Comments, Concerns & Questions:

Concern: Applying universal height allowances across campus rather than having lower limits for properties adjacent to residences.

Comment: Location of physical plant with north end development scenario to cut back noise

Question: Where will utility placement be staged? Will it shut down any residential roads?

Question: What will be the level of specificity in DA for each?

Comment: Define major and minor amendments-what will that look like?

Question/Comment: How do we address trade-off of trees vs buildings? Perhaps springboard trees marked form the first logging?

Question: Will a landscape buffer inspection be done by the City?

Comment: Not up-to-date with understory plantings

Comment: Impervious surfaces/pervious surface options should be included

Concern: Value of “Urban green space”

Comment: Appreciate the functionality (water run-off) designed as art (“science on display”) 

Concern: If we develop on wildlife areas, will we create new ones?

Question: Do we have a definition of view corridors? Where are they? How will development impact neighbor’s views?

Concern: Noise & vibrations

Concern: Safety of neighbors with encroaching population growth; barriers

Comment: Heights for properties adjacent to single family homes; wants visual modeling to compare heights; less concerned about height if there is adequate green-scape

Comment: Understanding trade-offs of height vs setback; will closer and shorter be preferable to further away but higher

Comment: Lights on west side of CC3 too bright at night; building orientation to minimize glare for neighbors

Comment: Parking lot lights helpful

Comment: Campus safety “spillover” into neighborhoods; CRO a potential benefit for neighbors

Comment: Like buses off campus and preserve interior for pedestrians

Comment/Concern: City code does not specifically memorialize PUD! Would like this language added.
Feedback on Scenarios

North
- Like transportation flow for buses and to north side parking
- Like dorms/dining facilities here but no so high as to block valley views
- Possible to “eliminate” north-south traffic on western-most road? End at CC3?
- Concern about location of chilling station
- Drop-off/transit loop on south side
- Arrivals at both ends with restricted access on campus way
- Improves campus connection to city
- Would there still be a dining facility in the south/east area?
- Why are the trees so thick & lush? They cover up 110th Ct upper road where as they don’t’ in other scenarios. Why have the upper road go through from north to south at all? Why not come in at west entrance and go east down to the lower road?
- Is that a road or a parking lot behind the Admin building? Would either one take out all existing buffer between Husky Hall and the Newman/Loewen property? Huge maples and what else would be a buffer there? How BIG is that building?

Core
- Don’t like placement of academic and other buildings on west perimeter
- Like making use of property on east of campus
- Best location for housing/dining from student standpoint

South
- Doesn’t improve campus connection to city
- Reduces traffic impact on north end
- Would negatively impact neighbors near cemetery (Valley View)
- Like traffic flow through campus because it keeps public transport options open
- Would increased pedestrian traffic through Valley View reduce or increase negative behaviors?
- Corp she one story only
- Don’t like expanded transit hub
- Overloads the south end
- I do like a southern transit circle for UW students and it is away from neighbors
- This scenario overloads 182nd, Circle Drive and southern neighbors
- Could the turn-a-round/drop off area be for buses too?
CMC/PUD’s (add to website)

**Development Agreement/Standards**

- How specific will we get in this document for each of these topics?
- Trees-Springboard-find out which one
- Impervious surface-water
- Noise-vibration
- Add Public and Campus Safety
- Transportation-drop offs at either end and not through campus

**Comment Form from 12-15-16 meeting**

I prefer the topography scenario-it was the most developed concept of the three indicating it has advantages compared to the other two. My reasoning for preferring it:

1. When Husky Hall and Village were integrated, it was a stop gap solution. These were re-purposed buildings and wasteful of space. Major campus expansion should not be done while bypassing that non-optimized short term fix.
2. Traffic will be smoothed out by not bringing buses on campus.
3. The topography scenario conserves the nice forest buffer toward the residential area.
4. Topography scenario has the best chance of giving us a campus with a single, uniform look to it.