



Special Meeting Planning Commission Agenda

October 29, 2024
5:30 pm
Hybrid Meeting

The Planning Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council. The Commission primarily considers plans and regulations relating to the physical development of the city, plus other matters as assigned. The Commission is an advisory body to the City Council.

Members: Alyne Hansen (Chair), Tony Zuniga Sanchez (Vice Chair), Bandhanjit Singh, Damiana Merryweather, Dee Abasute, Karin Ellis. One vacant position.

Staff Coordinator: Jenn Kester, Planning Manager

A quorum of the Council may be present.

ITEM	TOPIC	PROCESS	WHO	TIME
1	Call to Order / Roll Call		Chair	5:30 (2 min)
2	Approval of the minutes of October 15, 2024, meeting.	Review and Approve	Members	5:32 (3 min)
3	Public Comment on items <u>not</u> on the agenda. <i>Comments on agenda items will be addressed after the staff presentation and Commission discussion on each item below.</i> <i>See Public Comment Process below.</i>		Chair	5:35 (5 min)
4	Envision SeaTac 2044: Major Update to the City of SeaTac Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations. 1. Public Comment Review and Consideration of Staff Responses 2. Provide Direction to Staff or Make Recommendation to Council	Discussion and Potential Recommendation	Staff and Members	5:40 (80 min)
5	CED Staff Report	Briefing	Staff	7:00 (5 min)
6	Planning Commission Comments (including suggestions for next meeting agenda)	Discussion	Members	7:05 (5 min)
7	Adjourn			7:10

This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid format with in-person and remote options for public participation. The meeting will be broadcast on SeaTV Government Access Comcast Channel 21 and live-streamed on the City's website <https://www.seatacwa.gov/seatvlive>.

Public Comment Process: The commission will hear in-person public comments and is also providing remote oral and written public comment opportunities. All comments shall be respectful in tone and content. Providing written comments and registering for oral comments must be done by 3:30 pm, the day of the meeting. Registration is required for remote comments and encouraged for in-person comments. Any requests to speak or provide written public comments which are not submitted following the instructions provided or by the deadline will not be included as part of the record.

- Instructions for providing remote oral public comments are located at the following link: [Council Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee Virtual Meetings](#).
- Submit email/text public comments to PCPublicComment@seatacwa.gov. The comment will be mentioned by name and subject and then placed in the committee handout packet posted to the website.

**CITY OF SEATAC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Minutes of October 15, 2024, Meeting**

Members present: *Chair Alyne Hansen, Bandhanjit Singh, Damiana Merryweather, Dee Abasute, Karin Ellis*

Members absent: *Vice Chair Tony Zuniga Sanchez*

Staff & Others

Present: *Planning Manager Jenn Kester, Principal Planner Kate Kaehny, Senior Planner Zack Shields, Associate Planner Laura Stilwell, Admin Asst 3 Barb Mailo, OTAK Consultant Mandi Roberts, OTAK Senior Planner Emily Larson, DKS Associates Principal Consultant Wintana Miller*

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

- *Chair Hansen* called the meeting to order and roll call at **5:36 PM**.

2. Approval of the October 1, 2024, meeting minutes.

- *Commissioner Merryweather* motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Seconded by *Commissioner Ellis*.

Motion Passed: 5-0

3. Public Comments on items not on the agenda.

None

In person comments:

None

4. Envision SeaTac 2044: Major update to the City of SeaTac Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations

Public Hearing introduction and guidelines presented by *Planning Manager Kester*

Public Hearing:

- *Chair Hansen* opened the Public Hearing at **5:40 PM**
- *Chair Hansen* stopped the Public Hearing at **5:41 PM** due to technical difficulties with Live Stream and recording system

(5:56 PM) *Planning Manager Kester* announced that technical difficulties with the Live Stream system remained the same and was unrecoverable and therefore public viewing was not possible. However, the Public Hearing is being recorded on the Zoom Webinar and recording system and will be posted for public viewing at a later time.

Chair Hansen recommended to proceed with the Public Hearing as there was a good number of community members that have joined tonight's meeting in person and have signed up to make public comments.

- *Commissioner Merryweather* motioned to proceed with the Public Hearing with the understanding that the meeting is being recorded and may be viewed by the public at a later time. Seconded by *Commissioner Ellis*.

Motion passed: 5-0

- **Chair Hansen** reopened the Public Hearing at **5:56 PM**

1. Staff Presentation

Presented by *Principal Planner Kaehny* and *Senior Planner Shields*

2. Public Comments (in person)

- Doug Pepper
- Barbara McMichael
- Jay Pickering
- Sheryl Saechao
- Earl Gipson
- Arthur Eggar
- Robert Dyer
- Mike Quinlivan
- Jeff Kalin
- J Ben Vandemeer
- Daryl Jordan
- Gilbert Manipon
- Nuk Suwanchote
- Cheryl Costello

Planning Manager Kester read out loud the written public comments received and were not presented during in-person public comments:

- Ronny Seldal
- Gareth Row, BCRA, representing the Jordan Family Rezone
- Tasha Weiss, representing Master Builders of King and Snohomish County (MBAKs)
- King County Affordable Housing Committee
- State Department of Fish and Wildlife

3. Planning Commissioner Questions

Clarifying questions asked by *Commissioner Merryweather* and *Chair Hansen*

- **Chair Hansen** closed the Public Hearing at **7:39 PM**
- **Commissioner Merryweather** motioned to take a 5-minute break. Seconded by **Commissioner Ellis**

Motioned passed: 5-0

- Break commenced at 7:40 pm
- Break ended at 7:45 pm / meeting resumed

4. Direction to Staff or Recommendation

Meeting will be scheduled for October 29, 2024.

5. CED Staff Report

- Volunteer appreciation lunch is on November 4th at the Community Center, RSVP by 10.25
- The next City budget workshop is Friday at 6pm, Subscribe to city blog on website if you would like to be kept up to date.

- City posted on update regarding city manager hiring process. A search firm was hired. 28 candidates applied for the position; the city will announce finalists in late October 2024.

6. Planning Commission Comments (including suggestions for next meeting agenda)

Commissioner Merryweather thanked members of the public for showing up and for their testimonies. *Commissioner Ellis* thanked the members of the community for showing up and staff for the work. *Chair Hansen* thanked the community members for coming.

7. Adjournment

Commissioner Merryweather motioned to adjourn the meeting. *Commissioner Ellis* seconded.

Meeting adjourned at **8:01 PM**

DRAFT



MEMORANDUM COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Date: 10/25/2024
To: Planning Commission
From: Kate Kaehny, Principal Planner
Subject: **Review of Envision SeaTac 2044 Public Hearing Comments**

At this Tuesday's Special Planning Commission meeting, staff will provide a review of public comments received at the October 15 public hearing on the Envision SeaTac 2044 public review draft. Staff will also present a response to those comments, which in some cases includes changes to current Envision proposals for the Commission to consider.

After the discussion, Commissioners may choose to make their recommendation to City Council, which could include amendments to the current Envision Public Review Draft proposals to policies, codes, or zoning proposals. Alternatively, the Commission may decide to hold their recommendation until next week's regular Planning Commission meeting on November 5. (November 5 is the last opportunity to make a recommendation before the Council reviews the Envision proposals on November 19.)

UPDATE ON PUBLIC OUTREACH BEFORE OCT. 15 PUBLIC HEARING

To ensure the Planning Commission is aware of all outreach conducted in support of the Envision project, the following summary of activities undertaken between the August community planning meetings and public hearing are provided below:

- **Oct. 2: Envision Proposed Rezone Property Owner Open House.** Staff sent letters to property owners of the over 480 parcels that are proposed for rezones with information on the Envision project and an invitation to attend the open house. Over sixty people attended, and multiple staff were available to help individual property owners understand the proposed rezones and related code change proposals. Many of the comments heard at this meeting were echoed by those who gave comments at the Public Hearing, specifically, questions and concerns about the rezones, impacts on property taxes, and a desire for flexibility in terms of future development opportunities for peoples' properties.
- **Early October: South SeaTac Renter Survey.** Community liaisons were hired to survey the apartment communities in South SeaTac, especially along the S 204th and S 208th street corridors, regarding renter household opinions on the updated growth strategies, including complete neighborhood priorities for citywide communities. 62 people participated, and some were provided language assistance to complete the surveys. While many people supported the complete neighborhoods approach to improving the city, people also said their top priorities were public safety, increased access to grocery stores and healthy foods, and more recreational opportunities for teenagers.
- **Oct. 7: Envision SeaTac 2044 Public Review Draft Open House:** Over thirty people attended the open house where community members could review proposed changes to policies, codes, and zoning. Many people attended to understand more about rezone and code change proposals and had similar questions to those raised at the October 2 rezone open house.
- **Oct. 14: Central SeaTac Renter Focus Group:** Nine people attended a focus group at the Windsor Heights Apartments complex, in the community center run by Southwest Youth and Family Services. Participants cited public safety, such as street lighting, more sidewalks, and including

personal security, as a top priority. There was also interest in how to get more information about City activities.

ENVISION SEATAC 2044 PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT & RESPONSE MATRIX

To help the Commission understand comments received at the October 15 Public Hearing, a matrix has been created to not only highlight those comments, but also to provide a response from staff with additional background information and context for the Commission to consider. Also, as noted above, after considering comments at the Public Hearing, staff is recommending changes to the Public Review Draft proposals. These are related to the proposed rezones and codes for accessory dwelling units, and where ground floor uses should be required in certain urban village and neighborhood village zones. Please see the matrix attached to this memo for more information. At this Tuesday's meeting, staff will present an overview of all comments and staff responses and recommendations.

ENVISION PROJECT NEXT STEPS

- 10/29: Planning Commission Special Meeting and possible recommendation on Envision proposals.
- 11/5: Last opportunity for Planning Commission recommendation on Envision proposals.
- 11/19: Council Study Session and review of Envision proposals and Planning Commission recommendation
- 12/10: City Council action on Envision proposals

PACKET MATERIALS

Packet materials include the following:

- This memo
- Envision SeaTac 2044 Public Hearing Comment & Response Matrix
- Public Hearing Comment Letter from Mr. Greif inadvertently left out of Oct. 15 Planning Commission Packet

Please note that copies of presentation slides for Tuesday's meeting will be provided on 10/29.

**Envision SeaTac 2044 Public Review Draft
Public Hearing: 10/15/2024**

COMMENT SUMMARY & CITY STAFF RESPONSES

Comment Summary	Staff Response
PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS & QUESTIONS	
<p>Information requested on how rezoning might affect property taxes.</p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the City of Shoreline, which recently undertook a rezoning process, analysis from more than twenty (20) reputable studies found that property values in new developments near neighborhood centers and high-capacity transit generally rise in value, from 0% to 32%, the closer they are to transit stations or centers. • Property taxes can be increased based on increased changes in property value, but in Washington State there are property tax levy limitations that restrict the amount property taxes can be increased. • For more detailed information, please see FAQ information created for Rezone Property Owner Meeting (Oct. 2): Property Values & Property Tax FAQ
<p>Questions were asked regarding proposed Ground floor active use requirements:</p>	<p><i>Please see staff response to Commissioners’ questions about ground floor uses requirements in the section below with the following yellow highlighted title:</i></p> <p>Concerns About Proposed Rezones & Changes to Other Development Codes</p>
<p>Questions asked regarding accessory dwelling unit (ADU) allowances in higher-density zones.</p>	<p><i>Please see staff response to Commissioners’ questions about ADUs in the section below with the following yellow highlighted title:</i></p> <p>Concerns About Proposed Rezones & Changes to Other Development Codes</p>

Comment Summary	Staff Response
PUBLIC COMMENTS SUBMITTED AT HEARING	
<p>General Concerns: Concerns shared about various Envision SeaTac 2044 proposals along with preferences to not make changes to people’s neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the Puget Sound Regional Council, the four-county Puget Sound region is anticipated to grow by 5.8 million people by 2050. Under the state Growth Management Act, SeaTac is required to plan to accommodate forecasted growth. Through a countywide process, SeaTac was assigned the following targets to plan for by 2044: 5,900 new housing units and 14,810 new jobs. • Additionally, in 2023, state housing laws changed to require that areas with single family zoning throughout the State of Washington must allow up to two accessory dwelling units and new “middle” housing types like duplexes and townhouses by June 2025. • To help prepare the city for the forecasted and anticipated population, job, and housing increases, the Envision SeaTac 2044 project staff undertook technical analyses, shared information with the public, and received input from community members on potential changes to growth policies during a process that has been on-going for over two years. • Based on these efforts, the City is now proposing updated strategies, including proposed rezones, that focus growth over time to help create centers and villages that can provide a variety of options for housing, jobs, services, and amenities, while ensuring that future growth is supported by complete neighborhood infrastructure and services citywide. <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to proposed growth vision.

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p>Concerns Regarding Tree Canopy Policies: The Planning Commission heard public comment regarding a concern that there are not sufficient tree retention/canopy policies in the Envision proposals.</p>	<p>Staff Response: The City currently has policies that promote preserving and expanding the City’s tree canopy as follows. Only one revision is proposed to the existing policies.</p> <p><u>Ch. 2 Land Use Element</u> - <i>Proposed</i> (proposed revisions in blue, underlined text)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2.8K (Proposed): Preserve existing vegetation and street trees and encourage the expansion of the tree canopy throughout the city for the aesthetic, health, and environmental benefits trees provide • Policy 2.8L Require site-appropriate installation of trees and other vegetation along streets. <p><u>Ch 9 Environment Element</u> - <i>Proposed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 9.5E: Increase natural carbon storage by increasing tree canopy on city streets and properties and protecting green belts. <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to current proposals.
<p>Access to Parks with ½ Mile: Questions were asked about how the City can achieve goals related to providing parks within one-half mile walking distance of all households and concerns were shared regarding how the City will acquire new park land.</p>	<p>Staff Response: The Envision project proposes to maintain the City’s existing and long held policies to promote one-half mile access to parks, and to clarify that walkable access to parks is part of the Complete Neighborhoods growth strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One half-mile access to community or neighborhood parks is a current and long-time City policy in the Parks Recreation & Open Space Element (See <u>Policy 10.2A</u>) and PROS Plan. It is also a national park and recreation standard. The existing Parks Element and PROS Plan also note that quarter mile access to parks is an aspirational goal for the City.

Comment Summary	Staff Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Envision project proposes revisions to maintain the intent of these policies while clarifying their role in supporting updated growth strategies. (See the updated Parks & Recreation Element policies 8.2A and 8.2B.) City practices for expanding the parks system include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing gaps in the open space network in line with adopted policies and level of service standards, and Negotiating with willing parties. <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to current proposals.
<p>Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park Proposed Rezone: A representative from the Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park ownership read comments from a letter received by CPI Bow Lake Estates Owners, LLC. The letter includes the following statement in bold, underlined:</p> <p><i><u>While the Property Owner has no plans to redevelop the Property, the Property Owner is opposed to the Bow Lake Proposal for the reasons explained herein.</u></i></p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <p>The City is proposing changing the current land use designations and zoning of parcels underlying the Bow Lake Estates 55+ Manufactured Home Park to better support and increase consistency with the City’s long-time housing policy goal of supporting the maintenance of existing manufactured home parks as a source of affordable housing. This goal is provided below and includes proposed revisions that promote the housing security of its residents.</p> <p><u>Ch. 5 Housing & Human Services Element- Proposed</u> (proposed revisions in blue, underlined text)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GOAL 5.6 - Support the continued maintenance of SeaTac’s existing manufactured home park as a source of affordable housing and promote the housing security of its residents. <p>The City is not proposing changes to development regulations for manufactured home parks in SMC 15.465.600.</p>

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p><i>Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park Proposed Rezone (continued)</i></p>	<p>Current Land Use Designation & Zoning The current land use designations and zones of the two parcels underlying the Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Land Use Designations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial High • Residential High Mixed Use • Residential High • Current Zones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban High-900 • Urban High-1,800 • Currently the western portion of Bow Lake Estates has zoning that does not match the area’s land use designations which have Commercial High and Residential High Mixed Use designations. These designations allow high intensity commercial and residential mixed-use development. The CB-C and UH-UCR zoning that implements these land use designations allow for developments of unlimited height and density (except for FAA and Fire code requirements). The eastern portion of Bow Lake Estates has Urban High high-density multifamily zoning that matches its Residential High land use designation. Urban High zoning allows for multifamily/apartment zoning with buildings up to 55’ in height. <p>Proposed Land Use Designation & Zoning The Envision project is proposing changes to land use designations and zones of the two parcels underlying the Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park are as follows:</p> <p>Proposed Land Use Designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Residential Medium <p>Proposed Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufactured Home Park

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p><i>Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park Proposed Rezone (continued)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Proposed Changes Increase Consistency Between Policies and Regulations: As noted above, the City is proposing to change the land use designations and zoning of the Bow Lake Estates parcels to better support and increase consistency with the City’s long-time housing policy goal of supporting the maintenance of existing manufactured home parks as a source of affordable housing. The proposed changes also align with the following existing and new policy proposals from the draft Housing & Human Services Element: (proposed revisions in blue, underlined text)</p> <p>Policy 5.1F: Identify and use strategies to address the impacts of current local policies and regulations that may result in disparate impacts and displacement.</p> <p>Policy 5.2B: Promote a variety of housing types and options in all neighborhoods, particularly in proximity to parks, pedestrian and bicycle routes, resident-oriented services, transit, employment, and educational opportunities.</p> <p>GOAL 5.3: Strengthen the housing security and stability of SeaTac’s residents, and the continued longevity of the city’s existing residential neighborhoods..</p> <p>Policy 5.4A: Identify, maintain, and enhance the existing affordable housing stock in SeaTac, with a focus on units available for very low-, low-, moderate-, and middle-income households.</p> <p>Policy 5.4B: Use City land use and construction-related codes to encourage development and adequate supply of affordable housing for all economic segments of the forecast population.</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should property owners want to change the land use designation or zoning of the parcels in the future, they, like other members of the public, may propose amendments through the regular, biennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket process that will occur in 2026-2027. <p>Staff Recommendation:</p>

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p><i>Bow Lake Estates Manufactured Home Park Proposed Rezone (continued)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to current proposal.
<p>Concerns About Proposed Rezones & Changes to Other Development Codes: At the public hearing, multiple people shared concerns about the rezoning of their parcels and other proposed code changes, especially from owners of single-family homes.</p> <p>This includes commenters from the following neighborhoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bow Vista, located generally between S 188th Street and the Cedarbrook Lodge: Based on addresses provided at the Public Hearing, most residents with concerns about the proposed rezones reside in the extended Bow Vista neighborhood. North City Center along S 166th Street Southwest SeaTac “RBX” Rezones, along S 208th Street, west of 24th Avenue S. <p>The most heard issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall concerns about proposed rezones and related changes. People 	<p>Staff Response: After the public hearing, staff reviewed comments received about proposed zoning changes and reassessed those proposals regarding how they align with and help implement overall project goals including key project themes such as Increasing access to opportunity, Housing for all, and other new policy goals and proposals.</p> <p>Staff Recommendations: In light of this review, <u>staff is recommending changes to the original rezoning proposal for the following areas: Bow Vista urban village zoning and North City Center zoning.</u> Staff is also recommending <u>increasing flexibility for owners of single-family homes in all areas with proposed rezones.</u> See sections below for specific recommendations:</p> <p>1) <u>Bow Vista Area: Change the Current Rezone Proposal for Urban Village Zones</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bow Vista extended neighborhood is within the City Center and Urban Center boundaries. The area is located near the YMCA on both sides of S 188th and is proposed to be developed over time into one of the four new “village nodes” proposed by the Envision project that will increase access to new neighborhood services and housing choices. While most of the area’s zoning currently allows single family homes, all of the parcels within the City Center/Urban Center boundaries have land use designations that allow higher densities than the current zoning. Current Envision Rezone Proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Village Rezones: Rezone the areas near S 188th Street that are located within the City Center/Urban Center boundaries to Urban Village High (close to International Boulevard) and Urban Village Medium (farther from International Boulevard) near 36th Ave S.

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p>expressed concerns about changing the zoning of their property and allowing different uses than currently allowed. It appeared that all commenters had parcels with single-family homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for more flexibility. While some people were open to the proposed new zoning for their properties, there was a desire for more flexibility from the proposed zoning and other new codes than currently proposed. • Desire for accessory dwelling units: For people with existing single-family houses on their property (most/all commenters), many owners wanted the option to build accessory dwelling units, which some of the proposed zoning does not allow. • Concerns about ground floor commercial requirements. There were concerns that requirements for ground floor commercial uses in the proposed Urban Village High and Urban Village Medium zones would be barriers to the redevelopment of people’s properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Urban Residential Medium Rezones: Rezone areas to Urban Residential Medium to increase consistency between zoning and Comprehensive Plan. (Note: While the current land use designation is “Townhouse,” this designation is being removed and is being replaced by the very similar Urban Residential medium designation.) • Recommended Changes to Envision Rezone Proposal: Maintain Urban Village zoning, but alter as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bow Vista West - Urban Village Medium: Replace the Urban Village High zoning with Urban Village Medium to better recognize the single-family properties and parcel sizes in the area. - Bow Vista East/S 188th & 36th Ave S – Urban Village High: Replace the Urban Village Medium zoning with Urban Village High for the three large parcels with frontage on the west side of 36th Ave S. <p>2) <u>North City Center: Change the Current Rezone Proposal for Lots Adjacent to S 166th Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Envision Rezone Proposal: Urban Village High. To help establish a north end node for the City Center area, the parcels along S 166th Street at the northern edge of the City Center boundary, are proposed to be rezoned to Urban Village High land use designations and zones. (Currently, the parcels are zoned “Urban Medium” which allows townhouse and small apartments, though there are many single-family dwellings in the area.) • Recommended Changes to Envision Rezone Proposal: Urban Village Medium. To better acknowledge that these parcels are on the edge of this urban village node, as well as topographic and parcel size issues, staff is recommending that the parcels along S 166th be rezoned to UVM. <p>3) <u>Southwest SeaTac RBX Rezones: No Change Proposed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While no change is recommended to the rezoning of single-family parcels to match their current Regional Business Mix (RBX) commercial/industrial land

Comment Summary	Staff Response
	<p>use designations, staff is recommending that more flexibility be provided for owners of existing single-family homes in that area. See item #4 below.</p> <p>4) <u>Accessory Dwelling Units: Changes Recommended to Allow Properties with Existing Single-Family Homes to Include ADUs</u></p> <p>To increase flexibility and continue existing opportunities for building wealth for owners of properties that are proposed for rezones, staff is recommending that parcels with existing single-family homes be allowed to construct accessory dwelling units. The list below shows where staff recommendations for where new single family detached dwelling units and ADUS are allowed (including where no changes are proposed):</p> <p>Urban Village High Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Change: New Detached Dwelling Units not allowed • <u>New Recommendation</u>: For existing single-family homes, one ADU is allowed through nonconformance code <p>Urban Village Medium Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Change: New Detached Dwelling Units not allowed • <u>New Recommendation</u>: For existing single-family homes, one ADU is allowed through nonconformance code <p>Neighborhood Village High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Change: New Detached Dwelling Units not allowed • <u>New Recommendation</u>: For existing single-family homes, one ADU is allowed through nonconformance code <p>Neighborhood Village Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Change: New Detached Dwelling Units allowed (will be reviewed as part of middle housing code amendments next year) • No Change: Up to 2 ADUs allowed since -family is allowed (will be reviewed next year)

Comment Summary	Staff Response
	<p>Urban Residential Medium (URM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Change in City Center, <u>but new for Angle Lake and S 154th Station Areas:</u> New Detached Dwelling Units and new accessory units allowed (will be reviewed next year as part of middle housing code amendments) <p>5) <u>Ground Floor Commercial Uses for Urban Village & Neighborhood Village Zones: Changes Recommended to Increase Flexibility and Better Align Requirements with Current Codes</u></p> <p>To increase flexibility and better align requirements with other parts of the City’s development codes, staff is recommending changing requirements for ground floor commercial uses to be provided within certain village zones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current Envision Proposals: Currently, the Urban Village High, Urban Village Medium, and Neighborhood Village High zones all require that new developments provide 50% of their ground floors as commercial/retail/ services uses. Staff Recommended Changes: After hearing a desire for increased flexibility from the public, and reassessing existing City code, staff is recommending the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the requirement for 50% ground floor commercial uses for all parcels with Urban Village High, Urban Village Medium, and Neighborhood Village Medium zoning. <u>Require 50% ground floor commercial uses only in the Urban Village High and Neighborhood Village High zones located along certain streets</u> with high visibility and higher rates of pedestrian and/or vehicle traffic. <p>Recommended Locations for 50% Ground Floor Commercial Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Village High Zones in City Center: Maintain existing ground floor commercial requirements, but add the following locations:

Comment Summary	Staff Response
	<p>---City Center South/S 188th: Add ground floor commercial requirement to Urban Village High zoned parcel along frontage of S 188th Street between 36th Ave S and the eastern boundary of the City Center/Urban Center eastern boundary.</p> <p>---City Center Central/S 170th: Add ground floor commercial requirements to parcels zoned Urban Village High and Neighborhood Village Medium on the north side of S 170th Street.</p> <p>---Note: City Center proposals will be reviewed as part of the subarea plan project that will resume after the completion of the Envision SeaTac 2044 Comprehensive Plan update project.</p> <p>- Neighborhood Village High Zones</p> <p>---City Hall/S 188th: Require ground floor commercial uses in parcels zoned Neighborhood Village High located on both sides of S 188th adjacent to Military Rd S.</p> <p>---McMicken Heights/Military Rd S: Require ground floor commercial uses in parcels zoned Neighborhood Village High along both sides of Military Rd S.</p>
<p>Public Comment Inadvertently Not Included in Public Hearing Packet</p> <p>Jim Greif: 21231 42ND AVE S (Parcel 1022049140)</p> <p>Property owner opposes the proposal to change current single-family zoning, Urban Low 15,000, to match the existing Residential Medium land use designation because the property is severely</p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff agrees with Mr. Greif that the property is significantly constrained because of critical areas, and that a low density residential land use designation and Residential Low zoning of his parcel are appropriate. <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change current land use designation, Residential Medium, to Residential Low. • Change current zone, Urban Low 15,000, to the lowest density residential zone available under the updated zoning typology: Residential Low.

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p>constrained by critical areas, and therefore much of the parcel cannot be redeveloped.</p> <p>The property owner is also concerned about property tax issues regarding his critical area constrained parcel.</p>	
<p>Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties (MBAKS)</p> <p>Overall, the letter was supportive of the city’s work. Staff believe that the current proposal and its analysis on housing paired with the work next year on middle housing and ADU regulations will address any concerns expressed by MBAKS.</p> <p>MBAKS further requested that the city adopt its middle housing and ADU codes earlier than the June 30, 2025, deadline. Due to staff resources and priorities, staff does not believe we can commit to early adoption.</p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <p>Overall, the letter was supportive of the city’s work. Staff believe that the current proposal and its analysis on housing paired with the work next year on middle housing and ADU regulations will address any concerns expressed by MBAKS.</p> <p>MBAKS further requested that the city adopt its middle housing and ADU codes earlier than the June 30, 2025, deadline. Due to staff resources and priorities, staff does not believe we can commit to early adoption.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to current proposal.
INTERESTED PARTY COMMENTS	
<p>Jordan Family Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone applicant expressed concerns about mixed use requirements that would apply to their properties which are proposed to be rezoned to Neighborhood Village High.</p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <p>After hearing comments from the Jordan Family and their consultant regarding the need for flexibility to the Neighborhood Village High Zone, staff reassessed the proposed new zone and its related code provisions.</p>

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p>The four parcels are located in McMicken Heights on Military Rd S, just north of and adjacent to Scott Plaza.</p> <p>The four parcels are currently zoned single family but could be rezoned to the Urban High 900 multifamily zone. The Jordan’s original proposal requested a new Urban High 450 zone be created and applied to their properties. Their proposed new zone would maintain the current 55’ building height but allow for increased density/units.</p>	<p>The Staff assessment indicated that the current Envision proposal provides increased building height and removes density restrictions compared to the Jordan Family’s current zoning.</p> <p>Since mixed use development in other locations within the city is being constructed, and commercial tenant space is being leased in those developments, including such uses as pharmacy, daycare, and pizzeria, staff believes market conditions would also allow for ground floor commercial uses to be provided as part of a new development within the Jordan Family’s four parcels.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to current proposal.
AGENCY COMMENTS	
<p>King County Affordable Housing Committee Comments on Draft Housing and Housing-Related Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2023, King County’s Growth Management Planning Council directed the Affordable Housing Committee to conduct a housing focused review to assess draft Comprehensive Plans for alignment with the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPP). • After City staff discussions with AHC staff, in early October, the AHC sent a letter to the City with one recommendation for SeaTac’s 	<p>Staff Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Envision project consultant is completing work on data points required by the by King County Countywide Planning Policies. <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Envision project staff will add in all data points required by the CPPs within the housing policies and/or background report as necessary to ensure full compliance with issues identified within the Affordable Housing Committee’s letter.

Comment Summary	Staff Response
<p>housing-related policies, specifically, to complete the housing inventory and analysis in CPP H-3.</p>	
<p>Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife Comments on Envision Proposals</p> <p>Multiple state agencies review and comment on alignment between draft Comprehensive Plans and state law.</p> <p>In early October, City staff received a letter and comments from WDFW which highlighted multiple suggestions for changes to policies that could better align with WDFW related goals and plans.</p>	<p>Staff Response:</p> <p>While most of the comments appear to already be addressed through proposals in the Environment and Land Use Elements, staff may propose some, limited, additional changes to increase alignment with state fish and wildlife plans in the final review draft of the Comprehensive Plan to be reviewed by City Council.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission may direct staff to identify changes for the Final Draft policies to increase alignment with state fish and wildlife plans as appropriate.

Envision SeaTac 2044 Public Review Draft

Written Public Comment from J. Greif Received October 2, 2024

- Inadvertently not included in October 15, 2024, Envision SeaTac 2044 Public Hearing packet.

From: [jim greif](#)
To: [Kate Kaehny](#)
Cc: [jim greif](#)
Subject: Disproportionate parcel designation and use that is unfairly subjected to one property parcel and not to all other property parcels surrounding that one Parcel that have the same Parcel wetland and steep slope limitation but are exempted from property ...
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2024 3:58:02 PM
Attachments: [image002 \(1\).png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Kate Kaehny
Principal Planner
Envision SeaTac 2044 Project Manager
kkaehny@seatacwa.gov
206-973-4834

Thank you for calling me back to resolve this matter. As I mentioned on the phone all the Parcels surrounding our property parcel are given a unfairly derived tax exemption despite our parcel is designated in the same wetland and steep slopes and use limitation. My Family has been fighting this since 1998. Initially our land value was over valued by ten times compared to parcels next to us that were ten times the square feet. You can verify this by comparing the parcels listed below that have the same wetland and steep slopes and use limitation. 3 years ago I suffered 3 major heart conditions and I was forced to get a medical layoff. I am on a fixed income and already gave 5000 square feet of land to City of Kent that ended up destroying part of our property by under cutting it down by 3 feet causing tens of thousand in further property damage and wiping out my retirement funds. We never received full compensation for the land City of Kent tricked us into giving them.

The City of Seatac should mandate the re-Zoning to qualify the same Land Property Tax to adjoining Property Lines that have the same or similar types of Wetland and Steep slope and other use limitations to correct the injustice that has never been resolved and should be. We were told by SeaTac because of the Wetland of those adjacent Wetland Property and existing Wetlands we could not add any future buildings.

The following Parcels are given
unfair Tax exemption.

Parcel

8937800000

1022049004

1022049090

1022049179

1022049107

1022049139


1022049045

Thanks

James Greif

Parcel 1022049140

Greif (continued)



King County
Parcel Viewer
KCGIS Center
You're in KCGIS Center > Property Research > Parcel Viewer

Search results
Selected parcel(s)
New selection
Add to selection
Export Clear
Selected parcels: 1

Parcel number	Address
1022049139	N/A

Parcel 1022049139
Present use: Vacant(Single-family)
Jurisdiction: KENT
Taxpayer name: KENT CITY OF
Address: N/A
Appraised value: \$0
Lot area: 320,166
Levy code: 1526
[Property Report](#) [Districts Report](#)
Source: King County Assessor
Lot lines are approximate. Not for legal use.
See our [terms of use](#)

King County
Parcel Viewer
KCGIS Center
You're in KCGIS Center > Property Research > Parcel Viewer

Search results
Selected parcel(s)
New selection
Add to selection
Export Clear
Selected parcels: 1

Parcel number	Address
1022049004	N/A

Parcel 1022049004
Present use: Vacant(Single-family)
Jurisdiction: KENT
Taxpayer name: KENT CITY OF
Address: N/A
Appraised value: \$0
Lot area: 348,480
Levy code: 1526
[Property Report](#) [Districts Report](#)
Source: King County Assessor
Lot lines are approximate. Not for legal use.
See our [terms of use](#)

The screenshot shows the King County Parcel Viewer web application. The browser address bar displays the URL: <https://gismaps.kingcounty.gov/parcelviewer2/>. The page header includes the King County logo and navigation links: Home, How do I..., Services, About King County, and Departments. The main content area features a map of parcels with various parcel numbers. A pop-up window is open over a specific parcel, displaying the following information:

Parcel 8937800000
Present use: Condominium(Residential)
Property name: VIEWCREST
Jurisdiction:
Taxpayer name: N/A
Address: 21200 42ND AVE S
Appraised value: \$0
Lot area: 1,526,204
Levy code: # of units:
of buildings: 190
46
Property Report Districts Report
Source: King County Assessor

The map shows a yellow-shaded area with numerous parcel numbers, including 21211, 21210, 4020, 4050, 4055, 21223, 21215, 4021, 4036, 4040, 21230, 4029, 3031, 4035, 4045, 21241, 21240, 4049, 21245, 8937800000, 21257, 21261, 21275, 21270, 21268, 21281, 21293, 4030, 4007, 4021, 4035, 4043, 11401, 21403, 21404, 21411, 1022049139, 1022049004, 1022049214, and 049140. The map also shows a road labeled '42nd Ave S' and a scale bar indicating 0 to 100 feet.