

Minutes #23

(Adopted 11/16/2022)

Seattle Pacific University Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Wednesday, October 19, 2022

6:00 – 7:30 PM

In-person: Seattle City Hall, 4th Floor, Tahoma Conference Room

Virtual: Webex

Remote Meeting via WebEx – video recording is available on request.

Members and Alternates Present:

Debra Sequeira
Patreese Martin
John Olensky

David Rice
John Rush

John Stoddard
Sue Tanner

Staff Present:

Dave Church	Seattle Pacific University (SPU)
Cindy Harper	Seattle Pacific University (SPU)
Abby Weber	Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI)
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Nelson Pesigan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Brodie Bain	NAC
Michele Sarlitto	EA
Kristy Hollinger	EA
James Garland	Foster

1. Welcome & Introductions
Adoption of October 5, 2022, minutes

2. Public Comment

No public comments

3. Presentations

Revised Preliminary DRAFT MIMP

- Cindy Harper and Brodie Bain presented the second part of Revised Preliminary DRAFT MIMP

(Transcriber's Note: The notes 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 video recording and available upon request.)

4. Committee Questions/Deliberations

Patreese stated that a lot has changed with the pandemic and flexibility is important to maintain the university's mission and appreciated the context regarding constant evolution of learning spaces, and context for the setbacks to benefit the public spaces, expansion benefits and modification chart provided by Cindy Harper.

Eric Hanson wanted to know about the setbacks along 7th Avenue West. Cindy Harper noted that the setbacks were 20 feet, like most of the MIO proposed boundary along the surrounding neighborhood. Eric Hanson said that raising the height limits along 7th Avenue is going to get a lot of push back. Cindy Harper clarified that the building heights were not being increased.

Cindy noted that the block had a height limit of 50 feet in the 2000 MIMP; the preliminary draft revised it to 37 feet and 65 feet, but this was revised again to bring the height limit to 50 feet and 37 feet. The new revision drops the height in the southern part of the block further down from the 2000 MIMP to 37 feet with no potential development.

Eric Hanson wanted to know the existing building height in the Hill Hall block. Cindy noted it likely 43 feet but needs to confirm. With the clarification, Eric stated that it was not a concern anymore.

Sue Tanner had concerns about the proposed dorm next to Ashton Hall which is proposed as a 6 story building on 5th Avenue. This is across from existing residential. Cindy Harper responded by showing existing pictures and the 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.

Sue Tanner had concerns about comparing FAR for SPU to Seattle University (which is a very urban campus). Brodie Bain clarified that they only looked at Seattle University's FAR for reference. SU has a max proposed FAR was 2.5 and had an existing FAR of 1.7. There were no plans for SPU to go as high as Seattle University's FAR. For SPU, the max FAR allowable was 2.0 with the proposed development showing 1.5 .

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.

Patreese encouraged everyone to review the materials for clarifications and mentioned that the transportation study presentation at the next meeting would be important to button up the comment letter.

Eric Hanson mentioned that an EIS draft from April had alternatives, but it did not state a preferred alternative. Michelle Sarlitto clarified that the DRAFT MIMP is the preferred alternative. The other alternatives include no boundary expansion, height limits etc. to try and disclose the impacts associated with those different parameters.

Sue Tanner wanted to bring up the PRE-DRAFT EIS comment letter as per the agenda. Patreese mentioned that the comments have been drafted but the transportation piece was pending. The questions posed were to start a written dialogue.

5. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.