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INTRODUCTION
In January of 2014, Mahlum Architects was hired to prepare the West Campus Development Framework (WCDF) for the University of Washington-Seattle. The previous Campus Master Plan, prepared in 2003, established a development capacity of three million gross square foot, with 870,000 gsf allocated for the West Campus. Of that figure, only 78,300 gsf remains today. Diminishing development capacity across all sectors of campus has given rise to the need for the University to reconsider its broader programmatic and development needs in the future, and served as one of many catalysts for this study.

The West Campus has simultaneously undergone a dramatic transformation in recent years with the introduction of more than 4,700 student housing beds across eight new residence halls; a new police station and utility plant; the creation of a new light rail station scheduled to open in 2021, and the City of Seattle’s recent efforts to up-zone the broader University District. The West Campus is also slated for a new City park and several street, pedestrian, and bike improvements.

The West Campus Development Framework is intended to help the University position itself for anticipated future development relative to these and other changes; to create a compelling and exciting vision for the West Campus; to understand existing capacity and test future building heights to meet the University’s long term programmatic needs; to develop a variety of scenarios that highlight trade-offs, generate conversation, and inform University decisions; and to inform the next Campus Master Plan.
VISION

The vision for the West Campus Development Framework reflects the constant balancing act of a number of, at times, competing elements, from building heights and open space structure to building uses, circulation networks, and operational implications. The preferred plan, Campus and City Meet at the Shore, introduces nearly 4.38 million gross square feet of new development throughout the West Campus, with the majority of space anchored around a significant new waterfront park and stepped terrace that celebrate the waterfront as an amenity for the University and broader community.

The plan balances the need for the University to provide sufficient space to meet the University’s educational and research mission through added development and increased building heights, while creating a desirable public realm with appealing open space amenities. The plan recognizes the desire and need for the University to evolve and change over time, but in a manner that seamlessly and sensitively blends in with its surrounding context. Recognizing the identity of the West Campus and broader University District as a platform for innovation, the preferred plan recommends a mixture of uses including institutional, research, commercial and industry related uses—the quantity of which needs to strike the right balance to be most successful. Street treatment is approached in a manner that seeks to provide ample vehicular access, while creating a pedestrian-oriented, friendly, urban environment. Lastly, the plan aims to both balance and test the reality of established capital project policy and practices that often lead to single use and single user buildings, with the desire to create mixed-use buildings that reinforce collaboration across entities, and that leverage partnerships and collective pooling of funds.
PROCESS
The 15-month planning process for the West Campus Development Framework commenced in January of 2014 and was organized around three phases.

PHASE 1—DISCOVERY & ANALYSIS
Phase One focused on the assessment of existing conditions; a robust set of interviews with campus and community constituencies to understand and confirm the vision, goals, needs and considerations for the West Campus; the identification of opportunity areas or development sites throughout the West Campus; a development capacity analysis that identified opportunity areas for future development sites and existing site capacity parameters; and lastly a space needs analysis that generated a numeric program to be accommodated in the scenarios that followed.

PHASE 2—VARIABLES & SCENARIOS
Phase Two involved the development of planning variables and scenarios. Ultimately the variables comprised the building blocks for the three scenarios. Vetting the variables ensured that all ideas were on the table and under consideration in advance of composing the scenarios. Over several months the variables and scenarios were vetted with numerous constituencies for feedback and comments, which ultimately led to the development of the preferred, hybrid plan in Phase Three.

PHASE 3—PREFERRED PLAN & DOCUMENTATION
Phase 3 focused on the development, vetting, and documentation of the preferred plan. Phasing strategies were prepared simultaneously that explored multiple options for sequencing development over time.

PLANNING TEAM
The Planning Team was led by Mahlum Architects, based out of Seattle. Mahlum led the planning, urban design, and overall management efforts. Supporting the team was a broader set of collaborators including Gustafson Guthrie Nichol as landscape architects, Corneil Collaborative who led the innovation district content, U3 Advisors who led the implementation efforts, and Nelson Nygaard as mobility and parking consultants.

CORE COLLABORATORS
Throughout the process, the planning team worked closely with a team of core collaborators including Rebecca Barnes, University Architect; Kristine Kenney, University Landscape Architect; Theresa Doherty, Director of the Office of Regional and Community Relations and recent appointment as the co-chair of the upcoming Campus Master Plan; and Aaron Hoard, Deputy Director of the Office of Regional and Community Relations. This Core Team provided guidance, hands-on interaction, and direction throughout the process. At key milestones, the broader WCDF Steering Committee was engaged for feedback and direction. The Steering Committee was comprised of a cross-section of representatives including the following individuals:

:: Paul Jenny
:: Rebecca Barnes
:: Kristine Kenney
:: Theresa Doherty
:: Aaron Hoard
:: Todd Timberlake
:: Jeanette Henderson
:: Rob Lubin
OUTREACH AND GOALS FOR THE WEST CAMPUS

At the outset of the process the planning team conducted nearly 30 individual and group user interviews to develop a foundation for the development of the scenarios. Individual and group interviews were conducted with the following entities:

:: Student Focus Groups
:: Academic
  » College of the Environment
  » Health Sciences Administration
  » College of the Built Environment
  » College of Arts and Sciences
  » College of Engineering
  » School of Social Work
  » Program on the Environment
  » Center for Commercialization
  » Research
  » Applied Physics Lab

:: Regulatory
  » City of Seattle, DPD
  » SDOT
  » King County Metro
  » Community Transit
  » Sound Transit

:: Administrative
  » Facilities
  » Transportation Services
  » Faculty Representatives
  » University Landscape Architect
  » Office of Planning and Budgeting
  » University Leadership
  » Real Estate Office
  » Campus Security
  » Housing and Food Service
  » Office of Regional and Community Relations
  » Capital Projects Office
  » Sustainability Office
  » Libraries
  » Infrastructure

A set of recurrent themes emerged from these conversations, which began to simultaneously comprise a broader set of goals for the West Campus effort. These themes included the following.

:: Collaboration—desire for undedicated space and flexible buildings
:: Distinct West Campus Character—desire a distinct character, separate from Central Campus
:: Active and Inviting Uses—encourage integration with the community
:: Experimentation—showcase hands-on activity
:: Arts and Culture—position the West Campus as a regional cultural destination
:: Partnerships—explore new funding mechanisms
A comprehensive existing conditions assessment was prepared at the outset of the process. Analysis findings were broadly organized into the following categories: Community which situated the West Campus within its broader context and building use functions; Collaboration; Connectivity which assessed all forms of mobility and parking; Public Realm Character that examined defining site characteristics and landscape structure; and concluded with a robust Opportunity and Needs assessment which analyzed existing development capacity and identified the future programmatic need for the West Campus. The sections that follow describe the findings for each category in greater detail.
**CONTEXT**

The West Campus defines the western edge of the University of Washington’s Seattle Campus and is generally bounded by 15th Avenue to the East, 41st Street to the north, Roosevelt and I-5 to the west, and Portage Bay to the south. This 72-acre site immediately abuts the broader University District to the north, and is within a 15-minute walk of eight neighborhood zones.
GENERAL BUILDING USE

Most buildings within the West Campus are owned by the University, and collectively comprise nearly 4 million gross square feet (3.97M gsf) of space. Except for the concentration of recent residential development, the West Campus accommodates an assortment of building functions including academic, research, housing, administrative, support, and community-oriented spaces. For the most part, buildings are defined by a single use.
Academic Use by College

Buildings throughout the West Campus are generally defined by a single occupant or College, although there is representation from a number of Colleges or Schools including the College of the Environment, College of Built Environments, College of Engineering, College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Social Work, and the School of Medicine. College of the Environment is generally concentrated south of Pacific Street, while there is a significant presence of buildings associated with the College of Arts and Sciences along the 15th Avenue edge. Interestingly, Benjamin Hall, an intentionally interdisciplinary building is located farthest from the Central Campus.
RESIDENTIAL USE

Of the nearly 4 million gross square feet of development in the West Campus, 2.35 million gsf is associated with student residential facilities. In total nearly 5,500 students live within UW student housing, including 3,112 beds in suites throughout Alder, Elm, Poplar, Lander, Maple and Terry Halls; 2,216 beds in apartments throughout Mercer Court, Stevens Court and the Cedar Apartments; and 140 units of married / family housing in the Commodore Duchess.

Since 2013, the University has introduced roughly 3,100 new beds throughout Mercer Court, Lander, Terry and Maple Halls. Student residences are generally concentrated along Campus Parkway with the apartments in more peripheral locations along Pacific Street and 41st Street.
SOCIAL FUNCTIONS
As part of a broader campus-wide use survey previously conducted, individuals were asked to identify areas where they socialize. The planning team examined the results for the area within the West Campus boundary. The survey revealed that socializing largely occurs along University Way (the Ave) and in the new residence halls, but revealed a significant lack of social areas south of 40th Street toward the water, with one main exception Agua Verde. Findings from this survey suggest there is a tremendous need and opportunity for additional social spaces beyond the residence halls.
Using the same survey, the planning team analyzed findings related to where individuals dine. The survey revealed similar findings, with dining largely occurring along the Ave and in residence halls. Dining in the residence halls is orchestrated through Housing and Food Services (HFS) and includes Local Point in Lander Hall, the coffee shop and District Market Grocery Store in Alder Hall, Cultivate restaurant in Elm Hall, and the Husky Grind coffee shop in the Mercer Apartments. Additional non-HFS dining venues include Agua Verde along Portage Bay and College Inn retail along 40th Street. A similar dining void appears south of 40th around Brooklyn Ave and Pacific Street, revealing opportunity areas for additional dining, especially adult-focused dining venues, and non HFS run coffee shops.
In the campus-wide survey, individuals were also asked to identify where they typically exercise. In general, exercise areas are concentrated along the Burke Gilman Trail and in the Elm Fitness Center along Campus Parkway, with few exercise areas identified between the Burke Gilman Trail and the waterfront. The survey revealed an overall deficit of exercise/recreation areas within the West Campus, especially along the waterfront.
In an effort to understand how porous and inviting the West Campus appears to everyday users, the planning team mapped ground floor functions throughout the West Campus, identifying varying levels of access—from public (high access) to semi-public (medium access) to student-focused amenities (restricted access). Both indoor and outdoor spaces were mapped creating a more comprehensive picture of ground floor activity. This mapping revealed that most public open space anchors are located along Brooklyn and Campus Parkway, with the greatest concentration of public amenities along 41st Street. Both public and student-focused amenities are concentrated north of the Burke Gilman Trail, with fewer public amenities/access along Brooklyn Avenue and west of the University Bridge.
COLLABORATION

RANGE OF COLLABORATIVE FUNCTIONS

The term collaboration surfaced in nearly every stakeholder interview, and encompassed a variety of contexts from collaboration with peers, collaboration across departments, schools, or colleges, to collaboration with industry and community partners. In an effort to unpack the meaning of the word collaboration and the types of spaces necessary to support collaboration, the planning team developed a spectrum to understand the range of collaborative opportunities for the West Campus.

With level of investment and level of formality as key variables, the planning team was able to situate six different types of collaborative spaces along this spectrum. At one end of the spectrum are co-working and accelerator spaces—spaces that require minimal investment and are characterized by highly informal interaction; at the other end of the spectrum is interdisciplinary research—spaces that typically require high levels of investment and are defined by highly structured and formal activity. Formal collaboration space, not necessarily associated with research or lab spaces, requires less investment than interdisciplinary research, but by nature is still fairly formal. Informal activity, although still equally expensive if done right, supports spontaneous and less formal interaction. Maker spaces, or hands-on environments to make and build items and products, fall within the middle of both variables. These spaces tend to be more specialized, and consequently, more costly. The nature of the work also suggests that use of that space can’t be entirely spontaneous and informal, but requires some level of planning. Research partnerships, while highly formal, are also less costly because these spaces are often supported by industry partners, placing less financial responsibility on the University.
Equipped with this new lexicon for collaborative spaces, the planning team mapped such spaces throughout the West Campus. The effort revealed that there is a significant amount and diversity of collaborative spaces throughout the West Campus today, but much of the activity is largely concealed inside buildings and not actively contributing to the public realm. Spaces like Benjamin Hall (interdisciplinary research), Start Up Hall in Condon (accelerator space), Program on the Environment in Wallace Hall (formal collaboration), and Seagrant/NOAA buildings along Brooklyn Avenue (partnerships) don’t visibly celebrate the nature of collaborative work occurring inside. Even the informal collaboration space and fabrication labs inside Gould Hall could be better positioned to showcase their activities. In general, there is a lack of collaborative spaces south of the Burke Gilman Trail.

However, the spaces associated with new residential development are extremely successful at activating the ground floor, including the informal collaboration spaces in Poplar, Alder, Elm, Maple, and the Ethic Cultural Center; the hands-on demonstration kitchen in Lander Hall; arts studio / maker space in Maple Hall; and the UW Farm at the Mercer Apartments.
The University of Washington-Seattle boasts an incredible mode share, with only 20 percent of individuals driving alone, according to a 2013 survey conducted by Transportation Services, suggesting that the remaining 80 percent travel to campus by foot, bike, transit, and carpool/vanpool. Introduction of two new light rail stations near the University—next to Husky Stadium in 2016 and the University District station at Brooklyn and 43rd Street in 2021—will undoubtedly impact bus service and the University’s mode split, but those impacts won’t be known until the stations are implemented.
Two transit operators have a presence throughout the West Campus: King County Metro Transit and Community Transit. Bus routes run along most vehicular streets including Pacific Street, Campus Parkway, Brooklyn Avenue, University Way, 15th Avenue NE and along Eastlake Avenue/University Bridge. Community Transit routes are concentrated along 15th Avenue NE. Campus Parkway functions as the most significant transit hub for King County Metro and hosts the greatest number of bus stops. Bus access diminishes south of Campus Parkway.

The campus-wide use survey further reinforces Campus Parkway, 15th and Eastlake Avenue as the most significant transit corridors influencing the West Campus. Transit access accounts for 41 percent of the University’s mode share. This high percentage of transit ridership aligns with the findings that the campus gateways along 15th Avenue at Campus Parkway and 40th Street are the most significant entries onto the UW-Seattle campus as a whole.

There are a number of planned transit improvements that will likely have a bearing on the West Campus, including the 2021 University District light rail station at Brooklyn Avenue between 43rd and 45th Streets, and the proposed Eastlake High Capacity Corridor. The mode of the latter has not been determined.
VEHICULAR CIRCULATION

The planning team analyzed traffic volume data throughout the West Campus, which measured the quantity of cars on roads during a typical weekday. The analysis revealed that the greatest traffic volumes occur along Roosevelt Way (more than 15,000 vehicles) and 15th Avenue NE (10,000 to 15,000 vehicles), confirming their identities as vehicle-oriented barriers. Any street beyond 10,000 vehicles is considered “arterial” status. All other streets recorded traffic volumes of 5,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day—volumes characteristic of local streets. Interestingly, Pacific Street accommodates fairly low traffic volumes, but is too wide with few points of crossing.
North-south connections through West Campus largely occur along 15th Avenue NE, University Way (the Ave), and Brooklyn Avenue. West of Brooklyn Avenue and south of Campus Parkway the grid dissipates and transitions into larger blocks with truncated streets prohibiting vehicular movement. This condition is especially true on the block south of Pacific Street, and on the Mercer Apartments and Steven’s Court block. East-west movement is concentrated primarily along 41st Street, Campus Parkway, 40th Street, Pacific Street, and Boat Street. There are limited east-west vehicular connections between Campus Parkway and Pacific, and between Pacific and Boat Street. Vehicular movement is one-way along sections of 40th Street, further limiting east-west access.

The planning team leveraged the campus-wide use survey to understand travel routes of University constituents. Interestingly, while overall traffic volumes along Pacific Street are low, both Pacific Street and 15th Avenue NE surfaced as key vehicular routes for the University community.
**BICYCLE NETWORK**

The Burke Gilman Trail (BGT) serves as a defining feature and predominant bike path through the West Campus. While the BGT is known for its continuous, uninterrupted terrain, in the West Campus alone there are three street crossings, creating vehicular-bike-pedestrian conflict zones and safety concerns. The BGT is complemented by bike lanes along Pacific Street, 40th Street, Brooklyn Avenue, University Way, and portions of Eastlake Avenue. A dedicated two-way cycle track is located along 40th Street, between 5-corners and Terry Hall and most recently between Brooklyn Avenue and 15th Avenue NE.

From a bicycle use perspective, the BGT, Brooklyn Avenue and 40th Street are the most heavily used bicycle corridors.
Planned bicycle improvements have been identified within the City of Seattle’s Bicycle Master Plan, and include the introduction of sharrows along Campus Parkway, 41st Street, and University Way; widening of the outside lane along 15th Avenue NE; and a pedestrian pathway with bikes permitted along the shoreline. Additionally, the City of Seattle has designated 12th Avenue as a Greenway and Brooklyn Avenue as a Green Street, which would include grade-separated raised bike tracks along Brooklyn Avenue and an elevated table where Brooklyn intersects the BGT to calm traffic. Most recently, the Pronto bike share program introduced a bike sharing station at 12th Avenue NE and Campus Parkway.
WALKING NETWORK
Walking use patterns from the campus-wide survey revealed that most east-west pedestrian movement is primarily associated with students, while north-south pedestrian movement is primarily associated with faculty and staff. Key east-west pedestrian corridors include the north side of Campus Parkway, 40th Street, and the Burke Gilman Trail. North-south pedestrian movement is concentrated along Brooklyn Avenue, University Way, and 15th Avenue NE. Pedestrian movement dissipates dramatically west of Brooklyn Avenue and south of the Burke Gilman Trail, suggesting there are significant opportunities to expand and better integrate the pedestrian realm throughout the West Campus.
In the same campus-use survey, we inquired about areas that are difficult to navigate and key campus gateways. Interestingly, the gateway at 15th Avenue and Campus Parkway also surfaced as an area that is challenging to navigate, along with the area surrounding Henderson / APL.
**Parking**

In total, there are 2,208 parking spaces, including 909 spaces (41%) in structured parking; 734 spaces (33%) in below grade parking; 492 spaces (22%) in surface parking lots; and another 73 surface parking spaces (4%) that are restricted. The majority of underground parking is located below residence halls, while all 909 structured spaces are located in the Portage Bay Parking Facility. While only 22% of parking spaces are located in surface lots, collectively there are more than 12 surface lots spread throughout the West Campus, occupying valuable land and potential future development sites.
In addition to mapping the quantity of parking spaces, the planning team analyzed parking counts to determine utilization rates for the parking lots. Utilization rates that meet or exceed 85 percent are considered at capacity. Parking counts reflect the weekly average for the week of October 28 through November 1, 2014. Utilization rates for parking lots throughout the West Campus varied between 28 percent in the parking lot north of the Purchasing and Accounting Building to 95 percent in the underground parking lot below Stevens Court. Overall, there was an average utilization rate of 75 percent for parking lots in the West Campus, which reflects a high level of use. This level of parking use highlights the need to replace parking spaces in-kind, if parking spaces get displaced.
PUBLIC REALM CHARACTER

LANDFORM AND SITE CHARACTER
The composition of the West Campus today has been shaped by both natural and man-made forces. Natural topography of the area formed a series of north-south ridges and valleys that transitioned into a steep bluff to the south before gradually leveling off toward the shoreline.
Overlaid atop the natural landform are man-made walls and street, road, and trail additions—namely Roosevelt Way/University Bridge, Campus Parkway, 15th Avenue NE, and the Burke Gilman Trail, which mimicked the old rail line along the bluff. University Bridge and 15th Avenue NE act as edges to the precinct; Campus Parkway functions as a ceremonial axis; while the Burke Gilman Trail represents the topographic transition toward the shoreline.
These elements acted as defining thresholds for the West Campus and informed the five distinct characters throughout the site. North of Campus Parkway is defined by its gridded character, with the residential grid west of Roosevelt Way and the mixed-use grid between Roosevelt Way and 15th Avenue NE. The blocks immediately north and south of Campus Parkway assume a character that complements the grand scale of the Parkway median itself. The shift toward the Burke Gilman Trail is defined by declining topography and the verdant canopy of trees and vegetation surrounding the trail. The area south of Pacific Street toward the water defines the shoreline zone. Lower building height and reduced tree canopy allow for greater vistas toward the water and more open connection with daylight and the sky. The West Campus isn’t defined by a single typology, but is a composition of various characters.
**LANDSCAPE CHARACTER**

Site character and public realm identity are informed by the broader landscape and open space structure. The West Campus reflects the combination of both intentional and residual landscapes, with additional planned landscapes. Intentional landscapes throughout the West Campus reflect isolated investments, not connected by a larger landscape vision. Landscape improvements have largely been implemented on a per building basis, and mimic the overall ad hoc nature of acquisition and development throughout the West Campus. Examples include the UW Farm at the Mercer Court Apartments, the sunken garden at Gould Hall, the rain gardens east of the Fisheries, and courtyards within Stevens Court. Additional City parks are also interspersed throughout the precinct, including Sakuma Viewpoint and Peace Park north of NE 40th Street. The Campus Landscape Framework documented the distinct landscape typologies throughout the West Campus, further reinforcing the notion of a landscape mosaic.

While the West Campus lacks a broader open space structure, Phase I and II housing investments along Campus Parkway were planned in concert and have redefined the character of the street, with public realm amenities, benches, plazas, pedestrian mews, and transparency at the ground floor. The network of courtyards and elevated terraces has added a new dimension that previously
Planned landscapes will have a significant impact on the identity of the West Campus, most significantly the new City park along the waterfront. The City’s designation of Brooklyn as a Green Street and 12th Avenue as a Greenway will improve connectivity and function as threads that stitch together the various landscape elements.

**FAVORITE LANDSCAPES**

While intentional landscapes do exist throughout the West Campus, it is worth noting that very few landscapes were identified as favorite landscapes in the broader campus-use survey. The UW Farm at Mercer Court and Sakuma Viewpoint received a few responses, but overall the West Campus was not the recipient of favorite landscapes. However, the West Campus received an overwhelming number of responses when asked to identify landscapes in need of improvement. The vast majority of landscapes in need of improvement were located along the Campus Parkway median and 15th Avenue NE, suggesting a strong need to create favorable, memorable landscapes throughout the West Campus that will create an identity for the precinct.

**Favorite Landscapes (MyPlaces Survey)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 40th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 11th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 15th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPPORTUNITY AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

In advance of developing future scenarios, the planning team needed to understand the balance between the existing development capacity and the University’s growth needs over time, or square footage to be accommodated in the future.

DEVELOPMENT SITE ANALYSIS

The first step in determining development capacity was to identify a set of opportunity sites viable for future development, and understand any implications or constraints for developing those sites. The planning team worked closely with the core collaborators to analyze and ultimately arrive at a set of near and long term development sites. Collectively, the planning team evaluated building age, building condition, deferred maintenance and site utilization before identifying the development sites.

Building Age

Roughly 53 percent of space in the West Campus, or 2.1 million gsf has been constructed since 2004, most of which is associated with student housing. Twenty-one percent of space in the West Campus, or 835,000 gsf was built before 1979. While the quantity of older space is smaller, the area is distributed over 25 buildings, which suggests these buildings are not maximizing their sites from a development perspective.
Building condition adds another dimension to the building analysis. Leveraging building condition data provided by the University's Facilities department, the planning team mapped each building according to its Facility Condition Index number assigned by the Facilities group. Numbers fall on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being a superior or new building, 3 being fair with systems approaching end of expected life cycles, and 5 being a building in need of improvement with marginal functionality. Overall, most buildings received scores of 1 or 2, suggesting buildings are in good condition. A number of buildings, however, received scores between three and five. Buildings that received an FCI of 5 included the Bryants Building and three Guthrie Annexes; buildings that received an FCI of 4 included the Ethnic Cultural Center Theater and Eagleson Hall. The Northlake Building, Henderson Hall, Purchasing and Accounting building, and block of buildings between 3935 University Way and the Community Design Center, all received FCI scores of 3. Interestingly, many of the buildings with scores of 3 and 4 fall within the area of land bounded by the Burke Gilman Trail to the south and NE 40th Street to the north.
Deferred Maintenance

In addition to understanding building condition, the planning team assessed the level of outstanding deferred maintenance on each building on a dollars per square foot basis. Analyzing buildings from this perspective identified the Bryants Building as having the highest level of deferred maintenance at $437 per sf, followed by Henderson at $387 per sf. Other buildings that recorded deferred maintenance levels above $200 per sf included Eagleson Hall at $363 per sf and the HR / Staff Employment Building at $287 per sf.
Site utilization is a metric used to understand whether sites are being optimally utilized from a development perspective. Similar to an FAR (floor area ratio), it divides the overall built square footage by the area of the site. Higher ratios indicate that greater development is accommodated on a given site; lower ratios suggest that less development is accommodated on a particular site. Lower ratios are also indicators that the current development may not be fully utilizing the development potential of the site.

In general, the highest ratios generally align with more recent residential development, with Alder Hall recording the highest ratio at 7.8. A number of sites achieve ratios that exceed 2.0, including Condon Hall and Schmitz Hall which approach a ratio of 3.0. However, there are quite a few sites that record site utilization levels below 2, including sites south of Pacific Street toward the waterfront and all blocks in the center of the West Campus, between the Burke Gilman Trail and NE 40th Street. Surface parking lots are quite prevalent on these sites. The site south of the Portage Bay Parking Facility that contains the Ocean Research 2 building and NOAA/Seagrant buildings records the lowest site utilization level of 0.2.
Near and Long Term Development Sites

After synthesizing development site criteria, the planning team determined a set of near term and long term development sites.

Near Term Development Sites
Near term development sites typically include parking lots and smaller structures, displace fewer existing uses, and have fewer barriers to development. In total, near term sites occupy 13.6 acres of land and require the removal and replacement or relocation of 318,000 gross square feet of existing uses. A significant number of near term development sites are located in the center of the West Campus, between the Burke Gilman Trail and NE 40th Street, and south of Pacific Street.

Long Term Development Sites
Long term development sites are defined by an increased degree of difficulty to redevelop and displace a greater quantity of existing uses, consequently requiring a more robust surge space strategy. Long term development sites include Schmitz Hall, Condon Hall, Stevens Court, Marine Studies, Fisheries Teaching and Research Center, Commodore Duchess, and lot W41. W41 could be developed as is, or potentially expand across Eastlake Avenue to Roosevelt Way creating a larger, regularized parcel. This site would require ROW reconfiguration and negotiation with the City of Seattle DOT. In total, long term development sites occupy 7.1 acres of land and require the removal and replacement or relocation of 620,000 gross square feet of existing uses. Collectively, both near and long term development sites occupy 20.7 acres of land and displace 938,000 gross square feet of existing development, including 338,000 gross square feet of existing student housing.
Comparing the near and long term development sites to the development sites previously identified within the 2003 Campus Master Plan highlights just how successful the University has been in terms of acting upon and implementing many of the previously identified development sites. All remaining 2003 CMP development sites have been incorporated as potential development sites in the current West Campus effort. Additional new development sites not identified in the 2003 Campus Master Plan have also been identified for development.
SITE PARAMETERS AND REGULATORY CONTEXT

In order to assess the existing development capacity of the West Campus, the planning team needed to understand the set of existing site constraints or site parameters that influence the potential capacity of each site. A number of parameters are in place today, including building height limits from the 2003 Campus Master Plan, the shoreline setback, impacts of the Property Use and Development Agreement (PUDA), and City of Seattle’s Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Building Height Limits

Existing building height limits are codified within the 2003 Campus Master Plan and identify height limits for new development. The tallest building height limit approaches 105 feet and generally surrounds Campus Parkway. The most predominant building height limit is 65 feet, and generally applies to the area between NE 40th Street and Pacific Street. South of Pacific Street, the building height limit decreases to 50 feet, except for areas that fall within the shoreline setback, which requires a building height limit of 30 feet.

Shoreline Setback

The University of Washington and the City of Seattle have worked closely to understand the impacts of the City’s Shoreline Master Program on the 2003 Campus Master Plan. The 2012 agreement between the University and City reaffirms the policies regarding the shoreline that were implemented in the 2003 Campus Master Plan. Most significant from a development capacity perspective is the building height limit of 30 feet within a 200-foot setback from the shoreline. Additional regulations regarding uses were identified in the 2003 Campus Master Plan.
Property Use and Development Agreement

In 1994, the University developed the Property Use Development Agreement (PUDA) as part of the realignment of 15th Avenue NE. The PUDA resulted in the creation of parking lot W38, located at the southeast corner of Boat Street and Pacific Street, which is dedicated for public use and to serve the adjacent Boat Street businesses. Development of this site would require replacement of 60 parking spaces.

Environmental Impact Statement

In 2014 and 2015 the City of Seattle prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that evaluated the impacts of possible zoning changes and Comprehensive Plan amendments that would allow for greater building heights and density throughout the University District. While the EIS does not directly influence the development capacity within the University’s Major Institutional Overlay (MIO), it does provide insight into the level and type of anticipated development immediately adjacent to the West Campus in the future. The EIS considered two different up-zoning alternatives. The first alternative evaluated maximum building height limits of between 125 to 160 feet in the area immediately to the north of the West Campus. The second alternative would allow a maximum building height of 340 feet in the area immediately to the north of the West Campus. Even with setback and massing requirements in effect, both alternatives still represent a dramatically more dense future for the broader University District.
EXISTING DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY / EXISTING ZONING ENVELOPE

After identifying the comprehensive set of development sites and applying building height and shoreline setback requirements to each site, the planning team was able to determine the existing development capacity available. Keep in mind, actual allowable existing development capacity within the West Campus is prescribed by the Campus Master Plan, and remains at 78,300 gsf. This exercise explores capacity using existing building heights regardless of the 2003 development cap. Development on each site assumed a 14 foot floor to floor height, and a 60 percent site coverage rate to allow for setbacks, service, and access to daylight and air. Applying these assumptions to both the near and long term development sites generates an existing capacity of approximately 3,019,000 gross square feet, or 2,080,000 net square feet.

PROGRAMMATIC NEED

In addition to understanding development capacity, it was important to assess the University’s future programmatic need for the West Campus. The following paragraphs summarize the analysis and assumptions that informed the program for the West Campus.

Development History Analysis

Over the last 10 years, between 2003 and 2014, the University of Washington constructed approximately 2.9 million gross square feet of space, or 2.5 million net square feet of space, on the Seattle campus, according to the CMP-Seattle 2003 Development Capacity Analysis spreadsheet. Applying the same growth rate suggests that the University could anticipate nearly 5.8 million gross square feet of space, or 5.0 million net square feet of space over the next twenty years. In a parallel exercise,
the planning team analyzed the University’s development history over the last twenty years, when digitized building data became available, which similarly identified an annual growth rate of 250,000 net square feet of space per year, which similarly aligns with the twenty-year projection of 5.0 million net square feet of space. Of the 2.9 million gross square feet of new development that occurred over the last ten years, 62 percent, or 1.8 million gross square feet of space, is located in the West Campus.

Planning Assumptions and Program

Recognizing that development sites on the Central Campus will be more limited in the future, that more accessible development opportunities exist within the West Campus, and that there is the desire to transform the West Campus into a more dense urban district, for planning purposes, the planning team assumes that 75 percent of future development (as compared to 62 percent in the last ten years) will occur within the West Campus. Applying the 75 percent assumption to the total campus-wide, twenty-year projected program of 5.8 million gross square feet of new space suggests that the West Campus should plan for a program of 4.35 million gross square feet of new space. The associated net square footage figure will vary depending upon the existing square footage on development sites today. The 4.35 million gross square feet of new space served as the program to be accommodated in all three WCDF scenarios.
VARIABLES
PURPOSE OF THE VARIABLES

Before composing the scenarios, it was important that the planning team develop and vet a set of variables that would be strategically tested and explored throughout the scenarios. The variables were informed by user interviews, analysis, and discussions with the Steering Committee and represented planning elements such as identity, density, circulation, etc. The planning team explored various approaches and options for each variable. Ultimately the variables comprised the building blocks for each scenario; vetting the variables ensured that all ideas were on the table and under consideration in advance of composing the scenarios. We intentionally wanted to test a full spectrum of variables throughout the scenarios to further reinforce trade-offs between options and prompt broader University conversations.

The goal for both the variables and scenarios is to inform strategic conversations and choices the University will make regarding the West Campus. To do so, the planning team needed to test the most critical variables. Ultimately the variables tested explored different approaches to:

:: Identity
:: Density
:: Program Quantity
:: Mix of Uses
:: Landscape Approach
:: Circulation and Parking
:: Catalyzing Development
IDENTITY

APPROACHES EXPLORED
Identity explored questions surrounding the image, identity, and type of precinct envisioned for the West Campus. Different approaches were tested including a collegiate identity akin to more traditional, bucolic campus-like settings with grand open spaces, broader vistas, and a more consistent architectural aesthetic, e.g. the Liberal Arts Quad at the University of Washington and the Harvard Yard. The planning team also tested the idea of the West Campus as an Urban District, which perhaps felt the most natural given its surrounding context. Dense massing, minimal setbacks, taller buildings with a mix of uses including an active ground floor, connected to transit typify the Urban District, e.g. Portland State University and NYU. The final approach tested the research park identity, aesthetically defined by larger lab buildings, single use structures, and larger setbacks, e.g. University Park at MIT and South Lake Union in Seattle.

FEEDBACK AND DIRECTION
There was overwhelming support for the West Campus to embody an urban district. The urban district model reinforces the desire to be distinct from the Central Campus; is more responsive to the activity throughout the broader University District; and promotes greater permeability at the boundaries. There was the sense that the urban district approach better supports the vision for the West Campus as a vibrant, creative and active neighborhood, anchored around ideas around innovation. The research park model was strongly discouraged across all parties, while there was modest interest in the collegiate model. Moving forward, all three scenarios were to embody the urban district model.
APPROACHES EXPLORED
Density explored questions around where and how to concentrate density and increased building heights (beyond the 2003 CMP limits), and the overall form and organization it should assume. Should added density and building heights be concentrated along corridors, at key nodes or centers of activity, or perhaps the inverse—strategically located around open spaces or holes? Or should the West Campus assume a density gradient, one in which building heights and density reduce or taper across the precinct, or should it take on an even, consistent density with minimal variation?

FEEDBACK AND DIRECTION
Groups felt as though the even, consistent density felt forced, artificial, and not achievable. There was some concern that concentrating density along a corridor could feel like a wall or a barrier. There was interest in organizing density along a tapering gradient, and around nodes. In the end the scenarios should test multiple approaches to density.
PROGRAM QUANTITY

APPROACHES EXPLORED
Program quantity inquired about the appropriate programmatic range to test over the three scenarios. One approach was to keep the previously identified programmatic quantity of 4.35 million gross square feet constant across all three scenarios, enabling it to function as a controlled variable. A second approach tested a variety of programmatic quantities across the three scenarios, including 2.9 million gross square feet, 3.6 million gross square feet, and 4.35 million gross square feet. These figures roughly assumed that 50 percent, 62 percent, and 75 percent of future programmatic need would be accommodated in the West Campus.

FEEDBACK AND DIRECTION
There was some debate among groups regarding the programmatic quantity to accommodate. There was some concern that 4.35 million gross square feet of space was too high, and that there should be a no growth scenario. These concerns were ultimately regarded as non-starters and that the University needs to proactively plan for new development. It was concluded that all three scenarios should aim to accommodate 4.35 million gross square feet of space. By keeping the program constant, it also allowed for a more controlled comparison of trade-offs across scenarios.
MIX OF USES

APPROACHES Explored

The mix of uses variable explored two separate, but related questions. The first explored the question around which program elements or uses should be accommodated in the West Campus. After much vetting, the program elements to be tested in the scenarios included academic uses; science-research functions; administrative uses; student housing for any beds being displaced (no net new student housing beds); retail services and amenities; recreation; arts; collaborative partnership spaces; associated private industry; utilities; and parking.

After determining the correct range of programmatic functions, the second question addressed how these uses should be organized? One approach more or less resembles today’s current opportunistic approach; a parcel of land is available and it gets developed. The result is an assortment of uses. Another approach tested distinct zones or precincts for specific uses, e.g. a housing zone, an academic zone, a research zone, etc. The final approach explored ideas for a highly integrated and mixed-use environment, one that promotes multiple uses throughout buildings and integrates functions both horizontally and vertically throughout the building.

FEEDBACK AND DIRECTION

There was consistent support for the highly integrated and mixed organization of uses. There was the sense that a highly mixed environment would best promote spontaneous interaction; support activity at different times of day; create a vibrant and safe environment; and would even be helpful in managing peak traffic demand.
LANDSCAPE APPROACH

APPROACHES EXPLORED
Within the landscape variable, the planning team tested different approaches to landscape and open space structures. The first approach explored a distributed network of smaller open spaces, or urban gardens. It assumes a finer grain fabric for both built and natural environments, and operates at a more interstitial scale. Elm Plaza is an example of an urban garden. The second approach makes a big, bold statement and organizes the public realm around a significant landscape investment, such as a central square or major park. Jamison Square in Portland is a successful example of a central square. The final approach tests the idea of linear landscapes to connect and link the precinct. Recent examples of linear landscapes include the highline in New York City and Boston’s North End Parks on the Rose Kennedy Greenway.

FEEDBACK AND DIRECTION
Rather than regard landscape approaches as mutually exclusive, there was a strong desire to test a hybrid of options that created a clear hierarchy of open spaces. Regardless of the landscape approach being tested, all three options need to reinforce Brooklyn as a green street connector and reinforce east-west and north-south pedestrian connections.
Circulation and Parking

Approaches Explored
Circulation tested different approaches to accommodating vehicular movement throughout the site. The first approach places vehicular circulation along the periphery, promoting a pedestrianized core. The second approach reinforces the idea of an interconnected grid, which provides more circulation options for vehicles throughout the precinct, but encourages a smaller scale, fine grain block structure. The final approach concentrates circulation along significant streets. Rather than encourage a ubiquitous vehicular presence, this approach concentrates vehicular movement along key streets through the precinct.

The parking variable considers multiple options for managing auto storage. In many ways, the approaches to parking work in tandem and support the ideas explored within the circulation variable. One approach is to create multiple parking anchors on the periphery of the precinct, which would support the broader peripheral circulation network. Supporting the notion of an interconnected circulation grid is a distributed parking network of smaller parking lots. Less efficient in nature, this method supports a more incremental and smaller scale approach to development. The final parking strategy considers a single central parking repository that would serve the entire precinct. While efficient, it requires a larger, coordinated approach to development.

Feedback and Direction
All approaches to parking and circulation should be tested in the scenarios. The key concern was creating a circulation network that promoted strong connections to the University District, Central Campus and waterfront.
CATALYTIC PROJECTS

APPROACHES EXPLORED
The final variable considers the many to catalyze development and set the vision for the West Campus. One approach considers the notion of a bellwether building, or a building that functions as a discovery center, embodying and informing others of development to come. The design and aesthetic of the building should inspire and reflect the exciting vision for the future. Representative examples of bellwether buildings include District Hall in Boston’s Innovation District and South Lake Union’s Discovery Center. Rather than employ a building, the second approach leverages catalytic landscapes to incite investment. Catalytic landscapes provide cost-effective alternatives that serve as first steps in realizing the broader vision for the district. The final approach includes temporary or tactical strategies to build enthusiasm for the district. Pop up parks, parklets, and temporary art installations all serve as short term tactical strategies that encourage long term change. For tactical strategies to be effective, the method employed and content involved need to directly support and align with the broader vision and identity of the district.

FEEDBACK AND DIRECTION
While all approaches were regarded favorably, the preference was for the University to invest in high quality, long term projects versus low cost, temporary investments.

Bellwether Building, District Hall, Boston
Catalytic Landscapes, TechTown Living Room, Detroit
Temporary Tactical Strategies, Looped In at the Porch, Philadelphia
Matrix of Variables Explored

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
<th>PROGRAM QTY</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>MIX OF USES</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
<th>CIRCULATION</th>
<th>ENABLING</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGIATE</td>
<td>CONSTANT ACROSS ALL THREE SCENARIOS</td>
<td>75% OF DEVELOPMENT IN WEST CAMPUS 4.38M GSF</td>
<td>OPPORTUNISTIC ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>URBAN GARDEN</td>
<td>INTERCONNECTED LANDSCAPES</td>
<td>BELLWETHER BUILDING</td>
<td>UW AS DEVELOPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN DISTRICT</td>
<td>TEST MULTIPLE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS</td>
<td>65% (2.3 M GSF); 35% (2.9 M GSF)</td>
<td>NODES OR GATEWAYS</td>
<td>ZONES OR PRECINCTS</td>
<td>SUPERBUTLUR: PHASED AND MODULAR</td>
<td>CATALYTIC LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE FUNDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH PARK</td>
<td>HOLES</td>
<td>HIGHLY MIXED</td>
<td>LINEAR LANDSCAPES</td>
<td>SUPERBUTLUR: PHASED AND MODULAR</td>
<td>PERPENDICULAR MOLDING</td>
<td>TEMPORARY / TACTICAL</td>
<td>PARTNERSHIPS (PPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARKING LANDSCAPE ENHANCED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADIENT</td>
<td>HYBRID</td>
<td>EVEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCENARIOS
The scenarios were developed as a means to test the variables, and assess and evaluate trade-offs in an effort to balance the myriad needs for the West Campus. Before reviewing the scenarios, a set of evaluation criteria was established, by which to evaluate each scenario. Criteria included the ability to:

- Support the University’s educational and research missions
- Accommodate programmatic need
- Facilitate collaboration and innovation
- Create a memorable image and distinct identity for the West Campus
- Create a pedestrian-scaled, vibrant, active, safe and livable place
- Create an accessible district that is welcoming to the public
- Create a flexible framework that can accommodate multiple uses over time
- Represent an implementable, realistic plan

The first scenario, or base scenario, is near term and opportunistic in approach and leverages only the near term sites. The latter two scenarios represent visionary approaches characterized by major open spaces and greater height and density. The three scenarios are described in greater detail on the following pages and include Scenario 1 – the Strong Spine, Scenario 2 – Three Hearts, and Scenario 3 – Campus and City Meet at the Shore.
SCENARIO 1 – STRONG SPINE

BIG IDEA
The first scenario, Strong Spine, focuses on incrementally reinforcing Brooklyn Avenue as a collaborative corridor. It should be noted that Scenario 1 only utilizes near term development sites. In many ways, Scenario 1 functions as a precursor or first phase for Scenarios 2 or 3. Scenario 1 aims to reinforce Brooklyn and University Way as key organizing elements, which get activated by strategically locating development and open spaces along the spine.
Scenario 1 builds upon the language of urban gardens established by Elm Plaza and the Alder Courtyard. Pocket parks are distributed at key locations, including south of the Ethnic Cultural Center, south of Maple Hall, on the current site of Henderson Hall, east of the Fisheries Sciences building, and across 15th Avenue NE at multiple locations. The broader street structure is designed to reinforce north-south connections to the waterfront park and east-west connections toward campus. East-west connections are further reinforced by positioning 40th as a campus street oriented toward pedestrian movement. Additional east-west pedestrian connections are introduced south of the Ethnic Cultural Center, and continue east below Gould Hall and across 15th Avenue NE. A second east-west connection links the open space near Fishery Sciences with the Foege Building portal. North-south pedestrian connections are supported by the 12th Avenue greenway and new pedestrian connection along 11th Avenue.
CIRCULATION NETWORK

The public realm structure is further supported through modifications to the existing street structure. Traffic is calmed in two specific locations: along NE 40th Street and Pacific Street. Paving treatments, extension of the two-way cycle track, and raised street table would help to calm traffic and reinforce NE 40th Street as a pedestrian-oriented campus street. Removal of the median along Pacific Street and introduction of curb bulb-outs at pedestrian crossings help to expand the pedestrian realm and calm traffic. Other circulation changes include the removal of a portion of Cowlitz Road NE to create a unified block for development, and the relocation of the existing pedestrian crosswalk along 15th Avenue NE near Guthrie Annex 1 further north to align with the pedestrian pathway south of Gould Hall.
Student housing remains as is; no additional beds are provided. Commercial, cultural, and arts functions are concentrated along Brooklyn Avenue, further activating the street as an organizing spine and collaboration zone, and near the future Bryants Park. Additional arts functions are concentrated on the eastern section of Campus Parkway. All other uses are designated as institutional uses, which encompasses academic, administrative, research and partnership spaces.
BUILDING HEIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

With the exception of the tower at the intersection of Campus Parkway and Eastlake Avenue which reaches roughly 310 feet, most building heights between the Burke Gilman Trail and NE 40th Street range between 180 to 240 feet. Building heights step down toward the waterfront where the tallest buildings reach roughly 120 feet. These building heights allow for approximately 2.6 million gross square feet (2.3 million net square feet) of new development. Of the 2.6 million gross square feet of new development, roughly 1.8 million gross square feet of development is allowed within existing building height limits, which suggests that the remaining 800,000 gross square feet of development occurs beyond the existing building height limits.
SCENARIO 2 – THREE HEARTS

BIG IDEA
The second scenario, Three Hearts, celebrates the distinct characters of the West Campus, and utilizes both near term and long term development sites. The distinct characters of the West Campus—Campus Parkway, the midsection surrounding the Burke Gilman Trail, and the waterfront—are celebrated through the creation of three connected neighborhoods, each anchored by a significant open space or neighborhood heart.

Conceptual Idea

Neighborhood Heart
North-South Connectors
Key Open Spaces
Proposed Active Uses
Existing Active Uses
The public realm structure in Scenario 2 hinges upon the creation of three distinct open spaces or hearts supporting and activating their surrounding neighborhoods. In the neighborhood to the north, the widening of Campus Parkway allows the expanded median to function as programmable space for events, recreation, and leisure for both the broader neighborhood community and campus constituents alike. Elevated tables are introduced where Campus Parkway intersects cross streets, creating a cohesive landscape. In the core of the West Campus, a new urban plaza is introduced south of the Burke Gilman Trail providing a civic space amenity and hub of activity in an area that formerly lacked a center of gravity. Already in planning, the City’s new waterfront park south of Boat Street serves as the heart for the southern neighborhood.

North-south pedestrian connections are supported by the Brooklyn Avenue green street, the 12th Avenue greenway and introduction of new right-of-way along 11th Avenue NE between NE 40th Street and Pacific Street. Similar to Scenario 1, two east-west pedestrian connections are introduced. The first links Fishery Sciences to the Foege Building portal and the second traverses south of Gould Hall and connects to the new urban plaza.
Modifications to the street and circulation structure include the removal of one-lane of traffic in either direction along Campus Parkway. The removal of the two lanes enables the widening of the Campus Parkway median. The existing curb cuts for buses would remain in place. Scenario 2 identifies the reconfiguration of the block bounded by Roosevelt Way to the west, 11th Avenue to the east, Campus Parkway to the south, and NE 41st Street to the north. Reconfiguration and development of this site removes the diagonal road that carried northbound traffic from the University Bridge to 11th Avenue NE, and replaces it with a new 2-way couplet between Campus Parkway and NE 41st Street along Roosevelt to accommodate northbound traffic.* Scenario 2 also recommends converting Boat Street, between Fishery Sciences and Brooklyn Avenue, into a woonerf to calm traffic and enhance connections to the waterfront park. Similar to Scenario 1, traffic is calmed along Pacific Street, and a portion of Cowlitz Road NE gets removed to create a unified block for development.

*Development of the western edge of this site requires ROW reconfiguration and negotiation with the City of Seattle and DOT.
The neighborhood to the north, anchored by Campus Parkway, builds upon its identity as a student housing precinct. Replacement student housing for Stevens Court is provided within this precinct. Additional student housing is also introduced in two of the towers surrounding the urban plaza. Development surrounding the urban plaza and toward the waterfront contains a mix of uses with commercial, arts, and cultural functions on the lower levels with institutional uses above, which encompasses academic, administrative, research and partnership spaces. Similar to Scenario 1 commercial functions are concentrated along Brooklyn Avenue, extending down toward the waterfront park, with arts functions on the eastern edge of Campus Parkway.
BUILDING HEIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Building heights throughout the northern neighborhood along Campus Parkway are lower and do not exceed 75 feet. Building heights peak in the buildings surrounding the urban plaza, achieving building heights as high as 245 feet. Building heights step down toward the waterfront and generally hover around 70 to 80 feet with the exception of a few buildings that reach 125 feet. Acting upon both near and long term development sites with these building heights allows for roughly 3.6 million gross square feet (2.7 million net square feet) of new development. Of the 3.6 million gross square feet of new development, roughly 2.5 million gross square feet of development is allowed within existing building height limits, which suggests that the remaining 1.1 million gross square feet of development occurs beyond the existing building height limits.
View to the West

Overall Figure Ground

Proposed Buildings

Existing Buildings
PREFERRED PLAN—CAMPUS AND CITY MEET AT THE SHORE
The third scenario, Campus and City Meet at the Shore, generated significant enthusiasm and emerged as the preferred plan for the West Campus. Through a bold open space gesture, this scenario leverages the bluff to link the city and campus with the shore. This third and preferred scenario utilizes both near and long term development sites, and supports four broader goals for the West Campus:

- Goal 1–Create a Memorable, Vibrant and Livable Environment
- Goal 2–Support the University’s Educational and Research Missions
- Goal 3–Foster a Culture of Collaboration and Innovation
- Goal 4–Provide a Path Toward Implementation
GOAL 1 :: CREATE A MEMORABLE, VIBRANT AND LIVABLE ENVIRONMENT

BIG IDEA
The preferred plan is anchored around the creation of a significant waterfront park, making the shoreline more accessible and visible for all constituents. Design for the City’s new waterfront park has begun, and this plan carries that momentum forward, expanding the waterfront park onto the University’s land to the north. The end result is a significant open space, occupying roughly seven-acres of land that stretches from Portage Bay across Pacific Street, up a new stepped terrace to the Burke Gilman Trail. Brooklyn Avenue defines the eastern edge of the park and serves as the north-south green street connector further linking the precinct. The new heart for the West Campus emerges at the intersection of Pacific Street and Brooklyn Avenue where the park transitions into the stepped terrace.
The proposed landscape structure incorporates a number of typologies and strategies from the recently completed Campus Landscape Framework plan. Brooklyn Avenue serves as the green street spine that connects two new significant open spaces: the expanded waterfront park and terrace to the south and a reconceived Campus Parkway to the north. North-south and east-west connections are amplified, and enhance connections to both the campus and community.

**East-West and North-South Connections**

East-west connections aim to enhance movement between the West Campus and Central Campus. East-west pedestrian connections are incorporated in the reconceived Campus Parkway; along NE 40th Street which is envisioned as more of a shared street with limited vehicular access; along the connection south of Gould that links to the northern edge of the stepped terrace; along Pacific Street; and in the new pedestrian pathway that links the waterfront park to the Foege Building portal. North-south connections are reinforced along the 12th Avenue NE greenway, along 11th Avenue NE, the Brooklyn Avenue green street, and the Ave, and aim to better integrate the West Campus with the broader University District community to the north.

**Waterfront Park and Terrace**

- Green Street Spine (Brooklyn Avenue)
- Enhanced Connections
- Waterfront Park - UW Owned Land
- City of Seattle Waterfront Park
- Pedestrian Pathways
- Park and Garden Character
- Campus Parkway
The waterfront park is broadly organized into four areas: the City park south of Boat Street, the more active eastern area edge, more passive, naturalistic western area, and the stepped terrace. The naturalistic edge responds to the existing rain gardens and bioswales adjacent to the Fishery Sciences building. More wet in nature, this section would be ideal for boardwalks, bird watching, additional rain gardens and other stormwater management strategies. This area would also be compatible as a living lab or testing lab for related research and academic explorations.

The more active eastern edge is envisioned as a great lawn with pavilions. This section of the park responds to the broader campus and community need for additional open space for recreation. The open expanse can accommodate a full range of activities from lawn games, frisbee, pick-up soccer, to flying kites. Brooklyn Avenue defines the eastern edge and includes a pavilion and allee of trees. The proposed pavilion could accommodate a variety of functions including a café with seating. The allee of trees extends the existing rhythm of street trees along Brooklyn toward the waterfront. Two rows of trees south of the pavilion provide places of respite for reading, sitting and lounging. Agua Verde Café and Paddle Club along with Sakuma Viewpoint remain, further activating the park and providing ways to access and interact with the water. The eastern edge of the park is further enhanced with the introduction of active uses along the lower facades, and pedestrian-oriented street treatment along Brooklyn Avenue.

Similar street treatment with new paving and curb bulb-outs occur along Pacific Street, working to stitch together the waterfront park and stepped terrace into a single, cohesive open space. The wedge shaped terrace expands the waterfront park further north and leverages the sloping topography for additional seating and views of Portage Bay to the south. The northernmost section of the terrace intersects both the Burke Gilman Trail and new east-west pedestrian connection south of Gould Hall. New facades along the north side of Pacific Street, and a second pavilion on the south side of Pacific Street reinforce this intersection as the focal point and foundation for the park.
**Campus Parkway**

Similar to Scenario 2, Campus Parkway is reconceived as a civic amenity with programmable space for events, recreation, and leisure serving the broader community. The narrow median that exists today is largely unoccupied and represents a tremendous opportunity to better utilize and celebrate the space. It is recommended that one lane of traffic in either direction along Campus Parkway be removed to allow for the widening of the median. The existing street grid intersects Campus Parkway at 11th Avenue, 12th Avenue, Brooklyn Avenue and University Way providing clear opportunities to create distinct identities for each section of the Parkway. The westernmost section of Campus Parkway, between Eastlake Avenue and 12th Avenue NE, is the most heavily forested section. This section serves as a transition or buffer from the loud and fast movement of cars along Eastlake Avenue to the more pedestrian-oriented landscape to the east. A pedestrian pathway is introduced down the center of the median in these two sections, similar to Commonwealth Avenue in Boston. Campus Parkway, between 12th Avenue NE and Brooklyn Avenue, functions as an outdoor extension of the adjacent fitness center in Elm Hall with space for volleyball, bocce, yoga, etc.

Situated between Brooklyn Avenue and University Way, this section of the Parkway is located at the crossroads of activity and includes a hardscape plaza for pop-up parks, food trucks, or an outdoor market. The development site on the northeast corner of the median—the site of the former HR/Staff Building—provides another opportunity to locate an active use with a prominent ground floor function. The eastern side of Campus Parkway is more passive in nature and incorporates the ADA pedestrian ramp crossing proposed within the broader Campus Landscape Framework. Seating, flowers and art installations could be incorporated into the design of the crossing and complement adjacent arts functions. While each section of the Parkway takes on a specific identity, elevated tables at intersections work to create a cohesive landscape.
Modifications to the street structure are intended to improve pedestrian access throughout the district, while providing ample vehicular access. Traffic is calmed in two key locations—along Pacific Street between 11th Avenue NE and Brooklyn Avenue, and along Campus Parkway, which includes the removal of one lane of traffic in either direction to allow for the widening of the Campus Parkway median. These efforts work in concert with significant open space improvements with the goal of creating a more pedestrian-oriented environment. The vacation of Boat Street between 11th Avenue and Brooklyn Avenue also supports the broader effort of an expanded waterfront park.

Additional street vacations are introduced to optimize development sites, including along NE Northlake Place east of 8th Avenue NE, along Cowlitz Road NE, and the diagonal portion of Eastlake Avenue between Roosevelt Way NE and 11th Avenue NE north of Campus Parkway. The vacation of Cowlitz Road NE also provides the added benefit of removing vehicular access immediately adjacent to the Burke Gilman Trail, which encouraged pedestrian-bike-vehicular conflicts. It should be noted that the vacation of the diagonal portion
of 11th Avenue NE and NE Northlake Place requires land acquisition and negotiation with the City of Seattle. To accommodate the northbound traffic impacted in the vacation of Eastlake Avenue, it is recommended that a new 2-way couplet be introduced between Campus Parkway and NE 41st Street along Roosevelt. Northbound traffic would then take a right onto NE 41st Street.

In addition to street vacations, in some areas the grid has been reinstated and connections restored, made possible through the redevelopment of the Stevens Court and Henderson sites. It is recommended that a number of streets be regarded as shared streets, in which vehicles have limited access and street treatment and cues are suggestive of a pedestrian-oriented environment. These streets include NE 40th Street between five-corners and 15th Avenue NE, 11th Avenue between NE 40th Street and the waterfront, 12th Avenue between NE 40th Street and Pacific, and along Brooklyn Avenue.
The planning team recognizes that a broader circulation and parking plan needs to be prepared as part of the broader Campus Master Plan. For planning purposes, however, a parking strategy has been prepared that maintains the existing ratio of parking spaces to gross square feet of development. With the goal of creating a pedestrian-oriented environment, proposed parking is underground and not located in surface parking lots or structured parking.

Of the 2,208 parking spaces throughout the West Campus today, 792 parking spaces are displaced through new development, which suggests that 1,416 existing parking spaces remain in the future. Applying the ratio of existing parking spaces to existing gross square feet of development to the future amount of proposed development generates a future parking demand of 4,037 parking spaces, or 2,621 net new parking spaces. A common planning metric for underground parking is 310 gsf per parking space. This figure was applied when calculating the number of underground parking lots needed in the future. In total five new underground parking lot locations were identified in the proposed plan, which provide 2,786 spaces. Criteria for their locations included proximity to major vehicular streets; areas that are currently underserved by parking; and to minimize vehicular impact on pedestrian-oriented streets. The five proposed underground parking locations include the site east of 8th Avenue NE and north of NE Northlake Way; between Pacific Street and the Burke Gilman Trail and 11th and 12th Avenue NE; the site of existing parking lots W24 and W28 east of Brooklyn Avenue; the Purchasing & Accounting block; and north of Campus Parkway between 11th and 12th Avenue.
Active Ground Floor Uses

Central to the success of the West Campus is the creation of a network of active ground floor uses. Active ground floor uses consist of an assemblage of commercial, University, and innovation activities. Commercial functions could include retail, food and beverage, and other services; University activities include ground floor functions that are both visible and interesting such as fitness areas, student lounges, and maker spaces; innovation activity consists of visible incubator, co-working, start-up spaces, and even the potential for testing and demonstration areas. In total, the plan for West Campus introduces roughly 138,000 gross square feet of new commercial space on the ground floor. For comparison, University Village in Seattle records roughly 415,000 of gross leasable area.

Commercial functions are generally located along the east and west sides of the waterfront park, most prominently along Brooklyn Avenue south of NE 40th Street and along Pacific Street near the park. Innovation activity is generally concentrated along Campus Parkway with additional locations near the waterfront park. University activity complements the existing network of student housing and is located along the eastern end of Campus Parkway, NE 40th Street and south along 11th Avenue NE. The result is a network of varied and captivating functions distinct to the West Campus.
GOAL 2 :: SUPPORT THE UNIVERSITY’S EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH MISSIONS

Promoting the second goal—to support the University’s Educational and Research Missions—requires provision of sufficient space to meet educational and research needs of the University both now and in the future.

BUILDING HEIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Proposed buildings and massing have been specifically designed to support the broader public realm and circulation structures, and to achieve the University’s programmatic goal of creating 4.35 gross square feet of new development in the West Campus. By not developing the land devoted to the waterfront park, it suggests the University needs to seek greater building heights elsewhere throughout the site. From a development potential perspective, the waterfront park location is ideal to allocate as open space since the allowable building height limits are generally lower in this section of the campus.

The greatest building heights are concentrated at the northern tip of wedge, where the waterfront park and stepped terrace intersect the Burke Gilman Trail. Density is concentrated in this area to further reinforce this location as the heart of the precinct (center of gravity) and to take advantage of views afforded by the change in topography. While the building heights are tallest in this location—at times achieving 288 feet and 300 feet (approximately 21 floors at 14’ floor to floor)—the sloped topography, which decreases as you move south, helps absorb some of the height so the overall effect is not as significant. Beyond this area, additional towers generally achieve building heights of 230 to 240 feet (approximately 17 floors at 14’ floor to floor) in the areas north of the Burke Gilman Trail and on development sites along Campus Parkway. Building heights are lower toward the water, where the shoreline setback establishes a building height limit of 30 feet within the 200 feet of the shoreline.

Acting upon both near and long term development sites with the proposed massing and building heights allows for roughly 4,386,000 gross square feet (3,448,000 net square feet) of new development. Of the 4.38 million gross square feet of new development, roughly 2.67 million gross square feet of development is allowed within existing building height limits, which suggests that the remaining 1.71 million gross square feet of development occurs beyond the existing building height limits.
EXISTING AND PROPOSED FUTURE ZONING ENVELOPE

The planning team had previously determined the existing development capacity of the West Campus of roughly 3,019,000 gross square feet, or 2,080,000 net square feet, using both the existing building height limits identified in the 2003 Campus Master Plan and applying them to the new set of near and long term development sites.

Informed by the building heights that were tested in the preferred plan, the planning team prepared a new set of building height guidelines that effectively established a potential future zoning envelope. Five building height zones were identified to accommodate the building heights from the preferred plan and allow for gradual transitions between zones. The tallest building height zone (Zone 1) is 300 feet and is concentrated around the northern edge of the stepped terrace and waterfront park. The second tallest building height zone (Zone 2) is 240 feet and broadly encompasses the area surrounding Campus Parkway and toward the northern edge of the Burke Gilman Trail on the west. Zone 3, at 180 feet, is located south of both Zones 1 and 2, and helps transition between the taller buildings in the core and the lower building heights found in Zone 4. Zone 4 allows for building heights of 125 feet and encompasses buildings along the southern portion of 15th Avenue NE, and laterally along Pacific Street. Building heights subsequently step down to Zone 5, the shoreline zone, which allows for 30 feet building heights, as per the Shoreline Master Program setback requirement.

The specific building height limits for each zone were informed by existing guidelines, including the 2003 CMP, which informed
Zones 2 and 5; the City of Seattle EIS which informed Zone 1, and additional City of Seattle Zoning guidelines which informed Zone 4. Only Zone 3, at 180, was not informed by an existing planning guideline.

Applying the allowable building heights from each zone to the near and long term development sites suggests a potential future capacity of 7.4 million gross square feet, assuming 60 percent site coverage and 14’ floor to floor heights. Sixty percent site coverage allows for access to daylight, air along with servicing requirements.

The potential future zoning envelope creates a picture of the capacity that could be achieved, should all future buildings reach their maximum building heights. The likelihood of this occurring is rare, nor is it recommended. Specific zoning capacities should be identified for each zone or geographic area to preclude such development from occurring, and could be explored throughout the forthcoming Campus Master Planning effort.
TEST FITS
Historically, building siting has been somewhat opportunistic, such that if a user secures funding and an approved site is available, development can occur. In an effort to be more intentional about strategically siting facilities to optimize adjacencies and consider needs in an integrated manner, the planning team conducted test-fits for functions that expressed a potential need for additional space that could be accommodated in the West Campus. Site considerations, desired adjacencies, and programmatic quantity were determined for each entity before conducting the test-fit siting options. These functions do not represent the comprehensive set of needs, but reflect needs known at the time of the study.

SCHOOL A
Programmatic Quantity
:: Phase 1 – 200,000 to 250,000 gross sf
:: Full Build-Out – 400,000 to 450,000 gross sf

Site Considerations
:: Accommodate both undergraduate and graduate populations
:: Maintain five minute walk of medical/health sciences schools
:: Maintain proximity to labs on Roosevelt
:: Focus on dry research and teaching
:: No clinical outreach component
:: Development could be phased over time

Desired Adjacencies
:: School of Medicine
:: Health Sciences

Test Fit Options
:: Option 1 – 406,000 gross sf
:: Option 2 – 369,000 gross sf
CLINICAL  
Programmatic Quantity  
:: Affiliated Academic – 125,000 gross sf  
:: Additional Clinical – 125,000 gross sf  
:: Total – 250,000 gross sf  

Site Considerations  
:: Includes faculty offices  
:: Strong clinical and clinical teaching functions  
:: Consider parking requirements  
:: Ideally would benefit from proximity to transit  
:: Maintain walking proximity to Health Sciences  
:: Consider two buildings  
:: Maintain a visible identity  
:: Accommodates outside visitors  

Desired Adjacencies  
:: School of Medicine  
:: Health Sciences  
:: Hospital  

Test Fit Options  
:: Option 1 – 213,000 gross sf  
:: Option 2 – 217,000 gross sf
INTERNAL FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH

Programmatic Quantity
:: 160,000 – 200,000 gross sf

Site Considerations
:: Prefer westernmost site (Option 1)
:: Consider semi-trucks access the building
:: Requires potential proximity to water
:: Includes specialized lab, wet lab, and instrumentation space
:: Requires high bay shop space / industrial style space
:: Requires service access for large equipment
:: Accommodates on-site truck maneuvering

Desired Adjacencies
:: Other research schools and colleges

Test Fit Options
:: Option 1 – 206,000 gross sf
:: Option 2 – 100,000 gross sf
:: Option 3 – 217,000 gross sf
**ACADEMIC / GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS**

**Programmatic Quantity**
- Displaced Area – 56,000 gross sf
- Academic – 125,000 gross sf
- Industry / Government Partnership – 125,000 gross sf
- Total – 306,000 gross sf

**Site Considerations**
- Accommodates offices and research (50/50)
- High security concerns (100’ setback for federal facilities)
- Maintain southwest location
- Includes offices, classrooms, research functions
- Maintain potential proximity to water
- Separate, but proximate buildings are desired

**Desired Adjacencies**
- Internal Federally Funded Research

**Test Fit Options**
- Option 1 – 217,000 gross sf
- Option 2 – 100,000 gross sf
- Option 3 – 206,000 gross sf
RESEARCH

Programmatic Quantity
- Academic Precinct Plan identified the following need – 165,000 gross sf
- Displaced Area – 21,100 gross sf
- Total – 186,100 gross sf

Site Considerations
- Consider clinical (human-subject) use needs
- Conducts dry research
- Accommodates outside visitors

Desired Adjacencies
- Psychology

Test Fit Options
- Option 1 – 180,000 gross sf
PERFORMING AND FINE ARTS

Programmatic Quantity

- Studio Arts – 105,000 gross sf
- Performing Arts – 62,000 gross sf
- Displaced Performing Arts – 14,100 gross sf
- Total PA – 76,100 gross sf

Site Considerations

- Accommodate outside visitors
- Maintain proximity to transit and parking
- Provide proximity to high end retail
- Locate on a primary/main street
- Maintain highly visible location that reinforces identity
- Could be dispersed along a cultural corridor
- Destination function

Desired Adjacencies

- Existing arts and cultural functions

Test Fit Options

- Studio Arts Option 1 – 95,000 gross sf
- Studio Arts Option 2 – 96,000 gross sf
- Performing Arts Option 1 – 110,000 gross sf
- Performing Arts Option 2 – 86,000 gross sf
**INDUSTRY**

**Programmatic Quantity**
- Industry – 200,000 gross sf

**Site Considerations**
- Locations on or near edge of the University is desirable, but still needs to promote interaction with University constituents
- Supported by active ground floor uses and high end retail
- Provides access to transit, bike networks and parking

**Desired Adjacencies**
- Innovation functions

**Test Fit Options**
- Option 1 – 163,000 gross sf
- Option 2 – 142,000 gross sf
- Option 3 – 154,000 gross sf
**INNOVATION & COMMERCIALIZATION**

**Programmatic Quantity**
- Innovation & Commercialization – Varies
- Innovation Showcase Center – Varies

**Site Considerations**
- Requires flexible space
- Could be stand-alone or dispersed
- Supported by active ground floor uses and high end retail
- Not necessarily open to public
- Accommodates tech transfer, translational research, and start up entrepreneurial functions

**Desired Adjacencies**
- Industry
- Research

**Test Fit Options**
- Innovation & Commercialization Option 1 – 100,000 gross sf
- Innovation & Commercialization Option 2 – 102,000 gross sf
- Innovation & Commercialization Option 3 – 110,000 gross sf
- Innovation & Commercialization Option 4 – 62,000 gross sf
- Innovation & Commercialization Option 5 – 24,000 gross sf
- Innovation & Commercialization Option 6 – 49,000 gross sf
- Innovation Showcase Center Option 1 – 18,000 gross sf
- Innovation Showcase Center Option 2 – 86,000 gross sf
STUDENT HOUSING

Programmatic Quantity
:: Stevens Court Replacement – 228,000 gross sf
:: Comm Duchess Replacement – 100,000 gross sf
:: Total – 338,000 gross sf

Site Considerations
:: Provide parking access
:: Maintain proximity to transit
:: Maintain active ground floor uses
:: Safe and secure location

Desired Adjacencies
:: Existing student housing functions

Test Fit Options
:: Option 1 – 190,000 gross sf
:: Option 2 – 201,000 gross sf
:: Option 3 – 252,000 gross sf
:: Option 4 – 169,000 gross sf
:: Option 5 – 163,000 gross sf
EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

Programmatic Quantity
:: Outreach – 80,000 gross sf

Site Considerations
:: Primarily accommodates administrative office functions, but also includes distance education and classroom functions
:: Provide visible identity for marketing
:: Could be located in leased space
:: Consider storefront presence with other uses above

Desired Adjacencies
:: Flexible

Test Fit Options
:: Option 1 – 156,000 gross sf
:: Option 2 – 48,500 gross sf
**Childcare Center Expansion**

**Programmatic Quantity**
- Displaced Area – 5,000 gross sf
- Additional Expansion Space – 25,000 gross sf
- Total – 30,000 gross sf

**Site Considerations**
- Provide secure outdoor play areas
- Location should facilitate easy drop off / pick-up sequence
- Maintain proximity to transit

**Desired Adjacencies**
- n/a

**Test Fit Options**
- Option 1 – 70,000 gross sf
- Option 2 – 90,000 gross sf
After conducting the test fit exercise, should all known program needs plus recommended ground floor retail space be accommodated in the plan, collectively they would accommodate approximately 3,018,000 gross square feet of space. Within the proposed massing and building heights of the preferred plan, that leaves roughly 1,368,000 gross square feet of space for uses yet to be determined.
GOAL 3 :: FOSTER A CULTURE OF COLLABORATION AND INNOVATION

COMOTION
In 2014 the University of Washington rebranded the former Center for Commercialization into a new entity, CoMotion—a term that “evokes constant motion, collaborative momentum, and positive disruptive innovation.” The goal of CoMotion is to “collaboratively move innovations to impact by helping to create and promote entrepreneurial thinking, innovation mindsets, creative problem-solving, and experiential and team-based project learning throughout UW. This will be done through close partnerships with units on campus, leadership, and the community. We want to connect innovation communities within and beyond the University to help create successful impact, inventions, startups, and innovation leaders from UW, regardless of field of endeavor.”

The vision for the West Campus mirrors the broader mission and vision of CoMotion—and in many ways the futures of both are inextricably linked. The West Campus will set the stage and provide the physical spaces that propel interactions and foster entrepreneurial thinking.

INNOVATION DISTRICT APPROACH
The West Campus and broader University District is fertile ground for developing an “innovation district” that advances the mission and goals of CoMotion and the University at-large. The Brookings Institution describes innovation districts as “geographic areas where leading edge anchor institutions and companies cluster and connect with start-ups, business incubators and accelerators.” An innovation district is a place-based approach to employing proximity, density, and connectivity to facilitate the dynamic interplay of the knowledge economy. The West Campus has the right mix of diverse activities from academic, research, and creative activities, to student housing, private enterprise and a range of eclectic uses. The district is also characterized by a blend of new and old buildings, vacant and underutilized land and a waterfront primed for public use. All of these factors, taken together, position the West Campus as UW’s future Innovation District.

INNOVATION ECOSYSTEM
Realizing this vision relies upon the creation of an innovation ecosystem—a complex and connected network of spaces that serve diverse users and their myriad needs—that includes spaces to support collaborative research, industry partnerships, start-ups and entrepreneurs, and exploration and making, all of which rely upon a robust public realm that promotes both planned and spontaneous interaction—or shared collision spaces—and can be celebrated through an innovation showcase center. Beyond the spaces programmed for specific innovation programs, the plan recommends an overall design philosophy for redevelopment and public space that should establish a “look and feel” that inspires creativity and curiosity, and motivates individuals to think outside of the box. Elements of the innovation ecosystem are described in greater detail on the following pages.
Innovation Ecosystem
Collaborative Research

A significant amount of interdisciplinary research is currently undertaken in the West Campus today. In Benjamin Hall and a number of research buildings close to Portage Bay, many research activities in fields ranging from engineering, physics, to oceans, fishery and marine science bring together research faculty and students from a diverse range of faculties. Continuing to support and strengthen interdisciplinary academic research across all fields, not just hard sciences, in the West Campus is an important cornerstone of the plan. Building new interdisciplinary academic and research space with appropriate lab, instructional, office, lounge and seminar space in locations that are well connected to existing activities will continue to bring a broad mix of academics and researchers into and through the West Campus, increasing the level of collaborative research activity and energy.
Industry Partnerships

The University of Washington engages in formal partnerships with industries in various fields to pursue joint research ventures. There are tangible benefits to attracting “anchor” industry partners to the West Campus. In Kendall Square, major industry anchors like Novartis and Google partake in a range of partnerships with MIT and also attract and nurture an ecosystem of small, edgy, start up and entrepreneurial activities close by. The West Campus could become the place where industry collocates with University activities to promote such an innovation ecosystem.

Sites that can accommodate significant floor plates and are free and clear of complicating development factors are rare. Because the University owns much of the land in the West Campus and can prepare larger sites for development, one approach is to leverage the University’s land ownership to attract an industry partner to collocate. Another approach is to attract multiple industry anchors, but accommodate them in a smaller, interstitial manner through micro-sites that are distributed and integrated with other development throughout the precinct.
Spaces and initiatives to support start-up businesses and entrepreneurship programs are already being established in the West Campus. Start-Up Hall, a business accelerator, was recently established in Condon Hall, and Fluke Hall has long promoted the commercialization of research and new business formation. Although these types of support programs and spaces nurture entrepreneurship amongst faculty and students, they are relatively few and far between.

The Innovation District strategy recommends that the University encourage both internal and external private enterprises that will establish small business incubators (especially wet lab), accelerators, co-working spaces, spaces for small batch manufacturing, and other shared resource and support facilities. These programs will provide cost-effective, flexible collaborative space and offer technical, business development, and financial support to emerging entrepreneurs and start-ups. The plan recommends that these activities are located at street level and are visible to pedestrians and visitors as they have the ability to create an innovation aesthetic that will sow the seeds of sustained economic activity.
The Built Environments program as well as a number of arts and culture programs and facilities are located in the West Campus. In many ways, these programs promote hands-on, tactile learning commonly associated with a studio-culture. Maple, the new student residence hall along Campus Parkway will house a maker space / arts studio; Lander Hall’s Local Point includes a demonstration kitchen; Gould Hall houses fabrication labs; and Fluke Hall on the Central Campus recently added a maker space to its incubator. The unpolished, raw, and accessible character of these spaces invites individuals to make, explore, create, test, and engage. The rough and gritty character of the West Campus is also a great opportunity for creating public spaces, streets, and buildings that do not feel finished and can accommodate temporary installations and activities and sustain creative and temporary activities.
**Shared Collision Spaces**

Building facilities and creating programs for innovators of all kinds in the West Campus will not, in itself, nurture the collaborations the plan wishes to inspire. The choreographing of programs and activities across the West Campus must go hand in hand with a public realm plan that establishes corridors and points of high level activity and “collisions” between different innovation players. These areas can be indoors or outdoors, but must be constructed with spaces, furniture, and resources that promote interaction and engagement, whether it’s a café, food establishment, farmer’s market, a co-working space, meeting space, gallery, or public square for events.
Innovation Showcase Center

One of the critical resources that innovators and companies need is a place to come out of their labs and workshops to share their ideas and projects with innovators, potential investors, University constituents, and the broader community. District Hall, in Boston’s Innovation District, has become the “living room” for the innovation community in this emerging district. It is a 10,000 square foot temporary building with a café and bar, meeting rooms, and a large gathering space. It is a shared meeting place with resources for this community of entrepreneurs.

The West Campus should include a similar Innovation Showcase Center where researchers, innovators, and creative individuals can share their ideas and projects with their peers, potential investors, the UW community of academics and researchers, and with the Seattle population in general. Such a facility should include a café, a gallery space, meeting rooms and a large gathering space to host exhibitions and events. Iconic in nature, the design of such a facility should embody the ethos of innovation and serve as a beacon of ideas and creativity.
INNOVATION THROUGHOUT THE WEST CAMPUS

The accompanying image is not a definitive plan, but demonstrates one potential way to accommodate the network of spaces in the innovation ecosystem. In this example, industry partnerships are accommodated in the northwest tower, strategically sited to link the community with the University and facilitate parking and access. A second industry partnership location fronts onto the stepped terrace in a prominent location near the heart of the district. Exploration and making spaces, including rapid prototyping and fabrication labs complement the industry functions, while a new maker space is introduced on the northeast side of Campus Parkway providing access to the Ave, the Central Campus, and residence hall communities. A new home for CoMotion is located along Campus Parkway between 11th and 12th, adjacent to the new permanent home for Start-Up Hall, the accelerator and incubator.

Two sites were identified for collaborative research—on the northeast corner of the Ave and Campus Parkway, which could serve as the home for humanities and soft science research; and on the northeast corner of Brooklyn and Pacific Streets, which could serve as the home for wet lab research. Complementing these spaces are the collision spaces, including indoor co-working spaces, cafes, as well as an outdoor environment that encourages exploration and experimentation, including the testing terrace, the urban farm already in place, art installations, and demonstration areas to make research visible, whether its marine research, stormwater or biodiversity research. Collectively these spaces invite inquiry, spark dialogue, and encourage individuals to engage in problem solving and the exploration of ideas.
GOAL 4 :: PROVIDE A PATH TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

The preferred plan will require a logical and coordinated approach to phasing that strategically sequences new development to ensure existing functions are thoughtfully accommodated and sets up subsequent phases of development for success. The planning team developed two ways to approach phasing—one in which the waterfront park is developed first; and another approach that develops the waterfront park last.

DEVELOP WATERFRONT PARK FIRST

Developing the waterfront park first celebrates its function as a catalyst for future development, and assumes that investing in this significant amenity will encourage and spur additional adjacent investment. This approach leverages the park as a tremendous amenity and establishes it as a significant organizing element for future development throughout the West Campus. This approach, however, requires that the University embrace this significant investment early on in the development process.
The first phase of development is designed to accommodate functions from the Marine Studies, Fisheries Teaching and Research Building, and Wallace Hall, allowing those areas to be decanted. Buildings are introduced south of the Portage Bay Parking Facility, on the W38 parking lot west of the Fishery Sciences building, and attached to the Portage Bay Parking Facility. This development further reinforces Brooklyn as a significant axis and facilitates the creation of the Waterfront Park. In total, Phase 1 displaces 11,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 388,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 377,000 square feet.
Park First – Phase 2

With existing uses relocated into new buildings or surge space, Wallace Hall, Marine Studies, and the Fisheries Teaching and Research Building can be removed, and replaced with the new Waterfront Park which includes the creation of two new pavilion structures. In total, Phase 2 displaces 97,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 25,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of -72,000 square feet.
The Waterfront Park is further activated with the development of the prime parcel between Brooklyn and University Way. Peripheral sites including Eagleson Hall, the Northlake Building site, the Staff/Employment Building, the Guthrie Annexes and the site immediately south of the Henry Art Gallery, are strategically developed to decant remaining uses from the core of West Campus, e.g. Henderson and the Brooklyn Trail Building, allowing the core to be developed in Phase 4. In total, Phase 3 displaces 147,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 1,436,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 1,289,000 square feet.
Park First – Phase 4

Development of peripheral sites in Phase 3 allows existing functions in Henderson, Brooklyn Trail Building, the Child Care Center and 3902 Cowlitz Facilities Building to be accommodated elsewhere, and subsequently removed and redeveloped. In total, Phase 4 displaces 129,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 1,020,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 891,000 square feet.
Development introduced in Phase 4 is designed to accommodate the displaced beds from Steven’s Court, which suggests Steven’s Court can be removed in Phase 5 and replaced with new development. This new development completes the West Campus core, and further activates the Waterfront Park and Terrace. In total, Phase 5 displaces 224,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 548,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 324,000 square feet.
Park First – Phase 6

Phase 6 focuses on the redevelopment of sites adjacent to Campus Parkway, including the Schmitz Hall site, Condon Hall site, and Commodore Duchess site plus its adjacent vacant lot. Developing these sites in a later phase allows more time to identify surge strategies for buildings with significant existing uses. In total, Phase 6 displaces 330,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 705,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 375,000 square feet.
Development of the northwest parcel occurs in the final phase, Phase 7, to allow time for right-of-way negotiation and reconfiguration. In total, Phase 7 does not displace any existing uses; and develops 263,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 263,000 square feet.
DEVELOP THE WATERFRONT PARK LAST

Developing the waterfront park last recognizes that the park is a significant investment and requires the coordination and investment of multiple entities to be realized. This approach allows more time to confirm, plan, coordinate and implement the park. In many ways, the logic and development included in each phase is similar to the first approach, but the sequencing of phases differs to allow more time to realize the park.
Park Last – Phase 1

Phase 1 begins by developing parcels that are accessible for redevelopment in the near-term, minimally displace existing uses, and reinforce Brooklyn Avenue as a key organizing axis. Development includes all sites on the block bounded by Brooklyn Avenue, University Way, NE 40th Street and Pacific Street, along with the Portage Bay Parking Facility wrapper and the site south of the Portage Bay Parking Structure. In total, Phase 1 displaces 87,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 1,110,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 1,023,000 square feet.
Peripheral sites including Eagleson Hall, the Northlake Building site, the Staff/Employment Building, the Guthrie Annexes and the site immediately south of the Henry Art Gallery, are strategically developed to decant remaining uses from the core of West Campus, e.g. Henderson and the Brooklyn Trail Building, allowing the core to be developed in Phase 3. In total, Phase 2 displaces 71,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 614,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 543,000 square feet.
Development of peripheral sites in Phase 2 allows existing functions in Henderson, Brooklyn Trail Building, the Child Care Center and 3902 Cowlitz Facilities Building to be accommodated elsewhere, and subsequently removed and redeveloped. In total, Phase 3 displaces 129,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 1,020,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 891,000 square feet.
**Park Last – Phase 4**

New development introduced in Phase 3 is designed to accommodate the displaced beds from Steven’s Court, which suggests Steven’s Court can be removed in Phase 4 and replaced with new development. This new development, along with development of the W38 parking lot and the creation of the stepped terrace, completes the West Campus core, and sets the stage for the introduction of the Waterfront Park. In total, Phase 4 displaces 224,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 647,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 423,000 square feet.
With surrounding uses in place, the Waterfront Park and pavilions are introduced and further reinforced by supporting, adjacent uses that frame the park. In total, Phase 5 displaces 97,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 25,000 gross square feet of space, leaving a net area of -72,000 square feet.
Park Last – Phase 6

Phase 6 focuses on the redevelopment of sites adjacent to Campus Parkway, including the Schmitz Hall site, Condon Hall site, and Commodore Duchess site plus its adjacent vacant lot. Developing these sites in a later phase allows more time to identify surge strategies for buildings with significant existing uses. In total, Phase 6 displaces 330,000 gross square feet of space; and develops 705,000 gross square feet of space, leaving a net area of 375,000 square feet.
Park Last – Phase 7

Development of the northwest parcel occurs in the final phase, Phase 7, to allow time for right-of-way negotiation and reconfiguration. In total, Phase 7 does not displace any existing uses; and develops 263,000 gross square feet of space, generating a net area of 263,000 square feet.
PARK FIRST
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CAMPUS MASTER PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION

The West Campus Development Framework is intended to serve as a reference document for the forthcoming Campus Master Plan. The plan identifies proposed development sites, building height limits and corresponding future zoning envelopes. The plan also establishes underriding programmatic assumptions, which generated a programmatic goal of 4.35 million gross square feet of new development. Both the development sites and program assumptions should be tested and evaluated within the context and needs of the campus as a whole during the Campus Master Planning effort.

Zoning envelopes were established in the WCDF effort according to the proposed building height limits. Should all development sites be built to their limits, it would generate a development capacity that far exceeds the University’s programmatic goal for the West Campus. While uniform development that maximizes building heights is unlikely, the Campus Master Plan should consider the creation of development capacity caps per zone to prohibit such development.

Parking and mobility strategies were also developed throughout the scenarios and in the preferred plan, but we’re developed for the West Campus in isolation of broader campus mobility and parking needs. Parking and circulation recommendations in the West Campus Development Framework provide a starting point for a broader Campus-wide Mobility Plan.

Lastly, the West Campus Development Framework incorporates a new approach toward building uses and the public realm. The preferred plan allocates space for non-University industry partners, and recommends a highly mixed use organization. The success of the broader West Campus also relies upon the creation of a safe, vibrant and desirable public realm structure, which includes significant open space amenities, active ground floors functions, smaller scale streetscape investments, and an approach to parking that minimizes surface parking.

Traditionally these approaches have been challenging to achieve under existing funding structures in which a single user raises funds and constructs a building for that specific entity. With constrained costs, public realm investments are typically suspended. This West Campus Development Framework raises the following question that should be explored within the Campus Master Plan:

How can the University define a financial and regulatory context that promotes partnerships and mixed-use buildings with a multitude of functions and users; find ways to support public realm and open space investments; and establish requirements for underground parking?