

REVISED DRAFT

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Group Subcommittee Report on Recommended General Criteria for Selecting Neighborhoods for Neighborhood Plan Updates – December 10, 2009

The Criteria Subcommittee met to revise **General Criteria for Neighborhood Plan Updates - 2011 and Beyond** at a meeting on Thursday, December 10, 2009. The following people attended the meeting in SMT 1716:

Dennis Saxman

John Coney

Kay Knapton

Christie Coxley

Kate Stineback

Sharonn Meeks

Amalia Leighton

Request to NPAC for December 15 Meeting:

- + Discuss proposed both objective and subjective criteria.
- + Decision about sending recommended criteria (identified below) to City as NPAC advice.

I. Recommendations for Objective Criteria

The following objective criteria were developed considering available city-wide to relatively compare neighborhoods with each other. It was also assumed that all evaluations would be compared to existing neighborhood plans. The following general criteria are in no particular order:

1) Growth Target Status

- a) Evaluation of Residential/Housing Numbers
- b) Evaluation of Economic/Job Numbers

2) Demographic Change

- a) Evaluation of available City-wide data including but not limited to:
 - Census data
 - Regional transportation data (i.e. transit rider ship)
 - King County Health data (i.e. Health of King County Report)

3) Urban Village Boundary Applicability

- a) Identify development outside of existing urban village boundary
- b) Identify pending or approved request(s) to change urban village boundary

4) Elements of Existing Neighborhood Plan

- a) Identify elements missing from existing plan

5) Transportation Investments by City and/or other agencies

- a) Identify Capital Improvement Program (CIP) plans or projects
- b) Evaluate Transportation Oriented Development Opportunity
- c) Identify of Major State Projects (i.e. SR99 and SR 520)

REVISED DRAFT

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Group Subcommittee Report on Recommended General Criteria for Selecting Neighborhoods for Neighborhood Plan Updates – December 10, 2009

6) Lack of Infrastructure

- a) Identify missing sidewalks
- b) Evaluate Transit Service and Amenities (i.e. Bus shelters)
- c) Evaluate Wastewater Service
- d) Evaluate Stormwater Service
- e) Evaluate Power Service

7) Pressure from Developers and/or Private Institutions

- a) Identify changes in land use
- b) Identify pending zoning changes
- c) Identify Landmark Nominations and Designations
- d) Identify Major Institution Master Plans

8) Pressure from Public Institutions

- a) Identify Health Initiatives
- b) Identify Planning Efforts
- c) Identify Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project (non-Transportation)
- d) Identify Major Institution Master Plans

9) Distribution of Resources

- a) Evaluation of City budget (i.e. Considering Race and Social Justice)

II. Recommendations for Subjective Criteria

In addition to the objective criteria outlined above, the following subjective criteria could be applied after information was collected through a documented public outreach process coordinated between the neighborhoods and the City:

A. Stakeholder Participation

- Identify the stakeholders
- Is there a stewardship group?
- Which stakeholders are part of the stewardship group?
- How do the stakeholders communicate (i.e. at meetings, via email, newsletter/website)?

B. Willingness of Stakeholder to Participate

- Are the stakeholders willing to update their neighborhood plan?

C. Neighborhood Character

- Is there a feeling of neighborhood character?
- Is there concern over a loss of neighborhood character?