



City of Seattle
 Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
 Bernie Agor Matsuno, Director

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

Seattle University
 Major Institutions
 Master Plan Standing
 Citizens Advisory
 Committee

MEETING NOTES

Meeting #35

Thursday, January 12, 2012

Adopted on March 16, 2016

Seattle University
 Meeting Room

1313 Columbia Building, Room 115

Members

Loyal Hanrahan
 Betsy Mickel
 Ellen Sollod
 Betsy Hunter
 Paul Kidder
 James Kirkpatrick
 Maria Barrientos
 John Savo
 Bill Zosel
 Marcia Peterson
 Mark Stoner

Members Present

John Savo
 Loyal Hanrahan
 Paul Kidder

Bill Zosel
 Mark Stoner

Betsy Mickel
 James Kirkpatrick

Members Absent

Ellen Sollod

Marcia Peterson

Maria Barrientos

Ex Officio Members Present

Robert Schwartz, SU

Steve Sheppard, DON

Lisa Rutzick, DPD

Others Present (Staff and Guests)

Brodie Bain
 Joy Jacobson

David Neth

Jordon Heitzman

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard –
 DON
 Lisa Rutzick – DPD
 Robert Schwartz – SU

I. Opening and Introductions

The meeting was opened by John Savo, brief introductions followed.

II. Presentation on Logan Field

Robert Schwartz from Seattle University briefly went over the proposed upgrades to Logan Field. He noted that the orientation of the baseball facility will be changed to eliminate a glare problem for pitches. While the overall purpose of this renovation is to improve facilities for recreational sports, this renovation and re-orientation will bring the facility into compliance with Division One standards. The facility will include soccer and softball fields and a running track. The facility will also include an entry plaza. So long as no scheduled activities are ongoing, the facility will be open to the public. He noted that there will be a small clubhouse restroom and vender area as well as a small press box.

One of the concerns was the need for netting to protect others from fly balls etc. A great deal of effort had been given to making this feature work. It will be pulled back inside of the running track fence. Lighting will be included and will be similar to the shielded light fixtures at Garfield Playfield. They will be timed to be off after 11:00 PM.

Mr. Schwartz also noted that there will be a small reader board sign associated with the field. Steve Sheppard noted that at Seattle Central Community College a similar reader-board was proposed and it was discovered that there was an obscure provision in the Major Institutions

Code that required either that allowance of a sign be included in the adopted Master Plan or be authorized as an Amendment to the plan. In their case once they discovered this, their SAC then met and approved installation of a reader-board sign as a minor amendment ever prior to such being identified. In that case they just indicated their approval of amending the plan to authorize reader-board signs along commercially zoned streets. After some discussion it was moved and seconded that:

The CAC has been apprised and reviewed the location for a potential reader-board sign associated with the renovation of Logan Field, and that in the event that Seattle University proposes such a sign, and the City Department of Planning and Development concludes that such would require an amendment to the plan in effect at that time, the CAC recommends that such a sign be allowed under a minor amendment to the Seattle University Master Plan.

The question was called and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Review of Changes to the Analysis, Recommendation and Determination of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development

Lisa Rutzick was introduced to go over the changes to the Draft Director's Report. Mr. Rutzick passed out a table that included all CAC and other comments and identified changes made to the report in response to these comments. She then briefly went over the table.

Editor's Note: Only those comments where significant changes were made, or where the recommendation from DPD differs with that made by the CAC are included in these meeting notes. Where comments were either simply noted or required no substantive change, they are not referenced here.

Mr. Rutzick noted that the CAC has stated that the open space requirements along 14th Avenue were too vague and open ended and recommended adding the phrase publically accessible and modifications to the designation of the map on page 125 of the MIMP. DPD is recommending making these changes.

She noted that the CAC had advised that SU should not be responsible for the development of a street plan for properties that are outside of their MIO. Ms. Rutzick noted that after further discussions with SDOT changes were made to indicate that the required streetscape design plans will be for the east side of Broadway between Madison and Jefferson Street and for the south side of Madison between Broadway and 12th Avenue.

She also noted that there were minor changes to the wording concerning replacement housing requirement to state that the demolition of structures with residential uses or change of use of those structures to major institution uses within the boundary expansion area may not be approved unless comparable replacement housing is proposed. She noted that there were also changes to the list of street activating uses.

She noted that in the prior draft she had recommended that an EIS would be required for the Event Center. Seattle University noted that it was impossible to make this prior-determination. After consideration of this the new draft states that the Event Center is not approved as a part of this MIMP and that it would therefore require a major amendment to the plan to build the Event Center. It was noted that a major amendment is similar to doing a new MIMP.

There was considerable discussion of this issue. Ms. Rutzick stated that she might be able to identify some ways to simplify this process. Robert Schwartz stated that the CAC has been dealing with this issue of years with multiple looks at height bulk and scale. The CAC has never taken issue with the arena as a potential use. He noted that there would always be a project level review and EIS.

Ms. Rutzick read the language from the director's report as follows:

Of particular concern to the community is one of the three alternative development schemes proposed at this site: an event center to accommodate 5,000 people. Such a use poses potential unique traffic, parking, noise, and scale impacts which could affect the livability and vitality of the residential community to the east. The FEIS does not contain an analysis of the impacts associated with an event center. These impacts would have to be analyzed on a project specific basis at the time a Master Use Permit application is submitted. At the time of this Master Plan, the event center

use is not approved, although nothing precludes possible amendment of the Plan in the future according to the provisions of SMC 23.69.035.

DPD Recommendation

❶ Page 51, new sentence at end of page as follows: “The event center alternative proposed at 1313 East Columbia (or 1300 East Columbia) is not approved as part of the Master Plan at this time.”

Mr. Schwartz stated that he objected to the last part of the recommendation “is not approved as part of the Master Plan at this time”. Joy Jacobson suggested that a statement might be crafted that required additional study when a proposal was brought forward. Ms. Rutzick stated that the Event Center is less well defined than other known uses. Others noted that the alternative language “Should the event Center alternative be proposed at this site, it is expected that an EIS will be required to evaluate impacts including, but not limited to noise scale, light, glare, traffic, and parking specific to the use being proposed.” Ms. Rutzick noted that this is not a condition but simply a statement of what is already required.

John Savo stated that he agreed with Ms. Rutzick. There has been little information presented about the details of this proposal and definite concerns expressed by the community and the CAC regarding that particular use at that location. The CAC has never taken the position that it can't be done, but the language that this is not approved goes farther and implies that the use shouldn't go there. There are hurdles to be overcome prior to formal location of the event center here, but there should be some acceptable language that can be crafted other than that this is not approved.

Steve Sheppard stated that language along the line of:

Prior to any decision by the institution to move forward with an event center, the following shall occur: a traffic analysis shall be completed and presented to the Standing Advisory Committee; pre-schematic designs showing the approximate lay out and size of the building shall be presented to the community.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he would be more comfortable with this direction rather than outright non-approval. Others agreed. After brief discussion the wording was amended to:

Prior to any decision by Seattle University to move forward with a MUP application for an event center, the following shall be required: 1) a traffic analysis and site specific light, glare, and noise studies shall be completed for review with the Standing Advisory Committee; 2) alternative locations have been evaluated; and 3) the project shall have been presented to the Community at a widely advertised meeting at the conceptual design phase. In the event that a decision is made to move to the MUP phase, and as part of any MUP or SEPA review, the Standing Advisory Committee shall be given the opportunity to review and comment on the project during the schematic and design development phases.

Mr. Schwartz again stated general agreement with the conditions. Members also agreed with the language as presented. Steve Sheppard noted that this would be a council condition and would be required to occur prior to intake for a MUP.

Bill Zosel asked if this precluded the requirement for an amendment. Ms. Rutzick stated that if this direction is taken there would be no specific amendment required.

Discussion then turned to the location of open space. Ms. Rutzick noted that the CAC has recommended that open space be publically accessible and the University had presented additional information to better define this. Ms. Rutzick stated that the Director's Report now reads:

DPD Recommendation -- These conditions are reiterated in Section.

❶ The following sentence shall be added to page 125 as follows:
“Neither the short or long term development plans propose future development on the 1300 East Columbia site (not currently under university ownership). Given the sensitive edge condition of this

site, high-quality, welcoming open space shall be provided prior to or simultaneously with development at 1300 East Columbia Street consistent with the requirements of this condition. This open space shall be publicly accessible and urban in character, providing relief both visually and in the activities offered. Elements of these spaces shall include, but are not limited to landscaping, hardscaping, seating, artwork, trash receptacles and irrigation. The Admissions and Alumni courtyard just east of 12th and Marion provides an example of such high-quality open space.

Prior to issuance of a Master Use Permit for any project that would result in a building footprint exceeding 45,000 square feet at the 1300 East Columbia site, the University shall develop a plan to provide additional open space within the MIO east of 12th Avenue, present the plan to the Standing Advisory Committee for review and comment, and obtain DPD approval of the plan.”

② The following sentence shall be added to page 125 as follows:

“Given the sensitive edge condition of the site located at 1313 East Columbia (#312), high-quality, welcoming open space shall be provided prior to or simultaneously with development at this site consistent with the requirements of this condition. This open space shall be publicly accessible and urban in character, providing relief both visually and in the activities offered. Elements of these spaces shall include, but are not limited to landscaping, hardscaping, seating, artwork, trash receptacles and irrigation. The Admissions and Alumni courtyard just east of 12th and Marion provides an example of such high-quality open space.

Prior to issuance of a Master Use Permit for any project that would result in a building footprint exceeding 75,000 square feet at the 1313 East Columbia site, the University shall develop a plan to provide additional open space within the MIO east of 12th Avenue, present the plan to the Standing Advisory Committee for review and comment, and obtain DPD approval of the plan.”

Mr. Schwartz stated that Seattle University still has issues with this recommendation.

IV. Public Comments

Comments of David Neth - Mr. Neth noted that the Arena appears to be a more significant issue than previously considered. He noted that some viewed the lack of windows overlooking surrounding properties as a positive. He noted that there is a lack of information on the possible sports center. He stated that he thought that the Committee should have a fuller review of the Event Center.

V. Additional Seattle University Comments

Open Space on 1313 and 1300 E. Columbia Street - Mr. Schwartz stated that Seattle University is not comfortable with the use of the term planned open space as it relates to open space at 1300 and 1313 East Columbia. This implies that the open space must occur on each site. Instead the University is proposing that when development milestones are reached the Seattle University be required to submit a plan that shows Seattle University’s actual open space plan east of 12th. Lisa Rutzick responded that the intent was that open space on this site be a given, not just a possibility, and in addition to the overall landscape plan. She noted that these are sensitive sites on the boundary and that her thinking was that open space should occur on these sites. John Savo agreed that this was the intent of previous discussions and that there should be visible and usable open spaces as part of any development on these two sites.

Mark Stoner noted that when the CAC previously discussed removing the term “substantial” from this discussion that the intent was that this open space occur on these sites, or one of them, and not generally east of 12th. He stated that it should be on one of these two or both. He suggested at the wording from Seattle University might work if it were restated that prior to the development of 1300 or 1313 East Columbia that Seattle University be required to submit a plan that shows Seattle University’s actual open space plan for the aggregate of these two sites. Others expressed concern that such a plan might defer open space to the 1313 site and then develop 1300 prior to acquisition of 1313.

John Savo proposed the following general language:

That in the event that development above the threshold of 75,000 gross square feet on 1313 E Columbia Street or 45,000 gross square feet on 1300 E. Columbia Street, that Seattle University submit a plan that shows Seattle University's actual open space plan for these two sites.

Mr. Schwartz reiterated that the major concern of the University is that the term planned for both sites and the implication that this be on both sites. There was discussion of the prior intent of the CAC. Steve Sheppard read excerpts from the prior meeting notes that dealt with this issue as follows:

Concerning Recommendation 11 and 12 – Open Space Requirements on 1300 and 1313 East Columbia –

After further discussion the CAC endorsed: 1) changing the sentences in recommendations 11 and 12 from substantial public open space to publically accessible open space, and 2) changing the legend on page 125 to include two new classifications: 1) Planned Open Space (SU owned land), and 2) Planned Open Space (if Acquired) and that these two classifications apply only to the 1300 and 1313 sites. Members indicated that they intended that open space be a requirement and not just a goal.

He noted that in the lead in to this recommendation the discussion implied that the open space would be on both of sites, but that the intent of the CAC was not absolutely clear in this regard. John Savo stated that it appeared that the CAC still supports having open space on both sites.

Street Activating Uses – Mr. Schwartz noted that Seattle University objects to extending street activation use requirements to areas outside of the pedestrian overlay zones. Ms. Rutzick responded that the conversation was that 12th Avenue is a commercial spine and that there is a P-zone that has a higher standard so, why shouldn't Seattle University's new development comply with that standard and why should one side of the street be treated differently than the other. Mr. Schwartz asked if this requirement might extend to an academic building on the west side of 12th. If so this would be incredibly expensive. John Savo stated that he had never considered the west side of 12th Avenue. The full length of 12th would be Joy Jacobsen stated that it was her idea that street activating uses would be a requirement within the P zoned areas and a goal outside of that area. Others noted that this might apply to Broadway, Madison and other streets. SU staff indicated that the street activating uses would be on the East Side of 12th.

Members asked that there be some effort to clarify this issue. It was noted that the illustration on page 141 of the MIMP identifies several buildings along the west side of 12th outside of the P zone that SU identifies as sites or University retail and street activating uses.

John Savo suggested that the CAC consider a statement:

The CAC strongly endorses the plan for 12th Avenue as shown on pages 142 and 143 of the Final SU MIMP for the development of street level retail and street activating uses and that Seattle University be strongly encouraged to create street activating uses and retail wherever possible along 12th Avenues and particularly on blocks where existing building do not now include such uses.

The above wording was moved and seconded and passed unanimously.

Housing Replacement – He noted that there were relatively minor changes that the University is proposing. Lisa Rutzick noted that the intent of the Code is to assure that there is no I-net loss of the existing hosing stock. University student housing is not necessarily considered a part of that housing stock. Development of dorms does not mitigate loss of other housing. Mr. Schwartz stated that Seattle University is proposing that 4 student beds equate to one market rate housing unit for the purpose of calculating residential units. John Savo responded that the goal of the CAC is to encourage the retention of private non-student housing. Mr. Schwartz agreed that the CAC has been consistent with this and that the CAC and SU may simply differ on this issue.

V. Future Meetings

There was a brief discussion of future process. Members concluded that it might be possible to forgo most future meetings and deal with the final approval of the event center conditions by e-mail.

Lisa Rutzick stated that she has not yet published and that there has been a decision to separate the publication from the setting of the hearing date. Steve Sheppard suggested that the January 12th or 19th be tentatively reserved for possible meetings.