



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

Committee Members

Katie Porter, Chair
 Ashleigh Kilcup
 Leon Garnett
 Dylan Glosecki
 Maja Hadlock
 Raleigh Watts
 J. Elliot Smith
 Laurel Spelman
 Linda Carrol
*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Patrick Angus
 David Letrondo

Committee Alternates

James Schell
 Dean Patton

Ex-officio Members

Steve Sheppard
*Department of
 Neighborhoods*

Stephanie Haines
*Department of
 Planning and
 Development*

Andy Cosentino
*Swedish Medical
 Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh
*Seattle Department of
 Transportation*

Meeting Notes
Meeting #31
March 18, 2015,
 Swedish Medical Center
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
 Cherry Hill Auditorium

Members and Alternates Pres

Patrick Angus	Laurel Spelman	Dylan Glosecki
Linda Carrol	Raleigh Watts	Leon Garnet
Dean Patton		

Members and Alternates Absent

Ashleigh Kilcup	Katie Porter	David Letrondo
Maja Hadlock	J. Elliot Smith	James Schell

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Dylan Glosecki. Steve Sheppard noted that many members had indicated that they were not able to make the meeting. Therefor a request was made to take no formal actions at the meeting. Instead preliminary directions would be evaluated and final actions of any changes to setbacks etc. would be taken up at the next meeting.

Mr. Sheppard noted that members wer4e receiving the recent meeting notes and urged members to review them. As usual typos etc. were not the issue but content was. Typos will be take care of as the notes are posted in final form. He then briefly went over the anticipated schedule for future meetings. The Committee is nearing its end and realistically all of the Committee's final recommendations will have to be set by next Thursday's meeting.

II. Identification of setbacks for Reconsideration.

The Committee proceeded to develop initial directions for reconsideration of selected setback recommendations. The setbacks identified for reconsideration would be raised to the full Committee at the next meeting either with a recommendation from this meeting or without one where members appeared closely divided.

The Committee returned to setbacks for Sections EE . Members stated that they favored a reconsideration of the lower level setback. Raleigh Watts noted that the rationale was both the achieve a consistent treatment of the frontages along both Jefferson and Cherry Streets, promote greater pedestrian activity, and allow more space for landscaping.

Steve Sheppard stated that is was his understanding that members present wished to bring the following back to the full Committee:

That the lower-level setback for Section EE be increased to ten feet, I with the upper level 15 foot setback unchanged.

Members indicted that this was correct.

Discussion proceeded to reconsideration of Section FF Dylan Glosecki stated that a similar treatment might be applied to Section FF. There was brief discussion concerning whether a greater upper-level setback might be put forward. John Jex noted that at 10 feet this upper-level setback was set to match the structural system of the underlying garage. If it was increased farther then problems with the structural system of the existing garage would come into play.

Members suggested possibly recommending that the upper-level setback be to the second structural bay north from the street. Steve Sheppard suggested that this approach might be problematic in that it was not specific and suggested that the Committee simply identify the specific setback that it feels comfortable with. After brief further discussion, the members present concluded that this section should remain unchanged from the Committee's previous recommendation.

Discussion proceeded to reconsideration of Sections GG. Steve Sheppard noted that the Committee's previous recommendation to vary the setbacks to match the designs shown in the Final Plan was innovative and might be rather effective. Dylan Glosecki responded that he agreed but wanted to look at having a better match matching Seattle University. In this case there would be a five foot setback from street -level to 37 feet and 15 feet above 37 feet. He suggested that this be uniformly applied to Sections GG1, GG2 and GG3. Raleigh Watts stated that he was not as concerned with this section as it was essentially internal to major institutions. After further discussion, the members present concluded that they could not reach an agreement on this section and that it should be discussed further at the next meeting.

Discussion proceeded to reconsideration of Section JJ. Steve Sheppard stated that this section was one where many of those not present tonight wanted to see the lower-level setback increased to 10 feet. John Jex noted that the main consideration that led to the five foot recommendation was to achieve better street transparency and allow possible utilization of Canopied. After further discussion, members present agreed to bring this forward to the full Committee with a recommendation to consider an increase the lower-level setback from five to ten feet. Members noted that this was not a unanimous recommendation.

Discussion proceeded to reconsideration of Section KK. It was noted that this was the section where the Committee had spent the most time and the recommendation was rather complicated. Staff briefly outlined the Committee's previous recommendation. Some members suggested that section KK1 and KK3 be amended to bring the upper-level 15 foot setbacks above 65 feet down to 37 feet with a ten foot setback below that point. Others suggested staying with the previous recommendations. The Committee concluded that this section will be brought forward to the full Committee without a firm proposal.

III. Public Comments

The meeting was opened to public comments.

Comments of Ken Torp – Mr. Torp noted that this is his third request for information concerning the percent of increase in the proposed square footage that is attributable to Sabey Corporation. This information has not been provided. Concerning setbacks along 15th, there is no reason why the setbacks on the Swedish side of that street should be different than along the Seattle University side. The issue of canopies is a bit of a Trojan horse and a distraction from the real issue.

Comments of Jack Hanson - Mr. Hanson endorsed ten foot minimum ground-level setbacks along all peripheral streets.

Comments of Murray Anderson – Mr. Anderson also endorsed the 10 foot setbacks. He also noted that when the street-level setback is increased, the upper-level setbacks should be increased proportionately.

Comments of Ellen Sollod – Ms. Sollod reminded the Committee that Swedish is proposing a two story skybridge. The City discourages skybridges. The rationale for the two story skybridge is to separate staff and patients from visitors. However there is no such separation elsewhere in the hospital. She endorsed the greater setbacks for section KK as proposed by Dylan. The rationale for canopies seems weak outside of downtown. 15th Avenue is a boundary and not internal to the institution and it should have similar setbacks to other peripheral streets.

Comments of Abil Bradshaw – Ms. Bradshaw expressed continued opposition to the single building along the 18th Avenue half block.

Comments of Troy Meyers – Mr. Meyers endorsed the minimum ten foot setbacks along the peripheral Streets. He stated opposition to the inclusion of a skybridge.

Comments of Claire Lane - Ms. Lane stated that the street-level setbacks are important. The challenge is both transparency and safety. There are many opportunities to work with this and achieve street activation. There is a need to engage the street and interact with the neighborhood.

IV Continued Committee Discussions

There was a brief discussion concerning the decisions made prior to public comments. Members agreed that the positions reached prior to public comment remained valid and would be brought to the full Committee on March 27th.

V. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment

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