



## 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 Laurelon Vacation**

**Phase:** Street Vacation

**Last Reviewed:** April 16, 2009; April 2, 2009; March 16, 2009

**Presenters:** Bob Zimmerman, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects  
Todd Johnson, Seattle Childrens

**Attendees:** Allyn Stellmacher, Zimmer-Gunsul–Frasca Partnership  
Beverly Barnett, SDOT  
Carol Eychaner, Laurelhurst Community Club Planning Consultant  
Casey Hildreth, SDOT  
David W. Neal, Zimmer-Gunsul-Frasca Partnership  
Desiree B. Leigh, Seattle Childrens  
Heather Marx, SDOT  
Jeannie Hale, Laurelhurst Community Club  
Jeff Hughes, Seattle Childrens  
John Keegan, Davis Wright Tremaine  
Karen Ko, DON  
Kevin Chang, Laurelhurst Community Club  
Michael Jenkins, Council Central staff  
Paulo Nenes-Ueno, Seattle Childrens  
Peter Steinbrueck, Steinbruek Urban Strategies  
Scott J. Osterhag, Seneca Group Inc.  
Scott Ringgold, DPD  
Steve Sheppard, DON  
Suzanne Peterson, Seattle Childrens

Time: 2:07 pm – 3:10 pm

---

## **ACTION**

The Commission thanks the Seattle Children’s team and attendees for the discussion. The modifications to the design meet the original intent of the earlier iteration of the public benefits package if the following recommendations are responded to:

- Provide more permeability in the 75’ south end buffer space to create a better balance of openness and buffering.
- Make the connection to the Burke Gilman Trail as wide as possible, providing continuity in the planting and lighting. Consider how steps versus a sloped pathway would best serve the various users, including bicyclists and strollers
- Provide consistency of the plant palette and language on both sides of Sand Point Way.
- Shorten the pedestrian crossings as much as possible to increase the safety of pedestrians.
- Firm up the language used in the plans as it relates to design as appropriate for a master plan. Maintain the language as described in the Public Benefit Package
- Appreciates the intent to pursue and provide ADA accessibility.
- Considers that the tradeoffs obtained by the change of the initial proposal (with the Hartman building plaza) and the new buffer zones and public pocket parks are sufficient.

Six in favor, two abstain because they are not familiar enough with the project to cast a vote.

## Project Presentation

The Children's Hospital project team reviewed the public benefits package changes that have occurred since their last meeting with the Design Commission. The street vacation in the masterplan led the hospital to develop a public benefits package for the project. The approved public benefits package was presented earlier in the project, however some changes occurred which made it necessary to review a second time. These changes developed mostly from the removal of a significant building in the plan. On April 25, the city council approved the Children's masterplan and the public benefits that were offered in the package.

The original Public Package benefits included:

- Pedestrian and bike public access from the Burke-Gilman train to Sand Point Way NE. This original trail changed as the building
- Plaza, street and sidewalk improvements along Sand Point Way NE
- Enhanced Public access to Metro bus routes and Children's shuttle
- Plaza, street and sidewalk improvements along 40<sup>th</sup> Ave NE
- Pocket Park at corner of 40<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

Modifications to the public benefits include changes to the trail connecting to the Burke- Gilman. The trail will still provide the connection, however, the configuration will be changed to adapt to the new plan without the building present. Furthermore, the south end campus buffer is extended by 35 feet, therefore increasing the size of the pocket park.

## Public Comments

### Beverly Barnet, SDOT

Today we are looking at the changes that were driven in the Master Plan. Through work with the community and city council, we have the same public benefit as we did before, but configured a bit differently. This is such an important project which is why we want you to review it. We want to make the connection between the trail, street and campus, which I feel this scheme succeeds.

## Commissioners' Comments and Questions

*What is the dimension on the trail?*

8 feet.

*Earlier, you were trying to work on ADA access for the trail through the building. Is this still intended?*

This still needs to be worked out. We will be required to have ADA as part of the trail.

*Could you describe any circulation going through that buffer?*

We want to and need to provide the buffer so that the activities of the hospital are mitigated around the houses that are nearby. We also feel that it is quite nice in here so we want to make it accessible. We are not far along in our design development to completely know.

*What would be the lighting along this area?*

At this point we do not know. It will very much be integrated into the scale

*What is the surfacing of the walkway?*

It is some sort of hardscape and the steps would incorporate some sort of mechanism for bicycles to go along them.

*I'm assuming that the steps would not disrupt the topography of the area. I would imagine that in this case that it should have minimal impact.*

*What landscaping are you incorporating with this revised plan in that area?*

Currently it is fairly naturalized with natives and we would be including this into any repairing or new developments

*Is there some landscape consistency across the plan and some significance to the other side of the campus? It is an opportunity for integration and identity. It could be a soft and friendly way to extend the campus out into the neighborhood.*

*I have a question about the existing street condition and the train. What are the possibilities of shortening that connection for pedestrians?*

We will be looking at the extending safety zones into the street here.

*I'm a little concern about approving the public benefit project when I'm not sure the design is concrete.*

The public benefits package is going in phases and this is one increment.

In terms of the landscape, we have certain standards that we maintain and involve. In my point of view, it is fulfilling its goal with public benefit package and connecting the trail system.

*The wider buffer area, is that just a landscape buffer?*

The pocket park included might extend and we are looking to determine pedestrian pathways and educational opportunities.

*Now that you have more room it is great that you can add more benefits and tell a story and history to this area.*