



Minutes #8

(Adopted August 8, 2018)

Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Wednesday, July 11, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill

500 17th Ave – James Tower SECC

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Julia Blum

Justin Kliewer

Jeff Dvi-Vardhana (Alternate)

Claire Lane

Staff and Other Present:

Maureen Sheehan – DON

Daria Supp – Perkins+Will

David West – Swedish

Sherry Williams - Swedish

1. Opening and Introductions

Ms. Julia Blum opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

2. Housekeeping

A motion was made to adopt the June 13 minutes, and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

Ms. Maureen Sheehan noted that the minutes is not a transcript but a summary of the discussion. There is a voice recording of all the meetings available on request.

3. Meeting #7 Follow-up

Ms. Blum opened the discussion on Meeting #7 follow-ups and updates.

Sabey Updates

See attached

Schedule & Context

Ms. Sheehan reminded the Committee that the goal is to have a comment letter drafted by September where the Committee can vote at the October meeting. The letter should reflect on the design guidelines in the MIMP. It will be up to the Committee on how they want to format the letter before it is submitted to SDCI.

The committee requested to see samples of letters from other Committees. Ms. Blum commented on how the letter will be communicated to the Committee and Ms. Sheehan mentioned that she will take notes during Committee meeting and discussion and will provide a first draft of the letter for the Committee to review and provide feedback before finalizing the letter at the meeting. She mentioned that there is an opportunity for a Committee member(s) to draft a minority report, but it will be ideal to have a consensus opinion from the Committee.

4. Draft Communication Plan

Ms. Blum opened the discussion on the draft communication plan. Ms. Sherry Williams, director of Community Engagement for Swedish presented a draft MIMP communication plan to the Committee for comments and feedback, including: website and links, information postcard, Community Outreach and Community Connections.

She is working to update the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP website to make it more robust and easier to find information and links to the MIMP. The goal is to have the site updated with additional links, photos, design and a comment section where the public can provide comments and feedback that Swedish will be able to respond to. A question was asked if there is a way to monitor the traffic on the site and Ms. Williams noted that she will work with Communications track this.

A question was asked about the timeline of the redesign of the site and how the updates will be communicated. Ms. Sheehan asked if the Committee would prefer to see the site before it goes live, and a comment was made that they would rather the go live site sooner than waiting for the Committee to comment.

Questions/complaints will be directed to the main Swedish number and an operator will direct them to the staff person, likely Mr. David West and Ms. Williams. Mr. West added that part of this is the ability to track information and have the patient experience team extend to the community experience. Real time feedback and tracking responses in a timely manner is the goal.

A question was asked if the Swedish site include specific information on development proposals and Ms. Williams noted that information should be available and linked to the City's website.

Ms. Williams commented about having a tangible postcard available to the neighbors to be distributed to the neighbors. She will consult with Ms. Sheehan regarding the type of information that will be in the postcard, but it will include specific Swedish Cherry Hill campus information. The frequency of the distribution of these postcards has not yet been determined. Ms. Sheehan suggested that these advisory committee meetings should not be the vehicle for neighbors to voice their concerns and there should always be a contact person. The advisory committee meetings are available for the neighbors who wants to get involved in the process.

A comment was made that having a postcard to send out to the neighbors is a great idea a wonderful opportunity for Committee members to hand out to the neighbors. A suggestion was made to use less technical language to describe building plans, and designs.

A comment was made about the different languages and demographics and Ms. Williams will look at the Committee to identify neighbors that need language translation for this type of communication.

Ms. Williams talked about community outreach and reaching out to neighbors for a coffee meeting to talk about the needs of the neighbors. She mentioned about working closely with the Squire Park Council such as their newsletter and upcoming community events. She encouraged Squire Park neighbors to connect to their community to share MIMP information suggesting Committee members share contacts and make recommendations on how to connect with the community.

She noted that she will provide more update about the communication plan at the August meeting and she will work with Ms. Sheehan to see what can be provided to the Committee.

5. Updated 18th Avenue Building Plan

Ms. Blum introduced Ms. Daria Supp of Perkins+Will to provide an update to the 18th Avenue Building Plan.

Ms. Supp reminded to committee that the purpose of tonight's presentation is to respond to the feedback that the Committee and the community provided at the last meeting. The MIMP design guidelines are the key components to the entire process. The three main categories that they heard from the feedback were: relationship to context, architectural character and street activation. All the Design Team's responses will relate to these major categories.

A diagram was shown to describe the elevation of the 18th avenue building compares to the main campus. She noted that the building steps down in height as it moves toward the residential areas. The building is about 37 ft. The diagram also shows a modulated transparency using the window and glass and the change of materials. The existing campus uses the same modulated transparency.

Ms. Supp introduced Mr. Jason Henry of Berger Partnership to discuss about the landscaping. What they heard from the feedback was more detailed landscaping regarding street activation and the proposed planting, specifically using bigger coniferous trees and mixed species at the view from the courtyard.

Mr. Henry introduced Mr. Ryan Bussard of Perkins+Will to discuss about the materials. What they heard from the feedback was to provide more details about the materiality of the building. He noted that the building materials should be quieter and brighter because it is a lower building and having a lighter colored building provides a backdrop canvas for the different landscape architecture around the building. The building will be using a transparent glass for careful transparency that is facing the campus and the street and using a patterned, neutral transparent glass to provide a level of privacy for the people looking out and looking in and use of a weather corten steel with a red introduction in the project as a side element on the benches and the façade of the building.

Ms. Supp shared details about the entry plaza and by providing diagrams that show additions such as canopies for weather protection, benches, etc. She also described the vehicular entry at the plaza and the separation between pedestrians and the vehicles.

Ms. Blum opened the discussion for comments and feedback on the presentation.

Mr. Kliewer shared that it was helpful to see the one-year vs. the ten-year planting. He asked if it makes sense to intentionally align the larger trees to the glazing section or with the blank façade to soften the building. A response was made that they have the flexibility and if there is any feedback, it would be helpful.

He asked about the lighting plan and if there were plans for security lighting in. A response was made that there is a layer of ambient lighting that is not shown on the diagram.

A comment was made about the courtyard path that may invite people go in the area along the east property line and suggested removing the path. A response was made that there is a maintenance path along the area and they restrict and discourage people going beyond that point, but there is an option to remove the pavers and be plantings.

Mr. Kliewer asked about the illuminated art wall light panel and making sure that it is not casting light to the east. He also added that the weather protection is a good addition as well as the materials used such as the corten.

He asked about the actual panel size and if there is a gap that would break down the elements further. A response was made that the next steps include mitigating the scale of the panel and will be shared at the next meeting.

Ms. Claire Lane suggested introducing a decorative pattern to break the bulk and the verticality of the design at the lower levels. A response was made that the base pattern is very tight, and the transparent glass is non-existent that would allow lighter transparency at a lower level. A request was made for a diagram illustrating where the patterned and clear glass is being proposed.

Mr. Dvi-Vardhana commented on the terracotta materials at the base and its location around the campus. He also supported denser trees in the middle of the courtyard and the type of fence where the trees are planted to prevent any leaves falling into neighbor's yards. A response was made that they could adjust the placement of denser trees and there should be a balance between the screening and the evergreen coniferous and deciduous trees planted along the fence.

Mr. Dave West supported the comment about engaging neighbors to participate in the placement of the trees and look of fence. He also noted that the gate to the east property line will be secured.

Ms. Blum, in reference to neighbor's concerns regarding their property lines, fencing and privacy, supported Sabey receiving input from neighbors. She also recommended that the lighting in the courtyard along 18th avenue be available along main Cherry and Jefferson street making it more active. A response was made that the lighting plan does not show that the building will have an ambient spill as well as the street lights to provide street activation.

Ms. Lane questioned the service area of the building especially the mechanical roof top and how noise will be mitigated. She also asked about the traffic flow in the plaza. She heard from the last presentation that the plaza will not be an activated space for pedestrians. She would like to know how the flow of traffic will be managed on the surface area.

She also asked if the bench seating will get weather protection.

6. Public Comment

Ms. Blum opened the discussion for public comments.

(Editor's Note: The comments 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 voice recording (.mp3) form)

Comments from Mary McLaughlin: Ms. McLaughlin commented that she would like to be contacted regarding their backyards, the building, and the trees. She questioned how much of the building is going to be lit and its impact to the neighbors that live behind the hospital on 19th.

Comments from Vicky Schiantarelli: Ms. Schiantarelli shared her concerns about instead of looking at a lovely old brick building from across the street, she would be looking at a big white mausoleum, and not the beautiful elements of the campus. She added that the proposed trees are young and there were no mature trees to allow privacy. She was disappointed in the disregard of the transitional design of the building to the neighborhood. She also noted about the bio-retention issues along the campus that could potentially cause flooding in the neighborhood.

Comments from Larry Knopp: Mr. Knopp commented about the communication plan and he expressed his concern about the move from email and asking people to call the central switchboard. This is problematic because it takes away their ability to make comments in their own voice and being interpreted by a switchboard operator. He noted that he would like to expand the zip code boundary instead of 98102 and 98122 and include 98112, 98104, 98144. He noted that the Squire Park newsletter is going away due to a lack of funding and suggested Swedish consider fulfilling sponsoring it.

Comments from Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper commented that he was glad that the Design Team paid attention to the comments about the plaza entrance. He noted the guidelines that treat vehicle and pedestrian entrances separately and making them look outward. He reference the guideline for community use such as retail, coffee shop, etc. at the ground floor to engage the pedestrians and not just the tenants of the building. He echoed the comments of Ms. Schiantarelli that a white, lighter building does not echo the brick elements of most of the building campus and the community would want architecture that blends with the neighborhood. He suggested the Design Team go through the list of design guidelines and inform them about what does not apply and their corresponding actions so the Committee can prioritize their comments based on their input. He also noted that any communication about the design should be presented and communicated with the public to comply with the Open Public Meeting law.

Comments from Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelan commented her appreciation suggesting that the neighbors be consulted about the work that is being done. She suggested using horizontal bike parking instead of vertical and adding covers to the bike parking section to encourage more bike riders to the campus.

Comments from Abil Bradshaw: Ms. Bradshaw shared her concerns about the car headlights shining as they go in the building. She wanted to make sure that the height of the fence protects the houses from the green space and it is tall enough so that no one could climb over the fence. She shared her concerns about the leaf drop that will be falling from the trees to her backyard. She also would wanted to know if the function of the building has been determined.

7. Committee Deliberation

Ms. Blum opened the discussion for Committee deliberation. Ms. Sheehan commented that the goal of tonight's presentation is to provide the Design team the areas that they need to come back and review based on tonight's feedback and comments.

Ms. Lane commented that she appreciates that the Design Team incorporated some of the comments from the last meeting. She noted that there was no reference to the overall characteristics of the neighborhood and not enough emphasis provided regarding the building transition to the neighborhood. She added that she appreciates the public's comments about the tree plantings, fence and their concerns about the noises from the garage and the mechanical roof. She added that there was not enough detail about the bike infrastructure and how this mode of transportation affects the building design.

Ms. Blum commented that her biggest concern is street activation. She appreciates the design that was done regarding landscaping, ambient lighting, benches and canopies along 18th, and she would like to see a similar approach at Cherry and Jefferson street. She noted that she was not clear about the details of building façade along Cherry and Jefferson that could provide opportunities to activate that street.

Mr. Kliewer shared that the Committee should address the geotechnical concerns. He also commented about more investigation about the east fence such as a solid fence instead of rails to provide privacy to the neighbors.

Mr. Dvi-Vardhana commented that he likes the design of the building. He noted that Swedish did an excellent job designing a building that highlights their work that would help their overall marketing for the people who will be working at the building. He hopes that the landscape architect addressed the landscape and privacy issues for the neighbors that live behind the building.

Ms. Sheehan noted at the next meeting, there will be another iteration of the design. She asked if the Committee would prefer to discuss the Annual Report or the CMP (Construction Management Plan) along with the geotechnical presentation. The committee agreed they would prefer to discuss the Geotech issues at the August meeting because it is a long-running question and concern for the neighbors and discuss the annual report at the September meeting.

Ms. Lane asked if there will be more opportunities for comments from the Committee members and neighbors who were not present at this meeting. Ms. Sheehan noted that another week of comments is fine but is hesitant for the three Committee members who were not present to provide comments since there was more clarification that came out through the presentation. She will try to communicate to the other members what has changed.

Ms. Lane suggested that the Design Team briefly summarize what has changed in response to the comments and feedback from the Committee and the actions and response that were taken at their next presentation, so it will be clear to the Committee.

8. Meeting #9 Agenda & Adjournment

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