



Minutes #7

(Adopted 7/11/18)

Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Wednesday, June 13, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill

500 17th Ave – James Tower SECC

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Julia Blum

Catherine Koehn

Jeff Dvi-Vardhana (Alternate)

Kevin Klauer

Claire Lane

Justin Kliewer

David Letrondo

Staff and Other Present:

Brad Hinthorne – Perkins+Will

Daria Supp – Perkins+Will

Maureen Sheehan – DON

David West - Swedish

1. Opening and Introductions

Mr. David Letrondo opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the May 9 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

3. Meeting #6 Follow-up

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion on Meeting #6 follow-ups. Mr. Mike Hansen of Sabey introduced Ms. Tina Tufts, senior property manager for Sabey to provide a brief update on the current work that is happening on campus.

18th Avenue Underground Utility work

Comments have been received from SDOT for the Utility Major Permit (UMP) and the Street Improvement. Work will begin immediately after the permits are received and it will not require any road closures. The SIP covers capital improvements mandated in the conditions of the MIMP.

Puget Sound Energy

PSE has obtained their SDOT street use permit for the natural gas line work on 18th Avenue. It will more than likely require two days to complete and will occur in the next 2-4 weeks. Traffic will be limited to one-way.

Jefferson Tower Roof

The replacement roof project at Jefferson Tower started the first week of June. The target for completion is by the end of July, weather permitting.

Cherry Street Residential Project

Permit and MUP corrections have been submitted to the City. Expecting the MUP and building permit in July/August and this will begin the demolition plan. Some preliminary exterior work will be done in July. Ms. Claire Lane asked if there are any street closures when the demolition begins, and Ms. Tuft mentioned that she does not have the specific information regarding any street closures but will provide the information as soon as any updates are communicated.

Transportation Events

There was a transportation fair held in the plaza on June 6th. The purpose of the fair is to inform employees and visitors about transportation options and approximately 138 people participated. The next fair is planned for late September. There was also a Bike Everywhere Day held on May 18th and over 120 attendees visited the bike booth that provided bicycle tune-ups and free promotion items including a patch repair kit.

A comment was made about the time of activity during these projects, and Ms. Tuft commented that the work begins at what the city noise Ordinance allows them after 7:00 am. A comment was made about pressure washing at around 2:30 am 17th and Jefferson. Mr. Hansen made a note and will check and provide an update.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan commented about the context and schedule for tonight's meeting. There will be a design presentation on the 18th Avenue building plan as well as a schedule on what to expect going forward. At the July meeting, the design team will respond to the initial comments heard tonight and by August/September, the Committee should be ready to formally submit comments to SDCl. She added that the Committee, Swedish, and Sabey may not come to an agreement but the comments will provide a landing spot at the end of the process.

Ms. Lane asked for an update regarding the connector closure and Mr. Dave West commented that a notice was put up a week in advance and the work was completed.

Ms. Lane asked about an update on the communication plan that was discussed at the last meeting and Ms. Sherry Williams of Swedish commented that the Swedish Marketing Communications team is developing different methods to access the plan via electronically. She mentioned that she reached out to the residents of Squire Park community to advise on the communications plan.

Ms. Lane commented about revisiting the communication about the meeting. She noted that a one-time postcard was sent out to the neighbors, but she would like to continue discussing on how to do more outreach and communication to the neighbors so that they are fully informed about SAC meetings. Ms. Williams commented that in the overall communication plan, she is in contact with the Squire Park newsletter and she attends various community meetings and will be sending out postcards with website information and contact numbers about these meetings. She noted that these are some of the items that she will discuss with the Marketing Communications team and present these at the July meeting for feedback. Ms. Sheehan added that if the Committee knows any existing networks or infrastructure around the community such as neighborhood night-out, Facebook, etc. to share them with her. Ms. Lane suggested if the City could provide postcards and flyers for the Committee to distribute in the neighborhood, this

would be helpful. Ms. Sheehan noted that the City is happy to provide the materials but noted that there might be challenges regarding language and she would like to know if they could identify the languages that are available around the neighborhood to distribute these materials. Mr. Letrondo suggested that if anyone knows a neighborhood block watch captain, and that person typically has the contact information of everyone in the block. Ms. Lane noted that she will do research around the different languages in the neighborhood. She expressed her concern that this process is not advertised enough to reach all the nearby neighbors. A comment was made if another round of mailings to the neighborhood about the next meeting is feasible. Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will request the Department of Neighborhoods about another set of mailings but cautioned about sending out on-demand mailings.

Ms. Lane commented that the City lost some contact information and this process is a way to backfill the information that were lost. Ms. Sheehan noted that DON went back from previous meetings and reviewed the sign-in sheets and were able to gather all the contact information from neighbors that have participated and involved in the process.

Ms. Julia Blum commented that the transportation issue is a hot topic and it is not at tonight's agenda. She asked if there are any updates about the directional capacity analysis and any missing transportation documentation that Swedish still needs to provide. Mr. Mark Melynck noted that the directional capacity analysis is a component that is new to the survey process and has engaged with several stakeholders and the ITB (Integrated Transportation Board) that advises the campus on how to achieve the transportation goal and are currently going over the methodology. He noted that a document will be provided at the August meeting. Ms. Sheehan added that what Ms. Blum was referring to that the SOV rate is being met and the capacity analysis is condition #22 in yellow indicating it is in progress.

Ms. Lane asked about one of the conditions regarding a five-year review and any updates about the annual report and any feedback from the City. Ms. Sheehan noted that this condition is about the five-year, big picture SAC meeting. The annual report is required by the Land Use code, the City made comments about the report and Swedish has until July 30th (update: July 6th) to respond to these comments. She recognized that the report the Committee received had data gaps and Swedish is going back to update this and will ask the Committee to review the next report. It is not an approval, but a disclosure.

4. 18th Avenue Building Plan – Phase A

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion on the 18th Avenue Building Plan Phase A updates. Mr. Brad Hinthorne and Ms. Daria Supp of Perkins+Will provided an update to the 18th Avenue Building Plan and the design development standards.

Ms. Supp commented that the presentation is organized based on the development standards and design guidelines from the MIMP. She mentioned that the current project in the presentation is Phase A. The focus of the development standards for Phase A include setbacks, landscaping, open space, entries, heights, parking and loading. These are the MIMP requirements the City will be reviewing. Tonight's presentation will focus on the MIMP design guidelines. The role of this Committee is to prioritize key guidelines recognizing that not all the guidelines apply to every MIMP project.

She began by showing several diagrams of the street frontage and edge, street connections, public entrances and access points, parking and vehicle access, privacy and screenings, architectural characters including materials and patterns, and elevation.

It is a flat roof with a slope that directly drains water to a biofiltration system which drains to the storm sewer. She noted that the white building matches the campus entrance inside the court. They will use three varied materials on the façade (precast, terracotta, glazing) that works on rhythms and patterns that are consistent with the campus.

She noted that the transparency at the street level breaks up the first and second level by using transparent materials and a dense finer grain of terracotta and a large grain of the precast. The precast is like the modern take of the light tone base of the building.

A comment was made about the neighborhood houses selection and she noted that the pictures that shown does not represent the neighborhood and asked about the selection process. Ms. Supp commented that the guidelines for the selection were taken directly from the MIMP.

The security fence is about 6 ft. tall. The intent is to provide a satisfactory, sturdy, and sustainable buffer between the outside and inside of the campus for security. There are patterns that blocks the light with some amount of perforation and transparency at a higher level for security. The security fence is at the Sabey property line. It was noted that the 18th avenue side of the health walk was removed even though it still shows in the MIMP. Mr. Hinthorne commented that they would like to have a conversation that so the design is consistent with the MIMP and is preferable to the neighbors and will continue to discuss the best options.

The trees will take approximate 10 to 15 years, likely 10 years for a standard street trees, to mature to the desired 12-13 ft. It was noted that deciduous trees do not provide good screening during the winter and wanted to know where the deciduous and evergreen trees are located. The landscape architect noted that they did a mix representation at the plaza level and there are more conifer trees than deciduous trees to block the headlights and provide a buffer.

Ms. Supp mentioned that the pedestrian lighting is consistent with what is already on campus and it occurs in the wayfinding plan. Ms. Supp noted an active vibrant street front from a land use perspective it is about transparency at the street and lobbies by providing glazing and introducing transparency as much as possible. A vibrant street front also includes bike parking, benches, landscape, pedestrian lights, etc.

A question was asked if there are any covered and protected areas for people that are waiting for their ride. Ms. Supp noted that there are weather protected areas setback about 5 ft. Mr. Letrondo asked about the width of the turnaround to anticipate any shuttles and patient drop off and Mr. Hinthorne commented that for at the next presentation, they will show the scale and the width of the plaza for cars, trucks, etc. Ms. Supp noted the bollards and the change of the material contrast and the drive surface and the pedestrian.

The design team will continue to develop and provide renderings that shows signage as described in the wayfinding plan.

Ms. Sheehan commented that the intent of tonight's presentation is to comment on the design guidelines. the Committee needs to communicate to the design team what is lacking so they can go back and provide additional information. If the Committee still feels that it is insufficient, the Committee will summarize their comments in a letter to SDCI. Ms. Supp added that the design guidelines are meant for the entire campus and have prioritized which guidelines make sense for this project.

A question was asked if there are any consideration for stepping down regarding the height, bulk, and scale of the building at the side of the nearby neighbors. Ms. Supp commented that the Design team followed the grade and the building steps down as it moves across the site as well as acknowledges the modulations and rhythms.

A request was made for the entrances to be more vibrant and welcoming. Ms. Supp noted that transparency is more apparent than the glazing to connect to the street. There is a 10 ft. setback along Jefferson and Cherry at the back of the building and there is beautiful landscaping for the pedestrian experience and to activate the public realm towards the landscape. There was a suggestion for more community engagement such as public artwork for the community to contribute so it would feel like it is their neighborhood instead of Swedish.

Ms. Lane commented that she was pleased about the two buildings are not big and bulky and the use of the glass and windows helped lighten the building. She asked about the use of white materials in comparison to the Jefferson Tower building because she felt it looks different from the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Hinthorne noted they would bring sample materials in July so the Committee could touch and feel the materials.

Ms. Lane commented about the use of the plaza space and if the Design Team could consider making the space more active and more weather shelter for people that are waiting for their rides. She added that top vertical design help lighten the building and the glass makes it appealing but added that it does not transition well into the residential neighborhood and asked if the design team could revisit that.

She commented about landscaping and requested an investment is made in more mature trees to start with and more coniferous trees making sure that the Cherry and Jefferson side of the street looks more like a neighbor's backyard with garden-like planting and not an institution's backyard as well as more creativity on the fence.

A comment was made by Mr. Kliewer that he likes the modern interpretation of the building and was intrigued about the weathered material on the east façade of the building. He suggested the design team bring sample materials that they could touch and see. If they could consider if it makes more sense to have a solid fence instead of a black security fence. He is looking forward for a detailed landscape plan. He commented about the large blank façade panel on 18th at the plaza corner and would like to see more of a pedestrian experience coming into the building. He requested the location and access of the bike storage, details about the site lighting plan, and the location of the security lights so they do not impact neighbors.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comments shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions and have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the files in voice recording (.mp3) form)

Comments from Mr. Bob Cooper – Mr. Cooper commented having the spreadsheet that enumerates the council conditions be provided in a sortable format. He noted that he has not seen a schedule that list what the committee is considering in future discussions, and that will be a helpful information for the public. He cautioned the architects about looking at the enumerated City Council conditions and not just the MIMP. He

mentioned that the mid-century modern building theme does not fit with the neighborhood where the brick buildings are dominant. He added to closely look at and consider activating the street and make it more interactive for the neighbors instead of closing it off.

Comments from Ms. Cindy Thelen – Ms. Thelen commented that she lives behind the taller section of the building and she echoed Mr. Cooper’s concern that the design does not in the neighborhood. She noted that having the trees to grow for 10 years is discouraging and a 12 to 15 ft. tree is not very tall. She was concerned about the fence and suggested that a representative from Sabey consult with the neighbors about the trees and the fence. She also added that the City and the developers should be doing more of the community organizing and not the neighbors.

Ms. Sheehan reminded the public that those who comes in this meeting for the first time to provide their contact information if they would like to receive project-related and City news updates.

6. Committee Deliberation

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for Committee deliberation. Ms. Sheehan commented that the goal of tonight’s presentation is to provide the Committees thoughts and comments for the Design team to review and respond to the concerns when they come back for their next presentation.

Ms. Lane commented about what Ms. Thelen stated in public comment about an opportunity for the neighbors to have a conversation and consultation about sample materials, textured glass and what the fence would look like. Mr. Hinthorne asked if this meeting is a forum for that conversation. Ms. Sheehan noted that this is the required process, but it does not prevent the Design team from reaching out to neighbors to have a smaller meeting.

Ms. Lane commented her appreciation for the Design Team gathering all the feedback and comments and noted that she would like to see the building to be brought down into a human scale.

A comment was made about the barrier walls to reduce noise impacts and Ms. Supp noted that they are not noise barrier walls, and noted that the vegetations, screens, landscaping and the building themselves accomplish this.

Ms. Lane commented that it was helpful to hear the Committee members comments and the Design Team’s responses and explanations. She asked if there is a way to submit feedback in response to this evenings presentation before the next meeting. Ms. Sheehan noted that the Design Team will need time to adjust and suggested submitting additional feedback by next week to her via email and be as specific as possible.

7. Meeting #8 Agenda & Adjournment

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for Meeting #8 agenda.

Ms. Sheehan commented that next month’s agenda is to revisit the comments that were heard tonight and reviewing them again and identify any issues and concerns that the Design team can addressed. She added that the Design Team went through and identified the priorities in the design guidelines and encouraged the Committee members to identify priorities they would consider a priority.

No further business being before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.