



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

Kathy Nyland, Director



MEMBERS

- David Arnesen
- John Feit
- Loyal Hanrahan
- James Kirkpatrick
- Devin Reynolds
- Wolf Saar
- Pam Stewart
- Mark Stoner
- Bill Zosel
- Denise Matz (Alternate)

Ex-Officio Members

Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods
Colleen Pike,
Seattle University, Facilities Planning
and Real Estate

**Seattle University
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

Meeting Minutes

Meeting #3

August 22, 2016

Adopted October 25, 2016

Admissions & Alumni Building – Rolfe Room
Seattle University
901 12th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98122

Members and Alternates Present

David Arnesen	James Kirkpatrick	Bill Zosel
Wolf Saar	Devin Reynolds	Denise Matz (alternate)
Pam Stewart	Mark Stoner	John Feit (alternate)

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan	DON
BreAnne McConkie	SDCI
Emily Ehlers	SDOT
Colleen Pike	SU, Facilities Planning & Real Estate
Lara Branigan	SU, Design & Construction
Robert Schwartz	SU, Facilities Services
Jason Jones	Ankrom Moisan Architects
Bruce McKee	Capstone Development Partners

I. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Maureen Sheehan opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

Ms. Sheehan provided a brief overview of the agenda including the nomination process for the Committee’s chairperson and co-chairperson and the adoption of the June 2016 minutes.

II. Housekeeping

Mr. John Feit and Ms. Pam Stewart were nominated for Chair, and Mr. Devin Reynolds and Mr. Mark Stone for co-Chair.

The Committee unanimously elected Ms. Stewart as Chairperson and Mr. Reynolds as co-Chair by anonymous paper ballot.

Ms. Sheehan handed over the meeting duties to the Committee chair, Ms. Stewart.

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion to adopt the June 20, 2016 minutes. A motion was made to adopt the June 2016 minutes and it was seconded. The Committee voted and the June 2016 minutes were adopted.

III. 1107 East Madison – Design Update (00:12:35)

Mr. Jason Jones presentation included: a) neighborhood context; b) sidewalk along Madison; c) curb cut off of 12th Avenue, campus plaza, and the e) building materials.

The following principles and guidelines were used in the design including: a) respecting the context of the campus and urban fabric; b) welcoming entries on Madison and campus; c) active ground floor; d) quality materials that are consistent with the campus architecture, and the e) design for resiliency.

A site diagram was shown that indicated the site origin as well as campus entry, bus lines, pedestrians and traffic routes.

Mr. Jones commented about the livability and existing conditions around the site and ideas to make it a better sidewalk. The project team proposed to install a 4 ft. vegetation strip along the site.

He mentioned that the team is excited about the bio-filtration site on the plaza along Madison court at the base of the building.

Finally, Mr. Jones presented the building materials that showed the textures and colors proposed for the different panels of the building.

Mr. John Feit commented that the building design reminded him of a telecommunications building and the design was too buttoned up and needed to be more "happy". He would like to see the building stand out and embrace the structural design quality of the newer and better buildings around the campus. He also would like to see the building design capture the essence and influence of the Capitol Hill neighborhood. He noted that since the building will be a tall building and also at the main thoroughfare of Madison Avenue, it should at least be more appealing to the public.

Mr. Feit commented about the use of high quality materials and the details to be used for the building, but would like to see a happier building rather than a dark building. He noted his concern about proportion of the window openings to the overall mass of the building and how it does not appeal because of the dark proportions of the openings.

Mr. Wolf Saar asked if the project team looked at wrapping brick all the way around the building. Mr. Jones noted that it was preferred to have the bricks wrap around the entire exterior of the building, but it is not feasible due to the fact the brick cannot be staged over the adjacent properties.

Mr. Saar also commented about the window proportion of all three floors of the building and how it might be bothersome to some due to their appearing small in size. Mr. Jones noted that the window proportions are very big in scale.

Note: The Committee members, Design Team, University, and members of the public visited the site and reconvened after the walkthrough to discuss what they observed.

The design team thanked the committee for their comments and responded that they would explore how to make the building more visually interesting.

Ms. Stewart commented that another design update presentation from the team would be sufficient to address some of the concerns the Committee members saw during the walkthrough.

As the project continues to evolve, the design team will provide design updates to the Committee on where they are, and they will continue to gather feedback and comments from the Committee.

Mr. Saar commented that looking at the storage building, he liked what he saw during the walkthrough because of its strong vertical elements. One of his issues about the proposed building was the brick façade and punched openings that seem to have an odd aspect ratio. He also reiterated the importance of trying to expand the sidewalk further to more than the additional 6 inch increase now proposed from the previous iteration.

Mr. Bill Zosel asked SDOT for clarification regarding the Committee's response to their original approach of a 14' sidewalk standard.

Ms. Emily Ehlers of SDOT responded that the existing 8'-wide pedestrian zone (which includes street trees, a bus stop, and the sidewalk) is substandard. SDOT recommends a minimum first floor set back of 4' to accommodate wider sidewalks. The city's draft right-of-way improvements manual standard for this location is 14'-wide pedestrian area (8'-wide minimum sidewalk and 6'-wide planting strip).

The Design Team commented that they had considered several options and one of these options was the building transition. They noted that there are a number of challenging constraints that the team has to consider in order to

accommodate and balance the appropriate space, including the ability to balance between the sidewalk width and the need to accommodate office space.

Mr. Zosel suggested if there is an opportunity to move the ground floor and push it out further to the second floor without losing more space. He noted that a number of years ago, there was a proposal to turn the sub-storage building into a campus use and a decision was made not to pursue it, and that is available space.

Mr. Saar commented about the University's concern of losing space, and since that the building is 100+ years old, it is important for this Committee to be very deliberate and try to get the most sidewalk width it can possibly can for the public realm. The Committee recognized that the reduction in standard is what driving these suggestions. He noted that a possible middle ground can be identified that might not work, but there should be some solution about getting more sidewalk and having more space on the second level of the building. He would like to see getting a sidewalk that is a strong public connector.

The Design Team understood the concerns and has spent some time about this issue, but noted that one aspect that will not change is the storage building and its limited sidewalk.

Ms. Stewart commented that the Committee will look forward to another design iteration at the next meeting.

She brought to attention Mr. Bill Zosel's motion to move one of the Committee's alternate positions to a regular position. She asked both alternates for any comments with regards to the motion. Ms. Denise Matz commented that she is comfortable remaining an alternate and would be fine having Mr. Feit's move to a regular position.

The motion to move John Feit's alternate position to a regular position was seconded. The Committee voted and the motion was approved.

IV. Public Comment

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for public comments.

Comments from Ms. Brie Gyncild: Ms. Gyncild echoed Mr. Saar's comments, and agreed that there needs to be a common ground on the bottleneck issues that can provide benefits to both the public and the University. She expanded by noting that, although the narrowing of the sidewalk at the Storage Building is a constraint today, this may not be the case in the future. She is excited about the work that is being done and would like to see more discussions and input in the future to resolve any differences.

V. Committee Deliberation

Ms. Stewart opened the discussion for Committee deliberation.

Mr. Devin Reynolds responded to Ms. Gyncild comments and noted that it was good to know about the bottleneck issues with the sidewalks. He agreed on making sure that the pedestrian and bicycle experiences are given attention in the project.

Mr. Saar commented about the site tour and how illuminating it was to see the scale and visualize what the Design Team intended to do. He also noted the potential problems and challenges he saw along the 12th Avenue curb cut, which is already a congested area and tended to agree with the University's approach of providing a wider curb cut.

Ms. Sheehan commented about the letter about pre-MUP intake that was sent to SDIC last month. Currently, the project is in a comment review period.

She informed the Committee that tonight's presentation as well as all other presentation from this meeting are available online at the [DON](#) website.

VI. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

The committee will meet again when the design team is ready to update the committee based on the feedback received tonight. No further business being before the Committee, Ms. Stewart adjourned the meeting.