



Minutes #18

(Adopted July 10, 2019)

Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)

Wednesday, June 12, 2019

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill

500 17th Ave – James Tower SECC

Seattle WA 98122

Members and Alternate Present:

Kevin Klauer

Claire Lane

Justin Kliewer

Catherine Koehn

Greg Swinton

Staff and Other Present:

Nelson Pesigan – DON

Mike Hanson – Sabey

Mike Denney – Swedish

Sherry Williams - Swedish

1. Opening and Introductions

Mr. Justin Kliewer opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

Mr. Nelson Pesigan introduced himself and mentioned that he will be filling in for Ms. Maureen Sheehan until her return from maternity leave sometime in November.

Mr. Pesigan has been with the Major Institutions Program for six years as the support staff. He also transcribes the meeting minutes for all 13 Major Institutions.

2. Housekeeping (01:20)

There was a motion to adopt the May 8, 2019 minutes and it was seconded. The Committee voted, and the motion was adopted.

Campus Activity Update:

Mr. Mike Hanson of Sabey commented that there are no significant campus activity updates. A copy of [summary updates](#) was provided to the Committee.

Community Health Benefits Update:

Ms. Sherry Williams, Regional Director of Swedish Community Health Investment, provided a quick summary of the Swedish's Community Benefit Program for 2018. She noted at the last meeting that they have completed the 2018 Community Benefit Program report. Swedish spent more than \$237 million on community benefit programs, including \$23.8 million in free and discounted care.

She presented how the numbers were calculated based on specific programs and identifying the community health needs assessments. At the Cherry Hill campus, Swedish provided \$4 million in Charity Care, \$17 million in Medicare subsidies, and \$9 million inpatient programs and education. She added that they had a chance to support about 10,000 people in the Cherry Hill community. The Community Benefit Report is available [here](#).

Remote Access:

Mr. Kliewer confirmed that remote access is available for Committee members to call in if they are going to miss a meeting.

ITB Report Update:

Mr. Kliewer mentioned that the ITB (Integrated Transportation Board) report is ready. The co-chairs decided to postpone the presentation to focus on completing the discussion on the remaining design review guidelines.

Mr. Kevin Klauer mentioned that he is prepared to do a presentation at the next meeting after the edits are completed.

Mr. Mike Denney commented that Swedish Cherry Hill received the Gold Standard Award for Employers for Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) from SDOT last week.

Ms. Claire Lane commented that now the report is ready, she encouraged the new Committee members to review the current report and compare it from last years and the relevant information that was described in the MIMP.

Meeting #18 Context & Schedule:

Mr. Kliewer commented that the Committee will review the last design guideline that was discussed at the last meeting and will continue to move forward in discussion the next set of guidelines.

Ms. Lane mentioned that in addition to the design review process, there was a brief conversation at the previous meetings around the review process, communication, and hotel use. She added that the Committee will work with Swedish and the City about what the Committee would want to see at the next meeting around hotel use.

She also mentioned the conversation around community involvement and outreach and opportunity for the Committee members to go out in the community and identify ways the community can be involved in this process. This discussion will be postponed until the next meeting.

The focus at tonight's meeting will be on the design review process and will continue to have conversations around hotel use and community outreach at the next meeting.

Mr. Kliewer commented and distributed copies of background information and the research he compiled to identify the preliminary meeting notes about the Sanctuary Hotel project. He asked the Committee to review these documents to prepare for the hotel use discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Pesigan commented that he will post the documents to the website as a presentation for the next meeting.

Ms. Catherine Koehn commented about finishing the design review at tonight's meeting that will be at the draft comment letter and asked if the Committee is holding off approving the comment letter after the hotel use conversation. Mr. Kliewer responded that he understood the hotel use will be part of the comment letter and it will be a Committee decision to hold off completing the letter after the hotel use discussion. This also gives an opportunity for the Committee to draft the letter and add the hotel use conversation.

3. Sanctuary Hotel at Cherry Hill – Discussion of Guidelines B1.2.5 – B2.3.2

B1.2.5 Lighting, Safety and Security Guidelines:

Mr. Kliewer commented that the design team did a good job in providing transparency to the street level and maintained the clear line of sight along the perimeter on the north and west side of the existing parking garage.

Ms. Lane commented that the design team did a good job at the ground level use of glass for transparency and the light design to have people at the corner.

Ms. Koehn commented about the alley and any other recommendation other than making sure to keep it safe. Ms. Kliewer commented about building up on the property line and establishing a buffer.

B1.2.6 Artwork Guidelines:

Mr. Kliewer commented that Ellumus has no designated artwork been commissioned yet.

Ms. Lane commented that a neighbor sent her resources for Central Area Arts and recommended the SAC engage with them and their recommendations on how to incorporate local art/artists in the area. She added that there are different ways to use the space in the lobby to present artwork rather than displaying artwork in the gallery space (i.e. use the building elements of the lobby itself to incorporate artwork).

Mr. Kliewer commented on embedding a link or digital file on artwork resources as a resource for artwork guidelines.

B1.3.2 General Guidelines:

Mr. Swinton commented about the "green wall" and he noted that he saw examples of the green wall in West Seattle and added that it is functioning well. He was not sure what it would look like year-round.

Ms. Lane commented about her appreciation of having plants in the hotel garden that the neighbors would plant in their own garden.

Mr. Kliewer commented about as a recommendation regarding the green wall that it must be maintained, and it should be located where enough water will be available as opposed to being isolated.

B1.3.3 Planting Guidelines:

Ms. Lane asked if street trees will be planted, and Mr. Kliewer that street trees will be part of the SIP (Street Improvement Plan).

Ms. Koehn commented that it is worth putting a recommendation planting street trees on Jefferson St. to filter light and noise from the first-floor café.

Mr. Kliewer noted about adding a comment to the letter to maintain or increase the number of street trees.

B2.0 Architectural Character

B2.1.2 General Guidelines:

Ms. Lane commented that she appreciates the use of windows and transparency to break the two façades on the streets. She mentioned that neighbors brought up concerns about the two facades facing other buildings (i.e. the west and north facades) and they do not know what is going to happen in the building.

Mr. Kliewer mentioned that on the February 2019 presentation, the diagram showed the setbacks at different heights, and it did not show the required setbacks outlined in the MIMP.

Ms. Koehn commented that the design team did a great job listening to the feedback on the 18th Ave Building. She does not agree that the hotel proportion is designed to reflect the neighborhood.

B2.1.3 Architectural and Façade Composition Guidelines:

Ms. Lane commented that they will not know what will be up against the building and asked the Committee if they assess the building as is and independent of the campus building, because two facades are flat and blank.

Mr. Kliewer commented that he does not know how to review that is based on how the campus would look like and it is hard to say what the future will look. He added that the design team did a good job in mitigating the large blank walls.

Mr. Swinton agreed that conceptually, he appreciates the approach on the large blank walls. He is curious about how the paint would look like since there is a contrast in textures and materials, and he wants to have more information on how it would look like in reality.

Ms. Lane asked if windows are not allowed on each side, and Mr. Kliewer noted no - it is the proximity to the plot line that prohibits windows.

Ms. Koehn commented that on the 18th Ave Building, there were different window coverings and fixtures outside the building and suggested having this as a recommendation.

Ms. Lane read the Director's Report and the requirement of using trees as a transition to the neighborhood and using the articulation to the building façade to match the neighborhood.

B2.1.4 Secondary Architectural Feature Guidelines:

Mr. Swinton asked if the dual-purpose element, sustainability, glass types, and functions have already been explored.

Mr. Kliewer commented that the canopy providing cover at the patio provides visual depth and a stepping aspect.

Ms. Lane commented that the design team did a nice job expressing these features and it works on two sides of the building.

Ms. Koehn commented that the modulation did a very good job and she was curious about the neighboring buildings as it relates to architectural style, color, and materials. Mr. Kliewer commented about what is happening to every building and does it fit with the campus or build on campus or does it fit on a single-family housing scale and asked how an institution can build a building on any scale can achieve that. He added that it will not be feasible building on that scale.

Mr. Klauer commented about the transition element and having it stepped back talks to the single-story element to it and the design team did a good job expressing it.

Ms. Lane commented about bigger buildings and its transition to the neighborhood. She noted about the articulation of the neighborhood and the older buildings on campus and the materials are not just panels and she felt that the panel piece echoes the new residential neighborhood and not the historical context.

Mr. Kliewer noted that this is not going to be resolved and suggest incorporating the Committee's concerns and suggestions in the comment letter.

B2.2 Architectural Elements and Features

B2.2.2 Color and Material Guidelines

Ms. Lane commented that the composite board is not reflective, and the building relies largely on it and asked if there are other options or ways to address this.

Mr. Swinton commented that there are several options regarding color and materials and recommended for more exploration on possible options for the compostable board and texture materiality.

Mr. Kliewer gave a nod to the design team for having a Corten reference for the brick three-story level that relates to the residential scale.

B2.3 Rooftops

B2.3.2 Rooftop Design Guidelines

The Committee recommended that the rooftop be available for public access and enforce restricted hours.

Mr. Kliewer commented that he was satisfied with the general approach to the roof deck design and have it broken into smaller spaces to discourage larger gatherings

Ms. Koehn commented that she appreciated the low lighting on the roof, so it is not disruptive to the neighbors.

4. Public Comment (1:14:16)

Mr. Kliewer 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 Bob Cooper: Mr. Cooper, a near neighbor, commented about remote access and requested if members of the public can listen to the meeting remotely. He urged the Committee to carefully review and look at the hotel's allowable use as it relates to the MIMP and the City's ordinance including the hotel's setback requirements on the south side of the building. He commented about not disclosing the hotel project and its allowable use to the neighborhood and to the Committee sooner and blames the City for not being upfront about the project. He commented about a process where the community can be engaged early about new projects in the pipeline.

5. Committee Deliberation (1:22:30)

Mr. Kliewer commented about the next steps and suggested having three members work together to revise the draft letter based on the comments and discussion at this meeting.

Ms. Koehn asked if the draft letter can be sent to the whole Committee and Mr. Kliewer suggested having a three-person workgroup to work on the initial letter and present it to the Committee at the next meeting for review and comments.

Ms. Lane commented that she will be out of the country for two weeks and suggested for the three-person workgroup to listen to tonight's recording to capture what was discussed. She noted that Mr. Kliewer was able to request the recording at the last meeting to start the process.

Mr. Klauer asked if one person can write the initial draft and send it two people and make their individual edits. Ms. Koehn suggested having the document in DropBox or GoogleDocs to monitor edits and version control. Ms. Koehn volunteered to be the editor once the draft is available and Mr. Klauer mentioned that he can be the second editor. Mr. Swinton noted that he can be a reviewer for the next draft. Mr. Kliewer will write the first draft and share it with Ms. Koehn and Mr. Klauer.

Ms. Lane reminded the Committee that they can all share and communicate information, but they are not allowed to deliberate and make any decisions when communicating in email.

Ms. Lane asked about reaching out to members that were not present at this meeting and if having a buddy system worked last time. Ms. Koehn commented that Mr. Kliewer contacted her, and it was helpful, and it was the same with Mr. Swinton.

Ms. Lane commented that she can reach out to Ms. Twiss, and Mr. Swinton will contact Mr. Welcher, and Mr. Kliewer will reach out to Ms. Fitzhugh. Mr. Kliewer added that he will send out the digital file recording of tonight's to the Committee and asked to find time to listen.

6. Meeting #19 Agenda & Adjournment (1:36:46)

The Committee discussed the agenda for the next meeting including having Ms. Carly Guillory come in the meeting to address and answer questions regarding the hotel use with reference to the MIMP, and other agenda items for future discussion.

Other potential agenda items for later discussion include a presentation update from the ITB, the process of engaging the Committee early when a new project from Swedish comes into the pipeline, community outreach and engagement, the role of DON in engaging the neighborhood, and the SAC membership selection and nomination process.

Ms. Lane mentioned that the Squire Park Council will be having their meeting and she volunteered to attend the meeting and inform them about this Committee and the work they do for the neighborhood.

Mr. Denney asked Mr. Klauer if he can provide a brief transportation presentation update and have a Committee discussion at the next meeting.

Mr. Pesigan mentioned that he will not be able to attend the July 10th meeting, but a staff member from DON will be available to attend.

Mr. Kliewer commented that the Committee will go back and review the design guidelines in preparation for drafting a letter at the next meeting if time permits.

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