



City of Seattle  
 Seattle Department of Neighborhoods  
 Bernie Agor Matsuno, Director



King County



**HARBORVIEW MEDICAL CENTER  
 MAJOR INSTITUTIONS STANDING CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Harborview Medical  
 Center Major Institutions  
 Standing Citizens  
 Advisory Committee

**Members and Alternates**

Larry Brouse – Chair  
 Kristin O'Donnell  
 John Dolan  
 Frederick Scheetz  
 Anne Fiske Zuniga  
 Dorothy DeCoster  
 E Anne Newcombe  
 Maria Elena Vasquez  
 Laura Van Houghten  
 John C Koch  
 James Ericson

**Ex-Officio Members**

Steve Sheppard – DON  
 Michael Dorcy – DPD  
 Ted Klainer – Harborview  
 Medical Center

**MINUTES**

**Meeting #32**

**Wednesday, January 15, 2014  
 Harborview Medical Center  
 Executive Board Room (# GEH 72)**

**Members Present**

Larry Brouse  
 Frederick Scheetz  
 Jim Erickson  
 Kristin O'Donnell

John Koch  
 John Dolan  
 Anne Fiske Zuniga  
 Dotty DeCoster

**Members Absent**

Laura Van Houghten  
 Anne Newcombe

Maria Elena Vasquez

**Staff Present**

Steve Sheppard	City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods (ex officio member)
Ted Klainer	Harborview (ex-officio member)
Elise Chayet	Associate Administrator, Harborview
Michael Dorcy	City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development (ex-officio member)

**Others Present**

(see sign-in sheet)

**1. Welcome, Introductions**

The meeting was opened by Larry Brouse. Brief introductions followed. Steve Sheppard announced that since two members are absent, all alternate members in attendance would be eligible voting at the meeting.

**2. Discussion of any questions remaining from the prior meeting**

Larry Brouse noted that at the November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013 meeting, a number of committee members had raised issues and that King County Staff had



indicated that they would look further into those issues and provide more information to the Advisory Committee. Issues raised included: 1) traffic and particularly movement through the proposed open space; and 2) the mix of uses proposed for the building and the relationship of the open space to the surrounding neighborhood.

Several members noted recent news articles that indicated that Harborview was proposing moving the clinics from the Harborview Campus. Harborview staff responded that this is currently, it is a planning stage. Some clinics are being evaluated to see if they might be better operated by the University of Washington. No decision has yet been made.

Larry Brouse asked if there are any updates with regards to the traffic plans, parking, etc. He noted that there had been many questions raised about the flow of traffic through the open space and the actual utility of the space given its use for vehicle access to the loading docks.

Cathy Brown from King County Admiration responded that Sabey put together responses and other related additional information, and asked John Jex from Callison Architects to address the issue. Mr. Jex passed out a hand out that addressed some of the questions raised at the last meeting.

Mr. Jex noted that the project designed is based on the premise of intuitive connections from Broadway towards the west along Terrace Street. Terrace Street is improved and flows into the new plaza to the new east entry to Harborview Hall. The project is designed to provide an intuitive connection from Broadway towards the west along Terrace Street. The development of the new plaza and the continuation of street improvements along Terrace Street to the new east entry of Harborview hall is intended to allow the public to sense a welcome and entry through the building to 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The public amenities to be provided within the Harborview Hall Lobby are intended to augment this. The plaza will also include an access passing the historic fire station to the entry the Harborview Hall.

The plaza includes use of various different surface improvements to emphasize pedestrian movements. Terrace Street will have new sidewalks and upgraded landscaping. This open space will have improved security, overhead lighting, audible cues, paving and a pedestrian space that is open to the community and not available to service vehicles. He stated that traffic can then loop south and then east to exit the plaza space.

Sabey staff noted that the Committee had also asked for greater clarification concerning the relative size of the two open spaces. Sabey staff noted that the original open space that resulted from demolition of Harborview Hall, was 21,950 sq. ft. The new plaza would be slightly larger at 23,685 square feet. County staff also noted that the original open space was not "dedicated" and might therefore be temporary. The new open space will be permanently dedicated and there will be no development on the site. In addition the renovation of the fire station which is a landmark facility is also included in this plan.

Mr. Jex stated that Sabey would retain the existing west façade of Harborview Hall with the addition on the very top of new construction that will mimic the addition to the east. This will be designed to mimic the intended cap on Harborview Hall. The interior will

preserve the art deco feel of the building. He briefly went over some of the design features of this art deco restoration.

In regards to transportation and parking Sabey is reviewing the past MIMP transportation and parking studies. It is anticipated that there will be no additional impacts on that plan from this adaptive re-use as the proposal does not change the overall allowed square footage. The campus currently provides 1996 off street parking spaces and the report from property management is that the utilization is about 1800 spaces.

Jim Erickson asked if it wasn't necessary to choose the activity in the building before calculating the additional parking needs. Jack McCullough responded that the requirement under the Major Institution's overlay, you are limited for the life of the building to only uses for the Major Institution's uses. This is a different method for determining parking requirements than with other types of development. Parking is determined on an entire campus basis and not for each individual building.

Larry Brouse asked how a non-related uses of the building affects parking. Steve Sheppard informed the committee that when a new Master Plan is adopted, a very complex calculation is done to establish a minimum and maximum allowable parking. As long as any of the uses whether there are amendments are below the square footage authorized in the plan, the parking net applies to it, in that range. It does not take into account the uses in any specific building. The city actually imposes a maximum parking on the institution.

John Koch asked how much of the 2.1 million plan of potential sq. ft. how much is built so far. Staff responded that 1.988 is developed. The net add to Harborview Hall is a net of 70,000 sq. ft.

Overall marketing studies indicate that there is sufficient unmet demand to justify moving forward. Vacancy in this sub-area is less than 4%. Sabey staff indicated that the building would be viable even without County use of the building. However, it is presently anticipated that the County would occupy significant space in this building. Any function that is located into this building will be functionally related to the mission of Harborview. Staff noted several examples of County uses that fit, including the court functions related to mental health service and the consolidation of the access program.

Sabey staff briefly went over other design features of the adaptive re-use

Members asked what the amount of open space dedicated to car, auto, and delivery uses is. Staff responded that the only car access is Terrace Street. There would be access to the loading dock uses at Harborview Hall? The main use will be the delivery of patients to the ITA court.

### **3. Committee Deliberations**

Mr. Brouse informed the committee that this would be a good time to comment and discuss the opinions regarding the proposal by the County concerning their amendment request. Committee members made comments regarding their opinions on the proposal.

**Anne Fiske-Zuniga:** Ms. Zuniga stated that she joined the Committee about a year and a half ago. With at more information and analysis on the definition between minor and major amendments, I don't believe this fit the definition of a major amendment thus

am unable to vote in favor of recommending this as a major amendment. The open space appears to be better than the previous one from the perspective of a broader community not just the Harborview community. The location of this open space fronting Terry will be more likely use by the outside world rather than just Harborview. The use of the space will be used more because of the location. There is a benefit in the open space being a dedicated open space as opposed to just an open space. I raised the question about the vehicle use in the plaza area that has not been looked at, the space for people and enjoyments are important especially in a denser neighborhood.

**Kristen O'Donnell:** The plaza is back door far corner rather than in the center of the Harborview complex. Looking at the sketches of the buildings and the back of the Research and Development buildings. This is a back door, not a central open space. This major change. It does not quality as a minor. She stated tht she considers this a major amendment to the plan.

**Frederick Scheetz:** Mr. Sheetz stated that none of the information presented tonight changed his position. The proposed adaptive re-use is big and a totally about face from the concept that we previously adopted. He noted that the SAC is now the only entity speaking for the current plan. The County has disowned it. It serves a different purpose. He stated that he remains convinced that the previous plan and would back the resolution as presented at previous meetings.

**Dotty Descoster:** Ms. Decoster noted that she was not what the major differences between this plan and the Major Institution plan that you are?

Mr. Brouse responded that the Master Plan had three major components which resulted in the 9<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson building, Maleng building and the demolition of Harborview Hall and the installation of a central open space. The new plan says we won't do the last part. We will put the open space elsewhere. Thus, the issue is leaving the Harborview Hall precludes the central open space.

Mr. Brouse also mentioned that it was contemplated that in return for demolishing a lot of housing units in the neighborhood, there would be public benefits put in, and this open space being one of them. Extensive and emotional arguments were advanced that how this building was so seismically dangerous. If the issue would have been submitted to the community ten years ago, that the building has not been occupied for several years because it is dangerous, we want to take out a third of it and build 20% on top of it, for county offices and county use at a cost of 64 residential units in the neighborhood, this proposal would not have been approved by the community in the beginning because it is egregiously in the County's interest as distinct to the community and hospital's interest. The hospital, community, the university did not what this change. The County executive wants this change.

**John Dolan** - Mr. Dolan noted that if Harborview Hall was initially envisioned as remaining, then the entire plan would have looked different. Buildings would have been shorter, the sky-bridge would not necessarily been approved in order to allow greater openness along 9<sup>th</sup>. The entire plan was predicated on the central open space. Now the major buildings have been expanded and the central open space abrogated in favor of development on the open space and open space relocation to the eastern periphery of the campus. He expressed great disappointment that the County Executive had chosen to push this action. He stated that he views this action as a clear major

amendment to the plan, will vote so, and looks forward to his time opposing the change before the City Hearing Examiner on appeal.

**Dotty Decoster** The proposal itself is a benefit to the community as well as to Harborview. Not knowing the history of the plan itself, I'm inclined to think that the proposal might qualify as a minor amendment. However, countering this is the degree to which this departs from the past plan. As a result she stated that she was still undecided on the question.

**Larry Brouse** responded that there resistance in the community concerning the heights bulks and scale of the proposed development and its creating a "Berlin Wall" The community compromised a great deal and ultimately endorsed and advocated for the larger buildings. The County got the much greater height and scale of development they wanted; the community really got very little. The County got their three primary things which include: seismic protection of their emergency rooms, and their two buildings. Preservation was not actively proposed. Mr. Dolan stated that the proposed open space appeared inferior to him. The previous space was intended as a central gathering space to tie the campus together. The proposed plaza is really a circular drive entry. He noted that anytime you have street and vehicle access to the loading docks and building entry, it is not a pedestrian plaza but a general entry. Saying that it could be cordoned off and used for events etc., does not make it really usable open space. He also questioned the historic renovation/preservation. A great deal was made about preserving the building and the art deco interior etc. However, the only thing really being preserved is the front façade.

The community, city, county, hospital, university had a deal but now one of the party wants to abrogate the deal. I am severely troubled with that. This plan basically takes one-third of the original project that was the central premise and throws it out. The designers may do an admirable job designing the building, but that does not make it compatible with the original purpose of the plan. He stated that he would vote for recommending this as a major amendment.

#### 4. Committee Vote and Determination of its Official Position

Discussion turned to a final vote. Steve Sheppard stated that it is time to vote and move it forward. Further delay would appear counterproductive.

John Dolan suggested that the Committee vote to re-confirm it prior position and attach a letter that would further highlight parking and transportation. After Brief further discussion it was determined that this would constitute a new motion.

Larry Brouse asked that members vote whether this is a major or minor amendment.

The question was called by individual polling of members the vote was as follows

Kristen O'Donnell	major amendment
John Dolan	major amendment
Frederick Scheetz	major amendment
Anne Fiske Zuniga	minor amendment
James Erickson	major amendment
Larry Brouse	major amendment
Dotty Decoster	abstain
John Koch	major amendment



The total vote was therefore

Major Amendment	6
Minor Amendment	1
Abstaining	1

A quorum being present and the majority of those present having voted to recommend that this be considered a major amendment, that position was adopted as the formal position of the Committee.

Mr. Sheppard stated that the next steps includes the Committee forwarding its recommendations to DPD. DPD will issue a director's interpretation that is circulated and it is appealable. If appealed, it goes to the Office of the Hearing Examiner and the Hearing Examiner holds a hearing and issues a recommendation, which is appealable to the Superior Court.

Members noted tht they considered the previous wording of the resolution presented by Mr. Dolan be the basis for the Committee's letter. Mr. Brouse stated that he would write the formal letter with the previous wording of the draft motion and an accompanying cover letter. The letter will be forwarded to members for review prior to being transmitted to the City.

**4. Adjournment.**

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