

# Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee

## May 19, 2009

City Hall, Bertha Knight Landes Room  
600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98124

### MEETING SUMMARY

*Prepared by Triangle Associates, Inc.*

#### ATTENDANCE

✓ In attendance, □ Not in attendance, X Excused absence

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee Members			
Last	First	Affiliation/Neighborhood	In Attendance?
Ali	Abdirazak	At Large/Queen Anne, Magnolia	□
Ashkenazy	Boaz	At Large/Wedgewood	✓
Bailey	Adrienne	Central Area District Council/Central Area	✓
Brower	Josh	Seattle Planning Commission/Beacon Hill	✓
Coney	John	Magnolia-Queen Anne District Council/Queen Anne, Magnolia	✓
Coxley	Christie	Southeast District Council/Rainier Beach	X
Edwards	Judith	Greater Duwamish District Council/North Beacon Hill	✓
Hale	Jeannie	Northeast District Council/ Laurelhurst	✓
Hemminger	Dawn	Ballard District Council/Ballard	X
Hill	Eddie	At Large/Southeast	□
Im	Thomas	At Large/Downtown	✓
Knapton	Kay	Seattle Planning Commission	✓
Madsen	Joel	At Large/Eastlake	X
Martin	Kate	Northwest District Council/Greenwood	✓
Meeks	Sharonn	Southwest District Council/West Seattle	✓
Oien	Heidi	At Large/Capitol Hill	✓
Ramirez	Maria	Delridge District Council/Delridge	✓
Saxman	Dennis	East District Council/Capitol Hill	✓
Stanford	Catherine	Downtown District Council	✓
Staton	Renee	North District Council/Pinehurst	X
Stineback	Kate	At Large	✓
Thaler	Toby	Lake Union District Council/Fremont	✓
Vergis Vinh	Diana	At Large	✓
Wall	Irene	City Neighborhood Council Neighborhood Planning Committee/Phinney Ridge	✓

Alternates			
Last	First	Alternate for	In Attendance?
Barker	Cindi	Irene Wall	□
Benjamin	Craig	Dawn Hemminger	✓
Counts	George	John Coney	□
Hinrix	Robert	Judith Edwards	□
Joncas	Kate	Catherine Stanford	✓
Lee	Mona	Christie Coxley	□
Leighton	Amalia	Josh Brower and Kay Knapton	✓
McAtertey	Blayne	Kate Martin	□
Miller	David	Renee Staton	□
Murakami	Pat	Adrienne Bailey	□
Ramey	Brian	Toby Thaler	□
Wainwright	Mark	Sharon Meeks	□

**Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee  
May 19, 2009  
MEETING SUMMARY**

<b>Project Team/Other City of Seattle</b>			
<b>Last</b>	<b>First</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>In Attendance?</b>
Archie	Kimberlee	Department of Neighborhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bicknell	Lyle	Department of Planning and Development	✓
Gastil	Raymond	Department of Planning and Development	✓
Goldberg	David	Department of Planning and Development	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kern	Michael	Triangle Associates	✓
Murdock	Vanessa	Department of Planning and Development	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nolte	Dan	Councilmember Clark's Office	✓
Stern	Renee	Triangle Associates	✓
Tenna	Sebhat	Department of Neighborhoods	✓

<b>Public</b>			
<b>Last</b>	<b>First</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>In Attendance?</b>
Bradford	Bill	Jackson Place	✓
Cargill	Doug	Columbia City	✓
Harris	Ashley		✓
Wright	Tenaya	Central Area	✓

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Co-Chairs opened the meeting, welcomed the Neighborhood Plan Advisory Committee members, and led a round of introductions. The facilitator reviewed the agenda and meeting materials (available from the Committee's website). The Committee reviewed and approved the April 21, 2009 meeting summary (as revised at the meeting) by consensus.

**FEEDBACK ON MAY TOWN HALL MEETINGS**

Committee members provided feedback on the May 9 MLK at Holly and May 16 North Rainer town hall meetings sponsored by the City. A number of members came away from the meetings with positive impressions. They said the meetings were well-planned, well-attended and successful in incorporating non-English speakers into the process (one member pointed in particular to a significant number of Chinese-speaking people at a meeting being well-served by an interpreter). These members appreciated the background information that was provided by the presenters. They reported that the North Rainier meeting was held in a good location.

Other members were more critical of the meetings. One member who attended both meetings expressed the opinion that the City is dominating the process and not providing meaningful opportunities for input from the public or NPAC. He stated that he is very unhappy with the process and asked for a show of hands of others who felt the same way (six members raised their hands). He called for the process to change dramatically or be halted.

Committee members noted that there was a lot of participation at both meetings by NPAC members, City staff and developers. Some members felt that the use of building blocks as a visual aid at the meetings (to illustrate neighborhood planning and development) was effective; others felt it was not meaningful. One member asked if there were specific goals for what was to be achieved at the meetings (including attendance goals). Another said she was impressed by the variety of solutions presented to address issues and concerns in the neighborhood, but wished that more information had been provided on what density means for small businesses.

One member stated that an interruption of the agenda by a group of attendees at the Othello meeting was positive and he wished that the City hadn't diverted the conversation to a caucus group outside the meeting room. Other members said they were glad the City had created a forum for discussing that group's concerns, while still allowing the planned agenda to proceed.

**Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee**  
**May 19, 2009**  
**MEETING SUMMARY**

**SECTOR OPEN HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE**

The lead of the Sector Open House Subcommittee provided a report on its work since the April meeting to prepare NPAC to co-host open houses with the Seattle Planning Commission (see Subcommittee report on the Committee's website). As authorized by the Committee at the April meeting, the Subcommittee met with members of the Planning Commission and DPD to discuss dates, times and venues for the sector open houses. With regards to the open house agendas, the Subcommittee stated that listening to the concerns of the community is a major focus. They hope to have less lecture time at the open houses and more time to assess the needs of the community and ask what may be missing from the status reports. The Subcommittee suggested documenting feedback in multiple forms (digitally and hard copy) and would like to use a variety of graphics and visuals to present information.

The Subcommittee recommended that training/orientation sessions be scheduled for NPAC and Planning Commission members, to prepare for co-hosting the open houses. At these sessions, NPAC and Commission members can discuss the neighborhood planning process, familiarize themselves with the neighborhood plans, and review small group facilitation techniques (see draft agenda in the Subcommittee's report).

Several Committee members commented on the proposed groupings of the open houses (see Subcommittee report). One member said that the Pike/Pine neighborhood should be grouped with Capitol Hill and First Hill. Another noted that the South Lake Union and Uptown neighborhoods are closely aligned and would like to see South Lake Union represented at the sector open houses and/or that the South Lake Union stewardship groups receive information about the meetings and the status reports. Another asked that Georgetown be listed as Greater Duwamish. Another member suggested that the neighborhoods in the north end of the City be grouped differently to take into account the fact that many people would prefer not to cross I-5. It was further stated that some of the draft dates suggested by the City conflict with important community meetings, such as the 46th District Democrats.

One Committee member stated that it is out of sync to hold the open houses before the status reports are drafted and available. She requested more clarification on the goals of the open house. She expressed disappointment and frustration at the overall neighborhood planning update process, feeling that NPAC remains "behind the curve" and the process is too rushed. She would like more collaboration between NPAC and the City on key documents like the status reports. Several Committee members echoed these concerns. Another Committee member suggested that the previous neighborhood planning process was also frustrating for many of the NPAC members who were involved at that time. He urged them to not give up on the Committee and its goals.

The Co-Chairs checked to see if the Committee was in consensus about the Subcommittee's recommendation to move forward with sector open house training/orientation sessions. The Committee was not in consensus, so the Co-Chairs invoked Robert's Rules of order. It was moved and seconded to approve the Sector Open House Subcommittee's recommendation to hold open house training/orientation sessions for NPAC and Seattle Planning Commission members in early June. A friendly amendment was accepted that these sessions occur after the City provides the relevant draft status reports to NPAC and include a history of neighborhood planning. A friendly amendment was rejected to delay the training/orientation until the Status Report Subcommittee can review the status report material provided by the City and report back to the full Committee at its June 16 meeting. That amendment was then put forward as a separate motion and was seconded. That motion failed with 8 members in favor, 10 opposed, and 1

**Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee**  
**May 19, 2009**  
**MEETING SUMMARY**

abstention. The original motion and friendly amendment carried with 11 members in favor, 6 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

A community member from the Central District stated that the neighborhoods are very frustrated with the update process. Every neighborhood plan is very different and outreach is challenging. He stated that attempting to pull the communities together for a one-hour open house will not be effective. He asked the Committee to further consider the desired outcome of the open houses and how it will feed into the larger process. He stated that the March community workshops did not present important information on issues like pedestrian catchments or through-blocks.

A community member from Columbia City stated that the process is moving too quickly and the communities are not truly engaged. He said the May town hall meetings were not effective and he did not like the building block exercise. He is concerned that the City is dominating the process and ignoring past mistakes.

**COMMUNITY OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE**

A member of the Community Outreach Subcommittee stated that the group did not meet in the previous month, but they did communicate via email and telephone calls. On April 30, the Subcommittee and the Co-Chairs participated in a call with Councilmember Sally Clark (chair of the City Council's Planning, Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee) to discuss NPAC's recommendation to extend the timeline for the three SE Seattle neighborhood plan updates by 6 months. The Subcommittee lead said Councilmember Clark is aware of the frustrations caused by the compressed timeline, but would like to see the process continue. She would like feedback on the May town hall meetings and may reevaluate extending the process at a later time. Councilmember Clark also stressed the importance of the validation methods for the plan updates and understands that the compressed timeline poses a challenge to promoting validation in the neighborhoods. Councilmember Clark will attend the June 16 NPAC meeting to answer questions and further discuss key neighborhood planning topics.

**NEXT STEPS/FINAL THOUGHTS**

The Co-Chairs presented a revised NPAC schedule (available from the Committee's website) to ensure the Committee's topics of discussion at upcoming meetings are in synch with the City's neighborhood planning activities, while focusing on tasks from the resolution and ordinance. The Co-Chairs emphasized that the schedule is a work-in-progress and asked for Committee members to call or email with any recommended changes. One Committee member suggested that the schedule be revised to show that prioritization of plans will be addressed in August.

The Co-Chairs noted that the Validation Subcommittee needs to start moving forward and criteria needs to be developed for recommending the next neighborhoods for updates. A member of the Neighborhood Plan Update Subcommittee stated that the group met once to discuss the format for the next neighborhood plans. She noted that the websites are difficult to navigate and links are problematic. She requested that website links be established so that people can move easily from the Comprehensive Plan to the neighborhood plans. A Committee member requested that the DPD Planning Director and neighborhood planning Project Manager be present at all NPAC meetings.

The Co-Chairs thanked the members for their participation and adjourned the meeting. The Committee's next meeting will be Tuesday, June 16, 2009 in the Bertha Landes Room at City Hall.