

**Roosevelt Neighborhood Association  
6910 Roosevelt Way NE  
Box #518  
Seattle, WA 98115**

July 26, 2010

Honorable Councilmember Sally J. Clark, Chair  
Committee on the Built Environment  
Seattle City Council  
P.O. Box 34025  
Seattle, WA 98124

RE: 2010 Seattle Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposal #8

Dear Councilmember Clark,

The Roosevelt Neighborhood Association (RNA) strongly opposes the Comprehensive Plan amendment proposed by the Roosevelt Development Group (RDG). The RNA asks the members of Seattle City Council's Committee on the Built Environment and all other City Council members to reject Comp Plan amendment #8 from the 2010 – 2011 Comp Plan policy docket.

There are two broad reasons, with numerous specifics, for our position on this matter:

**1. No genuine community outreach has been performed by the applicant on the specifics of their Comprehensive Plan amendment.**

Question 3 of the Required Questionnaire in the Comp Plan amendment application includes the criterion that "There has been a neighborhood review process to develop any proposed change to a neighborhood plan, or a neighborhood review process can be conducted prior to final Council consideration of the amendment". No such process has taken place. The applicant's suggestion that "the neighborhood will be involved in review of the EIS and contract rezone proposed in connection with this amendment" is wholly inadequate to address to changes to our Neighborhood Plan; the EIS process does not provide for discussion of the Neighborhood Plan. Having invested countless hours in the development and evaluation of our Neighborhood Plan, we are justifiably concerned about Comp Plan amendments which would change it. The RDG Comp Plan amendment actively undermines key provisions of the Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan; no discussion around these issues has occurred and the RDG Comp Plan amendment makes no provision to do so. A key criterion for docketing this item is thus left unsatisfied.

Question 6 of the Required Questionnaire in the Comp Plan amendment application asks "Is there public support for this proposed text amendments (i.e. have you conducted community meetings.)? In their application and in public testimony in Council Chambers, the applicant and its representatives have listed a series of community

meetings as evidence of outreach on this topic. The RNA wishes to stress that in none of these meetings, or at any other time or in any other way, did any specific discussion of Comp Plan amendments take place between the applicant and the Community. Neighbors were only aware of the existence and content of the RDG's 2009 and 2010 Comp Plan amendment applications after they were filed with the City. No Comp Plan outreach has occurred. The Community is offended that this has been misrepresented by the applicant. Please see the Attachment to this letter for additional details.

**2. There is a better way to address the “public need” for increased density near the future Roosevelt transit station, and that is for DPD and the City Council to complete the legislative rezone process in the Roosevelt Station area, based upon detailed input from the Community submitted in July, 2006.**

The Comp Plan Amendment selection criteria ask if “The amendment is not better addressed through another process, such as neighborhood planning.” Each of the five (paid) speakers at the July 8 public hearing who spoke in favor of the RDG Comp Plan amendment made reference to the need for land use policy to address developments in transportation infrastructure; i.e., the future Roosevelt light rail station. Their argument was that the RDG Comp Plan amendment is a good way to plan for increased density in the vicinity of the transit station.

The RNA emphatically disagrees. The RDG Comp Plan amendment addresses only one corner of our community, out of context, and is dismissive of the whole. We maintain that it is inappropriate and counterproductive to evaluate the RDG Comp Plan amendment before completion of the community-wide land use analysis. The neighborhood's rezoning proposals represent true comprehensive planning; the developer's proposal is expedient and only self-serving. Moreover, to accept a developer's proposal, even just for study, ahead of and around a longstanding community request, sends a very discouraging message to neighborhoods across the City, about the value of their volunteer efforts in neighborhood planning.

Once again, the RNA asks that DPD and City Council analyze and act on the complete set of land use recommendations submitted by the RNA in July 2006, and that this work be complete before any consideration of Comprehensive Plan amendments which would impact the Roosevelt Neighborhood Plan.

The RNA urges City Council to reject Comp Plan amendment proposal #8. It does not meet all of the necessary criteria and it undermines the spirit of Neighborhood Planning in Seattle.

Sincerely,

Peter James  
President, Roosevelt Neighborhood Association