



MEMBERS

- Bill Zosel
- David Arnesen
- Devin Reynolds
- James Kirkpatrick
- Loyal Hanrahan
- Mark Stoner
- Pam Stewart
- Wolf Saar
- Denise Matz (Alternate)
- John Feit (Alternate)
- Ex-Officio Members**
- Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods
- Colleen Pike,
Seattle University, Facilities Planning
and Real Estate

**Seattle University
 Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

Meeting Minutes

Meeting #2

June 20, 2016

Adopted August 22, 2016

Student Conference Center – Room 210

Seattle University
 1000 E James Way
 Seattle, WA 98122

Members and Alternates Present

- | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| David Arnesen | Mark Stoner |
| Wolf Saar | Bill Zosel |
| Pam Stewart | Denise Matz (alternate) |

Staff and Others Present

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Maureen Sheehan | DON |
| BreAnne McConkie | SDCI |
| Colleen Pike | SU, Facilities Planning & Real Estate |
| Lara Branigan | SU, Design & Construction |
| Robert Schwartz | SU, Facilities Services |
| Bruce McKee | Capstone Development Partners, LLC |
| Jason Jones | Ankrom Moisan Architects |

I. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Maureen Sheehan opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

The nominations for the chair and co-chair was deferred for the next meeting due to some committee members not being present. With that, Ms. Sheehan would Chair the meeting.

II. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the March 16, 2016 minutes, and it was seconded. With a quorum present, the Committee adopted the March 2016 minutes.

Ms. Sheehan provided a brief summary of the agenda. She mentioned that representatives from SDOT will present the Streetscape Concept Plan and staff from Seattle University will present project updates on the 1107 East Madison Development Proposal.

III. Streetscape Concept Plan (00:04:20)

Ms. Emily Ehlers and Ms. Aditi Kambuj from SDOT presented the Streetscape Concept Plan.

Ms. Ehlers mentioned these streetscape concept plan design elements support a more vibrant, interconnected, and safer Madison Street.

Madison Street has a very narrow right of way, substandard sidewalks and irregular, large multi-leg intersections. For the past year and a half, SDOT has been working on the Madison BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) study focused on providing high

frequency, fast, and reliable public transit option, between 1st Avenue and downtown Seattle, and MLK Jr. Way. The different sections of the route has BRT lanes in the center, dedicated BRT lanes adjacent to the curb, or shared BRT-general purpose vehicle travel lanes. She showed a diagram of the center station cross section of the BRT along this section of Madison that showed two BRT only lanes for transit and a variable sidewalk depending on where the intersection is and redevelopment opportunities.

Ms. Kambuj talked about the streetscape draft concept plan and its features. The streetscape plan involves informing BRT and private developers about streetscape improvements along Madison Street. It addresses walking safety and comfort, landscaping, and lighting. The plan would be implemented over time by property owners, capital projects, and grant funded projects. SDOT will be doing a variety of outreach over the summer to inform about the BRT and the concept plan. Some of the recommendations of the plan include pedestrian clear zones, effective mobility networks, landscape and street tree improvements, pedestrian lighting and activity centers. SDOT is coordinating with Seattle University about the Concept Plan.

Ms. Ehlers presented street cross sections from the draft Seattle University Concept Plan. SDOT is working with Seattle University to refine the concept plan for consistency with the SDOT streetscape concept plan and BRT study. The cross sections reflect Madison Street, along the Seattle University frontage, at the following intersections: Madison and Broadway, Madison and 10th, Madison and 11th and Madison and 12th. The diagrams summarized the current existing sections of each of the affected corridors along with the proposed development sections.

The Madison BRT and the Street concept plan will conduct outreach throughout the summer. The Madison BRT design is expected to be completed over 2016-2017 and the start of service is anticipated in 2019.

A comment was made about how does the Concept Plan relates to the Seattle University Streetscape Concept Plan and what is this plan requesting from the Committee. Consistent with the City of Seattle's updated Right-of-Way Improvements Manual, and the draft streetscape concepts, SDOT recommends a minimum of a 6 ft. planting strip for trees and a buffer for pedestrians from moving vehicles. A minimum of 8 ft. wide clear pedestrian space so that individuals are able to pass comfortably.

Ms. Pam Stewart asked if private owners are allowed to push out to the sidewalk and have their outdoor seating along the pedestrian space. Ms. Ehlers noted that the primary goal is safety and mobility, SDOT supports and encourages sidewalk cafes, where space allows and under permit. Ms. Kambuj commented sidewalk cafes would need to meet ROWIM standard clearances.

Mr. Saar made a comment about the 1107 building design and the possibility of having part of the property be an inset, widening the sidewalk where there are blind corners. Ms. Ehlers mentioned that there may be a way to taper the building frontage to both accommodate additional space for people to walk and wait for the bus and match the edge of the adjacent self-storage building. Ms. Kambuj mentioned that it's important from a design and personal safety perspective to have more lighting in that specific area.

Ms. Kambuj mentioned that street tree canopy coverage is a high priority, and that the Urban Forestry recommended to keep the trees which are in good health and provide a buffer between moving vehicles and pedestrians.

1107 East Madison Development Proposal (00:23:20)

Ms. Colleen Pike began the project updates on the 1107 East Madison Development Proposal as well as an update regarding SDCI's determination that the proposed project does not meet the Exempt Change criteria.

Seattle University is developing student housing at 1107 East Madison (aka 1107 building). The goals of the projects that were being proposed at 1107 and 1111 East Madison are to develop student housing, provide a campus gateway, create a retail presence with the Campus Store, co-locate the Campus Store and Enrollment Services, and provide entrances on the street facing the community.

The concept for the 1107 Madison building would include a basement floor with below grade parking and access to 1111 Madison and Stumptown. There will be two levels of University space and eight levels of student housing that would accommodate 250-300 beds.

Currently, the project is in design, and the MUP intake is on June 27. Construction is scheduled to begin April 2017 and go through August 2018 with the building opening for the fall Quarter 2018.

SDCI has determined that the increased square footage is not an exempt change, and the University is requesting the change be considered for a minor amendment.

She briefly summarized the Municipal Code 23.69.035 which states the Advisory Committee will be given the opportunity to review the proposal and recommend if it is a major or minor amendment. The director of SDCI will make the final decision.

Ms. Pike discussed the criteria for a major and a minor amendment, and has suggested that the project does not meet the criteria for a major amendment. The use and height have not change. The site plan has been revised as the building footprint is smaller and covers less area and the size of the proposed development is now at 146,600 gross square feet. This does not exceed the authorized 2,145,000 gross sq. ft. that was authorized in the MIMP.

Ms. Stewart commented about the utilization on the gross square footage. Ms. Pike added that the average utilization for university buildings is about 55,000 sq. ft. and that was the basis of asking the City for an exemption.

Ms. Branigan mentioned that throughout the MIMP and within the EIS, it stated “net additional square footage”, the EIS contemplated all of its gross square footage as the code looks at it. Ms. McConkie clarified that the MIMP and EIS stated “net additional gross square footage.”

Design Presentation (00:36:17)

Ms. Pike introduced Mr. Jason Jones from Ankrom Moisan Architects, Inc. to discuss the 1107 building design.

The project is currently in schematic design and the feedback from this Committee is very valuable. He addressed the sidewalk questions, adding that they have dedicated two feet of sidewalks along the building, and the trees around will be preserved, as well as integrated bus stops and lighting along the building.

The project team came up with five design guidelines on how to approach this project:

- 1) Respect the context of the campus and the urban fabric
- 2) Welcoming entries on Madison and Campus
- 3) Active ground floor – Entries on Madison and Campus
- 4) Quality materials that are consistent with campus architecture
- 5) Designed for resiliency – longevity of building life.

At the ground floor level are the public amenities including University services. The majority of the University office space is located in the second level of the building and student housing is located on levels three through ten with a study lounge located at level three.

A cross-section of the building shows the proposed courtyard, office and community space, and residential spaces.

The project team looked at the design guidelines in detail such as pedestrian activities, program transparency, and materiality.

A comment was made about the materiality of the bricks and what the infill panels are. Mr. Jones noted that they are currently working with the University regarding the color, but they will be generally reddish in color, and the panels are high-quality, composite panels.

Mr. Jones noted there are several building performances they are working on to enhance its sustainability.

Review of Amendment Criteria and Design (01:16:55)

Ms. Pike commented that the development proposal is consistent with a minor amendment and the University is requesting the Committee’s support.

IV. Public Comment

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion for public comments.

Ms. Ellen Sollod commented that she was confused about the actual scope of the minor amendment. She also commented about the design team working with the University to increase the activity level on the covered plaza in order to make it a friendly and welcoming space for the students and the community.

V. Committee Deliberation (01:22:06)

Mr. Stoner commented that his concerns since the adoption of the MIMP were the bulk, scale and height for all development sites. He prefers to have a smaller building, and Madison Court to remain open and improve the experience. Height and massing are what matters most.

Mr. Zosel commented that it was not clear to him about the differences between this plan and what was outlined in the MIMP which was the demolition of the 1103 building.

Ms. BreAnne McConkie added that the MIMP explicitly stated a net additional gross square feet because it was contemplating the square footage from the 1103 building. It was going to be 75,000 in addition to the 1103 Building.

Mr. Zosel commented that since the MIMP is composed of different parts, it is fine that the University is proposing a taller building. In addition to making a decision whether it is a major or minor amendment, this Committee will have an opportunity to attach conditions. He noted that by developing a site by the Lynn Building, it should not discourage building additional height to the self-storage building.

Mr. Stoner commented that he agrees with Mr. Zosel since the University is not proposing adding square footage total in the MIMP.

Mr. Zosel noted that his understanding of the intention of the MIMP is desirable and should be encouraged.

Mr. Saar commented that the condition that is most concern to him is Madison and the sidewalk problem. He noted that he is not convinced that a 2 ft. setback is adequate based on the scale of the building. The main issue is the width, safety and pedestrian experience of the sidewalk. With regards to a condition, he noted that he has no issue with the massing, but the idea of making the sidewalk work for the public to access the building is essential. Mr. Stoner added this is a stumbling block for him and the interface with the storage building is a problem.

Mr. Arnesen commented about the bus stop and how does a passenger gets off since it will be in the middle of the street. Ms. Branigan commented that there will be two different routes. There will be no bus stop in the middle in front of the University. The bus stop will remain along E Madison Street, with a stop in front of 1107 E Madison St. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along Madison will run in the center of the street and stop just outside of the Seattle University frontage, so no people will be running mid-block across the street to board a BRT vehicle.

The Committee had a back and forth discussion about potential conditions to be added to the amendment including building height and sidewalk. Mr. Schwartz expressed concern about the City imposing additional setbacks; however Mr. McKee agreed to explore a reasonable compromise on the design options.

Mr. Zosel commented about the expectations of reviewing this project. Ms. Sheehan added this will not be the last time this Committee will review or discuss the 1107 project. Mr. Stoner commented that the Committee's discussion is about the support for a minor amendment and any conditions the Committee would like to add.

He commented about the façade and making a reinforcement on the ground level of the plaza. Ms. Stewart commented about a suggestion made by Ms. Sollod about having more activity on Madison to make it more alive and welcoming.

Mr. Zosel commented about the suggestion made by Ms. Ehlers with regards to having a smaller impact on people walking along 12th Ave by reducing the width of the proposed curb cut on 12th avenue. Mr. Stoner commented that he would also like to see an update on the exterior of the buildings.

The Committee continued to have a back and forth discussion about other possible conditions. These include building transitions and the curb cut width.

Ms. Sheehan summarized the conditions set forth by the Committee as follows:

- 1) Not to preclude the allowable size to the adjacent buildings.

- 2) The sidewalk along Madison is functional, safe and attractive, and in addition, and move the inset of the 1107 building so that the combination of planting and sidewalk is closer to the SDOT standards.
 - a. The transition along the 1107 and the Storage building be considered in the Design so it does not leave an abrupt change at the office level/sidewalk plane.
- 3) Minimize the curb cut width off of 12th for single vehicles.

Mr. Stoner made a motion that the development proposal be a minor amendment with the following three conditions, and Mr. Saar seconded. The Committee voted and the motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Sheehan informed the Committee that she will schedule the next meeting in four to six weeks. The possible topics will include continuing the design guidelines conversation as well as the nomination for the Committee's chair and co-chair.

VI. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

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