

**Minutes: Meeting #12**

Adopted: 5/13/2024

**University of Washington Medical Center – NW Campus  
Development Advisory Committee (DAC)**

Monday, March 25, 2024

6:00 – 8:00 PM

1550 N 115<sup>th</sup> St — Seattle WA 98133-9733

In person and Remote Meeting, via WebEx – video recording is available on request.

**DAC Members Present:**

Karoline Derse	Keith Slack
Carol Whitfield	Susan White - online
Shawn MacPherson	Kippy Irwin
Scott Sheehan	Andy Mitton
Joan Hanson (online)	

**Staff Present:**

Julie Blakeslee	University of Washington
Pam Renna	University of Washington
Katrina Nygaard	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (Zoning Team)
Kelsey Timmer	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT Development Review)
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Nelson Pesigan	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Donna Hartmann-Miller	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Kim Selby	NBBJ
Kevin Jones	Participant Panel

*(Transcriber's Note: The notes shown below are summaries of statements provided. They are not transcriptions; these have been shortened and edited to include the major points raised. Full comments are retained in the video recording which is available upon request.)*

1. **Agenda review and Introductions** (Meeting start time: 6:01 pm)
  - a. Welcome and Introductions
  - b. Committee Business
    - Approving minutes from last meeting (#11)
    - Discussing and voting on final comment letter
  - c. Public comment
  - d. Next steps, timeline, and scheduling
2. **Introductions**
  - a. See DAC Members Present and Staff Present lists from above
3. **Committee Business: Minutes Approval**
  - a. (6:22) Scott Sheehan: Meeting #11 Minutes. No adjustments or changes; Minutes accepted as presented.
4. **Committee Business: Final Comment Letter – discussion and vote**

*See end of minutes for copy of the Final Comment Letter*

- a. (7:02) Discussion of a change/adjustment
  - (7:54) Kippy Irwin reviews what has been written with the goal of it being more understandable and consolidated; wants to make sure all members feel good about the wording; Kippy reviews bullet points, then goes over the header topics. Kippy asks people to comment if they have an issue, she will go through the bullet points and Recommendation Comments
- b. (8:38) N 120<sup>th</sup> St vehicular access point prohibited
  - No comments
- c. (9:10) Tallest structures locations
  - No comments
- d. (10:01) Central Utility Plant location considerations
  - No comments
- e. (10:32) Parking garages
  - Conversation takes place re: changing “potential development and parking garage” and “preferred location of the parking garage”
    1. Karoline confirms parking garage & development wording
    2. Kim suggests “preferred but not prohibited elsewhere”
    3. Andy – can’t really establish a restriction at this stage, but would happen at the next phase
    4. Andy discusses revision of note vs figure confusion
    5. Discussion of where changes will go in what paragraph
    6. Kim points out the Code requires the plan provides where proposed parking goes (comments about “next to residential” gets confusing instead of identifying by location)
      - Carol Whitfield expresses opinion/concerns re: screening (plants and views) being described as limited visibility because there are clear views and there is no screening right now; conversation about trees and landscaping, conversation about the photo
    7. Kippy suggests a sentence dealing with Parking Garage restrictions they hope for in a certain area
    8. Dipti suggests inserting a graphic -make sure you insert in letter so make it very clear instead of having to reference the MIMP
    9. Andy suggests they change the last sentence in Rec Comment #3 something to effect of prefer to see potential development only
    10. Kippy clarifies the changes.
- f. (36:57) Setbacks
  - Setback is discussed; Carol Whitfield states it is not enough; Conversation reviewing the setback possibilities.
- g. (40:00) Restricting building height near residential property lines
  - Restricted building height is discussed; Dipti suggests clarification on what was proposed in the MIMP
  - Andy thought this is a repeat of the previous height statement; Kippy states this point was included because in original statement they made, the visual impact of height was their main concern
  - Kippy will add language re: unmentioned concerns of visual impact (shadow, views) and send out for review
  - Kim asks if mitigation in guidelines (windows, light, screening) is enough; Carol brings up privacy issues, not sure if the guidelines will help entirely with that; Kippy will write out something to capture what is being discussed and send it out

- h. (47:39) Maintaining trees & vegetation.
  - Some minor confusion because both Kim and Julie thought it WAS included in the plan already
  - Kim clarifies 40-foot setback covers the majority of trees, by default, the intent is that existing trees were healthy and were intended to stay, the removal of the north access helps to protect existing trees, and don't see where any trees would be in danger
  - Conversation about defining the design of the edges (particularly along the north edge) in regard to right-of-way, open space, and considerations of the north campus edge
  - Even with the buffer, want to ensure tree preservation expectations is added (rather than saying trees are not being protected)
  
- i. (59:58) Recommendations Comment #4
  - Andy - loop drive needs to be clarified in terms of location from property edges.
  - Re: Comment #4 Would like it to be treated like E&W – the language on page 7 should be applied to the north edge too
    1. Kim clarifies that the letter is feedback, not changes on the Final; the letter is for after the hearing examiner, but for presentation to council; language can be updated as changes occur in the process.
    2. Dipti defines the next steps in the process (provide comments to the draft director report and the final director report)
  - Agreement between Kim and Scott that all references are to the March 2024 document.
  
- j. (1:09:47) Kippy asks if anything is missed and Carol Whitfield follows this up asking when the next revision will be sent out, what is the process from now?
  - Kippy and Karoline – will make changes, Dipti will circulate.
    1. Next will be consent via email; everyone will have until April 5 (five weeks from MIPF being published) to submit.
    2. Dipti asks for timeline for clarification on when she can expect so she can circulate Thursday (March 28) is decided as the date that Dipti will receive updated version from Kippy & Karoline, then circulate to committee; everyone will have a couple of days to get changes back to Dipti(*note: this question occurs between 1:12:23 and 1:15:42, but it is a continuation of this conversation, so it is being inserted here*)
  
- k. (1:12:09) Last question: is the intro paragraph too wordy?
  - Conversation concludes it shows the values of the community.
  - (1:15:42) Kippy reviews changes
  
- l. Final Comment Letter – VOTE
  - (1:20:23) Move for a vote that the letter as presented tonight be revised as the committee discussed this evening to address the concerns as they were stated.
    1.
 

Andy Mitton	Y
Scott Sheehan	Y
Shawn MacPherson	Y
Carol Whitfield	Y
Keith Slack	Y
Karoline Derse	Y
Kippy Irwin	Y
Susan White	Y
Joan Hanson	Abstain - not able to hear complete discussion due to audio quality
    2. Passed

**5. Public Comment**

- a. No public comments

**6. (1:22:20) Next steps for DAC**

a. Discussion of next steps of the process

- Meeting #12 (Today): comment letter on final MIPF
- Next is go to SCDI, they will complete their Director's report
- Meeting #13 (potentially April 22) Director Report will come back to DAC and UWMC; this potential meeting will be to discuss *draft* City Staff Report
- SCDI will look at comments and may make changes.
- Meeting #14 (May 2024) POTENTIAL meeting to discuss *Final* City Staff Report
- Then get in line for the Hearing Examiner Date

**7. Adjourned 7:34pm**

## **Copy of letter being discussed.**

UWMC-NW DAC March 25, 2024

Re: Final MIMP & EIS Comments (March 2024 Documents)

UWMC Northwest campus is an asset to the Haller Lake and Northgate community. All DAC members feel it is an honor to be part of this committee and grateful that we have been given the opportunity to provide our comments on the UWMC - NW final MIMP and EIS. We all understand that UWMC - NW needs to grow and update many of its facilities. We represent the community surrounding the hospital and our goal is a successful outcome for positive change for both the hospital and the community. There are many seniors, adults, and young families that live near the campus and walk/run/ bike commuters passing through and near the campus. We ask that they are all considered in the proposed campus design and also considered in minimizing the associated construction, noise and pollution impacts. We have a very friendly, active community that will help make this campus wonderful if you design it to welcome and integrate them. The hospital has been a great neighbor since inception, and it is in the best interest of everyone to continue to do so. The recommended revisions that we have identified as having the strongest impact on the community can be summarized as follows:

- Prohibiting new vehicular access point from N 120th Street while maintaining the existing locked access gate for emergency access, short term construction, and deliveries that exceed clearances at the pedestrian bridge on campus
- Locating the tallest structures only near the central or southern areas of the property
- Central Utility Plant location considerations
- Allowing parking garages at the south and southern half of west property line, where not directly adjacent to residential structures
- Generous setbacks abutting and across from residential parcels
- Restricting building height near residential property lines
- Maintaining trees and vegetation on the property now, during, and after the development

### **Prohibiting access point from N 120th Street**

The DAC is happy with the N 120th St access point being eliminated from the Final MIMP.

### **Locating the tallest structures only near the central or southern areas of the property**

The proposed heights are still higher than DAC members would like to see being so close to our community. We hope for continued consideration on placing the tallest structure(s) in the central or southern 2/3rd of the property. The primary concerns are regarding views, shadows and a general “out of place/ towering over” feeling in our mostly single family residential homes and quiet neighborhood.

### **Recommendation Comment #1**

The DAC recommends placing the tallest structure(s) in the central or southern 2/3rd of the property.

### **Central Utility Plant location considerations**

### **Recommendation Comment #2**

The DAC recommends that SDCI confirm that the central utility plant within the final MIMP and EIS has strong parameters to control the impact of potential air quality, air-borne pollutants and noise to ensure that the nearby residents are protected.

### **Restricting Parking Garage Locations to the South and Southern Half of Western Property Line**

The DAC would like to see the parking garages restricted to the south and southern half of the western property lines where they are not directly adjacent to residential areas. This would create unacceptable issues including squealing tires, car alarms, light and emission pollution. The SE corner of the property (still being close to residential) has been approved by the DAC as a potential site.

### **Recommendation Comment #3**

The DAC recommends that in both the MIMP and EIS there is clear terminology about the parking garage locations being restricted to the south property line and southern half of the western property lines.

The DAC recommends change:

*Section III - Development Program, Future Circulation, Parking & Wayfinding – p.38*, Fig 3.16 which indicates Potential Garage Location in the northwest corner of campus (existing E-Wing location). Please revise to indicate “Potential Development” only.

### **Generous setbacks abutting and across from residential parcels**

The DAC is happy with the setbacks in the final MIMP/ EIS.

### **Restricting building height near residential property lines**

The DAC recommends that all buildings built near residential property lines are designed to have as little impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood as possible.

### **Maintaining trees and vegetation on the property now, during, and after the development**

The DAC is concerned about the existing trees at the North campus edge not being protected within the final MIMP. This is a large line of trees that, to the north, divides the institution from the neighborhood. The removal of these trees would have a significant impact on the whole neighborhood to the north. We have been led to believe that the North perimeter trees will stay and yet nowhere is this said in the MIMP. We would like to see something about preserving the North campus edge trees in both the Landscape & Open Space and Parking and Vehicular Circulation sections.

### **Recommendations Comment #4**

*Landscape & Open Space - p. 71 & 72*

- Recommend adding a new sub paragraph (insert between sub paragraph A & B), that is called North Campus Edge. Consider providing similar language that is stated in sub paragraph B for East and West campus edges that reads as follows: Where the property abuts the northern right of way, campus landscape areas will be maintained to help create a landscape buffer for the neighbors to the north. This includes the preservation of large mature trees to the greatest extent feasible. Where new internal drives are proposed, consider how existing trees can be preserved as part of the landscape buffer.

*Parking and Vehicular Circulation - p.74 & 75*

- Consider adding language about saving large mature existing trees on the North Campus edge.
- Suggest revising the last paragraph of this section to read as follows: ... The loop drive must be located at least 20 feet from property edges abutting residential neighbors and must aim to preserve as many existing trees as possible on the North Campus Edge.