SMC 23.69.035 Changes to master plan.

A. A proposed change to an adopted master plan shall be reviewed by the Director and determined to be an exempt change, a minor amendment, or a major amendment.

B. Exempt Changes. An exempt change shall be a change to the design and/or location of a planned structure or other improvement from that shown in the master plan, which the Director shall approve without publishing an interpretation. Any new gross floor area or parking space(s) must be accompanied by a decrease in gross floor area or parking space(s) elsewhere if the total gross floor area or parking spaces permitted for the entire MIO District or, if applicable, the subarea would be exceeded. Each exempt change must meet the development standards for the MIO District. Exempt changes shall be:

1. Any new structure or addition to an existing structure not approved in the master plan that is twelve thousand (12,000) square feet of gross floor area or less; or
2. Twenty (20) or fewer parking spaces not approved in the master plan; or
3. An addition to a structure not yet constructed but approved in the master plan that is no greater than twenty percent (20%) of the approved gross floor area of that structure or twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, whichever is less; or
4. Any change in the phasing of construction, if not tied to a master plan condition imposed under approval by the Council; or
5. Any increase in gross floor area below grade.

C. Amendments. The Advisory Committee shall be given the opportunity to review a proposed minor or major amendment and submit comments on whether it should be considered minor or major, and what conditions (if any) should be imposed if it is minor. The Director shall determine whether the amendment is minor or major according to subsections D and E of this section. The Director's decision that a proposed amendment is minor or major shall be made in the form of an interpretation subject to the procedures of Chapter 23.88, Rules Interpretation. If the Director and the Major Institution agree that a major amendment is required based on subsection E of this section, the interpretation process may be waived, and the amendment and environmental review process shall be subject to the provisions of subsection G of this section. After the Director makes a decision on whether an amendment is minor or major, the Advisory Committee shall be notified.

D. Minor Amendments. A proposed change to an adopted master plan shall be considered and approved as a minor amendment when it is not an exempt change according to subsection B of this section, when it is consistent with the original intent of the adopted master plan, and when it meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. The amendment will not result in significantly greater impacts than those contemplated in the adopted master plan; or
2. The amendment is a waiver from a development standard or master plan condition, or a change in the location or decrease in size of designated open space, and the proposal does not go beyond the minimum necessary to afford relief and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity in which the Major Institution is located; or
3. The amendment is a proposal by the Major Institution to lease space or otherwise locate a use at street level in a commercial zone outside an MIO District, and within two thousand five hundred feet (2,500') of the MIO District boundary, and the use is allowed in the zone for but not permitted pursuant to Section 23.69.022. In making the determination whether the amendment is minor, the Director shall consider the following factors:
   a. Whether an adequate supply of commercially zoned land for business serving neighborhood residents will continue to exist, and
b. Whether the use will maintain or enhance the viability or long term potential of the neighborhood-serving character of the area, and

c. Whether the use will displace existing neighborhood-serving commercial uses at street level or disrupt a continuous commercial street front, particularly of personal and household retail sales and service uses, and

d. Whether the use supports neighborhood planning goals and objectives as provided in a Council-approved neighborhood plan.

E. Major Amendments. A proposed change to an adopted master plan shall be considered a major amendment when it is not an exempt change according to subsection B of this section or a minor amendment according to subsection D of this section. In addition, any of the following shall be considered a major amendment:

1. An increase in a height designation or the expansion of the boundary of the MIO District; or

2. Any change to a development standard that is less restrictive; or

3. A reduction in housing stock outside the boundary but within two thousand five hundred feet (2,500') of the MIO District, other than within a Downtown zone, that exceeds the level approved in an adopted master plan; or

4. A change to the single-occupancy vehicle goal of an approved transportation management program that increases the percentage of people traveling by single-occupancy vehicle; or

5. A use that requires Council Conditional Use approval, including but not limited to a helistop or a major communication utility, that was not described in an adopted master plan; or

6. The update of an entire development program component of a master plan that was adopted under Code provisions prior to the 1996 Major Institutions Ordinance where the institution proposes an increase to the total amount of gross floor area allowed or the total number of parking spaces allowed under the institution's existing development program component within the MIO District.

F. If the Director, after reviewing any Advisory Committee recommendation, determines that a proposed major amendment is of unusual complexity or size, the Director may require that the institution prepare a new master plan subject to Section 23.69.032.

G. If an amendment is determined to be major, the amendment and environmental review process shall be subject to the provisions of Section 23.69.032, Master plan process. However, a concept plan and preliminary draft plan shall not be required. Instead, the Major Institution shall submit a major amendment draft report as part of the application stating which parts of the master plan are proposed to be amended. If an EIS is required for the major amendment, the draft EIS shall be prepared after submittal of the major amendment draft report. After comments are received on the major amendment draft report, the institution shall prepare the major amendment final report and if required, the final EIS. If an EIS is not required for the major amendment, the Director is not required to hold a public hearing on the major amendment draft report.

H. Noncontiguous areas that are included in a MIO District as a result of a previously adopted master plan shall be deleted from the MIO District at the time a major amendment is approved unless the noncontiguous area was a former and separate MIO District. The change to the MIO District boundaries shall be in accordance with the procedures for City-initiated amendments to the Official Land Use Map as provided in Chapter 23.76, Procedures for Master Use Permits and Council Land Use Decisions, and shall not be subject to the rezone criteria contained in Section 23.34.124.
SMC 23.69.034 Effect of master plan adoption.

A. After a master plan has been adopted, the institution may develop in accordance with the adopted master plan.

B. The Director may approve applications requiring a master plan prior to final adoption of the master plan subject to the provisions of action 23.04.040 F, Section 23.04.040 G, or Section 23.69.033.

C. The Director shall not issue any permit for any development which has not been included within the master plan unless the institution has met the requirements of Section 23.69.035, Master plan amendment.

D. Applications for master use permits for development contained in the adopted master plan shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 25.05, Environmental Policies and Procedures.

E. The adopted master plan shall be referenced on the Official Land Use Map and placed on file in the Department.

F. Following adoption of a master plan, the citizens advisory committee shall continue to advise the institution and the City regarding implementation or renewal of the master plan or amendments to the master plan. If more than one (1) major institution is designated within the same general area, individual advisory committees may be consolidated into one (1) committee. The committee shall meet as necessary but no less than once annually to review the status of the master plan.

G. When a master plan has been adopted prior to the effective date of these provisions and there is no standing advisory committee, an advisory committee shall be established in accordance with the provisions of subsection B of Section 23.69.032 at the time an application for an amendment to the master plan, requiring Council approval, is made.

H. The Advisory Committee and the neighborhood planning group from the surrounding area, if applicable, will be notified of master use permit (MUP) applications for Major Institution uses within the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) District and for Major Institution structures outside of but within two thousand five hundred feet (2,500) of the MIO District boundaries, and shall have an opportunity to review and comment on the applications if there is a discretionary decision and formal comment period as part of the MUP.

Comment [A1]: This provision has generally been interpreted as granting of the authority (requirement) for consent from the SAC. This has generally included comment on the proposed action's consistency with the provisions of the Master Plan, including any design guidelines included in the plan. Note that the SAC does not have any formal design review responsibilities aside from this provision. Comments are for the MUP application and their timeliness is governed by the MUP comment deadlines. Any presentation to the SAC from the institution or SAC comments thereon that are made prior the MUP comment period are to the institution for their convenience and benefit only.
The institution shall provide an annual status report to the Director and the Advisory Committee which shall detail the progress the institution has made in achieving the goals and objectives of the master plan. The annual report shall contain the following information:

1. The status of projects which were initiated or under construction during the previous year;

2. The institution’s land and structure acquisition, ownership and leasing activity outside of but within two thousand five hundred feet (2,500') of the MIO District boundary;

3. Progress made in achieving the goals and objectives contained in the transportation management program towards the reduction of single-occupant vehicle use by institution employees, staff and/or students; and

4. Progress made in meeting conditions of master plan approval.
Steve,

I won't be able to attend most of the SPU SAC this week due to a conflict with a extra meeting at City Hall of the Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee.

Please know that I support the location of the proposed SPU auditorium, the "arts street", and do not feel that on-site parking is needed. I have suggested in a separate meeting with SPU staff that they look into the possibilities for some public art for the auditorium project.

John Coney
Dear Mr. Sheppard:
I write to provide my opposition to Seattle Pacific University's proposal to build an auditorium at the corner of 3rd Avenue W. and W. Dravus. I am a local resident and believe that not only will this be an eyesore to the community, but is wrought with complications such as significant increased traffic, noise, and activity in our residential neighborhood. It is my understanding that this is being made as a "minor" amendment to the Master Plan, however, the building of a large auditorium is clearly more than a "minor" amendment.

In light of this, I would urge that in the short-term this not be brought to a vote tonight. It seems like such a major change, should at a bare minimum, be given an adequate opportunity for the public to give input in person and in writing to the proposed plan. The city should seek input from those who the auditorium will most effect - the neighbors of SPU.

I will be unable to make it to tonight's meeting. Like so many in the neighborhood surrounding SPU, I have young children and my family chose to live in our neighborhood for its quiet family appeal. A large auditorium in our neighborhood is inconsistent with our neighborhood's character and charm. I am further concerned about the certain increased traffic, parking problems, potential new traffic lights and stop signs, and additional people "hanging out" in our neighborhood - let alone the horrific complications from construction and unappealing visual effect of a large auditorium.

Hopefully, due consideration of the neighbors' concerns prior to making a decision about this matter.

Best,
Jaime Allen
3223 Conkling Place West
Seattle, WA 98119
I object to any discussion or decision by the board on whether the Crawford Music Building is a minor amendment at Tuesday's meeting, as indicated in meeting agenda item #4.

There has been no input yet on the building by the neighbors. They tell me they were not notified of our last meeting so no one showed up. They have not received minutes of the last two meetings. We have always received input from the neighbors before making decisions in the past. The neighbors should be invited to the 27th meeting and provided with past minutes and their input taken.

Also we are being asked to decide on a design that is at the early stage. Traffic flow and parking studies are not done. Architectural design and buffer conflict issues have been raised and not addressed. Clearly this building change conflicts with the Master Plan.

More issues regarding this building may be raised by the neighbors.

Last weeks Falcon says the building may cost $60 million dollars, the University does not have the money in hand, and the building may not be complete for six years. Why is there such a rush to determine the building is a "minor change". Building a building "half as big as Benaroya Hall" accessed by a minor intersection in a residential area is a major change.

It could require the installation of a traffic signal at 3rd West and Dravis with what resulting traffic impacts? It could require a 200 space garage and where would that go?

Since the building is big, as are the impacts to the public, from which we have not received input why should we be in a rush to judgment on this issue? Let's get input, see more of the design, see concerns raised already addressed, hear from the neighbors, see what the traffic and parking studies show, see buffer and architectural issues addressed, then make a rational decision.

I am opposed to making any decision on a minor amendment at Tuesday's meeting and request this be removed from meeting item #4.
Dear Steve,

I am very concerned about SPU’s plans to build an auditorium on 3rd Ave. West and W. Dravus. A large facility will increase parking and traffic congestion in a quiet residential neighborhood.

This is not a minor amendment to their master plan. It could have a major impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Furthermore, it is my understanding that comments have not been solicited from neighbors.

Please do not rush the decision to build this auditorium.

Susan Gossman
3270 Conkling Place West
Seattle, WA 98119
Review of the SPU University Center
Comments from John Coney and Douglas McNutt

1. The intersection of West Dravus Street and Third Avenue West will define the southern edge of the SPU campus. There is an opportunity to create an "iconic corner" at this location. The use of large-scale public art or perhaps a greater inflection in the building façade (more than just the window looking into an interior corridor) could provide a stronger sense of arrival at this most important edge of the SPU Campus.

2. The West Dravus Street side of the University Center needs a highly developed streetscape character to soften the southern edge facing the neighborhood. Dividing the building's Dravus Street side into several separate parts has helped reduce the horizontal scale of this façade. Hopefully a way will be found to make the building's height appear less prominent, particularly since this side of the building will act as a transition to the smaller, lower housing nearby.

3. The landscape design between the sidewalks and the building is critical on the Dravus Street and Third Avenue sides. Lower planting on the Third Avenue side would allow glimpses into the Lecture Hall. Higher planting, perhaps dense story-high thickets of bamboo or other plants would help camouflage the building height on the Dravus Street side. Whatever the design, the landscape should provide a strong decisive statement to help soften the over-all scale of the University Center.

4. Dravus should be illuminated with smaller pedestrian scale lighting as well as required functional street lighting.

5. The Dravus and Fourth Avenue West driveway/sidewalk entry into the campus should be treated as more than a non-descript backside area. This location should have a pronounced sense of arrival with decorative elements such as pavers, colored concrete, signature lighting, and distinctive planting. In time this entry may become a significant campus gateway, welcoming in the neighborhood residents south of the campus.