

September 19, 2019

Ms. Carly Guillory
Seattle Department of Construction & Inspection
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Via email: carly.guillory@seattle.gov

Re: Swedish Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee on Proposed Sanctuary Hotel Project (1522 E. Jefferson Street, Seattle, WA 98122) (Project #3025500)

Dear Ms. Guillory,

The Swedish Cherry Hill Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) is required to provide guidance to the City on implementation of the MIMP and to review and comment on the preliminary design of buildings proposed under the Swedish Cherry Hill Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP) adopted July 8, 2016. MIMP Design Guideline 1.1 states: “SAC members would then apply the guidelines as they evaluate how specific proposals address shared concerns about how hospital development is to address nearby neighbors and the public realm.”

The comments in this letter reflect feedback from the campus neighbors and SAC deliberation and observations during 4 public meetings between February 2019 and May 2019 where Ellumus, on behalf of Perfect Wealth Investment (the applicant), presented streetscape and building designs for the proposed 42 room hotel to be located at 1522 E Jefferson Street.

The SAC respectfully submits this letter with the expectation that the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) will continue work with the design team to ensure the final approved building complies with the MIMP guidelines and that Department of Neighborhoods staff will provide timely information to SAC members about this project.

SMC AND MIMP PERMITTED USES

The SAC discussed at length two major issues: the design review process, and the function or use of the hotel project. In terms of the hotel’s use, as proposed by its developers to the City and to the SAC, the SAC discussed whether it meets the expectations laid out by the City – both in the Seattle Municipal Code governing Major Institution Master Plans and in the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP. This project as proposed has raised many questions and significant concerns among SAC members and neighbors about its compliance with SMC, integrity with the MIMP itself, and how a hotel was discussed in the planning process so as to be approved as part of the Swedish Cherry Hill master plan. The SAC concluded that, as presented, the proposed hotel does not demonstrate compliance with the use requirements of the SMC and the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP.

According to Seattle Municipal Code which governs Major Institution Master Plans, section **23.69.008** concerns **Permitted Uses**:

A. All uses that are functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the central mission of a Major Institution *or* that primarily and directly serve the users of an institution shall be defined as

Major Institution uses and shall be permitted in the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) District. Major Institution uses shall be permitted either outright or as Conditional Uses according to provisions of Section 23.69.012. Permitted Major Institution uses shall not be limited to those uses which are owned or operated by the Major Institution.

B. The following characteristics shall be among those used by the Director to determine whether a use is functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the central mission of the Major Institution. No one (1) of these characteristics shall be determinative:

1. Functional contractual association;
2. Programmatic integration;
3. Direct physical circulation/access connections;
4. Shared facilities or staff;
5. Degree of interdependence;
6. Similar or common functions, services, or products....

F. Uses other than those permitted under subsections A and B of this section shall be subject to the use provisions and development standards of the underlying zone.

SMC clearly states both A and B must be satisfied for a MIMP project to be determined permissible use. If not, the code states that the underlying neighborhood zoning applies, and the Squire Park neighborhood is not zoned for a hotel.

The question before the SAC of responding to the proposed hotel project is two-fold:

Does the SAC find that the hotel project as presented to the SAC meets the permitted use Seattle Municipal Code for major institution projects?

Does the SAC find that the project faithfully implements the function of a hotel described in the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP?

PERMITTED USE CODE – PROPOSED HOTEL:

A. Functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the central mission of Swedish Cherry Hill or primarily and directly serve the users of an institution:

Over several SAC meetings, Swedish staff has made it clear that this hotel will not be functionally integrated with Swedish Cherry Hill. Swedish staff has cited HIPAA and other concerns about disclosing patient information to hotel operators and has repeatedly asserted Swedish is “not in the business of running hotels” so would not be involved in any of the day to day operations of the proposed hotel.

There is no question that the MIMP includes a hotel, yet SAC members have raised questions about whether the hotel *as proposed* is substantively related to the mission of Swedish.

At a meeting on Nov. 11, 2016 between staff from multiple City departments and the applicant, meeting notes reflect that City staff requested that the applicant’s letter to SDCI (to request approval as a permitted use) “include programmatic details outlining **how this hotel will be available for patients and families only, and not the general public.**” Instead, the letter from the applicant states “it is programmed so it *primarily* serves the users (patients and their families)”. Though Swedish’s mission is to serve their patients, and patient care was the sole rationale for including a hotel in the MIMP, neither the applicant letter nor the proposed hotel project indicates the hotel will be used only for patients and their families.

In the letter from the applicant to SDCI in November 2016 requesting approval as a permitted use, they wrote simply: *“Based on our understanding of the code, the proposed project use as a boutique hotel is functionally integrated with the central mission (to provide Quality Care to their patients and their families) of a Major Institution (Swedish Hospital at Cherry Hill Campus), and it is programmed so it primarily serves the users (patients and their families) of a Major institution (Swedish), it shall be permitted in the Major Institution Overlay (MIO) District.”*

Additionally, at the March 2019 SAC meeting, the [applicant’s presentation](#) included these bullet points under “Operations and Management” that raise questions about how the SAC can be assured that the hotel is fulfilling their intent to “primarily” serve patients and their families on an ongoing basis. It also raises significant questions about how any management agreement between the hotel owner and Swedish would ensure any access for patients and families because the applicant will not manage day-to-day operations:

- “The owner will hire a third-party hotel management team to operate the hotel
- The hotel will primarily serve Swedish patients and their families with a discount rate. It opens to the public if there is any availability.”

In notes from the November 2016 meeting, SDCI noted to the applicant that “if the use is found to not be functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the mission of Swedish (a “permitted use”), SMC 23.69.035 is applicable. Here we must determine if the change to the master plan is an exempt change, a minor amendment, or major amendment.”

FINDING: SAC members are concerned/do not believe the applicant adequately demonstrated that the hotel project as proposed meets the first permitted use requirement in SMC 23.69.008.

Permitted Use – B. The following characteristics shall be among those used by the Director to determine whether a use is functionally integrated with, or substantively related to, the central mission of the Major Institution:

1. Functional contractual association:

In meeting notes from November 2016, the applicant informed SDCI that a discussion had been initiated with Swedish Hospital through Mr. Andy Cosentino regarding the project’s functional relationship with Swedish. According to the 2016 letter submitted by the applicant to SDCI, “We are in the process of reaching an agreement with Swedish Organization for a mutually beneficial management plan to ensure the patients and families having privileges /advantages staying at the proposed property.”

The SAC has not seen or been made aware of any agreement other than a commitment to allow use of Swedish’s parking garage, and Mr. Cosentino is no longer with Swedish. Rather, current Swedish staff have made it clear that privacy concerns as well as operational constraints would likely prohibit such an agreement.

FINDING: The SAC does not believe the hotel project meets the criteria of functional contractual association.

2. Programmatic integration:

The applicant’s letter to SDCI does not respond in any way to the question of how it integrates programmatically with Swedish – it asserts only that the MIMP describes future space needs predicated on growing bed counts which include a hotel: *“As stated in the MIMP, the inventory of space needs indicates that as future demand for inpatient hospital bed count grows, the need for hotel rooms will, concomitantly, grow. As the data suggests, a projected increase of 27 hotel rooms to 56 hotel rooms is needed by year 2023.*

By providing a 42-room boutique Hotel project on the 1522 E. Jefferson Site that primarily serves the patient and their families are in alignment with this need.” In SAC meetings, Swedish has not indicated there is any plan or agreement for integrated programs, even the most basic as ensuring that patients and their families are able to book hotel rooms.

FINDING: The SAC does not believe the hotel project meets the criteria of programmatic integration.

3. Direct physical circulation/access connections:

The proposed hotel is across the street from Swedish’s MIO southwestern corner; there is no physical circulation or access connections to any other Cherry Hill campus building. In the applicant’s letter to SDCI, they described “proximity (within walking distance)” to Swedish’s campus, but no physical connections or direct circulation: “*The property’s proximity (within walking distance) to the central campus makes it an ideal location for a hotel use to serve the patients and their families while greatly reduce the traffic impact to the community, thus contribute to the reduction of SOV.*” Other projects built under previous Swedish Cherry Hill MIMPs have included a skybridge over a street or physically connecting a new building with existing ones with hallways, etc.

FINDING: The SAC does not believe the hotel project meets the criteria of physical connection, but the proximity facilitates direct circulation/access.

4. Shared facilities or staff:

In its letter to SDCI, the applicant wrote “*The proposed facility provides majority of the units to be accessible units with special features to meet the special needs for Swedish patients and families. It is possible and beneficial for some of the hotel staff to bear some degree of medical knowledge, such as having the onsite nurse (shared staff with Swedish hospital) to handle the emergency situation.*” The SMC characteristic does not reference accessible facilities; it refers to shared facilities, and because the hotel building has no physical connection to other buildings in the MIO, it cannot qualify as a shared facility.

Furthermore, in SDCI’s letter in 2018 regarding its permitted use, the applicant’s response was interpreted to mean “*an onsite nurse is anticipated,*” though the applicant did not explicitly “anticipate” this, and did not necessarily plan that Swedish would share staffing to provide an onsite nurse – only that it would be “possible and beneficial”. In SAC meetings, Swedish has made it clear that while any staff nurse may choose to work at a hotel, this would not be an arrangement between Swedish and the hotel - it would be a personal choice by individual nurses. Swedish has clearly stated they are not in the business of operating hotels and has not indicated there is any plan to share staff or facilities.

Finally, in response to this characteristic of permitted use, the applicant used its ‘accessory function’, the proposed café, as an “additional amenity (shared facility)”, yet the café qualifies neither as a shared facility nor shared staff with Swedish: “*Just as this boutique hotel can be an asset to the Swedish Institute and the surrounding neighborhood, the hotel’s accessory function - the ‘Corner Café’ on the ground floor can be an additional amenity (shared facility) to the Major Institution. This nice accessory not only primarily serve the Swedish staff, their patients and families, but also add warmth and welcome feel to the local community.*”

FINDING: The SAC does not believe the hotel project meets the criteria of shared facilities or staff.

5. Degree of interdependence:

The applicant described in ways in which its business or operations would be interrelated or independent with Swedish Cherry Hill. On the contrary, the applicant wrote that “it will maintain financial independence” from Swedish, “instead of adding burden to the institution”, rather than describing any ways in which the function or use of the hotel is interdependent with Swedish’s mission: The applicant “*is committed to*

provide functional amenities to support Swedish mission to accommodate the needs and desire from the patients and their families. While seeking mutual support and benefit, it will maintain its financial independence instead of adding burden to the institution.” Without shared facilities or staff; without direct, physical connections or access; and without any agreements for shared programming, the applicant was unable to describe any additional ways their hotel project is interdependent with Swedish.

FINDING: The SAC does not believe the hotel project meets the criteria of “degree of interdependence” because there is none described.

6. ***Similar or common functions, services, or products:***

The applicant described its similar functions or services as being related to building (ADA) accessible units: *With majority of the hotel units to be accessible, it expands the capacity of Swedish outpatient services, reduces the anxiety of their patients and families.”* ADA accessibility is not specific to hospitals, and many (if not all) newly constructed hotels have certain rooms that meet this standard, so this explanation makes this hotel project as similar to Swedish Cherry Hill as any other hotel in Washington is to Swedish. The hotel proposes no specialized services, products, or functions different than any other hotel in Seattle would offer, other than a discounted room rate for patients and their families - a service which Swedish staff told the SAC cannot be verified by Swedish.

FINDING: The SAC does not believe the hotel project meets the criteria of common functions, services, or products.

With the information provided to the SAC since February 2019 about this proposed hotel, SAC members have had no evidence that supports the request for permitted use for this hotel using SMC’s Permitted Use characteristics, or criteria, beyond the fact that the MIMP does indeed allow for a hotel for patients and their families.

In fact, more questions than answers have come up in SAC discussions about the connections between Swedish Cherry Hill’s mission and how a hotel owned and operated separately is capable of fulfilling the hospital’s mission. For example, we have asked:

- Without significant involvement by Swedish, how would a hotel know that it is “primarily” serving hospital patients and their families?
- How would it be monitored and enforced that a hotel “primarily” serves Swedish patients and their families? How would that monitoring, and enforcement be handled over time?
- How would a “discounted” rate be monitored? How much of a “discount” meets the mission of serving Swedish patients sufficiently?
- The developer/applicant has stated it will not manage the hotel once it is built: how would any agreement about possible shared or interdependent programming, staffing, functions, services, contractual association, etc. that could be developed for this project be enforceable with a third-party operator?
- If the hotel owners decided to sell the business, how would the mission of serving Swedish patients be ensured with new owners or operators?

These questions arose just in our conversations about the SMC that guides MIMPs generally. More questions arise when the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP was examined.

SWEDISH CHERRY HILL MIMP – PROPOSED HOTEL:

Plans for a hotel serving patients and their families is not new for this campus: even the 1994 MIMP for then-Providence Hospital lists proposed uses that includes guest beds (“dormitory-style inn for patients and their families”): a proposed new Providence Inn was slated for construction on 18th Ave with 40 rooms “to be used for patients and their families only” (p. 14).

The 2016 Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP allows for a maximum build out of nearly 3 million square feet, which includes planned space needs for: Hospital, Clinical/Research, Education, Hotel, Long-Term Care/Assisted Living/Skilled Nursing, and Other Campus Support: there is no question that a hotel has always been envisioned for Swedish Cherry Hill. But by including a hotel in the expanded Swedish Cherry Hill square footage, it is designed to serve the needs and mission of Swedish, and, like the 1994 MIMP, the 2016 MIMP ordinance does not envision a use other than Swedish patient care.

In reference to a hotel in the MIMP, the [Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP](#) refers to the hotel exclusively as the “hotel” or the “*Patient Family Hotel*” (p. 56). Nowhere in the MIMP is there a reference to hotel guests that are not patients or patients’ families: the MIMP solely describes a hotel for patient benefit, specifically related to anticipated increase in patients (‘inpatient bed growth’).

The purpose and size of the hotel and its guests are clearly described on page 139, the section on *Hotel Rooms*: “**The hotel forecast is primarily influenced by inpatient bed growth since the majority of the users are family members of inpatients. Some beds are used for early arriving inpatients and for outpatients coming from out of town for treatment.**” The majority of guests were planned to be patient families – the only other guests described were pre- or post- care patients themselves, not visitors to a boutique hotel in the Squire Park neighborhood.

Also, the MIMP sections on neighborhood amenities or benefits does not contain any references to the hotel as an amenity for the neighborhood to benefit from. The justification for a hotel in the MIMP is exclusively based on Swedish’s mission to provide excellent care for its patients – and the forecasted expansion of hospital beds.

Appendix G: Volume and Space Projections

The projected volume and space needs supports the Cherry Hill campus role within the Swedish Health Care system by providing patient care and research in Cardiac & Vascular, Neuroscience and other specialties.

Requirements by type of space are as follows: Hospital, Clinical/Research, Education, Hotel, LTC/Assisted Living/Skilled Nursing, Other Campus Support.

In projecting future needs, it is important to understand the major factors that influence future demand for health services.

On p. 131, **Appendix G: Volume and space projections**, a hotel is listed as a **space need** in response to an assessment of demographics, health care delivery changes, etc. The MIMP includes forecasting methods that include average length of hospital stay and ‘bed need’ (p. 136) to justify an increased need for hotel beds - i.e. increases in inpatient bed use will increase need by families to stay nearby.

(p. 134) Forecast Methodology:

The development and growth of current specialty programs will continue on the Cherry Hill Campus and contribute to future space and facility needs along with building and infrastructure replacement that have outlived their useful lives and are functionally obsolete.

Projections of needs are aligned with major categories of programs present on the Cherry Hill campus that require different types facilities, namely (the six types identified above).

On p. 139, under the heading **Space Needs - Hotel Rooms**, the MIMP describes the projected users of the hotel, which seems to be based on the Inn at Cherry Hill (rooms set aside within the hospital for patients’

families), which was in operation during the period when the MIMP was created but apparently closed in the last year or so. Nowhere does the MIMP here include the possibility of non-patient related ('general public') uses of the hotel:

*The Inn at Cherry Hill provides 'hotel' rooms for the **convenience of inpatients and their families**. The Inn offers family members comfortable and **reasonably priced** accommodations on the Cherry Hill campus so they can be close by to their loved ones while they are treated at the Medical Center. It is also **used by patients arriving early** for their inpatient stay, as some procedures and admits occur in the early morning. The accommodations, repurposed from former patient rooms, lack the types of space one would expect in a typical hotel. There are currently 29 beds available in mostly semiprivate rooms.*

*The **hotel forecast is primarily influenced by inpatient bed growth** since **the majority of the users are family members of inpatients**. Some beds are used for early arriving inpatients and for outpatients coming from out of town for treatment.*

On page 139, (**Inpatient Bed Growth**) the MIMP anticipates the demand for hotel space this way: "Family members are more likely to choose to be nearby their loved ones for their intensive and shorter hospital stays, so it stands to reason that demand for hotel/Inn beds in will increase along with inpatient bed growth." In projecting Hotel Room use on page 140, there is an assumption that at approximately 10% of hotel rooms would be used for outpatients – patients arriving early or patients receiving treatment who live out of town. There is no forecast for non-patient-related demand for hotel rooms, because "The hotel bed projections understandably follow the same general increases as the inpatient bed projections."

In the following section on **Space Needs** (p. 140), "The space benchmark for a modest hotel, as envisioned for the Cherry Hill Campus, is 1,000 Building Gross Square Feet (BGSF) per bed". Note that what is envisioned for this project is a "modest" hotel – not a "boutique" hotel.

Finally, according to the projected project timeline, the hotel was planned to be Phase E – the final phase of construction for this 20 year plan. While none of the timelines are binding and clearly subject to change, it may provide context for the intent and purpose of this hotel. It bears noting that the projected hotel bed demand seems to assume a current level of use, as the Inn at Cherry Hill was providing, because hotel bed demand begins with 29 beds in 2012, rises to 51 beds in 2023, up to 72 beds in 2040 (note that the final MIMP reduced the total allowed hotel beds by 24 from Swedish's projections.) It is very possible the level of projected demand for hotel beds was anticipated to grow as the other construction projects added more patient care – thus more need for more space for them and their caregivers – and that the Inn at Cherry Hill was intended to provide for the more limited demand in the meanwhile. If this hotel were built closer to the end of this 20 year, it's quite possible that there would be no need at all to consider non-patient related guests, because patients and their families would fulfill all the demand that Swedish projected – when it planned this hotel to be built last.

To assess intent for the hotel that may not be captured in the MIMP itself, there are references to a proposed hotel in documents related to the creation of the MIMP (Swedish Medical Center Cherry Hill Campus – MIMP Citizens Advisory Committee Final Report and Recommendations – May 28, 2015): the CAC did discuss the proposed hotel. On p. 50, the report indicates that "Swedish says (the Inn) would serve not only Cherry Hill but also its First Hill and Ballard campuses" – there is no mention of non-hospital related guests. In submitted public comments cited on p. 527, it is described as "Hotel that serves First Hill and Ballard". On p. 203 of the CAC's *Final Report and Recommendations*, Swedish employee Mr. Cosentino described the future hotel plans by describing the anticipated growth in guest rooms (24 to approximately 84 rooms by 2040) in the West Tower, saying "These rooms will be restricted to only patients and families and not for the public."

FINDINGS re MIMP: The Swedish Cherry Hill Master Plan ordinance and the process leading up to the final plan clearly includes a hotel – but one that is quite unlike the proposed hotel use presented to the SAC over the past six months. This project is incompatible with the MIMP’s explicit and implicit mission to serve patients and their families with excellent health care and supports, and it does not reflect the expectations by the CAC and surrounding neighborhood that it would serve only patients and their families. This expectation is reflected in SDCI’s original direction to the applicant in 2016 to demonstrate **“how this hotel will be available for patients and families only, and not the general public”**.

Given that the MIMP specifically allows a hotel, the SAC believes there are opportunities for the developer to revise its plans and work in collaboration with the City and the SAC to develop a hotel project that meets the intent and purpose of the hotel described in the Swedish Cherry Hill MIMP.

MIMP DESIGN GUIDELINES

Below are the SAC’s comments and recommendations based on our design review of the proposed hotel.

1.1.2 General Guidelines

The hotel design team presented a project with the goal of addressing the streetscape, mitigating the blank façades, acknowledging the character of the campus and surrounding neighborhood and softening the building edges on a highly visible street corner through landscape design.

1.1.3 Street Frontage Edge

The first-floor awning at the outdoor seating area provides a nice functional outdoor space along the street front and serves to break up the street level façade. The use of low-level lighting is appreciated as it will limit the light impacts on neighboring properties. We encourage the project team to include benches at the street frontage, either in the Right-of-Way or between the property line and the building.

1.1.4 Connection to the Street

The proposed pathway between the street and building adjacent to the building entrance on 16th Ave provides a clear and accessible physical connection between the street and building. The street level windows provide a visual connection between the street and building interior.

1.1.5 Public Entrances

The way the building is situated on a hill lends itself to a single primary entrance. The service entrance on Jefferson is appropriately downplayed and differentiated. The committee recommends a color or material transition at the sidewalk to alert pedestrians to the vehicle crossing (as allowed by SDOT). The right turn only sign, roll-gate, and appropriate alert signals (during daylight hours only) for the garage entry are important and should be maintained.

1.1.6 Streetscape and Pedestrian Pathways

The committee recommends benches or other seating located along E Jefferson either in the planting strip or between the sidewalk and the site wall (with the acknowledgement that seating design should not encourage loitering). Benches are particularly important as the hotel may include medical patients in a fragile medical state.

The committee recommends bike parking rack(s) in the right-of-way for general public use if allowed as part of the Street Improvement Plan.

The project does not include aspects of the Health Walk described in the MIMP as bordering the MIO.

1.1.7 Sidewalks

The committee does not feel that sidewalk overhead weather protection is required or appropriate at this location. The low-level landscape lighting as proposed should minimize light impact on neighboring properties and should be maintained.

1.1.8 Parking and Vehicle Access

See 1.1.5 for comments about vehicles crossing the sidewalk. Although the >>> meeting minutes show an SDOT request for parking access from 16th the project proposes a garage entrance on Jefferson. The committee recommends that the Master Use Permit approval include a condition that exiting from the parking garage be right-turn-only, as proposed by the hotel design team. The hotel's parking garage must be included in the campus-wide dock management plan required by the MIMP as it includes service vehicles as well as guest parking.

The committee is concerned that the limited amount of parking provided in the building is not sufficient for the number of anticipated guests. We strongly encourage overflow parking be provided in Swedish parking lots given the limited garage capacity of the hotel.

1.2 EXTERIOR SPACES

1.2.1 Statement of Intent

See comments below.

1.2.2 General Guidelines

See comments below.

1.2.3 Pedestrian Amenity

The walkway across the planting strip is appropriately sized and creates a pleasant pedestrian pathway. The committee recommends public benches be provided either in the right-of-way or between the sidewalk and the building. The large awnings over the patio along with the large amount of glazing at the first floor create a transparent and interactive experience at the pedestrian level. The committee believes the subtle, small scale hotel signage is appropriate for the residential neighborhood and should be maintained.

1.2.4 Screening guidelines

The proposed plantings between the sidewalk and the building has a residential scale that the committee feels is appropriate at the border of the MIO. Raising the outdoor seating area above the adjacent sidewalk mitigates the need for additional screening elements. Patio railing provides secondary screening. The committee is concerned that the planted screens at the concrete plinth will need special attention to grow properly and remain visually attractive.

1.2.5 Lighting, Safety and Security

The landscape design and first-floor transparency provide clean lines of sight that allow visual security at the building perimeter. The committee is concerned about safety at the west and north sides of the building and recommends the design team to continue working with Swedish/Sabey to ensure these areas are secure. The committee recommends that SDCI evaluate the final proposal for compliance with the guideline requiring buildings be equipped with interior lighting with automatic shut-off times and that automatic shades are installed where lighting is required for emergency egress. This is particularly relevant at the first floor adjacent to East Jefferson Street as it faces a residential neighborhood.

Consolidated entry points for the building contributed to safety and security.

1.2.6 Artwork

The committee encourages the design team to identify additional opportunities for exterior artwork. While the hotel logo is artful, the committee recommends the design team investigate resources for artwork that reflects the cultural history of the neighborhood. One possible resource is the Central District Forum for Arts and Ideas and Wa Na Wari.

B1.3 LANDSCAPE

B1.3.1 Statement of Intent

See comments below.

B1.3.2 General Guidelines

The committee is concerned about the viability of the green screen against a concrete wall but feels it can be successful if properly maintained.

B1.3.3 Planting Guidelines

The plant selection reflects a residential neighborhood garden that the committee feels is appropriate for the building's location at the perimeter of the MIO.

Street trees along E Jefferson street should be maintained or increased to provide a transition to the neighbor and screen noise and light.

B2.0 ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

B2.1 Height, Bulk and Scale

B2.1.1 Statement of Intent

See comments below.

B2.1.2 General Guidelines

The stepped building minimized the bulk of the building.

B2.1.3 Architectural and Façade Composition Guidelines

The committee is concerned about the blank facades on the north and west sides of the building and does not feel the design meets MIMP guidelines for addressing large blank walls. This is a particular concern given the uncertainty regarding future buildings at the north and west. The "framed" composition at the north and west mitigates the large blank façade. However, the committee is concerned about the effect of weather on the west façade particularly if the façade composition relies primarily on painted materials. The committee recommends additional depth and articulation provided by projecting elements if the building is not located directly on the property line.

B2.1.4 Secondary Architectural Feature Guidelines

The entry canopy serves the dual purpose of providing cover at the entry while also adding depth to the façade. The stepping of the upper levels away from the street and wrapping the weathered steel type material successfully modulates the east and south facades. The project represents a "base", "middle" and "top" as directed by the design guidelines.

The design does not demonstrate an architectural style that reflects the neighborhood buildings.

B2.2 ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS AND FEATURES

B2.2.1 Statement of Intent

The design team has intentionally employed materials (weathered steel referencing brick, etc.) that reference the existing campus but are not the same materials as used on the existing campus buildings. They have also referenced the façade divisions of some existing campus buildings by framing building windows through material variation. The building begins to establish a new cohesive look for the campus through the selection color tones to echo the existing / historical buildings.

B2.2.2 Color and Material Guidelines

The committee supports the use of composite material in place of real wood panels for long term attractiveness and resistance to weathering, but recommends a warmer "wood" tone in place of the Ash color. The committee also encourages the designers to provide additional texture for the composite boards to reflect the neighborhood character and minimize the flatness of large panels. This can also be achieved through breaking panels into smaller segments. The committee is concerned about the durability and quality of product installation for the long term aesthetics of the building in the context of the neighborhood and campus.

The material that mimics weathered steel references the brick found on the campus and in the neighborhood, and its location on the first 3 floors is appropriate to the residential scale. The

material provides visual depth that the committee would like to see extended to the other materials.

B2.3 ROOFTOPS

B2.3.1 Statement of Intent

It is unclear if the rooftop decks will be publicly accessible or limited to hotel guests only. The committee recommends that if the rooftop garden is publicly accessible restricted hours noise levels as appropriate for a residential neighborhood should be enforced.

B2.3.2 Rooftop Design Guidelines

The division of the rooftop deck into smaller, intimate spaces will discourage noise from large gatherings while creating unique experiences at each space. The committee appreciates the low downlighting to minimize light pollution and impacts to neighboring properties.

Summary Recommendation:

To summarize, the committee feels the applicant has designed an attractive building that successfully meets many of the design guidelines.

We encourage the designers and SDCI to work together in addressing the committees concerns as outlined above.

Swedish Cherry Hill SAC Members include:

Justin Kliewer
Claire Lane
Catherine Koehn
Greg Swinton
Amanda Twiss
Lisa Fitzhugh

If you have any questions, please contact Nelson Pesigan at (206) 684-0209.

For the Committee,

Nelson Pesigan
Department of Neighborhoods
Major Institutions and Schools Coordinator