

**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?**

Development is socially responsible to the extent its function, design, planning and execution are each informed and guided by a commitment to promoting the flourishing of persons, while respecting their autonomy and, if feasible, mitigating the effects of past injustices. There are trade-offs here, of course, but this imperative functions as a broad ideal to which we should aspire. Seen this way, environmental sustainability is simply one component of a broader social responsibility agenda.

So our goal must be to broaden our social responsibility agenda. Underserved populations and communities have development needs that go unmet. For instance, non-profit and neighborhood advocacy groups in the Central District need dedicated space of their own, and we still lack a GLBT community center.

In the absence of policy incentives, if socially responsible development continued, it would be the result from forms of public pressure. The mayor has a bully pulpit, and needs to use it to promote more socially responsible development practices. To consistently secure socially responsible development we need to ensure a transparent and reliable public process, and policy incentives backed by the force of law. We can do better than current practice on both these counts.

**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 in Aberdeen, raised in West Seattle, and have always considered Seattle my home. I have built my life here, and devoted my career to serving Seattle and its residents. Seattle is unique among American cities for its progressivity, creativity, innovation and natural beauty. I couldn't imagine living anywhere else.

The continued growth and development of Seattle will present both opportunities and challenges. We have the opportunity to help our poorest and most vulnerable residents, to reduce our impact on the natural world, to substantially invest in our critical infrastructure, to provide efficient, rapid transit, and so on. That is, we have the opportunity to translate our values into how we actually live and grow.

What we need is a stable trajectory of steady growth, guided and managed in a way that encourages broad opportunity, rather than the chaotic and unregulated boom and bust cycles that have characterized growth patterns in too many other cities.

Decisions about Seattle's future need to be oriented, towards making the least of us better off, and towards addressing the fears that accompany change. There is no single policy solution to meeting these challenges and avoiding these losses. But there are solutions. We need to ensure that our decisions about Seattle's future are transparent and public. We need to make sure these decisions are guided by collaboration and compromise, and that everybody has an opportunity to have their voice heard, to advocate for their interests, and participate meaningfully in the decisions effecting their homes, heritage and livelihood.

**3.Process: How do you rate Seattle's speed in response to demand for housing? 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?**

Seattle is adding rental units at a record pace, and yet demand continues to rise. Primarily, this is because of the rapid influx of new employees in the technology sector. This is good news for our economy, and should be encouraged, but it significantly increases pressure on those looking for affordable rentals in the city. In areas like Capitol Hill, it is increasingly difficult for working people to remain in their homes. For the poor, affordable housing in Seattle proper is increasingly difficult.

The city need to more proactive in using the tools at its disposal to encourage the creation of affordable housing stock, both housing for very low income residents and workforce housing. It is within our power to use community benefit agreements, land-use restrictions, incentive zoning, vacation requests etc. to encourage and incentivize developers to provide or subsidize the development of units of affordable, and/or agree to rental rate caps. We also can streamline permitting processes and ease restrictions on developers of affordable housing so that it is easier and cheaper for them to do their work. But we should not use these incentives on an ad hoc basis or, worse, for the purpose of political grandstanding. Rather, their use needs to be consistent, predictable, and codified into municipal policy.

**4.Built Form: What do you believe is the right mix of parking and building typologies in Seattle in the next 10 years?**

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to growth and to development for our diverse city. We need to focus growth and density in those areas of the city – like South Lake Union – that are designated to receive it, and that have the transit and infrastructure to support it. In those neighborhoods I will advocate for allowing developers both greater height and density in exchange for more in incentive zoning fees to fund the creation of affordable housing. By doing that we will reduce development pressure in other areas of the city, and help to preserve the unique character of our neighborhoods.

The right approach will preserve the unique characters of our neighborhoods, allow for increased density where appropriate, conduce to multi-modal public mobility by furthering our pedestrian,

bicycle, and rapid transit plans, preserve and expand our access to natural spaces, and foster economic development and the success of small businesses.

Parking requirements, too, should be determined on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis.

**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:**

Every neighborhood should have affordable housing options. Of course, no single type of affordable housing is adequate across demographics and neighborhoods, and as I mentioned above, there is no-one-size-fits-all approach across the city to growth or the housing approaches we will need to accommodate that growth.

I think micro-housing is a useful affordable housing option for lower income people and singles. Particularly in the University District, South-Lake Union and some areas on Capitol Hill, where there are concentrations of students, young people just starting out in their careers, and single professionals, micro-housing is going to be an increasing part of the mix. These developments are ideal for residents who don't spend much time at home, need to live close to where they study or work, want to be very nearby vibrant entertainment districts, and place a high premium on the availability of a variety of transit options. We need to make sure that micro-housing developments are consistently regulated across city departments and that our building codes are updated to address the growth in this sort of housing.

More generally, too often currently the important questions around growth, density and height – key variables in the affordability equation – are driven by factors other than sound policy considerations. And related zoning issues are considered in silos, rather than understood as being part of an integrated plan to move forward on development issues in a way that channels growth into the places that are slated to accommodate it while ensuring that growth includes housing affordable to Seattle residents at all income levels.

The recent debate about incentive zoning in South Lake Union is only the latest example. It concerns me that the SLU process went on for more than five years and yet we never created an effective plan to develop the levels of affordable housing that we need – none of the approaches put forward by the mayor and the Council come close to meeting the stated goals -- and instead we became fixated on battling over arbitrary levels of affordable housing fees. The question we should be asking is, “How do we best develop a holistic approach to affordable, and particularly workforce, housing that creates the numbers of units that we need in the designated locations?”

That would require an integrated plan that would not only set the level of incentive zoning affordable housing fees, but also consider that decision in tandem with other decisions the city makes about allowable height and density in the parts of the city like South Lake Union that are intended to grow, and would include finding creative ways to leverage existing surplus city properties in SLU and other parts of the city.

Murray

Bottom line: we want to create compact, diverse, more dense, green, walkable and transit-friendly neighborhoods that include a mix of housing appropriate for people of all income levels.