

REVISED DRAFT

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Group Subcommittee Report on Recommended General Criteria for Selecting Neighborhoods for Neighborhood Plan Updates – December 10, 2009 & Supplemented December 30, 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 objective criteria.
- + Decision about sending recommended criteria (identified below) to City as NPAC advice.

The Criteria Subcommittee and other NPAC members met again on December 30, 2009 in City Hall Room 370 to add the Element weighting/prioritization considerations discussion which is incorporated below. In attendance were: Cindi Barker, Dennis Saxman, John Coney, Sharonn Meeks, Irene Wall, Toby Thaler, Brian Ramey, Ashley Harris

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

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which are the furthest above the Comprehensive Plan growth targets, in comparison to all other neighborhoods

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)

REVISED DRAFT

**Neighborhood Planning Advisory Group
Subcommittee Report on Recommended General Criteria for Selecting
Neighborhoods for Neighborhood Plan Updates – December 10, 2009 &
Supplemented December 30, 2009**

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which are showing the greatest demographic change in census numbers (e.g. age, ethnic, social economic, cultural composition), either up or down, or other demographic changes which could indicate the existing NH Plan may insufficiently address new or changing issues.

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

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which have experienced greater proportionate development within the planning area of each Urban Village.

4) Elements of Existing Neighborhood Plan

- a) Identify elements missing from existing plan

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to Neighborhoods which are missing elements identified in the City Comprehensive 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)

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which have been receiving or are projected to receive significant public investment through the CIP, either projects driven by the Neighborhood Plan or projects driven to the neighborhood by City programs.

Greater priority should be given to neighborhoods that will be impacted by major State projects.

REVISED DRAFT

**Neighborhood Planning Advisory Group
Subcommittee Report on Recommended General Criteria for Selecting
Neighborhoods for Neighborhood Plan Updates – December 10, 2009 &
Supplemented December 30, 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

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which either had identified major infrastructure gaps as part of their original Neighborhood Plan and which still may not be fulfilled, or which now have gaps in infrastructure due to changes in the Urban Village which have created new demands.

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

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods where, if all permits or proposed land use changes in the pipeline were completed within the next two years, it would increase the residential units or job counts by 10 percent **or more**.

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods where significant buildings or other historical resources are subject to redevelopment pressure.

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which now have large contiguous area(s) identified for redevelopment, which were not identified in the Neighborhood Plan.

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

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

Greater priority for update should be given to neighborhoods which have outside pressures leading towards planning efforts of Major Institutions for development in and around the Urban Village that was not identified in the Neighborhood Plan.

REVISED DRAFT

Neighborhood Planning Advisory Group Subcommittee Report on Recommended General Criteria for Selecting Neighborhoods for Neighborhood Plan Updates – December 10, 2009 & Supplemented December 30, 2009

Weighting should also be given to neighborhoods that are having a Major Institution Master Plan implemented if the Master Plan was approved after the adoption of the Neighborhood Plan.

9) Distribution of Resources

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

Element weighting/prioritizing consideration:

The city budget should be reviewed for funding inequities based on social and demographic information that guides departmental decisions for equitable distribution of city resources. Priority should be given to neighborhoods and their planning areas that appear to be receiving less than equitable distribution, based on what was requested or identified in the original Neighborhood Plan.

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: (Note the subjective criteria were not reviewed or supplemented at the 12/30/09 meeting.)

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?