Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Darlene Hickman who welcomed attendees. Brief introductions followed. Ms. Hickman stated that the committee meeting might extend slightly beyond 8:00 PM and asked for member’s indulgence. Some members of the audience asked if it might be possible to have the public comment period moved forward, especially in the event that votes needed to be taken. Ms Hickman responded that it was not considered appropriate to intersperse comments but that in the event that votes were to be taken then it might be possible to move public comment forward to come prior to the votes.

II. Housekeeping.

A. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The agenda and minutes for the previous meeting were approved without substantive change.

B. Committee Maintenance

Steve Sheppard noted that the maximum size of the Committee is 12 and the minimum 6. Initially 12 members were appointed, but two have moved on and there are presently 10 remaining members. One Member has moved within the City and while she is still eligible to remain a
member, may also drop. As a result, at least two and possibly three members and a couple of alternates could be solicited, but need not be at this point. He noted that that members are typically appointed for two year renewable terms and that at this point all members are being considered as having been re-appointed. He asked that if any members wished to terminate their membership that they should inform him. In the event that the committee loses members so that it is less than 9 active members then a decision will be made concerning solicitation for new members. He noted that if such outreach is done, that special efforts will be made to assure that there are design professionals involved who can assist with the review of new buildings as they are proposed.

III Campus Character – an Architects Perspective

Doug Jennings and Douglas McNutt were introduced to briefly discuss issues related to Campus and Building Design. Mr. Jennings noted that the design and character of the campus affects whether students choose to apply to a particular school. In addition the character and environment of campus affects ones sense of safety and security. He noted that he had met with Melanie and Dave to explore thoughts and everyone shared a common interest in assuring that the character of campus be preserved and enhanced. He noted that there is an upcoming conference that will include a presentation by Susan Painter and invited all members to come to this presentation. He noted that he has participated in a few “webinars” concerning campus design and noted that architectural designs, landscape and overall campus lay out all affect how one perceives the campus.

IV. University Center Project

SPU staff was introduced to discuss the University Center Project. It was noted that at the last meeting SPU was talking about an auditorium at 3rd and Nickerson and a parking structure with ground level retail. Given the present economic climate, the retail project is now on hold. After considerable internal discussion it was determined that the all of the arts related projects including the auditorium should be consolidated into one structure. This would replace the auditorium at 3rd and Nickerson. The new facility would be located at 3rd and Dravus. Changing to this site will likely require an eventual minor amendment to the SPU Master Plan since the use was not initially anticipated at this site.

Mr. Bob Hull, from Miller Hull Partnership was introduced to discuss the project. Mr. Hull noted that he is a 37 year resident of Queen Anne and has worked with SPU for years. He noted that the project is in a schematic or pre-schematic phase. He briefly went over other buildings that his firm has designed for SPU. He noted that many of the art functions will be moved to this site.

Mr. Hull then went over the preliminary designs for a series of slides. He noted that the site is bounded by McKinley Hall , Beegll Hall, W. Dravus and 3rd Avenue W. The building will include a major auditorium and relate to the “Art Street”. The building will be designed to fit within the campus architecture that surrounds it and there will be an effort to respect the nearby church. He noted that all of the drawings presented are very preliminary. The preliminary designs are intended to fit within the MIO 50 designation and are broken up to reduce the appearance of height, bulk and scale. The hope is that the trees behind the building will continue to be visible.

He then entertained questions for the committee. A Member noted that the project might generate a great deal of traffic especially for the auditorium function. Mr. Hull responded that this is largely replacing existing programs and might not generate a great deal of new traffic. Nancy Ousley asked for clarification on the size of the auditorium function. Mr. Hull responded that entire project is 117,000 gross square feet. He noted that the initial design appears almost as two separate buildings but is actually one building connected underground. There will be 1100 seats in the auditorium. He noted that this is about half of the size of Benaroya Hall downtown. Others offered the opinion that this will generate more traffic and that this should be carefully evaluated.

Others members noted that at its previous location, this project was combined with the construction of an underground parking garage. That element appears to be missing at this location. The member asked if this was the case and what it implied. Mr. Hull responded that they are beginning design now on Miller Hall and that this presentation is at a very early
phase. Comments given today will be taken into account and the project will be brought back to the Committee later this year.

Collin Vasquez from DPD stated that he is a bit concerned that the project does not appear to give sufficient attention to Dravus Street. He stated that he would like to see a bit more design attention given to the way the building relates to this street. This needs as much attention as is given to 3rd Avenue or to the interior of campus. We need to encourage pedestrian interaction along this frontage. Mr. Hull noted that there is a major entry to the building off of this street front. Steve Sheppard noted that this building would not go through design review and that this committee is partially charged with reviewing building designs especially along the edges of the campus.

Jay LaVassar noted that this facility should also provide parking. He noted that when located at Nickerson the project included parking, but that at this location it does not. He suggested that a careful look be taken concerning the potential parking impacts at this location and consideration be given to an associated garage.

V. Discussion of Parking Issues

David Church noted that at a previous meeting the Committee asked that SPU discuss parking. He noted that the University has hired David Johnson with Transportation Solutions Inc. to look at parking issues. SPU has completed a study in late August and early September of all of the cars on the street as well as in SPU Parking lots so that a base line could be established and then did the same study after fall quarter started so that SPU could see what their impact was within the RPZ zone and beyond.

Mr. Johnson stated that the goal of the study was to document both on and off campus parking supplies and to determine if those supplies were adequate to accommodate the demand. They also wanted to look at the effectiveness of the surrounding Residential Parking Zones (RPZs) and what proportion of on-street supply was taken by SPU faculty and students. He noted that in the boundaries of the study were set by determining a reasonable walking distance and briefly went over methodology.

Mr. Johnson noted that there are over 2,100 parking stalls in the study area of which 1900 are uncontrolled and open to parking at all hours of the day. The others either are within the RPZs or have other restrictions such as time restrictions or loading zone designations. The conclusion of the study is that the drive alone commuter students are relatively low at 52% of commuter students. It was also determined that at peak only 50% of spaces within the RPZ's are used so that the RPZs appear to be doing their job.

Mary Catherine Snyder with the City of Seattle was introduced to discuss parking policies of the City. The City's goals are to manage on and off street parking so that meeting development goals, supporting transit, reduce auto use and improve air quality. She handed out information on the types of zones. She also noted that the Seattle City council is looking at City-wide changes to the program. Changes that are being proposed would limit the number of permanent guest passes and institute a temporary guest pass system. She also noted that there is an ongoing effort to improve enforcement or RPZ restrictions.

It was noted that there are major changes occurring all over Queen Anne. Homes are being converted from Single Family to duplexes and parking ever more difficult. These new units are only required to provide one parking space per unit and this is a problem. Ms. Snyder responded that there is an attempt to further affordable housing policies by relaxing parking requirements sometimes. Others asked for clarification on how parking restrictions are established. Ms. Snyder responded that this is sometimes done because of the narrowness of the street. It was also noted that evening utilization appears to be increasing and that this is after the time limit on the RPZ expires.

VI. Project Updates

David Church gave brief project updates. He noted that Irondale Residence hall and 6th Avenue W. and W. Bertona St., is now in for a permit and once the permit is issued, SPU will retain the permit, but it is no longer clear that the project will be started soon. The Cremona Modular Project is under permit and the project will likely go forward next summer. This is adjacent to the Ross Parking lot where two houses are currently located. He noted that this is a temporary use but there is
no timeline for their removal. Ultimately this site may become a sports facility, but there is no schedule for this. The project is 8400 square feet and may provide swing space for programs that must be relocated when new buildings are being constructed. This is a five classroom project. The Parking expansion will include 67 stalls and this is still on schedule and permits will soon be requested. It may not be constructed until the summer after next.

VII. Public Comments

Comments of Denise Derr - Ms. Derr stated that she lives on 4th Avenue W. This is the main residential street. She noted that she has lived in this location for 12 years or so. Twice a year there is a near head-on collision at the intersections on this street. She has repeatedly asked traffic circles at these locations – 4th and West Fulton and West Barrett Streets. The hill is steep and cars go downhill at high speeds.

Comments of Rita Shaw – Ms. Shaw noted that there are four modular buildings on Nickerson Street that were put up about ten years ago. These buildings were erected sequentially and this allowed them to come in just under where each would have been required to meet greater health and safety standards. These buildings were supposed to be up for only five years but they still exist.

Comments of Sharon Levine – Ms. Levine noted that SPU had committed to assure that development on the edges of the Campus respected the neighborhood and noted that she was uneasy with the auditorium project location, and particularly with the possible noise associated with mechanical equipment. Other locations might be less problematic.

VI. Adjournment

No further business being before the Committee the Meeting was adjourned.