

Attachment 1

Conditions of Approval for the
University of Washington 2018 Seattle Campus Master Plan

The City Council approves the University of Washington 2018 Seattle Campus Master Plan, as found in Clerk File 314346, provided that the University of Washington makes the following changes to the Plan as recommended by the Seattle Hearing Examiner and amended by the City Council.

1. Amend page 276 of the Housing section to include the statement, “The University shall construct no fewer than 150 affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI and no fewer than 300 additional affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 80% AMI within the MIO boundary, Primary Impact Zone, or Secondary Impact Zone prior to the completion of 6 million net new gross square feet authorized by the CMP.”

2. A condition of the Master Plan shall state: “The University shall construct no fewer than 150 affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 60% AMI and no fewer than 300 additional affordable housing units for faculty and staff earning less than 80% AMI within the MIO boundary, Primary Impact Zone, or Secondary Impact Zone. All the required housing shall be constructed prior to the completion of 6 million net new gross square feet authorized by the CMP.”

3. Page 98: Amend the first paragraph under “Open Space Commitment”:

...A design and implementation plan for the West Campus Green and the West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall be completed by the earlier of: the time 1.5 million square feet of net new development in the West Campus sector is completed; or the time the University submits its first permit application for development of Site W27, W29, W33, W34, or W35.

4. Page 102: Amend the second paragraph under “Open Space Commitment”:

A design and implementation plan for the South Campus Greens, as well as the South Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall ~~occur when construction on the first adjacent development site is completed~~ (be completed by the time the University submits the first permit application for development of Sites S50, S51, S52, S41, S42, S45, or S46).

5. Page 104: Amend the second bullet under “Open Space Commitment”:

~~Construction Completion~~ of the East Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall ~~align with~~ be completed by the earlier of: completion of construction of the 750,000 gross square feet of net new development allowed in East campus under the CMP; or exhaustion of the 6 million square foot growth allowance.

6. Page 240: Amend the last three sentences of the first paragraph under “West Campus Green and Plaza”:

A design and implementation plan for West Campus Green and West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall be completed by the earlier of: the time 1.5 million square feet of net new development in the West Campus sector is completed; or the time the University submits its first permit application for development of Site W27, W29, W33, W34, or W35. A concept plan for all three sections of the continuous waterfront trail-West, South, and East-shall also be completed ~~at this~~ by that time. The concept plan for the continuous waterfront trail shall be reviewed by SDCI for compliance with the City’s Shoreline Management Master Program and the University’s Shoreline Public Access Plan. The continuous waterfront trail design and implementation plan for the South and East campus sectors shall include convenient pickup and drop off facilities and signage throughout the length of the trail that reflects local Native American history.

~~At the latest, e~~ Construction of the West Campus Green and the West Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall occur when shall be completed by the earlier of: completion of 3.0 million gross square feet of net new development in the West Campus Sector; at the completion of adjacent development sites W29, W33, and W34; or the exhaustion of the 6 million gross square foot growth allowance. The University shall complete construction of the “Plaza” prior to completion of development of Site W29. The University shall complete construction of the “Belvedere” prior to completion of development on Site W27. The Plaza and the Belvedere are identified on page 98.

7. Page 240: Amend the second paragraph under “South Campus Green”:

A design and implementation plan for the Greens, as well as the South Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall ~~occur when construction on the first adjacent development site is completed~~ be completed by the time the University submits the first permit application for development of Site (Sites S50, S51, S52, S41, S42, S45, or S46).

8. Page 240: Amend the third paragraph under “Continuous Waterfront Trail”:

~~Construction of the~~ The East Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall align with be completed by the earlier of: completion of construction of the 750,000 gross square feet of net new development allowed in East campus under the CMP; or exhaustion of the 6 million square foot growth allowance.

9. The University shall include updates about the progress of the planning and completion of the West Campus Green, the South Campus Green, and the continuous waterfront trail in the annual reports to the City.

10. Page 239: Add a new section to the beginning of the page:

ACTIVE STREET-LEVEL USE AND TRANSPARENCY

Active street-level uses shall be located within buildings that are adjacent to the following locations: City of Seattle right-of-way in the West Campus sector, mid-block corridors in all sectors, the West Campus Green Plaza and the Belvedere, the South Campus Green, and the continuous waterfront trail. Active street-level uses include commercial uses, child-care facilities, multi-use lobbies, lounges, study spaces, and active academic uses like classrooms, labs, libraries and hands-on collaboration spaces. All buildings with required active street-level use shall provide transparency within 2-8 feet above the sidewalk along 60% of the building façade. Where active street level uses are required, street-level parking within structures, excluding driveway access and garage doors or openings, is prohibited unless the parking is separated from street-level street-facing facades by active street level uses that comply with the use and transparency requirements of this paragraph.

11. Amend the first two paragraphs under “Parking” on pages 240 and 241 to remove the student parking requirements, as follows:

PARKING

Parking is planned on a campus-wide basis, and needs for parking near new development are assessed concurrently with development planning. Parking spaces may be located in any sector to accommodate need. There is no minimum parking requirement. Overall, motor vehicle parking is limited to a maximum of 9,000+2,300 spaces within the MIO (the “parking cap”). Service and load zones, ~~parking for student housing,~~ and accessory off-campus leased or owned spaces are not counted toward the parking cap. Above-ground parking is not counted against the net new 6 million square foot growth allowance in the CMP.

~~Minimum parking standards for new student housing will be one space per unit for family housing and spaces for up to 4 percent of total residents for single student housing.~~

12. Page 68: Under “Parking Lot Typologies,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

PARKING LOT TYPOLOGIES

Parking on campus is provided through surface, structured, and underground parking lots of varying sizes. As the campus has grown, surface parking lots have increasingly been replaced by buildings, sometimes without replacing lost parking capacity on that site. ~~1991, the University agreed to a parking space cap of 12,300 in the MIO and that same cap is in place today, 25 years later. A parking limit of 9,000 spaces is established to reflect parking use and to discourage single-occupancy vehicular access to the campus.~~

13. Amend the last paragraph on page 68 as follows:

The following types of spaces are excluded from the parking space cap and the parking count in the table: bicycle, loading spaces, the UW vehicle, physical plant vehicle, shuttle, UCAR, and miscellaneous restricted parking spaces, and parking associated with residence halls.

14. Amend Table 5 on page 68 of the Master Plan to include parking associated with residence halls.

15. Page 68: Table 5. “Existing Parking Lots within Parking Spaces Cap, 2016” amend the notes at the bottom of the table as follows:

Total – 10,667 Parking Cap – ~~12,300~~9,000 ~~Under~~Over Cap – ~~1,633~~1,667

16. Page 120: Under “Parking,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

PARKING

The existing parking cap of 12,300 parking spaces ~~remains unchanged~~ is reduced to 9,000 parking spaces. All new parking shall remain within the 9,000 ~~12,300~~-parking spaces cap.

17. Page 240: Under “Parking,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

PARKING

Parking is planned on a campus-wide basis, and needs for parking near new development are assessed concurrently with development planning. Parking spaces may be located in any sector to accommodate need. Overall, motor vehicle parking is limited to a maximum of 9,000 ~~12,300~~ spaces within the MIO (the “parking cap”). Service and load zones, parking for student housing, and accessory off-campus leased or owned spaces are not counted toward the parking cap. Above-ground parking is not counted against the net new 6 million square foot growth allowance in the CMP.

18. Page 241: Under “Parking,” amend the paragraph in the middle of the page:

Parking access is preferred from streets owned by the University. Where necessary, parking access from streets that are not owned by the University shall be allowed based on the following hierarchy of preference (from most preferred to least preferred). ~~A determination on the~~ The final access location shall balance the need to minimize safety hazards and the feasibility of the access location based on topography, transit operations, bike infrastructure, vehicle movement, and other considerations. A determination on the final access location shall be made by SDCI, in consultation with SDOT, based on this hierarchy:

- 1. Alley
- 2. Local Access Road

- 3. Minor Arterial
- 4. Major Arterial Street
- 5. Major transit street or street with bicycle facility
- 6. A Designated Neighborhood Green Street

19. Page 260: Under “Introduction,” amend the last paragraph on the page as follows:
To reinforce the University’s commitment to limiting auto travel, the University shall ~~continue to~~ cap the number of parking stalls available to commuters within the Major Institution Overlay boundary to ~~12,300~~ 9,000. ~~This parking cap has remained unchanged since 1984.~~

20. Page 242: Under “Public Realm Allowance,” amend the second paragraph:

The public realm allowance refers to a minimum zone between the street curb and the edge of building facade, and is intended to provide space for a comfortable and desirable pedestrian experience. ~~The public realm allowance proposed are based upon and maintain the current street widths which the University understands to be sufficient. City of Seattle right-of-way widths are determined by SMC Chapter 23.53 and the Street Improvement Manual, or functional successor. Where required, improvements within the public realm allowance shall comply with any applicable Green Street Concept Plan.~~ City of Seattle right-of-way widths are determined by SMC Chapter 23.53 and the Street Improvement Manual, or functional successor. Where required, improvements within the public realm allowance shall comply with any applicable Green Street Concept Plan. The existing curb-to-curb width, plus the linear square feet associated with the public realm allowance defines the extent of impact on development sites.

21. Page 251: Under “Upper Level Setbacks,” amend the first paragraph under “First Upper Level Setback”:

~~Sites with building~~ Buildings with footprints that exceed 30,000 square feet shall maintain a minimum upper-level setback of 20’ along sides of the building where the height exceeds the 45’ podium. ~~Sites with building~~ Buildings with footprints smaller than 30,000 square feet and whose building height exceeds the 45’ podium height shall maintain a minimum upper-level setback of 20’ along at least two edges of the podium. The required upper-level setback shall be provided along the street or major public open space façade if one exists. If necessary to allow flexibility and modulation of the building form, a maximum of 50 percent of the building perimeter may extend up to 90’ without a setback.

22. Page 251: Under “Second Upper Level Setback,” amend the first paragraph as follows:

To create a more gradual transition between University and non-University property, an additional upper level setback shall be required ~~on building edges identified within the Development Standards and Design Guidance maps, pages 174, 189, 298, and 226. for University property as follows: sites with building~~ buildings with footprints that exceed 20,000 square feet and whose building height exceeds 160’ that are located along University Way and Campus Parkway, ~~shall be are~~ required to step back an additional 20’ at 90’ in height along a minimum of one façade, generally the facade facing the more prominent street edge. ~~Sites with building~~ Buildings with footprints that exceed 20,000 square feet and whose building height exceeds 160’ that are located

along Pacific Street, ~~shall be~~ required to step back an additional 20’ at 120’ in height along a minimum of one façade, generally the façade facing the more prominent street edge. The required second upper-level setback shall be provided along the street or major public open space façade if one exists.

23. Page 239: Under “Ground Level Setbacks,” amend the third paragraph:

~~Setbacks may be averaged horizontally or vertically.~~ University structures across a City street or alley from commercial, mixed use, manufacturing, or industrial zones outside the MIO boundary ~~shall~~ have no required ground level setbacks. Pedestrian bridges, retaining walls, raised plazas, sculpture and other site elements ~~shall~~ have no required setbacks requirements.

24. Page 156: Amend the paragraph under “Gateways”:

The University’s UW-Seattle campus is embedded within the larger urban fabric of the city and has multiple points of access. Gateways, including NE 45th Street at 15th Avenue NE, the “landing” of the University Bridge at NE 40th Street, and NE 45th Street at 25th Avenue NE, serve as important access points for pedestrians, bikes, and vehicles, and may provide a welcoming and clear sense of arrival on campus. Gateways also form key points of connectivity between campus sectors. Gateways should include visual enhancements that signify entries into the community, such as landscaping, signage, artwork, or architectural features that will be installed at the discretion of the University.

25. Page 232: Amend the second bulleted paragraph:

~~A new development site: A proposal for a development site not previously approved under the Master Plan is considered a proposed change to the Master Plan and will comply with the City-University Agreement Section II.C.1 – 5, Changes to University Master Plan. shall constitute an exempt Campus Master Plan change, unless the proposal requires a Plan amendment according to the provisions of the City-University Agreement because the Director of SDCI (or its successor department) determines that the specific use proposed for a site, within the broad use categories permitted in tables 14 through 17, is inconsistent with the guiding principles or policies of this Campus Master Plan, or because of the use relationship to, or cumulative use impacts upon, area surrounding the University boundary.~~

26. Page 233: Remove the two bulleted paragraphs.

27. Page 261: Amend the first bulleted item and the first sentence of the third bulleted item:

“Convene a transportation agency stakeholder meeting, at least quarterly, to review progress and discuss unforeseen transportation challenges and opportunities. Meeting attendees may comment on but do not have authority to set TMP priorities.”

“Conduct an annual survey and provide the results of its efforts to the City-University Citizen Advisory Committee (CUCAC), SDOT Director, SDCI Director, Seattle City Council members, transportation agency stakeholders, and transit agency partners.”

28. Page 261: Under “Monitoring and Reporting,” amend the text following the bulleted items:

The University’s TMP SOV rate goal is 17% as of the date of this Plan. The goal shall decrease to 15% one year after the opening of the Northgate Link Extension, to 13% one year after the opening of the Lynnwood Link Extension, and to 12% by 2028 or upon the development of six million net new gross square feet, if occurring earlier than 2028 (but no sooner than the opening of the two Link extensions identified above.)

If the University fails to achieve the applicable SOV rate goal, the University shall take steps to enhance the TMP to increase the likelihood that the goal will be achieved. Additional measures will be chosen by the University and may include, but are not limited to:

- Providing a transit pass that covers all transit trips with a minimum University subsidy of 50% for faculty, staff, and students, pursuant to SDCI Director’s Rule 27-2015 and SMC 23.54.016
- Replicating the student U-Pass “opt-out” program with faculty and staff to encourage participation among campus populations less likely to use transit
- Expanding the U-Pass to integrate payment for other transportation options, such as car-share or bike-share
- Implementing performance-based parking strategies, including charging more for high-demand parking lots
- Replacing monthly parking permits with a pay-by-use parking payment model

~~In 2028, if the University has not failed to timely reached its SOV rate goal of 17%, 15%, 13%, or 12% for a period of 24 months after the deadlines identified above have been reached, the Director of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) or its successor agency shall not issue master use permits or building permits shall not be issued for proposed development (other than maintenance, emergency repair, or other minor projects) within the MIO. if the University exceeds the 15% SOV goal over two consecutive years beginning in 2029. The Director of the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI)(or its successor agency) The SDCI Director shall withhold permits deny permit applications until the University has it has been reasonably demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director that it will implement additional mitigation measures shall be implemented that shall meet or restore the University student, faculty, and staff that will achieve the SOV rate to 15%. This measure shall not be applied to maintenance, emergency repair, or other minor projects proposed by the University.~~

29. Pages 50-51: Under “Movement to and from Campus” amend this section as follows:

MOVEMENT TO AND FROM CAMPUS

The University of Washington has an extremely desirable mode split—a term used to describe the various ways students, faculty and staff travel to and from campus. Its single occupancy vehicle (drive-alone) rate is low at ~~20~~ 17 percent of campus commutes, while walking, biking and transit collectively account for ~~72~~ 76 percent of campus commutes. The introduction of light rail is anticipated to further modify the mode split. The mode split is discussed in greater detail in the Transportation Management Plan Chapter, the University of Washington Master Plan Seattle Campus Annual Reports, and the Transportation Discipline Report in the CMP EIS.

The mode split aligns with the findings from the campus wide MyPlaces survey as part of the Campus Landscape Framework, in which individuals were asked to identify key campus gateways, or locations at which individuals enter the campus. Details of the mode split analysis methods and history are provided in the Transportation Discipline Report of the CMP EIS. In the mode split analysis, the intersection of 15th Avenue NE and Campus Parkway emerged as the primary gateway to campus, which aligns with Campus Parkway’s identity as one of two significant transit hubs near campus (the second hub is located at the Montlake Triangle). Additional gateways are also located along 15th Avenue NE and at the intersection of 45th Street and Memorial Way, which further reinforces the need to better integrate the entrances to campus with the surrounding urban context. Fewer gateways were identified along the edges of East Campus, which signals the need to improve connections between the Central and East Campus sectors generally.

The campus wide mode split for faculty, staff and students is taken from a U-Pass survey of travel modes to the campus in the morning. The 2015 survey’s results ~~are~~ were consistent with survey results from the last decade, and showed the drive alone to campus rate ~~is~~ was approximately 20%; ~~however,~~ However, the 2016 survey’s results, which represent the conditions after the opening of the Husky Stadium light rail station, indicate a drive alone rate of only ~~18%~~ 17%. The Transportation Discipline Report describes the analysis and ~~is~~ was based on the more conservative 20% drive alone mode split from 2015. The Campus Master Plan is based on the 2016 mode split of 17%.

30. Pages 51: Figure 32. 2015 Mode Split (Morning Arrivals to Campus):

Update Figure 32 to reflect the 2016 Mode Split from the 2016 U-Pass annual survey results.

31. Page 260: Under “Introduction,” amend the second paragraph:

Beginning in 1983, the University’s commitment to managing its transportation impacts was formalized in its Transportation Management Plan, which embodies the intent to expand commuting options for University students, staff, and faculty, and to shift travel habits away from single occupancy vehicles. The primary goal of the University’s TMP is to reach ~~a 15%~~ 12% single occupancy vehicle rate by 2028. Through its active and innovative efforts, the University has successfully kept single occupant vehicle trips under 1990 level despite a 35% increase in campus population.

32. Page 260: Under “Transportation Management Plan Goal”

Limit the proportion of drive-alone trips of student, staff and faculty to 15% ~~by 2028.~~one year after opening of the Northgate Link Extension, to 13% one year after opening of the Lynnwood Link Extension and 12% by 2028 or the development of six million net new gross square feet, whichever is earlier (but no sooner than the opening of the two Link Extensions).

33. Maintain the existing MIO height limitations for properties along University Way north of Campus Parkway (105’ for Site W19 and 65’ for site W20). Amend Table 10: Maximum Building Ht. Limit and Figures 125, 150, 153 and 191 to show the MIO height limitation of 105 ft. for Site W19 and 65 ft. for Site W20.

34. Limit structure height on development sites W31 and W32 to 30 ft. and amend Table 10 “Conditioned Down Building Heights” accordingly.

35.

(a) Pages 208 – 209 (Figure 169): Change to a Secondary Access Corridor the Priority Pedestrian Connector that extends southward from the northern end of Portage Bay Vista. Also change to Secondary Access Corridors two of the three northeast-southwest-oriented Priority Pedestrian Connectors (the three that are perpendicular to NE Pacific St.). List the symbols used to identify the Secondary Access Corridors in Figure 169’s key on page 209 under “Development Standards.”

(b) Page 240: Under “South Campus Green,” add the following to the end of the second paragraph:

The design and implementation plan for the Greens and South Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail shall include the final locations and dimensions of mid-block corridors, secondary access corridors and priority pedestrian connectors represented in Figure 169.

(c) Page 244: Add the following new development standard before “Shorelines”:

Secondary Access Corridors

Secondary access corridors are required in the approximate locations identified in Figure 169. Secondary access corridors are to be welcoming pedestrian corridors that provide public access, and views where possible, from NE Pacific Street into the South Campus and South Campus section of the continuous waterfront trail. These corridors shall be a minimum width of 12’ and, where possible, open to the sky.

36. Page 251: After the last paragraph under “View Corridors,” add:

When proposing to develop sites adjacent to or within the 12 view corridors described on Table 19 (pages 252 and 253), the University shall provide more detailed analysis of the existing or proposed views and demonstrate how the proposed development will maintain existing or proposed view corridors.

37. Page 252: Amend the View Corridor 8 description as follows:

View: Looking south at Portage Bay. The Mercer Court Apartments frame the east edge of the view corridor, with the tower of the proposed development site W37 framing the west edge. The view is of Lake Union generally to the southwest from the west pedestrian walkway along the University Bridge, at the edge of the existing UW Northlake building.

38. Page 253: Replace the View Corridor 8 graphic with the new one the University submitted to SDCI that is consistent with other view corridor graphics in terms of formatting.

39. Page 6: Amend the third paragraph under “Purpose and Context”:

Work on this CMP began in 2015 so that by 2018, the 2018 CMP would be in place to accommodate the Seattle campus’ growth demands. Between 2015 and 2018, the University of Washington developed this long-term vision for the Seattle campus as well as a 10-year conceptual plan for campus growth that ~~balances~~ provides for the preservation of historic campus assets with intensive investment.

40. Page 8: Amend the paragraph under “Guiding Principles”:

The CMP creates a framework designed to enable the UW’s continued evolution as a 21st century public higher education research and service institution. The CMP ~~balances~~ provides for the preservation of historic campus assets with increased density, and relies on the University’s strategic goals, academic, research, and service missions, and capital plan objectives, to inform the physical development of the campus. Five overarching principles guide the 2018 CMP:

41. Page 24: Amend paragraph Nos. 1, 3, and 5 under “Regulatory Authority and Planning Process”:

1. ~~Pursuant to RCW 28B.20.130, The University of Washington Board of Regents exercises full control of the University and its property has~~ “full control of the University and its property of various kinds, except as otherwise provided by State law.” Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.103 and .200, “[s]tate agencies shall comply with the local . . . development regulations and amendments thereto adopted pursuant to this chapter,” but “[n]o local . . . development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities,” including “state education facilities.” The Washington Supreme Court has ruled that the University is a state agency and that the Regents’ “full control” under RCW 28B.20.130 is limited by RCW 36.70A.103.

3. The City-University Agreement governs preparation of the CMP. Consistent with the City-University Agreement and the City’s Major Institutions Code, the CMP includes design guidance, development standards of the underlying zoning, and other elements unlike those applicable to other major institutions which differ from or are in addition to those included in the City’s Major Institutions Code, consistent with the City-University Agreement. A Major Institution Overlay (MIO) district and boundaries are established through the ~~CMP adoption and e~~City ordinance.

5. ~~The University shall comply with the provisions of the Seattle Shoreline Master Program and other applicable State or Federal laws.~~ University development remains subject to City development regulations that do not constitute development standards of the underlying zoning and do not preclude the siting of an essential public facility within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.200.

42. Page 150: Amend the paragraph under “Introduction”:

Chapter 6 contains detailed information on the 10-year conceptual plan for campus, including sector-by-sector descriptions of the design goals for each area. This Chapter further provides information on the University’s Project Review Processes, and includes non-binding design guidance. Although non-binding, design guidance will be implemented through capital project design and environmental review carried out by the Architectural Commission, the University Landscape Advisory Committee, the Design Review Board (all as applicable), and project design teams. ~~In a few places, Several figures reference~~ development standards are referenced; these standards of the underlying zoning are set out and explained further as mandatory requirements in Chapter 7.

43. Page 151: Amend the paragraph under “Demolition”:

~~Demolition is permitted prior to future development as long as sites are left in a safe condition and free of debris. Demolition may be permitted prior to future development where authorized by any required permit. Demolition permits are~~ may be submitted in advance of a building site being selected for development and any grading work is reviewed under the Grading Code (SMC Chapter 22.170). ~~Demolition of any structure, including any structure that is more than 25 years old or historic, is allowed if authorized by the UW Board of Regents.~~

44. Page 153: Amend the first four sentences of the first paragraph under “History of Stewardship by the Board of Regents”:

Over the last century, the University of Washington Board of Regents has been the steward of the University of Washington campus. The Regents recognize the value of the campus setting to the University, the greater University area community, the City of Seattle, the State of Washington, and future generations. The University is ~~As a state institution of higher education and a state agency. Pursuant to RCW 28B.20.130,~~ the Regents “have full control and authority over the

~~development of the campus of the university and its property of various kinds, except as otherwise provided by law.” The institution is encumbered with a public purpose that is essential to the future of the State, and this purpose requires that the campus continue to be developed to meet the growing and changing education needs of the State. Pursuant to RCW 36.70A.103 and .200, “[s]tate agencies shall comply with the local . . . development regulations and amendments thereto adopted pursuant to this chapter,” but “[n]o local . . . development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities,” including “state education facilities.” The Washington Supreme Court has ruled that the University is a state agency and the Regents’ “full control” under RCW 28B.20.130 is limited by RCW 36.70A.103.~~

45. Page 155: Amend the paragraph preceding “The Historic Resource Addendum (HRA)”:

The review of historic resources on the campus utilizes the process stated above. In 2017, the Washington State Supreme Court concluded:

The plain language of the current statutes provide that the Regents’ authority is subject to limitation by applicable state statutes, including the GMA’s provision that state agencies must comply with local development regulations adopted pursuant to the GMA. UW property that is located in Seattle is thus potentially subject to the [the City’s Landmarks Preservation Ordinance] absent a specific, directly conflicting statute.

University of Washington v. City of Seattle, 188 Wn.2d 823, 845, 399 P.3d 519 (2017). and does not include a review under the City of Seattle’s Landmark Preservation Ordinance. The University’s position is that it is not subject to the ordinance, as the University of Washington Board of Regents has full control and authority over all development on campus.[†]

[†]Arguments related to this topic have been heard by the Washington Supreme Court. A decision is pending.

46. Page 230: Amend the first paragraph under “Introduction”:

Consistent with SMC 23.69.006.B, this This chapter outlines the development standards of the underlying zoning that guide proposed-regulate development within the campus boundaries. The City-University Agreement requires that all University of Washington development within the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) boundary follow the standards outlined in this chapter. While Chapter 6 includes design guidance to be used to achieve the design intent for the campus, this chapter includes the required development standards of the underlying zoning for campus development.

47. Page 238: Delete all text in its entirety and replace it with the following:

Subject to a Major Institution Overlay (MIO), as shown on page 26, a variety of zoning designations make up the underlying zoning of the Campus. As of the date of this Master Plan, the

development standards of the underlying zoning are found in the provisions of SMC Chapters 23.43 through 23.51B, SMC 23.54.016.B, and 23.54.030 relevant to those zones.

This Chapter contains the development standards that supplant the development standards of the underlying zoning within the MIO boundary as allowed by SMC 23.69.006.B and the City-University Agreement. The development standards in this Chapter are tailored to the University and its local setting, and are intended to allow development flexibility and improve compatibility with surrounding uses.

Development standards of the underlying zoning not addressed in the Master Plan may be developed in the future by the University, provided they are consistent with and guided by the goals and policies of the City-University Agreement, the goals and policies of this Master Plan, and the process for any amendments to the Plan required by the City-University Agreement. Lack of specificity in the Master Plan development standards shall not result in application of provisions of underlying zoning.

University development remains subject to all other City development regulations that do not constitute development standards of the underlying zoning and do not preclude the siting of an essential public facility within the meaning of RCW 36.70A.200.

48. Page 241: Delete the fifth, one-sentence paragraph under “Parking”:

~~All new development shall consider opportunities for bike parking facilities.~~

49. Page 267: “Bicycle,” amend as follows:

Bicycle

Bicycling is a reliable, active, space-efficient, and carbon-free commute option for UW students, faculty, and staff. For neighborhoods close to campus, bicycling commuting times can rival those of transit or driving. Reliable door-to-door travel times likely contribute to the popularity (according to U-PASS survey data) of bicycling among faculty, who are otherwise more likely to drive alone. The University of Washington has long supported bicycle commuting through infrastructure and programming. Continued investment in the capacity and security of campus bicycle parking, quality of campus bicycle routes, and innovative educational and encouragement programming shall accommodate growth in the number of bicyclists reaching the growing campus.

The University of Washington currently supplies bicyclists with multiple locations for securing and storing their bicycles on campus. High security parking and showers are available at some campus locations for students, faculty and staff. Bike lockers and space in cages can be rented for a fee on a quarterly or annual basis. Bicycle routes on the Burke-Gilman Trail and University Bridge and elsewhere provide bike access to campus. The Burke-Gilman Trail provides excellent access to West, South and East Campus locations. Bike routes are outlined in the CMP. The

University completed a corridor study and design concept plan for expansion of the Burke-Gilman Trail in 2012 and is working toward implementing these improvements as funding allows.

POTENTIAL BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

1. Plan a comprehensive on-campus bicycle network that provides desirable bicycle facilities while reducing conflicts with other modes, enhancing the pedestrian experience throughout campus.
2. Work with partners to develop connections to and from key neighborhoods, regional bicycle facilities, and transit hubs.
3. Work with the City and transit agencies to improve sidewalks, transit stops, and other bicycle amenities near transit services and hubs including consideration of space for secure bicycle parking.
4. Coordinate with the City to create bicycle connectivity through the street network, particularly along the University Bridge, Montlake Bridge, Brooklyn north to Ravenna Park, and west over I-5.
5. Improve the connectivity and interfaces of the off-campus bike network, the Burke- Gilman Trail, and Central Campus.
6. Improve the capacity of the Burke-Gilman Trail as defined in the Burke-Gilman Design Concept plan as funding allows.
7. Provide adequate bike parking supply to serve demand.
8. Improve quality and security of bike parking through investments to expand covered and high-security parking, lighting, lockers, and shower facilities.
9. Develop a Bicycle Parking Plan that identifies a toolbox of parking solutions and design standards.
10. Investigate ways to reduce bicycle thefts.
11. Encourage transit agencies to identify strategies for accommodating increased bicycle travel demand on transit.
12. Consider integrating programs (like future bike share and secure bike parking) into the U-PASS and work with partner agencies to expand these mobility options with connections to transit hubs and other campus destinations.

50. Page 244: Amend the second paragraph under “Shorelines” (including the addition of a footnote) to recognize that any amendment to the Shoreline Master Program must be made by the City Council and approved by the Washington State Department of Ecology:

The Shoreline Management Act (SMA) regulates development, uses, and modifications of shorelines of the state in order to protect the ecological functions of shoreline areas, encourage water-dependent uses, provide for maximum public access, and preserve, enhance, and increase views of the water. The City of Seattle has adopted implementing regulations for the Shoreline Management Act for development and use of shorelines within the City limits. The City’s shoreline regulations, called its Shoreline Master Program (SMP), are currently found in SMC Chapter 23.60A. There are currently three shoreline environments within the MIO: the Conservancy Preservation environment, the Conservancy Management environment, and the Urban Commercial environment, as shown on pages 110 to 111. The University follows applicable SMP regulations for University development proposed within the shoreline. The applicable regulations ~~are will be~~ those in effect on the date of adoption of this Master Plan if: (1) the City amends the SMP to so provide; and (2) the Washington State Department of Ecology approves that amendment.¹³ If those conditions are not met, the applicable regulations will be those applied pursuant to City and Washington vested rights law. For existing buildings within the shoreline environment, regular repair, maintenance and restoration is allowed, provided such activity is consistent with the SMP.

¹³ As of the date the University submitted a final draft of this Master Plan to the City Department of Construction and Inspections, SMC 23.60A.016.D stated: “Nothing in this Chapter 23.60A changes the legal effect of existing approved Major Institution Master Plans adopted pursuant to Chapter 23.69 or Ordinance 121041.”

51. Page 246: Amend the first sentence of the third paragraph under “Structure Height Limits”:

All development within the Shoreline District, ~~which is all development within 200 feet of the shoreline and associated wetlands,~~ is restricted to a the maximum building height of 30 feet specified in SMC Chapter 23.60A.

52. Page 254: Insert a sentence after “Definitions” and before “Development”:

Where a conflict exists between the definitions in this Plan and those in SMC Chapter 23.84A or SMC Chapter 23.86, the definitions in this Plan shall apply.

53. Page 255: Amend the paragraph under “MIO” to accurately reflect legislative history:

The Major Institutional Overlay (MIO) boundary defines the extent of the campus that is governed by the City-University Agreement, and the development standards defined within this CMP. The MIO boundary was established by ~~o~~Ordinance 112317 and subsequently amended.

54. Page 104: clarify how waterfront trail relates to Shoreline Public Access Plan by revising the text in the last bullet point on the page to say:

The University has proposed a Shoreline Public Access Plan as part of the CMP that incorporates and supports the continuous waterfront trail. The trail’s design will incorporate the Access Plan improvements that relate to the trail shown on pages 108-111. Refer to those pages 108 to 111 for more information about the Shoreline Public Access Plan.

55. Page 108: Delete the following paragraph, because commercial uses are not public access uses.

~~Commercial water dependent uses, including moorage for private boats and boat rentals, may be included in the Urban Commercial shoreline in West Campus where their requirements do not conflict with the water dependent uses of the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences or limit public access to the waterfront. Potential uses could include a passenger ferry dock. Uses which would require additional single purpose public parking shall be discouraged.~~

56. Delete the following statement on page 108, at the end of the South Campus discussion:

~~The public dock in South Campus would be removed.~~

57. Page 108: Clarify the approval process for the Shoreline Public Access Plan in the introduction:

This section provides the University’s Shoreline Access Plan. It is a combination of both existing and new elements. Please refer to pages 48 and 49 for information on existing shoreline access conditions. It shall be binding upon University development within the shoreline district when the City approves the Access Plan pursuant to SMC 23.60A.164.K. ~~It is a combination of both existing and new elements. Please refer to pages 48 to 49 for information on existing shoreline access conditions.~~ Any modifications to the Shoreline Access Plan will be processed pursuant to the City-University Agreement’s provisions for amendments to the CMP.

58. Page 240: Add text to the end of the final paragraph under the heading “Continuous Waterfront Trail”:

The University has proposed a Public Access Plan as part of the CMP that supports the continuous waterfront trail. Refer to pages 108 to 111 for more information about the Public Access Plan. The continuous waterfront trail design and implementation plans will show the existing and proposed shoreline public access plan improvements documented on pages 108-111 that are part of the trail.

59. Page 109: Add the following after the recommended text regarding the continuous waterfront trail:

Boat Launch Access Points

The design and implementation plan will evaluate the need for new hand-carry boat launch access points and will provide for additional signage for all existing and proposed boat launch access points.

60. Prior to issuance of any demolition, excavation, shoring, or construction permit in West, South, or East Campus, provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT.

The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm>

61. Pages 234-237: Amend Tables 14 – 17 to list the year of construction for all existing buildings on identified development sites.

62. If SDOT determines that new traffic signals are warranted at the following intersections while the Master Plan is in effect, the University will pay the indicated proportional share of the cost of the new signals: University Way NE/NE 41st Street, 24.5%; and 6th Avenue NE/NE Northlake Way, 15.1%. The University will have one year following delivery of an itemized accounting from SDOT of the new signal cost for an intersection to pay its indicated share for that intersection. The amount of new signal cost for which the University will be required to contribute a proportional share will not exceed \$500,000 per intersection (adjusted upward by 3.5% annually from the date of final CMP approval to the date the University receives the accounting for the relevant intersection).

63. The University will contribute 9% of the costs of ITS improvements at the time of ITS implementation within the primary impact zone, and 3.3% of the costs of ITS improvements at the time of ITS implementation within the secondary impact zone. The University's contribution will be capped at \$1.6 million for ITS improvements in the primary impact zone, and \$293,000 for ITS improvements in the secondary impact zone. Both caps will be adjusted upward by 3.5% annually from the date of final CMP approval until the delivery to the University of an itemized accounting of improvement costs from SDOT. The University will have one year following delivery of an itemized accounting of improvement costs from SDOT to pay its contribution.

64. Upon development of six million net new square feet, the University will measure the demand-to-capacity ratio on routes serving Campus Pkwy near Brooklyn Ave NE. If the ratio on a route exceeds 96 percent, the University shall pay King County-Metro the operating costs for two additional bus transit coaches in both the AM and PM peak hours to provide additional capacity on routes serving Campus Pkwy near Brooklyn Ave NE. Operating costs for each additional bus transit coach is defined as the cost of the driver and the costs of maintenance and repairs.

65. The University shall fund SDOT capital improvements to facilitate transit performance within the primary and secondary impact zones at the time of implementation of the respective RapidRide project as follows:

- 11th Avenue NE/Roosevelt Avenue NE: 11% of the cost of the RapidRide project within the primary impact zone; 5.5% within the secondary impact zone.
- NE 45th Street/15th Avenue NE/Pacific Avenue NE: 30% of the cost of the RapidRide project and other planned transit improvements, including bus only and BAT lanes, within the primary impact zone; 15% within the secondary impact zone.
- Montlake Blvd NE: 25% of the cost of the RapidRide project and other planned transit improvements, including bus only lanes, within the primary impact zone; 12.5% within the secondary impact zone.

66. The University shall dedicate space at new developments adjacent to existing and future Link light rail stations and RapidRide stops to better accommodate higher volumes of transit riders, provide better connections between modes, accommodate shared mobility services, and provide transportation information related to travel and transfer options.

67. The University shall upgrade the campus gateway at 15th Ave NE/NE 43rd Street as adjacent sites redevelop to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and, without undertaking an obligation to act, consult with SDOT to identify opportunities to implement the U District Urban Design Framework streetscape concept plan connection between this campus entrance and the new U District light rail station.

68. The University shall expand, or pay SDOT for transit stop expansion, at 15th Avenue NE/NE 42nd Street and NE Pacific Street/15th Avenue NE as part of the NE 45th St/15th Ave NE/NE Pacific St RapidRide implementation.

69. The University shall separate pathways for bicyclists and pedestrians on the Burke-Gilman Trail through the campus, and install lighting following the University’s Facilities Design Guidelines and Campus Illumination Study, or successor documents, by 2024.

70. The University shall widen the Burke-Gilman Trail between Brooklyn Avenue NE and 15th Avenue NE (the Garden Reach) by 2028 or when site W27 develops. The University shall widen the Burke-Gilman Trail north of Rainier Vista (the Forest Reach) when sites C8 or C10 develop, or as opportunities permit.

71. The existing trip cap shall be maintained.

72. The University shall correct for typographical errors in the Master Plan as follows:

- a. Page 8, first sentence in top of third column: in the Development Standards ~~Chapter~~
Chapter

- b. Page 27, last sentence: For underlying zoning within the University’s MIO boundary, please refer to the City of Seattle’s Official Zoning Map, copies of which are included on pages 290 and 291 (Figures 201-204).
- c. Page 71, graphic change: remove extra line break before “Figure 55.”
- d. Page 94, last bullet: Please reference the ~~Project Review and Design Guidance chapter~~ section on page 156.
- e. Page 103, open space commitment text: The land inside the dotted line in Figure 98 is preserved for a future open space in Central Campus and East Campus, but is not intended to be completed within the 10-year conceptual plan.
- f. Page 126, Transfer of Development Capacity: The growth allowance may be moved between development sites and between sectors as outlined on page ~~255-233~~ of the Development Standards chapter.
- g. Page 130, second to last paragraph: For more information about partnership space needs, please refer to the space needs section on pages ~~34 through~~ 35.
- h. Page 154, second paragraph: Registered State and Federal Historic Buildings are identified ~~in~~ on page 92 (Figure 78).
- i. Page 157, first sentence: The maps on pages 174, ~~189-195~~, 208, and 226 (Figures 137, 157, 169, and 185) identify priority pedestrian connectors....
- j. Page 207, graphic change: modify building envelopes and labels for S38, S39, S40, S41 and S45 to be 200’.
- k. Page 242, third bullet point: change “Pacific Avenue NE” to “NE Pacific Street.”
- l. Page 243, Figure 189: change “Pacific Avenue” to “Pacific Street” in figure graphic and caption text.
- m. Page 319, update description of Figure 189 to say “Section through Pacific Street.”
- n. Page 251, View Corridors paragraph: Therefore, campus development is prohibited within designated view corridors that are depicted on ~~Figures 192 to 195~~ page 257 (Figure 193); on pages 174, 195, 208, and 226 (Figures 137, 157, 169; and 185); and in the table and accompanying graphics on pages 252 to 253.
- o. Page 264, Table 21: Change the top cell under “Faculty” to \$308 instead of \$150.

- p. Page 73 and 123, figures 59 and 111: clarify that current zoning on the north side of NE 41st Street between 11th Avenue NE and 12th Avenue NE allows heights up to 105’.

73. Page 255: Amend the paragraph under “Growth Allowance” as follows:

GROWTH ALLOWANCE

The phrase “growth allowance” refers to the 6.0 million gross square footage of net new development approved within the University’s MIO boundary and authorized by ~~under~~ this CMP. Square footage of above-ground parking, child care uses, housing that is permanently affordable to households earning less than 80% of Area Median Income, and square footage on the ground floor of buildings containing small businesses are exempt from the growth allowance limit. ~~is not counted against the net new 6.0 million square foot growth allowance in the CMP.~~

74. Page 143: Amend the last paragraph under “Storm Drainage”

There are currently no known capacity issues with the University’s storm drainage systems, but storm drainage shall be evaluated as new development occurs. If capacity issues are identified, the University will use best management practices to reduce stormwater overflows and discharges into waterways, to the extent practicable.