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

DRAFT Meeting Notes
Meeting #28
February 26, 2015

Swedish Medical Center
Swedish Cherry Hill Campus
550 17th Avenue
Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Laurel Spellman	Dylan Glosecki	Katie Porter
Leon Garnett	James Schell	Patrick Angus
J Elliot Smith	Linda Carol	Maja Hadlock
Raleigh Watts	David Letrondo	

Members and Alternates Absent

Dean Patton Ashleigh Kilcup

Ex-Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard, DON	Stephanie Haines, DPD
Andy Cosentino, SMC	Christina VanValkenburgh

(See sign-in sheet)

I. Housekeeping

The meeting was opened by Katie Porter. Brief introductions followed. The agenda was approved without changes. Ms. Porter noted that the main purpose of tonight's meeting was to develop Committee positions on most transportation Issues. Ms. Porter also noted tht the Committee will tentatively meet weekly from this point on. Mr. Sheppard briefly went over the schedule for production of the Committee's final report.

II Re-consideration of height on the West Block.

Raleigh Watts noted tht there has been a great deal of discussion concerning heights and that there is a consensus that heights are too great. He noted that Swedish appears quite constrained on its central Campus. This is the area where they have shown hospital beds. More height in this area might be acceptable. However, there does not seem to be so much consensus within the Committee for the 125 feet on the West Block.

Mr. Watts moved:

> That the Committee recommendation for that portion of the West block previously recommended at 125 feet be Reduced to 90 feet.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Sheppard stated that a reconsideration motion must be made by a person that previously voted in favor of the motion being reconsidered. Mr. Watts noted that he had voted in the affirmative on the motion adopting the previous 125 foot recommendation. Mr. Sheppard confirmed that this was the case.

Mr. Sheppard urged the Committee to try to avoid reconsiderations of past decisions. Committee members are free to do so, but given the close votes on some recommendation, this might lead to reversal after reversal.

Mr. Sheppard noted that technically the first action would have to be to move to reconsider and then to go forward to the formal reconsideration.

The Question was called to reconsider. The Committee voted 6-4 to reconsider. Discussion then turned to the consideration of the motion made above.

Raleigh Watts asked Mr. Jex to comment on heights as they related to floor-plates. Mr. Jex responded that the building is based on 14 foot floor to floor heights. Maja Hadlock stated that 90 feet would be 6 floors and that this reduction would be a further cut of 3 stories off of this building.

David Letrondo stated that he opposed this change. The committee previously indicated that this was the portion of campus that additional height bulk and scale would be acceptable. Still the Committee brought the height down from 200 feet to 160 feet conditioned to 125. We are now going to 90 feet. Andy Cosentino responded that this would severely impact the hospital and that he had no idea how many doctors this might reduce.

Maja Hadlock noted that some other hospitals use a smaller calculating for square feet per-patient and asked for clarification on this. Without this information, this further reduction appears reasonable.

Dylan Glosecki noted tht the majority previously voted for 125 feet and that there are setback issues that we will have to deal with. He stated that he continued to support the 125 foot. Still this is a great deal of increase from the existing development. He asked what the correlation was between the hospital Central bed tower and this development. Andy Cosentino stated that the rationale was to provide support faculties for the doctors. He urged the Committee to forgo a decisions at this meeting to allow Swedish to come back with an evaluation of what the impact would be. Dave Letrondo noted that Swedish has consistently reduced the height of development proposed and that we now appear to be asking to go ever lower.

Katie Porter asked Stephanie Haines if a change in height across 15th from 65 feet to 125 feet would be considered appropriate in other areas. Ms. Haines responded that t it would not normally be considered in a rezone elsewhere. However this is an MIO and there is the acceptance that there would be disparities greater than elsewhere.

Various members asked for a variety of different heights from 125 along 15 to 95 etc. Members expressed some support for going lower but not necessarily to 90 feet. Members noted tht this decision relates both the height bulk and scale and to transportation since it drives the total amount of square feet on the campus and thus trip generation.

Member asked that the motion be amended to condition the 160 foot lower than the 125 previously recommended. Various heights were recommended and some members continued to advocate the previous decision. With 95 first suggested. Others disagreed. Steve Sheppard asked Mr. Watts if a height of 105 could be substituted for the 90 in his original recommendation. This would not require conditioning. Mr. Watts agreed to amend his motion accordingly.

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

James Schell	Yes
Leon Garnet	Yes
Maja Hadlock	Yes
Elliot Smith –	Yes
Raleigh Watts –	No
Dave Letrondo –	No
Linda Carrol –	No
Dylan Glosecki –	No
Laurel Spelman –	No
Patrick Angus	Yes
Katie Porter –	Yes

The vote was 6 in favor 5 opposed none abstaining. A quorum being present and the majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

III. Discussion of Design Guidelines.

The floor was opened to review and comments on the Design Guidelines in Appendix H of the Final Report. Katie Porter asked if the guidelines as included in the final plan were typical. Stephanie Haines stated that the guidelines for Virginia Mason were a spate document and for Children's were in a similar form to those in this plan. Steve Sheppard noted that inclusion of design guidelines is a relatively new item. They are considered a relatively important element of the plan as they are intended to provide guidelines for review of projects from the Master Plan as they are reviewed by the Standing Advisory Committee.

Ms. Porter noted that the guidelines start on page 145 of the plan. Steve Sheppard suggested tht the Committee go through the guidelines, recommend specific changes, and then indicate support for the guidelines. There was a brief discussion of the included photos in the guidelines. The photos are illustrative and convey the guidelines. The operative portions are mostly the wording. After further discussion, the Committee determined that it would not generally comment on the illustrative photos, except in extreme cases.

The Committee then proceeded through the guidelines. Amendments were put forward as follows:

Section B.1.2 General Guidelines (Page 146 of the Final Master Plan)

Add bullets as follows:

- Promote design excellence
- Respect the Historic Context.

Amend bullet 4 on page 146 as follows:

- ~~Attempt to~~ Eliminate blank walls

There was discussion of how to define the historic context and whether more detail should be provided. Members concluded that the simple wording above would be sufficient. The committee was polled and the changes above were endorsed unanimously.

Section B.1.3 Street Frontage Edges (Page 147 of the Final Master Plan)

No changes were suggested other than better photos for the street frontage Architectural Features. Dylan Glosecki suggested to replace photos of the existing campus with ones that show the best street frontage treatments from other similar institutions. Members agreed that this should be a formal comment.

IV. Public Comments

Comments of Murray Anderson - Mr. Anderson stated that the heights initially presented were unrealistic. No one expected them to be implemented. He urged the CAC to continue to work to reach a compromise. He also noted that the community has consistently requested information that has not been provided. This includes: 1) detail on needs calculations; and 2) What is housed in James Tower that is specifically Swedish versus other agencies. Swedish should be considering recapturing some of this leased space. He noted tht the neighborhood has consistently asked for less total development. Traffic is also a major concern that needs to be dealt with. Neighbors need to feel comfortable and safe in the area. Greater Traffic compromises this.

Comments of Ken Torp – Mr Torp expressed concerns about Sabey. He formally requested that Swedish Medical center provide information that identifies what percent of the proposed expansion is attributed to Sabey Development. He stated that he was not sure that the Land Use Code anticipated this situation where a private for-profit developer received major benefit from the Code. In addition he stated that there be a reconsideration of the setbacks. The CAC has reduced setbacks in some locations.

Comments of Ellen Sollod – Ms. Sollod requested that the CAC revisit its setback recommendations for 15th Avenue. She briefly went over the CAC's recommendation and stated that that was worse. She suggested a 30 foot setback at 30 feet Thus creating a podium. This is being done elsewhere. She also asked that the Committee reconsider all zero foot setbacks. These are not acceptable. She also noted that Design guidelines should be both aspirational and measurable. Design guidelines should include the concept of design excellence and address sustainability in this era of climate change\. We should be looking for the best examples.

Xochitl Maykovich – Ms. Maykovich noted that she was from WashingtonCan and stated that the Committee may review and comment on mission of the institution the need for the expansion, public benefits, and the way the proposal will serve the public purpose mission of the major institutions. Swedish has failed to provide access to affordable health care. The Swedish response to public benefit goals is all fluff. There is one brief meeting of charity care. However many community members are in crushing medical debt even though Swedish/Providence is required to provide charity care. Swedish has not made the availability of Charity care well known to its patients. She stated that Swedish needs to do a

much better job of this. The plan addresses height. bulk and scale issues extensively but gives little attention to humans' services issues. She asked that Swedish sit down with WashingtonCan to address these concerns.

Comments of Troy Meyers – Mr. Meyers stated that while he does not consider the Cherry Hill Campus to be part of Downtown, still there was a recent survey by the Downtown Seattle Association that indicated that the SOV use rate for that area was 31.1%. In addition, Virginia Mason has done a good job meeting their goals in their transportation management Plan. Their 2011 update and updated to 2013 indicated that their rates now only 23%. It unreasonable that Swedish start at a 23% rate. Still, the 50% rate seems high and a more aggressive approach needs to be taken. He suggested that occupancy be tied to meeting reasonable goals. Transportation and congestion are major issued that arise from neighbors. He further stated that the partnership with Sabey argued against giving extra benefit. The benefits given through the major institutions process should accrue to the hospital and not to private for-profit companies.

Comments of Jack Hason – Mr. Hanson thanked the Committee for its efforts. He noted tht he and his neighbors remain concerned with the size of the expansions. They continue to be skeptical that an expansion of this size is justified by needs calculations., He and the Community have asked Swedish for information concerning how these calculations were developed. We believe that this information must really be available. The summary information both in the final plan and presented in January 2014 in its presentation by its consultant to the CAC is insufficient. For example there is no discussion of matters such as what population growth forecasts were actually used, what inpatient and outpatient mixes were anticipated, or how benchmarks for timing growth were determine and why these were chosen rather than others. This type of information is necessary to understand the rationale for this expansion. The CAC should be able to review it. He stated that he reiterated his previous formal request for this information. If this information does not exist he requested tht Swedish simply state that. Otherwise, this information should be forwarded to the Committee. He provided a letter to this effect.

Committee discussion of Mr. Hanson's request

The chair briefly interrupted public comment to address Mr. Hanson's request. Katie Porter asked Mr. Cosentino to responded to Mr. Hanson's request. Mr. Cosentino asked for specifics concerning what was made. He directed the Committee's attention to Appendix G or the Plan, and asked what additional information was needed. Ms. Porter noted that Maja and others had spent considerable time reviewing this information and had asked for clarification on how the benchmarks for square footage per bed. She had noted that Swedish appeared to be using a much higher figure than most other intuitions. Ms. Porter reiterated tht many people have requested more detailed information and that it would be good to respond. Mr. Cosentino stated that he would get back with additional information.

Comments of Joy Jacobsen – Ms. Jacobson asked that the CAC re-visit its setback decisions and sections be provided to the Committee that show the setbacks in proper scale relationship to adjacent development.

IV. Questions Concerning Uses on Campus

Editor's Note: The Discussion below was interrupted by a discussions of use. In order to allow easier review of comments this discussion is placed her. It occurred following the completion of the discussion of Section B1.1.4

Laurel Spellman asked for information from DPD related to allowable uses on Campus. Specifically she wanted some regulation that Swedish/Sabey cannot lease to unrelated uses on the campus. Over time, uses such, Labcorp, and NW Kidney Center locate elsewhere. Uses on the campus should directly relate to the key functions of the Hospital. Additional square footage should not be built to accommodate extraneous uses. Mr. Cosentino responded tht there are no uses presently on campus not related to the delivery of health care services. Limiting medical related services would not be appropriate. The justification for adding the amount of square feet proposed is to produce a world-class neurological Center. The neighborhood is accepting a large expansion based in part on projections for craniological and neurological uses on Campus and not on general medical office uses. The ownership of general medical offices by Sabey raises concerns that the size of the proposal is driven more by their desires than the hospital's expansion. Mr. Cosentino responded that it is hard to project 30 years in the future. Medical practice may change. Cures to diseases may redirect efforts.

Stephanie Haines stated that the Land Use Code dictates that only uses with a functional relationship to the institution can be included. It specifies that uses must support the institutions goals and missions. This is pretty wide. It does not specify that these uses must be owned by Swedish. It would be very difficult for DPD to specify anything further without going back and actually amending the Land Use Code. Other members noted uses such as lab-corps and the Seattle University Nursing Program as possible uses that could be relocated. Mr. Cosentino responded that the training of future health care professionals is an important use and is welcome on campus

V. Continued Discussion of Design Guidelines.

Discussion returned to comments on the Design Guidelines in Appendix H or the Final Report

Section B1.1.4 Connection to the Street (Page 148 of the Final Master Plan)

Dylan Glosecki suggested that the guidelines include the follows:

Add the following bullets immediately following the heading at the bottom of page 147 of the Final Master Plan

- Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and ensure tht the building will interact with the street
- Increase street transparence to the greatest extent that is appropriate given abutting uses.

He suggested specific percentage transparency requirements. Mr. Cosentino noted that this is a very sensitive issue. Federal policies require that patient privacy be protected so that a specific percentage requirement might not be appropriate. Dylan agreed and the Committee

adopted that addition of the bullet above as its positon. The added bullet was adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.1.5 Public Entrances and Access Points (Page 148 of the Final Master Plan)

Katie Porter stated tht she would like to see addition of information concerning the nature of entries that goes beyond a discussion of wayfinding. After brief further discussion, the addition of the following bullets were put forward:

Add the following bullets immediately following the Heading on B1.1.5 on page 148 of the Final Master Plan.

- Design public entrances to include elements that engage and emphasize the pedestrian experience including increased transparency.
- Design Entrances and other pedestrian features to encourage staff to use sidewalk level crossings between buildings were appropriate.

Add the Following bullet under the heading Create:

- Wayfinding that directs staff and patients between Cherry Hill and First Hill Campuses and to Seattle University.

The added bullets were adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.1.6 Streetscape and Pedestrian Pathways (pages 149 and 150 of the Final Master Plan)

Dylan Glosecki suggested adding the following to the list of pedestrian Amenities:

- Street front awnings
- Canopies where setbacks are less than 10 feet
- Transparent or translucent materials to maintain solar access

The added bullets were adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.1.7 Sidewalks (Pages 151 and 153 of the Final Mater Plan)

David Letrondo suggested addition of the following bullet immediately under the heading on Page 151

- Shield all sidewalk and exterior lighting to avoid light infiltration and glare to adjacent properties.

The added bullet was adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.1.8 Parking and Vehicle Access (page 153 of Final Master Plan)

Katie Porter suggested stronger language concerning that prioritization of pedestrian and bike safety as an addition to the bullets immediately under the heading as follows:

- Promote safety for bike, pedestrian and transit uses at any vehicle access points.
- Minimize the size and breath of street frontages devoted to curb-cuts and entrances to garages

Amend the second bullet under Consider us of as follows:

- Shielding to limit lighting, and noise impacts ~~to limit light effects~~ on adjacent properties

Dylan Glosecki suggested the following additions to the list under Consider Use of:

- Green screens and vertical plantings on the facades of above-grade parking
- Shielding/Screening of commercial loading zones

The added bullets were adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.2.1, (Page 154 of the Final Master Plan)

Add a statement to indicate that exterior design should seek design excellence.

Section B1.2.2 and B 1.2.3 (Page 154 of the Final Master Plan)

There were no substantive changes suggested.

Section B1.2.4 Screening Guidelines Page 156 of the Final Master Plan)

It was suggested that similar wording to that added to Section B1.1.8 as follows:

- Green screens and vertical plantings especially along facades blank facades.

The added bullets were adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.2.5 Lighting, Safety and Security (Page 156 of the Final Master Plan)

Katie Porter suggested that language that is reflective of the discussion under B1.1.7 should be added. After some discussion it was recommended that the following conditions contained on Page 106 of the Draft Report of the Director of the City Department of Planning and Development be incorporated into the this section of the Design Guidelines as follows:

- Use low-reflective glass and other materials, window recesses and overhangs, and façade modulation.
- Use landscaping, screens, and "green walls" to the extent practicable to obstruct light from shining to offsite locations.
- Restrict nighttime illumination of the site and selected buildings to provide lighting only when function or safety requires it.
- Equip interior lighting with automatic shut-off times. Install automatic shades installed where lighting is required for emergency egress.
- Use screens or landscaping as part of parking or structure design to obstruct glare caused by vehicle headlights.

The bullets above were adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Section B1.3.2 Landscape General Guidelines. (Page 157 of the Final Master Plan)

Katie Porter suggested that the statement of intent be changes a- follows:

The hospital campus shook be composed of a rich, ~~and~~ varied and well-maintained landscape and plant palette.

Section B1.3.3 Planting (Page 157 of the Final Master Plan)

Dylan Glosecki suggested that this section include greater focus on pollinator pathway certified plants, use of drip irrigation and capture and re-use of Storm Water. He noted tht these were included in the Children's Master Plan. Laurel Spellman suggested that consideration should be given to retaining all storm water on-site. Following brief further discussion the following bullets were added to the list under B1.3.3

- Include pollinator Pathway Certified plants
- To minimize need for irrigation, consider landscape designs that capture storm water run-off.
- Where irrigation is necessary, include drip irrigation systems where possible.

Section B2.1.2 Height Bulk and Scale General Guidelines (Page 158 to 160 of the Master Plan)

Members endorsed the general guideline bullets and then proceeded to a review of the various highlighted section of these Guidelines.

Members suggested minor changes to the wording in the second bullet under Pedestrian Scale (bottom of page 158) as follows:

- Pay special attention to the ~~first~~ ground floor of the building in order to maximize opportunities to engage the pedestrian and enable and active, transparent, and vibrant street front.

The bullet as amended above was adopted as the Committee recommendation.

Raleigh Watts suggested the addition of wording to encourage protection of privacy under the section "Design buildings from multiple viewpoints". He noted that the larger scale campus building would potentially look down into adjacent residences and that great care should be taken to protect the privacy of adjacent residents, especially in nearby single-family homes. After brief further discussion, the following bullet was suggested to be added immediately following that section at the bottom of page 159 as follows:

Protect Privacy for adjacent residences

- Design fenestration (windows) and balconies or other outward looking features, to minimize viewing from the campus buildings into adjacent residences.

The new section as outlined above was adopted as the Committee recommendation.

B2.1.3 Architectural and Façade Composition

Katie Porter suggested that use of murals be specifically added to the list of under these sections. Others noted that "art as appropriate to area zoning and uses" might cover this. Ms. Porter asked that Murals still be separately called out. After brief further discussion the Following was suggested as a new bullet:

- Murals

The added bullet above was adopted as the Committee recommendation.

B2.1.4 Secondary Architectural Features (Page 160 of the Final Master Plan)

Members noted tht the Committee had previously recommended that no un-modulated façade shall exceed 90 feet in length. Members endorsed changing this section to reflect

the Committee's previous recommendation. The first sentence of the first bullet under B2.1.4 would be changed as follows:

- No un-modulated façade shall exceed ~~125~~ 90 feet in length.

B2.2.2 Color and Material (Page 162 of the Final Master Plan)

Members asked that a new section under this section be added as follows:

- Avoid Uses that have a similar appearance to the Jefferson Tower.

There was brief discussion of this and no final endorsement of this was made.

Dylan Glosecki suggested addition of a bullet under "Consider use of:"

- Design elements that are compatible with documents such as "green guidelines for healthcare"

The added bullet above was adopted as the Committee recommendation.

B2.3.1 Rooftops – Statement of Intent (Page 162 of the Final Master Plan)

Members briefly discussed this section and endorsed the following change to the statement of intent

Where Rooftops are visible from location beyond the hospital rooftops are a design element and should be designed to be attractive

B2.3.2 Rooftop Design (Page 162 of the Master Plan)

Members endorsed the addition of the following bullet under "considered use of":

- Green Roofs with public access

VI Adjournment

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