



APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Mike McGinn
Mayor

Diane Sugimura
Director, DPD

Marshall Foster
Planning Director, DPD

Mary Johnston
Chair

Andrew Barash

Julie Bassuk

Graham Black

Brendan Connolly

Lauren Hauck

Laurel Kunkler

Julie Parrett

Norie Sato

Donald Vehige

Guillermo Romano
Executive Director

Valerie Kinast
Coordinator

Tom Iurino
Senior Staff

April 15, 2010

Convened 10:00 am
Adjourned 5:30 pm

Projects Reviewed

West Seattle Reservoir Park
Councilmember Tom Ramussen
Childrens Hospital Design Guidelines
Childrens Hospital Laurelon
Westlake Transportation Hub Strategy

Commissioners Present

Mary Johnston, Chair
Andrew Barash
Brendan Connolly
Julie Bassuk
Graham Black
Lauren Hauck
Laurel Kunkler
Julie Parrett
Norie Sato
Donald Vehige

Staff Present

Guillermo Romano
Valerie Kinast
Tom Iurino
Jenny Hampton



**Department of Planning
and Development**
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
PO Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

TEL 206-615-1349
FAX 206-233-7883



April 15, 2010	Project:	Children’s Hospital Design Review Guidelines
	Phase:	N/A
	Last Reviewed:	N/A
	Presenters:	Todd Johnson, Seattle Childrens Scott Ringgold, DPD
	Attendees:	Carol Eychaner, Laurelhurst Community Club Planning Consultant Jeannie Hale, Laurelhurst Community Club Jeff Hughes, Seattle Childrens John Keegan, Davis Wright Tremaine Kevin Chang, Laurelhurst Community Club Michael Jenkins, Council Central Staff Paulo Nunes-Ueno, Seattle Childrens Scott J. Osterhag, Seneca Group Inc. Steve Sheppard, DON Suzanne Peterson, Seattle Childrens

Time: 3:10pm – 3:55pm

ACTION

The Design Commission thanks Seattle Children’s for drawing on the expertise of the Design Commission in a voluntary review of the design guidelines. The Commission unanimously conditionally approves the guidelines subject to the following:

- Clarify Semantics
- Pull out the more substantial points in the guidelines and create checklist items.
- Prioritize intent vs. consideration
- Provide prioritization. Identify which items are more important than others.
- Add specificity or reference the MIMP to clarify the tangible intent of the items.
- Provide a statement about the relationship of the design guidelines document to the MIMP. Cross-reference both documents
- Where applicable reduce the language of “good intent” for statement like: “to the maximum degree possible”

After the meeting a subcommittee of the Design Commission reviewed revised design guidelines and provided the following recommendations that were subsequently responded to by Seattle Children’s to the satisfaction of the Design Commission.

NOTE: Based on the last presentation to the full Commission and the DRAFT we have subsequently received, we have the following comments regarding the Children's Hospital Design Guidelines.

1. Children's should consider more how this document will be used. This document will be used by community members in evaluating Children's future projects and given concerns about Children's expansion by at least certain community members, this document could serve a secondary purpose of reassuring the community of Children's good intentions. For this purpose, it should be written to be read by laypeople and should be clear in defining what community members could expect the quality of the edge development to be.
2. The introduction and purpose of the Design Guidelines should be clearer including the relationship to the MIMP and who is administering these guidelines.
3. The introduction should include a paragraph defining the action verbs in the Statements of Intent and Guidelines.
4. Each section should clearly (aka, written out not merely bolded) identify a Statement of Intent and Guidelines.
5. Guidelines should be grouped and organized thematically within each section with a clear title. Strategies should be included with specific guidelines as not all strategies relate to all guidelines.
6. An Artwork section should be added.
7. The Landscape section should be replaced by two separate sections – Exterior Spaces and Landscape.

In addition, please see the attached file for more specific comments and example sections.

Project Presentation

Todd Johnson and Scott Ringgold presented the Seattle Children's Hospital design guidelines to the Design Commission. These guidelines were conceived to order to put a framework in place for the eventual design team. They also act as a reference manual for the Standing Advisory Committee.

The team presented a summary of the major parts of the guidelines including examples of how the site could interact with the neighborhood, access points, description of design character and landscape tradition. It also includes public benefits and amenities, material character, and architectural aspects. The team proposed that these guidelines act as guides for the ultimate design of the space.

In a Jan. 2009 recommendation, DPD identified some proposed guidelines as a condition. We recommended elaborating on those guidelines and then there will be a better design framework. The goal of these guidelines is that we are creating a better design framework from the beginning. We want to have the Design Commission evaluate the draft guidelines for relevance and thoroughness.

These are meant for the Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) and DPD. The idea is that SAC will use these guidelines.

The Design Commission's role of reviewing these guidelines was a condition adopted by the council. We recommended that the commission review them so that they are applicable and target the key points for design in the future. Once we get your feedback, DPD will work to update them and approve them so that the SAC will then take these guidelines that will help us approve the project going forward.

Public Comments

Carol Eychaner, Planning Consultant Laurelhurst Community Club

In reviewing this document, what I found is that it wasn't really clear to me what the main goals of these guidelines were. I think that clarity needs to be addressed generally and also with specific guidelines. I attempted to try and provide some language that embodied the key issues. It also wouldn't be really clear to me what the priority of the guidelines should be. I suggested several suggestions with the garden edge, and in particular accessibility is important. We would like to have a bit more input into the process.

Commissioners' Comments and Questions

I think that it is important to remember that these guidelines are meant as a guiding document for the SAC advisory group in making decisions in the future. I want to make sure that these comments are looked in that light.

At the beginning of the document, it would be helpful for the terms shall, should and consider be defined and eliminate the terms would and could be in order to minimize confusion. Therefore there will be a clear understanding of what that means. Also make sure that there is flexibility and a clear focus about when that flexibility can play a part in the design.

I think there are also going to be situations where there are decisions made that people are deciding between guidelines. In the beginning there might be some sort of priority so that these decisions can be clear across the board.

This is a much improved version from the last time we looked at these guidelines. This is a great improvement, but there are some issues that still need to be addressed.

Is it acceptable to be more specific in pedestrian access?

To address the edge issues, there is desire to have the edges be accessible to move into the campus, but also it is seamless with neighborhood movement and neighbors do not have to travel through the campus. In the masterplan, there are these major points that address the access of pedestrian walkways. I don't see these guidelines having that level of descriptiveness. We are instead saying the values that we want to have there, without noting how.

I think these are not design guidelines at all. I think this is a narrative of goals. It doesn't have any specifics. I don't think this is a good model and can lead to a large amount of confusion in the future.

What you are not seeing is that there are specifics described in the masterplan with numbers and details within them. There is actually a detailed pedestrian connection description in the masterplan. The distinction between this and the masterplan is that this gets to the finer values and analysis of what we might need to do here. I agree we need to come up with more bulleted points.

There are some issues of formatting that need to be addressed. I share some of the concerns about if these are guidelines that they then really rely on good faith from both parties. When revising these we need to be more black and white and make sure that they can be enforceable. It really comes down to how they are framed.

Maybe they need to cross reference the masterplan so that it is clear that they are correlated and the masterplan can provide more detail and specifics.