

SECTION II COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT THE FINAL MASTER PLAN

After reviewing the plan, the CAC determined that the Virginia Mason Medical Center Major Institution Master Plan as contained in its submittal dated December 13, 2012, should be adopted generally as proposed in that document. This is significant. The CAC wishes to recognize Virginia Mason Medical Center's cooperation during the review of its plan. The CAC initially had many concerns related to the height, bulk, and scale of development, phasing and potential design quality of future buildings. Virginia Mason Medical Center staff and consultants consulted and cooperated with the CAC and surrounding community both at the various CAC meetings and in a design charrette and follow-up working meetings. Almost all CAC recommendations and comments were addressed and the plan is in large part the product of this collaborative and highly productive partnership.

Most of the provisions of the Plan as currently proposed are accepted by the CAC. These include:

- 1) MIO Boundaries;
- 2) Total FAR and square footage of development;
- 3) Most bulk and density standards;
- 4) Building demolitions;
- 5) General location of proposed new buildings;
- 6) Pedestrian access and circulation;
- 7) Parking quantity, location and access; and
- 8) Design guidelines.

It should be noted that despite a strong collaborative effort among the CAC, VM, DPD, and community members, the resulting MIMP represents a consensus choice of what would have the least negative effect upon the surrounding community, given VM's stated need for 3 million square feet at full build out. The Major Institution's Code disallows the CAC's recommending lesser total square footage of development, and therefore the CAC was choosing among alternative arrangements of the same bulk and scale.

The CAC therefore recommends:

Recommendation 1 - That the Final Major Institutions Master Plan for Virginia Mason Medical Center should be adopted by the City of Seattle.

There are areas where the CAC is forwarding further recommendations both to the Hearing Examiner and City Council as well as to help guide the deliberations of future Standing Advisory Committees. Among the most important of these are: 1) the need for robust neighborhood participation in review of implementation of the plan; 2) retention of a mixed

use retail and residential environment along Madison Street, Boren Avenue and Terry Avenue; 3) the need to have consistent setbacks and other features to soften the edges of the campus; and 4) assurances that housing lost to new development will be comparable and located in the First Hill Neighborhood.

FORMATION OF A STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND REVIEW OF THE PLAN ELEMENT

Under the provisions of the Major Institutions Code the Citizen's Advisory Committee continues as a Standing Advisory Committee (SAC). The role of the SAC is to: 1) Review an annual status report from the institution detailing the progress the institution has made in achieving the goals and objectives of the master plan; 2) review any proposed minor or major amendment and submit comments on whether it should be considered minor or major, and what conditions (if any) should be imposed if it is minor; and 3) review and comment on any development under the plan that involves a discretionary decision and has a formal comment period as part of the MUP process.

Recommendation 1 in the Director's Report states:

The Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) will review and comment during the schematic and design stage of all proposed and potential projects intended for submission of applications to the City as follows: Any proposal for a new structure greater than 4,000 square feet or building addition greater than 4,000 square feet; proposed alley vacation petition; and, proposed street use term permits for skybridges. Design and schematics shall include future mechanical rooftop screening. The Standing Advisory Committee will use the Design Guidelines in making this review. 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.

The CAC concluded that greater emphasis needs to be given to SAC involvement in all elements of the future implementation of the plan. Given the general nature of the Major Institution Code, development standards requirements, the role of review of individual building designs, streetscapes, wayfinding and other elements of future development review has become much more important. The current plan received near consensus support from the CAC only after its detailed involvement in the development of Design Guidelines for future building review. Without an ongoing strong commitment to continuing this collaborative process there is little guarantee that consensus will continue. Therefore the CAC recommends the following:

Recommendation 2 – That Virginia Mason Medical Center shall be required to create and maintain a Standing Advisory Committee to participate in the review and development of all plans and programs growing out of the Virginia Mason Major Institutions Master Plan. All Standing Advisory Committee meetings dealing with review of any element of the plan shall be open to the public, advertised in a similar manner to the Citizens Advisory Committee and

include a period for public comment. (Steve to put in information on what the nature of the outreach is per DON processes.)

In order to bring the recommendations of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development into agreement with the CAC's recommendation we suggest the following minor changes to that report:

The Recommendation 1 page 89 be changed as follows:

Virginia Mason Medical Center shall create and maintain a Standing Advisory Committee to ~~The Standing Advisory Committee (SAC)~~ will review and comment during: 1) the schematic and design stage of all proposed and potential projects including both new structures and building additions, intended for submission of applications to the City as follows: ~~Any proposal for a new structure greater than 4,000 square feet or building addition greater than 4,000 square feet;~~ 2) proposed alley vacation petitions; 3) an open space plan for the Lindeman block, 4) proposed street use term permits for skybridges; 5) a street design concept plans for Madison Street; 6) a comprehensive wayfinding plan; and 7) construction management and communication plans. Design and schematics shall include future mechanical rooftop screening. The Standing Advisory Committee (SAC) will use the Design Guidelines checklist for evaluation of all planned and potential projects outlined in the Master Plan.

In order to assure that this is reflected in later portion of the DPD Director's report the following items in that report should be amended as follows:

Recommendation 2 on page 89 of the Draft Director's Report:

Prior to Master Use Permit submittal of the Madison block redevelopment submit to SDOT for review and acceptance a concept streetscape design plan for the north side of Madison Street between Boren and Terry Avenues. Virginia Mason shall submit a draft of the Plan to the Standing Advisory Committee for its review and comment concurrent with its review by SDOT.

The plan shall be prepared consistent with the provisions of the Seattle Right-of-Way Improvements Manual. Elements of the plan must include, but are not limited to: a minimum 18 foot wide sidewalk; street trees and landscaping; continuous façade mounted overhead weather protection; seating and leaning rails; pedestrian scaled lighting; transit patron amenities, such as real-time bus arrival displays; and way-finding directing pedestrians to campus uses and other transit options such as the First Hill Street Car.

Recommendation 3 on page 89 of the Draft Director's Report:

Prior to approval of the first Master Use Permit for development under the final MIMP. Submit to DPD for review and approval a comprehensive wayfinding plan incorporating entry points to and through the campus for pedestrians, bicyclist and motorist. DPD shall consult with SDOT in its review. Virginia Mason shall submit a draft of the Plan to the Standing Advisory Committee for its review and comment concurrent with its review by SDOT.

Construction planning page 92 of the Draft Director's Report:

~~The need for a~~ A Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be ~~identified~~ provided with each development proposal. The CMP would be coordinated with the DPD Noise Abatement Office (DPD), SDOT and VMMC. The Construction Management Plan shall be included in any information provided to the SAC for any new structure greater than 4000 square feet of building additions greater than 4000 square feet. The following elements shall be included in the CMP if applicable.

The plan would include the following elements:

a) Construction Communication Plan – Prior to the initiation of the first major project under the Plan, Virginia Mason, in close coordination with the Standing Advisory Committee, shall develop an overall construction communication plan. The plan shall include a Contact person and Community Liaison. The Chair of the Standing Advisory Committee will also be included in the Construction Communication Plan associated with site-specific development along with the Contact person and Community Liaison.

Pedestrian Safety – Page 62 – The statement contains a section that is unclear. The CAC is committed to seeing all pedestrian facilities brought to City Standards and recommends the following amendment to this statement and that the latter section be considered as a condition.

Section 3.9, Transportation, Circulation and Parking of this Final EIS discusses pedestrian safety and notes that the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic could result in increased potential for conflicts at road crossings and even midblock locations. No mitigation is identified. To improve connections for pedestrians, Virginia Mason is proposing to strengthen existing pedestrian connections at street level through the campus. Whenever As individual blocks or frontages are developed along any of the streets within the MIO, and pedestrian facilities (sidewalk plus planting strips) that do not meet established city standards that exist at the time of redevelopment, Virginia Mason shall bring such facilities to the City Standard that exists at the time of approval of any MUP.

The CAC also noted that there is no longer an expiration date for the Master Plan and that the plan will continue in effect until its development authority is exhausted or Virginia Mason Medical Center determines that they need further changes to the development standards or other restrictions incorporated into the plan. The CAC was concerned that there is some effective review of this and therefore recommended that there be a check-in and mini-review of the plan at a future date. The CAC concluded that such a review should be conducted every five years and therefore makes the following recommendation:

<p>Recommendation 3 – That five years after adoption of the Master Plan and every 5 years thereafter, Virginia Mason in cooperation with its SAC shall hold a public meeting to review its annual report and other information intended to illustrate the status of plan implementation. The meeting shall be widely advertised to the surrounding community and involve opportunity for public comment.</p>

Advertisement of this meeting shall either conform to the procedure of the current procedures of the Department of Neighborhoods as listed below, or be done in a manner negotiated between the City, SAC Chair and Virginia Mason.

The current City procedure includes -

- a) Mailing to all property owners and residents within 600 feet of the MIMP boundary;
- b) Publication in the City Land Use Bulletin;
- c) E-mail notification to all those who have attended any meeting concerning this issue within the last five years;
- d) E-mail notification to the presidents or designated representatives of all Community Councils, Chambers of Commerce or other known neighborhood based organizations on the Department of Neighborhoods Community Contacts lists for the First Hill Communities; and
- e) Posting on the Department of Neighborhoods and Virginia Mason's web-sites.

MIO BOUNDARIES

From the point of view of the Citizen's Advisory Committee, one of the key elements of the MIO is the identification of boundaries beyond which the institution shall not expand. The establishment of this boundary is intended to give the surrounding neighbors and business owners a degree of certainty that the institution will not expand to force out other neighborhood business and residential uses. Therefore the CAC was initially very reluctant to accept boundary expansions.

A significant boundary expansion is proposed by Virginia Mason – the block bounded by Spring Street, Madison Street; Terry Avenue and Boren Ave (the 1000 Madison Block).

This boundary expansion initially generated controversy within the CAC. Expansion of Virginia Mason to include the commercial pedestrian zone along Madison was seen as potentially eliminating an important amenity in the neighborhood. Virginia Mason and the CAC evaluated alternatives with and without this boundary expansion. Review of these two alternatives showed that Virginia Mason needed this space to allow a logical and systematic replacement of its aging central Hospital and that it would allow significant reductions in height and bulk across the campus. Ultimately the CAC voted to support the amended boundary expansion. This vote was difficult for some members and not without some reservations. The CAC's decision to support this expansion was taken on condition that: 1) the height limit conditioning 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, Boren and Terry be compatible with the mixed-use residential character of Madison .

<p>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</p>
--

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.

HEIGHTS

Virginia Mason has proposed a uniform height limit of MIO240 which is the highest allowable height limit in the code. However, after discussions related to the expansion of the boundaries, Virginia Mason agreed to condition various blocks down to heights shown on Figure 20, page 47 of the Final Plan. The CAC concurs with this approach.

However, Seattle Municipal Code Section 23.69.035 E states:

Major Amendments. A proposed change to an adopted master plan shall be considered a major amendment when it is not an exempt change according to subsection B of this section or a minor amendment according to subsection D of this section. In addition, any of the following shall be considered a major amendment:

- 1) An increase in a height designation or the expansion of the boundary of the MIO District; or

This normally refers to the MIO height designation. Some have expressed uncertainty whether a change to conditioned heights could be considered a minor amendment as long as the proposed change was not modifying the MIO Zone designation itself. The CAC's position is that the conditioned heights are the applicable height designation and should be subject to the code provisions cited above. Therefore, in order to indicate the importance of the conditioned heights, and solidify the CAC's intent, the CAC recommends that the following be included as a clarifying condition to the Virginia Mason Master Plan.

Recommendation 5 – For the life of the Master Plan, any change to the conditioned heights within the MIO 240 Zones as shown on Figure 20, page 47 of the Final Plan shall be considered an increase in a height designation per SMC 23.69.035 E1 and shall constitute a major amendment to the Virginia Mason Master Plan.

SETBACKS

Virginia Mason is proposing setbacks that generally meet or exceed underlying zoning setbacks. In addition, Virginia Mason is proposing increased setbacks generally above 45 feet in height. The CAC supports this system and most of the proposed setbacks for specific sites. However, the CAC recommends one significant change related to the Ninth Avenue Parking Garage Block shown on Figure 14 and Table 8 on page 40 of the Final Master Plan and page 45 of the Draft Director's Report that states that the most sensitive campus boundaries are located at the southwest corner of the campus (9th Avenue Garage) and at the northeast corner (University/Terry Parking lot and Cassel Crag/Blackford Hall), and notes that the existing 9th Avenue Garage located at the northwest corner of 9th Avenue and Spring Street has been identified as a Planned Project. The CAC strongly agrees that this is a very sensitive boundary. The CAC received testimony from residents in the adjacent buildings that development on this site could severely impact the views and light. The CAC agreed and for that reason previously recommended that the treatment of the West Boundary of the MIO overlay receive special attention and that both the ground and upper-level setbacks along the west façade of any building constructed on the site of the 9th

Avenue Garage treat the Alley to the west similarly to a street for the purpose of determining appropriate setbacks.

The CAC continues to recommend that the MIMP be amended in this manner and specifically recommends that the Draft Director's Report be amended to include the following:

Recommendation 6 - Table 8 on 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 feet at ground level and 12 feet above 45 feet on both sides shall be required.

HOUSING REPLACEMENT

The CAC is committed to seeing the housing stock of First Hill preserved and to that end strongly recommends that all housing replaced as a result of the loss of the Chasselton, be located on First Hill. The CAC therefore recommends:

Recommendation 7 - That all housing replaced in exchange for the loss of any existing housing within the Virginia Mason MIO be located within the Greater First Hill Neighborhood defined as the area shown on Figure 1 page 4 of the MIMP and defined as the area between I-5 on the West, Pike Street on the North, 12th Avenue and Boren on the East and the south boundary of Yesler Terrace on the South

The Director of DPD suggested wording for a condition related to this provision. In order to bring these conditions into compliance with Recommendation 7, above, the following changes should be made:

❶ Before VMMC may receive a permit to demolish the Chasselton or change the use of the Chasselton to a non-residential major institution use, DPD must find that VMMC has performed either of the following two options:

Option 1. VMMC has submitted or caused to be submitted a building permit application or applications for the construction of comparable housing to replace the housing in the Chasselton. The building permit application(s) for the replacement housing project(s) may not include projects that were the subject of a MUP application submitted to DPD prior to Council approval of this MIMP. Minor involvement by VMMC in the housing project, such as merely adding VMMC's name to a permit application for a housing project, does not satisfy VMMC's obligation under this option. All such replacement housing shall be located within the greater First Hill Neighborhood (the area shown on Figure 1 page 4 of the MIMP and defines as the area between I-5 on the west, Pike Street on the north, 12th Avenue on the east and the south boundary of Yesler Terrace on the south.

Option 2. VMMC elects either: 1) within two years of MIMP approval, to pay the City of Seattle \$4,460,000 to help fund the construction of comparable replacement housing; or 2) after two years after final MIMP approval, to pay the City of Seattle 35% of the estimated cost of constructing the comparable replacement housing, as determined by DPD and the Office of Housing based on at least two development pro-formas, prepared by individual(s) with demonstrated expertise in real estate financing or development. DPD and the Office of

Housing's determination of the estimated cost are final and not subject to appeal. Money paid to the City under this Option 2 shall be used to finance the construction of comparable replacement housing and subject to the provisions of the City's Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development and the City's Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan in existence at the time the City helps finance the replacement housing.

For purposes of the performance **Option 1** above, the replacement housing must meet the following requirements:

Provide a minimum number of units equal to the number of units in the Chasselton Court apartments (62 units);

Provide no fewer than the number of one-bedroom units (7 units) as those in the Chasselton Court apartments and no units smaller than a studio (55 units) as those in the Chasselton Court apartments;

Contain no less than the square feet of units (31,868 net rentable square feet) in the Chasselton Court apartments;

The general quality of construction shall be equal or greater quality than the units in the Chasselton Court apartments; and

The replacement housing will be located within the First Hill neighborhood.

If VMMC chooses the performance **Option 2**, it is encouraged to: 1) contribute to the housing replacement project in a manner that will assure that at least 10% of the units (i.e., a number equal to 10% of the demolished units, for a total of 7 units) will be rented at rates affordable to persons earning less than 80% of the median area income for at least 10 years; and 2) utilize a design that allows the project to compete effectively for public and private affordable housing grants and loans. This design provision is not intended to discourage creative solutions such as siting affordable units in high-rise buildings otherwise containing market rate housing. VMMC may not receive credit in fulfillment of the housing replacement requirement for any portion of the housing replacement cost that is financed by City funds, with the exception that any City funds spent, in excess of construction costs, to provide affordability in what would otherwise be market-rate replacement units (i.e., to "buy down" rents in the completed building) shall not disqualify units as replacement housing under this condition.)

If VMMC chooses performance **Option 2**, the Office of Housing shall devote all funds provided by VMMC to a project or projects within the greater First Hill Neighborhood (the area shown on Figure 1 page 4 of the MIMP and defines as the area between I-5 on the west, Pike Street on the north, 12th Avenue on the east and the south boundary of Yesler Terrace on the south.

Although there was not 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 offered that 10% or 7 units shall 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

exists 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 advocate 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 10% goal identified above it also recommends that a higher voluntary goal be established. The CAC therefore recommends:

Recommendation 8 - That a higher voluntary goal, of 25% or 15 units of all housing constructed as replacement for housing lost be affordable to those making less than 80% of the median area income, be established.

Recommendation 9 - Virginia Mason and/or the City Office of Housing shall provide all proposals for housing considered as replacement for housing lost as a result of any demolition related to Virginia Mason Construction for review and comment by the Standing Advisory Committee.

A minority report will be issued concerning the affordability issue.

TREATMENT OF FAÇADES

One of the key elements in this plan is the use of the Design Guidelines (Appendix E) in the review of campus development. Careful review of individual building designs and streetscapes will be the crucial determining factor in determining whether the plan succeeds in balancing the needs of the institution against maintaining the health and vitality of the surrounding neighborhood.

As noted earlier, the unique nature of this high-rise neighborhood creates a different relationship between nearby residents and the institution. The views of upper level façades are of great importance to residents in surrounding high-rise buildings. Building modulation and window patterns that are perceived from a distance or from apartment windows can add interest to large building complexes. This concept needs to be reinforced within the plan.

Recommendation 10 – That in order to reinforce the importance of careful review of upper-level façades, the following changes be made in the text of both the Master Plan and Design Guidelines:

Master Plan Page 8 and Design Guidelines Page 46 – Goals and Objectives:

Design buildings, including rooftops, upper level and street level façades, with consideration of how they will appear to viewers from surrounding residential buildings, nonmotorized travelers at street level and motorized travelers.

Design Guidelines Page 33 – Boren Avenue, last paragraph:

Streetscape and landscape character: enhance the street landscaping and ground and upper floor building façade of the Jones Pavilion to improve the ~~pedestrian~~ experience of both pedestrians and nearby residents.

Design Guidelines page 74 -

- Consider the building from multiple vantage points:
 - Multiple Views
 - Roofscape
 - Views into the Building
 - Views of Upper Level Façades

Many CAC members point to the monolithic façades of the Jones Pavilion as an example of inappropriate treatment in the context of this neighborhood. The CAC hopes that some retrofitting of this building's façades can be developed so that it can be brought more closely into compliance with the design guidelines.

RETENTION OF RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

The CAC is dedicated to the retention of a strong retail presence along Madison and other retail edges of the Virginia Mason Campus. The Director of DPD has recommended conditions related to future use in these areas. The CAC concurs with these recommended conditions, but is concerned over the loss of the existing businesses. For that reason, the CAC recommends that:

Recommendation 11 – Virginia Mason shall endeavor to support the retention of existing retail businesses located within their MIO boundaries including assistance finding alternative relocation spaces and notification of the availability of retail space upon completion of projects including such.

In order to bring the Conditions recommended by DPD into compliance with this recommendation the CAC recommends the following addition to page 59 of the Draft Report of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development:

- ① The underlying street-level development standards for commercial zones shall apply per SMC 23.47A.008 to all street facing façades in the underlying NC-160 Pedestrian designated zones; including Madison Street, and portions of Boren and Terry Avenues.
- ② On page 50 of the Final MIMP, second paragraph under Street-Level Uses and Façades in NC zones, second paragraph- the last sentence shall be amended as follows:

If the proposed expansion to include the 1000 Madison block is approved, Virginia Mason intends to consider any of the following uses for potential location at street level along Madison Street and the portions of Boren and Terry Avenues within the NC zoning and would be in compliance with the underlying zoning: medical services such as optical, eating and drinking establishments, retail sales and services, indoor sports and recreation, or perhaps lodging uses or additional open space.

- ③ In the event that development occurs along Madison, all existing businesses anticipated to face termination of leases and relocation shall: 1) be given six months prior notice of termination of tenancy; 2) be provided assistance from both the City Office of Economic Development and Virginia Mason Medical Center to identify available spaces in the surrounding areas for permanent or interim relocation; and 3) receive advanced notice of the availability of lease space in the completed development.

This recommendation is not intended to require either monetary assistance with relocation or a first right of refusal for lease of space made available upon completion of development by Virginia Mason.

The CAC is also committed to maintain a viable retail community in the time between adoption of the plan and demolition for construction of new structures. The CAC previously recommended this to Virginia Mason. Virginia Mason responded that while it is in Virginia Mason's and the neighborhood's best interest to retain the existing structures for their functionality and revenue producing potential, this use needs to be balanced against the cost to maintain the buildings and the timing of the development plans. The CAC believes that Virginia Mason should be required to maintain its current building in usable safe and habitable condition until such time as demolition occurs and therefore recommends:

Recommendation 12 – That the Final Master Plan be conditioned to require that Virginia Mason retain existing retail street front business spaces for lease until such time as the building(s) this space located in is demolished for new construction.

PHASING OF DEVELOPMENT AND INTERIM USES

Virginia Mason repeatedly stated to the CAC that it intended that all parking on campus be accommodated in underground lots or within the proposed new buildings. The CAC is committed to seeing this occur. The CAC recommends that this commitment be made formal and that no new surface parking be allowed on any site within the MIO not already devoted to such. For that reason, the CAC recommends:

Recommendation 13 – That the Final Master Plan be conditioned to prohibit a change of use to surface parking for any lot within the present or expanded MIO that was not devoted to surface parking as of March 1, 2013, either now vacant or made vacant through issuance of a demolition permit.

The above is not intended to preclude either: 1) loading docks included in new buildings as reviewed by the SAC; or 2) temporary loading and unloading or construction equipment storage established on a temporary basis as part of the construction management plan for any ongoing construction project.

REPLACEMENT OF TREES

The CAC is committed to maintaining existing mature street trees wherever feasible, and installing additional street trees where appropriate. Statements on page 54 of the MIMP identifies an surprisingly short life span for street trees that seems to us a significant understatement of normal street tree life and might imply that less effort might be made to retaining existing mature trees when new buildings are constructed. The CAC therefore recommends that:

Recommendation 14 - Paragraph 4, Page 54 of the Final MIMP shall be amended as follows:

A requirement within both SMC 23.45.524 (HR) and SMC 23.47A.016 is the provision and retention of street trees. Virginia Mason proposes to comply with those requirements. The existing street tree canopy on Virginia Mason's campus includes a variety of trees of varying ages and in varying degrees of health. ~~The average life of a street tree in Seattle is~~

approximately 15 years, demonstrating an ongoing need for Virginia Mason to be is committed to protecting and maintaining mature street trees where possible, and replacing trees as needed over time. Virginia Mason intends to maintain the street trees that are healthy and do not pose safety hazards. The institution will replace trees when they are removed as developments require their relocation. Where rows of trees create an identifiable streetscape, that identity will be maintained where feasible.

SKYBRIDGES AND CAMPUS POROSITY

Virginia Mason is proposing seven potential skybridges and specifies their locations on Figure 29 of the Master Plan. The Plan states that there is no current plan to seek approval for specific skybridges or tunnels at this time, but applications will be made as each becomes necessary. The Plan further states that these skybridges are intended both to provide movement between buildings for internal efficiency and to increase the ability for pedestrians to move through the campus as many would be open to the public during business hours and offer an out of the weather path through the city. In other areas it is implied that this system of skybridges in an amenity that would mitigate future development.

The CAC concurs that some, or even most, of the proposed skybridges may be needed and is committed to careful consideration of all applications for such. However, the skybridges should not automatically be considered an amenity. Individual skybridges may be needed to enhance Virginia Mason operations, and some may enhance the ability for pedestrians to move through the campus, but they may also impinge on protected views. However, the CAC reserves its final conclusions on each of the proposed skybridges until such time as actual application is made and design details are known. Therefore the CAC recommends:

Recommendation 15 – That Virginia Mason shall create a porous campus that provides access through larger buildings via major corridors, pedestrian corridors, streets, and skybridges as needed. Skybridges shall only be constructed as needed for necessary hospital functioning and Virginia Mason shall endeavor to minimize both their number and visual impact on the neighborhood.

MINOR INCONSISTANCIES

The Advisory Committee notes that there are multiple typos and minor inconsistencies throughout the Plan and Design Guidelines. Most of these are not substantive and the CAC will provide a listing of them to Virginia Mason to correct when the compiled Master Plan is completed.