



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
Bernie Agor 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
and Alternates**

Katie Porter – chair
Dylan Glosecki vice
chair

Lara Branigan
Leon Garnett

Maja Hadlock
Ashleigh Kilcup

James Schell
J. Elliot Smith
Laurel Spelman

Linda Carrol
*Swedish Medical
Center Non-
management
Representative*

Patrick Angus
David Letrondo
Dean Paton
Raleigh Watts

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard
*Department of
Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines
*Department of
Planning and
Development*

Andy Cosentino
*Swedish Medical
Center
Management*

Christinia Van
Valkenburg
*Seattle
Department of
Transportation*

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Meeting #14

April 24, 2014

Swedish Medical Center
550 17th Avenue
Cherry Hill Auditorium

Rooms A and B

Members and Alternates Present

Katie Porter
Linda Carrol

Patrick Angus
Leon Garnett

David Letrondo
Maja Hadlock

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON
Marcia Peterson,

(See sign-in sheet)

Stephanie Haines, DPD
SMC Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

I. Opening Comments and Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief Introductions followed. The Meeting notes through meeting 11 11 were approved without substantive change

There was a brief discussion concerning the purpose of the Committee. David Letrondo stated that he was concerned that the Committee appeared to be constantly returning to the issue of needs. He directed the Committee's attention Seattle Municipal Code 23.69.032D: CAC's comments shall focus on identifying and mitigating impacts. He noted that Mr. Sheppard had clarified the previously but asked for further clarification. Mr. Sheppard noted that the language in the Code is a bit ambiguous. That section states in part

“The Advisory Committee may review and comment on the mission of the institution, the need for the expansion, public benefits resulting from the proposed new development and the way in which the proposed development will serve the public purpose mission of the Major Institution, but these elements are not subject to negotiation nor shall such review delay consideration of the master plan or the final recommendation to Council.”



Almost every Advisory Committee has struggled with this issue and the Department of Neighborhoods has raised this without law department. The language and other references in the Code have been interpreted to mean that the Institution defines its needs and goals - in essence its business plan. The institution presents their needs to the Committee and the Committee CAC comment on those presentations. However, the Committee cannot recommend denial of the plan based upon their disagreement with the institutions projected needs. Consideration of needs may inform the Committees deliberations, but ultimately the Committees task is to evaluate the requested height, bulk, scale (HBS), transportation plans etc. against its consistency with, or appropriateness within the broader neighborhood context.. The Committee can say that the scale is too great and recommend changes in scale or other mitigating elements to achieve a balance between accommodating the needs of the institution and protecting the livability of the neighborhood. The Committee can also state that the proposed level of development is too great. The committee does not necessarily have to come back with proposals to balance their need with community's feedback and limits that they are proposing.

II. Public Comment

The Meeting was opened to Public Comments

Comments of Mary McLauphlin - Ms. McLauphlin stated that she understood that the purpose of Committee was to represent the neighborhood. It doesn't matter what Swedish or Sabey wants. Swedish has said, "they don't know why they need this much space, don't have any plans for it..." Ultimately, the whole e of this committee is to say what is good for the neighborhood and attempt to mitigate the bad aspects of the plan.

She further stated tht the proposed Goal of 50% Single Occupancy Vehicle use is not good enough, especially with bus cuts - #3 and #4 which go directly through this neighborhood.

Comments of Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod stated that the proposed bulk height and scale of development is too great for the neighborhood, in every way. The Campus is surrounded by lower-density development. Even along 15th Ave the adjacent to Seattle U. Major Institutions Overlay allows height only to a maximum of 65 feet. Simi9alar heights should be considered for the adjacent Swedish properties and if greater heights are proposed then there should be substantial upper-level setback. She encouraged Swedish and Sabey to look at vast resources of other campuses within the boarder Swedish/Providence system and satisfy proposed needs in other locations. Adopt a good neighbor policy here on Cherry Hill. What would it take for Swedish to be a good neighbor?

Comments of Cindy Thelen: Ms. Thelen stated that neighbors have put forth ideas, we are not monolithic, there are different voices, but we'd like to see some of our ideas mocked up. She observed that to this point Swedish has incorporated few neighborhood concerns. Height, bulk and scale is way out of control for residential neighborhood. She asked that Swedish consider locating this expansion elsewhere. We're not interested in bringing jobs into the neighborhood.

Comments of Greg Harmon: Mr. Harmon stated tht he considered the proposed heights to be too great to be accommodated within this low-rise neighborhood.

Comments of Vicky Schianterelli: Ms. Schianterelli stated that she agreed with the comments made by I Bob Cooper presented at last meeting. The focal point of the tower now is being able to see the old elements of the hospital. They should not be blocked by

other structures. She noted that the entire proposal feels like a high-rise, not a welcoming hospital. It would be more appropriate in the Central Business District than here. She noted that the proposed development in the 18th Avenue half block is strikingly similar to that proposed in 2009. That proposal was rejected by the Seattle Hearing Examiner and that decision is what triggered this process in the first place.

Comments of Jerry Matsui: Mr. Matsui stated that the proposal for the 18th Avenue half block now is no different than back in 2002, with a continuous wall on the mid-block. The plan needs to go back to proposals in 1994 with residential-type structures, max height of 28', patient family housing, a daycare, and green space. This area should be a transitional piece of the plan. Let's not forget that Providence is part of this. This is about what Sabey wants, rather than what is necessary. Sabey should give up houses on 19th.

Comments of Ken Thorp: Mr. Thorp stated that the Committee should look at Children's hospital model for what an institution should like in a residential neighborhood. Buffer and transitional heights.

Comments of Laurie Lucky: Ms. Lucky noted that a woman who came to a CAC meeting a few months ago had asked that Swedish consider opening a clinic in Southeast Seattle and asked if there has been any consideration of this. She also noted the alliance with Providence Medical system and referenced its positions concerning woman's reproductive health care. She stated that she was not in favor of special accommodations for any hospital that denies reproductive rights, end-of-life care, etc.

Comments of Sonia Richter: Ms. Richter stated that the proposal is too big. It's like the emperor's new clothes. There's no way to make this ok. 17th – 200' at 18th and Cherry. Do they need extra space? Look at Children's process – of course they had lawyers and others to fight it. We don't have those resources, but we could get them.

III. SMC progress on Current TMP

Swedish staff reiterated that they have formalized their relationship with CommuteSeattle. That group will be assisting Swedish to identify transportation needs and evaluate strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.

Swedish will develop a revised TMP as part of this plan. Commute Seattle will conduct the required surveys to respond to TMP reporting. At this point there is a major effort to consolidate reporting and surveys on campus.

IV Continued Committee Discussion of the 18th Avenue Half Block

Katie Porter summarized the outcome of the agreements from Meeting 13b as follows:

- 1) That height be limited to 37 ft. height;
- 2) That a minimum 25 ft. setback along the east property line be maintained;
- 3) That the building mass be separated into about 4-5 separate buildings;
- 4) That Swedish be encouraged to excavate the building(s) into the site to achieve lower height;
- 5) That there be a 5 ft. setback along Jefferson and Cherry as long as there is a street level transparency; and
- 6) That a partial street vacation in order to shift building mass west, be investigated.

David Letrondo noted that this position seemed to be going back towards the 1994 plan. He asked why are we re-visiting what we already did in 1994? He noted that there are many ways to break up the appearance of height and bulk without actually building four separate structures. Mr. Letrondo suggested several different methods including possible facade modulations, screening, use of different materials etc. One alternative might be to have a one or two story podium with the higher areas split with vertical or horizontal modulations. Marcia Pederson agreed that the Committee should stop talking about the 1994 plan. She noted that years have passed and that the development scheme developed at that time no longer is appropriate. Others offered the observation that four separate buildings would be desirable.

Katie Porter noted that it has been the consistent comment from residents near that half block the half-block that they viewed the 1994 agreement as a major concession that would remain long-term. They had traded off greater development west of 18th for much more modest development on that block and associated neighborhood amenities there. She asked what has changed other than a failure to develop the envisioned uses on that property?-. Swedish never delivered on its promises

A member noted that Children's had significantly reduced its heights and setbacks from similarly zoned areas. Marcia Pederson responded that Children's is different in that it occupies a much bigger. In addition, Children's expanded its boundaries and demolished a considerable number of houses. That's how they achieve those transitions and setbacks. She noted that in its earlier alternatives, Swedish too proposed expansion onto the entire 18th Avenue block. This was proposed in order to achieve a similar transition. However the neighborhood and Committee opposed this action.

Katie Porter observed that there is a great deal of distrust in the neighborhood over the issue of transition and use of the 18th Avenue half block and also with how transportation has been handled over the years. The neighborhood's goal has been to maintain the low-density and low-rise character of the neighborhood. That was the goal 20 years ago, and clearly remains the goal today. Neighbors want to see Swedish as an ally in this effort. Currently Swedish and Sabey are seen as opponents, trying to counter that goal. David Letrondo responded that the reason Swedish is proposing greater development is that Swedish has different needs now.

Various members noted that there was broad support for the lower heights and possible splitting of the building into various structures or masses.

Maja Hadlock noted the discussion of a partial street vacation and asked if the City had looked at that since the last meeting. Christina Van Valkenburgh responded that she and others had discussed this. Partial vacations are more complex than full vacations. The remainder of the street would have to meet all the standards set for this type of street. Reducing the public right of way would end up with a sub-standard street, and SDOT would not be likely to support a partial vacation. She also noted that SDOT is planning a greenway for 18th. We need at least 2 10' lanes, plus sidewalks, a planting strip, and a 10' lane.

Katie Porter asked if the Greenway could be relocated to 19th Avenue. Ms. Van Valkenburgh responded that there is – streets have a hierarchy. 19th Avenue is meant to be more local use than 18th Avenue and therefore it is unlikely that SDOT would support relocation of the proposed greenway she noted that from an engineering standpoint, it's very

unsafe to have curbs not aligning across intersections. There would be a jog on 18th, meeting with the other blocks from the north and south. North of cherry would be different. Council makes final decision on street vacation, but SDOT wouldn't support. CAC can make whatever recommendation it wants.

Katie Porter stated tht regardless of the current SDOT thinking she would favor having two alternatives for development on the 18th Avenue half block- on wit and one without a partial vacation. Stephanie Haines noted that the partial vacation will not be in the DEIS later in May. If it is a serious option, there would have to be a supplemental EIS, because this is a major modification

Discussion returned to possible building configurations. Mr. Jex from Callison began to draw up rough sketches of various alternatives to a four buding scheme. After brief discussion Committee members asked that Mr. Jex model the various alternatives and especially what a four building mass might look like and provide this to the Committee at its next meeting. Mr. Jex agreed to do so to the extent that a model could be developed that would have usable floor plates.

V. Adjournment

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