was set 20 years ago for Crown Hill has not been fully realized yet. We need to create high quality pedestrian livability inside the village first before expanding. Such an expansion is premature and will result in unnecessary displacement

Specific boundary concerns:

- Group 2 and Group 3 - 4: 20th street being a narrow alley and not suitable for rezoning
- Group 6: Whitman School should not be in the up zone area - will increase pressure on the district to sell it is an asset.
- Group 6: How about more density along 15th, pushing the boundary south?

9) Notably few concerns were raised regarding Residential Small Lot zoning given the extent of RSL in the Urban Village. However, residents have raised many questions about the specifics of RSL and the practical impacts as they make changes to their home and properties. Most consistent concerns about RSL were the impact on trees and green and

concerns about lot lines and set-backs. The Committee is working to share responses from the City for RSL and other questions which will be shared on Frequently Asked Questions of the website. [link]

- Group 2: Support for RSL zoning, as it is preferred to the new, immense single family houses we see being constructed in other parts of the city. But concerned about lot lines, variances, tree canopy loss, and out of scale development
- Group 3-4: For RSL lot - What are the lot line requirements? How can we preserve green space, trees?
- Group 5: Prefer LR1 rather than RSL so I have more options for my property
- Group 5: In favor of RSL because developer now knocks down small SF existing and builds a big SF instead and the new large home is expensive. Wouldn't it be better to have 3 smaller cottages, less expensive, better scale.
- Group 6: Don't need to push RSL so far into the neighborhood.
- Group 6: Neighborhood specific RSL should have the same setback as single family.
- November 5th Neighbor-to-Neighbor Meeting: Homeowners had many questions about how RSL would impact their properties, from tax implications to application of MHA fees to mitigations to neighbors from development happening around them.

10) There is community interest in creating better Commercial and Small Business spaces:

- Group 1: Interested in redevelopment of business center. Is eliminating full block zoning viable for business development and a viable business district?
- Group 2: Arterials are not pedestrian friendly or safe. Concern about there being foot traffic along 15th and Holman to support small business
- Group 4: Don't require ground floor retail/commercial in every building on the arterial. We already see that most of it is vacant in the three new buildings on 15th Ave. There is way too much small retail space and I've heard that most of these spaces cannot qualify for cafes or restaurants because of code requirements (ventilation, noise, etc.) that are specific to food service establishments
- Group 5: All the small, local businesses along 15th will be gone when new tall buildings are built there. Those businesses would have to move first for construction and then might not afford the new space anyway to be able to move back in.
- Group 5: One person said he thinks commercial should not be limited to arterials. He likes small shops on non-arterial streets.
- Group 5: What about office space instead of making it all retail in the NC zone? I don't want to have my business office be at street level.
- Group 6: Like having more commercial = ground floor - businesses to walk to. Aggregation of businesses, like Ballard Ave - which is a restaurant hub.
- Group 6: More strategic use of P to support the business districts
- CHUV Community Survey: 79% of residents said it was Extremely or Very Important to "Build business spaces along arterials integrated with multifamily residential development that support small and locally owned businesses, and retail spaces that attract pedestrian friendly businesses like coffee shops, small retail and office space."

11) Neighbors want parking protections. Many fear they will lose basic mobility, particularly if transit is not upgraded. These concerns are expressed more frequently by Seniors.

- Group 1: Expansion large enough that people will still try to drive to Safeway or center of UV to shop, not walk
- Group 1: Many developments coming in are already building parking, even though it's not required in an urban village because it is a financial incentive to buyers.
- Group 2: Why isn't parking required?
- Group 3 – 4: Consensus was that we need to balance development, cars and parking.
- Group 6: Trying to get RPZ. People park in front of house, don't move for three weeks, block mail boxes Specifically: Low-income residents need free street parking. Outsiders that park and take the bus park in neighborhood spaces
- Group 6: Transit capacity is not keeping with development - don't reduce parking. This is an auto-oriented area, will take a lot of time to be appropriate for car-free
- Group 6: It is unsafe when people park across 15th to go to a building without parking.
- November 5th Neighbor to Neighbor meeting: Parking was a big concern discussed at this meeting. One neighbor suggested: "Create a Residential Parking Zone (RPZ) for residents only. A building that provides no off street parking is not eligible for RPZ membership, and the number of RPZ permits is tied to the number of provided off-street spots." Other comments: Our area is already being used as a park and ride for commuters, making access to our homes increasingly difficult. We have no sidewalks (north of 85th) so walking to our homes is already more dangerous than in other areas.
- CHUV Community Survey: Parking was the most mentioned concern in the open comments section of the survey, generating 70 comments. A typical survey comment, "Address parking ratios and requirements for new development. There is too much emphasis on having NO parking for apartments and condos, which is magical thinking, not realism."

*NOTE: The order of these items is **NOT** a reflection of their importance to the community, nor is the order of the list a ranking of priorities of the CHUV Committee of Smart Growth. Additionally this summary focuses specifically on feedback and recommendation on the draft maps and the zoning questions, not the broader community concerns raised around fairness, the viability of the policies, and other matters not directly related to the maps.*