



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 it be encouraged with policy?

I believe environmentally sustainable development is an important part of socially responsible development. But socially responsible development (SRD) must also consider neighborhood makeup and character.

In the absence of policy incentives, purely profit-driven development can result in transformations to neighborhoods that displace families and entire communities of people, particularly communities of color and lower-income communities. Socially responsible development, and policies to encourage it, must promote vibrant, diverse communities across race and class.

In addition to people, SRD must also consider the historic character of places. Of course all neighborhoods change and grow over time. But smart policies can help us preserve historic buildings and storefronts while accommodating needed growth and density.

Finally, I believe the best of SRD also promotes healthy and active living and is connected to public transit in ways that only come about through policy incentives and extensive stakeholder and community involvement.

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?

I want to see Seattle avoid future development that centers around the personal automobile as the primary means of transportation. That means not relying on strip malls and big box stores but instead encouraging mixed-use development, ground-floor retail for local businesses and retailers with residential living in the floors above. I know some people feel a sense of loss when they see new growth and development without accompanying growth in parking spaces. But if we can make the needed investments in public transit--which are significant--as well as in walkable, bikeable communities, I think we can demonstrate that we can accommodate growth without accommodating a new car for every new person in Seattle.

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. 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?

At the core of the infamous "Seattle process" is a desire to ensure that everyone has their voice heard in the important decisions that will impact their lives. I fully adhere to this aspiration, while acknowledging we often fall short. I also recognize that we have more demand for affordable, workforce and market rate housing stock than currently exists, as demonstrated by our high costs of housing. An important feature of the Seattle process is that it often allows us time to more fully examine a proposed development's potential opportunities and impacts. But this can also create delays in developments that can increase costs for both builders and ultimately the renters/owners. As a policymaker, I believe we can strike a balance and that meaningful stakeholder engagement is not mutually exclusive of swifter implementation of socially responsible development. I am always open to new approaches to improving our current

processes and look forward to working with the socially responsible development community to explore new possibilities.

Building Typologies: 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**
- **Rowhouse or cottage housing**
- **Townhomes**
- **Midrise developments (45' to 85')**
- **High rise developments**

As mentioned above, my vision of Seattle's future development does not center personal automobiles as the primary means of transportation. To achieve this vision, we need to be expanding our conversation about public transportation in Seattle from merely staving off drastic cuts to exploring how we can drastically expand the size of our current system. I do not think it is realistic to assume we can accommodate a new car for every new person in Seattle over the coming decades. Nor should that be our goal if we are serious about fighting climate change.

I think the typology of Seattle's future development will represent a mix of ADUs, rowhouses, cottages, townhomes and mid- and high-rise developments. This means increased density in neighborhoods across Seattle. I envision transit-oriented communities that encourage healthy and active living by considering cultural, retail, commercial and transportation needs, allowing people to live near where they work and play.

Affordability: In which neighborhoods and what mix should affordability be found? Please also discuss strategies you believe are effective at reaching affordability targets,

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.**

I believe every neighborhood in Seattle should include its share of low-income, workforce and market rate housing. This means we need every single one of these tools listed above, as well as the State Housing Trust Fund and federal HUD resources.

In the recent South Lake Union rezone, I led the effort to strengthen our incentive zoning program, which you can read more about [at my blog](#) or [view in this video](#). Despite the efforts I led to nearly double the projected number of workforce housing units being produced in South Lake Union, we will still be over 3,000 units short of the projected demand for affordable units (at 60-80% AMI). This is why I also called for the review of our entire incentive zoning program, work that is now underway and will yield recommendations for meeting our future affordability targets that I plan to lead on in my second term.

In the Yesler Terrace redevelopment I led the effort to secure city funds to be seed money for a study to help build a cultural center for Little Saigon. We need cultural anchors in communities to help prevent displacement of a community's historic residents. The Yesler project's vast redevelopment threatened to gentrify that area in a way that threatens to displace small and family business owners in Little Saigon, and I believe I have a responsibility as a policymaker to work with that community on solutions that will help them preserve their presence and livelihood in the community.

O'Brien

Of course we must also preserve our current older stock while also making room for microhousing and other new housing options for a variety of income levels. I firmly believe there is great potential for further accessory dwelling unit development throughout Seattle's many traditional single family neighborhoods that will help us meet our density goals while also preserving the character of the neighborhoods.