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I. Opening of Meeting – Initial Comments
The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Ms. Porter stated this is an informal meeting intended as a brainstorming discussion. The Committee will neither pass motions nor conduct any formal Committee business. In the next formal Committee meeting, it will have the motions that will be discussed in tonight’s meeting. She also noted that public comments would be taken at the start of the meeting.

II. Public Comments
The floor was opened to public comments.

Comments from Aleta Van Patten:  Ms. Van Patton encouraged the Committee to continue to question the placement of both, neurology and cardiology At Cherry Hill. She noted that there are many other locations where these functions might be located. Swedish hospital is not the mecca.

Comments from Julie Popper:  SEIU: Ms. Popper noted that the Sabey Corporation is a for-profit company and as such is interested in
more profit. She noted that she had discussed the issue of program moves with some union members. They informed her that cardio is already starting to move. This appears to give a more accurate picture of what’s going on. She urged Swedish Medical Center to be more forthright and honest about what’s going on.

**Comment from Bob Cooper:** Mr. Cooper noted that he had gone back and looked at the past Plan. He noted that much of the vision of the prior plan never materialized. The building that was initially envisioned as a three 3 story building turned into the James Tower. Daycare for neighborhood kids never materialize. He noted that the eastside of the campus was envisioned as a transition between Swedish Cherry Hill and not a block-long massive building. He stated that the existing tower is an iconic landmark and would suggest that nothing should obscure the existing site of the tower. It is a He stated that the master plan should be about accommodating primary medical care it is not accommodating research, foundations or assisted living.

**Comment from Greg Harmon:** Mr. Harmon stated that he lives on 19th Avenue and E Cherry Street. He offered two major comments: 1) the 18th Avenue half block should remain as a transition between the low-rise neighborhood scale and the larger buildings to the east. The currently proposed buildings are out of scale; 2) LabCorp and other auxiliary services that are taking space can be located elsewhere. There is already a Northwest kidney center in Broadway.

**Comment from Cindy Thelen:** Ms. Thelen stated that she lives on 545 19th Avenue. It is important to remember that the task of the Major Institutions Master Plan for Cherry Hill is to balance the needs of the Swedish with maintaining the vitality of the neighborhood. She noted that the proposed development on the 18th Avenue half block will impact Single family homes. She also advocated that no parking garage be located off of 18th Avenue. The height on that half-block should not more than 37 ft. measured from one point on the slope. Ideally this half block should be developed with smaller buildings with open space between, greater setbacks, narrowing of 18th Avenue, and neighborhood amenity. She urged Swedish to consider the privacy of the neighborhood and consider a small number of windows in the building to be used. Consider green space, rain gardens, chemical noise, exhaust provide ventilation system. Scale back proposal,

**Comment from John Perry:** Mr. Perry stated that he lives on 16th Avenue. He questioned why these developments or uses are proposed for this particular space. More details on this are needed. Why must it be here? Many of these uses do not have to be in a residential area. Cherry Hill is not necessarily the place for research and further development.

**Comments from Jerry Matsui:** Mr. Matsui stated that he lives behind the 18th Avenue half block. He stated that this half block should be transitional. From 1994 up until today that has been the plan and vision. This particular planning process seems to ignore that. The proposed use would have no open space, green space, nor amenities for the neighborhood. It benefits Sabey. He urged the Committee to take the long-term view that this should remain a transitional block

**Comment from Vicki Schiantarelli:** Ms. Shiantarelli stated that she agreed with most of the previous comments made at the meeting. She stated that a 50 foot height is not the proper transition to the 30 foot single family area to the east. She noted that Children’s has done a
better job with transitions to the single family areas. She particularly noted that Children’s bought up 5 blocks of residential space in order to a better transition.

She urged the Committee to look at how other institution, university and hospital deal with transition and look at their relationships with Sabey.

**Comment from Abby (last name not available):** The commenter noted that the last EIS did not see ground water or flooded lots of road on the west side. However this area has a basement flooding problem. It is a high saturated area. The commenter asked it the proposed development with include irrigation and whether it will interrupt ground water flows. This needs to be addressed in the EIS.

### III. General Committee Discussion

**Editor’s Note:** The discussion moved from topic to topic. For these notes those portions that dealt with the same topic have been placed together.

#### Resignation of Nicholas Richer and Solicitation of New Members

Steve Sheppard noted that Nicholas Richter was moving and thus was resigning from the Committee. He thanked Nicholas for his services to the Committee. Mr. Sheppard mentioned that this resignation leaves two regular and two alternate positions vacant. These will need to be filled in the next few weeks. The City will be soliciting new members. Those on the mailing list will receive notice.

Marci Peterson mentioned that a flyer going around with information on what are we currently proposing and detailed information about it and where we are in the current process. There will be copies available to the people in attendance.

#### Programmatic Changes - Possible relocation of Uses off of the Cherry Hill Campus

Ms. Porter noted the comments from SEIU concerning program moves and asked for any additional comments and updates and to respond with regards to moving cardio to First Hill. Ms. Peterson responded that Swedish Medical Center is in the process of studying the possibility of moving some services to First Hill. This study includes both cardio and neuro, but is in very early phases. Mr. John Jex commented that this is a major issue that is of interest to the community. The general types of medical care changes in 5-10 years; there is a 15% growth per year. In Neuro and Cardio, there is a growth problem; neuro and cardio are both growing rapidly and cannot co-exist in the current facility. There are things that need to be changed on campus in order to provide better patient care. For instance, vascular surgery was moved to First Hill in the last month and a half strictly due to volume issues. Cardiac uses several ancillary services that are not well represented at Cherry Hill campus. He stated that Swedish Medical Center is looking at a number of changes. There evaluation will be expensive and will clearly take time, Neighbors will not notice it and it will not have a material impact on the development process.

#### Sabey and/or Swedish Ownership east of the 18th Avenue Half Block

Mr. Richter stated that Sabey should make a clear commitment to sell its residential properties outside of the 18th Avenue half block back to residential. He offered the opinion that this might help reduce mistrust between Sabey and its neighbors. Ms.
Peterson responded that it might be preferable to retain these properties as rentals. Mr. Richter noted that current relationship between the neighbors and the institution is clouded by mistrust and that the long-term question would be how long these would remain as rentals. Many would continue to see ulterior long-range motives and ask why Sabey would be interested in a small time rental especially on 19th.

**Nature of Transitional Uses in the 18th Avenue Half Block and Past Treatment of that Area**

Ms. Porter stated that she was surprised on what she saw on the 1994 plan. It seemed clear that that plan located a series of very small scale buildings there as a compromise. She asked for clarification on this.

Mr. Sheppard responded that when the Sister of Providence purchased the properties along both 18th and 19th Avenues, the neighborhood grew very concerned. The sisters envisioned expansion on that entire block. After considerable conflict, agreements were reached between Squire Park and the Sisters of Providence to dispose of homes along of 19th and to the east. Those properties were returned to private residential use. Properties on the east side of 18th were retained and their use negotiated as part of the development or the last master plan. The neighborhoods agreed to support new higher development west of 18th in exchange for location of very low-scale uses on the 18th Avenue half block. Soon thereafter, the city began to review the major institution code in general. The problem was the code at that time required the institution to identify use, approximate size and footprint, 5-10 years down the line. It is no longer reasonable to develop that way that would constraint the designers, so the city stepped back, instead of designing a specific building; the plans now focus on development standard and particularly on the allowed height, bulk and scale on a development site. Specific uses and designs are determined later and subject to review by the Standing Advisory Committee.

Ms. Porter stated that one of the key tasks for the Committee will be to determine what the appropriate transition along this half-block should be. Ms. Porter commented if the 1994 agreement seemed like a fair transition. Ms. Peterson responded that that smaller buildings called out in the 1994 plan might appear fair to some in the neighborhood, but might not meet the needs of Swedish.

**Height in the 18th Avenue Half Block and Height Measurement Techniques**

Mr. Richter noted that development on the 18th Avenue half block varies between 37 ft. rising to 50 ft. depending upon the topography. He suggested that the buildings be partially excavated into the site to retain a maximum height of 37 ft. He noted that the proposed 25 ft. setback appears reasonable. Others disagreed and stated that a greater setback from the rear property line was desirable. He suggested that modulation or splitting of the building masses would greatly help soften its appearance and assist with any transition. Ms. Porter agreed.

A brief discussion concerning height measurement ensued. The major issue was how the code determines the ground level of determining height. There was no consensus reached on this issue and members continued to advocate for a maximum height or 37 feet regardless of method of measurement.
Mr. Sheppard noted that at Seattle University their CAC worked with the University to define height measurement techniques that were different than that contained in the Code. These were made conditions of that plan. Mr. Sheppard offered to provide examples.

**Possible Partial Vacation of 18th Avenue**

Members noted that much greater flexibility could be achieved with a partial vacation of 18th Avenue and a narrowing of that street. That might allow development on the 18th Avenue half-block to shift west and allow both reduced height and increased setback from properties on the west side of 19th Avenue. Ms. Peterson asked what is involved in the street narrowing. Ms. Haines responded that this would require some sort of street vacation.

Mr. Richter asked if it is possible to have a conditional or partial street vacation. Ms. Haines responded that this would be complicated and that it would be important to begin discussions now. It will be up to SDOT and the City Council and they are not favorable to street vacations. However it is possible that a partial street vacation might work.

**Building Massing in the 18th Avenue Half Block and Setbacks**

Mr. Porter mentioned that several members had proposed having 4 separate, rather than one single building on the 18th Avenue half block. If so then each building might have a different height calculation. Members stated that this might be a good direction to consider achieving a better visual transition. Others noted that the 25 foot setback needs to be screened and landscaped.

Ms. Porter made a comment that a 37 ft. maximum and having about 4-5 buildings with lower intensity and lower parking demand and a radius being establish and parking analysis that focuses on where people are parking away from the residences, if it is possible to have a lower intensity to this block.

Mr. Jex stated that he could not say if that will achieve the needed square footage in a new configuration. The parking count could be mitigated but cannot give any specifics.

**Parking in the 18th Avenue Half Block**

Concern was also expressed over the amount of parking designated on 18th it was noted that the street is already congested and that entering and exiting cars from the garage might be difficult. In addition members noted that it was important to have all of the parking underground.

Mr. Jex responded that there are pros and cons concerning underground parking on the 18th as to a structured parking. There is a need to see the transportation plans in the EIS to see the statistics regarding higher volume parking on higher areas. The draft report will have the parking counts by zone. This report will be available in May and a transportation studies will analyze it.

Ms. Peterson responded that she would be concerned if parking was lost on this block. Many patients will be using nearby facilities and less parking on that block might.
severely affect them. She urged the Committee not to overly burden patients due to lack of parking.

A comment was made that currently, only 15% of parking are being proposed to patients. A request was made to determine the average percentage of parking breakdown in the campus. Another comment was made to be careful in making analogies and comparison with Children’s parking because there were careful planning and analysis that was done to make sure parking around the Children’s campus is acceptable to the surrounding community.

**Summation of Positions concerning the 18th Avenue Half Block.**

Ms. Porter noted that there had been some progress defining issues and noted that the 18th Avenue half block would be the focus of future meetings. She summarized the current directions of the Committee 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.

**IV. Concluding Comments and Adjournment**

Mr. Richter thanked everyone on the Committee and encouraged the Committee to continue the discussions in order to achieve a sustainable solution.

Ms. Porter thanked Swedish, Sabey, and Callison for providing a new alternative. She noted that she appreciates the continued willingness of Swedish to adjust plans and integrate community wants and hopes. She observed that this might help bring institution and the neighborhood closer to some agreement.

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