

SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY DRAFT MIMP OVERVIEW



DAC Meeting **May 17, 2023**

REMAINING SCHEDULE

1. Public hearing on DEIS

(within 21-50 days after DEIS publication) + public comment period

2. DAC, SDCI, SDOT comment on draft MIMP/EIS

(within 6 weeks of publication)

3. EA submits preliminary FEIS to SDCI (within 6 weeks of #2 comments)

for DAC, SDCI, and SDOT comment

4. University submits final MIMP

(within 13 weeks of comments in #2)

5. SDCI publishes final MIMP and FEIS

(within 7 weeks of submittal of preliminary FEIS in #3)

6. SDCI prepares draft Director's Report, Dep't of Neighborhoods works with DAC to prepare draft DAC Report

(within 5 weeks of publication of MIMP/FEIS)

7. University and DAC review/comment on draft SDCI Director's Reports

(3 weeks)

8. SDCI issues final Director's Report

(within 2 weeks of Institution/DAC comments)

9. Final DAC report

(within 2 weeks of Final Director's Report)

TONIGHT'S AGENDA

1. Review: October - November 2022

Revised Preliminary Draft MIMP Meetings

- Oct 5: *What we heard, how we responded*
- Oct 19: *Bulk regulations, planned projects, potential development*
- Nov 3: *Transportation & parking*

2. Progress: January - April 2023

Draft MIMP Publication

- New content for Draft EIS
- Changes to revised Preliminary Draft MIMP
- Other work related to process

3. Next Steps: May - June 2023

Comments on Draft MIMP & Draft EIS

- DAC Responsibilities
- DAC Deliverable
- Draft MIMP Components
- Responses to questions from Oct 5 and Oct 19 meetings
- Draft EIS & Draft EIS Presentation




REVIEW: OCTOBER 5 MEETING

Where We Are

- Place
- Plan & Map
- Process & Schedule

What We Heard & How We Responded

- Comments & Themes
- Responses & Revisions
 - Plan Document
 - Growth
 - Expansion Areas
 - Building Heights
 - Campus Edges
 - Campus Trees & Open Spaces
 - Traffic & Parking



SPU campus: part of neighborhood open space pattern

REVIEW: OCTOBER 19 MEETING

SPU Intent

- Sense of Place
- Making an Aspirational Plan
- Public Benefits

Bulk Regulations

- Height Limits
- Setbacks
- Floor Area Ratio
- Lot Coverage
- Open Space
- Structure Width & Depth
- Facade Modulation

Specific Applications

- Ashton Hall Block
- Hill Hall Block

Planned Projects

Potential Development

Frameworks & Calculations

Design Guidelines



Aerial rendering of potential new development and new entrance

PROGRESS: JANUARY - APRIL 2023

New and Updated Content for Draft EIS

- Maps
- Graphics
- Numbers
- Alternatives
- Shadow Studies
- Views
- Renderings

Updates to Revised Preliminary Draft MIMP

- Added cross-references in text and appendix.
- Adjusted Zoning Modification Table.
- Clarified specific standards: landscaping, structure width and depth, setbacks, etc.
- Added more details to text: expansion areas.

Other Related Work

- Response to rezone criteria comments
- Response to DAC questions from previous meetings

Area	Zoning Category				Structure Width				
	Underlying Zoning	Existing MIO	Proposed	Modification	Underlying standards	2000 MIO	Proposed	Modification	Reason
Area A (NW Area)	Expansion Area A				Expansion Area A				
A1	IG1 U/45	-	MIO-65	Yes, MIO	No limit	-	No requirements	No	Allow for flexibility to address requirements related to specific building uses and program needs.
A2	IB U/45	-	MIO-65	Yes, MIO	No limit	-	No requirements	No	Allow for flexibility to address requirements related to specific building uses and program needs.
A3	LR3 RC (M)	-	MIO-50	Yes, MIO	120'	-	120'	No	Allow for flexibility to address requirements related to specific building uses and program needs.
A4	C2-55 (M)	-	MIO-65	Yes, MIO	250'+	-	No requirements	Yes	Allow for flexibility to address requirements related to specific building uses and program needs.
A5	LR3 RC (M)	-	MIO-50	Yes, MIO	120'	-	120'	No	Maintain compatibility with context.
A6	LR2 (M)	-	MIO-37	Yes, MIO	90'	-	90'	No	Maintain compatibility with context.
A7	LR1 (M)	-	MIO-37	Yes, MIO	45'-60'	-	45'-60'	No	Maintain compatibility with context.
Area B (East Area)	Expansion Area B				Expansion Area B				
B1	C1-55 (M)	-	MIO-50	Yes, MIO	250'+	-	No requirements	Yes	Allow for flexibility to address requirements related to specific building uses and program needs.
B2	C2-55 (M)	-	MIO-50	Yes, MIO	250'+	-	No requirements	Yes	Allow for flexibility to address requirements related to specific building uses and program needs.
Area C (South Area)	Expansion Area C				Expansion Area C				
C1	LR3 (M)	-	MIO-50	Yes, MIO	120'	-	120'	No	Maintain compatibility with context.

Sample of Zoning Modification Table edits

NEXT STEPS: MAY - JUNE 2023

DAC Responsibilities

- Themes & Topics for Review
- Deliverable

Draft MIMP

- Components
- Navigation

SPU Responses to Comments and Questions

- Future commercial development south of Nickerson on east side of campus
- Campus vs. neighborhood design guidelines
- Illustrative vs technical maps
- Ashton Hall site and 65-foot height limit
- Ashton Hall site relationship to nearby residential properties
- Graphics of proposed development in neighborhood context

DAC RESPONSIBILITIES & DELIVERABLE

DAC Responsibilities

- Themes & Topics for Review
- Deliverable

EIS Topics

- Air Quality
- Tree Preservation
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use Patterns
- Aesthetics - Height, Bulk, and Scale
- Public View Protection
- Shadows on Open Space
- Traffic, Transportation, and Parking

Related MIMP Topics*

- Open Space & Landscaping
- Buildings by Use/Land Use
- Height, Bulk, and Form
- Bulk Regulations
- Circulation & Parking
- Infrastructure Improvements

**Located throughout Development Program and Development Standards Chapters.*

Deliverable

- Review Draft MIMP and Draft EIS.
- Prepare and submit one comment letter in response to both documents.

DRAFT MIMP COMPONENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

01. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

02. INTRODUCTION

History and Enrollment
Location
Academics
Needs
Key Campus Strategies
Opportunities
Process
Community
Approach

03. DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

Property Ownership
Property Occupancy

Existing Facilities

Existing Facilities

Planned and Potential Development

Illustrative Plan
Aerial View
Planned Projects
Planned and Potential Development
Planned and Potential Demolition
Development Summary
Existing Buildings by Use
Planned & Potential Buildings by Use

Circulation Network

Street and Sidewalk Network
Pedestrian Movement
Bike Movement
Vehicular Movement

Transit Movement
Existing Pedestrian Circulation
Proposed Pedestrian Circulation
Existing Vehicular Movement
Proposed Vehicular Movement

Parking

Existing Parking
Proposed Parking

Open Space

Open Space Network
Open Space Approach
Trees
Other Open Space
Existing Open Space
Proposed Open Space

Development Density

Proposed Building Heights
Existing Height, Bulk and Form
Proposed Height, Bulk and Form
Proposed Campus Massing Cross-Section A
Proposed Campus Massing Cross-Section B

Infrastructure Improvements

Potential Infrastructure Improvements
Potential Street and Alley Vacations

Alternatives

Alternative 1
Alternative 2
Alternative 3
Alternative 4
Alternative 5
Decentralization Option

Community

CW Goal 3
CW Goal 4

Purpose and Intent

04. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Introduction

Existing Underlying Zoning
Proposed Underlying Zoning

Structure Setbacks

Along Public Rights-of-Way

Pedestrian Circulation

West Nickerson Street
West Bertona Street
West Cremona Street
West Dravus Street

Height Limits

Lot Coverage

Existing Lot Coverage
Proposed Lot Coverage

Landscaping

Percentage of MIO to remain open

Transition in Height and Scale

Between Development within the MIO District and
the surrounding area

Structure Width and Depth Limits

Setback within Structures

Preservation of Historic Structures

View Corridors

Guidelines by Topic

Guidelines by Use

Mixed Use Development
Education and General Development
Campus Housing
Athletics and Recreation
Campus Getways

05. TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

Authority

TMP Goals

Implementation Requirements / Strategies

Parking Standards

Evaluation Criteria

Annual Report

06. APPENDIX

A: Definitions

B: Height Measurement Technique

C: Existing Facilities

D: Existing Parking

E: Environmentally Critical Areas

F: Trees Information

G: Zoning Modification Table

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Comments & Questions Topics

- Future commercial development south of Nickerson on east side of campus
- Campus vs. neighborhood design guidelines
- Illustrative vs technical maps
- Ashton Hall site and 65-foot height limit
- Ashton Hall site relationship to nearby residential
- Graphics of proposed development in neighborhood context

Questions from Wednesday, October 5, 2022, Meeting:

1. Nancy needs more information on the Eastern part of the campus around south of Nickerson and how existing and future commercial development may be affected by any of the planned buildings. It is understood Street level commercial would be maintained for new buildings. Dave said this would be addressed in the future.
2. Patreese would like to hear more about the design guidelines and comparison between the campus specific versus the neighborhood design guidelines. Specifically what is unique about SPU's design guidelines?
3. Patreese would like more information on the open space typology and requested to distinguish between illustrations versus maps showing actual areas/ square footage.
4. Patreese wanted to know if Ashton could be a non- conforming use. That parcel is designated as with a height of 65 feet because Ashton exists as a 57-foot-tall building and therefore cannot be designated under a 50 feet height limit. Patreese is concerned that the 65 feet height limit may make some folks nervous.

Questions from Wednesday, October 19, 2022, Meeting:

1. Sue Tanner had concerns about the proposed dorm next to Ashton Hall -proposed as a 6 story building on 5th Avenue. This is across from existing residential. Cindy Harper responded by referencing existing pictures showing steep area and trees that exist across the street from the proposed dorm. Because of the topography Cindy explained that the proposed buildings will be almost at the same level as the surrounding buildings. Sue said she would need to walk along that block to become more familiar with the topography.
2. Debra S wanted to see graphics related to the proposed development in context of the neighborhood. Brodie Bain responded that it would be an EIS effort to look at those impacts. Dave Church responded that these changes were being made to the previously submitted MIMP. They did not want to spend a lot of resources and money creating graphics at this point.

DAC questions from October meetings


RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Question/Comment

- Need more information on eastern part of campus around south of Nickerson.
- How is existing and future commercial development affected by potential development?
- Need to understand how street level commercial would be included in new buildings.

Response

- New entrance at Cremona to provide unified campus image and appearance.
- Street-activating ground-level uses are part of plan.
- MIMP provides new SF for commercial, potentially for existing uses.
- SPU can't force businesses out.
- SPU does not control who decides to leave or stay.



Commercial/mixed-use area south of Nickerson

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Question/Comment

- Need more information about design guidelines.
- Describe campus design guidelines vs. Neighborhood design guidelines.
- How are SPU's design guidelines unique?

Response

- No neighborhood design guidelines for this area.
- MIMP guidelines apply in MIO, but City guidelines do not.
- No code requirement for design guidelines.
- Many other MIMP sites are small, mostly edges, with no core, so design guidelines are more important.
- Most potential new buildings are in core campus area.
- SPU's guidelines unique because they are mostly posed as questions, which are open-ended, promote strategic thinking, and lead to more flexible, context-aware, and context-sensitive design solutions that work with changing conditions.

D. Pedestrian Environment

1. How does the design incorporate convenient, attractive, well-lit, and protected pedestrian entries?
2. How does the design incorporate pedestrian-scale elements, such as landscape elements, that help to define pedestrian areas?
3. How does the design avoid blank walls?
4. How does the design promote universal access, especially in sloped areas?
5. For projects involving parking lots, how does the design minimize visual and physical intrusion of parking lots on pedestrian areas?
6. For projects involving parking garages, how does the design minimize visual and physical intrusion of parking lots on pedestrian areas?
7. For projects involving parking garages, how does the design minimize the visual impact of parking structures?
8. How does the design screen dumpsters, utility, and service areas?
9. How does the design consider personal safety?
10. How does the lighting design minimize glare and light pollution into adjacent spaces, while prioritizing safety and security?

E. Landscaping

1. How does the landscape design reinforce the positive aspects of the landscape character of the campus and the neighborhood?
2. How does the landscape design enhance the building or site?
3. How does the landscape design take advantage of special site conditions?
4. How does the landscape support teaching and research?
5. How does the landscape contain elements prioritizing low impact or restorative design?
6. How does the landscape assist in wayfinding?
7. How does the landscape design incorporate native or Pacific Northwest adaptive plant species?


RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Question/Comment

- Need more information about open space typology.

Response

- The open space typology diagram is a visual way to describe the character of different landscapes in and around campus.
- Typologies consider shape, use, context, size, prominence, and relationship to buildings.
- Open space typology is not required, but helps illustrate open space concepts and character, and how the campus sits within the overall open space framework.



Open Space Typology Diagram

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS


Question/Comment

- Distinguish between illustrative maps and maps showing actual square footage (SF).


Response

- Base maps are drawn to scale.
- All potential new development buildings show actual SF.
- All existing buildings, parcels, and zoning districts show approximate SF.*
- Need site survey to have exact SF for existing conditions, which is not an appropriate investment at the planning stage.
- Other diagrams, such as landscape and setbacks, are drawn to illustrate concepts. Marks are proportional and are optimized for readability.

**This information is imported from GIS, which is not exact at ground level due to satellite, aerial, and orthophoto sourcing.*



Potential new buildings show exact SF.



Setback diagram lines are not to scale.



RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Question/Comment

- Can Ashton be a non-conforming use?
- Note the 65-foot designation because Ashton is 57-foot building.
- Concerns about 6-story building on 5th Avenue.
- Concerns about relationship to existing residential.

• Response

- 2000 MIMP designates this area at 65 feet.
- This MIMP is not proposing to change this designation.
- Adjacent development is increasing in density.
- Ashton was conforming when built.
- Part of the area was sold for non-SPU development. It will conform to City requirements, not MIMP requirements.
- 6 stories envisioned on "elbow" of 5th Ave W. Vacated Etruria side is lower due to topography.
- 5th: 3 single-family (1 rental), 1 vacant multi-family, 2 triplexes.



Ashton Hall Site: MIO height limit, parcel delineations, building against hillside.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Question/Comment

- Want to see graphics related to proposed development in the neighborhood context.

Response

- EIS will respond to this.
- EIS presentation is next.

FACT SHEET	
I. SUMMARY	
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION – Proposed MIMP and ALTERNATIVES	
2.1 Proponent/Project Location	
2.2 Background Information	
2.3 Project Objectives	
2.4 Description of the <i>Proposed Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP)</i>	
2.5.1 Proposed Campus Development.....	
2.5.2. Modification of Certain Development Standards	
2.5.3 New Transportation Management Plan	
2.5 Alternatives.....	
2.6.1 Alternative 1 - No Action Alternative	
2.6.2 Alternative 2 – No Boundary Expansion and No Change to Height Limits	
2.6.3 Alternative 3 – Boundary Expansion and No Change to Height Limits	
2.6.4 Alternative 4 – No Boundary Expansion and Increased Height Limits	
2.6.5 Alternative 5 –Boundary Expansion, Increased Height Limits and No Street Vacations	
III. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES and UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS	
3.1 Air Quality / Greenhouse Gas Emissions	3
3.2 Tree Preservation.....	3
3.3 Cultural Resources	3
3.4 Land Use	3
3.5 Aesthetics – Height, Bulk and Scale	3
3.6 Public View Protection.....	3
3.7 Shadows on Open Space.....	3
3.8 Traffic, Transportation and Parking	3

Preliminary Draft EIS table of contents

SEATTLE PACIFIC UNIVERSITY DRAFT MIMP OVERVIEW



DAC Meeting **May 17, 2023**