



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

VIRGINIA MASON MEDICAL CENTER MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES – Adopted August 17, 2016

Meeting #23

Virginia Mason Citizens Advisory Committee

Wednesday, February 20, 2013

Virginia Mason Medical Center
 Correa C Conference Room
 925 Seneca Street

**VIRGINIA MASON
 MEDICAL CENTER
 MAJOR INSTITUTIONS
 MASTER PLAN
 CITIZEN'S ADVISORY
 COMMITTEE**

Committee Members

Evan Abookire-Horton
 Robert Anderson
 Larry Brouse
 Chris Balisky
 Samuel Cameron
 Raymond Crerand
 Jim Erickson
 Katlin Jackson
 Miranda Livermore
*Virginia Mason Medical
 Center Non-management
 representative*

Terry Miller
 Albert Shen
 Dr. Sharon Sutton

Committee Alternates

Samuel Gerszonowicz
 James Kirkpatrick
 Ted Klainer
 Tyler Tonkin

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard
*Department of
 Neighborhoods*
 Stephanie Haines
*Department of Planning
 and Development*
 Betsy Braun
*Virginia Mason Medical
 Center Management*

Members Present

Albert Shen	Sharon Sutton	Bob Anderson
Larry Brouse	Terry Miller	Jim Erickson

Ex Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD	Betsy Braun, VM
---------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Others Present (Staff and Guests)

(see sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome, Opening Remarks and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Albert Shen. He noted that we are at the end of the process and thanked Mr. Sheppard for compiling a draft of the final report. He stated the objective of the meeting is to get through as many of the recommendations, come to an agreement on each of them, if we don't get through all of them tonight we have next Wednesday as well.

Steve Sheppard stated that the actual final CAC report would consist of the document being reviewed tonight plus a compilation of all the correspondence received the minutes and other attachments such as previous comment letters. The intent tonight is to see if we can approve the meat of the final report so that the remainder would simply be production and editing.

Mr. Shen pointed out that there were only a couple of major items the CAC will probably spend a little more time tonight: 1) housing replacement and 2) specifics of the 9th Avenue Garage Setbacks. In other regards it appears that all members agree on the wording of the Draft CAC Final Report.

Editor's Note: 1) several members had indicated that they could not be present at this meeting but had stated to him their approval of the Draft, and 2)



discussion of editorial changes or changes to correct typographical errors in Draft 2a are not included in this summary.

II. Committee Discussion of Final Documents

Mr. Sheppard noted that members had received several progress drafts and that he had sent out a new draft, 2A, that shows all of the changes and additions from Various members reviews of the various versions of Draft 1. Members should be using this version tonight and then indicate where you may want further changes, or you disagree with changes or statements that were made. Some should go pretty quick and some we'll want to talk about.

Bob Anderson noted that the addition of #4 on Page 6 was significant and certainly captured the intent of the CoOmittee. Steve Sheppard noted that this was suggested by Dr. Sutton.

Terry Miller observed that it stated that the 1000 Madison Block will be fronted by and institution. This is incorrect as it will actually be fronted by retail and neighborhood commercial uses at street level. Sharon Sutton suggested that this be changed to occupied above street level by an institution. Members agreed.

Steve Sheppard noted that in the lead up to the first recommendation to adopt the Master Plan there was one late change late to add that the CAC was accepting the FAR and square footage of development and then add afterwards a statement recognizing the total square footage need was not an issue open to review by the CAC. Terry Miller stated that she wasn't not happy with the use of the word "endorsed" and suggested that this be changed to accepted. Larry Brouse agreed stating that this gives a better understanding that the CAC accepted the FAR but was not happy with this. Members agreed with this change.

Concerning the Authority of the Standing Advisory Committee during Design Review Larry Brouse noted that in the middle of the page 8 where is says the SAC's recommendations are statutory not advisory, that is legally correct or is it? Steve Sheppard noted tht currently the SAC would not have the same statutory power that the City's Design review boards have and that in response to comments from members that they wanted clarification on this and that they wanted assurances that the SAC's comments would be taken seriously suggested the following wording:

The recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee concerning the schematic Designs shall be given substantial weight by The City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development. In the event that major deviation from the guidance given by the Standing Advisory Committee are made, DPD shall inform the SAC the specific reason(s) for over-riding the SAC's recommendation.

Jim Erickson stated that Item 2, uses the phrase retain the mixed use and residential and retail environment along Madison. Mr. Erickson recommended that this be changes to read along Madison, Boren and Terry. Betsey Braun noted that retail does not exist along all of these streets. After brief further discussion members directed that this change be made.

- Discussion briefly returned to the discussion of the recommendation concerning design reviews. Sharon Sutton suggested the following minor wording change:

The recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee concerning the schematic and design stage proposals shall be given substantial weight by the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development. In the event that a proposal substantially deviates from the guidance given by the

Standing Advisory Committee, DPD shall inform the SAC of the specific reason(s) for over-riding the SAC's recommendation

Members agreed to this wording change.

In the next paragraph, not sure in the last line what “this” refers to, there is little guarantee that this will continue. Does this refer to consensus? Add consensus after this.

Betsy Braun asked for clarification on the best way to advertise the SAC public meetings when they are scheduled? Steve Sheppard responded that the Code requires is that SAC meetings be advertised in compliance with the operating procedures of the Department of Neighborhoods which says for the Standing Advisory Committee meetings noted in the paper, mailed to the members and to anyone who's participated either in this process or in the follow on processes. Later when we talk about the 5 year check, then we would propose that it be a larger mailing.

In the paragraph right above recommendation #4, the business about including the buildings fronting Madison, do we need say the other streets as well to be consistent? Members agreed to add the other streets for consistency.

Bob Anderson asked for clarification concerning what the phrase and comparable to that loss means. After brief discussion, the following wording was established for this recommendation.

Recommendation 4 - *That the boundary expansion as requested by Virginia Mason at the 1000 Madison Block be approved subject to the conditions that 1) the height limit conditioning be contained in the Final Master Plan; 2) that any housing lost be fully replaced within First Hill per recommendation #8 below; 3) the design of the new structure on 1000 Madison Block respect the historic character of the Baroness Hotel; -4) retail uses along Madison, Boren and Terry be retained to the greatest extent possible and (5) that façade and street front features included in buildings fronting Madison be compatible with the mixed-use residential character of Madison.*

Concerning the Desire for a Five Yer Check in - Steve Sheppard noted that one of the suggestions made by members was the inclusion of a five year check-in. Steve heard comments from committee members saying they wanted the Advisory Committee members to really be involved so he took wording from the Seattle University report. Members directed that this new recommendation be included in the Final Report.

Concerning Heights - Bob Anderson stated that a long standing agreement between Virginia Mason and Horizon House that actually preceded this process was to maintain 190 foot height limit to the north of Horizon House. When Horizon House built its latest building it was held it to that height to be in sync with the surrounding community. I am asking that a similar height restriction be incorporated into the plan for the blocks on the north and east sides of Horizon House.

Betsy Braun responded that Virginia Mason has two concerns. First concern this action would potentially remove 5 floors off the building. If tht is done then Virginia Mason would have to adjust the plan to try to pick up that the lost development potential elsewhere to maintain its 3 million square foot target. Second, while Virginia Mason appreciates Horizon House's concern. If the plan starts stepping down on all edges to reflect adjacencies where does one stop? Virginia Mason previously put forth a plan that pushed the mass to the center of the campus but would have required heights up to 300 feet. The consensus within the CAC at that time was that this was not a

preferred option. Virginia Mason is also concerned with making such a major change at this late date.

Bob Anderson noted that Virginia Mason has not identified specific plans for the core of the campus and it would seem that a small change here could be accommodated with little difficulty. This would be a simple way to balance the needs of the institution with the needs of the community. He referenced the statement concerning the intent of the Major Institutions Program and stated that he has concluded that 240 feet on these blocks would overshadow the area. Sharon Sutton responded that this is true for many areas and if she was faced with making a choice between greater setback on the 9th Avenue Block or less height here, she felt that the greater setback was more important. Others noted that this issue had been dealt with previously and that the vote was unanimous for the 240 foot heights.

Bob Anderson stated that part of his consideration is an underlying disagreement with the necessity for a full 3,000,000 square feet and agrees this is late in the process. After brief further discussion the members directed that the final report remain as it is shown in Draft 2a.

III. Public Comment

Review of the Final Report was interrupted for public Comment.

Comments of Skip Viau: Mr. Viau stated that he was a resident of First Hill and asked for clarification concerning how does the 240 foot Height would affect Horizon House and if the setbacks along Spring were increased. Staff responded that the upper level setbacks were increased along Spring Street from the initial proposals from 10 to 20 feet.

IV. Continued Committee Discussion

Concerning Setbacks: Betsey Braun stated that Virginia Mason has looked at the optimum footprint for development on the 9th Avenue block. Virginia Mason believes that it needs an 93 foot east-west footprint for development to make this site usable for Medical office buildings. Virginia Mason has indicated to DPD that it is willing to adjust setbacks to accommodate a larger setback along the alley so long as Virginia Mason can retain a 93 foot section This would probably require balancing greater setbacks along the alley with slightly less setback along 9th Avenue. She asked that the CAC consider amending its final report to better match Virginia Mason needs and be more in line with what Virginia Mason has proposed for this site. She noted that Virginia Mason is proposing

In clarification Ms. Braun noted that they are proposing three 30 foot structural bays with there feed devoted to façade treatment. This would leave more space than currently devoted to setback, but not quite as much as the CAC is asking for in its current final report draft. A smaller structural bay poses major problems. Virginia Mason would like to balance the added setback between both side.

Katy Chaney noted that the setbacks on the hospital side on Ninth Avenue its 10 feet at street level and then its 20 feet back above 45 feet and then it's an additional 30 feet back if you're above 75 feet. Dr. Sutton asked what 9th Avenue would look like with the new slightly greater setbacks proposed by Virginia Mason. Virginia Mason responded that the current setback for the garage may be less than what might be chosen. It will depend upon the final design and what the CAC chooses concerning this proposal for balancing. Dr. Sutton stated that her perspective is to err in favor of greater attention to the setback from the residential development to the west rather than across the street to adjacent Virginia Mason Development.

Stephanie Haines noted that Virginia Mason had suggested a 7 foot rather than a ten foot setback. Ms. Braun asked if the CAC was amenable to allowing Virginia Mason to maintain a 93 foot wide east west dimension. Committee members indicated that they were willing to do so. Mr. Braun then noted that the next issue was how to balance the available setback. Katie Chaney stated that the site is 125 feet east to west and that the amount available for the combined setback would therefore be 32 feet. Steve Sheppard noted that therefore if the alley had a 20 foot upper-level setback then the street could only be 12. DR. Sutton recommended simply stating that the building may be a maximum of 93 feet wide east-west and to have the actual balance determined Virginia Mason in consultation with its designers and design review by the Standing Advisory Committee.

The Committee settled upon the following wording for inclusion in its final report.

***Recommendation 7** - Table 8 page 40 of the Final MIMP shall be amended to reduce the width of the upper tower to 93 feet in the east-west direction. The setbacks shall be balanced between the alley and 9th Avenue based on the merits of the final building design. The CAC's goal is to balance the needs of the residents to the west and the needs of the pedestrian experience on the east on 9th Avenue. A minimum setback of 7' at ground level and 12' above 45 feet on both sides shall be required.*

Housing Replacement: Larry Brouse stated that he felt that the previous positions of the CAC were well thought out and the proposal in draft 2a seem acceptable. Sheppard noted that members had suggested some greater commitment to affordable housing and in the back and forth reviews of the drafts for this meeting some had suggested that there be a 25% affordability goal. He noted that this is written as a goal and not as a requirement. Sharon Sutton stated that she intends to write a minority report on the housing replacement section of the MIMP. She stated that she felt a moral duty to protect the current lower and moderate cost housing. Comparable to her means comparable in size, in quality, and in rent.

Steve Sheppard noted that the struggle broadly is whether the housing replacement provision in the code implies that there is an implied subsidy when you're replacing comparable housing.

Bestsey Braun suggested the following language for the final report that she felt better clarified the intent of the CAC recommendation.

Although there was not a consensus within the CAC concerning whether replacement housing should be more heavily skewed towards affordable rather than market rate housing that the retention of affordable housing should be a priority many concluded that this should be considered. Virginia Mason has offered that a minimum of 7 units should be affordable to persons earning less than 80% of the median area income for at least 10 years some on the CAC proposed that up to 100% of all replacement units should be affordable. The CAC was advised that the City has been struggling with this issue and that no current consensus existing because of the definition of comparable housing. Several CAC members consider cost structure as a very important part of any acceptable definition of comparability; others remain concerned with the loss of affordability in the neighborhood in general and advocates skewing replacement housing towards greater affordability than that lost. The CAC therefore recommends that affordability should be a major goal; therefore while the CAC concurs

with the minimum goal identified above it also recommends that a higher voluntary goal be established.

The remainder of the recommendation would remain generally unchanged with only minor changes to correct typos. Committee members agreed to this change

This concluded Committee deliberations on its final report.

V. Approval of the Final Report

It was moved and seconded that

The Final Report Wording Corrected and amended at this meeting should be approved.

No further discussion occurring, the question was called. The final vote was five in favor one abstaining. Dr. Sutton abstained. Steve Sheppard noted that a quorum being present and majority of the quorum having voted voting in the affirmative, that the report was accepted as written and corrected.

Steve Sheppard thanked the Committee for its efforts and noted that this was both a particularly dedicated CAC and an affective one. From where we started, with the great controversy, and many people in the community expressing displeasure and discouragement with the size, bulk, and scale of the proposed development to where we are today is a testament to your skills.

Thanks were offered all around to the members and ex-officio staff.

VI. Other Business

Jim Erickson stated that the First Hill Improvement Association is working to encourage a study of the Madison corridor and it's centered on the Madison Rapid Bus Transit and its impact on retail and in this group we have often discussed the 14 stores that exist. Now I'm not saying that we will do a study, we're asking for a study and I want to keep this group in touch with what we're doing and be able to invite people from this group to take part in the study if they choose too. I would suggest that I could send a few memo's to the addressee list that exists and I guess I could put it as a blind carbon copy or whatever you want to say and anyone can write to me and say take my name off I'm not interested, but my hope is to get a few volunteers when we start to do a study. Is that okay?

CAC members said it would be okay to contact them.

VII. Next Meeting and Adjournment

Steve Sheppard noted that the Chair and staff will have to prepare for its testimony to the Hearing Examiner, but otherwise this could be the last meeting. This will likely happen shortly before the Hearing Examiner hearing. The February 27 meeting was.

No further business being before the committee the meeting was adjourned.