



Meeting Minutes #35

(Adopted TBD)

Swedish Cherry Hill Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC)

April 10, 2024

6:00 – 8:00 PM

(Transcriber's Note: The notes 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 video recording and available upon request.)

In-person Location:

Swedish Cherry Hill Campus

Swedish Education Conference Center, Conference Room D

500 17th Ave

Seattle, WA 98122

Virtual:

Webex

Committee Members Present:

Claire Lane

Kathy Yasi

Maureen Devery

Ellen Sollod

Cat Koehn (virtual)

Kevin Heims

Swedish Cherry Hill staff:

Rachel Jenner

City of Seattle staff:

Nelson Pesigan, Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON),

Carly Guillory (virtual), Seattle Department of Construction and Inspection (SDCI),

Gordon Clowers (virtual), Seattle Department of Construction and Inspection (SDCI)

Sabey Staff:

Mikel Hanson

Tina Tufts

Opening & Introductions

Presentation

IAC committee worked through draft letter, fine-tuned message.

Section 1 permissible use, IAC concerns about that, compliance with code

Section 2 design review

Section 3 compliance with transportation management plan (TMP).

The project does not meet characteristics of functional use. All the users that are functionally integrated with are subsequently related to the central mission of the institution or that primarily or indirectly serve the users of an institution.

Claire Lane: initially the applicant had said all the rooms would be available and all would be compliant and that at the last meeting April 1, 2024, she was surprised to learn that only two rooms would be compliant. Two rooms relate directly to the code for any hotel of this size.

Ellen Sollod: the hotel is designed to serve the general open public clientele and has no provision of specific services to Swedish patients or their families other than they could rent a room if there is one available. Inclusion of verbiage helps to reinforce and emphasize how this use does not comply.

Kevin Heim: text provides clear context.

Maureen Devery: compared this hotel that could be any hotel anywhere to a Ronald McDonald House with its playground, playhouse, actual things for children.

Ellen Sollod: at the time of the MIMP the community was clear that this should be a family hotel that prioritizes medical services and not a general hotel.

Kevin Heim: letter notes on page 3 that the plan and programming has changed; redirect the city to analyze that what the hotel is today is not what was originally conceived.

IAC discussed how what was originally conceived is not what is designed now. What the community wanted before and what has happened since. Discussion of how letter covers these concerns. What constitutes a major amendment?

Design Review:

Claire Lane: the original design was more elegant; the redesign does not address problems identified in the original design and has created a lot more.

Ellen Sollod: suggested reconciling two paragraphs together on page 13 regarding landscaping plan along plant strip versus that immediately next to building. A major difference is the attractive bioswale versus concrete planter wall. She noted mobility issues with pavers and recommended standard pavement. Benches are fine and those on slope and for those going from one bus stop to the next may provide resting place. She noted difficulty with last sentence “appears to meet MIMP”.

IAC comments that benches are helpful and as this street is part of the Swedish “health walk” benches add to what was proposed as a community amenity. Make sure design will not impede proposed health walk.

Ellen Sollod: bike racks should be in the right of way for general use; they are now moved up by the door.

Kevin Heim: bike parking is required to be covered which is why it was moved. The relocated bike parking now makes using the front porch impossible.

Ellen Sollod: definition of inside versus outside bike parking – contradiction in the MIMP.

Claire Lane: added verbiage about not designing something that will impede healthy walk. Staff should have parking in the basement – clarify language about this rack location and be consistent with language.

Integration of artwork is an integral part of MIMP. Artwork helps speak to the character of the community which is a design guideline overall. Screening – concrete walls are not appropriate screening. Screening using plants or artwork is preferred.

Architectural character:

Claire Lane: design does not solve problems. Guidelines about materials, height, bulk, scale. Roof deck on level 4. MIMP requires minimizing viewing into adjacent residences.

IAC discussed the use of patios and the need for access to fresh air while ensuring privacy of adjacent residences.

Material palette discussed. The historic building continues to wear well; proposed palette / materials will not. Corten steel has been used a lot; perhaps used here as substitute for brick. Earlier design showed siding in various sizes which was not as monolithic as what is proposed now. Concern about durability of proposed materials and compatibility with surrounding neighborhood. Proposed building is more compatible with multi-family apartment buildings than Swedish. Proposed palette not attractive, applicant should be pushed to be more creative.

Kevin Heim: cited 2.2.1. The design does not provide a cohesive look; he mentioned potential branding issues with a large hotel chain.

Ellen Sollod: How materials are used in the original design is important.

Cat Koehn: Candlewood Suites' colors are burnt orange and beige. Less concerned with colors, more concerned with neighbors' privacy.

Mitigation options: green roof without access to patio.

Poor compliance with TMP:

Discussion about process to get to MIMP. Hearing Examiner recommendations. Swedish must demonstrate substantial progress for meeting the goal and show a continued reduction. Each building must meet SOV goals. SOV is only part of compliance. Overcrowding on already reduced bus routes. Mitigation to provide funding to provide additional service or steps to mitigate that. How seriously is SDCI looking at TMP?

Campus-wide Dock Management Plan:

IAC needs to have a voice. Impact to the neighborhood, impact to health walk.

Public Comments

Vicki Schiantarelli: the IAC is doing the city's work. She has been involved since 1985. IAC has been kept short on purpose with the premise that with no quorum the committee could be circumvented. The city should not be allowed to move forward until due diligence has been done. To move forward, 1) build based on the underlying zone, 2) follow code and do what needs to be done. Doing otherwise is a major amendment which would trigger a whole new MIMP. The city is not doing its job. MIMP for hospital, not Sabey, Kidney Center or hotel.

Mary Pat DiLeva: lives across the street. Concern about patios – sound carries, and it would not be pleasant for the neighbors. She must close her windows in the summertime because of adjacent row houses with patios because of noise. The idea of a green roof is probably a good one.

Rachel Jenner, Swedish: Potential candidate identified as Swedish representative for committee. Hope to have someone at the next meeting. She sent out an email that they did submit the 2023 annual report which is being reviewed. Submit any comments or feedback to Swedish so they have an opportunity to respond.

Committee Deliberation

Claire Lane: does the IAC want to revisit any parts of the 2022 annual report to give background and context for newer members. Get back to regular rhythm of meetings, meeting back at Swedish Cherry Hill so that community and committee members can walk to meeting.

Mr. Hanson, Ms. Tufts, Sabey: no comments

Claire Lane **made a motion** that we approve the draft with recognition that the modifications that we have talked about will be made and we can resend that final to everyone. But because it feels that it is imminent that they may decide it is essential that our comments are received by them in a timely way. I do not want to wait until May. I would like to be immediately as soon as we can finalize this. I would like to move that as a committee we approve the draft as our recommendation to the city regarding the hotel project, and that the modifications that we have enumerated as a committee will be incorporated into that draft. **Unanimous approval by the IAC.**

Nelson Pesigan will put the letter into letterhead format. Claire Lane and Maureen Devery's signatures which will be provided to him electronically.

Claire Lane: that would be done by Friday as agreed.

Parties of interest must be notified of the city's decision; Nelson Pesigan sent that information to Carly Guillory so once that decision is made all will be notified.

Kevin Heim: what about parties of interest who signed up via the portal?

Claire Lane: no notification when the comment period was extended; the committee did not have an opportunity to appeal if they wanted to. She said they were not notified for so long that state law superseded the ability for the city to make any kind of remedy. She wanted that clearly in the record.

Claire Lane: next steps to have regularly scheduled meetings and the ability to shape an agenda and have enough time to build the materials so they can be given out ahead of time with appropriate notification. She said the IAC deliberated a lot on the letter on the record to put out there what they were writing and thinking about.

Claire Lane **made a motion** to approve the draft as the IAC recommendation to the city regarding the hotel project and that the modifications that we have enumerated as committee will be incorporated into that draft. Ms. Sollod seconded. The vote was unanimously approved.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:52 pm