



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

Najwa Alsheikh, Chair

Patrick Carter

Andrew Coates

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Joy Jacobson

Eric J. Oliner

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Mark Tilbe

Jamile Mack

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Nicholas Richter

Committee Alternates

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 #7

July 18, 2013

Swedish Medical Center

Swedish Education & Conference Center

550 17th Avenue

First Floor - James Tower

Members and Alternates Present

Najwa Alsheikh,

Patrick Carter

David Letrondo

Andrew Coates

Dylan Glosecki

Nicholas Richter

Laurel Spelman

Maja Hadlock

Members and Alternates Absent

Jamile Mack

J. Elliot Smith

Mark Tilbe

Eric Oliner

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

Stephanie Haines, DPD

Marcia Peterson, SMC

Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Najwa Alsheikh opened the meeting. Brief introductions followed.

II. Housekeeping – Approval of Agenda

The agenda was modified to include a discussion of revisions to the number of alternatives. Najwa noted that several of the previous alternatives have been dropped from further consideration.

III. Election of Committee Co-Chair

Ms. Alsheikh mentioned that Cynthia started as Committee chair but had to step down. Therefore, the election of a new co-chair is on the agenda and an email was sent to members concerning this vote. Steve Sheppard briefly summarized the duties of the co-chair. Ms. Alsheikh then asked for volunteers or nominations. Committee members declined to vote at the meeting and requested that this vote be postponed until the next meeting; all agreed. Ms. Alsheikh emphasized that the election has already been postponed once and urged action on this item at the next meeting.

IV. Alternatives No Longer under Consideration (added to the agenda)

Marcia Peterson from Swedish Medical Center informed the committee

that SMC had determined that several of the alternatives previously discussed will no longer be under consideration. This was in part due to feedback from the Committee and public comment. Previous alternatives that will no longer be considered include: Alternate 3 (which is de-compress growth which expands out beyond the current boundary to the 19th and that goes up to the North and to the South) and also Alternate 4 (which expands onto the DSHS site). With these options not advancing, this reduces the number of EIS has to cover to #3, #5, and #6.

Ms. Peterson noted that Alternative #3 includes the vacation of both. 16th and 18th. #5 vacates 16th and includes a couple of sky bridges across 18th, and # 6 also includes a street vacation.

Dylan Glosecki suggested that there be an alternative that included no street vacations. David Chamness with Callison Architects responded that the vacation of 16th relates to the function of the emergency department. This is critical to the future emergency department and how the ambulances access the emergency department. After brief further discussion the Committee expressed general support for inclusion of an option including no street vacations.

Nicholas Richter thanked SMC for listening to the Committee and neighbors and removing Alternate 3. This dialogue and communications bodes well for the future. He noted that it was his opinion that the vacation of 16th Avenue might not as critical as long as 18th Avenue remained open with pedestrian activity maintained along 16th to the building through open connections, and if there is a vacation, it is fine as long as it includes in all of the options and pedestrian activity is emphasized.

IV. Discussion of Design Elements

Najwa Alsheikh noted that members had requested time to consider possible design elements that they believed might help soften or mitigate some of the impacts of the proposed campus development on the neighborhood. Dylan Glosecki had taken this opportunity to put together a series of images of both positive and negative elements at the SMC Cherry Hill and other nearby institutions. Mr. Glosecki was given the floor to present these images.

Mr. Glosecki noted that the images were intended is to facilitate discussion about what type of pedestrian amenities Swedish might add as it further developed its campus and interacts more with the surrounding neighborhood. This is an informal presentation. The Committee would like gather ideas on what Swedish can develop going forward.

Editor's Note: The presentation related to slides and was not easily converted into written form.

Images shown were:

1. Group Health on 15th – interior plaza connected with pedestrian access.
 - a. Showing retail spaces – gets pedestrian trail, interacts with campus.
2. Seattle U's corner – open space plaza, shaded trees, playgrounds, play space.
3. Street furniture at the street level

4. Current view of Swedish campus – does not feel welcoming
5. Current view of the current pedestrian connector to the campus

Ms. Alsheikh opened the floor to discussion. She stated that she would take comments and questions from both the Committee and public related to the slide presentation.

Public Comments/Questions Concerning Design Elements

Patrick Carter noted that there were no people on these photos; which suggests that these spaces are not in huge demand. How many people go to the pizza parlors, nail salons on 12th, maybe they are not beneficial? Dylan responded that the pictures were taken in the morning where people are at work 10-10:30 am. That is not a common time when the public is visible. Dylan mentioned that these spaces are very important and it does have a lot of uses.

Ken Stangland responded that he lives on 16th and uses these spaces a lot. He uses the park/pedestrian pass way. However it closes early. These spaces should remain open longer so that people can use them 24 hours a day.

Vicki Schianterelli noted that inclusion of upper decks, open spaces or viewpoints on the upper deck of any building along 18th Avenue would present a problem for anyone on her block as a lot of folks might be staring at the backyards. More thought will need to be given to the rear of buildings, and especially anything constructed with its frontage on the east side of 18th Avenue. There will need to be considerably more innovations so that we can live in harmony with the major institution. Dylan responded that right now the Committee is brainstorm ideas; we are not proposing anything want some feedback from the community to take to Swedish. Vicki noted that she would like to have more opportunities to be involved in these discussions.

Bob Cooper stated that he lives on 16th south of the campus and that the small park in that area is used regularly. If there were more green spaces and plaza space at grade, it would definitely be used more often. He also noted that any pedestrian connector would need much better signage.

Eileen DeArmon stated that SMC is proposing that there be a future Design Workshop to discuss and gather input from neighbors about what neighbors value most in the neighborhood. No date has been set, but it should be relatively soon. Steve Sheppard stated that the Committee should co-sponsor this event. Virginia Mason did this and it was open to the public and proved very useful. The Committee decided to schedule it at the end of summer so people can do more planning, build communications, schedule facilitators and architects.

Committee Comments/Questions Concerning Design Elements:

Najwa Alsheikh noted that she was concerned 16th Avenue remains accessible to people regardless of whether it is vacated. There are spaces designated as public spaces but it is barren. It should include a well-designed public walkway at a minimum.

Members commented that the campus currently feels fortress-like and turns its back on the community. From Jefferson, it is neither accessible, nor can you see the entrance. There should be more landscaping and less concrete. The neighborhood would benefit greatly if

Swedish provided better pedestrian/biking connections or if there were an effort to create a Greenway (enhanced streets) that goes through the 18th Avenue. Others opined that public amenities and small shops would be desirable along portions of the MIO boundary.

Andrew Coats stated that he would like to focus on the 16th Avenue and would like to see how the emergency vehicles will be coming in and out and understand the design elements. A great deal more information is needed from the architects including more information on alternatives.

V. General Public Comments

Comments of Murray Anderson – Mr. Anderson stated that he lives across the street from Jefferson and wanted to second the need to have more variety and interest along that side of the campus. Street level life is important. He also expressed concerns regarding the vacation of 16th Avenue and especially how it might be configured. Would there be any public access for continued entry to the garage or would it be primarily used for emergency vehicles only? Is there some way the street can be configured as a one lane one way so half of the street can be a walking plaza? He also noted that the design of 16th Avenue might be crucial to neighborhood acceptance of this level of development. Mr. Anderson also asked for clarification on ownership patterns and specifically which buildings are owned by SMC and which by Sabey. He offered the suggestion that SMC uses displace other leased space in the Sabey building. He noted that the total level of development is great and that if the neighborhood is being asked to accept this it should be clear that it is SMC uses and not for Sabey leasers. Is this a part of Swedish; or a ploy by Sabey just to build office buildings?

Response: Marcia Peterson responded that the programs SMC would build will be supporting the campus. There is no intention of turning these new buildings into a general hospital; its focus will be on specialties like the Heart Center and Neuroscience. Natalie Price noted that the information about the buildings is at the Swedish website. There is an updated FAQ's posted on the website.

Comments of Bob Cooper: - Mr. Cooper stated that when looking at 18th Avenue vacation consideration might be given to moving development to the west and creating a much larger setback between the new hospital development and properties to the west. This area should continue to function as the buffer between the medical and residential development. Looking at 16th – pedestrian safety is very important and essential. Pedestrian through access is very important as is better signage. I would like to see a clear identification of entrances, which I believe is very important.

I would like it confirmed that everything will be related to Swedish or Swedish function. That seems different than in the past as the various medical office buildings were seen as a part of a research facility not the hospital. He suggested that there be some definition concerning what is considered functionally related to the role of the hospital.

Response: Marcia reaffirmed that there is no policy change. It will be all part of the NeuroScience Institute. There was a presentation made by Dr. Lewis that summarizes the vision of additional services for this campus. It is available online in the Swedish website.

Comments of Jerry Matsui – Mr. Matsui stated that he lives on 19th avenue. He expressed concern over the proposed height along the eastern boundary. The proposed height is increased from 37 feet to up to 90 feet. It would essentially be a two block long 90 foot high

wall looming over the adjacent single family residence. He agreed with Mr. Cooper that the development be pushed to the west and stepped down towards the single family. I would like know a change on how to load the facility because the way it is currently designed is like a concrete mausoleum. He also stated that greater open space is needed and offered the opinion that this might be an appropriate use for the property along the east side of 18th Avenue.

Comments of Vicki Schianterelli – Ms. Schianterelli noted that in the prior plans green space was given up in exchange for decreased height. She asked how SMC would propose to meet the MIO open space standards. Green space is required and crucial. She also stated that open space between the boundary of the 18th and 19th is particularly important. The rear yards of properties along the west side of 19th Avenue are used for gardening and other activities by residents. If the 90 foot buildings were built these activities would be greatly compromised.

Comments of Ken Torp – Mr. Torp stated that he lives on 15th Avenue between Cherry and Jefferson. All of the alternatives propose the vacation of 16th Avenue and to many of us this vacation is not acceptable. Much of the discussion has been how to put lipstick on this pig. We need to first figure out whether the vacation is acceptable, necessary and required. All of the options also contain a kind of finger thrust up the rear of the neighborhood only because the property is owned by Sabey. This is unacceptable. This should be taken off and kept at the underlying zoning. We are looking at the fundamental issues of size bulk and scale. Looking at small designed details only takes away from this focus.

Comments of Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod stated that she served on the SU Major Institution Master Plan committee. She stated that is early in the process to be discussing details as the major elements have not been determined yet. The Committee needs to understand that any street vacation must balance out the function of the street that the City relies on. All functions of the street have to be accommodated, not only by Swedish. I would to see a careful analysis and evaluation of the alternatives and how this really fits the needs of Swedish and the neighborhood; think of the big picture. Regarding the comments on the proposals:

- 1) The boundary expansion to the Spencer Technology site is not desirable and does not achieve a significant expansion of square footage.
- 2) The street vacations needs to be carefully analyzed; connectivity is not just about pedestrian access or a 14 foot sidewalk;
- 3) Height should be concentrated on the center of the campus not along the edges;
- 4) Proposed height is too high. 200 ft. height should be centered at the center of the campus, not on the edges. She stated that it is important to keep in mind the effect of the proposed heights on properties north of Jefferson street as well as along 19th.
- 5) Public access routes need to be open if possible. Going through a hospital or medical building to get a public route is questionable.
- 6) The building program may simply be too ambitious. It is possible that the building program that SMC is proposing is just too large to be accommodated on this site and in this environment. Uses that are not for the hospital functions should be located at a different

Swedish location. Wall along Cherry St. and Cherry St. – analyze the height scale and other aspects of community connectivity.

Comments of Greg Taplock – Mr. Taplock stated that he lives on 16th and Cherry across the proposed 200 ft. building. The building that is there right now is a flat top building that allows a sweeping city view for every resident that sits behind the site you are proposing to build. Removing this view would be a major loss. He also asked how long the construction plan is. It can go on for a long time. He stated that if this moves forward in the direction of blocking the view; I choose to vote to leave the neighborhood.

Comments of Larry Malfort: - Mr. Malfort stated that he wanted to echo Ms. Sollod's comment concerning the importance of not building high on the edges makes sense. If 16th is to be vacated for use by emergency vehicles, what is the fate of the existing parking garage? Will parking go somewhere else?

Response: Access to the parking garage will be maintained. There will still have parking access as well as pedestrian. An underground access is part of the vacation; because of the grade, that maintains a current issue.

V. Continued Committee Discussion

Dylan Glosecki stated that he would like to see a breakdown of the 3 million square feet to identify where the square foot would be located. A simple graphic format would be really helpful. He also noted that a park space as a buffer on 18th half block between the existing single family houses would be desirable. He agreed that the focus should remain on the height, bulk and scale. However it is not too early to begin looking at other measures that might mitigate that height, bulk and scale.

Najwa Alsheikh noted that she is nervous about advocating for retail use because it will eventually lead to an increase noise, traffic, and congestion. She had negative experiences with retail at other locations. Nicholas Richter noted that retail uses similar to what is presently located along 18th Avenue near Union Street might work. It is a nice place to start looking that primarily serves the community as an example that fits well in the neighborhood. Najwa agreed that the example does fits well with the neighborhood.

Laurel Spelman commented that having six alternatives was a bit overwhelming. Three alternatives are more manageable. A physical model should be developed and available so everyone can see every angle of the project. Nicholas Richter noted that the same result might be achieved through a computer 3D model where the committee could manipulate the viewpoints to see it from various perspectives.

Steve Sheppard noted that there is clearly an emphasis both in public comment and from the committee on height, bulk, and scale. Many are stating that the development program identified by SMC might be too large. Under the code SMC proposes the level of development and that this is not negotiated with the Committee. That does not mean that the Committee must accept the plan as proposed. The Committee might look at the heights. Bulks and scale of development and the transportation and other impacts and take acceptance to them. It would be up to the institution to propose development standards that could be accommodated. That is the direction the analysis goes, not necessarily stating that the need for development has not been justified.

V. Adjournment

No further business being before the committee; the meeting was adjourned at 8:15pm.