



**Webster School Design  
Departure Advisory  
Committee**

**Members**

Dan Allison  
Jocelyn Bauer  
Thomas Haff  
Mike Helmick  
Alison Kartiganer  
Connie Myers  
Dan Vos  
Tad Anderson  
Darcy Fulcher (Alternate)  
Kevin Philbin (Alternate)

**Ex-Officio Members**

Maureen Sheehan,  
Department of Neighborhoods  
Holly Godard,  
Seattle Department of Construction &  
Inspections

**Webster School**

**Development Standards Design Departure Advisory  
Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting #2**

**April 30, 2018**

Adams Elementary School  
6110 28<sup>th</sup> Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98107

**Members and Alternates Present**

Dan Allison	Mike Helmick	Dan Vos
Jocelyn Bauer	Alison Kartiganer	Tad Anderson
Thomas Haff	Connie Myers	Darcy Fulcher (Alternate)

**Staff and Others Present**

Eric Becker	SPS
Holly Godard	SDCI
Brian Ho	TCF Architecture
Rachel Huck	SDOT
Todd McBryan	Heffron Transportation
Maureen Sheehan	DON

**I. Opening and Introductions**

The meeting was opened by Ms. Maureen Sheehan from the City of Seattle, Major Institutions, and Schools Program. Ms. Sheehan welcomed all in attendance and briefly summarized the agenda. Brief introductions followed.

**II. Overview of the Process (00:03:20)**

This is the Committee's second meeting. The first meeting was held on March 19, 2018.

Ms. Sheehan reviewed the departure process. She also added that Committee member(s) who is in the minority, will have an opportunity to write a report explaining his or her position and that will be included in the final report.

**III. Presentation**

**Project Overview:**

The School District requested five departures, one, lot coverage, was approved at the last meeting. Mr. Brian Ho of TCF Architecture went through each departure and shared specific information requested by the Committee at the previous meeting.

## **1. Setback**

Mr. Ho noted that the setback departure is specifically related to the playground equipment. The building addition is not in question because it is within the allowable setbacks.

A diagram was presented to show that the playground equipment on the property line at the southwest corner of the site. A covered play addition was also showed, and it was considered in the departure because it is considered playground equipment.

He noted questions regarding visibility and accessibility between the school site and Webster park as well as the joint-use agreement (JUA). He showed a conceptual view of the site and what the connection would look like between the park and the new playground. The Design Team is proposing a chain link fence that wraps around the perimeter of the site and gates. The school does not have exclusive use of the park. The school may use the park and after school hours the public can use the school grounds.

Mr. Dan Vos commented if a rolling gate is possible and Mr. Ho noted that it is. The intent is to allow an easy opening and use as possible.

Mr. Eric Becker, Senior Project Manager for the School District, shared that the JUA is reviewed every three years, and is currently effective until 2019. The JUA is reviewed annually and the school principal and parks discuss the use of park facilities and scheduling. The school will not have exclusive use of the park and the public can utilize the park throughout the day.

Mr. Becker addressed concerns about toddlers and school kids interacting at the park, and he noted that it will be a conversation with the future principal and staffing about how to monitor and manage this. Mr. Ho noted that the design team would like to fit the school aged kids play area on the site. Mr. Vos noted that there is not much use of the park during the winter months to address concerns about interaction.

Ms. Jocelyn Bauer asked if there will be street trees to replace those that were removed. Mr. Ho mentioned that street trees were added to this project per SDOT requirement, but the trees previously removed are on Seattle Parks and Recreation property.

Ms. Bauer asked about the height of the play structure and Mr. Ho noted that it is about 6 ft. Mr. Tad Anderson commented about the height of the fence at 8 ft. and could it be made shorter. Mr. Becker noted that the school district recommends 6 ft.

Mr. Tad Anderson commented about the shared use and impacts on the park and he noted that the gymnasium shades the sundial in the park to some extent and asked if this was considered by the design team. Mr. Ho mentioned that the height of the structure is within the allowable constraints and they determined that there will be minimal or no additional effect to the shading.

Mr. Anderson noted a comment by Groundswell NW Strategic Planning & Advocacy Director, Mr. David Boyd suggesting a curve roof at the western edge of the gymnasium could reduce the shading that makes the new building appear less massive and bulky. Mr. Ho noted that the height of the gymnasium requires a 23 ft. clearance criteria to allow sports activities inside the gymnasium. Changing the roof form could reduce the height but the shading will not be impacted as much, and the Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB) provided rejected any changes to the roof line.

## **2. Height**

Mr. Ho shared that the discussion from the last meeting was about the elevator penthouse equipment. He noted that the penthouse will be located on the east side to accommodate the multiple heights of the 1930 and 1908 building. The request from the last meeting was to provide options to access the elevator and he showed a diagram that presented a study of elevator versus the stair access. The stairway option could lower the height under 5 ft. from 57.8 ft. to 53 ft.

A question was asked if a rooftop hatch was considered, and Mr. Ho noted that was the solution they looked at, but the School District's strong preference was an elevator to provide easy access for maintenance workers. He added that adding a stairway from the third level of the building to the rooftop would have a

negative impact to façade of the building and was not approved by the LPB. He emphasized that elevator roof access is safer and provides an easier access to the roof for maintenance.

Mr. Vos thanked the Design Team for presenting and considering the stair option and he now felt that there was not much to gain in having the stairs than the elevator. Ms. Kartiganer and Ms. Bauer agreed and appreciated the effort that was presented. Ms. Bauer was curious about the feedback from the LPB about the elevator penthouse. Mr. Ho noted that the LPB recommends minimizing the visual impact and prefers a lighter color.

Mr. Ho commented about the question that was raised regarding matching the 1908 brick to the gymnasium and he added that having to match the bricks, as well as the additional weight, will be challenging and the LPB would prefer not to mimic and replicate what already exists. They would rather like it to be different but compatible.

Mr. Haff commented that he was concerned about the height and inquired about the frequency of outages, filter changes, etc. Mr. Becker commented that the School District had discussions with the facilities staff and they are asking to change the filters quarterly. He noted that the equipment is about 24x15" per unit and there is a lot of bulk to move up and down. It is important to have good and safe access to the roof for less impact. He added that having the stairs would also take away program space.

Mr. Haff commented about needing that much space for the penthouse and inquired if the mechanical equipment could be at the bottom instead of the rooftop.

Ms. Myers commented about the program space and the classrooms are in the second and third levels. She noted that the older kids need a break out space and having the stairs will take away that space.

#### **4. Bus loading**

Mr. Ho mentioned that the School District is proposing to locate bus loading on 68<sup>th</sup> because of the new accessible entry. There was a request to better understand why they can't use 30<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup>, and the team would not recommend that route due to proximity to the school, grade change, and no supervision for bus drop off. The primary issue along 67<sup>th</sup> is accessibility.

Mr. Todd McBryan of Hefron Transportation addressed questions about bus routing. There was a question if buses would leave going south and turn on to 30<sup>th</sup> and he noted they would not suggest that option. A TMP recommendation was to separate the school bus and parent pick up and drop off and then to identify travel route pattern.

There was a request to see different traffic calming measures around the site, and Mr. McBryan provided a chart showing different SDOT traffic calming measures that can be used. Once the Seattle Safety Traffic Committee is established the committee will walk the school site to identify appropriate traffic calming measures.

Ms. Fulcher commented about having a stop sign installed because of accidents happening along 30<sup>th</sup> and 68<sup>th</sup>, and Mr. Ho noted that stop signs are subject to federal guidelines that agencies are required to follow.

Mr. Haff asked about how many buses the school will anticipate on the site, and Mr. Ho noted that based on a 450-student capacity, the School District estimates three full size buses and three special education buses.

Mr. Allison commented that there were no buses in 1979 and everyone walked to school.

Ms. Bauer asked if the Committee can condition to make a recommendation to SDOT, and Ms. Sheehan mentioned that the Committee can ask SDOT to look at something. Ms. Rachel Huck of SDOT commented that the traffic engineers will look at crosswalks, stop signs, and the safe routes to school program.

Mr. Anderson commented if a safe bicycle route to the school was considered and having 68<sup>th</sup> or 67<sup>th</sup> be closed to allow only bicycles. Ms. Huck noted that is a recommendation that they could look at.

A comment was made if the School District considered lowering the enrollment for the school. Ms. Sheehan mentioned to focus on the bus loading and unloading departure and not on school enrollment projections.

## 5. Parking

Mr. Ho commented that there was discussion at the last meeting about the number of stalls on site and asked about what a realistic number is to get to the 100 required spaces. There was also a discussion about trade offs including less playground and open space for more on-site parking. With these challenges, the design team decided to have the spaces on the north. He noted that moving parking to the south would impact existing landscaping and require relocation of underground piping, utilities connection, etc.

To make the project as efficient as possible, the team was able to add three more stalls for a total of eight. The departure request is for 92 parking spaces.

Mr. McBryan responded to a request to simulate parking utilization around the site and he provided a diagram that showed parking occupancy during mornings, evenings, large and medium events. Ms. Bauer commented if the study includes driveways and curb cuts and Mr. McBryan noted it does based on the assumed setbacks for driveways.

Mr. Vos commented that it was great to see the simulation and asked if it is possible to lower the number of required ADA stalls to better meet the expected demand for ADA space, and Mr. McBryan noted that they do not want to jump into the conclusion of lowering the demand number based on a simulation. The simulation only shows the potential impact on street parking.

Ms. Bauer commented about the entrance location to the parking area, and Mr. Ho noted that it is an existing curb cut.

Mr. Haff asked if it is permitted and legal to double stack cars like the Husky Stadium during game day, and Mr. Ho commented that it is possible if someone can manage it.

## IV. Public Comments and Questions

Ms. Sheehan opened the floor for public comments and questions.

**(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 Chris Jackins:** Mr. Jackins, coordinator for the Seattle Committee to Save Schools provided a list summarizing why should this Committee should reject the departures being requested.

**Comments from Dave Boyd:** Mr. Boyd encouraged the Committee to use the full three meetings that they were allotted to discuss and gather additional information from the School District about the effects to the park. The park is designed to fit all ages where younger kids can play in the playground, throw frisbee and older kids and adults play basketball. Groundswell NW is concerned about the impacts to the park and the materials presented were inadequate. They recognize the school boundary needs a fence, but the fence should be made of a higher quality and tall enough to provide as much open space as possible. He is concerned about that the shading of the sundial in the park and he would like to have the roof of the play structure be analyzed. All structures are subject to conditions and he asked to look at minimizing the additions as much as possible. He also asked the committee to reconsider the lot coverage departure as a way to reduce the impacts on the park and to push the building minimally to the east and reduce the space connecting the gymnasium.

**Comments from Lucille Berentson:** Ms. Berentson lives on 68<sup>th</sup> and she commented that parking impacts her home. She noted that the whole scope of the project is huge for the neighborhood and added that it needs to be scaled down. She felt that the School Board should listen to the neighbors. She welcomes having an elementary school, but the scope of the project is too big for a small area.

## V. Committee Deliberation

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussions for committee deliberation. She asked the Committee to deliberate on the need for these departures and then discuss on whether to recommend approving or denying each of the departures with or without any conditions.

The Committee proceeded to deliberate on the requested departures.

## **1. Setback**

Mr. Helmick suggested of adding a reasonable setback of 5 ft.

Ms. Godard mentioned that there were two items for the standard setback departure, one is the covered play from 30 ft. to 13.9 ft. and the other item is the chip area from 30 ft. to 5 ft.

Mr. Helmick suggested to approve what the school is asking for: a 5 ft. setback.

Ms. Myers commented that she would recommend approving the departure.

Ms. Bauer commented that she would recommend approving the departure and agrees with Mr. Helmick's suggestion about the playground equipment setback. She would be interested in adding the condition of reduced fence height and an alternative to the chain link fence.

Ms. Kartiganer commented that she would recommend approving the departure with conditions and inquired if a translucent roof for the covered play area was considered in the design.

Mr. Vos commented that he would recommend approving the departure and agree with Ms. Bauer's comments about the fence height and the chain link as reflected by the Groundswell NW. He added that the fence should be as visually appealing as possible.

Mr. Anderson commented that he would recommend approving the departure. He added that this is a good opportunity to add language to emphasize the need of a good coordination between the School District and the Community regarding their JUA including working collaboratively about the use and access of the park by the public when the school is in session and public access to the gymnasium.

Mr. Allison commented that he would recommend approving the departure without any conditions. He noted that Groundswell NW was asking for a nice fence and vertical rails. He mentioned that he was not a fan of a chain link fence, but the school had a chain link fence for at least 45 years and he has not heard any complaints, and he was not sure if the fence design is related to the setback departure.

Mr. Haff addressed the condition about the fence design and he commented that there are people that are living in the park. Even though he was not a fan of a big fence, he noted that there are people coming from the park to the school and vice versa to camp on the property. He wants a fence that is transparent and visible. He commented that he would abstain from voting on the departure.

Mr. Helmick commented that the design of the fence is not subject to the setback departure. Ms. Godard noted that the style of the design of the fence for security purposes to the property line is the connection.

Ms. Bauer commented that she was thinking about the park and the school and it is a better amenity for the community if there is less of a barrier. She suggested a 6 ft. fence is appropriate to address security.

The Committee had discussion about the design of the fence and Mr. Allison noted that a black, vinyl coated chain link fence is an improvement. Ms. Myers added that it is easier and less costly to maintain.

Ms. Bauer commented that she was curious about other options besides a chain link fence and a suggestion was made to have vertical rods. Ms. Myers commented that these are costly to install and maintain.

Ms. Bauer noted that she is fine with chain link if it maintains transparency and consistency along the site and suggested removing the design of the fence as a condition.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned the JUA that was provided by Mr. Anderson as a condition.

Ms. Bauer commented that it is valuable to clarify the use between the school and the park.

Ms. Godard noted that there is a communication plan where the neighbors and the school work together and that could be a part of the discussion about the JUA.

Mr. Allison commented that he agrees on encouraging cooperation between the school and the park, but he does not see a relationship to the setback departure.

Mr. Anderson commented that he decided to remove the language about the JUA between the school and the park as a condition for the departure.

## **2. Building Height**

Ms. Bauer commented she would recommend approving the departure as she sees no other viable alternative.

Ms. Kartiganer commented that she would recommend approving the departure as is.

Mr. Vos commented that he would recommend approving the departure with the condition of following the LPB's recommendation about the type of materials to be used.

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Allison commented that they would recommend approving the departure.

Mr. Haff commented that he would recommend denying the departure because there was not enough study about the elevator and the excessive amount use of space.

Mr. Helmick and Ms. Myers commented that they would recommend approving the departure.

## **4. On-street Bus Loading & Unloading**

Mr. Vos commented that he recommends denying the departure. The school site was never built to support the loading and unloading of buses. The property is small and compact and if the school board wants more students on the site they should have to make difficult choices and not park buses on a narrow residential street. He added that the buses should operate in the arterials.

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Allison commented that they would recommend approving the departure.

Mr. Haff commented that he would recommend denying the departure and agreed with Mr. Vos.

Mr. Helmick commented that he was not concerned about the street width for the buses. He would recommend approving the departure with the condition of safety with egress and recommend working with SDOT on traffic calming measures on 68<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Meyers commented the school is in an urban environment and this is how it operates. She noted that the Seattle Safe Routes to School Committee does an excellent job in outlining the safest way around the school and she has no problem keeping it as a condition.

Ms. Bauer commented that she would recommend approving the departure with conditions as stated by Mr. Helmick. She asked if there were any conditions requiring parking mitigation with SDOT. Ms. Sheehan suggested to recommend SDOT focus on a specific intersection rather than prescribe what needs to be done. Ms. Bauer inquired if it is possible to have community input and involvement with SDOT and the Seattle Public Schools review process. Mr. McBryan noted that the Safe Routes to School committee is open to the neighborhood and allows participants from the neighborhood to come to the meetings and express their concerns. Ms. Bauer was curious about the notification process, and the neighbors should be involved in the safety measures discussion.

Ms. Godard noted that the Transportation Technical Report lists the recommendations as stated in Sections A through F that mitigate the concerns about parking, safety, etc. through the Transportation Management Plan (TMP).

Ms. Kartiganer commented that she would recommend approving the departure with the condition of focusing on the intersection that was stated.

## **5. Off-street Parking**

Ms. Bauer commented that she would approve the departure with a condition that a communication plan be implemented by the school to notify the neighborhood about big events. Ms. Sheehan noted that the language is summarized in the TMP Sections A through F.

Ms. Kartiganer, Mr. Vos, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Allison commented that they would recommend approving the departure with the condition stated by Ms. Bauer.

Mr. Haff commented that he would recommend denying approving the departure.

Mr. Helmick commented that he proposed changing the departure request for 94 rather than 92 spaces since the load and unload spaces were useful.

Ms. Meyers commented that she would recommend approving the departure.

## **VI. Committee Recommendations**

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion for Committee recommendations and noted that the Committee had deliberated on all the remaining departures.

### **Departure #1: Setback**

A motion was made to recommend approving the departure for setback with the following conditions; and it was seconded.

- a. Specify the setback at 13.9 ft. for the covered play area and 5 ft. for the playground equipment;
- b. Reduce the fence height between the park and the school to 6 ft.

By show of hands, a quorum being present and the majority of those present voted 8 in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

### **Departure #2: Building Height**

A motion was made to recommend approving the departure for setback with the condition to follow and support the Landmarks Preservation Board's recommendation regarding the materials used; and it was seconded.

By show of hands, a quorum being present and the majority of those present voted 7 in favor and 1 not in favor, the motion passed.

### **Departure #3: Lot Coverage**

*(Note: The Committee voted to recommend approving the departure for the lot coverage without any conditions at the first meeting on March 19, 2018)*

### **Departure #4: On-street bus loading and unloading**

A motion was made to recommend approving the departure for on-street bus loading and unloading with the following conditions:

- a. Recommend the Transportation Management Report as stated on Sections A through F be incorporated with the emphasis on public involvement and community notification;
- b. Work with SDOT about traffic calming measures along NW 68<sup>th</sup> St. and 30<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW and bus safety egress.

By show of hands, a quorum being present and the majority of those present voted 6 in favor and 2 not in favor, the motion passed.

### **Departure #5: Off-street parking**

A motion was made to recommend approving the departure for off-street parking with the condition to recommend the Transportation Management Report as stated on Sections A through F be incorporated and a departure for 92 parking spaces, and it was seconded.

By show of hands, a quorum being present and the majority of those present voted 7 in favor and 1 not in favor, the motion passed.

## **VII. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting**

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will send out the draft recommendation report for feedback and comments as soon as possible. That there will be an opportunity to draft a minority report that will be added to the recommendation.

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

April 30, 2018

File: Webster departures statement 2

**My name is Chris Jackins.**

(Box 84063, Seattle 98124) (521-3288)

**I am the coordinator of the Seattle Committee to Save Schools.**

**Ten points:**

1. **The proposed departures from City zoning code on the Webster project should NOT be approved.**
2. **Traffic, parking, loss of playground space and open space, noise, views, loss of historic building features, and loss of trees are just a few of the impacts from the project.**
3. **According to City zoning departure rules, the District zoning departure requests can only be approved if the need for the project departures is balanced against the impacts on the neighborhood.**
4. **The need for the project as it is currently proposed is too far out of balance with the impacts on the neighborhood.**
5. **Departure Committee members are in the middle of a flawed process.**
6. **There are members of the public who are not being notified of the departure meetings, even when they request in writing to be notified.**
7. **District staff are providing false information.**

8. **The School Board voted on April 4, 2018 to approve a \$6 million Webster budget increase. The District had stated an alternative: quote, "To remain within the project budget and on the project schedule the District would not build the gymnasium", unquote.**
9. **Restoring the current gym was never considered. District staff publicly told the Board that there had never been a gym at the Webster site, which is not true.**
10. **Please be a voice for public concerns. If a majority on the Committee votes to approve the departures, the minority is allowed to write a separate Minority Report. Please do so.**

**Please vote "No" on the departures.**

**Thank you.**