



December 1, 2020

Abby Weber  
Seattle Department of Construction & Inspection  
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
P.O. Box 34019  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019  
Via e-mail: [abby.weber@seattle.gov](mailto:abby.weber@seattle.gov)

Re: Seattle Pacific University Citizens Advisory Committee Comments on MIMP Concept Plan

Dear Ms. Weber,

The Seattle Pacific University (SPU) Major Institutions Master Plan (MIMP) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is charged with advising the City and SPU concerning the development of the new Seattle Pacific University Major Institutions Master Plan (MIMP). The CAC has the opportunity to comment on the Concept Plan. The CAC met four times (September, October, November, and December 2020) to review the draft SPU Concept Plan and offers the following comments.

The intent of our comments is to articulate the guiding principles to ensure the final MIMP provides the greatest benefit of future improvements to the University while balancing the impacts to the community and increasing the overall public good. Our commitment to deliver this product over the coming months is based on an open dialogue and partnership with the University.

**Design Guidelines**

1. Provide light and shadow studies for proposed development sites.
2. Analyze the pros/cons of orienting development on W. Nickerson St. toward the South Ship Canal Trail.

**Historic Preservation**

3. Provide an inventory of Historic structures and landscapes and plans to preserve/rehabilitate them.

**Trees**

4. Provide an inventory of significant trees on and adjacent to the campus, paying particular attention to the deciduous trees near the President's residence.

**MIO Boundary**

5. Expansion of the MIO Boundary into non-residential areas deserves careful consideration to ensure future uses are compatible with adjacent properties and explicit transparency with the current property owners is needed. Specifically, the area north of W. Nickerson St. and west of 6th Ave. W. and the area bounded by the triangle formed by W. Nickerson St., W. Dravus St., and Queen Anne Ave N.

**Parking**

6. On-campus parking supply and the rate charged to park on-campus needs to meet the needs of students and staff who choose drive to the campus as well as encourage students and staff to park on campus as street parking in the neighborhood is very limited. This is of particular concern in areas where new on-campus housing is proposed close to residential streets.

7. Only some streets impacted by the University are Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ). The University will need to work closely with the committee and SDOT to develop Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) methods and parking demand management strategies to reduce the number single occupancy vehicle (SOVs) trips to the campus.

#### **Transportation**

8. The campus is adjacent to a major bicycle trail used by staff and students. The University needs to include bicycle infrastructure (bike racks, showers, identified bike routes, etc.)
9. Analysis and attention need to be paid to plans for enhancing pedestrian and vehicular safety, especially at 3rd Ave W, West Bertona St., W. Nickerson St., and future “Campus Gateways.” The committee would like to know more about plans for enhancing pedestrian and vehicular safety to accommodate more frequent pedestrian crossings, and discourage mid-block crossing, particularly if there are attractive mixed-use elements that draw students across these streets.

#### **Retail Use**

10. There is support for University’s desire to increase retail opportunities in the area, but it needs to be done in a way that integrates and builds off the existing retail.

#### **Building Height**

11. The current zoning designation of all parcels adjacent to the MIO boundary, as well as known proposed changes to these zones, if any, should be included in order to assist the CAC in considering the impacts of the proposed MIO height changes on the surrounding community.
12. The proposed MIO boundaries increase all MIO-50 to MIO-65. The Concept Plan states that the adjacent single-family and low-rise residential neighborhoods remain buffered by a ring of MIO-37, but that is not the case for the southwest portion of campus (7th Avenue W including W Cremona St., W Dravus St., and W Barrett St., and 5th Ave W between W Barrett St. and W Dravus St.) Consideration needs to be given for properties adjacent to the MIO boundary, specifically around the southwest portion of campus. Mitigation measures, such as extending the MIO-37 buffer, and including landscape buffers, building setbacks, and buildings stepping up, need to be considered to create adequate transitions from the campus to these properties.
13. Ensure the maps in the MIMP reflect the current underlying zoning both within and adjacent to the MIO. This is particularly important along W Nickerson St where the University is proposing the height be increased to 65’ where the underlying zoning shown in the Concept Plan is C2-40, but the city zoning maps show it to be C2-55. If, in fact, the University is proposing to increase the height by 25 ft in these locations, this requires careful consideration, because this is considerably higher than the existing allowed heights in these locations and along the length of W Nickerson St. However, if it the existing zoning is C2-55, so that the proposed increase is just 10 ft, the impacts may be less significant and less of a concern.
14. There are significant topographic changes on campus and the surrounding neighborhood. Consequently, the taller campus zoning heights will impact surrounding properties differently, depending on where each sits on the high and low points of the slope. The university should focus on increasing building heights in the areas of campus that are at lower elevations. For example, Hill Hall is built into a valley; however, the Concept Plan identifies the area south of Hill Hall as a potential site for development. This proposed development site sits at the high end of the valley and should be assigned a lower building height. To illustrate these types of changes, we would like to see the images on page 23 of the Concept Plan expanded to illustrate buildings across the campus with the proposed building heights included.

For the Committee,

Patreese Martin & Nancy Ousley,

Committee Co-chairs