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Proactively planning for change along a 1.5 mile corridor in NE Seattle
The question is not whether your part of the world is going to change. The question is how.

- Edward T. McMahon
Foreword

Recognizing that change is inevitable, residents of the Wedgwood, Ravenna, Bryant, View Ridge, and Hawthorne Hills neighborhoods initiated a community-led, proactive planning process for the 35th Ave NE Business District. The goals of this plan were not necessarily intended to facilitate immediate change to the business district, but to create a community supported platform for positive change in the future.

A “Small and Simple Neighborhood Matching Fund Grant” was awarded by the Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON) to examine the 35th Ave NE Business District, extending from NE 65th Street to NE 95th Street. This document summarizes the efforts developed by the community following a series of public workshops.

The Zoning Recommendations and Supplemental Design Guidelines are intended to encourage new development, provide mixed use local retail services, and enhance the neighborhood character and livability. The Streetscape Toolkit identifies opportunities to enhance the 35th Ave NE’s pedestrian and visual qualities. The scope did not include analysis or recommendations for changing the fundamental alignment or characterization for the roadway section between curbs. This will be done by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) at a later date with the installation of a separated bicycle facility along 35th Ave NE, as identified in the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan.
Introduction
History and Background

**2009–Visioning**
The Wedgwood Community Council (WCC) applied for a “Small and Simple Neighborhood Matching Fund Grant” in response to the first mixed use, four-story development proposed along the 35th Ave NE corridor.

Before this time, residents were generally unaware that the existing zoning along 35th Ave NE allowed for four-story construction. Some considered this to be uncharacteristic of the neighborhood and the building shed light upon land use issues and concerns that the neighborhood had not previously considered. The WCC used the grant to facilitate a community discussion to articulate a visioning plan.

Three well-attended community meetings were held and over 800 people responded to the Wedgwood Vision Plan Survey.

**2010–Wedgwood Vision Plan**
The Wedgwood Vision Plan was completed in 2010\(^1\) and includes statements that reflect the Wedgwood community’s values about commercial and mixed use areas, business district character and design, open space and community amenities, transportation and street improvements, residential neighborhoods and housing, and community sustainability.

The Wedgwood Vision Plan also identifies a number of suggested actions, including the following for commercial and mixed use areas:

- Undertake a neighborhood plan that includes a review of current zoning standards and design guidelines with the City Department of Planning and Development (DPD). Revise development standards as appropriate in accordance with community preferences established in the neighborhood plan.

- Work with Seattle DPD to establish neighborhood-specific design guidelines that direct new development.

---

\(^1\) This applied only to 35th Ave NE and surrounding residential community between NE 75th Street and NE 95th Street, per the WCC bylaws.
2012–35th Ave Committee
Volunteer residents of the community formed the 35th Ave NE Committee (Committee) to pursue the suggested actions within the Wedgwood Vision Plan and to develop a neighborhood plan for 35th Ave NE. However, because the 35th Ave NE Business District is not associated with an Urban Village (an area designated for planned growth within the City of Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan), a neighborhood plan as defined by the City was not feasible. Therefore, the Committee pursued the development of alternative planning tools to reach similar outcomes.

Since the 35th Ave NE Business District extends south of the Wedgwood neighborhood boundaries, per the WCC bylaws, residents from all neighborhoods along 35th Ave NE were encouraged to participate.

Two kick-off community meetings were held for residents of Ravenna, Bryant, Wedgwood, View Ridge, and Hawthorne Hills to describe the project goals, objectives, and to invite anyone in the community to join the Committee.

The Committee co-hosted seven “Coffee Talks” with the American Planning Association-Washington Chapter, Community Planning Assistance Team (CPAT) to inform the Committee and the greater community on a variety of planning principals. Coffee Talk topics included:

- Creating the conditions to support neighborhood businesses,
- Making a neighborhood walkable and the importance of proximity,
- Design at a human scale: a primer on urban design concepts and City of Seattle design review guidelines,
- Place-making and successful streetscape features,
- Density and its benefits,
- Financial realities of development,
- Incentivizing successful development, and
- The trade-offs of land use planning.

Inventory of Businesses
Following the Coffee Talks, the Committee inventoried existing businesses along 35th Ave NE to better understand the baseline conditions. Of the businesses between NE 65th Street and NE 95th Street, 71% are service-focused businesses (e.g., accountants, lawyers, dentists), 24% retail-focused businesses (e.g., coffee shops, boutiques, grocery stores) and the remaining businesses are government-based (e.g., Post Office, NE Branch Library).
2013–Business District Survey
Over 1,000 people participated in the 35th Ave NE Business District Survey, developed by the Committee to better understand how the business district serves its users and surrounding residents. Of these respondents, 89% self-identified as living in the neighborhood. The survey results illustrated a general discontent with existing business district conditions:

- 84% are comfortable with more development,
- 92% would like increased retail diversity,
- 88% believe the business district is underdeveloped, and
- People stated they would be comfortable with more development if it improves streetscape/walkability (75%), were well designed (72%), located appropriately (55%), provided increased retail (46%), or transitioned well with single-family (44%).

Respondents also identified their most desired business types.

2014–Merchant Survey
The Committee reached out to all of the existing businesses with storefronts within the 35th Ave NE Business District. The Committee attempted to visit every business and invited all to a happy hour event hosted on their behalf. During these events, the Committee’s goals were explained to attendees and a Business District Merchant Survey was given to them. Completed surveys were collected from approximately 24% of the businesses. The results showed that:

- On average, the businesses who responded have been in business at their location for 18.3 years,
- 40% own and 60% lease,
- 72% customers come from the neighborhood, and
- Businesses desired added retail diversity to the business district.
Community Input

Three public workshops were the heart of the public engagement strategy for this project. Held at the Messiah Lutheran Church, each workshop was well attended with an active and engaged crowd. Participants offered their ideas for the corridor, critiqued draft alternative concepts, and refined the preferred recommendations. Between meetings, the Committee and consultant team collaborated on plan refinements based on community feedback. Following Workshop #3, the committee held a two-week public comment period so those unable to attend the workshops could provide feedback before the plan was finalized. The Committee website was regularly updated, providing the public with information about the results of each workshop and drafted recommendations. The final revised zoning and streetscape recommendations were then presented to and endorsed by both the RBCA and WCC. The Appendix summarizes these events and provides the detailed recommendations derived from the community, 35th Ave Committee, and City input.
**Project Outreach**

Throughout this project, the Committee reached out to the surrounding communities. This outreach strategy included:

- **Mailing every resident within five blocks of the business district two postcards notifying them of the scheduled public workshops to solicit community input and feedback.**
- **Posting flyers and other materials at businesses within the business district.**
- **Placing A-boards identifying the location, date, and time of each public workshop along the business district.**
- **Publishing blog posts on the 35th Ave Committee’s website and Twitter feed.**
- **Sending information to the WCC, RBCA, Wedgwood View blog, and Ravenna Blog for posting on their websites and social media sites.**
- **Hosting a two-week public comment period following the third public workshop to solicit feedback from those who could not attend the workshops.**

During every public workshop, the 35th Ave Committee requested each attendee to place a pin on a map of the Wedgwood and Ravenna-Bryant neighborhoods that corresponded to their residence. The pins on the map illustrate that attendees of the public workshops were concentrated between those areas five blocks to the east and west of 35th Ave NE and between NE 65th Street and NE 95th Street.
Neighborhood Context

This project examines 1.5 miles along the 35th Ave NE corridor, between NE 95th Street to the north and NE 65th Street to the south. In general, the focus is 35th Ave NE and the parcels directly adjacent to the street, but the following maps and neighborhood context consider the neighborhood within a quarter-mile (approximately a 5-minute walk) of the corridor, including the Wedgwood and Ravenna-Bryant neighborhoods.

Land Uses Considerations

The 35th Ave corridor has taken on a unique character and feel that is characterized by small commercial nodes, single-family housing, and a proportionately large number of institutional uses. Near the intersections of NE 75th Street and NE 85th Street are larger concentrations of retail uses and local restaurant destinations such as Wedgwood Ale House, Wedgwood Broiler, and Zaw Pizza. There are also a number of community gathering places that attract people from the neighborhood, including churches and synagogues, post office, library, and Hunter Tree Farm. Eckstein Middle, Wedgwood Elementary, View Ridge Elementary, and Assumption-St Bridget Schools add vibrancy to the neighborhood but do not abut the corridor.
Housing and Retail Mix

The 35th Ave Committee survey found that local community members would like diverse retail options but additional population density is needed to support retail growth.

In general, one residential unit can support approximately 15 square feet of retail use.\(^1\) Using this calculation, it takes a minimum of 500 housing units within easy walking or biking distance (i.e., a quarter-mile) to provide substantial support for a small neighborhood commercial area. As shown in the graphic to the right, this is similar to the retail and residential density near the intersections of NE 65th Street.

15,000 housing units within a quarter-mile can support a thriving neighborhood business district of approximately 30,000-50,000 square feet in size. A walkable commercial area of this size provides a full range retail sales and services, similar to the Phinney Ridge neighborhood.

The 75th and 85th nodes have a distortional amount of retail square footage. This is due, in part, to the two grocery stores that serve the broader community. A significant growth in local housing density is needed to increase market demand and warrant new retail development such as restaurants and cafes.

---

\(^1\) Easton, Gregory and John Owen, “Creating Walkable Neighborhood Business Districts: An exploration of the demographic and physical characteristics needed to support local retail services,” 2009.
Zoning

Zone designations regulate use and development characteristics of land throughout Seattle. Along the 35th Ave corridor, zoning districts specify single-family residential, multifamily residential, and commercial uses. A summary of the specific designations, typical allowed uses, and some additional conditions are described below:

### Single Family (SF)
Detached single-family structures on similar-sized lots. A resident may operate a home business but the appearance of the property shall remain residential.
- Single dwelling unit; one accessory unit allowed within structure
- 5,000/7,200 SF minimum lot size required for each detached structure

### Multifamily Lowrise (L-2/3)
Provides for a variety of multifamily housing types, including cottage housing, rowhouse, townhouse, and apartments. In some areas, Retail Commercial (RC) allows for commercial uses on the ground floor.
- 2 to 3-story lowrise apartment, rowhouse, or townhouse
- Density limit of one unit per 1,600 SF of lot area (1,200 SF for apartments)
- Building width limit of 90 linear feet (rowhouse exempt)
- Equivalent of 60% of lot area required Green Factor
- 25% of lot area required for Amenity Area
- Maximum height of 30 feet, plus 5 feet for pitched roof

### Neighborhood Commercial (NC1)
A small shopping area that provides primarily convenience retail sales and services to the surrounding residential neighborhood. The preceding number refers to the height limit and maximum floor area ratio (FAR).
- Small grocery store, hair salons, coffee shops, and apartments above
- Residential uses limited to 20% of facade along 35th Ave NE
- 10,000 SF maximum size for most uses

### Neighborhood Commercial (NC2)
A larger pedestrian-oriented shopping district serving the surrounding neighborhood and a broader community; allowing comparison shopping among a range of retail businesses. The preceding number refers to the height limit and maximum floor area ratio (FAR).
- Medium-size grocery, drug store, medical facilities, and apartments
- Typically no limit of residential and nonresidential uses except for site focusing on 35th Ave NE are an exception. Residential uses limited to 20% of facade
- 25,000 SF is the maximum size for some commercial uses

---

**Existing zoning**
- **Single Family**
- **Multifamily Lowrise**
- **Neighborhood Commercial 1**
- **Neighborhood Commercial 2**
Zoning Constraints

Zoning includes a number of conditions and specific requirements that may potentially impact redevelopment. During Workshop #1, concerns regarding some zoning were heard:

- In any market, developers may have difficulty financing ground floor retail with only two stories of housing above. Redevelopment in NC1-30 zoning can result in one-story commercial with no additional housing density (similar to the Starbucks on NE 73rd St) while providing little incentive for investment by property owners.

- Height limits in neighborhood commercial zones discourage certain commercial uses. For example, building three, 10-foot floor-to-ceiling residential floors in a NC-40, limits ground-floor commercial to 10 feet. This is not ideal for any most retail and precludes restaurant use because approximately a 15’ floor-to-ceiling height is necessary for HVAC ducts and other systems.

- The L-2 RC zone allows the Seattle Audubon to locate their offices and shop on the ground floor of the existing home but additional floors can only be used for housing. The Audubon is hoping to expand their offices and classrooms. They would like to include these new uses in the existing buildings but land use restrictions are forcing them to rent space off site.

- Physical constraints such as utility easements or narrow lot size make redevelopment of some underutilized sites unlikely.
Building Character

The majority of buildings in the Wedgwood and Ravenna-Bryant neighborhood were built shortly after WWII as part of single-family residential neighborhood expansions.

Mid-Century Modern
The mid-century modern movement was the prevalent architectural style as the area developed. Regional mid-century architecture is characterized by horizontality, natural materials, expansive windows, and a strong relationship with the outdoor landscape. A number of mid-century churches, commercial, and residential buildings remain today, providing a unique character and identity of the area, exemplified by the work of Paul Thiry and Hayden Kirk.

Single-Family Housing
Historically, small retail uses along 35th Ave NE serviced neighborhood residents. Despite changes and growth to the commercial areas, the adjacent residential uses have remained predominately single-family. There has been very little development of apartments and other multi-family housing in the area. The Jasper, which opened in 2012, was the first four-story mixed-use building to be built near Wedgwood’s commercial center on 35th Ave NE.
Natural Features

The 35th Ave NE corridor traverses two watersheds, both of which drain into Lake Washington. South of NE 86th Street, storm water drains to Union Bay; while north of NE 86th Street, water drains to Thornton Creek. The piped drainage to the south stands in for a now-buried stream that ran through the valley east of 35th Ave NE, starting at approximately NE 70th Street. This drainage basin—referred to as the North Union Bay Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) area by Seattle Public Utilities’ (SPU) Long-Term Control Plan—has one CSO outfall that is out of compliance. Over the coming years, SPU will be bringing this CSO into compliance¹. North of NE 86th Street, the water flows to the Thornton Creek system, which is one of four primary salmon bearing streams within the City of Seattle.

¹ Seattle Public Utilities Long-Term Control Plan can be read at http://www.seattle.gov/util/EnvironmentConservation/Projects/DrainageSystem/SewageOverflowPrevention/LongTermControlPlan/index.htm
Concept Plan

From the existing curb to the building frontage, the community can work with public and private partners to create and enhance a memorable sense of place along this important north-south corridor.

The 35th Ave NE community gave voice to these three aspirations for their streetscape:

1. Safely walk and bike to 35th Ave NE.
2. Gracious walk, shop, and linger on 35th Ave NE.
3. Safely cross to both sides of 35th Ave NE.

On the following pages, readers will find a set of tools tailored toward achieving these objectives.

In considering the corridor, land use patterns create a series of connectors, linking together nodes of more intense development. Each of these typologies offers opportunities to improve the corridor in different ways.
Connectors

The connectors are defined by the characteristics listed below. When improving these areas, the community should strengthen these attributes:

1. Enhance the sense of calm created by land uses like single-family homes, schools, and places of worship.
2. Build on the leafy identity of 35th Ave NE to north of the study area by creating a continuous tree canopy that defines the ceiling of the street, similar to the image on the left.
3. Create a hierarchy of well-defined spaces and reinforce a sense of privacy for the adjacent property owners.
4. Emphasize the rhythmic and directed nature of the connectors. Focusing attention on the destination, create a human-scaled structure that pulls pedestrians forward.
5. Prioritize amenities, design features, and elements that make the place welcoming and gracious for pedestrians.

The tools and strategies presented on the following pages fall into two categories: along and across.
Geometry

The scope of this study did not include reconfiguration of the curb-to-curb geometry along the entire corridor. However there are significant improvements to the pedestrian realm that can be made without affecting the current curb alignment. The most powerful of these improvements is a simple reconfiguration of the 10’ space between the curb and the adjacent property line. Where there is currently several feet of inefficiently allocated pavement or planting space, this area could be reconfigured by placing a sidewalk along the property line and allowing a 5’ clear landscape zone where trees and shrubs can be planted next to the curb. The benefits of this kind of reconfiguration are shown on the following pages.
Most importantly, the reconfigured geometry creates a clear, continuous walkable zone that reinforces the attributes of the connectors as described previously, and creates a consistent edge that demarcates public and private space.

By creating a continuous soil trench, street trees will be able to thrive and become healthy, mature specimens. This will reduce pavement upheaval and cracking caused by tree roots. This type of damage can be seen in a number of locations along the corridor, creating tripping hazards for pedestrians.
With this continuous soil trench, a more consistent planting of street trees becomes possible, allowing for not only the continuous arcade/promenade feel along the corridor, but also the creation of a smaller, human-scaled “room” along the sidewalk corridor that offers the opportunity to create moments of interest. Ideally, this would occur every 30’ so that people’s interest is continually piqued as they move along the corridor.

Individual property owners and residents can also play their part in 35th Ave NE’s transformation. Small edge treatments like benches, little free libraries, and plantings help create that engaging, activated edge that invite people back to visit again and again.
Community Building along an Active Edge (cont’d)

There is a myriad of possibilities for the City and individual property owners to enhance the walkability of the corridor including (clockwise from top left):

1. Use interpretive benches along 35th to tell the community’s stories (e.g. religious organization histories or architectural heritage).

2. Add more pedestrian-scaled lighting fixtures either in the landscape zone or at the private property edge to increase the sense of safety.

3. Grow edibles. People are connected by food traditions, which makes growing edible plants a great way to encourage more engagement and interaction between neighbors while providing a visually interesting texture for people to observe as they walk.

4. Invite play by integrating games and programming into the streetscape. A wonderful local example is Hopscotch CD, where the Central District made a neighborhood-wide hopscotch game.

5. Make space for birds and other pollinators. Seattle artist Sarah Bergmann has been pioneering this work with her Pollinator Pathways project.

6. Create gathering spaces. This could be as simple as adding bike racks where 35th Ave NE and one of the Neighborhood Greenways intersect.
The sense of feeling unsafe along the corridor routinely came up in discussions with the community. Part of the reason people do not feel safe along the corridor is that there are few physical barriers separating the cars from pedestrians, leaving pedestrians and cyclists feeling exposed, unbuffered from the noise and the potential dangers of swiftly travelling automobiles. From a driver’s perspective, there is no “visual friction” to create uncertainty, which slows drivers down. Visual friction is the proven strategy using visual complexity within the built environment to passively encourage drivers to slow down since our brains need more time to recognize and process the more complex information along a corridor. This strategy increases safety for all roadway users. Adding trees would significantly help improve roadway friction, but they will take some time to mature. There are immediate physical and programmatic opportunities to add more friction along the street: allowing parking along the curb lane at all hours, creating planted curb bulbs, or installing green stormwater infrastructure facilities.
**Make corridor crossings as safe as possible**

There are relatively long blocks, making it difficult or inconvenient to cross three and sometimes four lanes of traffic. Having two lanes of traffic in either direction is particularly problematic for safe pedestrian crossings and creates one of the most dangerous street crossing conditions. This is currently the case between NE 77th and NE 82nd during rush hours. As SDOT and the community work together to add and improve crossings of 35th Ave NE, those crossings should be as narrow as possible, preferably only crossing one lane of traffic in each direction by using bulbouts at strategic locations. The crossings should be highly visible and, if possible, reflect some of the community spirit as shown in some of the crossing examples below.
Nodes

As the community works with the development community and SDOT on improvements around the NE 65th, NE 75th, NE 85th, and NE 95th Street intersections, these node characteristics should be emphasized:

1. Interrupt the character of the connectors to create different types of space along the corridor.

2. Link the edges to the street by creating a more visually permeable edge.

3. Promote multi-family residential and commercial land uses to activate and enliven the street.

4. Offer diverse gathering spaces for small conversations and larger gatherings.

5. Use higher-quality materials to create a more gracious, dignified pedestrian realm.

The following pages present a set of tools that can be used to create these kinds of spaces in the nodes.
Geometry

Within the nodes, the community expressed the most concern about the amount of space provided for and the quality of the pedestrian realm that new development provides. Building setbacks are seen by the community as a way to alleviate many of these concerns for the reasons described in the following pages.
Sidewalk Activation
The additional space afforded by the reconfiguration described on the previous page allows for an increasingly vibrant public realm to take root through sidewalk activation. This could take the form of increased container plantings, cafe seating, or sidewalk sales along the corridor, amongst many others.

Accent Paving and Public Art
Between the curb edge and the walkable zone of the sidewalk, there are opportunities for further enhancements of the public realm through accent paving and public art.
Street Furnishings
Due to the increased land use density and the need for pedestrian amenities, the nodes should have street furnishings that help create and shape a refined pedestrian realm. These furnishing include (clockwise from top left): benches, bollards, trash receptacles, bike racks, and street lights. These should be located in the same zone as identified for the accent paving and art.
Canopies
Overhead weather protection is tremendously important in making a welcoming pedestrian realm, particularly in Seattle. By setting the buildings back, both a row of street trees and continuous rain protection can be achieved in the nodes.

Soil Connectivity
One of the most important factors for achieving healthy urban street trees is the volume of soil available for the tree’s roots. New structural systems like SilvaCells are providing great opportunities for trees to grow in constrained urban conditions while supporting pavement and/or amenities above.
**Street Crossings in Nodes**

The community recognizes the need for wider crossings for 35th Ave NE at the major east-west arterials, but there are several minor perpendicular streets within the nodes that can have their crossings shortened to improve pedestrian safety. Though safety is enough reason to implement these shorter crossings, there is an added benefit: these curb bulbs also create larger public gathering spots away from the highest-volume perpendicular streets in the nodes.
Transit Stops
Within the nodes, SDOT and Metro should consider moving the locations of the bus stops after the intersections. This is particularly important at the NE 75th Street intersection where moving the transit stop to “far side” of the intersection will allow for the creation of a left turn pocket within 35th Ave NE’s narrow right-of-way. This modest revision will allow traffic to continue to flow more freely during transit loading and unloading operations.

SDOT should study turning movements and volumes for southbound 35th Ave NE traffic at this intersection and sign and stripe to clarify turning movements in a manner that best facilitates traffic flow and improves safety.
Seattle Supplemental Design Guidelines

The architectural design of a new building can reinforce the streetscape and may be a positive addition to its neighborhood. Throughout the engagement process, the community was generally in favor of taller, new development if it was designed carefully to fit in with the corridor’s character and provides desirable retail. The following design guidelines help mitigate the negative impacts associated with new development and provide specific details for how buildings can activate the adjacent sidewalks. The guidelines are not meant to replace Seattle’s City-Wide Design Guidelines and Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD) staff. They are intended to provide further guidance to the Northeast Design Review Board (DRB) in their evaluation of future development proposals.

The following strategies and design approaches address open spaces and buildings facing 35th Ave NE. The number prefacing each guideline refers to the enumeration and organization of the City-Wide Design Guidelines. For brevity, only the most relevant and important guidelines have been included. Photos and diagrams offer examples and inspiration.
Corridor Specific Design Guidelines

**CS2.D.5 Respect for Adjacent Sites:** Lessen Privacy Impacts to Neighborhood

Use vegetation, setbacks, or other visual barriers to protect the privacy of adjacent residences. Windows overlooking residences would generally be at least 80’ from neighboring houses and outdoor living areas. People normally perceive a separation of 80’ to be sufficient to provide personal privacy. Continue stepping back building for solar access if building is south of single-family home.

**C5.B.2 Historical/Cultural References:** Respond to Architectural Character

Reinforce the architectural character of the neighborhood. Characteristics to consider include use of natural materials, integration with landscape, horizontal emphasis, and expansive windows.

**CS2.C1 Celebrate Corners**

Ensure a minimum 12’ wide pedestrian area at corners for safety and universal access. To reinforce this identity of nodes on 35th Ave NE, buildings facing the corners of intersections of 65th, 75th, 85th, and 95th should feature some special treatment such as a corner entry, art work, plaza, balcony, etc.

**PL1.B.2 Pedestrian Volumes:** Provide Comfortable Sidewalk Width

All buildings in the NC zone should be set back a minimum of 12’ from the curb line to allow for street trees and ample pedestrian movement.
Ensure all residential entrances have a private/public buffer, e.g. porches or stairs.
Provide additional buffer and raise residential units above sight-lines from the sidewalk. This is particularly important because of the arterial character of 35th Ave NE.

**PL3.C Retail Edges: Maximize Commercial Floor Height**
Commercial and mixed use buildings in NC zones should feature a minimum 15’ floor-to-ceiling height which allows for restaurant uses and flexible commercial space. This is a very high priority for the community.

**DC1.B Vehicle Access and Circulation: Reduce Negative Impacts of Parking**
In order to encourage pedestrian activity and improve the streetscape, parking access must be from the alley or side-streets if feasible. Otherwise, a two-way curbcut on 35th Ave NE is allowed. A Pedestrian overlay is recommended for segments of 35th Ave NE. Refer to these standards for more details.

**DC2.A.1 Reduce Perceived Mass: Stepback the Facade**
To reduce the potential of the “canyon” feel along the business district, a 10-foot setback from the right-of-way is recommended for all floors above the fourth story.
Zoning Recommendations
Rezoning Opportunities

At the Nodes
Changes to zoning can encourage investment to underutilized property by providing additional opportunities for development and increasing land value. Results of the 35th Ave Business District Survey illustrated that the majority of the community wants increased retail diversity. During Workshop #1, participants expressed some concern about oversaturating the retail market and preferred to concentrate retail uses near the 65th, 75th, 85th, and 95th nodes. In general, the survey and results from public workshops indicated that the community was willing to allow additional residential density to support the existing use and encourage new investments along the corridor. During Workshop #2, residents examined likely build-out scenarios related to allowable building height and evaluated a number of height, bulk, and design guideline options. Some participants felt that the most intense development option allowed buildings that were too tall, but that the existing zoning was too restrictive.

With community preferences in mind, the following zoning recommendations increase the likelihood of redevelopment (i.e., additional building height) at the nodes and in some cases, change the land use to allow flexibility in use and building type.

Note: No distinction has been made between NC1 and NC2. The City is currently pursuing a Pedestrian-Designated Zone overlay for the NC districts at NE 75th and 85th Streets.

Where Existing Zoning Remains
There are a number of sites outside the major nodes that were examined during the public workshops, but no zoning changes are recommended. For example, the current scale and uses at the small commercial area near NE 70th Street are generally appropriate to the corridor. With the exception of the NE 70th Street intersection, single-family homes and places of worship dominate the areas between the nodes. Participants strongly agreed that they would like to protect the existing churches, but opinions differed on the existing single-family homes. On one hand, some participants believed many of the homes had fallen into disrepair and have seen little investment in recent years. Some wanted to allow commercial uses to occur at these locations and others argued to protect the single-family residential character. Either way, Seattle policy does not allow rezoning in SF designated areas. Therefore, the Committee has not made zoning recommendations for SF zoned lots.

1 The Hunter Tree Farm has become an unofficial community gathering place and currently hosts community events throughout the year. Commercial uses on this site, including the annual tree sales that occur there, are not allowed under the current L2-R and SF zoning and require seasonal permits to occur. This precludes investment in improvements to the existing brown building and ancillary structures. While no changes are proposed to SF parcels, consistent with Seattle city policy, the 35th Ave Committee recommends L2-R parcels between NE 80th St and NE 78th St are modified to L2-RC to allow commercial use on the ground floor.
Recommended Changes

NE 65th Street Node

As the southern most part of the study, the 65th node is near the future Roosevelt LINK light rail station and has the potential to become a symbolic entrance into the commercial corridor. Housing redevelopment is planned for the north block between 32 and 34th Ave NE with required ground-floor commercial along NE 65th Street. Existing alley access and additional height allowances will help encourage new investment at key parcels.

Existing zoning at NE 65th Street node

1. *Currently zoned L-2. Change to the future land use and zoning change is required to allow street-level commercial.

2. Currently zoned NC-30. Change to the future land use and zoning change is required to allow street-level commercial.

3. *Currently zoned L-2. Land use change would encourage new development by allowing 5-story buildings and require street-level commercial.


* Note: Requires land use change within the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning changes at NE 65th Street node

- NC-55
- NC-30/40
NE 75th Street Node

The Safeway site offers the most significant redevelopment opportunity at the 75th node. Podium construction with structured parking below would allow Safeway (or a similar scale retail use) to reconstruct with multi-family housing above. Ideally, an internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation network through the site would provide a secondary connection to 35th Ave NE for commercial uses and the existing multi-family housing to the east. Additionally, creating a pedestrian connection from the east to 35th Ave NE is a desired access point since no such access exists for five blocks, between NE 75th Street and NE 70th Street. A ten-foot increase in height in other areas of the commercial zone will encourage new development in the area.

Existing zoning at NE 75th Street node

- Currently zoned NC-30. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings.
- Currently zoned NC-30. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 6-story buildings.
- Currently zoned L-2. Land use change to NC-40 would encourage new development and allow for N/S vehicle access through Safeway site.

* Note: Requires land use change within the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
NE 85th Street Node

The 85th node currently has the most existing retail square footage in the corridor and is home to a new City park (to be developed in 2018-2021). The QFC and Wedgwood Broiler parcels are under single ownership and offer the greatest opportunity for redevelopment. A one-story height increase around the NE 85th Street intersection is recommended to encourage future investment. It is also recommended to extend the NC zoning south of NE 82nd Street to provide flexibility and allow the Seattle Audubon to expand, adding classrooms and office space to the top floor.

Existing zoning at NE 85th Street node

① Currently zoned NC-40. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 5-story buildings.

②* Currently L-2 RC. Land use change to NC-30 would allow for classrooms and office space on the top floor of the Audubon Society.

* Note: Requires land use change within the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
NE 95th Street Node

The 95th node mostly features small parcel sizes. These small sites, along with vehicle access constraints, has made redevelopment difficult. A single story height increase is recommended to encourage reinvestment at underutilized properties.

Existing zoning at NE 85th Street node

Currently zoned NC-30. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings.
Next Steps
Implementation Strategies

Change is coming to 35th Ave NE. Investment by both the City and private development will likely occur over the next several decades. With the support of the community, the vision and potential interventions described in this plan will help guide this transformation—yet this takes time.

Many of the changes will occur through private-sector development, encouraged by the proposed zoning provisions and guided by the supplemental design guidelines. Wider sidewalks and street landscaping will be accomplished partly through private development, but the community should also continue to lobby for public facilities to improve pedestrian amenities. The following pages outline how community leaders can effectively partner with City departments to pursue their objectives through ongoing efforts. Part of that effort will be to continue to engage with residents, business, and property owners in the community.
Streetscape Toolkit

Implementation of streetscape improvements between the curbs along 35th Ave NE will be the responsibility of SDOT, who has indicated that they are eager to address some of the safety concerns identified in this plan. These improvements might include, but are not limited to, parking restrictions, channelization, curb bulbs, crossings, and similar engineering treatments designed to enhance roadway safety.

The streetscape toolkit section of the plan is intended to be used as a Street Concept Plan, such as those within Chapter 6 of the Seattle’s Right-of-Way Improvement Manual (ROWIM). This planning process did not have the resources to address a future separated bike facility along 35th Ave NE, as identified in the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan. The City is currently beginning a major revision to the ROWIM. Streetscape concept plans, such as this, will remain within the revised ROWIM although 35th Ave NE may be reclassified as a different street type. Nevertheless, as redevelopment occurs along 35th Ave NE, developers and the City may reference the streetscape design guidelines within this plan to develop their frontage improvements. It is recommended that the Committee and community members stay informed of every development proposal along the corridor and provide input early in the review process to remind developers and the City of these streetscape design guidelines and advocate for their adherence.

There are also a number of potential funding pathways that the community can pursue to advance this plan’s right-of-way goals between the curb and the property line. These include:

- SPU’s reLeaf program provides free street trees to neighborhoods that want to enhance their urban canopy and which commit to maintaining these trees during their establishment period.
  More information at www.seattle.gov/trees

- New artistic interventions along the 35th Ave NE corridor can help enhance the pedestrian experience. These could be new art works or could simple interpretations of the existing built environment and it’s cultural legacy. Funding for these programs could come from a number of organizations including The Office of Arts and Culture.
  More information at www.seattle.gov/arts/ and www.4culture.org/publicartintro

- The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods also offers a number of funding opportunities. The Small Sparks Fund, for example, can be used for programming or modest interventions that “build a stronger and healthier community.” Larger projects can be funded through the Small and Simple grant and the Large Project Fund.
  More information at www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/nmf/default.htm
Supplemental Design Guidelines

Design guidelines are used by the Northeast DRB during design review of proposed commercial and multi-family buildings. They encourage new development to complement and enhance their surroundings. The guidelines also direct designers and project reviewers to look closely at the neighborhood and the design review process provides a forum that allows public participation.

There are two types of guidelines that apply to development in Seattle:

- City-Wide Design Guidelines—apply to all areas of the city except downtown.
- Neighborhood Design Guidelines—offer guidance that is more specific to the features and character of neighborhoods identified as urban villages by the City.

At this time, there are no neighborhood specific guidelines for the 35th Ave NE Business District. In the absence of Neighborhood Design Guidelines, it is recommended that the community present the supplemental design guidelines in this plan to the Northeast DRB. This will alert DRB members to the community’s design concerns and priorities so that they can take them into account during the review of projects on 35th Ave NE. Additionally, community members should stay informed of every development proposal on the corridor and provide input early into the review process.
Zoning Recommendations

As this plan only proposes zoning recommendations, it is recommended that the community seek interested legislative changes to implement the proposed height and use changes recommended.

In November 2014, the City Council authorized funding for a Legislative Rezone of the corridor, at the request of the Committee, in response to these recommendations for DPD’s 2015-2016 work plan. This Legislative Rezone process will review the zoning recommendations described within this plan and revise them following their own analysis and additional community input. The City’s Legislative Rezone process will only address proposed changes to building heights, not changes in use.

DPD will also review how the proposed rezone supports or impacts:

- Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan,
- Surrounding property uses and land use zones, and
- Housing, public services, pedestrians, transit service, street capacity, and water and sewer capacity.

The Committee recognizes that the changes developed by the City may be different from what is recommended in this plan, but it is expected to be of similar size and scale from what has been proposed herein. It is recommended, therefore, that the community continue to work proactively and cooperatively with DPD to ensure the most desirable outcome for the community and business district is achieved.

The plan also recommends expanding the allowable uses on a few parcels, from low-rise residential to neighborhood commercial. For example, changing the Seattle Audubon’s property on 35th Ave NE and NE 82nd Street from low-rise residential to commercial would allow them to build classrooms and office space on a second level. These proposed changes in use would necessitate a change to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), which is part of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan. A change to the FLUM would have to occur prior to the City’s Legislative Rezone to be included in that process or each parcel would have to go through a Contract Rezone process, which is a project-specific rezone funded by the land owner. It is expected, however, that the support of these changes demonstrated within this plan would expedite a Contract Rezone should individual property owners choose to pursue this. Therefore, the Committee should continue to reach out to individual property owners to discuss the community’s support and opportunities for reinvestment.
Appendices
Workshop #1

Information Gathering

On April 22nd, about 80 people attended the first public workshop during which the consultant team led a short presentation on the planning and data gathering that already occurred, the goals of the project, and the existing conditions of the 35th Ave Business District. Participants then broke into eight small groups working together to discuss land use, building types, and streetscape features along the business district.

The group exercises included marking and transcribing comments on a map of the business district; reviewing and ranking photographs of different building types, sizes, and designs; and different streetscape design features. After about 45 minutes, each group presented a summary of the group exercises to the rest of the participants. Comments, questions, and conversation grew out of these presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes (Character)</th>
<th>Notes (Location)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 40-feet</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Ugly/boring design; Too many buildings like this; Don't want to look like Ballard and Roosevelt</td>
<td>Good for bringing business but hasn't attracted the right uses; Ok if parking is provided; No more tall buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With restaurant</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>Nicer design; Provide setbacks and stepping façade</td>
<td>Like retail close to street; Locate at nodes; Limit the number of mixed-use buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 55-feet</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>Best design; Like the diversity of setbacks and heights; Include more setbacks at ground floor</td>
<td>Include mixed income; Like restaurant use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Live/Work</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Attractive design</td>
<td>Not great business diversity; Some can be allowed but not preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Single-story</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Boring / uninspired design; Dangerous entry into parking lot</td>
<td>Like outdoor patio; Would be better if included more uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Multi-story</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Waste of space; Setbacks needed; Has a pedestrian relationship to the sidewalk; Inappropriate materials for the neighborhood (i.e., not wood)</td>
<td>Would like a PCC or Trader Joe’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Type</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Notes (Character)</td>
<td>Notes (Location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use</td>
<td>1. 40-feet</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Ugly/boring design; Too many buildings like this; Don't want to look like Ballard and Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. With restaurant</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>Nicer design; Provide setbacks and stepping façade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 55-feet</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>Best design; Like the diversity of setbacks and heights; Include more setbacks at ground floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Live/Work</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Attractive design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Single-story</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Boring/uninspired design; Dangerous entry into parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Multi-story</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Waste of space; Setbacks needed; Has a pedestrian relationship to the sidewalk; Inappropriate materials for the neighborhood (i.e., not wood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Two-Story</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>Not horrible; Like setback for small open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Multi-story</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Like plaza, trees, and gathering spaces; Do not like building design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes (Character)</th>
<th>Notes (Location)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>9. Single-story</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Like the contemporary/modern design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Two-story</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Generally like design; Fits with single-family homes; Consider how it responds to the rest of the block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Apartment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Sterile design; Dislike metal façade; Like plaza and gathering space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Row housing</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Like peaked roofs; Space between buildings needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Townhouses with street access</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Like wood architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Cluster housing</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>Neighborhood appropriate design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Preservation</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Very important; Consider integrating retail/restaurants into existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Infill</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Okay, but limit the amount of infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. ADU</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape Type</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Notes (Character)</td>
<td>Notes (Location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Private street trees</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>Maintenance concerns</td>
<td>Plant where there is room; Avoid overly dense planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bench seating</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Locate near restaurants, cafes, and bus stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visually Permeable Fence</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Better than a solid fence but prefer nothing at all</td>
<td>Set away from sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Street Trees</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>Maintenance concerns; Need grates or walkable surface track</td>
<td>Plant where there is room; Ensure wide sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accent paving</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Cool; This is not Westlake Plaza; Maintenance concerns</td>
<td>Locate on parallel streets but not 35th Ave; Use at crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parklets</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Great!; Outstanding!!</td>
<td>Carefully locate for business and residents; Locate on side streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sidewalk Fruit Trees</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Pest and mess concerns; Pretty but not functional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pollinator Pathways</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Maintenance concerns; fun!; great!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Swale</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brilliant; Use SPU funding opportunity where available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vegetated Curb Bulb</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>Maintenance concerns related to safety and cleanliness</td>
<td>Use to improve safety at crosswalks; Intrigued but skeptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Inline Curb Bulbs</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate bike racks; Will slow traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tabled Intersection</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>More pedestrian and European; Ensure pedestrians are safe (i.e., behind blockers)</td>
<td>Will slow traffic; Use at the intersections of 65th and 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Little free library</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Make short for kids</td>
<td>Better for residential street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Interpretive Benches</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Education opportunity; Consider “donor tiles”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Moveable planters</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Nice; Flexible</td>
<td>Don’t block sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pedestrian Streetlight Retrofit</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Excellent; More intimate; Direct light onto sidewalk</td>
<td>Locate at nodes, not along the entire corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Inline Curb Bulbs</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrate bike racks; Will slow traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tabled Intersection</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>More pedestrian and European; Ensure pedestrians are safe (i.e., behind blockers)</td>
<td>Will slow traffic; Use at the intersections of 65th and 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Little free library</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Make short for kids</td>
<td>Better for residential street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Interpretive Benches</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Education opportunity; Consider “donor tiles”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Moveable planters</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Nice; Flexible</td>
<td>Don’t block sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pedestrian Streetlight Retrofit</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Excellent; More intimate; Direct light onto sidewalk</td>
<td>Locate at nodes, not along the entire corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Mapping Exercise

- Want restaurant with good parking.
- Protect buildings; lot serve as community event space; Opportunity for farmers market.
- Safeway buildings set too far back.
- Parking lot feels like a dead space.
- Consider increased traffic.
### General Notes

#### Land Use
- Consider the demographics of the neighborhood
- Don’t prioritize parking (2)
- Single-family homes on 35th tend to be rundown
- Would support new apartments that provide affordable alternatives for new families

**Redevelopment location:**
- Only at nodes (3)
- Provide pocket parks between development areas
- Support zoning changes that would provide more commercial

**Uses to preserve:**
- Peaceful qualities of the neighborhood
- Some single-family homes
- All churches and library

**Concerns about redevelopment:**
- Hesitant/don’t want to increase density (and increased traffic) in exchange for new businesses (3)
- Allow tall buildings only if parking and setbacks are required
- Do not turn 35th into a canyon like Lake City Way i.e., keep buildings to 3 stories

**Architectural character:**
- Prefer “village craftsman” style (2)
- Avoid corrugated metal (2)
- Opportunity for sustainability
- Opportunity for planted buildings, decks, walls, and roofs

**Like more of these uses:**
- Diverse retail (3) e.g., credit union
- Dining/restaurants (2) e.g., home-style restaurants and gelato
- Neighborhood retail i.e., not regional
- Community meeting place, e.g., place for dances like at Phinney Ridge
- Alleys, especially if there is already an easement
- Pedestrian friendly parking

**Don’t want more of these Uses:**
- Gas station
- Multi-story buildings
- Banks (2)

#### Streetscape
- It takes longer than 20 minutes for many people to walk from Roosevelt because of the hill
- Existing crime and safety issues near bus stops
- Support Neighborhood Greenways, especially along 39th Ave
- Prioritize pedestrian and bike access to 35th
- Prefer to walk along 34th or 36th because of traffic noise

**Crosswalks:**
- Crosswalk timing across 35th needs to be extended
- Like raised crosswalks/curb extensions designs at crosswalks

**Sidewalks:**
- Want more sidewalks (10+)
- Want wider sidewalks, i.e., three people wide (2)
- Want better sidewalk maintenance, i.e., leaves and low branches
- Lack of sidewalks in the neighborhood i.e., along 30th Ave
- Keep buildings set-back for wider sidewalks

**Elements would like to see:**
- Covered bus stops
- Community board/kiosk at key sites, e.g., library and post office
- Bike racks (4)
- Bench seating
- Plantings/landscaping (2)
- Parking
- Want on-street parking for both sides of 35th
- Maintain street parking near houses of worship (2)
- Do not allow parking meters on 35th (2)
Workshop #2

Design Direction

On June 11th, the second public workshop was held to gather information from the community in order to develop Streetscape Guidelines and Zoning Recommendations. Over 80 people attended Workshop #2. Break-out sessions were held to look at zoning and streetscape options for each primary intersection along 35th Ave NE where commercial uses are most prevalent (e.g., NE 65th St, NE 75th Street, NE 85th Street, and NE 95th Street).

The presentation summarized the result of Workshop #1 and provided background on how zoning and streetscape design alternatives were developed. To help illustrate the potential extent of zoning changes, the consultant developed box illustrations of potential buildings as if the business district was fully developed under various alternatives.

After the presentation, four tables were set up with posters illustrating the different potential streetscape design features and zoning alternatives for each node. Participants were given a score sheet to fill out at each table, where they were able to ask questions and provide feedback.
Results

**NE 85th Street preferred massing**
- Prefer 5 stories (3.6 out of 5)
- Neutral rating for 6 stories (3.1 out of 5)
- Dislike what is currently allowed (2.8 out of 5)

**NE 65th Street preferred massing**
- Prefer 4-5 stories (3.5 out of 5)
- Dislike what is currently allowed (2.4 out of 5)

**NE 75th Street preferred massing**
- Prefer 4 stories (3.6 out of 5)
- Neutral rating for 6 stories (3.1 out of 5)
- Dislike what is currently allowed (2.6 out of 5)

**NE 95th Street preferred massing**
- Prefer 4 stories (3.7 out of 5)
- Dislike what is currently allowed (2.6 out of 5)
- Dislike 5 stories (2.9 out of 5)
Workshop #3

Public Review

On July 31st, 70 people attended the third public workshop where the consultant team and 35th Ave Committee presented recommended streetscape guidelines and zoning recommendations based on community feedback from the previous two workshops. Supplemental design guidelines for the business district developed by the consultant team were also presented.

After a presentation summarizing the zoning recommendations, streetscape guidelines, and supplemental design guidelines, participants visited workstations where they could review the preferred plans for each node, ask questions of the consultants and 35th Ave Committee, and provide feedback. Each participant was provided an evaluation form for specific feedback.

Following the Workshop #3, the proposal was posted online for those in the community who were not able to attend. The 35th Ave Committee held a public comment period from August 1-15 to solicit additional feedback.

Based on the feedback received from the Workshop #3, the public comments, and the data gathered from the previous public workshops, the consultants and 35th Ave Committee made revisions to the supplemental design guidelines and zoning recommendations. No revisions were made to the streetscape design guidelines.
At full build out:
- 200 residential housing units
- 20,000-50,000 SF commercial

**ZONING CHANGES:**

**DESCRIPTION:**

65a. Currently zoned L-2. Land use change would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings and require street-level commercial.

65b. Currently zoned L-2. Land use change would encourage new development by allowing 5-story buildings and require street-level commercial.


65d. Currently zoned NC-30. Change would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings.

* Note: Requires land use change.

---

At full build out:
- 150 residential housing units
- 12,000-30,000 SF commercial

**ZONING CHANGES:**

**DESCRIPTION:**

95a. Currently zoned NC-30. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings.
At full build out:
- 200 residential housing units
- 25,000-60,000 SF commercial

**ZONING CHANGES:**

**DESCRIPTION:**
85a. Currently zoned NC-40. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 6-story buildings.

85b.* Currently L-2 RC. Land use change to NC-30 would allow for classrooms on the top floor of the Audobon Society.

* Note: Requires land use change.

At full build out:
- 300 residential housing units
- 45,000-85,000 SF commercial

**ZONING CHANGES:**

**DESCRIPTION:**
75a. Currently zoned NC-30. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings.

75b. Currently zoned NC-30. Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 6-story buildings.

75c.* Currently zoned L-2. Land use change to NC-40 would encourage new development and allow for N/S vehicle access through Safeway site.

* Note: Requires land use change.
## Workshop #3 Results

### Individual Evaluation Summaries

(1) Yes (-1) No (0) Maybe, but only with revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Changes and Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65th Ave NE</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>Land use change and height increase to 3 stories; keep at 3 stories; by stair stepback on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Keep at 4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65c</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>Height increase to 5 stories—closest retail to I-5 and transit hub; Not with current zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65d</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Height increase to 4 stories; It speeds up destroying apartments on the corner and a loss of affordable housing; Not with current zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Ave NE</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>Height increase to 4 stories; W/ stair stepback on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75b</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Height increase to 6 stories; Could be 4 floors w/ restaurant; W/ stair stepback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75c</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>Land use change and height increase to 4 stories; Make it safer for pedestrians; W/ stair stepback on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85th Ave NE</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>Height increase to 6 stories; W/ stair stepback on upper floors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85a</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>5 stories is more than enough; if firm supplemental guidelines in place; W/ setback; Only if setbacks from street on upper stories; This would spread south inevitably; 4 stories is plenty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85b</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>Land use change; This would spread south inevitably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Ave NE</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>Height increase to 4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95a</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>4 stories is enough; 4 stories and only if supplemental guidelines are in place; 4 stories only; 4 stories would be better; Type—4 not 6; 4 stories maximum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Design Guidelines

| DGa           | .53   | Reduce negative impacts of parking; Side streets narrow, alley is one way; Prefer strong N/S flow; Guidelines are nothing; But no parking means no businesses; Bulbs out; Encourage parking in rear; Parking is plentiful and free now; Must have parking if commercial street businesses can survive. |
| DGb           | .49   | Maximize commercial; There doesn't need to be 65' at each node in my opinion; Create opportunities for small business; As long as we increase the population density; Don't add more than market can support; Need a flexible approach; would bring population/activity density; Need more quality restaurants. |
| DGc           | .86   | Respond to architectural character; Interesting design; Very definitely want the Brick!; Save the Theodore; More than pious requests; Especially important; Avoid cookie cutter buildings; Continue stepbacks of buildings; Good idea but how to implement. |
| DGd           | .78   | Lessen impact to neighborhood; Consider sunlight reaching streets as well;             |
| DGe           | .67   | Setback ground-floor residences; setUP above street level; More encouragement for bicyclists to use greenways; Unless adopted by the City; This doesn't seem relevant—I'm not convinced taller homes look better. |
| DGf           | .86   | Provide comfortable sidewalk width; Wider is better;                                  |
| DGg           | .75   | Celebrate corners; Would be good to elevate intersection at 75th and 35th; There's no enforcement; Like no curb—mixed textures brick concrete etc. |
Supplemental Design Guidelines
- Design guidelines must be adopted by the city council. Otherwise the paperwork is just another file in the Department of Planning and Development without any force whatsoever.

65th Ave NE
- 65th development in conflict
- Move people out prematurely
- Verify “200 units”
- Notify community
- Why not wait for development to occur naturally?
- 32nd is a good thing for the neighborhood
- Walkability is important
- Add benches, setbacks, and trees
- Consider parking and needs at churches/synagogue
- Provide incentives for providing public amenities
- Increase density to bring new residents for turn-over
- The owners and residents of affected properties should be told of the changes in mind and the possible impacts e.g. increased property taxes, sooner demolition of structures, etc. Those on 34th and 36th told of shadowing and the parking dislocation and intensified use of alleys
- Maintain zoning
- Crossing signal at 68th is good

95th Ave NE
- Spaces that invite eateries that are walk ups
- Concerned about canyons at intersection—stepped back by floor. More than corner treatment
- Sidewalk plan for 98th?
- Possible NC 40 not 47? Why the variation in height?
- Neighborhood concern about lack of sidewalks and safe crosswalk
- Need pedestrian hubs in designated places to walk to—pedestrian friendly
- Can you run the numbers to understand the impact of more cars on 35th—study the impact of the proposed changes
- Mature trees maintained in exchange for extra height—can we do tree analysis?
- Thornton Creek tree preservation

85th Ave NE
- To maintain continuity of grocery store availability; if QFC redevelops, would be concerned about “food desert”
- Consider making the 85th node a pedestrian mall for up to 5 blocks, from 80th-85th. This would make an inviting place for walking, meeting, etc

Streetscape Connectors and Nodes
- Concerns about narrowing street where parking is currently not allowed
- Prefers easy vehicle access—2 lanes, same experience in car as on bus
- Not enough pedestrian traffic for signal warrants
- Elderly pedestrians—extended signal time?
- Accessibility to ground-related housing
- Is 35th a thoroughfare? “Arterial”
- Road diet—4 lanes—turning lanes (Like 75th), traffic predictable
- Is city on board with narrowing 35th? City’s primary concern is safety
- Parking on both sides is good—friction
- Jasper’s overhang is ugly. Closed in and too low
- Buildings should be setback, raingardens, trees
- Will development displace businesses?
- 35th and 68th—church, library, housing—Good intersection for bulb out
- Planters in row, shift sidewalk—how feasible?
- Paving shift overtime
- Need a tree map of all NC 40 + other upzones
- Need a traffic report/estimate on cumulative impacts of full development of NC 40 + upzones (how many new people?)
- Putting a sidewalk next to the property line of a private residence invites trespass by pedestrians on the abutting property. The owner will put up a fence or rockery in self-defense. As a result, the public tends to leave a shy distance and the sidewalk’s usable space is lost. A shrewd owner will rouse his neighbors, they’ll hire a lawyer, and bring a class action for damages in inverse condemnation.
- Safer routes to schools
- A lot of the streetscape concepts would not be necessary if we weren’t trying to accommodate cars. If the nodes became pedestrian zones, then they would naturally be welcoming and safe, and business-friendly

75th Ave NE
- An upzone lets a developer build to the limit. Requiring a developer to apply for a contract rezone gives leverage for amenities, setbacks, etc.
- The plan needs to address the blind intersection at NE 73rd and 35th Ave NE by stepbacks. Cars park to the NE 73rd sidewalk facing southbound
- Cars going eastbound can’t see southbound cars without moving into traveled lanes. This causes side swipe accidents.
- The city promises, but hasn’t, to put up “No Parking within 30’” signs. As a result, buildings need to be set back.
- Need safe walking access to bus stops
Public Comment
The following public comments on the draft streetscape design guidelines and zoning recommendations were submitted during the public comment period of August 1-15, 2014 following the Workshop #3. Minor edits to the public comments below were made for formatting reasons only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The north south traffic problem of left turns could be solved by alternating green and turn left going north with south traffic stopped then south traffic doing the same with opposing traffic stopped. This would not require the bus stop to be moved. One lane at a time would go forwards and turn without disruption.</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was unable to attend this meeting but I have some concerns about what I think I am interpreting from these notes and pictures. First, to make 35th into a two lane road 100% of the time will make passing through WW trying to get home at busy hours terrible. As it is, with bikes, buses, connectors and cars it is very difficult. Secondly, I certainly hope that there are some trees available to make a canopy that have roots that don't buckle the sidewalks. The sidewalks all up and down 35th are destroyed by tree roots, making it very dangerous to walkers. Third, I am very much opposed to building up 4-6 stories in this neighborhood. We already have difficulties with parking on our side streets due to the Connector, Post office, church and businesses that do not have enough or any parking. Bringing in more density is absurd. There is simply no way to provide parking for all of these people! I find it interesting that at the 2nd meeting, one of the points made to justify all of this building up and adding all these features to walking areas, etc was that 35th is a 4 lane street. Now you are suggesting making it a full time 2 way street. Not consistent. I am still very opposed to turning WW into Ballard and would consider selling my life long property to move to a quiet neighborhood like the one I live in now. That is not what I had planned for and I object strongly to this whole bring in density idea. That is exactly why I purchased my home in the quiet neighborhood that I grew up in. Not happy!</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi there, Thanks so much for all the care and thought you are putting into making the 35th corridor safer and more productive! I’m glad the 75th/35th intersection is being updated for safety. It’s a difficult intersection and I don’t feel safe there, whether I am driving, biking, or walking. I’m sure many people have mentioned how hard it is to turn left from 35th onto 75th -- at any time of the day, but especially during rush hour. I have waited through several lights trying to turn left and it is nearly impossible. The pocket turn lane will help allow traffic around - I think making the pocket lane long enough for 6-8 cars would be a good idea. Also, would green turn arrows help? Even with turn lanes, traffic goes so quickly on 39th that it’s hard to turn left. I actually go out of my way to drive around the block and avoid left turns altogether. Also, is there a way to slow people down as they drive east on 75th toward 35th, perhaps rumble strips on the pavement or something? I’m always terrified to walk in that intersection because drivers seem so frantic, distracted, and fast. Thanks again!</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about bikes? Curb bulbs force bikes into traffic. Hopefully the master bike plan will address this.</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see my neighborhood of Bryant recognized with a few street signs (there aren’t any on the two bike paths). I would also like to see that area south of 75th not called Wedgwood—businesses and planning folks place take note that is Bryant. I am also confused about the new zoning in my neighborhood. I am on the south east corner of 38th and 73rd. According to the map I saw, the west side of the street is zoned differently than my side of the street?</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the report provide information on how residents without sidewalks can work with the city to add sidewalks to areas between NE 85th to NE 95th so that residents will be able to walk to the new commercial development?</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly disagree with Zoning for 6 story buildings along 35th NE and NE 85th. This would dwarf neighboring houses and greatly diminish property values to those living adjacent to 6 story buildings. Maximum 3 story, preferable 2 story buildings in our neighborhood. We still need to see the sun in our neighborhoods. We need to preserve our neighborhood for people living here and there is more to Wedgwood than 35th Ave NE!</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon looking at the diagrams again, I am now seeing that that three of the four blocks at the intersection of NE 35th and 85th NE (Blocks with QFC and Wedgwood Broiler, Rite Aid, and All That Dance on the corners) would be rezoned for 6 story buildings. Is this correct? My concerns: 1. Cutting off sunlight and feeling of an open neighborhood 2. Population density in this area 3. Increased traffic and congestion in an area which will be affected by a second school built on the Thornton Creek site. 4. Building 6 story buildings next to residences is a horrible thing to do to homeowners. Thank you.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t want to see buildings this big in Wedgwood. I suppose the planners wouldn’t mind if we were like South Lake Union, but it just doesn’t fit the character of this neighborhood. I was not able to attend any of the planning meetings, and I can’t understand the stuff on the website, so any explanation of why this is desirable is going right past me. The tiny little maps look like the idea is to build big buildings all up and down 35th. OK, some are “only” four stories. Did people really vote for that? Some of my concerns are about increased traffic, and the parking mess that would result from such development. This is at odds with the stated goal of a pedestrian-friendly neighborhood. More buildings mean more people and more traffic. That makes walking more dangerous and more difficult. Also, wouldn’t they be cutting down more of the big old trees that define Wedgwood? There’s been too much of that already. I wouldn’t want to see big buildings lining 35th. I like that there are houses on our main street. I don’t want the huge increase in traffic. Please don’t do this.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six stories is way out of proportion with the neighborhood!!! Please do not recommend zoning for six stories at this location.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning for six-story buildings is way out of proportion with the neighborhood. Even four stories would be difficult.</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Madam/Sir, Recently Wedgwood Community Council unveil the plan to rezone some Wedgwood area and I am surprised the area around the intersection of 85th Ave NE and 35th St can have 6-story buildings. Such high buildings would be out-of-character for our neighborhood and certainly will worsen the parking issue caused by the 3-story apartment building on 35th and 86th. Please reconsider it and reduce the height limit to 3 or at most 4 stories.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that 6 stories is too high. Four seems more in keeping with Wedgwood.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi. First off, thank you for all the work you did. I was at the 2nd meeting and was impressed with the turn-out.

My comments: I am surprised to see the encouragement of 6 story development at 75th and 85th. I believe that many of my neighbors (and I will admit I feel this way too) moved here because it was a community of mostly single-family units. I think we all wish there was another good restaurant or greater bar selection at times and in the abstract, but when I speak to many of my neighbors they like living in a part of the city that feels somewhat more like a small town at times.

Many of us can access Lake City or Northgate or even the U-District or Downtown if we want a choice of bars, but it’s nice to come back to Wedgwood where we can relax in our own homes and not fight for a seat at the Alehouse or Fiddler. Are we really in desperate need of another bar or a dress shop or Whole Foods or hardware store?

What I heard from of my neighbors - and I feel this myself - is we want to feel like the choice we made to buy our houses and move our families into this neighborhood as it is, is honored and respected. I bought in Wedgwood, because I liked what it offered my family - a smaller neighborhood feeling and access to downtown. There was a reason I chose not to live in Fremont, Greenwood or Capital Hill. I’m fine with Wedgwood the way it is.

My preference would be to petition the Department of Planning & Development and the City’s Design Review Board to either adopt guidelines that largely preserve Wedgwood and the surrounding parts of 35th Ave NE largely as is - or limit the height of new construction to four stories and cap at a small amount the construction of that type that is permitted.

Thank you again for all the hard work and the opportunity to offer my two cents.

Regards,

Much of the plan looks appealing and like improvements. However, I am opposed to the 6 story building permits on 85th street. I believe that buildings that tall are not in common with the architecture and feel of the community. I live at 3532 on 85th street just a couple of houses from the Rite-Aid store. Recently a 4 or 5 story condo was built north of 86th on 35th street and it has increased traffic and provided no additional services to the community. I don’t like it and if more were built on the corner of 85th I would move. Wedgwood is wonderful because it has a neighborhood community feel, six story buildings would bring more of an urban feel. Also, the traffic improvements would likely be eliminated with the increased number of residents that additional condos and apartments on 35th would bring.

Thanks for considering, and if you are in the habit of responding please tell me why anyone wants to rezone 85th street this way? I am curious what the advantages to me as a resident are, especially one that lives near the proposed changes.

Much of the plan looks appealing and like improvements. However, I am opposed to the 6 story building permits on 85th street. I believe that buildings that tall are not in common with the architecture and feel of the community. I live at 3532 on 85th street just a couple of houses from the Rite-Aid store. Recently a 4 or 5 story condo was built north of 86th on 35th street and it has increased traffic and provided no additional services to the community. I don’t like it and if more were built on the corner of 85th I would move. Wedgwood is wonderful because it has a neighborhood community feel, six story buildings would bring more of an urban feel. Also, the traffic improvements would likely be eliminated with the increased number of residents that additional condos and apartments on 35th would bring.

Thanks for considering, and if you are in the habit of responding please tell me why anyone wants to rezone 85th street this way? I am curious what the advantages to me as a resident are, especially one that lives near the proposed changes.

I cannot believe that the 1,000 people you are said to have been interviewed all wanted 6 story buildings along 35th Ave NE from NE 55th to NE 85th. This type of building is not in scale with the small homes that dominate Wedgwood and the Bryant neighborhood.

What IS the 35th plan?

Dear Madam/Sir:

I am writing to urge you to STOP the rezoning plan that will allow building 4-6 story buildings on 35th Ave. NE. Also vote no or stop the plan to put in ‘Bulb outs’ which will reduce the ability of cars to travel through this corridor which is main link from North Seattle to the City. The increased congestion and the impact to our infrastructure is not what the neighbors want. A meeting with 70 people in your third meeting session does not reflect the neighborhood. Your communication on this plan has been misleading. Most residents do not have time to get to community meetings and do not know what you are considering. Your bus stop communication does not clearly indicate that there will be zoning for tall buildings. People walk away with the impression that there will be some work with the trees on the street not rezoning to accommodate 4-6 story buildings on 35th Ave NE. Do not OK this.

Please do not endorse this plan unless you can show documented support of the majority of the entire neighborhood.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am writing regarding the upcoming plans to rezone 35th for 4 to 6 story buildings. I am strongly against this move. By rezoning this area there will be increased traffic congestion and parking problems for Wedgwood residents. The Wedgwood area does not need these buildings. It would disrupt traffic flow and heavily increase the traffic. Wedgwood is a quiet residential area and this would bring increased traffic and noise. There has been extremely poor communication re: the plans for the Wedgwood residents. I am extremely upset that there are plans for these large buildings and the influx of people that will increase the traffic and safety of residents. Parking will also be a problem and I do not want this area rezoned for these buildings.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long time area resident - since 1958 - I say no to 4 &amp; 5 story apts --- who wants that?? not homeowners -- the developers stop it! obey zoning laws! and also: no bike lanes on 35th n.e. - thanks -</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello, I wasn’t able to make it to any of the community meetings, but I wanted to let you know that I’m excited about all the proposed recommendations. More development, more people, more businesses, safer streets, more pedestrian friendly-- it all sounds great to me! I hope there will be adequate bike parking spaces along 35th. Thank you to the whole committee for your hard work on all this!</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear 35th Plan Committee, I have followed the events on plans for 35th Ave but have not been able to attend the meetings. I’m sure a lot of effort and outreach has gone into your plans. The excellent graphics and many streetscape examples really help our understanding. However, at the heart of the plans is the intense development intrinsic to NC-40 and NC-65 zoning allowances. And I find I am shocked by what is envisioned for our community. Those of us living in Wedgwood have worked hard to maintain our nice, quiet neighborhood. Our extensive single-family residences encourage our friendly, neighborhood lifestyle. Our one-story businesses at 35th Ave and 85th St are wholly consistent and compatible with our “Mayberry” neighborhood. It appears to me that this happy state of affairs can and will be all unraveled with your plan as proposed. I understand that Seattle needs more affordable housing and that higher density apartments facilitate that. But that should not give leeway to change the very essence of our neighborhood. I know that most of the NC-40 zoning shown in your current plans was done years ago; but even so, the character of the Wedgwood Community still needs to be defended. A case in point: The Jasper Four-Story apartments, while complying with the NC-40 zoning, are totally out of place with who we are, yet you envision Six-Story Jaspers in multiple locations! I lived in Ballard and am quite familiar with the density along NW Market St near 15th Ave NW, and the neighborhood this provides. That zoning, while fine (or not) for that section of Ballard, is wholly inappropriate for the Wedgwood neighborhood. It almost seems cruel that your plan allows Four-Story apartments backed right up to the fence-line of single family residences. Please, at least, allow a buffer of Three-Story NC-30 apartments (as seen now at 95th St) as a transition to our neighbors’ back yards. In summary, a more “user friendly” plan for our beloved Wedgwood would limit any zoning contiguous to existing residential areas to three stories, NC-30. And in other areas, it would seem that four-story NC-40 would be a compromise you could and should accept. We don’t need, and should not be forced to accept, six-story, 65-foot high, NC-65 apartments. Please consider these suggestions as a response of our neighborhood to the need for us to contribute “our fair share” of affordable housing in a way that will not subvert the very quality of Wedgwood that makes it such a wonderful neighborhood community in the first place. The scope of the changes you have proposed, if modified as suggest herein, will still provide a significant number of affordable housing units. The increment lost from your current proposal would be minor and certainly necessitated by the impact on our neighborhood of even this compromised (NC-30 + NC-40) plan. And another thing - Particular to NE 84th St as it meets 35 Ave NE - The neighborhood on 84th St has become the Windermere Overflow Parking Lot. This we accept with gritted teeth. And it is particularly insulting to check the Windermere lot and see open spaces, yet realtors camp on our local residential streets with an arrogance protected by impunity. And where oh where can I guess the Apartment Overflow Parking Lot will be? Thank you for listening.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dear Planning Committee,

I am an 18 year resident of Wedgwood, living near 36th Ave NE and NE 84th St. My family chose to live in Wedgwood, as opposed to Wallingford or Roosevelt, because of the quiet and natural setting Wedgwood provides.

The 4-6 story zoning proposals for 35th Ave will change the entire Wedgwood neighborhood. Please reconsider the height impact on neighbors within a 3 block radius on each side of 35th Ave. The Jasper building has significantly impacted the homes east of the construction.

I realize Seattle is growing. But Wedgwood is known for its trees, and looking up at a building and not our trees is not acceptable. Perhaps you should spend time canvasing the streets that are within a close proximity to 35th Ave and speak to homeowners about the impact.

I think the proposal is great. I am personally a fan of increased density and I think that having more retail/commercial use will make this neighborhood that much better. My only concern would be traffic on the residential streets, particularly those like 85th or 31st.

**Direct email**

I am troubled with the prospect of supplanting our Wedgwood QFC and other businesses in the plaza with a 6 story building that contains some business prospects on the first floor and the other floors condominiums. We have the Jasper apartments on 35th and between NE 86th and NE 87. Adding another building like this just two to three blocks south is troublesome.

1. **1. Taking out the existing businesses in the plaza would erode some of our neighborhood ‘feel’. Replacing these community friendly businesses with the ‘cookie cutter’ multi story condo’s does not promote the neighborhood feeling. I have heard this from many of my Wedgwood neighbors.**

2. **2. My family and neighbors are most concerned about putting a multi story condo directly in our backyards. The current conditions allow us to have some privacy with the existing businesses. A six story building would take away any privacy that we have. This privacy and quiet feel is one of our neighborhoods key selling points. We did not mind paying a little more for our house as we had this privacy as well as access to business. This re-zoning would have us and others in our area looking to relocate from the neighborhood we call home.**

It seems more holistic thought needs to be put into what kind of effect these business prospects have on powerful and positive neighborhoods. We do not support this at all.

**Direct email**

This plan has not been sent to nearby community groups also on 35th Ave NE, and many of us are suspicious about who this benefits. It looks like developers. I think you need to get the word out to more people if you want any credibility. I have seen the FAQ, as have others at the Lake City Neighborhood Alliance, and it seems fishy. Why weren’t community groups contacted?

**Direct email**

Hi! I just wanted to give my input about the proposed development guidelines for the intersection of 35th NE and NE 85th.

I feel very strongly that having 3 of 4 corners with 65’ zoning will create much too much height in a very narrow area, creating a canyon of sorts. The idea of having a restaurant-height first floor sounds okay, but we don’t really have the street size to accommodate lots of extra traffic, and with buildings located closer to the street (with parking in the back) as proposed, will only make traffic seem louder in that narrow area.

Additionally, extra employees at multiple businesses will need to access parking, which would mean that they will park on streets nearby, making parking challenging for home residents. In Wallingford, they have had to resort to zoned parking for residents who live along the 45th street corridor, even without the building heights being suggested by this plan.

The ideas of having more sidewalk space and planting zones in front (to allow for socializing) and also having buildings sited closer to the street with space in the back for parking (to allow privacy for neighbors behind) cannot coexist without shrinking the size of the building, making it unlikely that the developer will find it a profitable development. The result will be that the community will get one or the other, but not both. We will either have another Jasper-like building out front on the street, or another Jasper building for the neighbors behind— neither sounds good to me!

Finally, I am concerned that over-development of this intersection will make a dangerous intersection downright deadly. This is a walking zone for school children, for students at the dance studio, multiple bus stop zones, and many times people are at risk of being hit by cars not looking for pedestrians in crosswalks. More traffic at this intersection is truly a disaster waiting to happen.

Thanks for all of the time this committee has put into looking to the future development of Wedgwood, I appreciate the opportunity to be involved and have a say in this planning.

**Direct email**

Hi-

We’ve lived in Wedgwood for over 10 years and feel that anything over 4 stories will be bad for our neighborhood. Please limit buildings on 35th to 4 stories or less!
Dear Madam/Sir: I am writing to urge you to STOP the rezoning plan that will allow building 4-6 story buildings on 35th Ave. NE. Also vote NO or stop the plan to put in ‘Bulb outs’ which will reduce the ability of cars to travel through this corridor which is main link from North Seattle to the City.

Please do not endorse this plan.

Thank you

What is the implementation timeline for the zoning changes? e.g. When would you expect this to DPD for review (prior to any council process)?

It sounds like the “final” feedback for the project needs to occur during the grant funding timeline, but the final review of the zoning changes, if supported by DPD staff, would occur much later, assuming the City decides to take this on. Whether one is for or against the current proposal, rezoning an area outside of an urban village when so many areas inside urban villages are seeking planning funds to do the same seems a bit odd. …Any thoughts appreciated.

I have spent quite a bit of time reviewing the zoning recommendations and streetscape design guidelines for 35th Ave NE, and have been following the discussions in Nextdoor Wedgwood. There are many recommendations that could make the 35th Ave corridor more pleasant, but I am very unhappy with the recommended increases in building height. I think that 5-6 stories is too high anywhere along 35th, but particularly at the NE 85th corner. I love the ‘residential feel’ of the commercial zone there.

Meaning, the height of the buildings is in scale with the height of the homes around it. We are not a city in the northeast with row houses, that can handle a 6 story building on the same block. Six story commercial buildings will look completely out of place with the rest of the neighborhood. I know that the “vision” is that they be “stepped back” but even with that accommodation, I think that 6 stories is way too high for this neighborhood. Additionally, the taller the buildings, the more people that brings, along with more noise, parking issues, etc. The business area at 85th is quiet and peaceful, and in scale with the neighborhood. Let’s keep it that way.

I live at 10016 38th Ave NE and so the 95th street plan is of more impact to me. We are already growing too high in this area and traffic accidents are an unfortunate common occurrence at this intersection. Increasing heights here, I believe, will cause even more problems.

Currently there is only one (maybe two?) buildings taking advantage of the NC-30 zoning in this area which is nowhere near capacity. If the amount of buildings here were overflowing or needing more space, I could see increasing the height to NC-40. But, in this case it doesn’t make sense. Leave the height limit alone in this area and in 5 years if we have a larger percentage of buildings at NC-30.

I do like the 75th street plan. Especially moving the bus stop. If nothing else, this should be top priority.

Thx!

It is a bad idea to increase the building height along 35th Ave. NE. Increased building height will take away the charm of being a cozy family neighborhood. People in this area don’t want to feel like they are living downtown with taller buildings or increased traffic.

I also feel strongly that putting bricks in the pavement on walkways will be a hazard for pedestrians especially people that walk with canes, walkers or even high heels. The tripping fact over uneven bricks and pavement increase with the age of the sidewalks. The esthetic beauty of brick sidewalks diminish as weeds grow between the bricks

I hope that you will consider my views on these two subjects .

Sincerely ,

A one sided flyer would cost 4 cents per side and could be hand delivered to the owners on 35th Ave. N.E. between 65th and 75th telling of the proposed up-zoning and of our board meeting. It could invite comment to the RBCA by mail or e-mail. A flyer could also go to those on 34th and 36th. The flyers south of N.E. 70th would stress the changes on N.E. 65th St; those north orient toward N.E. 75th St. Combining both into a single flyer would take two pages. Let me know your thoughts.
Dear Planning Committee

I have lived on 33rd Ave NE near NE 70th St since 1973, and therefore have a great interest and concern about plans for increased density along 35th Ave NE.

If we could count on increased public transportation service in our area, then, a tasteful implementation of increased density would be potentially beneficial, and make for a more interesting and walkable neighborhood, with more shops and resources of various kinds along 35th.

But in light of the fact that King County Metro is in the process of seriously slashing bus service, I cannot support any proposal that would bring an increase in people to an area that is facing a major decrease in public transit. The last thing we need in our area is more people dependent on cars.

So I think that any plans for increased density along 35th Ave NE must wait until we have a stable source of funding for public transit. Right now, there is no such solution in sight, and it may be many years before there is one, given the “Seattle process”.

Sincerely

Section 85a is currently zoned for NC-40, but part of it would increase to NC-65 under this plan.

Since almost all the building in that area are currently one-story, I believe that adding 6-story buildings would be too much of a contrast to the current streetscape. If the area currently had a number of 2-4 story buildings, the contrast with a 6-story building would not be so severe, but that is not the current situation. Therefore, I believe it is premature to move to NC-65 at this time.

Sincerely,

Hello, and thanks for putting this all together.

I’m sure it can be frustrating to do so much work, invite people to join you in your efforts, and have relatively few “takers” ---- untilllll the nearly final draft is on the table, and people jump in to say “OH, NO! Please don’t!” Where were you people during those meetings?! I took the survey, and yes, I’m interested in more shopping, more restaurants, more traffic calming and easier crossing on 35th. However, I am NOT interested in 6-story buildings. Isn’t the Jasper tall enough to allow a lot more density in the area? Why go bigger?

The upper-story setback is definitely helpful for those walking and driving on 35th. But consider the shade it will bring to the residents immediately to the east of 35th NE. They will be in dense shade from noon on, in late fall and winter. I have not seen an artist’s / architect’s rendering, but it seems that those homes on 36th NE will have such shade that it will actually change the microclimate of their yards and gardens.

And folks -- that’s just not fair.

Please reconsider and go no higher than 4 stories. (Even then, many won’t like it, but … yes…. change is constant.)

Thanks again for doing, and thanks now for listening.

Thank you for all the work you have done on this project to improve our community.

The vision for 35th looks fantastic. The only part of the plan I did not care for was the 6 story buildings. It seems the four-five (max) stories would be just fine to improve density housing in our neighborhood. I do love the step design to improve sunlight.

Thanks again!

To Whom it May Concern,

As a nearby resident, I do not feel it is a good idea to allow the building heights to be increase to six stories at NE 85th St and 35th Ave. Four stories is more than enough to encourage growth and the increase to six stories will dwarf all surrounding houses and take away from the beauty of our neighborhood.

Many areas along 65th Ave are only four stories tall and have successful businesses. It would be wonderful to allow new restaurants and businesses and this can be done with only four stories. I would rather not have these new businesses if it means having six story buildings. The extra two stories will allow too many people to live in a small area, causing an increase in congestion. This area will already be much more congested because of the Thornton Creek School growth. Allowing six stories is excessive and will not positively impact the neighborhood. I recently moved to this neighborhood for the quiet streets and small neighborhood feeling it had. Please don’t take that away. If people want trendy shops and big apartment/complexes they can choose to live nearby in Wallingford, Greenlake or Ballard. Don’t take away the atmosphere that makes Wedgwood unique.

Thanks
Dear 35th Avenue Committee,

I live in Cedar Park and I travel on 35th Avenue NE regularly. Though I do not reside in Wedgwood, I shop there frequently. I am very disappointed that these proposals were not publicized in the surrounding neighborhoods that will also be affected by them.

I am very confused by these proposals and the conflicting viewpoints about them. I had never heard of this committee or its proposals until a few days ago, and I did not have time to read and digest all of the information at the various links by Friday August 15. While your committee says it made an effort to notify people who live very near to 35th Avenue NE, you apparently made no effort to notify neighborhood groups in the surrounding areas (such as Lake City Neighborhood Alliance). We would never have heard a word about this if Ann Berberian had not shared Marianne Matsumoto’s e-mail with us a few days ago. I am concerned about the possible impacts of your proposals on traffic (increased) and parking (decreased), which would affect anyone using 35th Avenue NE, including most of the people in Cedar Park. Why did you not publicize your efforts more widely, so that everyone affected could comment?

Given the lack of information sent out to the community at large, and the fact that this appears to be a private effort, I do not understand why the public comment period has to end on August 15 (in the middle of summer).

Isn’t this an arbitrary deadline? What is the big rush, if nothing is going to happen right away anyway? It is also unclear to me whether these recommendations will be honored by anyone at the City.

Kim McCormick also raised the point that schools in NE Seattle are already overcrowded, and increased density of housing units on 35th Avenue NE would exacerbate that problem, if families with children occupy those new units.

Finally, given that we have seen how developers exploit every loophole they can for their own profit, it is hard not to see this effort as a give-away to developers. While the committee says that this work is not being done to accommodate any developers, it is hard to believe that this effort is not being cheered on by developers.

I am frustrated and disappointed by the late notice to the larger community and the arbitrary deadline for comments in the middle of summer. If you really wanted to get input about these proposals, you should have publicized your efforts outside of the immediate 35th Avenue NE community earlier and given people a real chance to comment.

I’ve looked over the guidelines and believe they propose some good changes/alterations to the streetscape and zoning of the area. However, as stated in the FAQ, if future increased building, and therefore density occurs, traffic will increase overall. We desperately need a left turn signal on 35th for East/West turns as we have now (finally) turning North/South. The corner of 35th and 75th is particularly busy with car, pedestrian and bike traffic, trying to cross this intersection. Is this proposed anywhere in the plan?

Regards,

I think the overall plan and thoughtfulness that went into this is great. I think the idea of more density is the way we need to go. I like the urban area clusters. In general I think that four stories is an appealing height. More density but still feeling like a neighborhood. The jasper apts did a great job of fitting into the neighborhood. I really appreciate what they did. The plans to increase the height to six stories may be ok where it is buffered by retail areas that are four stories. But the 85th street zoning calls for six stories right next to residential areas. That will impact those houses very much. I think that part is not good. The shadows from six floors would greatly reduce the light to 36th street houses. I have concerns about that part.

Thank you again to all who have out time and energy into this plan.

I am very surprised by the recommendation that “Height increase would encourage new development by allowing 4-story buildings”, after the discussions I participated in during the meeting on July 31st. The majority of people I heard and the voting I observed were AGAINST the increase in height beyond three stories. All of a sudden it’s four?? Then it will be five, then six, and so ad infinitum once there is a variant.

Regards,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I cannot begin to say how much I am against this plan and the “community” support for it. The turning of 35th NE, and NE 75th, into one lane, each direction, has restricted traffic and slowed commute times for those going to work, and those who need to go work on homes with plumbing, heating, and maintenance problems. I look forward to the lovely 35th Ave “pull” outs with the trees that will eventually lift and crack the sidewalks creating another set of problems for the committee to solve. The big new apartments, with no parking planned, are nothing more than “rabbit warrens” which will spoil the very essence of what Wedgewood was designed to be and what attracts families to this locale. So, my vote is to keep the developers out of our nice little neighborhood cause I like it the way it is.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although there were many good ideas that emerged from the community meetings devoted to the future of 35th, there is one idea that, if implemented, will have a long-lasting negative impact on the street as well as on the Wedgwood neighborhood as a whole. This was the idea to re-zone the area allowing the construction of six story buildings on the corner of 35th and 85th. I believe there is general consensus that we need a more vibrant local business area in that location, but not at this cost. Increased traffic in what is a congested area, blocking the sunlight to neighboring homes, and a lack of infrastructure to accommodate increased urban density in a neighborhood that was designed for single family homes are just of a few of the downsides of building such tall structures. Furthermore, I fear that if this is permitted, rezoning will continue up and down 35th completely reshaping Wedgwood and rendering it unrecognizable in five to ten years. The argument that this change will “encourage businesses” to take root in Wedgwood is questionable. This is an argument often touted by developers to advance their own agenda and it does not necessarily reflect the desires of the neighborhood. To improve their bottom line, developers are interested in developing the most square footage on the smallest plot of land, but going over four stories would irreparably alter Wedgwood. It is in our long term interest as residents of the Wedgwood neighborhood to reject the proposed change to the zoning code allowing the construction of six story buildings on the corner of 35th and 85th and I request that you don’t pass it. Best regards,</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great job to everyone on this planning and process. I believe the additions will make Wedgwood an exciting and thriving community. I have only one input and concern and that is the height allowance in certain areas. 6 story buildings will overshadow (literally!) the neighboring houses. The greenery and openness of the area is a defining aspect of the community, my suggestion is to limit building heights to 4 stories, which should allow developers and current homeowners peaceful co-existence. Regards,</td>
<td>Blogger Contact Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First off, I commend and thank all those that participated in the 35th Ave Committee project. A lot of good work has resulted and I look forward to seeing some of the recommendations implemented in our neighborhood in the years to follow. While I was actively involved and promoted the Wedgwood Vision Project (resulting in the Wedgwood Vision Plan), I decided to “audit” activities focusing specifically on the development of 35th Ave NE, because I believe this was only part of the whole regarding what Wedgwood Vision Project (WVP) was all about, and tried to accomplish. Furthermore, I was uncomfortable becoming actively involved in a development-only focused effort. WVP: “proposed to engage local residents, businesses, schools, nonprofits, and religious organizations in the civic conversation to identify shared values and a community vision related to future growth and development of the Wedgwood neighborhood”, “to find out how people felt about Wedgwood today and what they desired 20 years into the future”, “Wedgwood simply does not have the population density and infrastructure needs as urban villages such as Ballard, Green Lake, Wallingford, and the University District. Nevertheless, we intend to have a say in what happens to our neighborhood. What better way to do this than to create a future vision of Wedgwood?”, “The best way to predict the future is to plan it. The Vision Project and the resulting Vision Plan will provide important guidance in the near term as well as lay the foundation for a formal neighborhood plan.” Although the development of 35th Ave NE and its surroundings was a big part of WVP, and the last statement from the Vision Project above is spot on with what the 35th Ave Committee is attempting, WVP was an all-encompassing comprehensive effort to address the desires and needs of its members now and 20 years into the future, far beyond only zoning and land use concerns of the core commercial areas. My assessment (based on WVP results) is that the Wedgwood Community in general (together with surrounding neighborhood members that participated in WVP) are generally happy with the look and feel of the neighborhood, and that is why they decided to reside, work, and frequent the neighborhood. Of course it is not perfect, and when asked, many wishes and desires materialized. Because of the scope and resources available to the project, WVP didn’t spend a lot of time discussing the resulting consequences and how development may negatively impact the members of the community.</td>
<td>Direct email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members of the community who presently live and work in areas with a very “residential feel” close to the proposed commercial core areas will without a doubt, be hugely impacted both financially and in their “quality of life”. Even those residing further away will be impacted due to increased density to their daily life destinations. I believe both WVP and the present 35th Ave Committee project needed to address such issues with more detail and disclosure. While more restaurants, hardware stores, bike shops, public meeting spaces, and mom and pop shops may be desirable, at what cost to those with the largest vested stake in those areas? Are the trade-offs acceptable? If not now, when will they be?

WVP was originally a reactionary effort against several proposed developmental changes to the neighborhood. The Wedgwood Community rallied initially to prevent such development projects, then reach compromises generally resulting in acceptable outcomes. Moving forward, the organizers with the support and leadership of Wedgwood Community Council decided that what is needed was instead of always being reactionary, to take a proactive approach to have a say in what they wanted (or didn’t want) now, and into the future 20 years ahead. It was not a pro-development effort, although it attempted to convey the message that future development was inevitable, and we needed to be part of the process instead of letting it just happen to us.

Specifically:

• I believe its possible to attain many favorable aspects of the 35th Ave Committee recommendations without allowing 4-story buildings. 3-stories would probably be acceptable (size and number and proximity to other large buildings kept it check). I believe 4-story buildings are presently way out of scale (Jasper), and perhaps inevitable 20 years into the future, but not now, or any time soon.

• I don’t believe it’s necessary to displace and replace all the homes on the West side of 35th Ave NE between 75th and 85th any time soon (although not specifically mentioned, that is what the proposed changes means). When development of the North and South business cores or “nodes” become overdeveloped, that would be the time when those residing in this area will have to decide if they want to stay where they live and have a more urban feel to the surroundings of their home, or move further away to a quieter areas.

• I believe members of our community that live close (but not in) the commercial core of the neighborhood made their decisions mostly because of just that: They want to live close to the businesses but not within them. While natural progress and development will inevitably change their streetscapes, I am opposed to proactive zoning and planning changes too far ahead of actual demands and needs. While planning for the future is necessary, do we really want to, or have to widen the commercial areas so much, so soon? How about a graduated approach of 10 years, 20 years, 30 years into the future instead?

• I believe the effort should focus more on how to attract desirable businesses and commercial activity rather than specifically changing zoning. Of course zoning changes will inevitably have to be included in such efforts. But the “Field of Dreams” (Kevin Cosner baseball movie) approach doesn’t actually work. You can’t just expect baseball players to “show up” if you built a baseball field in the middle of nowhere. You have to build AND bring the players. I think there are still many ways to attract the businesses desired by the community with minor changes to zoning instead of comprehensive changes. Just changing the zoning will not necessarily yield desirable businesses. We as a community should instead create efforts to attract desirable businesses and address zoning changes as necessary.

• I realize the zoning recommendations are very much an advisory effort and not binding (much like the Vision Project). But they definitely make a huge statement to the City as a representative consensus from the greater community. It is extremely important to make certain demographics and sample sizes of attained data is clearly stated. Even the Vision Project survey ultimately only reached out to approximately 800 respondents from the Wedgwood population estimated to be around 4000 members (give or take by a huge margin).

My biggest concern remains. There is absolutely no consideration for parking requirements for houses of worship and the library. Many elderly and handicapped NEED street parking near entrances in order to utilize these buildings. Parking is already difficult on weekends for these people and for the surrounding residences. With the elimination of bus route 71 the need will be even greater. We elders pay our property taxes on fixed incomes. Why do not get any consideration? Regards,

---
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I would like to express my views on the proposals made for the Wedgwood community.

I have been a resident of Wedgwood for a number of years. It seems to me that a small number of residents that are actually going to be effected by the brunt of the rezoning and beautifying of 35th NE have not been well informed of the meetings nor have they been heard in regards to the rezoning that would permit multiple dwellings to be built in their back yards.

As I read through the proposals of trees or other natural material that would be used to screen the new multiple dwellings from the homes that would be sharing boundaries with them, I ask you has anyone considered how you would screen people from standing in their windows and looking down upon your backyard? My home would become a gold fish bowl. I would lose light by having a large structure erected behind my home. We already have difficulty with over shaded areas. In addition most of the homes on 36th Ave NE between 80th and 82nd have undergone extensive remodeling. I would find it hard to believe that the sale price of these homes would be increased by apartment buildings sharing borders...

As I attempted to indicate at one of the meetings that parking on 36th during the day has become difficult. We compete with the post office, Microsoft connector bus and the businesses already operating by QFC. Many times my husband must park in front of our driveway when he returns from work. A recent function at the corner of 35th and 80th had cars parked everywhere. Street parking was impossible.

Wedgwood itself is a great community. It has not changed in the 62 years that I have been in this area. But it needs to. When I heard comments about the tacky houses on 35th it made me angry. Just walk a few blocks into Wedgwood and you will find uncut grass, unpaved streets, no curbs and many homes have unattended yards. To me 36th Ave is one of the best streets in the neighborhood and your proposals will change that.

I know it sounds very glamorous to have out door cafe’s where we can sit and talk with our neighbors. Sidewalks that will accommodate double wide strollers and pet walkers. But lets be honest here. Have you noticed when dinning out how many people are entertaining themselves not with their eating companion but with their cell phones or digital devices? Do we need more stores to accommodate a few who need to have their lashes put on, or their nails to be extended? We already have two coffee shops and a great pub.

 Beautifying what we have seems like a great idea. Lets think more about putting our bucks into the interior lighting for Wedgwood so we could walk safely at night without falling over the broken sidewalks or stumbling thru the grass of a yard where a sidewalk has never been. The people on 36th have paid their dues for the sidewalks and curbs. Its time the interior does the same. I would love to see the demographics of the survey. How many people actually participated from Wedgwood? What was the age group or where in Wedgwood did most of the responses come from? I heard at the meeting that approximately 1000 responses were gathered. These were from Ravenna, Wedgwood, and North to 95? I also heard that there are maybe 1000 people living in Wedgwood. Most of my neighbors that I have spoken to thought this whole revision was for bike lanes only. So I guess my question is are decisions being made for Wedgwood by outsiders?

If you must do something with 35th then cosmetic things could be done to clean it up and make it more attractive. I certainly go for that. People who purchased property for their businesses along 35th can certainly afford to spruce up without raising the roof and renting to transients. The building near the Optical shop has been allowed to disgrace the area. I am sure they must be looking forward to a rezone so they can tear down that mess and build big.

Hopefully you will take note of my comments. They are not being made to be mean spirited but to simply say lets stop and look a little deeper at what can be done to enhance without the price being paid by those of us who have truly cared for our homes and look forward to a full retirement in them.

Sincerely

Good Morning:

I would like to make a comment on the proposed plan for 35th.

I live on NE 86th and 35th, after the Jasper went in our streets have now become more flooded with traffic congestion and noise.

I am not in favor of a 6th floor building going in on 35th and 85th, this will impact our neighborhood, adding more congestion, more noise, possibly bringing down the value of our home. Parking in front of our house will increase (we have on numerous occasions had to ask people to remove their cars from our driveway).

So this is one unhappy neighbor!
Dear Committee,

This is great for developers, but probably not great for the neighborhood. Do we really need 185,000 sq ft of commercial space and 650 residential units along the 35th Ave NE corridor? This plan also calls for turning 35th into a two lane road, which seems fraught with problems if your plan is to increase density this much. It turns the area into a commercial district. Neighborhoods will lose their community feel; homeowners (and renters) on the west side will certainly lose their views; street parking one block off 35th in both directions will be prime. Of course it will happen because the real goal is to make money, not to improve neighborhoods.

I took the survey at the Northeast Library and was surprised to discover when I saw the complete survey online that the survey taker intentionally omitted questions. That led me to believe that your results were skewed. I am deeply troubled that such enormous changes are being proposed in my name (as a member of the neighborhood) and would like my comments taken into account before this goes forward.

Please know I love my neighborhood for what it is-- a safe, friendly, walkable area. I would be thrilled to see more affordable housing and local business in the area, but only to the extent that it enriches the community. I don't think this plan does that.

Thank you for your time.

Dear Planner,

We were sorry to not be able to attend the last two meetings but would like to be on record with feedback on the proposed plan. We support neighborhood input on city planning and appreciate the opportunity.

It was not too long ago that the city changed the zoning along 35th, we see no reason to increase it further at this point. We know this because when we bought our home in 1995 our neighbor was zoned residence only and now is zoned NC 40 (see next paragraph). We have a 4 story, 90 unit apartment vs. a single story commercial building adjacent to us because of this fairly recent change. Wedgwood has been growing with the times. There are apartments all along 35th and plenty of business/service opportunities: Hairdressers, barber shops, tanning, nails, pasta shop, attorneys, dentist, eyewear, bakery, doughnuts, pizza, several bars, grocery stores, restaurants, dance studios, coffee shops, several pharmacies, yoga, accountants, insurance, fast food, doctors, banks, churches, preschool, eyelash extensions, laundromat, etc. as well as close proximity to U-Village, Lake City and Northgate...you name it, Wedgwood has it or has had it (used bookstore, frame shop, bike shop, clothing/gift shop, toy store, hardware store) or will have it or have it again. The commercial and residential seems ample for this area. When neighbors advocate for a better restaurant or urban eatery, we do not mean 4 - 6 story buildings with more work/live spaces. We have already fought for the scale we have (consider when Kroger wanted the giant store where the QFC is and the many meeting regarding Jasper) We consider Wedgwood very walkable as long as sidewalks do not get narrower.

The single family home next to us (87th, just off 35th) was recently sold and will become 3 units between 2 and 4 stories each although it’s only a 5100 square foot lot! With the current zoning, this would continue to happen along with several story apartment buildings in many places along 35th Ave. Why would we EVER want to zone for 6 story buildings in this area? We will never be the station for the light rail and have dense zoning places close by: Roosevelt, the University District and Northgate. Roosevelt has suffered at the hands of landowners buying up land, letting them become an eyesore (to save on property taxes) while waiting to purchase all the parcels desired to maximize profits on development and spent hundreds of hours trying to find consensus between 4 story and 10 story development. I understand that the Audubon would like more classroom space but would encourage other options than rezoning (e.g. the building just south which is under-utilized, Homestreet Bank (has a policy of making use of their facility for non-profits) and Wedgwood Presbyterian) and commend their natural landscaping.

I am not understanding how putting in pop-outs in the curbs and letting people park full-time on 35th will increase traffic flow when adding much more density to the area both in residents and commercial development that would attract traffic from outside the neighborhood.

As someone with a degree in Art, I would like to see aesthetically pleasing living areas, developed parks and open spaces and support development within existing zoning that encourages community-friendly walkability (wide sidewalks that support strollers, wheelchairs and other mobility devices, as well as setbacks which provide plenty of shade and natural beauty landscaping, etc.)

We appreciate those who made the meetings and helped organize them and are glad to live in an area of the city where people are not forced into cookie-cutter trendiness. We love our currently vibrant, walkable, livable, diverse neighborhood of Wedgwood where change is always happening. Thanks for all,
I thought many of the ideas were good and would promote walking, community gathering, traffic management, and allowances for reasonable growth. My thoughts on this as a whole are as follows:

- Saving our mature tree growth throughout development (especially given we will be losing many from the Children’s Home Society lots), and when putting in trees consider varieties that contribute to our food source perhaps.
- 5 and 6 story bldgs seem pretty tall for this district. It will be important to find ways to design these structures so as to avoid the Ballard Wall-of-Walls syndrome.
- Large asphalt and concrete parking lots are horrible on so many levels (rain run off, petroleum product use, heat generators, non-friendly use of space, etc) that alternative surfaces should be a design consideration for any new paving that happens; e.g. Permeable, solar roadways panels, http://greeneconomypost.com/green-parking-lot-2830.htm
- Making an effort to bring art, community kiosks and gathering spots, local interests and character into any developments, is how a place keeps its soul and doesn’t de-volve into an “Anywhere USA” strip street.

Thank you for giving those of us who could not make it to the meetings, a forum in which to comment.

I second Valarie’s comments. I feel very fortunate to live in a neighborhood where these issues are being proactively addressed through this grassroots initiative, and greatly appreciate everyone who has participated. In general, I’m excited about the proposed changes, and welcome the increased density and pedestrian improvements on 35th. But I realize that there are going to be differences of opinion with any proposal, and that’s what this process is all about. Please get involved now, and urge your neighbors to do the same, while there is still time to provide input.

To the 35th Ave Planning Committee,
I appreciate the tremendous amount of work that you have done to come up with this plan. I also appreciate your efforts to keep the community informed. I am, however, in complete disagreement with the proposed increase in building heights particularly at 85th.

One thing I’ve learned from dealing with the school issue at Thornton Creek is that transportation and public school space should be dealt with along with planning for buildings. At the first meeting of the 35th street planning process, the consultant said that transportation was a regional issue and would be dealt with by SDOT at some point but would not be part of the planning process.

By this, I don’t mean where cars park, although that is certainly important, but how decisions made about a particular section of of 35th Ave NE would interact with traffic coming in and leaving.

Given the congestion in schools in our area, I think this planning should include elementary school space. If we add over 800 families to an area where the need for school seats is growing, responsible planning would mean allowing for space and funds to put a school. Developers should be required to contribute.

I also would like to see buildings that incorporate green roof space for community garden plots and buildings that use other methods for limiting drainage into storm drains.

Regards,

Hello,
As a 20 year resident of Wedgwood, I would like to register my opinion very much AGAINST 6 story buildings anywhere on 35th street, and particularly at 35th and 85th.

It sounds as if you feel you have been informing the neighborhood of your intentions, but it has only been recently that this recommendation has been brought to light.

I think this is against the best interests of the neighborhood we cherish and the property in which we’ve invested.

Thank you,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a near neighbor who intends to live here for many years to come, I think it’s very important that the future plans for 35th maintain adequate space for large street trees, with at least 7’ wide planting strips, to allow mature canopy to eventually arch over the street. 5’ planting strips are not large enough to be able to plant trees that would grow large enough to shade the street. The maximum size street tree that can be planted in a 5’ strip is 25’ - trees 45’ - 60’ at maturity would add a lot more grace, character, and beauty to the street, not to mention the vastly greater environmental, social, and economic benefits that come from large trees instead of small trees. The ability to add silva cells and structural soil to the street would be amazing. I am also in favor of moving to permanent parking spaces along 35th instead of temporary ones and channelizing the traffic into 2 lanes. And changing the zoning to allow 4 or 6 story buildings would be fine by me, as long as those buildings are zoned mixed use and include retail on the lower level. Thanks for your hard work on this project! Sincerely</td>
<td>Direct Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a retired planning consultant and as a resident of Wedgwood for nearly 50 years, I have to protest the lack of clear information about the proposed rezone to allow six story buildings on 35th. In notices of the community meetings, there was no mention of such a drastic change. If there had been, I’m sure a great many more Wedgwood residents would have attended the meetings and would have protested, especially since parking would be limited on 35th and could drastically impact the neighbors who live on nearby streets. This lack of information is not consistent with due process. I believe it is your responsibility to clearly inform the Wedgwood community of the six-story zoning proposal and to call a halt to the proposal if the community objects to it</td>
<td>Direct Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi- I may have missed it but I’m wondering how this impacts the value of the current homes in the area. We live close to the 85th/35th ave. intersection- we currently look at trees- not 6 story buildings. Has there been conversation to maintain the 4 story zoning height? Thanks. Regards</td>
<td>Comment Widget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m writing to voice my opposition to changing the height allowances for buildings at the intersection of 35th Ave NE and 85th St. The current zoning allows for up to 4-story commercial buildings in this location, and the proposed guidelines would increase this height to up to 6 stories. There are only a handful of properties which would be directly affected by this change, predominantly those are located immediately east of the QFC and Rite Aid properties. I live in one of those affected properties, at 3526 NE 85th St, immediately east of Rite Aid. I have seen the visual, aesthetic and loss-of sunlight impacts caused on east neighbors of the Jasper residential property located at 35th Ave and 86th St; as a 4-story building it looms over the neighboring residences and dominates the area visually, and completely cutting off sunlight past mid-day on the residences to the east. Visually it shatters the aesthetic of what has been traditionally a single-family neighborhood with a smattering of small apartment complexes. The traffic associated with the property binds up intersections and fills up neighboring streets with parked cars. A 6-story facility will have an even greater impact on those surrounding residences cutting off afternoon sunlight and clogging up already badly-congested streets and intersections with additional drivers; roads which are already filled with delivery trucks, store patrons, garbage trucks, recycling trucks and homeowners headed to and fra. I have read in the planning materials that one of the benefits of a 6-story development will be to promote economic activity to the area. The true winners of such a zoning change will be those individuals who own the commercial space, and stand to benefit by replacing existing functional buildings with taller buildings which can generate greater income for the landowners. The losers will be those surrounding homeowners who would be subjected to months of construction noise, then, in perpetuity, subsequent years of traffic, loss of sunlight and visual impacts. The wealth of the few will be generated at the expense of losses by the public. The current commercial space is filled with vital energy, with every building full, with neighbors meeting and visiting in single-story, highly functional businesses. I do not support any zoning changes to allow any increases in building heights in this area</td>
<td>Direct Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Sir or Madam - Thank you for the opportunity to review the development plan for the Wedgwood neighborhood. My family lives at 35th Ave NE and 85th Street, next door to Rite Aid. I have not participated in the public review process nor have my neighbors, we have been occupied with raising our young families or managing severe health issues. It is my hope that my feedback will be given serious consideration even though I have not participated in the public meetings. I must admit to feeling confused as I read this plan. I remember the street and zoning guidelines action in the neighborhood being started as a response to the negative impact of the Jasper development, to give neighbors a chance to develop the neighborhood in a way that would lead us to choose to call our neighborhood our forever home. I am in favor of a plan to preserve sunlight to residential houses shown on slide 53. Sunlight is vitally important to me and my family. We have recently installed solar panels on our roof to do our part in reversing global warming by reducing use of fossil fuels. We grow as much of our green food as possible in the front yard, because greens are mostly made of water and the primary impact on the environment is transportation from farm to consumer. I believe we humans have a right to a sustainable planet, and removing access to sunlight significantly reduces my ability to make pro-sustainability life choices.</td>
<td>Direct Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I read in slide 60 that there is a proposal to increase the intersection of 85th street from a zoning of 4 stories maximum to 6 stories. I am opposed to increasing the maximum building height primarily because it reduces sunlight for the neighborhood. So although the presentation suggests the development will not block the sun, my experience tells me the presentation is not giving all the facts.

Below, please see a photo of my backyard to my neighbor’s fence at 7 pm in August. At Rite Aid’s current building height of 2 stories, set back far from the eastern property line, it casts a deep shadow across the neighboring properties to the east. Rite Aid is set nearly one story above its adjacent houses, so a 4 story building on the property would have the effects of a 5 story building. If a 6 story building were built on the intersection of 35th and 85th street, even with setbacks, the sun would be blocked to the north and east in afternoons and evenings. The 4-story Jasper sets a shadow across its neighbors, and the neighborhood has committed to not repeating its monolithic effects. The current proposal for height takes the zoning in the wrong direction, and the setbacks and staggered stories are theoretically a good theoretical idea but do not go far enough to deliver promised effects. If we were in the tropics the proposal would probably work fine, but the angle of our sun for half of the year at our latitude needs to be taken into account.

I am unclear who is planning development and zoning and what their biases are. Is it possible that the entity constructing the plan is positioned to receive greater financial gain if a higher density plan is approved? Please be transparent. Some background in the presentation leads me to suspect that a predevelopment entity has prepared the background material to convince the neighborhood to support higher density, and presented information in a biased way to support their interests. Am I interpreting this incorrectly? For example, I believe the presentation on slide 53 is misleading, it suggests sun to residential properties would be preserved. I would like to see an actual summer-winter sun study, and the factual results of the study distributed to the neighborhood for comment. In Wedgwood families love to walk up and down the streets with children and dogs and bask in the sun when it is out. The neighborhood will lose this characteristic if our sidewalks are literally shadowed by development. I see the content in the presentation about setbacks and open spaces, but the reality of my yard vs the proposal in the presentation leads me to believe the presenters are out of touch with reality of the angle of the sun in our neighborhood.

I am not opposed to higher population density, but I believe there are multiple ways to achieve it. I am not in favor of plans to increase population density in a manner that forgets social justice. For example, I have had up to 10 people (2-3 families) living in my house at any time. If 6 story buildings are built on the busiest Wedgwood intersections, the property values of the 6-story areas will increase as they gain regional views, and the property values of the neighboring single family homes will decrease because they will bear the effects of traffic, noise, and shadow. In my neighborhood, the less wealthy already own the more affordable houses adjacent to busy streets. The high-density housing will further drive down the property values of bordering houses. Where is the social justice in this decision, that certain commercial properties should be given even greater height at the expense of neighboring properties?

What will be the effects on traffic of this added density? Every car that has regularly parked in front of my house has had the car mirror hit by another car. What is the private individual’s cost of the higher density? Existing residents will bear the effects of slower traffic, of pedestrian danger of added cars, of louder noise from the additional mass of neighbors, of the loss of light and the access it gives to a more sustainable lifestyle.

Slide 58 gives the results of public opinion, asking people if they like what is currently there, if they like a 4 story building, or if they like a 5 story building. It doesn’t ask if they would like a 2 or 3 story building. The presentation reports that, given the choice between 4 or 5 stories, neighbors consistently reported they prefer 4 stories. How was this public survey data used to conclude that 6-story buildings should be plopped on 65th, 75th, and 85th? This leads me to believe that the survey was constructed in a biased way to draw conclusions that neighbors are in favor of higher density. What I would love is having a 15’ high commercial district along 85th street with 2 stories of living space above it. This could give the neighborhood a lovely feel (like Maple Leaf, Madison Valley), with added services that would benefit all residents. The idea of painting 4-6 story buildings along 85th street, I feel, would convert my neighborhood from a very lovely place to live and work to a soulless fast loud dark corridor reminding me of the relentless pursuit of wealth by propertyed and commercial interests over the common man who is powerless to stop it. I would much rather we work to preserve a beautiful and sustainable planet for ourselves by placing reasonable caps on density and building height, preserving the ability of children and dogs to walk without danger, and allowing existing neighbors to choose sustainable living including solar panels and gardens.

Thank you for your serious consideration.