



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

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Raleigh Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Maja Hadlock

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical  
 Center Non-  
 management  
 Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Lara Branigan

**Committee Alternates**

James Schell

Dean Patton

Ashleigh Kilcup

**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 #22**

**December 18, 2014**

Swedish Medical Center  
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus  
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

**Members and Alternates Present**

Dean Patton	Dylan Glosecki	Katie Porter
Leon Garnett	James Schell	
J Elliot Smith	Linda Carol	
Raleigh Watts	Dave Letrondo	

**Members and Alternates Absent**

Patrick Angus  
 Laurel Spelman

**Ex-Officio Members Present**

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Andy Cosentino, SMC	
Christina Van Valkenburgh, SDOT	

*(See sign-in sheet)*

**I. Housekeeping**

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. She noted that the Committee would be voting on the major issue of heights at this meeting. For this reason, public comments have been moved to the start of the meeting.

Ms. Porter noted that members have received the final MIMP and EIS and still have questions for Swedish. Ms. Porter also noted that she has received meeting minutes from past meetings, but was not been able to review and asked that this be deferred to allow the Committee to spend more time on its recommendations. Mr. Sheppard agreed and asked if drafts might be posted to the web. Members agreed that this could be done in some cases but reiterated their requests for more time to review them.

**II. Public Comments**

Ms. Porter opened the floor for public comments.

**Comments from Murray Anderson:** Mr. Anderson noted that the original proposal that was presented by the CAC included boundary expansions

across both Jefferson and Cherry. Have these been formally abandoned? Are other parts of the neighborhood being proposed for up-rezoning? If that any such proposal should be abandoned

**Comments from Ken Torp:** Mr. Torp thanked the CAC members for their hard work. Looking at the height on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and across from Seattle University; its MIO is 65 ft. The City determined that this was reasonable for this location. There is no reason why the Swedish MIMP should be higher than 70 ft. when across the street; there is a reasonable transition by the City at 65 ft. He urged the CAC to be sensitive to the viability and livability of the surrounding residential neighborhood and the precedence that was established by the City as a reasonable transition.

**Comment from Aleta Van Patten:** Ms. Van Patten noted that her comments are the same as at previous meetings. If Swedish wants to bring more hospital bed to the campus, that might be acceptable, but if Sabey wants to build office buildings those can go elsewhere. Most hospital care does not need such a large amount of office buildings; doctors do not need instant access to hospitals. The plan is too big, and will generate too much for traffic. This development must be compatible with the adjacent Seattle University campus heights. Don't let corporate powers bully the neighbors and permanently damage the neighborhood.

**Comment from Ellen Sollod:** Ms. Sollod submitted written testimony. She referenced diagrams concerning the larger issues. This proposal would result in a 160 foot height wall along the north and west margins of the neighborhood. With this, Swedish does not demonstrated care for the neighborhood. Alternative 12 still contains far too much square footage. The CAC and the City should assure that the SMC proposal conforms to the Land Use City Code including transition requirements, encouragement of decentralization and accommodation of a balance between the needs of the neighborhood and Swedish. The only solution is to lower the square footage. Providence health Care is one of the largest providers in the nation. If Swedish's needs cannot be met at this campus then location at other nearby locations (decentralization) should be considered.

**Comments from Bob Cooper:** Mr. Cooper noted that he has sent a lengthy comment. The overall plan submitted by Swedish to the CAC is deficient and should be rejected entirely. It is fundamentally incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The increase in traffic will degrade the neighborhood and that is the fundamental problem. This campus is not located in an urban village; it does not fit to the neighborhood. Sabey's own legal team has argued for this point in other venues. There are many uses that should be located elsewhere. He noted computer farms as an example. This is a monolith that raises in the middle of a low-rise neighborhood. Swedish lacks consideration. The institution does not understand the neighborhood; and the neighborhood has not asked for several amenities and would urge the Committee to reject the plan in its entirety.

**Comments from Lori Lucky:** Ms. Lucky noted that access to the FEIS has been difficult. The plan remains incompatible with the neighborhood; there is a huge shadow in the northwest corner and Swedish is not very transparent concerning what will be in these buildings. She noted that there have been program changes and that Swedish has been less than forthcoming with this information.

**Comment from Troy Myers** Mr. Myers stted that he is embarrassed that after a half dozen iterations, the same issues keeps coming up. The proposals are completely out of scope and out of scale. This area is not in an urban village. Swedish appears to justify this development based upon its business model. In the past this was a community-serving facility, but has grown into a megalith. The Central area will not be able to absorb the traffic. The CAC should deny and turn down the proposal. There had been issues on transparency, and the information are corrupt and the public could not access the information. He urged that the plan be rejected.

**Comments from Sonja Richter:** Ms. Sonja stated that she hopes the CAC members would think about the height, bulk and the tall buildings in the schematic and keep in mind how huge these buildings will be in the middle of the neighborhood compared to other buildings.

**Comments from Abel Bradshaw:** Mr. Bradshaw stated that the proposals are out of scale and the representatives from both Swedish and Sabey do not care about the neighborhood at all. The proposals are not mitigating the height of the hospital in the neighborhood and are unacceptable. The CAC should reject the proposal.

**Comment from Cindy: Thelen** -Ms. Thelen thanked all the CAC members for their work. She seconded what Mr. Myers presented, and support the testimonies of her neighbors. There will be severe impacts from the proposed development on 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. A 37 ft. building height and not one long building. The job the CAC is to consider the vitality of the neighborhood and you should question the impacts of heights on this neighborhood.

### **III. Committee Discussion and Votes on Height Issues**

Ms. Porter closed public testimony and opened the floor to consideration of heights. Dean Patton asked for more information concerning the relationship to the heights across 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the Seattle University Campus. Should SU and Swedish heights be similar? Mr. Sheppard responded that each institution is separate and each are allowed to propose their own heights.

Ms. Porter acknowledged that there are a number of people who wants to deny the MIMP and its entirety. She expressed some surprise with this position. Members of the audience expressed surprise with this statement.

Ms. Porter also noted that there is a tunnel between 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> and asked if that requires a partial street vacation. Ms. Haines responded that it would. Ms. Porter also asked about the Phase C and a number of potential scope expansion areas. Mr. Jex responded that Phase C and E will come in multiple phases of construction activities, current services will be available, but it will be constructed in multiple phases. Phase E covers the Seattle Rehab Center location and would be an issue only if Seattle Rehab moved elsewhere. He agreed that more discussion of these phases might have been desirable. There was a brief discussion of phasing issues.

The discussion moved to heights on campus. Mr. Porter expressed her hope that the Committee can move forward with a vote tonight.

Dean Patton stated that he is uncomfortable voting on height absent knowing what the setbacks might be. Mr. Glosecki stated that he too is uncomfortable with the vote, but it is necessary to establish a foundation point for further discussion and other issues that are in effect and better understanding from the near neighbors.

Mr. Sheppard noted that the Committee previously rejected a wholesale endorsement of Alternative 12. The Committee must now determine where it wants to go as an alternative. Members decided to address the height issues separately for: 1) the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half Block; 2) the Central Campus; and 3) the area west of 16<sup>th</sup>.

#### **18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half-Block**

Dave Letrondo referred to the polling of members done before the meeting and provided tonight for discussion as shown below.

SWEDISH CHERRY HILL MIMP												
CAC ALLOWED MAX HEIGHTS												
18-Dec-14												
	15th/16th			Mid Block					18th Halfblock			
	North (N)	West (W)	South (S)	North (N)	West (W)	South (S)	Southwest (Sw)	Southeast (SE)	North (N)	East (E)	South (S)	
Alt 11	65	150/125	65	105	160	37	105	40	45/37	15	45/37	
Dean (Alternate)	alt 12	65	alt 12	90	90	alt 12	90	alt 12	37	alt 12	37	
James (Alternate)	alt 12	65	alt 12	90	90	alt 12	90	alt 12	37	37	37	
Patrick	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	37	37	37	
Maja	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	37	37	37	
Raleigh	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	125/105	105	125	105	alt 12	alt 12	37	
Laurel	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	140	105	alt 12	alt 12	37	37	37	
Leon	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	37	alt 12	37	
Dylan	alt 12	125	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	105	alt 12	alt 12	37	alt 12	37	
Ashleigh	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	37	37	37	
Dave	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	37	
Linda	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	alt 12	37	
Katie	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	
Elliot	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	abstain	

He noted that there appears to be considerable agreement among members with the exception of small areas that slightly exceed 37 feet due to grade changes. Members noted that some of this difference relates to how height is measured. None-the-less all expressed preference that no portion of the building exceeds 37 feet.

After brief further discussion, it was moved by Ashlie Kilcup that:

The modulation, and heights shown in Alternative 12 for the 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue Half Block be approved so long as no portion of the building in that half block be greater than 37 feet in height at any spot.

The motion was seconded by Dylan Glosecki. The question was called and the Committee polled. Mr. Sheppard noted that a quorum was present and that all members and alternates in attendance were eligible to vote. Votes were as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes
Katie Porter	Yes
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	Yes
Maja Hadlock	Yes
J Elliot Smith	Yes
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	Yes
Dean Patton	No

The vote was 11 in favor, none opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative the motion passed.

### Central Campus

Ms. Porter noted that there was significant agreement for most of the area but disagreement with the height of the 160-foot hospital area. Mr. Patton stated that the whole scale that is being discussed is still too big and recommend not to approve Alternative 12.

Various members stated that there appeared to be consensus with height for the Central Block as shown in Alternative 12 with the exception of the 160-foot tower. Dean Patton disagreed noting that the 105 feet proposed for much of this area would still be too high and block views of the bell tower. Mr. Glosecki noted that the current master plan allows 105 feet and that going lower would actually be a take-away from current allowances. Ms. Porter asked whether the institution be subject to such

a reduction in height. Ms. Haines responded that the current MIO height is at 105 ft. when the last MIMP expired, and there is no requirement at this point. Height could be reduced.

It was moved by J Elliot smith that:

The heights shown in Alternative 12 for the Central Block in Alternative 12 be approved for all areas other than that portion indicated as 160 ft.

The motion was seconded and the Committee polled. The vote results are as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes
Katie Porter	Yes
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	Yes
Maja Hadlock	Yes
J Elliot Smith	Yes
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	Yes
Dean Patton	Yes

The vote was 11 in favor, none opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative the motion passed.

Discussion then turned to the Hospital tower. Ms. Porter observer that it appeared that members positions concerning this area ranged widely from as low as 90 feet to as high as the 160 feet shown in Alternative 12. A comment was made that it is not a good idea to support a high tower.

Dean Patton observed that he has heard no support in the community for the higher tower. Not one neighborhood commenter has advocated this height. For this reason, alone it should be rejected.

Members asked Mr. Jex if the tower is taken down to 125 ft., what will be the approximate change. Mr. Jex mentioned that the 2 floors of the bed tower would be eliminated. That would be approximately about 96 beds and about 100,000 sq. ft. He also noted that if you maintained uniform floor plates, those portions towards the east would actually be just below 150 feet in height.

Mr. Glosecki noted that members have expressed the opinion that there should be some allowance for additional hospital bed. He noted that at this point he could live with 160 feet for this tower, but is not totally convinced. Katie Porter noted that Swedish does own this section of the Campus. Mr. Cosentino noted that that it would be owned and operated by Swedish Health Care Services.

Raleigh Watts stated that by advocating reducing height he was not opposing additional bed but suggesting that they be located in different ways and in lower buildings.

After brief further discussion, Dylan Glosecki moved that:

The height of the hospital tower on the central block in Alternative 12 (160 ft.) be approved s shown in the Final Master Plan.

The motion was seconded and the Committee polled. The vote results are as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	No
Katie Porter	Yes
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent

Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	No
Maja Hadlock	No
J Elliot Smith	No
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	No
Dean Patton	No

The vote was 5 in favor, 6 opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the negative the motion failed.

Ms. Porter asked if there were other heights that might be put forward for a vote. Ms. Carrol noted that the loss of 96 beds would be a significant impact and asked what the effect might be if the height were reduced to 140 feet. Mr. Jex responded that this would reduce the height be one floor and would result in the loss of about 48 hospital beds

It was moved by Linda Carrol proposes that

The height of the hospital tower on the central block be MIO 160 ft. conditioned down to a maximum height of 140 ft.

The motion was seconded and the Committee polled. The vote results were as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes
Katie Porter	Yes
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	No
Maja Hadlock	No
J Elliot Smith	No
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	No
Dean Patton	No

The vote was 6 in favor, 5 opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative the motion passed.

### **West Block – West of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

Discussion then turned to consideration of heights in the block bounded by 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, S Jefferson Street and S Cherry Street. Ms. Porter initiated the discussion by observing that when polled informally a majority did not appear willing to totally endorse the height proposed in Alternative 12, but suggested that a formal vote be taken on that position. Members Agreed.

It was moved that:

The heights as shown in alternative 12 for the areas of the campus west of 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue be approved.

The motion was seconded and the Committee polled. The vote results were as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	No
-----------------	----

Katie Porter	No
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent
Dylan Glosecki	No
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	Yes
Maja Hadlock	No
J Elliot Smith	No
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	No
Dean Patton	No

The vote was 4 in favor, 7 opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the negative the motion failed.

Dylan Glosecki moved that

The height of the medical office tower in the block bounded by 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, S Jefferson Street and S Cherry Street presently shown as MIO 160 conditioned to 150 feet in the Final Master Plan, be further reduced to condition height further so that no portion of the building be greater than 125 feet in height.

The motion was seconded. Brief Discussion followed.

Mr. Glosecki noted that when polled some had indicated support for the greater height and one as low as 65 feet, but that most members appeared willing to see 125 feet.

The question was called and the Committee polled. The vote results were as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes
Katie Porter	Yes
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	No
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	Yes
Maja Hadlock	Yes
J Elliot Smith	No
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	Yes
Dean Patton	No

The vote was 8 in favor, 3 opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the Affirmative the motion passed.

Ms. Porter stated that for clarity the Committee might want to formally indicate acceptance of the portions of the West Block that are shown with heights of 65 ft.

It was moved and seconded that

The heights of 65 feet for those portions of the block bounded by 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, S Jefferson Street and S Cherry Street not shown as 150 ft. in Alternative 12 be approved.

The motion was seconded and the Committee polled. The vote results were as follows:

Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes
Katie Porter	Yes
Patrick Angus	Absent
Laurel Spelman	Absent
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Raleigh Watts	Yes
Maja Hadlock	Absent
J Elliot Smith	Yes
Leon Garnett	Yes
James Schell	Yes
Dean Patton	Yes

The vote was 10 in favor, none opposed. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the Affirmative the motion passed.

#### **IV. Possible Future meeting Dates**

Ms. Porter informed the Committee that they need to schedule time to discuss other issues

Ms. Haines Noted that the draft Director's recommendation report will be available on January 15<sup>th</sup>; and the CAC will be meeting that night. Ms. Porter suggested that a meeting be scheduled prior to release of the draft report, to attempt to deal with other issues prior to focusing on the Draft Director's Report. Members indicated their willingness to meet the week of January 8<sup>th</sup>.

#### **V. Adjournment**

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