



March 19, 2019

Carly Guillory
Seattle Department of Construction & Inspection
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

RE: Seattle University Standing Advisory Committee Review and Comment for 1300 Columbia
Property Minor Amendment Proposal - SDCI Project #3033147

Dear Ms. Guillory,

The Seattle University Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) has reviewed the proposed amendment for the 1300 East Columbia property to the Seattle University Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) and recommends that SDCI review and approve it as a minor amendment.

Seattle University requested a determination by the Director of the Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) as to whether the University's use of the property at 1300 East Columbia would require amendment to the University's MIMP. The change requested is to update the MIMP to reflect the Code-authorized major institution use of existing improvements on the property until the University redevelops the site at some point in the future. The change does not alter any of the Council-mandated open space requirements, which the University committed to and will build in conjunction with future development of the site, as required by the MIMP.

Background

The Seattle Municipal Code permits major institution uses within the MIO. The 1300 East Columbia property has been within the MIO since well before the adoption of the current MIMP, although the University did not acquire it until after MIMP approval. The MIMP anticipated the University's acquisition and significant development of the site and did not prohibit any interim institutional use of the existing structures or surface parking lot.

SMC 23.69.008 defines and authorizes "Permitted Uses" as follows: "All uses that are functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the central mission of a Major Institution or that primarily and directly serve the users of an institution shall be defined as Major Institution uses and shall be permitted in the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) District." The SAC agrees that this definition permits major institution use of the 1300 East Columbia property prior to development. The requested minor amendment updates the MIMP's Development Program to reflect the Seattle Municipal Code's authorization for major institution uses within the MIO.

The MIMP presumed the hospital laundry would continue to operate, and the major institution uses in the existing improvements are less impactful than the operation of the hospital laundry. Thus, proposal

to allow the University to use the existing building and parking lot for institutional use pending redevelopment will not result in greater impacts than those contemplated in the adopted master plan. In addition, the MIMP intended the site to be put into major institution use; it anticipated that the property would someday support major institution uses in a substantial redevelopment, possibly with a footprint of 45,000 square feet or greater. Because this use is consistent with the intent of the adopted MIMP and will not produce significantly greater impacts than anticipated in the MIMP, the SAC agrees that the proposal qualifies as a minor amendment under SMC 23.69.035.D.1.

Recommendations

The SAC met twice to discuss the proposed minor amendment. The intent of these meetings was to update the committee on the University's use of the property and provide comments to Seattle University. At their second meeting, the SAC was asked to review the proposed minor amendment and submit comments on whether it should be considered minor or major and what conditions if any should be imposed if it is minor.

The SAC understands that Seattle University intends to take the following actions regarding the 1300 Columbia property:

- The existing parking lot already has existing and well established landscaping including trees and shrubs. The University shall maintain these landscaped areas consistent with the standards used for the campus in general.
- In addition to maintenance of the existing landscaping, the University agrees to expand the landscape areas to comply with Major Institution Master Plan Development Standards for Landscape Screening for parking lots located along any MIO boundary and to accomplish this no later than December 2019 if the Standards are deemed applicable by SDCI. If SDCI determines that the Development Standard for Landscape Screening do not apply, the University shall make a good faith effort to provide screening along 14th Avenue in addition to the existing landscaping before the same date.
- The University shall clean and/or paint the eastern façade of the building facing 14th Avenue no later than December 2019.
- The University shall conduct periodic "trash patrols" to ensure the area is free of trash accumulation.
- The University Department of Public Safety shall include the 1300 East Columbia property on their routine security patrols to limit nuisance activity on the site.
- All conditions documented in the MIMP for 1300 Columbia including setbacks, height constraints and open space requirements remain in effect.

In light of the above, the SAC has no objections to allowing the University to use the existing improvements in the acquired property for Major Institution uses. In accordance with SMC 23.69.035, the SAC recommends that the proposed amendment to the Master Plan be considered a Minor Amendment.

Seattle University SAC Members include:

David Arnesen
John Feit
Loyal Hanrahan
James Kirkpatrick

Denise Matz
Michelle Moore
Wolf Saar
Pam Stewart
Mark Stoner
Wes Wheless
Bill Zosel

If you have any questions, please contact Maureen Sheehan at (206) 684-0302.

Sincerely,

Maureen Sheehan
Department of Neighborhoods,
Major Institutions and Schools Coordinator

Attached:

Final Meeting Minutes - #1 February 5, 2019

Draft Meeting Minutes - #2 April 2, 2019 (to be approved)



Minutes #9

(Adopted April 2, 2019)

Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) for Seattle University

Tuesday, February 5, 2019

5:30 – 7:30 PM

Seattle University

Student Center, 1000 E. James Way, Room 130

Seattle WA 98122

Attendees:

John Feit

Wolf Saar

Bill Zosel

James Kirkpatrick

Pam Stewart

Maureen O’Leary (Alternate)

Michelle Moore

Wes Wheless

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan

Michael Houston

Lara Branigan

Colleen Pike

Robert Schwartz

1. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Pam Stewart opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

Ms. Maureen Sheehan announced that Michael Mead is no longer with the committee as he moved out of the neighborhood. She mentioned that Mr. Michael Houston from SDCI (Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections) is present tonight.

A motion was made to adopt the September 13, 2018 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. Center for Science and Innovation – New Sciences Building Update

Ms. Stewart introduced Ms. Colleen Pike to present an update to the Center for Science and Innovation project.

Ms. Pike commented that the project is underway. The University will present to the Board of Trustees on February 20th and ask to proceed in construction. The formal groundbreaking ceremony is scheduled on May 30th. The permitting process will proceed as soon as possible after the groundbreaking. She noted that the new building is set to open in September 2021.

4. Transportation Management Progress and Committee Discussion

Ms. Stewart introduced Mr. Craig Birkliid to present the transportation management plan.

Mr. Birkliid summarized the overall parking profile and transportation demands for the University. Overall parking demand has declined and there was an increase in transit options and use of alternate transportation modes.

The University helps fund the Residential Parking Zones (RPZs) around the campus property. He added that due to the changes from single-family residence to multi-family residences, the cost of the program has increased. Due to an increase in on-campus housing they have seen a relief in parking and transportation demands. He mentioned that restricting parking for freshman year students also reduced parking demand also helping students learn to navigate the city by transit or walking.

The University also provides a Nighthawk Safe ride program that provides safe rides for students within 6-8 blocks of campus. The availability and proliferation of car services such as Uber, Lyft, Car2Go, Reach, Scoop, etc. also provide viable options for students rather than car ownership. The University has a very robust regional business passport ORCA transit pass for eligible employees as well as discounts for students.

The University continues to support bicycle commuters by having over 450 covered and uncovered bike rack spaces across campus, secured storage rooms and access to showers for all staff and students and lockers for a nominal fee, and other services including the use of fleet vans for educational and recreational outings.

The University's partnered with the City of Seattle Department of Transportation to provide traffic and pedestrian signals at 12th and East Marion and 12th and East Spring St. to improve campus access, traffic flow, pedestrian safety and flow of emergency vehicles.

Mr. Robert Schwartz commented if there is a better alternative for the RPZ that would provide more benefit to the neighborhood instead of subsidizing private developments. Ms. Sheehan noted that the institution could explore alternatives for an equitable way to provide mitigation impacts and benefits to the neighborhood in lieu of an RPZ subsidy.

Mr. Bill Zosel asked if the use of Uber and Lyft are counted in the SOV goal. He also asked about more details and information regarding how the SOV goal numbers were calculated and the CTR survey. Ms. Sheehan commented that SDOT reviews the annual report that the institution submitted and looks at the transportation management plan. Mr. Zosel requested they invite a representative from SDOT to explain what the numbers meant in the SOV rate and CTR for a better understanding about the institution's transportation goals.

5. Proposed Minor Amendment

Ms. Stewart introduced Ms. Pike to present the proposed minor amendment.

Ms. Pike presented an overview of the proposed minor amendment of the 1300 Columbia property and its current location and use. She noted that the property was not owned by the University when the MIMP was approved and was identified as a potential acquisition and development site in the MIMP.

The University is requesting an approval of the proposed minor amendment to continue the use of the property for general storage, support construction projects and parking until developed in the future.

Ms. Pike added that the letter submitted to SDCI that summarizes the University's intent to proceed with the proposed minor amendment request.

6. Public Comments

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comments 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 voice recording (.mp3) form)

Comments from Ms. Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod commented that she served as a former member when the Institution's MIMP is being developed. She noted that the material that was presented about the proposed minor amendment is misleading. On page 127 of the MIMP, the property is identified and designated as planned open space. She added that the City Council makes an amendment to the MIMP and it is a very serious directive. She noted that it was a contentious part of the MIMP development with community outcry and engagement about these two parcels of land. She added that not only the MIMP addresses a planned opened space but also the edges around the University. She encouraged the committee to involve the neighborhood in discussing this minor amendment and have the University make it open space before proceeding to a vote.

7. Committee Deliberation/Vote on Minor Amendment

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

The Committee deliberated and had a back and forth discussion about the specifics of the proposed minor amendment. The committee members asked for more details and clarity about the University's plan for this property and the potential impact to the neighborhood if the requested minor amendment is denied by this committee. The issues that were discussed was around perpetuity, timeline, and ways that could benefit the surrounding neighborhood in an interim basis. The institution commented that there is no immediate development plan in the pipeline for the property. The institution also added that their intent was not to make major changes or back away from having an open space.

Ms. Sheehan commented that if there are questions that would help the committee decide to recommend or deny the proposed minor amendment request, she can make a request from SDOT or SDCI to come to the future meeting. She also recommends putting in conditions on the minor amendment and the committee could have SDCI explain the different parameters of these conditions. She added that SDCI will make the final decision, but it is up to this committee to present the pros and cons of granting or denying the minor amendment request that the SDCI can enforce.

She mentioned that she will work with the institution and the City (SDCI, SDOT) to find a date for the next meeting to present in more details about the proposed request and the reference to the MIMP. She is looking at scheduling the next meeting within 30-45 days.

8. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.



Minutes #10

(Adopted TBD)

Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) for Seattle University

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Seattle University

Vi Hilbert Hall, 1107 East Madison

Seattle WA 98122

Attendees:

John Feit	Denise Matz	Pam Stewart	Bill Zosel
Loyal Hanrahan	Michelle Moore	Mark Stoner	Maureen O’Leary (Alt.)
James Kirkpatrick	Wolf Saar	Wes Wheless	Manette Stamm (Alt.)

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan	Michael Houston	Lara Branigan
Colleen Pike	Robert Schwartz	

1. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Pam Stewart opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the February 5, 2019 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. RPZ Update (04:10)

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion on the RPZ Update.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan mentioned that at the last meeting, there was a Committee discussion around RPZ (Residential Parking Zone) program in the neighborhood operated by the City of Seattle. There was a discussion around parking, transportation. With the influx of multi-family units, the cost of the RPZ subsidy will increase for the University.

She noted that the University suggested they would look into moving away from subsidizing the RPZ and invest in the community in a way that is equitable. She went back to SDOT to begin a conversation with them, and they mentioned that they are open to have a meeting with the University. Due to schedule challenges, the University and SDOT have not met, but both are willing to explore alternatives. If that is the path, the discussion will be presented to this Committee because it could be a minor amendment to the Master Plan or the Transportation Management Plan. This will not be a one-time conversation between the City and the University.

The Committee had a back and forth discussion and they agreed that the RPZ is not working for everybody, is outdated. and the transportation landscape has changed over the years. This may be a good opportunity to identify possible alternatives.

Ms. Sheehan asked for feedback to identify issues, questions, and possible solutions. The University has initiated a conversation with SDOT about the process. She would like to gather feedback and questions from the Committee about the RPZ:

- SDOT for more RPZ program information or introduction, how it works, etc.,
- How SU utilizes the RPZ program, time of day, etc.
- Pros/Cons of having an RPZ program.
- How will RPZ affect if there is a change in the SU area compared to other zones/area such as Swedish Cherry Hill.

She will also provide an RPZ map to the Committee.

Ms. Stewart suggested on inviting a representative from SDOT to discuss and explain the RPZ program.

4. Proposed Minor Amendment (20:18)

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion on the proposed minor amendment.

Ms. Colleen Pike provided an overview of the location of the 1300 Columbia Property. The University is requesting to amend the MIMP (Major Institution Master Plan) to allow the institution to maintain the existing use of the property. The University is not asking to change any of the City Council's mandated open space requirements. The University is requesting approval of the minor amendment without any additional conditions to use the property until it is developed in the future.

The University plans to invest in the property and already has existing and well-established landscape including trees and shrubs. The University is planning to clean and paint the eastern façade of the building facing 14th Avenue in December 2019. Periodic trash patrols are conducted. The Department of Public Safety patrols the area to limit any nuisance activity on the site. All conditions documented in the MIMP remain in effect in the property.

Ms. Pike provided data on the MIMP parking requirements on the 1300 Columbia Property showing the spaces are within the minimum and maximum range if additional spaces in the Columbia property lot are added.

5. Public Comments (41:07)

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for public comments. There were no public comments.

6. Committee Deliberation/Vote on Minor Amendment (26:45)

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for committee deliberation.

The Committee began to deliberate on the issues concerning the University's proposed minor amendment. The Committee had a back and forth discussion about the vague language within the

Master Plan and it will be up to SDCI (Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections) to interpret the intent of the Land Use code on surface parking within the Institution's MIO (Major Institutions Overlay).

Mr. Michael Houston of SDCI commented about the minor amendment proposal and talked about an exemption change to the Master Plan and he will go back to SDCI to look for clarity in the interpretation of the language concerning the Land Use code within the MIO.

The Committee discussed ways to make the surface parking lot visually appealing to the residential neighborhood through landscape improvements, screenings, etc. that is prescribed in the Master Plan. Ms. Sheehan commented that a final decision will be made by SDCI. She suggested that any recommendations and conditions that the Committee would like to present be actionable and enforceable by SDCI.

There was a motion to support the draft minor amendment presented by the University with the addition that SDCI should make a land use code interpretation and determination whether the standard landscape screening for the surface parking lot applies in the Master Plan. If SDCI determines that it does not apply, the Committee asks the University to make a good faith effort as a good neighbor to the nearby residents to provide landscape screenings by the end of the year. The motion was seconded, the Committee voted, and the motion passed.

7. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

Ms. Pike mentioned about a ground-breaking event for the new Center for Science and Innovation Building on May 30th at 11:30 am. An email invitation will be sent out to the Committee to anyone who can attend. The new building will be opened in Fall 2021.

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.