

Minutes: Meeting #5
(Adopted 8/14/2023)

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

Monday, July 24th, 2023

6:00 – 8:00 PM

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

Members Present:

Karoline Derse	Susan White	Joan Hanson
Keith Slack	Carol Whitfield	Andy Mitton
Shawn MacPherson	Kippy Irwin	
Kevin Jones	Scott Sheehan	

Staff Present:

Julie Blakeslee	University of Washington
Pam Renna	University of Washington
Kim Selby	NBBJ
Dipti Garg	Seattle Department of Neighborhoods (DON)
Holly Goddard	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
John Shaw	Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

(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.)

1. Introductions

Meeting start time: 6:00 pm

- Meeting Minutes from 7/10/2023 : Minutes adopted.

2. Committee Business: Discussion on Preliminary Draft Comment Letter- Scott Sheehan

- Traffic & Parking, Access & Circulation (2) (Karoline, Susan)

1. Bicycle Parking : Recommend referencing SMC 23.54.015.K for minimum bicycle parking requirements

2. Loading Docks: Recommend changing section title to "Loading Docks & Loading Zones."

Recommend adding language to clarify that this section does NOT apply to patient/staff drop-off or ride- share zones. Recommend adding language to require visual & noise screening from adjacent property lines.

3. Pedestrian Circulation : No recommendations

4. Public Street Improvement: Recommend that if North Entrance to N 120th St will continue to be a required option due to UWMC functional requirements, the following minimum improvements will be required:

Improvements to entire vehicular path of travel from north to connect to Aurora Ave N and N 130th St at 1st Avenue, including ROW improvements to sidewalks, gutters, street trees, landscape buffers, signaled crossings, bike lanes, etc. should the N 120th St entrance be required by the UWMC-NW for continued operations. These would be of particular importance considering increased pedestrian & bike traffic to/from the light rail stations at 130th.

5. Vehicular circulation:

Recommend Staff arrive on-time to staggered shifts, often in misalignment with frequency / availability of public transit OR not allowing ride-share for people who live near each other.

Patients are often not repeat users who can test various access methods to make a conscious choice of their commute methods. Also, patients presumably have a higher tendency towards mobility issues than the general public, making public transit less desirable and bicycle/walking unfeasible. Furthermore, arriving for any medical treatment or diagnosis is a stressful event that triggers selection of one's default transportation mode (typically single-occupant vehicle) for emotional safety.

Recommend referencing SMC 23.54.015, Table C for Institution Parking Minimums AND note that precedence has been set for increasing maximum allowable parking spaces in the Northgate Overlay District to accommodate overflow during peak hours.

Recommend raising allowable maximum and mandatory minimum number of parking stalls to prevent overflow into adjacent residential zone.

Question: Would a road and buses be air pollution to the canopy?

Discussion: Electric vehicles are going to be the required norm by 2030. That would lessen the air pollution significantly.

Suggestion to give preference so that the fleet is electric, particularly during quiet hours or specific times of day.

Question: On the loop road, do the buses go the entire route?

Addition to be added: Restricted access for buses if a loop road is there. Limited access to for loading zones/ docks.

- Landscape, Open Spaces, Stormwater, Tree Preservation (2) (Andy, Kippy)

A list of recommendations was reviewed including:

Recommend UWMC NW manage a tree replacement policy that meets sustainable tree canopy coverage on the campus that is resilient to climate change. Ensuring new tree plantings are done responsibly, varying the species and varieties of trees to avoid monocultures, and spacing trees for long term health and sustained success. This should be coordinated with the Urban Forestry Management Plan.

Recommend for mature/ exceptional/ old growth tree preservation that there is no new site development (ie. roads, parking lots...) in all setbacks around the perimeter of the property where existing mature/ exceptional/ old growth trees stand/grow.

Recommend encouraging mature, exceptional, and old growth tree preservation whenever possible during this MIMP development. And if ground disturbance is required that removes significant tree roots and reduces available water, that it be required to have stormwater diverted to supply natural water to the tree. Supplemental irrigation can also be considered.

Recommend removing existing landscape cloth or fabric (and avoid using cloth in the future) anywhere on campus as part of new landscape development in order to increase soil health, water absorption and tree preservation.

Recommend creating a nature walking path/trail that is a woodchipped path that loops the perimeter setback area of the property. This accessible on foot path/trail will wind within the mature/ exceptional /old growth trees and be complemented and supported by native shrubs and ground covers.

Comment: Where feasible keeping equal access for accessibility.

Recommend that all heights over 65' be restricted to the south ⅓ of the property and that there is an additional height restricted consideration where Stendall Place borders the property. Both of these considerations would be for access of light and view for neighboring properties.

EIS 3.7-7 recommend that the wording be changed from, "BMPs are not implemented due to concerns of infiltrated stormwater percolating..." to, BMP's be tested at each building site and implemented **where possible** with all surface stormwater management tools, such as rain gardens, bioswales and woodchips to improve soil condition for rainwater absorption and retention. We recommend that the parking garages be neighboring the cemeteries on the south side and west side of the property. This would be for air pollution and stormwater runoff considerations.

Recommend for architectural guidance a stronger consideration for how modulation to the building massing could limit impacts to adjacent neighbors, in particular Stendall Place. Consider providing more specific dimensions for the length of a side facade before a recess, or other building setback may be required to allow more light to adjacent developments. Consider how window placement on side facades can maintain the privacy of dwelling units by minimizing placement of windows where they directly align with neighbors' windows within 20 or 30 feet of the side property line. We like the example given in the meeting about clerestory windows, or translucent windows, but could not find reference to this in the MIMP.

Recommend changing the wording in the screening section that noise producing equipment be screened with walls or other sound absorbing built elements that support vegetation or planted green screens, etc. (vegetation alone will not mitigate for noise impacts). Acoustical mitigation can be through screening or choice and location of equipment.

Recommend adding a section in screening that addresses how fencing, landscaping, or other techniques to buffer dwelling units along a side lot line should be scaled appropriately to provide privacy and allow light and air circulation.

Recommend considerations for permeable pavements as part of a kit of parts that could be used in different applications on campus as applicable.

MIMP pg 43 a -Recommend that the terminology is changed from *several* mature trees to *many* mature trees.

MIMP pg 71-72 - Recommend that the wording in infrastructure/stormwater be revised - "accommodating on-site mitigation when necessary to embrace a holistic, naturalized landscape character while preserving accessible open spaces". We suggest wording that supports using surface stormwater management tools such as; rain gardens, bioswales, woodchips to improve soil condition for rainwater absorption and retention, that could be integrated with accessible open spaces.

MIMP or EIS (wherever it fits best) recommend that there is an intent about designing stormwater management to be an asset that is used in the landscape and open spaces whenever possible before going to the retention tanks or catch basin filtration. We feel these gray infrastructure techniques should be a last resort only when needed (or as a supplement to green infrastructure).

EIS. 3.4.2 - Recommend that there are some parameters around building locations within the MIMP as follows -

We recommend that the parking garages be neighboring the cemeteries on the south side and west side of the property. This would be for air pollution and stormwater runoff considerations.

Recommend that all heights over 65' be restricted to the south ⅓ of the property and that there is an additional height restricted consideration where Stendall Place borders the property. Both of these considerations would be for access of light and view for neighboring properties.

EIS 3.7-7 Recommend that the wording be changed from, “BMP’s are not implemented due to concerns of infiltrated stormwater percolating...” to, BMP’s be tested at each building site and implemented **where possible** with all surface stormwater management tools, such as rain gardens, bioswales and woodchips to improve soil condition for rainwater absorption and retention.

Comment : Articulated Campus wide design and concept be adopted by the group.

Native oak should be inclusive of adaptive tree, so it isn’t limited.

Question: Why is the native oak chosen? Does that take into consideration the root structure and how that can affect roads?

Comment: The theme of healing to the environment is something we could expand on, and it is a real asset to the community.

Question: Can you talk more about the concept of the lowland forest?

Answer: Lowland Forest is what is around the Seattle area.

Question: How does the healing forest get interpreted on the UW site?

Comment: Healing landscapes are lush, green, and bring an aesthetic that causes calm. Perhaps water that brings birds.

Comment: Replace northwest lowland forest with healing forest.

-
- Views, Shadows, Air Quality, Noise, Utilities, Infrastructure (3) (Carol, Kevin, Keith)

Noise:

The noise environment surrounding UWMC currently is vehicular traffic noise, pedestrians and building mechanical equipment and other associated building facility noise.

Recommend that the loop road that is proposed be on the other side of the fence away from the perimeter of the property.

A new CUP plant will be built on campus. It is inevitable that it will be much larger to support a much larger facility.

Recommend placing the Cup inside of the campus and away from neighbors to reduce noise levels when operating at full capacity.

Comment: Do you think there would be a benefit in stating the maximum decibel, because right now it is included in the municipal code, but if it was included in here, it would be sustained and not waver.

Question: Does the monthly generator create a lot of noise?

Air Quality:

Air pollutants from a hospital are many and are of concern to the neighborhood. There are many causes of pollution from the campus including medical gases, increased traffic due to the expansion, venting and exhaust such as from the CUP. As the expansion occurs, the construction from vehicles, demolition, grading, stock piling of soils, soil compaction and operation of generators and compressors will have an enormous impact.

UWMC has a sustainability action plan that’s targeted to reduce greenhouse gases. This, along with three other government agencies jurisdiction over the air quality should ensure that the quality will be healthy.

Regarding the CUP, no information is available as to what emissions will be produced there and what the noise levels will be. It is recommended to review this ASAP.

Recommended to have a sound wall or a solid fence.

Discussion about types of sounds walls, open spaces, fences, and the various options. General consensus is that a wall or a fence would be appropriate, but there needs to be a review of the impact to soil due to the foundation needed to sustain and support a wall.

Question: Can they build right up to the property line and does the code require landscape screening?

Answer: Yes, you can have a 6-foot fence with a lattice above it. There are many options for a fence.

Comment: Air quality, incinerators are always going. The recommendation is to give some guidance to UW regarding this.

Question: What type of gases are released that support surgery?

Discussion regarding the setbacks and heights. Alternative #2 preferred. Important to not be too restrictive on the recommendations. Suggested to look at other tools that are available in zoning to affect the building's façade and perimeters.

Infrastructure:

It is recommended that the 40' setback be maintained from existing master use permit and the Greenbelt be maintained along the Eastside of the property.

As presented in FIG. 3.10 Alternate 1. – It is recommended that a Solid Structural fence should replace the existing chain-link fencing (Westside of the Eastside greenbelt) along the Eastside greenbelt.

As Presented in FIG 3.20: it is recommended that the "Potential Garage Location" in the Southeast Corner of the property would be acceptable, as long as the parking garages be constructed at the SW and SE corners of the property, parking garage in the SE corner shall not have an entry/exit directly onto N 115th St. as a 3rd driveway. The trees near this area along N 115th are very mature and healthy and should be left.

It is recommended that the future structures that are adjacent to the residential properties have Windows treatments that block the line of vision from the residential properties, the upper sections of glass can be vision panes but the lower sections to obscure the view of the neighboring properties shall be opaque as to let light in but burrs the vision.

It is recommended that a central loading area would be preferred to allow noisy activities to be centralized and dealt with altogether. A minimum of 9 loading seems to be excessive (pg. 83 Development Standards for Loading docks).

It recommended that the delivery travel path be consolidated with the travel bath to and from the Central Utility Plant (CUP). This travel path would be easily isolated/designated for these delivers of unloading and loading be separated from the general traffic/pedestrian travel patterns?

It is recommended that an underground distribution corridor be implemented around campus to get from building to building.

Recommend that the parking garages be constructed at the SW and SE corners of the property, parking garage in the SE corner shall not have an entry/exit directly onto N 115th St. as a 3rd driveway. The trees near this area along N 115th are very mature and healthy and should be left.

It is recommended that service areas/ exposed utilities shall separate by fencing and vegetation.

Comment: Medical gasses would be separate from utilities and should not be included.

- Land Use (height, bulk, scale, setbacks) (3) (Scott, Shawn, Joan)

Recommend the 175' allowable area more specifically defined and located near A-Wing as suggested in the EIS. Recommend lower height limit of 35 ft. with a 50 ft. setback. Would like to see a greenspace with walking paths. Recommend that largest and tallest new tower be placed to the south of A wing where parking lot H is currently located.

Discussion of where the funding will be coming from and how the amount is figured. An estimate of 1 billion is proposed, but not adopted.

Question: Is the hospital fundraising now to cover this project?

Answer: No

Discussion of FAR usage and how to ensure the DAC understands the terminologies to be used in the draft.

Discussion of the NW corner, and the conclusion that all have excepted is to keep the heights low and the setback is 175.

Discussion of the building shapes and sizes that are possible to avoid the canyon effect.

3. Public Comments

No public comments.

4. Meeting scheduled for 8/14/2023 and 8/28/2023.

5. Meeting Adjourned 8:07 PM

