

**Responses to CAC Comments
Preliminary Draft MIMP Review – October 2008**

01 April 2009: This document describes how the Draft MIMP responds to Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) comments and identifies these locations within the document. Some comments refer to both the MIMP and the EIS; however this list of responses only applies to the MIMP. The original numbering is used to facilitate cross-referencing with the *Preliminary Draft MIMP*. **Mithun's responses are in blue; all other text below is original text from the CAC as reported by DPD.** Due to subsequent editing of the document, some page numbers may differ from the original locations and will be noted as such.

**SEATTLE UNIVERSITY
MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

mithun.com

**SEATTLE
UNIVERSITY
MAJOR
INSTITUTIONS
MASTER PLAN
STANDING
CITIZENS
ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

Members

John Savo (Chair)
Loyal Hanrahan
(Vice Chair)
Paul Chiles
Betsy Mickel
Ellen Sollod
Betsy Hunter
James Kirkpatrick
Maria Barrientos
Bill Zosel
Darren Redick
Tenaya Wright
Paul Kidder

Ex-Officio

September 19, 2008

Dianne Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning and Development
PO Box 94649
Seattle, WA 98124 - 4019
Attn: Lisa Rutzik

Ronald Smith
Vice President of Finance and Business Affairs
Seattle University
901 12th Avenue
Administration Building # 117
Seattle, WA 98122

RE: Seattle University Major Institutions Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee Comments and Recommendations Concerning the Seattle University Major Institutions Master Plan Preliminary Draft and Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Seattle University.

Dear Ms. Sugimura and Mr. Smith,

In accordance with SMC 23.69.032.D(7), the Seattle University Major Institutions Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) submits the following comments on the Preliminary Draft Major Institutions Master Plan (PDMIMP) and the Preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS).

The CAC focused on the physical features of the proposed plan – the height, bulk, and scale.

SEATTLE
Pier 56
1201 Alaskan Way, #200
Seattle, WA 98101

T 206.623.3344
F 206.623.7005

SAN FRANCISCO
660 Market Street, #300
San Francisco, CA 94104

T 415.956.0688
F 415.956.1688

Members

Steve Sheppard –
DON
Lisa Rutzick - DPD
Katiri Schlessman -
SU

The CAC directed their efforts to what the proposed expansion would look like and how it would impact the neighborhood. We care about the scale and position of the buildings; the setbacks and open space; parking; and impacts such as traffic. We believe it is our role to balance the growth of the institution with long term compatibility of the surrounding neighborhoods consistent with SMC 23.69.025.

We want to be clear that a failure to comment specifically on any aspect of the preliminary draft documents does not necessarily mean that the SU CAC is in favor of that aspect of the plan and that the CAC retains the option to amend or expand its comments when it reviews the draft and final documents.

To that end we offer the following specific comments:

Concerning Alternatives to be included in the Draft Seattle University Major Institutions Master Plan and evaluated in the Draft EIS.

Aside from the required “No Action Alternative”, the PDEIS identifies only two additional alternatives: 1) “no Student Housing Alternative and “No Vacations Alternative”. Both of these alternatives are very minor variations of the preferred alternative. The SU CAC concluded that neither is genuine and that a greater range of alternatives needs to be developed and evaluated. Alternatives should look at variations to those elements of the plan that would be real and significant while still meeting the general needs of Seattle University. The SU CAC has focused its attention to issues of bulk and height east of 12th Avenue and to the issue of appropriate boundaries for the overlay district. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The Preliminary Draft MIMP and EIS should be amended to include a broader range of alternatives. These alternatives should include: 1) a no boundary expansion alternative; 2) an alternative significantly reducing proposed height east of 12th; and 3) an alternative encompassing boundary expansion to the south of the existing campus.

Both of these alternatives have been explored and are presented in the Development Program chapter on p90-91.

The Preliminary Draft MIMP and DEIS should be amended to delete further consideration of those alternatives that do not reasonably meet the objectives of the institution and particularly: 1) the no student housing and no vacation alternatives.

The existing alternatives have been preserved because they are formally required or else help shape a comprehensive view of alternative development possibilities. These are found on p88-89.

Concerning the Relationship of in the Draft Seattle University Major Institutions Master Plan to its Adjacent Neighborhoods.

The SU CAC notes that the broad focus of the DEIS in particular needs to be expanded to more fully evaluate the impacts of the SU MIMP on the broader First Hill/Capitol Hill, Squire Park Neighborhoods and on that part of the broader Central District Community north of S. Jackson Street. The DEIS acknowledges only that the Seattle University campus is located within the 12th Ave. Urban Center Village. Seattle University does indeed encompass parts of the 12th Ave community, but is also parts of the broader First Hill/Capitol Hill and Central Areas community. The cumulative impact of institutional, and other, development in these areas is significant. Many new hospital and associated support buildings have been and are currently being built, commercial establishments are moving East across 15, new apartment and condominium buildings are springing up, new transportation corridors are being built and planned. The plan and particularly the EIS need to more fully explore the relationship of continuing development on the Seattle University Campus with broader development in these areas. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The broad focus of the MIMP and particularly the DEIS should be expanded to more fully evaluate the impacts of continuing development on and surrounding Seattle University Campus on the First Hill/Capitol Hill and Central Areas community. This evaluation should include an analysis of the commutative impact of both SU and immediately adjacent institutional development at SMC.

The impact of SU's development upon the surrounding community has been significantly addressed in a new chapter, Campus and Community Context. This has been added to provide greater detail on general design guidelines, activation of campus edges, specific urban design strategies along the 12th Avenue corridor, and the relationship between the MIMP document and adopted neighborhood plans and studies in the surrounding community. This chapter begins on p125.

The SU CAC is also concerned with the relationship of development under the proposed MIMP and the ongoing efforts to spur development along 12th Avenue under the provisions of the 12th Avenue Development plan. That plan specifies both design guidelines and uses along the ground floor areas. The area is also covered under a pedestrian overlay and is subject to the provisions of SMC 23.47A005. The CAC concluded that special efforts should continue to support this effort and that these should be highlighted in the SU MIMP. The CAC therefore recommends that:

Any new development, or substantial renovations or existing uses, along both sides 12th Avenue will follow the provisions of 23.47A005 with respect of street-level uses and specifically include entries along 12th Avenue and includes both pedestrian oriented uses and entries along 12th Avenue.

This recommendation has been included in the *Campus Edge Improvements* section (p128-129) and the *Creating a Vibrant 12th Avenue* section (p130-139) of the *Campus and Community Context* chapter.

The SU CAC also noted that the treatment of the Seattle University boundaries is presently inconsistent. The CAC would like to see greater attention given in the plan to developing a more consistent design approach along all of the boundaries of the University. For instance, both Seattle University and the community would clearly benefit from a more sensitive border treatment along Madison Avenue to create a stronger campus identity through outward-looking architecture, increased visual permeability, and an improved the pedestrian experience. The campus presently essentially turns its back on this street. A similar condition exists along James between Broadway and 12th. While this is not a border, it is a major arterial and has a major impact on the experience of the campus. Finally, 12th Avenue from Jefferson to Madison should be thought of as the primary face of the campus to the community and to the City.

The issue of edge treatment is a significant urban design issue and warrants concentrated study and the development of design goals and objectives. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The Draft Seattle University Master Plan should specify those actions to be undertaken to improve the primary interface points between the University and Community. SU needs to redesign its border along its Campus Edge, and arterials running through the Campus, to create a stronger campus identity through outward-looking architecture, increased visual permeability, and improved pedestrian experience.

This recommendation has been included in the *Campus Edge Improvements* section (p128-129) and the *Creating a Vibrant 12th Avenue* section (p130-139) of the *Campus and Community Context* chapter.

The Seattle University Major Institutions Master Plan should include a commitment to improving pedestrian facilities along the Madison Street frontage.

This recommendation has been addressed in the *General Design Guidelines* section (p126-127) of the *Campus and Community Context* chapter.

Concerning the Treatment of that Portion of the SU Campus east of 12th Avenue

Seattle University is proposing a hybrid campus. Its main campus (west of 12th to Broadway) is a traditional separate campus with clearly defined boundaries and no intervening private development. A definable street grid system is no longer apparent. The area east of 12th is a mix of university and private uses. The street grid remains essentially intact and private development is interspersed in the area.

The relationship of these separate areas and the impacts of the campus on the surrounding area are different. The SU CAC is concerned that the MIMP needs to both recognize this and propose a series of goals and policies that may be different for these two areas. Specifically the MIMP should include development guidelines (FAR, Lot coverage, heights, setbacks, and design guidance) that are specific to each area and carefully consider the impact on immediately adjacent private development, particularly east of 12th Avenue. Essentially the SU CAC recommends that the two portions of the campus be dealt with as two distinct zones with different goals and policies. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The Draft Seattle University Master Plan should include goals, policies, development standards and design guidance specific to that area of its proposed campus east of 12th Avenue.

This recommendation has been included in the *Campus Edge Improvements* section (p128-129) and the *Creating a Vibrant 12th Avenue* section (p130-139) of the *Campus and Community Context* chapter.

Concerning the Development of Design Guidelines

The SU CAC believes that one of the keys to improving the interface between the adjacent neighborhoods and development along the SU boundaries will be outstanding design and development of a cooperative relationship with the surrounding community. The committee believes that this can best be done through the development of design guidelines with the CAC and included in the MIMP to guide the Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) in its review Master Use Permits and building designs. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The Draft Seattle University Master Plan should include specific design guidelines with special emphasis on new development along the street edges of their Campus, and along any arterial street running through campus. These guidelines should be jointly developed by SU and the CAC and included in the final adopted plan.

This recommendation has been included in the *Campus Edge Improvements* section (p128-129) and the *Creating a Vibrant 12th Avenue* section (p130-139) of the *Campus and Community Context* chapter.

Concerning MIO Zoning – Proposed Heights

The SU CAC reviewed the proposed changes to heights included in the PDMIMP. Changes were proposed 1) along the east side of Broadway between the current alley just north of Cherry Street and Cherry Street where the 160 foot height limit would be extended to that area; 2) along the east side of

Broadway between James Way and East Jefferson Street; and 3) east of 12th Avenue where a uniform MIO 65 is proposed to replace a variety of heights.

The CAC makes believes that the height increases along Broadway should be included in the Draft MIMP and evaluated in the EIS. However, the CAC conclude that the uniform MIO 65 east of 12th should be changed in the draft plan and EIS. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The increase to MIO 65 for those areas east of 12th Avenue be approved, with the exception of the current MIO 37 zone north of East Columbia to the MIO boundary just south of East Marion between 13th and 14th Avenues which would be designated as MIO 50.

Seattle University has considered the impact of an MIO-50 designation on the current northern MIO-37 zone between E Cherry and E Marion and has determined that it does not meet the needs for future development. Therefore, the university is keeping the request for an increase to MIO-65. More information on this can be found in the following locations in the Development Program chapter:

- *Long-Term Plan for 1313 E Columbia section on p46-48*
- *Massing Studies section p77 and p80-82*
- *Alternatives section on p88-90*

Concerning Boundary Expansions

The SU CAC reviewed the proposed boundary expansions along both Broadway and 12th Avenue. After considerable discussion, the SU CAC neither endorsed nor opposed the expansions. They should continue to be included in the draft documents for further consideration. However, the SU CAC was concerned that the impact of the boundary expansions on both existing and potential private non-university uses in the boundary expansion areas needed much more evaluation both in the plan and particularly in the EIS as a potential land use impact. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The scope of issues addressed in the Draft EIS should be expanded to specifically evaluate the impact of private for profit (non-university) development in those areas proposed for expansion of the MIO overlay boundary under any alternative proposed.

This is covered in the Draft EIS document, but not in the Draft MIMP.

However, the CAC also concluded that other alternatives to meet SU expansion needs should be evaluated in the draft documents and especially possible long-range expansion to the south. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The plan and EIS should include an alternative that would evaluate possible expansion of the SU MIO Boundary south of Jefferson Street and West of 12.

Both of these alternatives have been explored and are presented in the Development Program chapter on p90-91.

Concerning the Designation and location of Open Space.

The SU CAC notes that the existing SU campus serves an important function as an urban oasis in the areas. It ample and well maintained open spaces are used both by its students and neighbors. The plan envisions great height, bulk and scale east of 12th Avenue. Yet no formal open space is identified for that area. The SUS CAC believes that is a serious oversight and that provision of such apace would be an asset to both Seattle University and its surrounding neighborhood.

With its purchase of the Historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant (Alternately the US West Building designated as site 313 or as 1313 E Cherry Street) , Seattle University may have an opportunity to undertake adaptive re-use and preservation of the historic building on that site while also providing open space. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The plan include designated open spaces east of 12th Avenue and that one of the sites formally evaluated for such a designation be the west half of the Historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant (Alternately the US West Building designated as site 313 or as 1313 E Cherry Street).

Opportunities for the development of new open spaces consistent with the program identified in this MIMP can be found on the *Future Open Space* diagram on p115 of the Development Standards chapter. Due to the unique programmatic opportunities at the 1313 E Columbia site, it is an unlikely location for providing substantial public open space. Locations for other potential open spaces nearby this location are shown on p115. More information on the 1313 E Columbia site can be found in the Long Term Plan for 1313 E Columbia section (p46-48) and in the Massing Studies section (p77 and 80-82).

(See also discussion under specific sites.)

Concerning Street and Alley Vacations

The SU MIMP proposes the vacation of the E. Columbia Street stub approximately 125 feet east to the north-south alley running south from Columbia to E Cherry Street and the vacation of that alley. Property along this alley is not owned by Seattle University and is currently used by the Northwest Kidney Center for both deliveries and patient access. It appears that Seattle University has no intention of pursuing this vacation so long as the Northwest Kidney Center was operating in that location. The CAC therefore recommends that:

That the potential vacation of that portion of E. Columbia Street between Broadway and mid-block between Broadway and the vacated 10th Avenue Right-of-way and the connecting alley south to E Cherry Street shall be pursued by Seattle University only in the event that the University acquires all properties accessed by this street end and alley.

This issue has been clarified in the Planned or Potential Street and Alley Vacations section on p76 of the Development Program chapter.

Concerning the Development of the Historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant (Alternately the US West Building designated as site 313 or as 1313 E Cherry Street)

The SU CAC notes that the Preliminary Draft MIMP identifies intended uses for most sites except the Historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant (Alternately the US West Building designated as site 313 or as 1313 E Cherry Street) which is simply identified as a student life use. While there has been some discussion of various uses, including possible use for a division one basketball arena, these discussions are vague. This is one of the key sites to the community and its development will present special problems and opportunities related to historic preservation and the provision of open space. Development of this site will need to be dealt with very sensitively. The CAC therefore recommends that:

That Seattle University Draft Major Institutions Master Plan should define a specific use for the 1313 Columbia Site.

Several potential uses of the 1313 E Columbia site, including athletic uses, are detailed in the new section *Long Term Plan for 1313 E Columbia* on p46-48 of the Development Program section. Massing studies for these potential uses can be found on p80-82 of the Development Standards section.

The CAC also appreciates that Seattle University presently supports the retention of the façade of the building in any future development, but not necessarily the entire building. The CAC believes that adaptive reuse of the building should continue to be evaluated rather than just incorporating a portion of the facade into any new development. The CAC therefore recommends that:

That Seattle University Draft Major Intuitions Master Plan should contain provisions for the possible preservation of the two-story portion of the Historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant (Alternately the US West Building designated as site 313 or as 1313 E Cherry Street) as a record of the neighborhoods evolution.

The MIMP document includes this recommendation in the Historic Preservation section on p112 of the Development Standards chapter. The Building Demolitions section of the Development Standards chapter cross-references this information on p49.

Concerning the Lynn Building

Seattle University should seek historic designation (landmark status) for the exterior of the Lynn Building and adaptive reuse of the building rather than its demolition and replacement.

The MIMP document includes this recommendation in the Historic Preservation section on p117 of the Development Standards chapter. The Building Demolitions section of the Development Standards chapter cross-references this information on p49.

Concerning the Development of Facilities for Division One Basketball

A great deal of discussion has occurred concerning the manner in which Seattle University will incorporate both practice and game day facilities for its upgraded basketball program. Seattle University has recently indicated its intention to utilize Key Arena in the Seattle Center Area for an unspecified length of time. There has also been discussion of the possible development or an arena possibly utilizing portion of the Historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant (Alternately the US West Building designated as site 313 or as 1313 E Cherry Street). Since development to accommodate this use will be significant and will have both land use and transportation impacts, the CAC recommends that the plan identify how this use will be accommodated both in the short term (leases to the Key Arena) and long-term (any development on or near the existing SU Campus). The CAC therefore recommends that:

The Seattle University Draft Major Intuitions Master Plan should identify the location of any new basketball arena:

Several potential uses of the 1313 E Columbia site, including athletic uses such as basketball, are detailed in the new section Long Term Plan for 1313 E Columbia on p46-48 of the Development Program chapter. Massing studies for these potential uses can be found on p80-82 of the Development Standards chapter.

Concerning Noise Infiltration to the Surrounding Neighborhood

The SU CAC notes that noise infiltration both during construction and the eventual operations of buildings is an ongoing issue for many neighbors. Both student at SU and the surrounding community would clearly benefit from special attention to the design of buildings to assure that noise generation is kept as low as feasible. Some consideration should be given to adopting lower standards decibel level that currently is required by the code. The CAC therefore recommends that:

The Seattle University Master Plan and EIS should be modified to clarify that noise is a major concern and that measures should be considered to reduce noise generation that are even more stringent than that currently required by City of Seattle standards.

Noise issues are primarily handled by the EIS, but are addressed briefly in the *Other Standards* section on p118 of the Development Standards chapter.

Concerning Traffic and Transportation

Developing and implementing an aggressive Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is a critical issue for the broader community and the SU CAC. The transit section of the DEIS appears to remove quantitative goals for transit use Greater use of transit is crucial to maintaining the livability of the community. SU efforts should be aggressive and broad and efforts should be made to carefully coordinate these efforts with other institutions in the area. The SU CAC therefore recommends that:

Seattle University should develop a TMP that more significantly encourages transit uses. The SU TMP should include: 1) new and innovative methods for encouraging and supporting public transportation; and 2) quantitative goals to evaluate its success.

A public presentation on the specific goals, measures, and programs to achieve greater transit use was given on August 13th, 2008. More information can be found in the Transportation Management Program chapter of the MIMP and the transportation-related sections of the EIS.

Increase the efforts to partner with, and spend money with, other institutions such as Swedish, King County Youth Services, Harborview, DSHS, and with Metro to improve public transit serving the University and its neighborhood.

The university is actively engaged with these stakeholders to improve public transit serving the university and its neighborhood. This is an explicit goal within the TMP on p153.

Explore strategies to reduce parking on campus such as: 1) greater use of pricing (Higher costs for on-campus parking) to further decrease on-campus parking demand; and further subsidizing transit passes up to 100% of their cost..

Subsidizing transit passes at 100% does not typically entice more riders to use transit when compared with more modest subsidies. Furthermore, subsidizing transit passes at 100% diverts money away from other transportation management strategies that can encourage non-single-occupancy trips such as ‘guaranteed ride home’, car sharing, and van pools.

Prohibit the establishment of new surface parking lots under the new MIMP for the institution on or east of 12th whether they are temporary or permanent..

No new surface parking lots are proposed in this Master Plan. In fact, many existing surface parking lots are proposed to be replaced with high-quality development, often placing the existing parking below grade in the structures.

Increase the commitment in the plan to encourage greater use of flex cars.

Flex-car use has not yet grown beyond the availability of the 2 cars currently available on campus. The university will work with a car-sharing provider to increase availability if the increase in demand warrants it. The Transportation Management Program presents a comprehensive approach to shifting trips from single-occupancy vehicles to other modes, including flex-cars.

Consider 13th Avenue as a future primary north-south pedestrian route (after full development) and develop streetscape and building facades accordingly

13th Avenue is considered an important campus interface with the community. Guidelines for the development of buildings, streetscapes, and landscapes for all campus edges and areas adjacent to non-university uses can be found in the Campus and Community Context chapter. Design guidelines are found on p126 and campus edge improvements are on p128.

Miscellaneous Additional Recommendations

The Seattle University Major Institution Master Plan should provide greater detail concerning proposed SU leasing in the surrounding areas.

SU doesn't have specific plans to lease additional space at this time. The university may, however, pursue leased space in the vicinity of campus as specific university needs are identified in the future. The university will follow the requirements of the MIO code (23.69.022) with respect to leasing. More information can be found in the *Leased Space* section on p70 of the Development Program chapter.

Add a goal relating to promoting a positive relationship with the community.

The university is dedicated to promoting a positive relationship with the community and has included this as a formal Master Plan goal on p22 of the Mission, Goals, and Objectives chapter. More information about specific connections to neighborhood goals can be found in the *Master Plan Consistency with Neighborhood Plans* section on p140 of the Campus and Community Context chapter.

Add a goal that Seattle University shall continue and expand upon its tradition of design excellence in Architecture.

The university describes its architectural program and commitment to design excellence in the *General Design Guidelines for Campus Development* section on p126 (Building Design).

Add a goal to integrate art and the thinking and work of artists in campus development

These are articulated in two goals in the *General Design Guidelines for Campus Development* section on p127 (Design of Exterior Spaces).

The Draft EIS should reference the estimated electrical, gas, steam, water and sewer needs for the new buildings and evaluate whether existing utilities infrastructure can handle increased demand levels.

Seattle University maintains direct communications with utility providers to coordinate projected demand for infrastructure. All relevant utilities have existing or planned capacity to accommodate the growth of Seattle University per this Master Plan.

The SU MIMP and EIS should clarify how the single occupancy vehicle goals will be measured in the TMP.

The last section of the TMP matrix covers ‘TMP Regulation & Monitoring’ and establishes the SOV goal of 35% and the requirement to conduct a biennial survey of the campus population to measure progress towards the goal. The 35% SOV goal applies to the entire daytime campus population. The university is also required (under the major institution code) to provide an annual report on the master plan that includes TMP related information such as program changes and reports on the survey findings.

We would like to acknowledge the openness of Seattle University and its consultants, Mithun, Blumen Consulting Group and Transportation Solutions, Inc. in discussing the issues raised, and the questions asked, by the CAC. At all times during the review of the Preliminary Drafts of the MIMP and Major Institution Master Plan, the SU team was forthcoming and frank in their comments to the CAC.

I would also like to thank the University leadership for granting the time extensions requested by the CAC that were needed to adequately deliberate on the University proposals.

Sincerely,

John Savo, AIA
Chair