

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 it be encouraged with policy?

Socially responsible development can be championed by a strong mayor. It is encouraged by Seattle stakeholders through our values as a city. As a part of doing business here, we strongly encourage new construction projects to utilize skilled labor and offer safe, living wage jobs for its workers. Socially responsible development also includes providing opportunities for minority and women-owned business to compete for capital projects and build new infrastructure which maintains and protects the character of the community where the project is housed. We try to encourage socially responsible development through the DPD design review process, which includes a public comment component. In the absence of specific policy incentives, the City's local leadership must actively engage in communicating its vision for the City—publicly promoting positive outcomes and speaking out against negative impacts. In addition, elected officials should consider policy which mandates certain development minimums (e.g. apprenticeship programs, wage standards), especially as concerns public works projects.

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?

I was born and raised in Seattle and believe it is the best city world. Seattle is my home and has generously provided opportunity for the development and success my family and I. I love its growing urban environment, the diversity of people and perspectives, its thriving cultural community, as well as the city's beautiful natural surroundings. A trend from Seattle's past that I would prefer to avoid in the future is concrete box buildings, some of which are located in our downtown core. Those buildings may have intended to be durable, but they lack significant character and detract from the natural beauty surrounding the city. An example would be the concrete box of the IBM Building as opposed to the aesthetics of the building once known as the Washington Mutual Tower.

One of the aspects of growth that bring about fear of loss is the discussion of density. Many perceive this as the loss of space, privacy and freedom. Many also fear the loss of neighborhood character and unique identity. Again, our leadership must communicate what we want to see in the growth and development of our urban centers, while still respecting and protecting the character of our individual neighborhoods. We must embrace culture as pertains to design and the built environment.

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. 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?

I rely on constituents within the development community to provide feedback on the permitting and design review process to know whether they believe it is working or not. The use of technology and streamlining the process is critical toward their success. Many have said that the process is much improved from where it was years ago. Benchmarking the dates of approvals during the process is critical toward improving the process. With bank lending increasing, I believe market rate housing is being completed at an appropriate rate. We still have a great shortage for affordable housing and family shelters, but our market rate inventory is healthy. I believe the "Seattle process" exists in an effort to get our future right, and to engage in the diversity of opinion that is reflected throughout this city. I encourage an engaged citizenry, but believe there is an appropriate time to move the

discussion forward to action; time does cost money. We cannot let political cowardice keep us from advancing what we know is in the best interests of the city overall. One change I would make to the planning and permitting process is to add neighborhood specialists to the project review board for a neighborhood stakeholder perspective to the projects being considered.

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

This is a difficult question without knowing the type of growth our city will experience. To know the right mix will be largely dependent upon what kind of density we experience. As a country, our national birth rates are fairly flat and there are conflicting studies which outline where our housing growth is coming from. Are they young adults looking for their first apartments, new immigrants and refugees, suburban flight to the city? The needed inventory will be largely dependent upon where our growth is coming from and must also be tied into our City's annexation strategies. I support annexation of underutilized areas and believe this also gives us real estate to invest in affordable housing. We know that we must build for increased density in and around our urban villages and centers, and that improved transit systems will reduce our reliance on car ownership. However, we aren't quite there yet, so how do we meet the needs of our current city while planning appropriately for the future? Single family homes should provide a least one parking space per lot. Mid and High-rise developments in and around current and planned transit hubs should be exempted from parking requirements. There is no one size fits all solution for every project, but I see the above as a general guideline. Different neighborhoods will have different requirements for what is appropriate for their communities. Those living in dense urban neighborhoods who wish to access nature and the outdoors have many options for weekend warrior transportation through services such as Smart Car, Sound Transit, ride shares and/or car rentals.

5. **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

We should strive to achieve a mix of affordable housing throughout all of our urban villages and centers. Access to a reliable mass transit system and local neighborhood jobs will improve our low-income residents living environment and quality of life. Effective affordable housing strategies include: increased housing supply and micro housing options, incentive zoning (particularly in or near the new development), Seattle Housing Levy (to increase inventory funding), and the Multi-Family Tax Exemption program. We shouldn't selectively depress a neighborhood's growth potential just to keep one or two affordable housing spaces, but look to incorporate affordable housing in the new developments at minimum on a one to one replacement ratio. I would like to explore with the voters in 2016 an increase in funding for the Housing Levy to include a slightly

Harrell

more aggressive approach to building additional family shelter facilities as supplement to the one family shelter we currently maintain.