



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

Kathy Nyland, Director



MEMBERS

Julia Blum
Nate Coomer
Justin Kliewer
Catherine Koehn
Claire Lane
Dave Letrondo
Jeff Dvi-Vardhana (Alternate)

Ex-Officio Members

Maureen Sheehan,
Department of Neighborhoods

June Altaras,
Swedish Cherry Hill

Carly Guillory,
Seattle Department of Construction &
Inspections

**Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill
Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)**

**Meeting Minutes
Meeting #1**

**January 31, 2017
Adopted May 11, 2017**

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill
500 17th Ave – James Tower
Swedish Education Conference Center (SECC)
Seattle, WA 98122

Members and Alternates Present

Julia Blum
Justin Kliewer
Catherine Koehn
Claire Lane
Dave Letrondo

Staff and Others Present

Maureen Sheehan
June Altaras
Danielle Simpson
Sara Zora
Andy Cosentino
John Seely
Carly Guillory
Sherry Williams
David Chamness

I. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Maureen Sheehan opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Member Orientation

Ms. Sheehan began an overview, structure of the Committee and its roles and responsibilities.

She noted that an MIO (Major Institution Overlay) was put together to balance the growth within the neighborhood so that an Institution can grow as well as maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood. There are 13 Major Institutions in the City of Seattle, and Swedish Cherry Hill is one of them. She mentioned that it is a good reference to look at other institutions to identify similar challenges and best practices.

Ms. Sheehan noted that this Committee is now a SAC (Standing Advisory Committee). The CAC was formed in coordination with the City of Seattle and Swedish to develop a Master Plan. The SAC role is to monitor compliance with the Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP). While height, bulk and scale has been determined, the role of the SAC is to fine tune the external interaction among the residents of the neighborhood, and the institution.

The MIMP identifies the specific rules within the MIO. These rules are the development standards.

One responsibility of the SAC is to review and comment on the annual report the institution assembles to disclose the progress it's made on implementing their Master Plan. Other responsibilities include reviewing amendment requests. Any unexpected changes that were not covered under the Master Plan are brought to the Committee and to the City and provide recommendations about the amendment requests.

The bulk of the Committees work will be providing comments on proposed development under the Master Plan. Swedish Cherry Hill outlined several buildings in the Master Plan that they would like to complete within the next couple of years, and they will present them to this Committee to review and comment about the design.

The Seattle Department of Constructions & Inspections (SDCI) and Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) are the Committee's two major resources when they look at building codes, zoning information, transportation management plans, etc.

She mentioned that herself and Ms. June Altaras at Swedish Cherry Hill are also their resources if the Committee has any questions about the process.

III. Housekeeping (00:15:50)

Ms. Sheehan opened the discussion in reviewing and adopting the draft SAC by-laws.

There was a motion to adopt the by-laws as written and it was seconded. With a quorum being present and majority of those present having voted by raise of hand; the motion passed unanimously. The By-laws will be posted and available at the [DON](#) website.

Ms. Sheehan opened the floor for nomination and election of a chairperson and vice-chairperson. The role of a chairperson is to facilitate the meeting, and ensures that all Committee members are being heard and help make decisions. The role of a vice-chairperson is to assist the chairperson in facilitating the meeting and act as a chairperson if the chairperson is absent.

Mr. Dave Letrondo was voted as the Committee's chairperson by a show of hands and Ms. Julia Blum as vice chairperson.

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion to review Meeting minutes #33 from April 2, 2015. He noted that there is no need to approve the minutes since he was the only member present at the meeting.

IV. City Process & MIMP Conditions (00:21:50)

Mr. Letrondo introduced Ms. Carly Guillory from SDCI and Ms. Sara Zora from SDOT to make a brief presentation about the City Process & MIMP Conditions.

Ms. Guillory of SDCI provided a handout to the Committee that identifies the MUP (Master Use Permit) process. During MUP submittal, there will be a comment period, and a review by various staff. SDCI will publish its decision and begin a 14-day review period. If there are no appeals, a permit is issued. A building permit may also be submitted so it can be reviewed simultaneously with the MUP. A building permit cannot be issued until the MUP is issued.

SDCI will go out and do a land use and building inspections, and once these are all approved, a Certificate of Authenticity (CoA) is issued. She emphasized the importance of the timeline because several conditions in the MIMP relate to the timeliness of the issuance of various permits. For example, a street concept plan is required before issuing the MUP.

Ms. Zora of SDOT mentioned she will be the liaison for the project and noted that she preferred contacting her via email. She provided a handout that summarized all the various transportation conditions that were implemented by City Council's decisions during approval of the MIMP. The condition that this Committee will be able to provide comments along with the City reviews include: streetscape concept plans for 18th Avenue, street frontage pocket parks that were identified and agreed upon in the MIMP process, a comprehensive wayfinding plans, and the construction management plans. She said that along with the MUP submission, SDOT would require other documentations such as transportation permits, and TMP (Transportation Management Plan) goals.

V. Swedish Cherry Hill Update – 2017 (00:26:33)

Mr. Letrondo introduced Mr. Cosentino to provide a brief update on projects for 2017 Swedish Cherry Hill.

Mr. Cosentino provided a book for the Committee members as a reference to the MIMP, TMP, design guidelines, City Council legislative summaries and the conditions of approval from the City Council's findings. He mentioned that these are also available online. A 3-D scale of the development that was adjusted to scale from the recent and approved MIMP is also available as a reference.

He introduced Mr. John Seely and Ms. Danielle Simpson to provide a summation of the MIMP and an overview of the scope, scale and design of the proposed development.

Ms. Simpson mentioned that herself, Mr. Seely, and Mr. David Chamness are their resource regarding the Swedish Cherry Hill development project. They have been working on the campus for over 20 years and are very familiar with the MIMP design and planning process, and if the Committee has any questions about the design process to contact them.

Mr. Seely gave a brief overview of the MIMP process and its history. All the detailed information is available in the binders provided.

The MIO boundaries begin at 15th Avenue up to 18th Avenue with Jefferson and Cherry Streets as the boundaries. It is about 13 acres +/- . The first development will be at 18th Avenue and will take about 1.7 acres of the 13 acres of development.

He mentioned the importance of understanding the history and the ages of these campus buildings. These buildings have aged over the years, and as architects it is essential that these buildings continue to be updated with the latest technology needs. Technology has changed over the last 10-15 years and this has an effect to the current hospital space, and it is important to understand what the MIMP has allowed for these aging Swedish Cherry Hill buildings.

The existing campus is about 1.1 million sq. ft. inside the 13 acres. The approved MIMP allowed an additional 1.7 million sq. ft. that will take a total of about 2.753 million sq. ft. The actual need was about 3.1 million sq. ft. and through the MIMP process, a compromise was found. Swedish Cherry Hill determined that they were comfortable at having a total of 2.7 million sq. ft. of development instead of the 3.1 million sq. ft. There will be no road closures or expansion outside the 13-acre boundary and existing buildings will be demolished and will be replaced by new and modern buildings.

He highlighted the three elements of the design process: setbacks, heights and modulations. These elements will help define and create the design and integrity of the buildings as well as a pedestrian level scale.

The setbacks are divided into three areas: internal, external, and adjacent properties. The internal setback is along 18th and 16th Avenue that is internal to the campus. The external area is the perimeter outside of the campus, these include 15th, 18th, Cherry and Jefferson. The adjacent areas described are adjacent to the residential properties on the east side of 18th Avenue.

The setbacks specific to 18th Ave include a 25-ft. setback between the residence and any new structure. This allows a green path and landscape area. As part of the approved MIMP, a 6-ft. high fence is required to separate the landscape area with the surrounding residence.

Along Cherry and Jefferson, there will be a 10-ft. setback. The internal setback was not required in the MIMP and the buildings can be brought to the property line.

The MIMP identified six different height restrictions for the campus. They range from 160 ft. down to 37 ft. The maximum height is at the center of campus and tapers down to the perimeter or edges. The height restriction for the 18th Avenue development is 37 ft. The highest element left on campus after the MIMP is the Bell Tower.

The key to understanding the 18th Avenue development is the modulation. The MIMP allows a maximum of 40 ft. between breaks and a minimum break of 5 ft. deep and 10 ft. wide. Along Cherry and Jefferson, it goes to 90 ft. and internally it goes to 125 ft. These four facades provide a different feel and requirements for a pedestrian and vehicular perspective.

The design guidelines are another important aspect of the development as it responds to the City, the surrounding neighborhood and the hospital. These guidelines bring the buildings into life.

These guidelines create consistency in the design excellence by setting specific materials and responses to the campus and ensure the buildings respond in form and scale to the surrounding neighborhood. The historical context is also important to the neighborhood in making sure that the older structures are relevant to the neighborhood. These guidelines create a precedent that is respectful, modern and contemporary.

The landscape is also important as it creates an impact to the development by softening the edges along the buildings from a pedestrian perspective and the design team will look at ways to enhance these areas.

The wayfinding and vehicular movement goes hand in hand and it is critical to the 18th Avenue development and the design team will discuss about the idea of screenings and lightings around the campus area.

VI. Public comment (00:49:01)

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comment shown below is a summary 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. Nicholas Richter: Mr. Richter commented that he was a member of the CAC and grew up in the neighborhood. He commented about the SAC and its renewed sense of working with the community and the MIMP process. He noted the long-standing issues and concerns from members of his community about parking and noise pollution, and he hopes that this Committee take these issues into consideration in their discussions. He suggested to review the CAC's final report, comments and recommendations and its history. There were recommendations from the report that were not approved and the process was very contentious.

VII. Committee Deliberation (00:51:50)

Mr. Letrondo opened the discussion for Committee deliberation. Ms. Sheehan noted that this is an opportunity for the Committee to discuss what was presented and ask questions to Swedish and the presenters.

Mr. Letrondo commented that he was familiar with what was presented and asked the Committee to ask any questions regarding the height, bulk and scale of the project.

A question was asked about the timeline of the whole process. Mr. Cosentino mentioned that they are still exploring 18th Avenue and identifying the right function and form. He noted that they do not anticipate any formal requests or commitments until meaningful work is accomplished, possibly until mid or late summer. He also added that if there is any pushback about the project that he will inform the Committee.

Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will communicate to this Committee in mid or late summer about any updates to the project, and schedule a meeting.

Mr. Letrondo commented about this process of not having a normal EDG (Early Design Guidance) and MUP process since there are guidelines incorporated into the MIMP. Ms. Guillory mentioned that Design Review Board were not involved in this process. She noted that they would look at the project and identify the permitted use or if it needs to have an amendment to the MIMP. She mentioned that a typical process involves an environmental analysis, and any analysis will be an addendum to the final approved EIS. She added that they will be looking at specific requirements such as a transportation impact studies for the MUP review.

Ms. Clare Lane inquired that since this project does not go through the design review process, what design reference and information does the project team use to design.

Mr. Seely mentioned that they look at the surrounding neighborhood and identify the scale and materiality that relates to design. He pointed out about the James Tower as a reference for scale, materiality and modulation. He added that along 18th Avenue, they would use the scale of the residence and multifamily homes for their design. He suggested that if they see any good design that is appropriate to the surrounding neighborhoods to bring it forward.

Ms. Sheehan added that this is an iterative process where the architects will present a design and this Committee will have an opportunity to provide feedback and comments.

VIII. Adjournment and scheduling of next meeting

Ms. Sheehan noted that they will hear from her about any updates or to schedule the next meeting around late summer. A website at [DON](#) is available where all the meeting notices and minutes are posted. A link where the members of the public can sign up for meeting notification is also at the website.

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