

Minutes #26

(Adopted 5/31/2023)

Seattle Pacific University Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Wednesday, 5/17/2023

6:00 – 7:30 PM

In-person: Seattle City Hall, 3rd Floor, Room 370

Virtual: Webex

Remote Meeting via WebEx – video recording is available on request.

Members and Alternates Present:

Nancy Ousley	Debra Sequeira	John Olensky
Patreese Martin	John Stoddard	
John Rush	Sue Tanner	

Staff Present:

Dave Church	Seattle Pacific University (SPU)
Abby Weber	Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI)
Kelsey Timmer	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Cindy Harper	Consulting Planner SPU
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Nelson Pesigan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Rebekah Anderson	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)

Consultants:

Mike Swenson	Transpo Group
Michele Sarlitto	EA Engineering
Kristy Hollinger	EA Engineering
Steve Gillespie	Foster
Priyanka Saglani	Perkins & Will

(Transcriber's Note: The notes shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions and have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the files in video recording and available upon request.)

1. Welcome & Introductions

Dipti Garg Quick Reminder Name Change- from CAC to DAC per city ordinance
Patreese Martin Meeting #26 Context review.

2. Public Comment Dipti Garg

Jay La Vassar submitted an email comment regarding proposed street and alley vacations. Email was read to the committee and noted.

3. Schedule and Timeline Steve Gillespie

Steve reviewed the process from now until the final report.

- Public hearing on DEIS within 21-50 days after publication.
- DAC SDCI SDOT comment on draft MIMP/EIS
- EA submits preliminary DEIS to SDCI within 6 wks.
- University submits final MIMP within 13 wks.
- SDCI publishes final MIMP and EIS within 7 wks. of submission of preliminary DEIS
- SDCI prepares draft Director's report DON works with DAC to prepare draft DAC report within 5 wks.
- University and DAC will review the comments on the SDCI Directors report; Abby Weber will circulate.
- SDCI will issue the final director's report. If there is a disagreement, there could be a minority report submitted as an option.
- Questions

Nancy O. had requested access to the slide which was available on the overview Dipti had sent out prior, page 2.

Dave C. asked Steve G. when will the meeting occur electronically for the Queen Anne land use review committee? Steve said they will present on June 19th @ 7PM.

Nancy O. requested the committee be emailed in case they wish to participate.

4. Public Hearing Information Abby Weber

We will be publishing the draft MIMP and EIS as well as public notification. That will begin a 30 Day public comment period. The public hearing will be a virtual meeting open to all. It will not be a DAC meeting, but DAC members can attend as a member of the public. The public presentation will include a brief overview of the proposal, and a presentation of the different review components. A brief overview of the alternatives and a high level of discussion of the impacts. This is then followed by a public comment period. This should occur midsummer.

Rezone components

Abby reviewed the slide noting that the Height limit and MIO boundary expansions are considered regional components and therefore a public purpose statement is required by code which then should be reviewed and commented on by DAC in the draft documents.

Presentations

5. Draft MIMP Revisions Review Cindy Harper

Three sections of the presentation, review, progress, and next steps.

Review:

Planning Orientation reviewed planning area/expansion area. Key Strategies review of what SPU is planning to do. Reviewed 6 in total:

1. Establish a primary campus entrance along Cremona.
2. Develop the boundaries and transition between campus and low-rise residential areas.
3. Concentrate academic functions south of Nickerson Street.
4. Right size academic and student life space.
5. Provide more on-campus student housing.
6. Continue growth down the hill towards north and east and not south residential areas.

October 5th, 2022, meeting Review:

Review of the themes discussed:

- Plan Document
- Growth
- Expansion Areas
- Building Heights
- Campus Edges
- Campus Trees & Open Spaces
- Traffic & Parking

October 19th, 2022, meeting Review:

- Discussed SPU intent including a sense of place, aspirational plan, and public benefit.
- Discussed Bulk Regulations including height limits, setbacks, floor area ratio, lot coverage, open space, structure width & depth, façade modulation.
- Discussed Specific Applications of both Ashton Hall Block and Hill Hall Block.

Progress: January -April 2023

Focus has been to provide changes and updates including updated maps, graphic numbers, and alternatives.

New and Updated Content for Draft EIS

- Maps
- Graphics
- Numbers
- Alternatives
- Shadow Studies
- Views
- Renderings

Updates to Revised Preliminary Draft MIMP

- Added cross-references in text and appendix.
- Adjusted Zoning Modification Table.
- Clarified specific standards: landscaping,
- structure width and depth, setbacks, etc.

- Added more details to text: expansion.

Other Related Work

Response to rezone criteria comments

Response to DAC questions from previous meetings

Next Steps-May-June 2023

DAC Responsibilities

- Themes & Topics for Review
- Deliverable- Comment letter will be after a review of the MIMP and Draft EIS

Draft MIMP

- Components Table of Contents has been updated to include Exec Summary.
- Navigation

SPU Responses to Comments and Questions Summary- Cindy Harper

Question Topics

- **Future commercial development south of Nickerson on east side of campus:**

Question/Comment was regarding east part of campus and how the new buildings would effect commercial development?

Response summary: MIMP provides new SF for commercial use including existing use. SPU can't force businesses and does not control who stays or leaves.

- **Campus vs. neighborhood design guidelines**

Question/Comment was requesting a comparison of campus design guidelines vs. neighborhood design guidelines and how are SPU's unique.

Response Summary: There are no neighborhood design guidelines for the area, nor code requirements. Most potential new buildings are in the core campus area. SPU's guidelines are unique because they are mostly posed as questions which are open-ended.

- **Illustrative vs technical maps.**

Question/Comment was requesting more information about open space technology.

Response summary: Typologies consider shape, use, context, size, prominence, and relationship to buildings. Open-space typology is not required but helps to illustrate open space concepts and how they work within the overall space framework.

Question/Comment wanted a distinguishment between illustrative maps and maps showing and actual SF.

Response summary: Base maps are drawn to scale. All new buildings show actual SF. All existing buildings, parcels, and zoning districts show approx. SF. Other diagrams are drawn to illustrate concepts.

- **Ashton Hall site and 65-foot height limit**
- **Ashton Hall site relationship to nearby residential**

Question/Comment asking if Ashton be a non-conforming building? Concerns brought up about a 6 story building on 5th Ave.

Response summary: In 2000 the MIMP designated this area @65 ft. Adjacent development is increasing in density, 6 stories envisioned on elbow of 5th Ave W. The vacated Etruria side is lower due to topography.

6. Transportation Review EIS -Mike Swenson

Public Comment #1 Summary: Sharon LeVine.

Closure of 6th and that there had not been any studies initiated.

Response Summary: The MIMP does not approve any street or ally vacation, but rather it alerts the community that the University may wish to propose vacation in the future and at that time, a study would be proposed.

Public Comment #2 Summary: Kristin Carlson

Were the traffic impact studies were done when the University was in session and not during COVID or summer.

Response Summary: School years 2018-2019 were used. Those estimates were truth-tested against actual data.

DAC Comment #1: Nancy Ousley

Are the streets wide enough for traffic circles?

Response Summary: SDOT has sole jurisdiction and there are currently no active proposals currently. The University will support traffic circles if the community wants them.

DAC Comment #2: John Rush

Will there be bicycle transportation modeling around 3rd and Bertona?

Response Summary: There are no planned or potential projects that would impact either the existing signal at 3rd or future potential signal at 6th.

DAC Comment #3: John Rush

Asked for clarification on the traffic light installation on 6th.

Response Summary: SPU supports the 2000 MIMP proposal as the signal will provide an alternate means to access Nickerson.

DAC Comment #4: John Rush

Asked about the queue's backup if 70-100ft or approximately 4 cars on 6th.

Response Summary: This information will be added to the Transportation Discipline Report.

DAC Comment #5: Nancy Ousley

Will the street need to be widened at 6th and Nickerson?

Response Summary: Not at this time but SDOT could revise existing parking which would be deciphered in design discussions with SDOT.

DAC Comment #6: Patreese Martin

Has a study been done that will account for people moving into the area. There is a concern for safety. The arterials will see more use.

Response Summary: After analysis of the mitigation scenario, it is assumed that 80% of rerouted trips will use 6th street and 20% will use Nickerson via neighborhood streets. This represents 31 trips per day and 39 at peak PM hours.

DAC Comment #7: (Response)

A collection of counts was made. Please refer to the slide. 3

Transport collected counts at the following intersections in the neighborhood west and south of SPU both when SPU classes were in session and when they were *not* in session to understand the impacts of SPU-related traffic along neighborhood streets:

1. 8th Avenue W (West) & W Barrett Street
2. 8th Avenue W (East) & W Barrett Street
3. 8th Avenue W & W Dravus Street
4. 6th Avenue W & W Dravus Street
5. 5th Avenue W & W Barrett Street

The traffic counts indicated that volumes along the adjacent roads are low during the AM and PM peak hours (generally under 60 vehicles per hour, or less than 1 vehicle per minute). Along several street segments the peak hour traffic volumes decrease when SPU classes are in session. Along W Barrett Street, traffic volumes increase by at most 15 vehicles during the AM peak hour, and 3 vehicles during the PM peak hour. Along W Dravus Street, traffic volume decrease during the AM peak hour and increase by at most 12 vehicles during the PM peak hour. Along 8th Avenue W, traffic volumes increase by at most 9 vehicles during the AM peak hour, and 2 vehicles during the PM peak hour.

DAC Comment #8: Eric Hanson

Will changes be proposed at 3rd Ave. between Dravus and Nickerson?

Response Summary: None are noted at this time. The pedestrian level is not likely to change.

DAC Comment #9: Sue Tanner

Asked for a study to be completed at 8th Ave and Barrett as there are upcoming projects that will add traffic.

Summary Response: MIMP has minimal impacts, and the property is not under the control of the University.

DAC Comment #10: Patreese Martin

What leverage is there to reduce parking?

Summary Response: RPZ area are outlined, and the University supports its ongoing implementation.

DAC Comment #11: Nancy Ousley

Asked about street vacation process and wished for them to be made available.

Response Summary: MIMP presents it in a visual matter, but inclusion does not imply approval. Further analysis will be required by SDOT and the City Council as part of any final decision.

Kelsey Timmer provided a link regarding City policy for street and alley at the meeting.

<https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/SDOT/PublicSpaceManagement/2018CityCouncilStreetVacationPoliciesAdoptedByResolution31809.pdf>

7:18 PM Meeting Adjourned.

Public Comment: Attached

Seattle Pacific University Development Advisory Committee (DAC)

Subject: Proposed Street and Alley Vacations

Seattle Pacific University is requesting street and alley vacations from the City of Seattle as part of its new Master Plan (MIMP). It is requesting that portions of six streets and two alleys be vacated for its exclusive use. This would involve ceding four acres of publicly owned land and giving it to a private institution.

This action is not needed for the other University developments proposed in the MIMP for the future development of the University. These street and alley vacations would cause harm to the neighborhood traffic circulation patterns and loss of up maybe 100 on-street parking spaces. As to the University providing compensating parking spaces, under the last 20-year MIMP none of the parking structures were built. Charging for use of university parking spaces causes students to avoid them and use neighborhood street-parking. Also, the neighbors who would be losing on-street parking could not use the University provided spaces.

The traffic analysis showing there will be few adverse effects for the street and alley vacations is in error. As an experiment SDOT might temporarily close the section of 6th Ave West between West Cremona Street and West Dravis Street and evaluate the impact to traffic and asking neighbors their opinion of the results.

Giving the University four acres of land by the city would be very costly. Considering tenth acre lots in the area selling for \$500,000 each ceding four acres of land would be worth 20 million dollars.

The proposed MIMP has many good features that would benefit both the University and the neighborhood except for the street and alley vacations. The Development Advisory Committee should go on the record as opposing the proposed street and alley vacations.

Jay La Vassar