

October XX, 2018

**Re: DRAFT Swedish Cherry Hill Standing Advisor Committee Comments on Proposed 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Site**

The Swedish Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) is required to review and comment on the preliminary design of buildings proposed under the Swedish Cherry Hill Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) adopted July 8, 2016. MIMP Design Guideline 1.1 states: "...SAC members would then apply the guidelines as they evaluate how specific proposals address shared concerns about how hospital development is to address its nearby neighbors and the public realm."

The comments in this letter reflect the concerns from neighbors of the campus and the SAC's deliberation and observations during eight public meetings between November 2017 and August 2018 where Sabey Corporation presented designs for wayfinding, streetscape, and building design related to the proposed campus expansion on the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue site identified in MIMP as Phase A. The design team made some revisions in response to committee feedback and public comments and presented additional information as requested. Yet some of the most critical comments were not addressed.

The SAC respectfully submits this letter with the expectation that the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) will continue to work with the Sabey Corporation to incorporate the following comments when reviewing the Master Use Permit (MUP) application for the proposed buildings.

Included below are comments organized according to the Master Plan Design Guidelines identified in the MIMP. The committee has heard from Sabey, the architects, and the community in the past eight months; as such, the comments below reflect areas the committee believes require additional revision, as well as elements that are important and should be preserved.

The committee appreciates the design revisions presented but believe the design does not fully succeed in meeting the MIMP Design Guidelines. Among all proposed buildings in this MIMP, this building most closely abuts neighborhood homes: along the eastern edge of the MIO, it shares a block and a property line that abuts backyards of single-family homes. The transition from residential area to the institutional campus couldn't be more explicit or important than with this building, and the consensus from the first presentation is that the plan doesn't sufficiently meet the clear guidelines for respecting the sensitive nature of this relationship. This is the first building of the new MIMP and its design – including its architectural elements and features, color palette, materials, and texture – will become a reference point for all future buildings that will also have to be compatible with this one, as well as existing buildings. The committee is aware that if this building doesn't sufficiently conform to the General Guidelines, it will change the context and reference point for future construction plans and potentially undermine the strength of the MIMP's guidelines.

The committee submits these comments with significant concerns about how the overall design fails to address important design guidelines negotiated with the Cherry Hill/Squire Park neighborhood.

**B1.1 Hospital Campus Character: General Guidelines**

- **Promote design excellence**
- **Acknowledge the character of surrounding single-family residential, multi-family and educational use areas at each edge.**

- **Use landscaping to soften and enhance outdoor spaces and screen utilities, and other more functional elements**
- **Eliminate blank walls**
- **Use a compatible palette, texture, and color of building materials to unify the hospital campus**
- **Respect the historic context**

### **B1.1.2 General Guidelines**

- Sabey presented a design that reinterpreted the existing campus in different building’s massing and materials. The committee recognizes the intent of inverting the historical light-colored stone plinths and highlighting the vertical glazing rhythm exemplified by James Tower, but we believe it fails to acknowledge some of the most important overarching design guidelines for the hospital campus and its buildings.
- Specifically, it fails to address the design guidelines to “acknowledge the character of surrounding single-family residential and multi-family buildings at each edge” and “respect the historical context” of the neighborhood or the campus.
- The committee is also concerned this design is a significant departure from the “palette, texture and color of building materials” that unifies the hospital campus. (B1.1.2) The committee is concerned about the appropriateness of the predominately white palette as well as the overall design approach within the historical character of the neighborhood.
- The committee is especially sensitive to the need to harmonize the residential neighborhood and the Swedish campus because this building will share a property line with single-family residences. The building should serve as a more sensitive transition from the campus to the residential community.

**Recommendation #1: The committee recommends that the architects work with the committee further to identify better solutions to concerns about building materials and design palette to achieve a more harmonious transition between the residential neighborhood and these hospital campus buildings.**

**Recommendation #2: The committee suggests that design feedback (enumerated in later sections) based on privacy, exposure, security, or noise risks to neighbors on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue carry special weight with the City’s review of the committee’s concerns or suggestions and SDCI’s permit processes.**

### **B1.1.3 Street Frontage Edge**

#### **B1.1.4 Connection to the Street**

The committee appreciates the architects’ responsiveness to some of the concerns voiced by community and committee members about street activation and pedestrian engagement, and the designs are much improved by their modifications. The changes help the design address the guidelines and these modifications should be preserved in the final plan, but they are insufficient. The committee remains concerned about the design’s inadequacies in improving street activation and engaging pedestrians for this project. The committee believes more should be done to adequately address MIMP design guidelines on these topics.

- The revised entrances now facing the 18th Ave sidewalk were a response to significant comments by community members and the committee; these entrances now successfully align with the design guidelines to orient buildings to interact with the street and should be maintained. (B1.1.4)
- Outdoor benches and public seating (seating area at 18<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson, as well as seating adjacent to the mid-block entry on 18<sup>th</sup> Ave.) added in the design process respond to committee and public comments about further activating space (B1.1.3).
- The added seating area on 18<sup>th</sup> Ave and Jefferson St. **may** also address the street frontage edge design guideline: “Design open spaces and pocket parks adjacent to Street Fronts”. (B1.1.3) **(OUTSTANDING QUESTION: this would qualify as a ‘pocket park’ if it is at least 400 sq feet – is it??).**
- This added seating may also address the standards for **MIO Community Amenities within landscaping** **(OUTSTANDING QUESTION: does the seating @ 18<sup>th</sup> & Jefferson meet standard per pg 41 of MIMP - “The following would be located within the public right of way... add pedestrian respite areas on the hill climb areas of E. Cherry and E. Jefferson Streets”?)**. If so, it does not address the required area of respite that must also be on Cherry St.
- The glazed “plinth” concept successfully provides opportunities for visual connection to the street along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue and addresses design guidelines about street level transparency. (B1.1.4)
- The Cherry and Jefferson Street facades are secondary and fail to engage with the streetscape. The committee understands the need to minimize entry points, but would like to see increased visual and functional connections to the street and the residential character of these streets along these facades.
- While the interior building design and use is not part of the SAC review, the glazed building perimeter also provides an opportunity for artwork or other displays. (B1.1.4 and B1.1.7)

**Recommendation # X:** The committee would like clarification about the intent and criteria for “respite areas on the hill climb areas of E. Cherry and E. Jefferson Streets”. If such respite areas are required for both streets, the committee recommends a second seating area be included on E. Cherry.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee would like clarification about whether the proposed seating area at 18<sup>th</sup> Ave and E. Jefferson qualifies as a ‘pocket park’.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee recommends increased visual and functional connections to the street and residential character of the neighborhood on both the Cherry St. and Jefferson St. façades.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee suggests interior design plans further address opportunities for street activation and pedestrian engagement, through visible art, color, and possible retail.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee encourages any public use areas such as a café be placed adjacent to the ground floor glazed areas near the entrance, or at the corner of 18<sup>th</sup> Ave and Jefferson St., to promote public engagement at the street level and near transit connections.

### **B1.1.5 Public Entrances and Access Points**

### **B1.1.6 Streetscape and Pedestrian Pathways**

### **B1.1.7 Sidewalks**

- Revisions to the entry orientation and canopies successfully addressed requirements regarding visual pathfinding, clearly identifiable entries, and weather protected entry points. It also addressed the requirement to treat vehicle and pedestrian entrances separately. (B1.1.5 and B1.1.7)
- The increased street front setback along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue creates a more gracious pedestrian experience along an important thoroughfare. Setbacks were a contentious issue in developing this MIMP, which requires only 0' setback for this project (page 28, MIMP); this design element is greatly appreciated by the committee and community. (B1.1.7)
- The entrances' only use of signifying architectural elements are the oversize glass sections. Based on comments, architects added a sign above the south entrance to aid in wayfinding and identification, but otherwise there is limited use of "distinctive architectural elements or landscaping" to "provide visual emphasis and ease of identification" at entryways. (B1.1.5)
- The alternating paving surfaces and other features such as safety bollards should be maintained and strengthened, particularly as the courtyard entry creates the possible intersection of pedestrian, bicycle vehicular traffic, and loading dock traffic. Use of varying colors and/or textures in walkways/ground plane will help guide pedestrians appropriately. The location of the raised street crossing adjacent to the courtyard successfully addresses required pedestrian circulation within the campus while providing traffic calming through speed reduction. The wider sidewalks are appreciated to accommodate increased pedestrian traffic. (B1.1.6)
- The screening elements and plantings should fully block headlights from projecting into the neighboring properties. Select lighting of courtyard trees, bollards, and an art screen should provide nighttime lighting for safety without light spillover for 19th Ave neighbors. (B1.1.6)
- The SAC is concerned that limited and less visible bike parking could be a deterrent for those who wish to bike to campus. Design guidelines call for "pedestrian amenities in prominent, active areas that are complementary to adjacent building use or programmed open, space, such as... bike parking." (B1.1.6) The committee is concerned about the limited number of street level bicycle parking spaces and would like to see additional facilities provided, especially considering expected traffic congestion as a result of MIMP and required ongoing SOV trip reduction goals. This will be important to work with the Greenway that is being built along 18<sup>th</sup> and will again help engage the public.
- The guidelines call for a **Health Walk** integrated into the pocket parks in building Phase A (page 65). The committee did not discuss the Health Walk as it relates to the proposed design and would like to ensure that it is integrated into this building phase, if required by the MIMP. (B1.1.6)

**Recommendation # X: The committee notes Sabey and the architects did not respond to our requests for a presentation on the site's lighting design plan and light impacts, especially on the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue neighboring properties. The committee would appreciate a lighting design presentation to the committee. The committee strongly recommends that any lighting is designed and analyzed for the least light intrusion on adjacent neighboring properties.**

**Recommendation # X:** The committee can't make substantive comments about wayfinding elements without a presentation with an updated wayfinding plan. We recommend a presentation to the committee now that the building draft has been completed.

- **Recommendation # X:** The committee suggests the design of the proposed art screen include a thoughtful process that could engage the community in an open call for proposals or perhaps highlight a local artist.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee would like additional bicycle parking and amenities provided and information about how the site will adapt, if at all, in response to upcoming 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Greenway plans.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee would like clarification about the MIMP's Health Walk. If such an amenity is required, the designers and committee members should review and comment on any Health Walk design before it is submitted to the City.

#### **B1.1.7 Sidewalks**

#### **B1.1.8 Parking and Vehicle Access**

- The committee remains concerned about the vehicular entry sequence as it relates to pedestrian cross traffic and impacts on neighboring properties. As noted above, the bollards and alternate paving should be maintained.
- Revisions to the entry orientation and canopies successfully addressed the requirement to treat vehicle and pedestrian entrances separately and should remain in final plans. (B1.1.7)
- The location of the loading dock is of particular concern, as it is located at the MIO boundary and adjacent to multiple neighborhood residences. The committee strongly suggests limitations on the type and time of use to avoid noise, pollution, and odor impacts on adjacent properties. In addition, the committee suggests using building strategies and materials to ensure maximum sound baffling and minimize detectable sound on neighbors' properties. (B1.1.8)
- Appropriately sized trees both in width and height needs to be diagrammed in order to ensure there is no light pollution from vehicles entering the parking circle when deciduous trees are bare.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee strongly suggests limitations on the type and time of use of the loading dock to avoid noise and odor impacts on adjacent properties, as well as monitoring and enforcement plans for use that are at least as stringent as any current restrictions on the James Tower loading docks.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee strongly suggests building strategies and materials used in constructing the loading dock to maximize sound baffling and minimize sound on adjacent neighbors' properties.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee would like to see a tree replacement plan or agreement in place to ensure the long-term viability of trees as part of the site's long-term light control efforts.

## **B1.2 Exterior Spaces**

**Statement of Intent** – *“The hospital campus should relate to and feel integrated with the historic Providence hospital and surrounding residential areas while maintaining clarity of its identity, character and use. Exterior design should seek design excellence.”*

There is consensus among committee members that the design is pleasing. Yet there is also consensus among the committee that the building does not feel integrated with, provide any kind of transition from, or relate to the surrounding residential neighborhood. This is especially concerning as this building – above all others planned in this MIMP – is in immediate proximity to private homes, sharing a property line with residential backyards.

### **B1.2.2 General Guidelines:**

This set of guidelines begins by stating, “Exterior spaces should extend the color, texture, pattern and quality of the surrounding residential areas”, and other guidance uses phrases like “provide a unifying context for the site development which matches or complements existing campus and surrounding areas.” These issues are, once again, primary concerns for the committee.

- The design is partially successful through many of the thoughtful landscaping choices: the committee strongly feels the landscaping plan meets much or all of those criteria and appreciates the care demonstrated in the multifaceted/multi-functional variety of plants and trees selected.
- Multiple comments from community and committee members repeat concerns that this building does not attempt to meet the exterior building design guideline that exterior spaces “should extend the color, texture, pattern and quality of the surrounding residential areas”. (B1.2.2) These concerns are aligned with similar concerns about meeting the MIMP’s General Guidelines to “Acknowledge the character of surrounding single-family residential, multi-family and educational use areas at each edge” and “respect the historic context”.
- Similarly, despite minor modifications to some building material color in the design process, the building also remains anomalous among buildings on the hospital campus in terms of a “compatible palette, texture, and color of building materials to unify the hospital campus” and “respect(ing) the historical context” of both the campus, in which brick is a predominant material, and the neighborhood, which is zoned for single-family residential or low-rise 3.
- With both the public art and the exits on both Cherry and Jefferson, the design nods to exterior space guidelines (“Artwork integrated into publicly accessible areas of buildings and landscaping”) or plantings around exit doors, but the design avoids more explicit opportunities to enliven these design elements.
- The plaza design nicely connects the buildings with each other and across 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue, but feels static, not someplace “designed to include and provide access to neighborhood open space... with seasonal sun and shade to provide outdoor comfort for families, patients, caregivers and neighbors.”
- See B2.2 for additional comments.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee recommends stringent review of the compatibility of the palette, texture and color of the building materials in relation to the balance of the campus and the surrounding neighborhood.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee would like to see more explicit designs for the public art and the exits on Jefferson and Cherry.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee recommends more flexible seating and opportunities at all building corners along 18<sup>th</sup> Ave. to maximize seasonal sun/rain cover that would invite more use described by the exterior space guidelines.

### **B1.2.3 Pedestrian Amenities**

#### **B1.2.4 Lighting, Safety and Security**

- Wider sidewalks, the courtyard and entrances aligned across the courtyard, and alignment with the entrance to James Tower across 18<sup>th</sup> Ave all provide clear and significant connections for pedestrians between these two buildings and with the hospital campus, but otherwise provides minimal pedestrian amenities.
- The proposed art screen(s) at the east end of the plaza driveway is intended to minimize light pollution by cars, while providing some artistic amenity.
- The committee does not believe the open-rail fence at the north and south sides of the east landscape buffer provides adequate privacy for adjacent properties along the east property line, though it does provide security through visibility. The fence along the east property line should create privacy for the homeowners while still creating a sense of blending the new building with the surrounding neighborhood, not creating a blockage between the two. (B1.2.4)
- Lighting along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue will enhance pedestrian safety, and accent and selective up-lighting will highlight trees and other landscape features along the building perimeter, softening the building edge.
- SDCI should also ensure that landscape lighting in the eastern landscape buffer is adequate to provide a secure zone without adding light pollution and impacting neighboring properties.
- Lighting should encourage/discourage pedestrians where appropriate.
- The committee remains concerned about the impacts of light pollution from the east façade impacting neighboring properties. To provide more privacy for 19<sup>th</sup> Ave neighbors, the architects propose semi-private glass for the east façade rather than the clear glass of the other façades. The committee and community members had significant questions and remaining concerns about the design and light impacts of the proposed material. Future interior layout of the building must consider lighting impacts when allocating use along the building perimeter. Office spaces with time and motion-controlled lighting must be prioritized in place of continually lit rooms and corridors. Shades/blinds for the windows in high traffic areas may be another solution to be used in the evenings and mornings when it is still dark out. (B1.2.5)

**Recommendation # X:** Before making a final recommendation, the committee would prefer to hear feedback from the neighbors after meeting with Sabey, proposed by the committee and community members, about residents' preferred options for the fence design and any other hardscape recommendations for the eastern security buffer zone.

**Recommendation # X:** Before making a final recommendation, the committee requests the architects provide a lighting plan and lumens study, that include an interior night illumination plan, for the committee and SDCI to review.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee requests the exterior lighting design, including the landscape lighting, should minimize vertical light pollution and not contribute to light pollution for near neighbors.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee recommends exchanging privacy glass for the patterned glass design for the east façade.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee requests a comprehensive interior lighting plan that will ensure minimal light pollution for neighboring properties.

**Recommendation # X:** The committee suggests additional seating along the street, including Cherry St. and Jefferson St.

### **B1.3 Landscape**

**Statement of Intent:** *“The hospital campus should be composed of a rich, varied and well-maintained landscape and plant palette.”*

- The choice of landscaping plants was very well-received by the community and the committee, especially for the range of colors and seasonality of the plants. The diversity of plantings (color, size and variety) successfully creates a landscape order appropriate for the neighborhood. It reflects the landscaping of the neighborhood and meshes well with the naturally occurring biodiversity nearby.
- The diverse types of conifers create a pleasing variety of textures and shapes, as well as more year-round screening of the buildings for adjacent residences. (B1.3.1)
- The diversity and thoughtful collection of rainwater-friendly plantings is also appreciated. (B1.3.3)
- The mix of coniferous and deciduous trees is appreciated, and the 10-year projected growth diagram was helpful in understanding tree impacts on the building edge, especially because of the extremely close proximity to neighborhood homes. Nevertheless, there is concern that the primary approach to privacy and screening for adjacent neighbors is based on landscaping, with virtually no hardscape components, despite page 41 of the MIMP, which calls for design of “The eastern campus edge (18th Avenue half-block) with landscape, privacy walls, building modulation and landscape terraces.”
- The committee appreciates that the landscape design was adjusted to align deciduous and coniferous trees with the modulation of the buildings’ façades in order to provide more screen from adjacent residences. Care should be taken to plant more mature trees to ensure more immediate privacy for neighbors on the east edge of the property. Community and committee members expressed particular concern that the landscape design provides a significant screen in the 10-year projected growth of proposed trees, but very little screen in the early years after planting.



- The committee has concerns that the majority of the trees proposed are deciduous, resulting in bare branches in fall and winter that will negatively impact the privacy of adjacent properties along the east property line. There is also concern about trees growing over the property line onto adjacent properties and annual leaf fall due to overhang that should be considered when planting and maintaining the trees. B1.3.3)
- Careful stormwater management, including bio-retention planters, will be crucial in addressing neighborhood concerns about residential flooding and the impacts from runoff and perched water. We support the plan to have experts on site through the duration of the project to address any geotechnical and drainage concerns.

**Recommendation # X: The committee recommends planting more mature trees, especially the conifers, to ensure more immediate privacy for neighbors.**

**Recommendation # X: The committee wants to hear feedback from 19<sup>th</sup> Ave neighbors about their recommendations for security/privacy fence surrounding the east security buffer zone, and any other hardscape elements that may contribute further to their privacy or security.**

**Recommendation # X: Longtime neighbor concerns about stormwater runoff and perched water should be required to be monitored carefully by geotechnical and drainage experts during and after construction to ensure there are no negative flooding impacts on 19<sup>th</sup> Ave residences.**

**Recommendation # X: See section B1.1.7 recommendation re: tree maintenance plan**

## **B2 Architectural Character**

**Statement of Intent:** *“Design buildings with materials that help visually reduce the scale and form of the buildings into smaller scaled elements and that complement the existing historic architecture & neighboring structures with the same visual field.”*

### **B2.1.2 Height, Bulk and Scale (pedestrian, street & building scale)**

### **B2.1.3 Architectural & Façade Composition**

### **B2.1.4 Secondary Architectural Features**

- The decision to step the buildings down with the grade by pushing the south building partially below grade seems to comply with MIMP requirements, so was well received by the committee. The reduction in perceived mass at the campus edge is appropriate and effective. Recessing the screened rooftop equipment area also contributes to reduced perceived massing. (B2.1.1)
- **The committee has not reached consensus on whether the design achieves appropriate pedestrian and street scale along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue.** The increased setback for the building’s footprint and proposed plantings along the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue facades **create/do not create a successful street scale**, and should be maintained. The large glazing segments at the street level façade along 18<sup>th</sup> Ave **establish a relationship at the pedestrian scale**. This is particularly successful at the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue plaza and the southwest corner of the south building.
- The building envelopes are essentially flat with depth and texture provided primarily by fenestration and glass envelopes for entrances. Wall setbacks at the large glazing panels

provide some building modulation along the facades, and patterned etched glass windows on east façade provide some privacy and repeat strong vertical “rhythm”. (B2.1.4)

- The design team responded to concerns about the large blank wall segments by increasing glazing and adapting modulation of the walls along the north, south and west facades. Appropriate concerns about privacy for neighbors limited the ability to increase glazing along the east façade.
- The committee remains concerned with the lack of pedestrian scale at the Cherry and Jefferson Street facades. (B2.1.2)
- The committee also remains concerned about the scale of the white façade panels. The story-high panel segments are not at a pedestrian scale, and the committee recommends exploring more panel divisions, particularly at the Cherry and Jefferson Street facades. (B2.1.3)
- The west façade successfully creates visual interest and draws the eye towards the entry courtyard through reduced modulation spacing. (B2.1.3)
- The additional Corten steel provides some additional texture and a modest reference to the campus building palette. (B2.1.3 and B2.1.4)

**Recommendation # X: The committee recommends SDCI confirm compliance with height restrictions for each building separately.**

**Recommendation # X: The committee recommends \_\_\_\_\_**

**Recommendation # X: The committee recommends \_\_\_\_\_**

## **B2.2 Architectural Elements and Features**

**Statement of Intent:** *“Integrate new buildings with the existing architecture to establish a new cohesive whole for the campus.*

The committee is divided on the appropriateness of the design for the location at the eastern boundary of the MIO. (B2.1.4) here is consensus that elements of the buildings’ scale and perceived mass are effective and should be retained in the final plans. Façade elements such as the large glazing segments and modulation of the west façade and the plaza successfully/do not successfully establish a relationship with the street and pedestrians, but other concerns remain about the scale of the façade’s cast concrete panels. Yet other significant concerns remain that, in addition to the project failing to substantively meet critical overarching design guidelines for the campus as a whole, the project does not successfully meet specific design guidelines for architectural features, façade and scale elements, as well as color and materials.

The building reinterprets the campus buildings by referencing datum lines and fenestration patterns, while discarding the dominant materials of the campus and the existing color palette. The design (building envelope, materials palette and color palette) neither references neighboring residential buildings nor the historic context of either the neighborhood or hospital campus.

### **B2.2.2 Color and Material**

- Many committee members appreciate that a new building does not need to rigorously repeat existing designs and materials and that this design is a fresh take on what could be built on this campus. Yet there are strong feelings among community and committee members that the current design doesn't address the MIMP's overarching Campus "General Design" Guidelines to "acknowledge the character of surrounding single-family residential, multi-family and educational use areas at each edge" nor uses "compatible palette, texture, and color of building materials to unify the hospital campus".
- Multiple design guidelines related to Color and Materials state: "Architectural design should be visually integrated with existing campus while mitigating visual impacts to surrounding residential neighborhood" and should consider "compatible palette of materials which is visually harmonious and applied across entire campus" and with a "color palette selected according to relationships with other nearby buildings." (B2.2.2)
- **The committee is divided on the appropriateness of a primarily white palette** for this project. The palette for this project is primarily white (and clear glass), which fails to provide visual consistency with adjacent structures, the neighboring community, or the hospital campus. In addition, the panel sizes, material texture, and finish of the white panels are problematic. The committee appreciates the architects' attempt to warm up the material palette with a substituted choice of cast concrete material for the primary building cladding, but preferred the depth of color in the first sample of cast concrete. While the committee agrees that brick should not be required, we feel that the texture of the façade panels need to relate to the adjacent campus and the pedestrian scale.
- Incorporating other material elements could help reference the red and warm sandstone tones of the historic tower and newer James Tower, and help relate the proposed building to the current Hospital campus and the neighborhood. Incorporation of materials such as wood panels or additional weathered steel would help minimize the contrast that is a concern of the committee. (B2.2)
- The concern from the committee is not just the color palette, but also the materials palette is seemingly unique to these buildings, especially the significant use of glass as a design element. One of the key large-scale features is all-glass entrance, which provides variety in scale, but not material or color, and does not reference either the hospital campus or any of the residential or educational buildings in the neighborhood.
- Other design guidelines also call out using "reusable and sustainable building materials where feasible" and use of "design elements compatible with documents such as "Green Guidelines for Healthcare" (B2.2.2) which were never referenced by the architects, so it's not clear that these were considered in the design process when considering materials.

**THIS SECTION NEEDS MORE EXPOSITION. THESE ARE IS MAJOR ISSUES AND WE NEED TO SPEND SOME TIME TO FIND CONSENSUS ON KEY POINTS AND DEVELOP SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON COMMITTEE'S CONCERNS.**

**Recommendation # X: The committee recommends \_\_\_\_\_**

**Recommendation # X: The committee recommends \_\_\_\_\_**

## **B2.3 Rooftops**

**Statement of Intent:** *“Where rooftops are visible from locations beyond the hospital campus, rooftops are a design element and should be designed to be attractive.”*

### **B2.3.2 Rooftop Designs**

- Placement of the screened mechanical equipment away from the building perimeter reduces perceived building scale and will help mitigate noise impacts. There remain concerns about future construction and design decisions that could contribute to neighborhood noise; future decisions should make noise reduction on the rooftop an important goal given the very close proximity of homes. (B2.3.2)
- The proposal does not include any occupiable roof areas. The committee has not reviewed or commented on any occupiable rooftop areas, and these should not be included in future revisions. (B2.3.2)

### **Summary Recommendation:**

We **do not support** moving forward at this time with Swedish Medical Center’s proposed design for the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue site and request revisions to address the committee’s concerns outlined above.

We appreciate the opportunity to continue conversations and work together to ensure a final design that successfully meets the MIMP guidelines.

#### **POSITIVE DESIGN ELEMENTS:**

- 
- 
- 

#### **CONCERNS ABOUT DESIGN:**

- 
- 
-

---

Here are a few example excerpts from a Recommendation meeting with our Design Review Board. The priority guidelines are reference in parenthesis at the end of the statement.

- The Board strongly supported the proposed punched windows shown on the north elevation [Recommendation packet, page 55] that serve to break up the flatness of this otherwise austere, mono-colored elevation. The Board stressed the importance of this quality detail of the punched window openings and recommended the following condition: The north elevation shall retain the inset, punched window openings as presented. The Board also recommended a condition to further explore adding some of the larger sized windows similar to those shown in the new interstitial section on John Street (see Item 1.c.6 below) to this elevation to provide greater relief and street facing presence. (CS2-S-III-I; DC2-B & C & D2, DC2-S-V-iii)
  
- The Board specifically noted and supported the following elements:
  - 1) Art plan concepts and mix of physical and digital installations and ability for flexibility of displays over time. (CS2-A; CS3-B-2; DC2-S-V-ii)
  
  - 2) Artful screening of the vent shaft and stressed the importance of this element. (CS2-A; CS3-B-2)
  
  - 3) Vertical elements marking the pass-throughs on Broadway, and plaza side of Sites A [122 REC 1 packet] and B [123 REC 1 packet]. (CS2-S-II-i)
  
  - 4) The manner in which both Buildings A and B South framed and integrated the plaza area with active edges [137 REC 1 packet]. (PL3-S-I-ii)
  
  - 5) Streetscape amenities including wider sidewalk widths, benches and bike racks. (PL3)