



City of Seattle
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Bernie Matsuno, Director

SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**SWEDISH MEDICAL CENTER
CHERRY HILL CAMPUS MAJOR
INSTITUTIONS MASTER PLAN
CITIZEN'S ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

Committee Members

Eric J. Oliner
Najwa Alsheikh, Vice-Chair
Cynthia Andrews, Chair
Laurel Spelman
Dylan Glosecki
Jamile Mack
Mark Tilbe
Joy Jacobson
Andrew Coates
Michelle Sadlier
J. Elliot Smith
Patrick Carter

Committee Alternates

Maja Hadlock
Nicholas Richter
David Letrondo

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard
Department of Neighborhoods
Stephanie Haines
*Department of Planning and
Development*
Marcia Peterson
*Swedish Medical Center
Management*
Cristina Van Valkenburgh
*Seattle Department of
Transportation*

Meeting Notes

Meeting #3

January 31, 2013

Swedish Medical Center
Swedish Education & Conference Center
550 17th Avenue
First Floor - James Tower

Members and Alternates Present

Najwa Alsheikh	Jamile Mack	Andrew Coates
Elliot Smith	Laurel Spelman	David Letrondo
Mark Tilbe	Nicholas Richter	Joy Jacobson
Dylan Glosecki		

Staff and Others Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD	Marcia Peterson, SMC
Cristina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT		
<i>See sign-in sheet</i>		

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was opened by Najwa Alsheikh. Brief introductions followed.

II. Brief Process Review

Steve Sheppard was recognized to review the process. Mr. Sheppard noted that the process is lengthy and distributed a Simplified Major Institution Planning Process (attached at end of document). He noted that there would be many opportunities for both public and Committee comment before any final plan is adopted.

Swedish Medical Center has not submitted its formal application or concept plan. However they will present a Draft Concept tonight to give the Committee and neighbors a heads up. If there are no major changes the application and concept plan will be filed soon and possibly as early as tomorrow.

III. Formal Presentation of the First Draft of Swedish Medical Center – Cherry Hill Concept Plan

Editor's note: This presentation was made from a series of power point slides and was not easily summarized in written form.



Marcia Peterson, Director of Strategy for Swedish Health Services and ex-officio member of the CAC was introduced to lead off the discussion of the draft concept plan. – Ms. Peterson thanked members for their participation and noted that the presentation will include presentations by: 1). Marcel Loh, Chief Executive of our Affiliations and Suburban Hospitals, who will discuss factors affecting SMC's projections of growth and needs; and 2), David Chalmness and John Jex from Callison Architects who will present some proposals that we're going to put forward. She then turned the floor over to Marcel Loh.

Factors Affecting the Growth of the Cherry Hill Campus

Marcel Loh, stated that he wanted to discuss the rationale behind the draft concept plan. The master plan is intended to guide future development over the next 30 years or more. The objective is to develop a balanced plan that meets the needs of the Institution while being respectful to community. He noted that the Cherry Hill Campus fits within a system which includes 5 hospitals, the largest of which is First Hill Campus located 8/10 of a mile east of here. That facility is the center of our cancer care, subspecialty surgical programs, transplants, orthopedics and woman and children's services. Cherry Hill focuses on heart and neurosurgical procedures. Cherry Hill and First Hill combined is considered SMC's high end specialty complex. He noted that SMC has community hospitals, in other surrounding communities. We increasingly work on a hub and spoke system where initial diagnosis and care may occur in the community hospitals with patients referred to First Hill or Cherry Hill for more complex or intensive care.

Swedish acquired the Cherry Hill campus from the Sisters of Providence in 2002. We changed its purpose from a general acute care mid surge hospital to a specialty campus that provides high- end tertiary quaternary services focused on neurosciences, cardiovascular services, rehab, sleep, and behavioral health. Shortly thereafter SMC entered into a partnership with the Sabey Corporation. Under that partnership SMC sold part of the campus to the Sabey Corporation. About 40 percent of the campus is now owned by the Sabey Corporation.

Mr. Loh noted that The Cherry Hill facilities also provide public amenities to the neighborhood and community including the cafeteria a couple of Starbucks on the campus, and the Inn at Cherry Hill which provides an opportunity for patients and family members to stay to loved ones, during treatment. We have many education kiosks, we have a community pharmacy that the community can fill a prescription, we have a few retail areas, we have a reflection room, and this is the main hub of transportation in this part of Seattle we have all access information about that as well.

This planning effort is underway against a background of uncertainty brought on by National Healthcare Reform. What we know is: 1) there is a focus on reducing the cost of healthcare; 2) there is a similar focus increased access. Increased access will drive some of our plans for growth. In addition both technology and standards for patient care have changed. Previously surgical suites were about 300 or 400 square feet, but with new technology operating rooms today are 900 square feet. With the increased use of robotics this may grow even more. All of this leads to a consensus that our footprint will need to grow. In addition demographics will push growth. Our population is aging and life expectancy increasing which likely increase will demand for hospital services as this older population develops more chronic diseases. SMC has looked at models based upon projections for the age and demographic of a concept for our community.

Presentation on Concept Plan Alternatives

John Jex, from Callison Architects was introduced to discuss Concept Plan Alternatives. Mr. Jex stated that the challenge is creating alternatives that can accommodate various possible future developments. All bu8idl alternatives are predicated on accommodating about 3 million square feet of total development.

Three alternatives are being considered:

- #1 – No Action Plan – maintains the existing boundary from the original Major Institution Master Plan. It keeps the current height limits as it exists today on the property. It was conclude very quickly that this doesn't offer growth opportunities for a tertiary quaternary medical center of this type.
- #2 – Concentrated Option for Future Development – This option starts with the assumption that a total of 3 million square feet of building area will be needed over the next 30 years. That is 1.8 million new square feet. . Parking to support that would go from 1,500 spaces up to 4,500 spaces. This pushes the FAR up to 5.1. This option include possible vacation 16th and 18th Avenues. There are much better connections of services across that boundary. It also allows possible creation of different open spaces.
- #3 – Dispersed Option – This alternative decompresses the balloon. It includes boundary expansions to the east north and south including the half block on the west side of 19th Avenue... As a result both over all heights and FAR can be reduced. FAR is down to 3.7. Again this option vacates 16th and 18th Avenues, has the potential for open space, separation of arrival, and zones of service separation as Alternative 2 does.

IV. Committee Questions and Comments

Members questioned the need for the street vacations and asked for clarification concerning how neighborhood circulation patterns would be maintained. Mr. Jex responded that vacation of the streets would allow greater flexibility for internal design.

Members asked for clarification on development options for the area between 18th and 19th Avenues Mr. Jex responded that one of the challenges under the concentrated option is the narrow width of the half block. Development of a medical building, doesn't allow much room for a buffer. If the boundary is expanded under the dispersed option, and if private owners sold, development might be easier and could include greater buffering. One of the issues being discussed is dispersion of parking. Currently the majority of parking is on the west side of the campus. Development on the block between 18th and 19th would allow development of some underground parking. Stephanie Haines noted that as part of the SEPA process traffic and parking would be carefully evaluated.

Steve Sheppard noted that both action alternatives include both street vacations and significant changes to the development standards. The Committee will be expected to comment on the appropriateness of both. However, the code no longer requires that the Institution design the specific buildings. Mr. Sheppard also noted that any street or alley vacation will require a separate process that includes identification of public benefit packages to compensate for loss of the right-of-way.

Mr. Sheppard noted that the code contains specific language concerning evaluation of need. The code states that you may discuss the institution's need projections, but that the need for expansion is not open to negotiation. SMC identifies how much space they believe they need. You may comment on that or even question it, but the Committee's major focus is on the appropriateness of the heights bulks scales and on developing ways to mitigate for these and other traffic-related impacts...

There was a brief discussion of how the proposed FAR at SMC compared to those in nearby major institutions. Stephaney Haines responded that the FAR for Virginia Mason is 8.5, just below 5 for Seattle Children's and about 9 at Harborview.

V. Public Questions and Comments

Comments of Able Bradshaw – Mr. Bradshaw expressed concern about the shadowing effect on her garden from option 3. She also expressed significant concerns over increased traffic.

Comments of Vickie Schiantarelli – Ms Schiantarelli stated that many of the surrounding properties have basements and some have sump pumps because there is flooding in the area. That will need to be addressed as his construction could cause further flooding. She also expressed concerns over the lack of coordination between Sabey tenants and SMC concerning compliance with Transportation management plans. She noted that under the proposed option two low-density developments restricted to a maximum of 37 feet in height would abut MIO designations allowing up to 90 foot heights. Shadowing from this would be unacceptable with properties in heavy shadow not only all winter but much of the summer, not only for the existing houses on the west side of 19th Avenue but also for the homes across the street.

The whole presentation tonight appeared to be based on identifying benefits for Swedish but in the master plan there is also a requirement to balance this against the needs of the surrounding neighborhood. Where is this in the discussion? She stated that she questioned how SMC proposes to balance between the needs of the Institution with the impact of the neighborhood. There needs to be more than three options if this is what you're presenting.

Comments of Cindy Feldon – Ms Feldon expressed concern that Sabey would buy homes in or near the boundary expansions area. She specifically asked what the consequences would be if the boundary was expanded? Would Sabey or SMC then be able to just go in and buy the property? Ms. Feldon also asked for more information on the process is for expanding the boundary, and community benefits related to street vacations.

Staff Responses - Stephanie Haines, DPD responded that expanding the boundary does not necessarily change underlying zoning and does not give the institution the ability to force owners to sell to them. By putting this overlay it doesn't affect your property as you development it and it doesn't allow or City say you have to sell the property. They are proposing the boundary through this process.

Cristina Van Valkenburgh, SPU – This process is a legislative process so it's something the Council will have to approve and the public benefit is a very consideration by the City Council examples of a public benefit it could be a substantially improved streetscape that would go above and beyond what the code required, it could be some improved public space within the campus that is truly public for the neighborhood, those are kind of examples of things that can be considered through the street vacation process. Normally the applicant would propose a package of public benefits, the City will consider those benefits, and the City may have some idea of what should be the appropriate benefit associated with the vacation so there's communication that goes back and forth and the final decision lies with the City Council.

Comments of Robert Goodwin – Mr. Goodwin noted that he was involved in the appeal of the previous proposal along 18th Avenue related to whether it was a major or minor amendment to the past plan. That proposal was attractive but was huge in comparison to what was previously envisioned such as a small a daycare center. Let's have a conversation on what kinds of different things we can do with that property. I think everyone agrees right now it's an eyesore, it's ugly to see it in its current state, it's unfortunate use of land right now but instead of talking about what we're going to do with that and having a constructive conversation about that, two fair worse things are going to happen if you don't just accept this other development. It's going to look a lot worse and that's sort of a shame.

Comments of Undisclosed Speaker – The speaker stated that both alternative 2 and 3 are unacceptable. It is shocking that the Institution is proposing to expand its boundaries to 19th. Expansion should be on the main campus with heights expanded there and not elsewhere.

Steve Sheppard stated that additional comments should be emailed to steve.sheppard@seattle.gov, written comments to Steve Sheppard, City of Seattle, Department of Neighborhoods, PO BOX 94649, phone number is there too.

VI. Continued Committee Discussion of Possible Comment to the Concept Plan

Nicolas Richter asked if a street vacation request has been made. Ms. Haines responded that no formal proposal has been made. She noted that the vacation process is separate so that a vacation might be approved as a part of the master plan and then denied later as part of the vacation's formal review. Cristina Van Valkenburgh provided more detail on this issue. She stated that as a vacation goes through the approval process the City will look carefully at both the transportation effects and identify those public benefits that might be required to compensate for loss of the public right-of-way.

Patrick Carter asked who monitors compliance with any provisions of the Master Plan. Steve Sheppard responded that both the City and the Standing Advisory Committee will have important roles in monitoring compliance with the plan.

Van Valkenburgh noted that a Transportation Management Plan is a condition of approval of the Plan. The Seattle Department of Transportation is responsible for monitoring the transportation component of the on an annual basis. The Institution submits an annual report listing actions and compliance with all conditions – both transportation related and others. Both the City and Community Advisory Committee reviews that report. Based on the last report SMC is very close of meeting its transportation goal. There is some question however about the Sabey development which we have recently done a survey and the results are a little bit different than the overall campus. It is the City's intent is to monitor the entire campus.

There was a follow-up discussion concerning the need to maintain good pedestrian connections in the area and to carefully consider the transportation elements of the plan.

Elliot Smith asked if this process would normally address possible changes to the zoning in the surrounding neighborhood outside of the MIO Boundary. Steve Sheppard responded that the process looks only at the zoning within the MIO Boundary. There was follow-on discussion with some members suggesting that a broader look at surrounding zoning might be appropriate.

Ms Schianerelli was briefly recognized. She stated that Sabey has been quietly purchasing property on the west side of 19th Avenue. They were using the properties as parking lots. We have a deep concern here about the way Sabey conducts itself.

VII.

Adjournment

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

**Attachment 1: Simplified Major Institutions
Planning Process Handout**

SIMPLIFIED MAJOR INSTITUTION PLANNING PROCESS

- Step 1.** The Institution files a notice of intent to prepare a master plan with the Director of the Department of Planning and Development (DPD).
- Step 2.** The City through the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) forms a Major Institution Master Plan Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC). The steps in this process are:
 - a. DON mails to those surrounding the Institution to solicit volunteers to serve on the committee.
 - b. Once volunteer applications are received, DON and the Institution jointly interview members, discuss them and then the Institution forwards a list of suggested members to the Director of DON.
 - c. The Director of DON reviews the list of potential members, makes any changes the Director believes are necessary and forwards a list of suggested members to the Seattle City Council through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Institution and City outlining the process.
 - d. The City Council approves the composition of the committee through the MOA by resolution.
- Step 3.** The Institution submits an application that includes a concept plan showing:
 - a. Proposed Institution boundaries; and
 - b. A proposed site plan including planned development and an estimate of total gross floor area proposed by the Major Institution; and
 - c. Planned uses; and
 - d. Any planned street vacations and planned parking location and access; and
 - e. A description of alternative proposals for physical development and decentralization options, including a detailed explanation of the reasons for considering each alternative; and
 - f. A description of the uses and character of the surrounding neighborhood surrounding and how the Major Institution relates to the surrounding area.
- Step 4.** Following submission of the application the Advisory Committee reviews and submits comments on the Concept Plan, and if there is one, the Environmental Checklist, and participates in the development of a schedule for the completion of the Master Plan.
- Step 5.** The Institution prepares a Preliminary Draft Master Plan and the Institution or DPD, whichever is the lead agency, prepares a Preliminary Draft EIS.
- Step 6.** The CAC receives briefings from the Institution and DPD on the Preliminary Draft Master Plan and EIS and prepares formal comments on these to the Institution and DPD.
- Step 7.** After receipt of comments from Step 6 above, the Institution and DPD revise the Preliminary Draft Master Plan and EIS and publish the Draft Master Plan and EIS.
- Step 8.** DPD, the Institution, and the CAC hold a public hearing on the Draft Master Plan and Draft EIS.
- Step 9.** Based in part on information received at the public hearing, the CAC submits comments on the Draft Master Plan and if an EIS is required, on the Draft EIS.
- Step 10.** The Institution prepares the Final Master Plan and DPD a Preliminary Final EIS.
- Step 11.** The CAC prepares comments on the Preliminary Final EIS and forwards these to DPD.
- Step 12.** DPD revises the Preliminary Final EIS and publishes the Final EIS. Note that there is no Preliminary Final Master Plan or review of such.
- Step 13.** DPD prepares a draft report on the application for a Master Plan and submits the Draft Director's Report to the CAC and the Institution for their review.
- Step 14.** The CAC submits comments to the Director on the Draft Director's Report.
- Step 15.** The CAC prepares a written report on the Master Plan including, its recommendations, public comments received, issues which the CAC believes were inadequately addressed in the Final Master Plan and EIS and any conditions that the CAC suggest be applied to adoption of the Master Plan.
- Step 16.** After reviewing the comments from the CAC, DPD prepares a Final Director's Report which addresses each of the issues in the Advisory Committee's comments on the Draft Director's Report. In addition, on those issues where the Director's recommendation differs from the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Director must include explanation of the difference, and forwards this report to the CAC and the Hearing Examiner.
- Step 17.** After receipt of the Final Director's Report, the CAC produces the Final Report of the Advisory Committee. This report also includes comments on the Final Director's Report.
- Step 18.** The Hearing Examiner holds a hearing on the proposed plan during which the CAC is expected to present its finding and recommendations as included in its Final Report.
- Step 19.** The Hearing Examiner forwards a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed Master Plan which includes: 1) the Hearing Examiner's recommendation, 2) the proposed Master Plan and Environmental documentation, 3) the Advisory Committee's Final Report, and 4) the report and recommendation of the Director of DPD.
- Step 20.** The City Council shall review and consider the Hearing Examiner's recommendation, makes any changes, or imposes any conditions the Council feels are needed and adopts the Master Plan by Ordinance.