



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**

Katie Porter, Chair

Leon Garnett

Dylan Glosecki

Maja Hadlock

Raleigh Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Majo 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*

Marcia Peterson

*Swedish Medical  
 Center Management*

Cristina Van Valkenburgh

*Seattle Department of  
 Transportation*

**Meeting Notes**

**Meeting #17**

**July 17, 2014**

Swedish Medical Center  
 Swedish Cherry Hill Campus  
 550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

**Members and Alternates Present**

Katie Porter	Patrick Angus	David Letrondo
Dylan Glosecki	Linda Carrol	James Schell
Laurel Spelman	Maja Hadlock	

**Members and Alternates Absent**

Lara Branigan	J. Elliot Smith	Dean Patton
Raleigh Watts		

**Ex-Officio Members Present**

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

*(See sign-in sheet)*

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed. She noted that the Committee still needed to discuss the sky bridge and other issues deferred from the last meeting. Members agreed

Ms. Porter also noted that members of the Community had developed a 3-D model of the present proposal and have asked for about ten minutes on the agenda to briefly present the model. Members agreed.

**II. Housekeeping**

Mr. Sheppard stated that he would be putting meeting minutes online for the Committee members to review and approve and also to be available to the public. Most members stated that they preferred approving minutes at future meetings. Steve Sheppard noted that they will be put on-line as preliminary documents subject to change.

**III. Discussions on Comments on Draft EIS and Draft Master Plan**

**Sky Bridges**

--

Editor's note: This discussion was interrupted by the discussion of timing and FAR. For purposes of clarity the discussion has been combined here.

Steve Sheppard noted that the issue of sky bridges were not dealt with and that there was some confusion concerning the issue, and particularly whether the Committee was endorsing a sky bridge on campus including across 16<sup>th</sup>. He noted that some members had suggested that any connection across 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue should be underground.

Brief discussion followed. Members stated that any sky bridge proposed across 16<sup>th</sup> should be a replacement for the current structure and not an addition. Ms. Porter added that she would like to have the Committee discuss the issue of whether any sky bridge was a one or two story structure. SMC staff responded that it was their intention to demolish the existing sky bridge during construction and replace it with a new sky bridge. There would be only one sky bridge across 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and no sky bridge across 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Members appeared comfortable with that clarification. Steve Sheppard noted that the comment in the draft document provided before the meeting appeared to be in line with the discussion and asked if the Committee felt comfortable simply endorsing the statement concerning sky bridges in the draft document without changes. Members agreed.

Mr. Cosentino stated that a double decked sky bridge is not a given. Instead a wider side by side structure that separates visitors from patients is more likely. David Letrondo noted that he has designed hospitals and that this separation is often done. Ms. Porter stated that this issue for Sky Bridge appears to be reasonable accommodation and replacement for the existing structure...

Ms. Van Valkenburgh stated that the sky bridge is a separate approval and if it is not in a plan it is not automatically approved.

### **Timing of Reviews**

Mr. Sheppard stated that in the last meeting Ms. Laurel Spelman raised the issue of the time frame of the plan. She proposed that there be a time limit of 20 years, and not that it be indefinite. In the past both the Hearing Examiner and Council have stated that the CAC does not have the authority to change the code provision to insert an expiration date. As a compromise, recent plans have included a provision for the institution to report back to the future Standing Advisory Committee in a more detailed manner than occurs yearly with their presentation of their annual report. Under the recent proposals, the institution has been required to hold a broader review on each 10<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of adoption of their plan. This review would be advertised broadly to the neighborhood and it would be more formal than the normal annual report.

Ms. Spelman stated that her comment wasn't so much about timing for review but about the time frame for establishing needs. She suggested planning for space needs to 2025 rather than 2040.

Dylan Glosecki stated that he liked the idea of formal check-ins. Any check-ins should be done in incremental steps with the ability to adjust the check-ins with Swedish. He stated that this could be tied to various phases of development with the reviews tied to completion of the plan's phases.

David Letrondo asked if this issue was raised in past MIMP's. Mr. Sheppard responded that check-ins were done differently at different institutions. Children's, tied the check-ins to completion of their Phase 3 plans to state needs. Seattle University has a 15 year check-in.

Ms. Spelman withdrew the idea of a timeframe as it is not allowed by code but recommended that the Committee consider establishing an upper-limit of development. She suggested that the CAC consider establishing a lower allowed FAR (Floor Area Ratio). She suggested an FAR of about 4.5 which would generate about 2.5 million gross square feet of development.

Mr. Sheppard directed the Committee to look at the statement in the draft document. He summarized it as follows:

The current proposed heights, bulks and scales and projected future development of 2.75 million square feet, results in an FAR of about 4.73. With reductions of heights to better integrate with the surrounding community, total FAR may also need to be reconsidered. FAR in similar lower rise settings such as Children's Medical Center, or Northwest Hospital have ranged from 1.4 for Northwest Hospital to 2.2 for Children's Medical Center. FAR on First Hill where the campuses abut high and mid-rise development ranges from 3.3 for Harborview to 5.4 at the Swedish Medical Center First Hill Campus to 8.4 at Virginia Mason. The FAR of 4.73 proposed for the Cherry Hill Campus fall in the lower range for the First Hill high-rise areas. Consideration should be given to a reductions in FAR to complement any reduced heights.

This comment asks for consideration of FAR reductions and does not direct such.

Mr. Cosentino noted that Children's was able to greatly expand their MIO boundary, and that SMC is more closely constrained. Other members suggested focusing on height bulk and scale rather than FAR. After brief further discussion it was determined that the above wording should remain unchanged.

A comment from one of the CAC members suggested having a check-in at five years for the Standing Advisory Committee.

After brief further discussion, Dean Patton moved:

That there be an augmented community check in at each five year anniversary of the adoption of the plan.

The motion was seconded. No further discussion occurred. Ms. Porter called the question by show of hands. All present voted in the affirmative.

A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

#### **IV. Presentation on the neighborhood 3-D model representation**

Editor's note: This presentation referred to a 3-D model and is not easily summarized verbally.

Ms. Ellen Sollod provided a brief summary regarding the 3-D model she and others had developed. Ms. Sollod stated that she and the rest of the neighbors believed that they had not had sufficient information in the MIMP to fully visualize the height, bulk, and scale of the proposed development. The purpose of the 3-D model is to better illustrate two elements that the neighbors want the CAC members would like to see and these are: 1) planned future lot coverage; 2) alternative 10 heights; and 3) the general scale of the single family and low rise neighborhood that surrounds the proposed buildings. Ms. Sollod noted that the model incorporated grades for streets. 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue was used as the base and calculating the elevations. Ms. Sollod then walked through several of the blocks. She noted that along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue the combination of building heights and grade change create a wide variety of heights. A building at 160 feet on 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue is 175 Feet on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and at 200 ft. on 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be as high as 215 ft. along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She noted that similar situations occur along 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Avenues. The 50 ft. building, creating a wall along the backyard of the residential houses. The current proposal would also create a fortress-like structure at Cherry St. with the addition of a sky bridge. The model also demonstrated the lack of transition on either side of the neighborhood.

Ms. Sollod concluded by stating that it was her conclusion that the model illustrated the incompatibility between the heights, bulks and scale of the proposed development and the surrounding neighborhood.

A brief discussion of scale of the surrounding neighborhood followed. Mr. Cosentino asked if the model has been validated by a licensed architect. He stated his concern about having the CAC make a decision based on the model without some review by a registered architect.

Ms. Porter responded that she cannot say or determine that this model is an actual representation of the buildings and the neighborhood. Laurel Spellman noted that the CAC has requested Swedish a 3D model representation several times but was never provided such. Ms. Porter stated that the model that was presented appeared a good start.

Mr. Cosentino stated that he appreciated the work done by the neighbors to represent the area and the buildings on the model, but would like to cautioned the CAC that there might be errors on the model and would like the CAC to refrain from making a decision just by looking at the model. Ms. Porter acknowledged that there are flaws on the model.

Ms. Sollod stated that she would be delighted and welcome Swedish to come up and bring a 3D model to the Committee that shows the height, bulk and scale rather than testing the veracity of the model.

## **V. Public Comments**

**Comment from Ken Torp;** - Mr. Torp stated that he appreciates the hospitality of Swedish and mentioned why the CAC tries to focus on small issues such as sky bridges, and modulations and is not looking at the big picture, i.e. height, bulk, and scale that is compatible with the residential neighborhood. He stated that it was his opinion that the answer was no. He mentioned that the CAC should tell Swedish and Sabey that this is unacceptable about the adequate transition. They should look at what Children's did to their surrounding neighborhood.

**Comment from Troy Myer:** - Mr. Myer stated that he was very thankful about the model presented. He stated that he currently sees 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a hostile street, and that the model looks like building a fortress, and he would like to see an opening up on 17<sup>th</sup> and in the middle of Squire Park to navigate around because the current proposal was so apart in proportion. He also stated that he was thankful of the public comments.

**Comment from Kathy Yasi** - Ms. Yasi stated that she is a family care provided that lives on 21<sup>st</sup> and east of Columbia. She stated that she is opposed to the development because of the giant structure, huge lot coverage, inadequate setbacks and issues on traffic, water and light. She mentioned that she walks along with young children and would like to have the traffic speed in the area at a kid's pace. She stated that when employees park their cars on 21<sup>st</sup>, there were no more adequate parking spaces left. She also stated her concern about the storm water issue that goes down the hill as well as the night time lights that will show on these buildings. She is not against Swedish as an institution, but is concerned about protecting the vitality of the neighborhood.

**Comments from Cindy Feeling:** Ms. Feeling lives on 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue and suggested that Swedish should create model. She noted that the model should show both cars and people to scale and additional information concerning setbacks along Jefferson and Cherry Streets. .

**Comment from Vicki Schianterelli:** - Ms. Schianterelli stated that she is Ms. Feeling's next door neighbor. She noted that in 2010 the neighbors had raised a balloon to 37 feet above the rear lot line of the lots along 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. That illustrated the view blockages along that side of the Campus She reminded the Committee that from day one that she asked Swedish to produce a 3-D model. Their response was repeatedly no. She would like to see an architect's version as well and particularly how the slope from Cherry to Jefferson Streets would affect the apparent heights.

**Comment from Jerry Matsui:** - Mr. Matsui stated his comments might appear familiar. He noted that the DEIS shows the actual traffic impacts that will occur is SMC did everything right and is not necessarily an objective evaluation. He noted that Swedish has not had a good record in following through on commitments. The impacts presented are “best case scenarios”. He stated that he and others are not necessarily against the hospital, however that should not give Swedish a blank check. The development places high rise development in the middle of this low rise neighborhood. He stated that the proposal can best be described as intensive. He suggested that greater height be only allowed for hospital development, not Sabey development. He stated that the intention of the process was not to allow for-profit development to benefit from the overlay. He stated that the final plan should be rejected. He again stated that the alternatives proposed by Swedish is unacceptable especially the development of high rise buildings in the middle of a residential neighborhood.

**Comment from Merlin Rainwater:** Ms. Rainwater stated that she did not live in the immediate neighborhood, and stated that the main reason he attended this meeting was to get information on the Transportation plan and to voice her opinion about Swedish not meeting the goals of the previous transportation plan. He would like to see that the goal of the transportation plan is regularly met.

**Comment from Murray Anderson:** Mr. Anderson lives on Jefferson for almost 30 years. He stated understands the changes that will occur. However when he saw the proposal he was dismayed. He stated that he remains perplexed. On the face of it, this proposal appears to be totally out of scale with the neighborhood. He mentioned that there is need to further justify the size of the buildings. He also stated that it is impossible for Swedish to project 20 years down the road concerning what the neighborhood would look like and he assured that the neighborhood will definitely look different in the next 20 years.

**Comments from Lorie Lucky:** Ms. Lucky stated that she lives two blocks north of 17<sup>th</sup> and Cherry and not a near neighbor, but she is part of the Squire Park neighborhood. She stated that she opposes the plan because of the height and bulk is way too high and it seemed like it will create a fortress. She noted that the uses for these building appear unclear. The community was told that this would be the location of a state of the earth heart research center, but at a previous meeting the SEIU representative stated that this function was being moved to First Hill. She stated that she was concerned about the houses on the edge of Jefferson that were remodeled into beautiful Victorian style houses and how it will become of them because of the expansion.

**Comments from Greg Harmon:** Mr. Harmon lives on 19<sup>th</sup> and Cherry and stated that the intensity of the buildings is way too much for the neighborhood. While the scale has been reduced somewhat it is still too large. He stated that smaller buildings and separate structure are needed. He stated the need for these buildings to transition better to Seattle University and that the setbacks are insufficient. He further stated that the traffic impacts appear understated.

**Comments from Aleta Van Patten:** Ms. Van Patten lives on 15<sup>th</sup> and Columbia and stated that the model clearly shows the massive scale of the building. She stated that so long as the same number of square feet of development was placed into the neighborhood, that the expansion would bring a lot of people in the neighborhood which result in more traffic contamination. She mentioned that Swedish should consider accommodation for the neighborhood.

## **VI. Update on Integrated Transportation Board (ITB)**

Mr. Cosentino informed the Committee that the ITB held its first meeting on July 10<sup>th</sup>. The purpose of the meeting was to look beyond the MIMP and agree upon a unified approach on building coherent policies, enforcement of parking and enticement for patients’ visitors, and vendors that are coming in the campus. The board included representatives from SDOT, King County Metro, LabCorp, Northwest Kidney, and Sabey. It is intended that they meet every two weeks. These groups

participating each has a vested interest in identifying problems and challenges and coming up with a unified solutions to an ongoing problem of traffic and parking around the campus. Currently, the group is gathering data, and tackling surface parking and traffic mitigations. Mr. Cosentino added that updates will be provided to the Committee in the next 60-90 days.

Ms. Spelman asked what would occur in case that the proposed development degraded the level of service at various to a D rating. Would that would trigger SDOT to condition the project by installing traffic lights or pedestrian improvements.

Ms. Van Valkenburgh responded that the level of service only focuses on cars and it is not SDOT's sole concern. SDOT's concern would be safety and travel option for everyone. If there is a concern, SDOT will work with Swedish on signal hardware and improvements on the ground to make it safer for people and bicyclist to cross the streets.

Various members noted that the Swedish record was mixed at best concerning addressing traffic and parking problems, and that it will important that the board to look at why the process did not work in the past. Mr. Cosentino stated that all of the five companies will be looking at what works well and acknowledged some failures in the past.

## **VII. Adjournment**

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