

1. **Socially responsible development:** Seattle takes a strong stance in favor of environmentally sustainable development. Do you believe that Seattle also encourages socially responsible development? What does socially responsible development mean to you, and in the absence of any policy incentives, how does it come about? How can the City Council encourage it with policy?

I believe environmentally sustainable development is also socially responsible development. Climate change requires us to think regionally and globally to address the impacts of population increases over the next decades. Density that allows neighbors to live near where they work, transportation alternatives to give everyone an option to a single-occupancy vehicle, sidewalk and pedestrian developments that allow residents to safely walk throughout our city, safe and separated Neighborhood Greenways and cycletracks are examples that fit into both the environmentally sustainable and socially responsible columns. By encouraging one, we achieve them both. Seattle is currently leading the pack, but we can always do more.

One of the best ways the City Council can encourage more socially responsible development is by requiring housing developers to build more price controlled units in their market rate buildings. A report published by Harvard University and the University of California, "The Economic Impacts of Tax Expenditures", recently gained a lot of national attention because of its finding that cities (and regions) with a smaller middle class witnessed lower rates of upward mobility. It also drew the correlation that upward mobility was dependent on households with different income levels intermingling. Economically segregated communities did very little to help the economically disadvantaged members of the community. Seattle fared pretty well in comparison, but we can do more to promote policies that foster more economically diverse communities.

2. **Negative outcomes:** What trends accompanying growth and development in other cities, or in Seattle's history, do you hope Seattle will avoid in future development cycles? What brought you to live in Seattle? What aspects of growth do you believe bring about fear of loss? How can Seattle avoid negative outcomes?

Seattle is recovering better than most from the Great Recession and as more companies move here to do business, we must build the housing and transportation infrastructure to allow growth without sprawl. Our best chance for fostering smart growth is to promote and encourage urban density around transportation hubs. The expansion of the new light rail and the rapid-ride systems gives us a real opportunity to do just this. We can set higher goals to encourage more affordable housing to be built with new developments along these routes. While I value and protect the Seattle culture of single-family housing, I am simultaneously dedicated to creating urban density our urban villages and along the transportation corridors where in-fill opportunities are available. We must work to decrease urban sprawl and protect our beautiful city's environment at the same time.

Rapid expansion can bring about the fear of loss to many residents – the fear of losing the neighborhood character one loves. It is our citywide responsibility to ensure the public that growth is being smartly, and fairly, managed. That requires the involvement of those who are willing to solve the problem, not just complain about it.

I came to Seattle 35 years ago because I love the northwest and its progressive values. I raised my family here and have deep roots in our community. I'm staying!

3. **Process:** How do you rate Seattle's speed in response to demand for housing? How can Seattle improve upon existing planning policy and process (Comprehensive Plan; Design Review; Planning Commission; etc.)? What are the benefits and shortcomings of the "Seattle process"? If you would modify the planning or permitting process in any way, please cite positive and/or negative examples from other cities, or proposals envisioned by current and past council members. Are there any specific precedents from Seattle or other cities that you view as a model of civic and private partnership in the built environment?

This is a question that would take pages to answer thoroughly. Speed? We are slower than some cities but faster than many. We could definitely speed up the process on the front end by issuing permits administratively, but that would slow us down from lawsuits on the back end.

A thorough planning process with neighborhood involvement is critical to assure we increase density while protecting neighborhood character. Few people love change, yet most people value having their opinion heard and respected. That's the balance that I strive to achieve.

Seattle is fortunate that thousands of energetic people and businesses want to move here. We are growing out of the Great Recession much more quickly than most cities because of the influx of young people, families and businesses coming and electing to stay in our city. It is important that we effectively streamline certain aspects of the planning and permitting process while maintaining the opportunity for input and review.

San Jose, California has a program I believe we should emulate. To improve and fast track permitting, they offer an alternative where a developer invites key neighbors and key city departments into a room. Everyone commits to stay with the process until resolution is reached. The developer pays a hefty premium for this process, but they save months of time and obtain both predictability and certainty. Neighborhoods get to be included from the front end. The challenge is to select representatives that can and do speak for the neighborhood and to include city officials with decision making authority.

4. **Built Form:** What do you believe is the right mix of parking and building typologies in Seattle in the next 10 years? If you anticipate reduced car ownership and/or increased density, please discuss potential changes in how Seattleites access nature and the outdoors. Examples of building typologies include:
- Single Family
 - Small lot/ADUs
 - Row house or cottage housing
 - Townhomes
 - Midrise developments (45' to 85')

- High rise developments

The challenge before us is to address people's concerns to protect their single-family neighborhoods, with the reality that 100,000 new neighbors are moving into our city in the next decade. This is a big number. 100,000 people not just within the region, but INSIDE SEATTLE.

This means we must anticipate their arrival. I believe Alan Durning's new book Unlocking Home has some great suggestions: increase flexibility to allow more DADUs, (I would keep them within the neighborhood scale); allow attached dwelling units inside the house or over the garage, too, without required parking places; encourage roommates; require a stream-lined permit process and neighborhood involvement for "apodments". Encourage developers with incentives to add employee and affordable housing in their projects.

Seattle has a culture of neighborhoods, each one being very distinct and original. Our building typologies and policies must respect and reflect that diversity. Neighborhoods experiencing a lot of growth and that are well served by public transit should be allowed to increase density both in urban villages and on transportation corridor and receive public benefits like parks, libraries, community centers, Neighborhood Greenways in return. I look forward to working with you on these approaches.

5. **Affordability:** How do you define affordability, and in which neighborhoods and what mix should affordability be found? Please also discuss strategies you believe are effective at reaching affordability targets in these areas, and those you believe are ineffective. Please cite specific examples from other cities. Example strategies include:
 - Preservation of older housing and retail, and other means to prevent displacement;
 - Increased housing supply and microhousing;
 - Incentive zoning;
 - Seattle Housing Levy—please also discuss any specific changes to the program or amount that you'd favor when the Housing Levy is brought up for renewal in 2016; and
 - Multi-Family Tax Exemption.

This answer will complement my answer to number one and four above. Affordable housing in this city – as well as ever other major city – is shockingly hard to come by. In South Lake Union for example, 80% AMI requires a family of four to have an income of \$69,000 annually. Housing may be available for certain well paid Amazon or bio-tech employees for example, but will not be available for the hotel workers who commute to Seattle from Tukwila and make less than \$20,000 per years.

Every neighborhood should have housing options at multiple prices up and down cost spectrum. This is frankly an easy thing to say and a harder thing to accomplish. Think Laurelhurst neighborhood as an example. That is an upscale neighborhood with very little space (or appetite) for new development. Only on the margins, or along Sandpoint Way, will empty lots be available where middle-income housing will be built. The city has helped create low-income housing in and near Magnuson Park. That's a good start.

This means that our most realistic opportunities are to create housing where infill space is available – along Rainier and MLK Way for example; along Aurora where some not-so-savory buildings could be replaced by affordable and sustainable multi-family housing near our light rail and rapid ride stops. We can also creatively use those light rail stops to build multi-family on top of the stations. Whenever we think about building something new, we should consider the filter: 100,000 more people coming into our city. We need to create spaces for them to live. After all, these are our kids and grandkids who are coming home.

I am a longtime supporter and advocate for the Seattle Housing Levy and other programs that create and protect affordable housing options. I look forward to working to pass a renewal Housing Levy in 2016. I also strongly support zoning incentives and other policies that encourage development of affordable housing.

I will work to form agreements between the City, Metro, King County and Sound Transit to develop affordable housing on land near the Light Rail Line and major arterials. The transit oriented development process surrounding the Capitol Hill Station is a great example of collaboration on development projects with affordable housing at the forefront. The recent development agreement that passed through the City Council will result in the land directly surrounding the Capitol Hill Station being developed with more than 35% of the units being dedicated to affordable housing. This will be done by dedicating an entire building to affordable housing and increasing building heights to allow for more affordable units.

--Sally Bagshaw

September 14, 2013