

RELATIONSHIP TO PLANS AND POLICIES

OVERVIEW OF KEY PLANS, POLICIES AND CODES

Seattle's **Comprehensive Plan**, "*Toward a Sustainable Seattle*," was initially adopted in July 1994. The Plan is amended annually and was updated in 2004. It is a 20-year policy plan that articulates a flexible framework for adapting to real conditions over time, and includes 20-year growth targets for urban centers and villages. The Comprehensive Plan satisfies requirements of the State's Growth Management Act and fits within King County's framework of Countywide Planning Policies. The Urban Center designation for Downtown, which includes the Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. Urban Center Villages in South Downtown, is part of the regional growth strategy outlined in the Countywide Planning Policies calling for the concentration of a significant share of the region's employment and housing growth within a limited number of urban centers linked together by high capacity transit service. Some areas on the southern periphery of the South Downtown study area are within the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center (MIC), another Comprehensive Plan designation intended to promote the economic viability of Seattle's industrial areas. The City's Comprehensive Plan also includes numerous land use policies that help define the basis for the City's zoning and Land Use Code regulations.

Following adoption of the City's Comprehensive Plan, approximately 37 **neighborhood plans** were prepared in the late 1990s to address future conditions in and around urban centers and villages. Neighborhood plans were prepared for two areas within South Downtown: Pioneer Square and Chinatown/International District. Portions of the South Downtown study area are also addressed in the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center Plan, and the Central Area's neighborhood plan (east of Rainier Avenue S.). For each neighborhood, recommendations were formulated into land use policies that are expressed in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

The **Land Use Code** contains land use regulations organized through zone designations. Requirements for future development are associated with each zone. These include types of uses allowed or prohibited, setbacks, allowable heights and densities, and parking requirements among others. In some cases, overlay areas are established to modify the standards of the base zoning to better address development objectives in a specific area. Applications for development are reviewed through the City's Master Use Permit (MUP) process, and often go through a design review process that provides for public input on project design. In South Downtown, two special review districts—the Pioneer Square Preservation District and the International Special Review District—provide additional requirements and require additional project review by a volunteer review board. The intention of these additional requirements is to protect and promote the special historic, architectural and cultural qualities of these areas.

SEATTLE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Core values upheld by the Comprehensive Plan are: community, environmental stewardship, economic opportunity and security, and social equity. The unifying goal of the Comprehensive Plan is: "to preserve the best qualities of Seattle's distinct neighborhoods while responding positively and creatively to the pressures of change and growth."

The Plan's overarching growth theme is the Urban Village strategy that directs most new development to several defined growth centers of various sizes. The Urban Village growth strategy indicates four categories of growth centers:

- **Urban Centers**—regional centers that are the densest neighborhoods, with diverse mixes of uses
- **Manufacturing/Industrial Centers**—regional centers of industry

- **Hub Urban Villages**—neighborhoods with balanced housing and employment, less dense than and located away from urban centers
- **Residential Urban Villages**—neighborhood growth areas that are a focus of goods and services for residents and local vicinities, but may not provide employment concentrations

RELATIONSHIP OF LIVABLE SOUTH DOWNTOWN PLANNING

Comprehensive planning requires a big-picture perspective, examining how actions relate to a citywide growth strategy, how the functionality of many city systems can be assured, and how the citizens’ needs will be served as growth occurs. The relationship of Livable South Downtown planning to the Comprehensive Plan can be examined from a big-picture perspective. For example: how does it relate to the City’s overall growth strategy, the economy, infrastructure needs, citizen needs, and environment?

Growth Strategies and Definition of Growth Centers

Observations:

- Livable South Downtown planning’s EIS alternatives and the broad directions of its recommendations are supportive of the city’s Urban Village growth strategy, with caveats as noted in the following observations and accompanying bullet points:
 - Recommended zoning would provide for greater land use efficiency within the Downtown Urban Center through denser future infill growth
 - Recommended zoning would provide for more efficient use of utility and transportation systems, which can accommodate projected growth assuming that transportation systems are expanded as planned and that further impact-mitigating actions are taken if or when significantly adverse impacting transportation conditions would be present.
 - Recommended zoning and denser future infill growth patterns would result in fewer overall impacts of growth on the natural environment than comparable amounts of growth distributed in the broader suburban region
- Livable South Downtown’s EIS alternatives and the overall land use planning and zoning recommendations would be are consistent with the broad housing, growth and community development objectives of the Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. neighborhood plans (see the Housing section in this chapter for further discussion).
 - Provides additional development capacity through rezones, with height and density limits scaled to maintain development’s compatibility with uses in surrounding vicinities
 - Provides additional strategies to encourage housing growth, and generates additional affordable housing and/or resources for affordable housing
 - Contributes to strengthened residential and economic base of neighborhoods
 - Risks of adverse impacts on housing can be mitigated through actions recommended as part of this EIS and the planning process.
- Certain zoning changes in Industrial zones west of I-5 under Alternatives 1 and 3 (e.g., those from Industrial zones to a “South Downtown Mixed” zone) would represent a change from be inconsistent with the industrial-preservation themes of the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing & Industrial Center (MIC) Plan because they would rezone away from Industrial zones. However, if such changes were favored, analyses for Livable South Downtown planning support a conclusion that a limited area at the northern margins of the MIC can be re-designated from Industrial to Commercial or Mixed Use and into the Downtown Urban Center without significant harm to the preservation of Industrial use patterns in the balance of the MIC.

- The range of recommended possible land use and zoning changes addressed by the alternatives (including Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and the Preferred Alternative) can be accomplished while maintaining compatibility with the land use and activity patterns, and maintaining the effective economic functioning of the Port of Seattle operations west of the study area. This suggests that land uses and activities in the study area can coexist with nearby industrial users, including the ability for continued Port operations at Terminal 46 and related flows of freight. One exception to the overall conclusion of compatibility is noted. Under Alternatives 1 and 3, due only to possible residential uses west of 1st Avenue S. and south of Railroad Way S., there would be probable significant adverse land use compatibility impacts related to exposure of future possible residents to activity levels and noise of nearby Port and railroad operations. Such impacts would need to be mitigated through specifications on residential location and construction quality if such residential uses are to be present there. Under the Preferred Alternative, with no residential uses on the WOSCA property nearest Terminal 46, no such impacts are identified. To maintain freight mobility over the long-term, the City and other agencies should also continue planning and implementing street network and other system improvements to maintain and improve freight movement capabilities.
- The Livable South Downtown planning recommendations (e.g., the Preferred Alternative) include no recommended changes to the Stadium Area south of S. Royal Brougham Way are relatively limited in the Stadium Area to avoid potential growth-related congestion conflicts with Port activities and freight traffic.

Economy

- A wide range of possible zone changes evaluated within the EIS alternatives and the recommended changes of the Preferred Alternative can be accomplished without significantly impairing the important economic functions provided by Port of Seattle operations. Based in part upon identified compatibility impacts of possible residential uses west of 1st Avenue S. and south of Railroad Way S. under Alternatives 1 and 3, the Preferred Alternative does not recommend changes that would authorize such residential uses in that location.
- With implementation of mitigation strategies and/or continuing cooperative public- and private-sector efforts with respect to community and economic development strategies in the Chinatown/I.D. neighborhood, a wide range of possible zone changes evaluated within the EIS alternatives and the recommended zoning changes of the Preferred Alternative can occur without probable significant adverse effects on the economic and business character of the Chinatown and Little Saigon vicinities.
- Future development, investment and additional resident populations in the study area would provide net economic benefits within the affected neighborhoods, primarily addressing the entirety of the Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. neighborhoods. This is a broad observation offered at the programmatic level that assumes that future development would occur in the manner encouraged by the recommended zoning changes of the Preferred Alternative.

Infrastructure

- Technical review of the zoning alternatives indicates that future expected growth to 2030 can be served by utility infrastructure systems, although it is possible that localized improvements to meet service hookup needs of individual future development projects might be needed.
- This EIS discusses a range of possible mitigation strategies that can be pursued to address potential significant adverse impacts on transportation systems. Also, see observations about

transportation systems made above, under the first bullet point for “Growth Strategies and Definition of Growth Centers.”

Citizen Needs

- The recommendations of Livable South Downtown planning are consistent with neighborhood plans’ representations of citizen needs, addressing topics including affordable housing, open space/streetscape improvements, economic and residential vitality.
- Historic and cultural character of the Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. neighborhoods would be maintained even as additional growth would occur in the coming decades.

Environment

- More efficient growth within the Downtown Urban Center would contribute to an enhanced quality of the built environment in affected neighborhoods, and would result in fewer adverse natural environmental impacts than would occur with the same amount of growth if it occurred elsewhere in the region.
- Livable South Downtown planning incorporates recommendations that would aid in environmental sustainability and climate protection efforts.
- Attention should be given to strategies that would reduce the potential for economic and physical damage from major seismic events in this area that has documented seismic hazards.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

PIONEER SQUARE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

The 1998 Pioneer Square Neighborhood Plan promotes coordinated and collaborative “*action planning*” efforts that will “*embrace change while maintaining historic character and diverse identities.*” Action planning “*focuses on implementation of key projects facilitating the physical and economic development of the Pioneer Square Historic District.*” The top seven topics of action for plan implementation are defined as:

- *Catalyzing housing development*
- *Developing the North Lot of the football stadium property*
- *Improving public safety, cleanliness and behavior standards*
- *Strengthening the economic base*
- *Building pedestrian linkages*
- *Improving access during stadium events and securing a community parking facility*
- *Developing the parking lots on the east side of Occidental Park.*

The plan also notes five “critical areas” that need additional investment to improve public spaces:

- Occidental Corridor
- Second Avenue and Yesler Way (Fortson Square)
- Fourth Avenue S. and S. Jackson Street
- Central Waterfront
- Pioneer Square Park (at First Avenue and Yesler Way).

The neighborhood plan encourages growth of affordable and market rate housing to broaden the availability and range of housing in the neighborhood. Incentives, promotion of the area, and partnerships for development of targeted properties are encouraged, as are strategies to preserve and expand artist live/work housing. Protecting the historic character and encouraging new resident-serving business types (grocery, pharmacy, hardware and other services) are high priorities. Maintaining cleanliness of public areas, as well as public safety and civil behavior, are also recognized as important components for success. The plan describes strategies for addressing several dimensions of economic vitality, including the neighborhood's image, accessibility and opportunities for synergies. By recognizing and addressing the many interwoven issues and opportunities, the Pioneer Square Neighborhood Plan is a good example of an integrated approach to planning for the neighborhood's future.

Relationship to Livable South Downtown Planning

Livable South Downtown planning addresses several high priorities of the Pioneer Square neighborhood plan, including actions that address housing, development of Qwest Field's north parking lot, development near Occidental Park, strengthening the economic base and building pedestrian linkages. Livable South Downtown planning shares the neighborhood plan's primary interest in actions that will encourage additional housing for households of all income levels. Actions supported by both planning efforts include zoning amendments to the Land Use Code, tools to encourage renovations of existing buildings for residential use, strategies to encourage new infill development, and zoning that will accommodate residential/mixed-use development in a portion of Qwest Field's north parking lot.

Recommended land use actions, per the Preferred Alternative, that serve City and neighborhood goals will ensure reasonable compatibility of height, bulk and scale, and sensitivity to historic character (see other sections of this chapter for further discussion). Directions pursued by Livable South Downtown planning are consistent with the themes and recommendations of the Pioneer Square Neighborhood Plan. Other neighborhood plan recommendations are not directly related to land use and zoning, but are important factors in the planning area. These include parking, accessibility, public safety, cleanliness and behavior standards.

Urban design proposals include elements consistent with special area recommendations of the neighborhood plan, and some elements that are complementary and additive. The Livable South Downtown urban design recommendations apply to Occidental Avenue S. south of S. King Street as mentioned in the neighborhood plan. They also include recommendations for Second Avenue S. and S. Washington Street that are complementary to the neighborhood plan's intentions for Fortson Square. Livable South Downtown recommendations include attention to the 4th Avenue S./S. Jackson Street vicinity, recognizing its key location as a link between the neighborhoods and as a transit hub. Current recommendations support design themes expressed in the neighborhood plan.

Table 3-5 summarizes the relationship of alternatives to the neighborhood plan.

**Table 3-5
Relationship of Alternatives' Zoning Proposals to Pioneer Square Neighborhood Plan**

LAND USE AND ZONING CONCEPT IN ALTERNATIVES	CONSISTENT	NOT CONSISTENT	NOT ENOUGH PLAN INFO TO JUDGE
Alternative 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Target increased height limit of 130 feet to non-historic-contributing properties in PSM 100'</i> ▪ <i>Changes to or elimination of the variable height limit</i> ▪ <i>Height increases to 180 feet for housing on the North Lot</i> ▪ <i>Height increases to 180 feet in the 4th Avenue S. vicinity</i> ▪ <i>TDR strategy supporting renovation</i> 	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		✓
Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Target increased height limit of 130 feet to non-historic contributing properties in PSM 100'</i> ▪ <i>Subarea-specific height limit adjustments to fine-tune the current PSM 100'</i> ▪ <i>Changes to or elimination of the variable height limit</i> ▪ <i>Height increases to 240 feet for housing on the North Lot (with this maximum height applicable to the approximate north half of the North Lot in the Preferred Alternative)</i> ▪ <i>Height increases to 150 feet in the 3rd/4th Avenue S. vicinity</i> ▪ <i>TDR strategy supporting renovation</i> 	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		✓
Alternative 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No maximum height change above 100 feet in the PSM 100', with a TDR strategy supporting housing renovation</i> ▪ <i>Changes to or elimination of the variable height limit</i> ▪ <i>Height increases to 150 feet for housing on the North Lot</i> ▪ <i>No height changes in the 4th Avenue S. vicinity</i> 	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓		
Alternative 4/No Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No Changes</i> 		✓	

The finding of the “no action alternative” being inconsistent with the neighborhood plan reflects that plan’s emphasis on taking actions to encourage positive changes in the neighborhood.

CHINATOWN/I.D. NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

This 1998 neighborhood plan builds upon past planning work by the neighborhood. It encourages taking action to make positive, tangible improvements in the neighborhood. Its primary planning themes are:

- Cultural and economic vitality
- Housing that is affordable and diverse
- Public spaces that are safe, dynamic and pedestrian-friendly
- Accessibility both within and to the neighborhood for all modes

The plan describes the interwoven nature of issues related to growth, safety, public amenities, and the social and economic vitality of the neighborhood. The plan acknowledges the social fabric of the neighborhood, its cultural resources and its demographic mix, which includes elderly residents, low-income and immigrant households. It identifies many desirable community improvements, such as lighting, park and sidewalk improvements. It recognizes the potential negative impacts of external forces on the neighborhood, including those related to population growth, real estate market influences on land value and rents, and the potential for displacement of residents and businesses.

The plan includes numerous action strategies addressing each planning theme, with supporting details for each topic. Strategies on economic vitality address the following topics:

- Neighborhood marketing and promotional activities
- Developing new business markets, such as night-time activities
- Business improvement strategies, resources and assistance
- Community recreation center
- Ensuring utility infrastructure is sufficient to support community needs

Strategies on accessibility and safe, dynamic public spaces address the following topics:

- New open space
- Improved maintenance and activation of park spaces
- Public safety, crime prevention and police presence
- Control of stadium event crowds and parking
- Parking—expand off-street and maximize on-street parking opportunities to address needs
- Lighting improvements for safety
- Pedestrian safety and amenities

Strategies addressing housing and rehabilitation of existing buildings include the following concepts:

- Transfer of development rights (TDR) and bonus programs;
- Inclusionary zoning for affordable housing;
- Leveraging of funds for rehabilitation of vacant or substandard buildings;
- permit streamlining; and
- property tax exemption for low-income residential projects

Relationship to Livable South Downtown Planning

Livable South Downtown planning recommends changes to encourage growth consistent with this neighborhood plan in ways that will stimulate greater economic vitality, diversify housing opportunities, and improve public safety and accessibility. Recommended actions and strategies would update land use, urban design and zoning regulations to promote consistency of future development with the neighborhood plan and consistent with today's community expectations, including:

- recommending actions and mitigation strategies meant to retain and enhance existing affordable housing resources, and encouraging infill development of a mixture of affordable and market-rate housing (see the Housing section in this chapter for further evaluation);
- encouraging growth in locations that will complement the neighborhood with additional residents and customers while sustaining existing business and residential communities;
- maintaining appropriate relationships of building bulk and scale;
- respecting and protecting the area's cultural, historic and architectural character;
- encouraging the achievement of improved public open spaces, recreation opportunities and pedestrian connections within and between neighborhoods.

Livable South Downtown planning recommends several adjustments to zoning, height limits and other standards that govern the size and shape of future buildings. These would encourage additional residential and business growth within the central Chinatown and Little Saigon vicinities and the neighborhood's periphery. Rezoning in Little Saigon east of 12th Avenue S. would change that area's intended future development pattern from an industrial and commercial mix of uses to a likely mix of commercial and residential uses.

None of the Livable South Downtown zoning proposals are directly related to specific neighborhood plan recommendations because that plan did not identify specific rezone requests. The neighborhood plan does support inclusionary zoning, density bonus and TDR programs. Livable South Downtown proposals will be consistent with the Chinatown/I.D. neighborhood plan if they provide for affordable housing retention and growth in supply, and retain good scale and height relationships with the existing neighborhood building character. See the Housing section in this chapter for further evaluation.

Table 3-6 summarizes the relationship of alternatives to the neighborhood plan.

**Table 3-6
Relationship of Alternatives' Zoning Proposals to Chinatown/I.D. Neighborhood Plan**

LAND USE AND ZONING CONCEPT IN ALTERNATIVES	CONSISTENT	NOT CONSISTENT	NOT ENOUGH PLAN INFO TO JUDGE
Alternative 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Extension of IDM zoning one block south of S. Dearborn, between I-5 and 12th Ave. S.</i> ▪ <i>More intensive development, up to 240-foot height limits north of S. Jackson St. near 4th, 5th Aves. S.</i> ▪ <i>40-foot increase in height limit in Chinatown core, south of S. Weller Street</i> ▪ <i>20-foot increase in height limit in Little Saigon including NC3-85' east of 12th Ave. S.</i> 	<p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p>		<p align="center">√</p>
Alternative 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Downtown Mixed Commercial and Mixed Residential zoning east of I-5, and one block south of S. Dearborn St.</i> ▪ <i>Height limits as high as 125 feet in Little Saigon</i> ▪ <i>More intensive development, up to 180 foot height limits north of S. Jackson St. near 4th, 5th Aves. S.</i> ▪ <i>40-foot increase in height limit in Chinatown core, south of S. Weller St.</i> 	<p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p>		<p align="center">√</p>
Alternative 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>More intensive development, up to 180-foot height limits north of S. Jackson St. near 4th, 5th Aves.</i> ▪ <i>No height increase in Chinatown core</i> ▪ <i>NC3-85' zoning throughout Little Saigon</i> ▪ <i>South Downtown Mixed zone south of S. Dearborn St</i> 	<p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p>		<p align="center">√</p>
Alternative 4/No Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No Changes</i> 		<p align="center">√</p>	
Preferred Alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u><i>IDM zoning one block south of S. Dearborn, and between I-5 and 12th Ave. S.</i></u> ▪ <u><i>More intensive development, up to 240-foot height limits north of S. Jackson St. near 4th, 5th Aves. S.</i></u> ▪ <u><i>Up to 65-foot increase in height limit in Chinatown core, outside Nat. Register Historic District</i></u> ▪ <u><i>Downtown Mixed Commercial and Mixed Residential zoning east of I-5</i></u> ▪ <u><i>Height limits up to 125 feet in Little Saigon, and up to 160 feet near S. Dearborn St.</i></u> 	<p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p>		<p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p> <p align="center">√</p>

The finding of the “no action alternative” being inconsistent with the neighborhood plan reflects that plan’s emphasis on taking actions to encourage positive change in the neighborhood.

GREATER DUWAMISH MANUFACTURING AND INDUSTRIAL CENTER PLAN

The MIC Plan urges long-term support for and protection of industrial uses and family wage jobs in the Greater Duwamish area via land use and zoning regulations and policies, transportation investments and economic development strategies. The Plan indicates the following objectives:

- Restrict incompatible or competing land uses within the MIC;
- Encourage manufacturing and industrial job retention and growth;
- Establish a growth target of 10,860 new family wage industrial jobs [current 20-year growth target is for 9,750 new jobs by 2024];
- Retain and improve access to industrial areas and transportation routes within the MIC;
- Retain existing businesses and encourage new manufacturing and industrial development within the MIC.

The MIC Plan prefers protection of industrial uses to encourage retention of quality jobs and economic growth in industrial and manufacturing sectors, and preservation of industrially suited land for those uses rather than competing or incompatible uses. According to the Plan, non-industrial uses tend to be accompanied by pedestrian and automobile traffic that compete for street capacity and create accessibility conflicts that can impair industrial operations. Non-industrial uses can also lead to higher lease rates and land values that can negatively affect the financial viability of industrial uses (which can also be considered a factor in assessing overall compatibility among industrial and non-industrial uses).

Zoning amendments with the MIC Plan’s adoption in 2000 strengthened the industrial emphasis of land use regulations in the Industrial zones while specifying standards applicable to non-industrial uses. The Plan’s zoning changes also included establishment of an Industrial Commercial (IC) zone and Stadium Transition Area Overlay District overlay zone that provided more flexibility for a mixture of commercial and industrial uses north of S. Holgate Street primarily along the 1st Avenue S. corridor, and defined development standards related to building density, facades, setbacks and the pedestrian environment. This stadium transition area represents the northern edge of the MIC and the southern edge of the Livable South Downtown study area.

Relationship to Livable South Downtown Planning

Livable South Downtown planning recognizes the MIC Plan’s emphasis on retaining and protecting industrial areas, industrial jobs and their economic benefits, maintaining and improving accessibility for commerce and industry, minimizing conflicts between industrial and non-industrial uses, and avoiding land value pressures that can discourage industrial users. The current planning effort also recognizes the conjunction of these influences in the Stadium Area vicinity, and this area’s proximity to the Downtown Urban Center. In terms of geography, land use patterns, and daily functions, the Stadium Area vicinity serves as a transition area between Downtown and the MIC, and a conduit for port-related traffic, commuting traffic, entertainment event traffic, local commerce and other neighborhood traffic.

A range of land use and zoning options are considered that recognize the possibility of intensifying development potential and possibly introducing residential uses in portions of this area north of S. Royal Brougham Way. Along the west side of 1st Avenue S. north of S. Royal Brougham Way, and the “south-of-Dearborn” vicinity north of the I-90 ramps, a potential transitional area is identified that could include commercial uses (such as offices) and potentially residential uses as well under Alternatives 1 and 3. Proximity of these areas to the Pioneer Square and Chinatown/I.D. neighborhoods means they could

LAND USE AND ZONING CONCEPT IN ALTERNATIVES	CONSISTENT	NOT CONSISTENT	NOT ENOUGH PLAN INFO TO JUDGE
<p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IC zones west of 1st Ave. S. ranging from 65 to 100 feet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit to 100 feet</u> ○ <u>No increase in density limits for commercial uses</u> ▪ IC zone east of Qwest Field to 240 feet, density to 5 FAR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit to 240 feet</u> ○ <u>Density increase</u> ▪ IC zone south of S. Charles St. to 160 feet, density to 3 FAR in “south-of-Dearborn” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit</u> ○ <u>Increased density limit for non-industrial uses</u> ○ <u>Rezone from IG2 to IC</u> 	<p>√ √</p>		<p>√ √ √ √</p>
<p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ S. Downtown Mixed zone south of S. Dearborn St. to 160 ft. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit</u> ○ <u>Increased density limit for non-industrial uses</u> ○ <u>Rezone from IG2 to SDM</u> ▪ S. Downtown Mixed zone ranging from 100 to 120 feet west of 1st Ave. S. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit to 100-120 feet</u> ○ <u>Residential uses in 120-foot zone</u> ○ <u>Increased density limits for mixed uses</u> ▪ S. Downtown Mixed zone over the railroad tracks west of 4th Ave. S. (e.g. south of S. Dearborn St.) to 180 feet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit</u> ○ <u>Increased density limit for non-industrial uses</u> ○ <u>Rezone from IC to SDM</u> ▪ Height limit increased to 85 feet on Pyramid Brewery block <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit to 85 feet</u> ○ <u>No increase in density limit</u> ○ <u>Rezone from IG2 to IC in corner of this block</u> 	<p>√ √</p>	<p>√ √ √ √ √ √ √</p>	<p>√</p>
<p>Alternative 4/No Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No Changes 	<p>√</p>		

LAND USE AND ZONING CONCEPT IN ALTERNATIVES	CONSISTENT	NOT CONSISTENT	NOT ENOUGH PLAN INFO TO JUDGE
<p><u>Preferred Alternative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>IC zones west of 1st Ave. S. ranging from 85 to 160 feet</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limits to 85, 120 and 160 feet</u> ○ <u>Increase in density limits for commercial uses</u> ▪ <u>IC zone east of Qwest Field to 160 feet</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit to 160 feet</u> ○ <u>Density increase</u> ▪ <u>IC zone south of S. Charles St. to 160 feet, in “south-of-Dearborn”</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Increased height limit</u> ○ <u>Increased density limit for non-industrial uses</u> ○ <u>Rezone from IG2 to IC.</u> 			<p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p style="text-align: center;">√</p>

RELATIONSHIP TO CENTRAL AREA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

The Central Area’s neighborhood plan encompasses a large area extending as far north as E. Madison Street and as far south as Interstate 90. Included are several neighborhood business districts, most notably including the 23rd/Union and 23rd/Jackson and 12th Avenue S. corridor (north of Yesler Way) vicinities. Much of the Central Area plan’s content is directed to these areas, but a few elements address areas in proximity to the Little Saigon neighborhood. These include the vicinity east of Rainier Avenue S. and south of S. Dearborn Street (described as “Hiawatha”) and the vicinity near the Rainier Avenue S./S. Jackson Street intersection.

The plan promotes the revitalization of Central Area neighborhood business districts in a manner that will reflect the area’s heritage and values. It advocates for quality open space and streetscapes, including various urban design elements such as landscaping, public art, gateway elements, banners and signage, and land use principles such as street-level uses oriented to the sidewalk rather than parking lots separating buildings from the sidewalks. Gateway elements recommended by the plan would use the urban design elements listed above to define entries into the neighborhood that celebrate its heritage, its identity and related themes, linking the neighborhoods and also contributing to an enhanced visual environment and streetscape. Gateway locations are defined at the Rainier Avenue S./S. Jackson Street intersection vicinity, and at the Rainier Avenue S./S. Dearborn Street intersection.

In the Hiawatha area, the plan recommended several rezones to encourage future residential development and a more walkable district near Rainier Avenue S. These efforts have been relatively successful, as new multifamily residential development has occurred in this vicinity, although few changes have occurred on properties abutting Rainier Avenue S.

Relationship to Livable South Downtown Planning

The Central Area Neighborhood Plan supports mixed-use development and improved pedestrian-oriented streetscapes throughout the neighborhood in a manner that is generally supported by Neighborhood Commercial zoning. These themes are consistent with the goals of the Livable South Downtown zoning recommendations for the vicinity east of Rainier Avenue S. that is in the Central Area's Jackson Place vicinity. Also, by recognizing the "gateway" functions of the Jackson and Dearborn Street intersections with Rainier Avenue S. and advocating for aesthetic improvements, the neighborhood plan is in accord with Livable South Downtown urban design objectives.

RELATIONSHIP TO SELECTED LAND USE CODE PROVISIONS

STADIUM TRANSITION AREA OVERLAY DISTRICT (SMC 23.74)

This is an overlay zone applicable to the western and southern portion of the EIS study area (refer to Figure 2-1), for which the stated purpose, intent and description of the zone are reproduced below from SMC 23.74.002.

23.74.002 Purpose, intent and description of the overlay district—Rezone requirement—Rezone criteria

- A. *Purpose and Intent. The purpose of this chapter is to implement the City's Comprehensive Plan, including the neighborhood plan for the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing/Industrial Center, by establishing a Stadium Transition Area Overlay District for the area shown on Exhibit 23.74.004A. The Stadium Transition Area centers on large sports facilities and allows uses complementary to them. It is intended to contribute to a safer pedestrian environment for those attending events and permits a mix of uses, supporting the pedestrian-oriented character of the area as well as the surrounding industrial zone, while minimizing conflicts with industrial uses. Within the overlay district, use provisions and development standards are designed to create a pedestrian connection with downtown; discourage encroachment on nearby industrial uses to the south; and create a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Allowing a mix of uses, including office development, is intended to encourage redevelopment and to maintain the health and vibrancy of the area during times when the sports facilities are not in operation.*
- B. *Relationship to Surrounding Activity of Areas Located Within the District. The District is an area where stadiums and similar major, regional attractions are located, in which transportation and other infrastructure can support additional development. It is an area surrounded by land with widely varying development patterns and land use characteristics including the mixed use urban development of south Downtown, Pioneer Square, the working waterfront, and the industrial area. The desired relationship of the Stadium Transition Area is with Pioneer Square and First Avenue, permitting strong pedestrian and transit links to the north. There should be well-defined edges between the pedestrian activity of the Stadium Transition Area and industrial activity surrounding it. The portion of Fourth Avenue South that is north of Royal Brougham and the main line railroad tracks create a strong edge to the east and should be the eastern boundary. South Holgate Street, the first major cross street to the south of Safeco Field, should be the southern boundary. Boundaries should not be shifted farther into the industrial area.*
- C. *Rezoning resulting in Boundary Changes to the Stadium Transition Overlay Area District [sic]. A rezoning pursuant to Chapter 23.34 shall be required to change the established boundaries of the Stadium Transition Area Overlay District. A rezoning shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 23.76, Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions. Areas to be included within the District boundaries shall be compatible with the purpose and intent as stated in this*

section, and shall either be areas developed as major spectator sports facilities, or areas that meet the criteria for Industrial Commercial zoning and are along preferred pedestrian routes that can provide safe and attractive passage for pedestrians between the stadiums and retail areas and transit service.

23.74.006 Application of Regulations

Land located within the Stadium Transition Area Overlay District, as shown on Exhibit 23.74.004A, is subject to the regulations of the underlying zone except as otherwise expressly provided in this chapter. In the event of a conflict between the provisions of this chapter and the underlying zone, the provisions of this chapter apply. Where the provisions of the underlying zone are more restrictive, that is not considered a conflict and compliance with the provisions of the underlying zone is required, except as specifically provided in this chapter. Where the provisions of this chapter are more restrictive, compliance with those provisions is required, subject to any departures that may be authorized pursuant to design review under Section 23.41.012 and to provisions for nonconforming uses and structures in Sections 23.50.008 and 23.50.010. (Ord. 119972 section 10 (part), 2000.)

The Stadium Transition Area Overlay District sections 23.74.008, 23.74.009, and 23.74.010 describe “uses” permitted and prohibited, “height,” and “development standards” respectively.

- In addition to uses allowed by the underlying IC zone, the Overlay District allows for medical services, museums, community centers, clubs and religious facilities. Prohibited uses include heavy manufacturing uses, high-impact uses, recycling uses, airports, hospitals, schools, bus bases, animal-related uses, lodging uses, and principal use parking (except parking allowed for spectator sports facilities or exhibition halls).
- The height provisions merely note that the underlying zone’s maximum height limits are not applicable to spectator sports facilities and also provide more details regulating parking garages.
- Development standards in section 23.74.010 describe details about accessory parking, outdoor storage, curb cut locations, a density limit of 3.0 floor area ratio (FAR) with the first 75,000 square feet of street-level uses of various kinds exempt from the density limit, street façade requirements, screening and landscaping, blank façade limits, transparency requirements, principal pedestrian entrances, and a provision in section 23.74.010C that describes a “pedestrian environment” within a 40-foot radius at intersections along 1st Avenue S. and Occidental Avenue S.

Relationship to Livable South Downtown Planning

The purpose and intent of the Stadium Transition Area Overlay District overlay zone, as described verbatim above from SMC 23.74.002, inform and define the current overlay zoning. As indicated, it is an area that has transportation and other infrastructure capable of supporting additional development, it supports uses complementary to the stadiums, and contributes to an improved pedestrian safety and pedestrian-oriented character of the area, while minimizing conflicts with industrial uses. Allowing a mix of uses including office development is intended, to encourage redevelopment to maintain the health and vibrancy of the area during times when the sports facilities are not in operation.

The relationship to the EIS alternatives can be briefly summarized as follows.

- Alternatives 1 and 3 contemplate a new South Downtown Mixed (SDM) zone that would contain provisions that achieve the same or similar purposes as those achieved by the Stadium Transition Area Overlay District, for locations north of S. Royal Brougham Way and west of 1st Avenue S. The SDM zone could, however, allow for the possibility of residential uses in the approximate northern third of the “WOSCA property” as part of a mix of uses including commercial uses. That use would vary from the current overlay zone’s list of permissible uses.

- Alternatives 1 and 3 also suggest (but do not necessarily require) that the SDM-zoned portion of the study area along 1st Avenue S. would be removed from the Overlay District, which if pursued would entail a change in the boundaries of the Stadium Transition Area Overlay District.
- A similar change in the boundary of the Overlay District would be assumed to occur under Alternative 3 for the portion of the proposed SDM 180' zone extending south of S. Dearborn Street on the west side of 4th Avenue S.
- Under Alternative 2, no changes would be assumed to occur to the Overlay District boundaries because the zones would remain in Industrial Commercial zones. However, maximum height limits and other regulations such as development standards would change.
- Alternative 3 also contemplates the possibility of adding lodging (hotel) uses as a permissible use in the Overlay District.
- The Preferred Alternative recommends IC zoning north of S. Royal Brougham Way on the west side of 1st Avenue S. that would likely retain the Overlay District. The IC zoning would, however, make changes to height limits, density limits and other probable bulk controls and development standards that would influence the ultimate size and configuration of future buildings developed on the west side of 1st Avenue S.

***RELATIONSHIP TO PIONEER SQUARE PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION ON THE “NORTH LOT”***

The City’s Department of Neighborhoods (DON) approved design guidelines in May 2007 to express preferences for the qualities of future development at the Qwest Field north parking lot. The introduction to the guidelines identifies that the north parking lot is a “*transition area*” and “*as such, creative interpretation of materials and architectural elements can be used for new construction...when it is visually compatible with, and does not detract from or overwhelm, the character of the District.*”

The goals of the guidelines include articulating how new development can be compatible, and encouraging the design of new development that:

- adds vitality to the District;
- fits in the context of its site;
- contributes to the quality building stock of Pioneer Square;
- provides comfort and safety;
- is welcoming to pedestrians;
- reinforces the neighborhood’s unique character;
- provides design variety within the site;
- provides connectivity to its surroundings; and
- incorporates crime preventive features.

The guidelines for the design of new construction address numerous features such as: massing, building heights, setbacks, scale, street walls, non-street wall elevations, building articulation and definition, floor-to-floor height, entrance orientation, display windows and storefronts, upper floor windows, balconies, pedestrian friendly design, environmentally responsible design, craftsmanship, materials, color, signs, awnings/canopies, building lighting, rooftop/mechanical elements, uses, parking, streets and sidewalk treatments, street lighting and public art.

Relationship to Livable South Downtown Planning

The draft guidelines are a detailed expression of how new building design, particularly as expressed in exterior elements, can maintain compatibility with Pioneer Square’s neighborhood character. Full

conformance with design guidelines would be expected to ~~effectively extend the~~ improve the relative compatibility of building character with of Pioneer Square. ~~into the area south of S. King Street.~~ Partial conformance in proposed building designs ~~would tend to~~ could negatively affect ~~introduce a different~~ character. ~~that would be negatively influenced by the omission of particular architectural details.~~ In newer development, architectural designs risk being oversimplified or ~~having incompatible in such~~ detailing as ~~a~~ window dimensions and building materials, for example. Also, street-level use patterns may not correspond to historical use patterns in adjacent areas. These potential flaws can be avoided when sufficient attention is paid to the design guidelines during the design process.

Guidelines addressing massing, building height, street level uses, upper level uses, and location of parking uses are most relevant to Livable South Downtown planning. These elements are most directly affected by zoning. Livable South Downtown's zoning Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 study the continuation of Pioneer Square Mixed zoning, but with three different possible variations in the maximum height limits: 150, 180 and 240 feet. Accompanying these limits would be density limits and other probable requirements to define how building bulk may occur. Under the Preferred Alternative, this area could experience development up to 240 feet in height, but bulk and density controls are also defined as part of the Preferred Alternative.

The impact analyses in other sections of this chapter—most notably addressing height, bulk and scale—suggest that a height limit of 150 feet at the north parking lot would be able to maintain compatible height/bulk/scale relationships within the Pioneer Square context, while height limits of 180 and 240 feet could result in significant adverse impacts unless the particulars of height, bulk and scale controls are specified in more detail (see the Preferred Alternative description in Chapter 2 for more information about proposed height, bulk and scale controls). Such strategies ~~might~~ may relate to the massing of buildings on the site, transitions from lower height buildings to higher height buildings, the use of setbacks, and how the buildings are articulated both vertically and horizontally. Under the Preferred Alternative, the recommended controls would be able to influence development such that significant adverse height, bulk and scale impacts would not be expected.

Livable South Downtown zoning recommendations could either incorporate a number of the recommended prescriptions from the guidelines, or rely on the coverage provided by those recommendations as well as relying on the implementation of the guidelines through future Pioneer Square Preservation Board review of future specific development proposals.

OTHER LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESSES

SR 99/ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT PLANNING

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) are engaged in evaluating options for future street and highway improvements associated with SR 99. This includes a “surface and transit” option that would not include either a tunnel or a viaduct in the immediate vicinity of the study area. This option has several implications for future street networks and traffic patterns that are being evaluated by SDOT. WSDOT has already acquired the western half of the “WOSCA” property for probable right-of-way purposes, and is expected to use the rest for construction staging purposes during the construction period. Safety, mobility and infrastructure improvements are planned for 2007. The Washington State Department of Transportation anticipates that viaduct removal will begin in 2012.

See Appendix G.1 and the Transportation and Parking sections in this chapter for evaluation of transportation impacts.

SR 519 PHASE 2 PLANNING

SR 519 planning proposes street and highway improvements meant to provide additional connections to and from Interstate 5, Interstate 90 and the Stadium Area vicinity. This includes an additional bridge connection from the interstates, a bridge at railroad tracks near S. Royal Brougham Way with a connection down to 3rd Avenue S., and improvements to the 1st Avenue S./S. Atlantic Street intersection. As of summer 2007, an Environmental ~~Assessment Impact Statement~~ was being prepared on this project (completed in 2008), to facilitate construction in a 2009-2012 timeframe. See Appendix G and the Transportation section in this chapter for evaluation of transportation impacts.

INDUSTRIAL LANDS STUDY

In 2006 and 2007, DPD planning staff engaged in a review of current industrial area land use policies, including documentation of existing conditions and issues. This study was spurred by development trends in the Manufacturing and Industrial Centers, the relationship to continued support for manufacturing and industrial economic sectors, and how these areas’ plans and policies will be implemented. In conjunction, the Planning Commission hosted a series of public forums with presentations and discussion by speakers and interested citizens.

The Industrial Lands Study and Mayor’s Recommendations were completed in summer 2007. The recommendations articulate that industrial zones are most appropriately located in the City’s Manufacturing and Industrial Centers (MICs), and not within urban centers and villages or near dense residential uses. The recommendations proposed stricter controls on non-industrial activities, such as limits on size of use, in industrial zones in order to control conversion of industrial land and “[send] a clear message to industrial businesses about the City’s continued support for their activities.” The recommendations also offer language to clarify research and development laboratory uses, in order to discourage standard office uses within industrial areas.

Land Use Code amendments that address relate to the above issues are anticipated were approved by the City Council in late 2007. This included limits on size of use and a Comprehensive Plan policy that encouraged further examination of business expansion strategies. Additional formal review of industrially-zoned lands outside the MICs and at the edge of the Duwamish MIC is planned being conducted by DPD in 2008, including land located within the Livable South Downtown study area, in the

south-of-Dearborn area. Mayor recommendations also address programmatic actions, such as job training, City staffing, and industry marketing.

This EIS acknowledges the above as part of the existing planning and land use context. Even though the Preferred Alternative recommends retention of IC zoning in the affected MIC area, other EIS alternatives contemplate a change in the Comprehensive Plan designation on the Future Land Use Map of the MIC areas north of S. Royal Brougham Way from Industrial to Downtown, and associated rezones. Such action is permissible according to rules for rezones and Council Land Use Decisions contained in SMC 23.34 and 23.76, respectively. As noted in the Land Use—Zoning, Land Use and Development Patterns section (DEIS page 3-13), this would represent a significant shift in the City’s land use policy for these locations.