




# City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development  
Diane M. Sugimura, Director

## Greenwood Town Center Rezone DPD Recommendations 2 November 2010

Map A: Overview of Greenwood Town Center Rezone Subareas



### Overview

This report is a summary of the outreach effort for the Greenwood Town Center Rezone process that was facilitated by the City of Seattle's Department of Planning and Development (DPD). Based on the feedback from the outreach effort and preliminary analysis of the Land Use Code rezone criteria DPD's recommendations further outlined in this report include:

1. Rezone subarea 1 from Commercial 1 with a 40' height limit (C1-40) to Neighborhood Commercial 3 with a 65' height limit (NC3-65), NC2-65 and with a Pedestrian Zone Overlay P-Zone) across both zones along NW 85<sup>th</sup> St.
2. Keep subarea 2 as Single-Family 5000 (SF5000); maintain future consideration for Lowrise rezone options.
3. Keep subarea 3 as NC2-40; maintain future consideration for height increase to 65 feet.



## Background


In March, 2009 the Greater Greenwood Land Use Design & Development Advocacy Group (GGLDDAG) developed a rezone proposal for a series of properties located within the Greenwood Town Center. A rezone from single-family to multifamily requires a change to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), initially proposed as part of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan changes. Some members of the greater Greenwood neighborhood felt as though more outreach should have been done by GGLDDAG, and that the proposal was not fully supported by the community.

At the request of the Greenwood Community Council President Trevor Stanley, the FLUM change and the rezone proposal was removed from the list of proposed 2009 Comprehensive Plan changes. City Council directed DPD staff to work with the Greenwood Community Council to solicit feedback from the broader Greenwood community on the proposed rezones. This report details DPD's recommendations for rezoning, which are based in part on feedback from this outreach process.

It should be noted that some residents of Greenwood undertook additional public outreach to inform their neighbors of the rezone proposal. While this report focuses on the results of DPD's efforts, which were broader and neutral in tone, the forthcoming analysis from DPD that will accompany the rezone legislation will include more information on the residents' effort.

## DPD's Public Outreach Process

The outreach process focused on collecting feedback on the rezone proposal depicted in the following graphic:



The outreach process had two main components: a public open house and an online survey. In order to plan for the open house and the online survey, DPD staff formed a small stakeholder group to assist with meeting strategy and logistics. The six person stakeholder group consisted of representatives from the Community Council, the GGDDAG, and citizens living in the rezone areas<sup>i</sup>.

The stakeholder group met five times to plan for the public meeting and online survey, and once to debrief from the public open house. As part of their involvement in the stakeholder group, members staffed stations at the public open house; each station was related to one of the three specific rezone areas. One stakeholder member, Trevor Stanley, was unable to attend the open house, and his place served by a substitute.

DPD staff used several different approaches toward raising awareness of the open house. DPD hosted a project website, [www.seattle.gov/dpd/greenwoodrezone](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/greenwoodrezone) which included a link to the open house invitation, and the online survey. In addition, DPD sent a hardcopy mailing of the open house announcement to all property owners within 300 feet of the proposed rezone area boundaries, approximately 475 addresses. Notices were also posted on blogs and emailed from community listservs as well.

#### Open House

The open house was held on June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and attended by approximately 120 people. The meeting was an open house format, which facilitated dialog and open communication between staff, stakeholders and community residents. Councilmember Sally Clark provided opening comments and stayed to talk with meeting attendees. Overall, there was support for the open house format, although several people expressed their disappointment at the lack of a traditional hearing-type format (a presentation followed by public comment).

In addition to communication with staff and members of the stakeholder group, meeting attendees were able to leave comment forms (anonymously if desired), and place Post-it notes directly on specific subarea maps, expressing their opinions. Comments were nearly identical to those left in response to the online survey, therefore a summary of the key themes for each subarea are combined in the Survey Results section of the report.

#### Online Survey

In order to reach a wider cross-section of public opinion on the rezone proposal, DPD staff developed an online survey that was available from June 15<sup>th</sup>-July 15<sup>th</sup>. A total of 518 people responded. The following five survey questions provide an overview of the demographic information that was collected:

1. In the proposed rezone area do you: (Check all that apply)				
Answer Options	Subarea 1	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Response Count
Own and live in your home	18	43	27	83
Live and rent your home	8	26	13	43
Own residential property	11	22	12	42
Own commercial property	5	4	12	17
Own a business	8	8	14	23
Work	18	15	21	45
Frequently shop/visit	494	205	271	498
<i>answered question</i>				<b>505</b>
<i>skipped question</i>				<b>13</b>

2. If you live in Greenwood, what is your household type?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Single-Family Home	87.9%	372
Apartment	8.3%	35
Townhouse	3.8%	16
<i>answered question</i>		<b>423</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>95</b>

3. How many people live in your household?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
One person household	14.7%	61
Married/Partner with children less than 18 years old	40.1%	167
Married/Partner with no children	36.5%	152
Household with roommates	8.7%	36
Other (please specify)		22
<i>answered question</i>		<b>416</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>102</b>

4. How long have you?								
Answer Options	0-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15-19 years	20-24 years	25+ years	N/A	Response Count
Lived in Greenwood?	126	102	68	51	34	44	6	431
Worked in Greenwood?	65	26	26	13	15	11	113	269
Shopped/visited Greenwood?	51	93	85	58	54	75	0	416
<i>answered question</i>								<b>461</b>

*skipped question* **57**

<b>5. What is your age?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
0-18	0.2%	1
19-25	2.4%	11
26-32	14.3%	64
33-39	25.2%	113
40-46	23.4%	105
47-53	17.8%	80
54-60	14.0%	63
66-72	2.7%	12
72+	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		<b>449</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>69</b>

**Survey Results: Subarea 1**

The proposal for subarea 1 consisted of rezoning the existing C1-40 to a combination of NC2 and NC3 zoning, with a height of 65 feet. A pedestrian-zone (P-zone) overlay was also proposed for properties fronting 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue NW. Subarea 1 had the most demonstrated support for the proposed rezone, with nearly 49% of people who answered the question demonstrating moderate or strong support for a rezone to NC zoning. However, this is compared with 46% of people who strongly or moderately did not support the rezone.

<b>How do you feel about the proposed rezone in Subarea 1?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
<b>Strongly Do Not Support</b>	36.2%	174
<b>Moderately Do Not Support</b>	10.0%	48
<b>Neutral</b>	5.2%	25
<b>Moderately Support</b>	20.8%	100
<b>Strongly Support</b>	27.9%	134
<i>answered question</i>		<b>481</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>37</b>

In analyzing the 202 comments related to subarea 1, it is apparent that there is general support for the proposal to rezone to Neighborhood Commercial, and that the primary objection expressed is the proposed height increase to 65 feet. Many comments suggested a compromise of a rezone to NC-40 or keeping the 65 foot height limits toward the center of the block that comprises the Fred Meyer parcels. Other key themes that emerged:

- Support for range of retail sales/services/residential options.
- Emphasis on pedestrian access and making a pedestrian zone.

- Dissatisfaction with losing Greenwood Market and creating more big-box retail that would drive out smaller businesses in Greenwood.
- Desire for a rezone accompanied by an increase in public open space and other amenities.
- Concern about the lack of parking and increased traffic that more residents would bring to the neighborhood.

**Survey Results: Subarea 2**

The proposal for subarea 2 consisted of rezoning parcels along NW 87<sup>th</sup> Street from single-family (SF5000) to Lowrise 3 (L3). Approximately 27% of responses indicated strong or moderate support for the proposal to rezone the existing SF5000 to L3 zone. Approximately 64% of responses did not support the proposal.

How do you feel about the proposed rezone in Subarea 2?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Do Not Support	53.8%	256
Moderately Do Not Support	10.3%	49
Neutral	8.8%	42
Moderately Support	13.2%	63
Strongly Support	13.9%	66
	<i>answered question</i>	<b>476</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>	<b>42</b>

Rezoning subarea 2 from SF5000 to L3 is complicated due to several other planning processes that are currently underway or would need to be initiated. One, a change from single-family to multifamily would require an update to the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map, which is updated once annually. This process was initiated and then removed during the 2009 Comprehensive Plan update process, and would need to be proposed again.

Two, City Council is currently evaluating significant changes to all Lowrise zones and rezone criteria, and is likely to vote on the proposal at the end of 2010/early 2011. Most significantly and directly related to subarea 2, the current rezone criteria do not allow designated Environmental Critical Areas (ECAs) to be rezoned to L3. Nearly all of subarea 2 is in a peat settlement area, which is an ECA. The proposed rezone criteria would allow use of the L3 zone in certain types of ECAs, including peat settlement areas.

The 210 comments to the question of rezoning subarea 2 identified several key themes:

- Concern about a change in neighborhood character from single-family to multifamily.
- Worry that local property owners would either see their property devalued or, conversely, higher taxes would drive them out of Greenwood.

- Need for significant improvement to the roads and sidewalks to support any kind of new development.
- Lack of data to fully understand impacts to the peat bog settlement area.
- Distress over possible impacts to, and loss of, street parking.
- Desire for a safer pedestrian environment.

**Survey Results: Subarea 3**

The rezone proposal for subarea 3 did not call for a change in zoning (currently NC2), but rather proposed an increase in allowable height from 40 to 65 feet, and an extension of the current P-zone overlay west on 85<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Approximately 29% of survey responders expressed moderate or strong support for subarea 3, as opposed to 61% who did not.

How do you feel about the proposed rezone in Subarea 3?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>Strongly Do Not Support</b>	48.3%	229
<b>Moderately Do Not Support</b>	12.7%	60
<b>Neutral</b>	9.9%	47
<b>Moderately Support</b>	10.3%	49
<b>Strongly Support</b>	18.8%	89
	<b><i>answered question</i></b>	<b>474</b>
	<b><i>skipped question</i></b>	<b>44</b>

As with subarea 2, many survey responders felt that there would be undue impacts to the existing single-family zone that directly borders subarea 3 to the south, across an alley. Key themes from the 175 comments on subarea 3:

- Concern over creating a “tunnel-like” effect along NW 85<sup>th</sup> Street and creating an abrupt transition to the existing single-family neighborhood.
- Uncertainty over the level of demand for mixed use space along this corridor.
- Desire to give this area a much needed “face lift” to attract business to an abandoned stretch and create a better looking neighborhood.
- Worry that properties directly adjacent to the rezone area will lose access to light.



height limit to 65 feet in order to encourage reuse of the site with housing while preserving the potential for retail tenants with high floor-to-ceiling heights to serve the neighborhood. Tall ground floors are usually a key driver for creating good retail space. Tenants, especially grocers, and developers typically need more than 40 feet of building height in order to incorporate housing into a mixed use development. A height limit of 65 feet would maintain flexibility for a range of options in future redevelopment, while impacts from height, bulk and scale of a project can be mitigated through the design review process.

Careful siting and design treatment based on techniques described in City and neighborhood design guidelines will help new development in subarea 1 fit in with the vision for the town center and make appropriate transitions to abutting, less intensive zones. The design review process allows for design solutions that help reduce impact of height, bulk and scale of a project. In other words, if a transition in height is not provided in a project, and the design does not adequately address the concerns of a community, the design review process provides an avenue for advocating for decreased height or bulk or other design features to help the transition along the perimeter of the project. The intent of the design review process is to allow the community to provide feedback on proposed development to help ensure neighborhood compatibility.

Subarea 2: Remain SF5000, and reserve future consideration for Lowrise zoning.

If subarea 1 is developed as mixed use with increased housing and commercial space, subarea 2 could be a good candidate for a future rezone to add more housing close to services. However, issues were raised about infrastructure and potential peat settlement in the area, and there is too much uncertainty about the outcome of the proposed changes to the Lowrise zones to recommend a rezone at this time.

Rezoning to L3 or a different Lowrise zone could help accomplish the vision for a town center and still provide a transition from the commercial activity across the street. Therefore, DPD recommends that the community reexamine the proposal after the Lowrise changes go into effect and there is a better understanding how Lowrise zoning could blend into the neighborhood.

Subarea 3: Maintain the existing NC2-40 zone, and reserve future consideration for an increase in height, either through a future rezone process or contract rezoning.

While DPD is not recommending a rezone of subarea 3 at this time, there is merit in continuing to examine the potential for a height increase to 65 feet in subarea 3, either in a future legislative rezone, or through contract rezones on a parcel basis. Increased height could provide incentive to develop traditionally difficult sites; parcels that are narrow and shallow. Based on community feedback, there is general agreement in the need to redevelop this neglected stretch of 85<sup>th</sup>.

Public comments also focused on the potential impacts that increased height would have on the adjacent single-family homes to the south. Given the grade change toward single-family

homes to the south, any impacts to light are lessened. In addition, setback requirements for commercial zones adjacent to single-family zones would further limit shading and bulk impacts.

**Next Steps**

DPD will prepare legislation to rezone subarea 1 with the intent of releasing an environmental (State Environmental Policy Act - SEPA) Determination in 2011. After the SEPA determination is released, there will be a three week comment and appeal period. If there are no appeals, legislation could be transmitted to City Council in January 2011. City Council’s Committee on the Built Environment (COBE) will review the legislation and hold a public hearing on the rezone proposal. After the legislation is acted upon by COBE it will move on to review and a vote by full Council, before going to the Mayor for his signature. Once signed, legislation will go into effect 30 days from the date of the Mayor’s signature.

Andrea Petzel, Senior Planner  
City of Seattle – DPD  
(206) 615-1256  
[andrea.petzel@seattle.gov](mailto:andrea.petzel@seattle.gov)

---

**Greenwood Rezone Stakeholder Group:**

Community Council: Trevor Stanley  
Community Council: Hugh Handyside  
Citizen: Constanza Marcheselli  
Citizen: Rob Fellows  
GGDDAG: Keith Bates  
GGDDAG: Evan Bourquard