



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

Raleigh Watts

J. Elliot Smith

Laurel Spelman

Maja Hadlock

Linda Carrol

*Swedish Medical
 Center Non-
 management
 Representative*

Patrick Angus

David Letrondo

Ashleigh Kilcup

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 #25

January 29, 2015

Swedish Medical Center

Swedish Cherry Hill Campus

550 17th Avenue

Swedish Cherry Hill Auditorium – A Level

Members and Alternates Present

Dean Patton

Dave Letrondo

Patrick Angus

J Elliot Smith

Ashleigh Kilcup

Linda Carrol

Dylan Glosecki

Members and Alternates Absent

Raleigh Watts

Maja Hadlock

Leon Garnett

James Schell

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. Brief introductions followed. The agenda was approved without substantive changes.

II. Discussion of Setbacks

Discussion proceeded to setbacks. Steve Sheppard began the discussion on setbacks with Section AA, page 25 Of the Final Master Plan. Shows setbacks on the rear side of the 18th avenue half block.

Dave Letrondo stated 25 ft. setback is very generous and more than appropriate. It is consistent with the setbacks in the single family underlying zone. Mr. John Jex referenced page 34 illustrates the underlying zoning setbacks for comparison. Mr. Sheppard commented this matches the single family setbacks.

Steve Sheppard noted the CAC had previously recommended a reduced height for this location. Mr. Sheppard suggested considering what the Hearing Examiner does in case it does not go to a reduced height and advocate bigger setback.

Mr. Sheppard asked if there were any disagreements with the setbacks proposed for this Section. Members indicated they approved of the proposed setbacks for this location.

Steve Sheppard asked for clarification concerning the modulation along the rear facade of the development on the 18th Avenue half-block. He noted modulating is shown on the illustration on Page 27 of the Final Master Plan and asked if modulating started at the 15 foot setback and represented a further setting back from point. Mr Jex responded in the affirmative.

Upon further discussion, Mr. Dylan Glosecki moved:

The upper level setback got Section AA on page 26 of the final Master plan be increased from 30 to 35 feet.

The motion was seconded. No further discussion occurred and the question was called.

Mr. Sheppard noted all members and alternates in attendance were eligible to vote. The Committee was polled. Votes were as follows.

Elliot Smith	Yes
David Letrondo	No
Linda Carrol	No
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Patrick Angus	Yes
Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes

The vote was 4 in favor and 2 oppose. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

It was noted the Committee was accepting the setbacks as shown in the Final Master Plan for Sections BB and CC. Committee members indicated approval of this and no formal vote was considered necessary. After brief further discussion, members made no specific comments concerning setbacks on Section DD.

Discussion then turned to consideration of setback along Jefferson Street – Section EE as shown on page 29 of the Final Master Plan. Patrick Angus asked why the setbacks along Jefferson and Cherry were not greater. He noted this was one area where street activation was proposed. Others noted there needed to be space provided for adequate landscaping. Steve Sheppard asked if members wanted to advocate significantly different setbacks along Jefferson and Cherry Street. Members noted that the two streets are very different. Cherry is on long façade and Jefferson is much more varied. Members briefly considered whether an increased lower-level setback along section EE might allow greater street use and facilitate incorporation of canopies. Members stated this did not appear to be a real possibility given the existing nature of development at this location. Members indicated the five foot lower-level setback might be acceptable. Members also noted the application of streetscape improvements along this street through the design guidelines might be very important. Elliott Smith stated he favored a larger setback along both Cherry and Jefferson Streets. He suggested ten feet would be more appropriate. David Letrondo stated with the street right of way the current setbacks appeared adequate and he would support the retention of the 5 foot setback.

Linda Carol stated that she too believes the five foot setback along Jefferson seem appropriate. Following brief additional discussion, Dylan Glosecki moved:

The 5 ft. lower-level setback to an elevation of 27 feet as shown on section EE page 29 of the Final Plan, be endorsed by the CAC.

The motion was seconded

Mr. Sheppard noted all members and alternates in attendance were eligible to vote. The Committee was polled. Votes were as follows.

Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes
Patrick Angus	Yes
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Linda Carrol	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Elliot Smith	No

The vote was 5 in favor and 1 oppose. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed. Mr. Sheppard affirmed this is now the CAC's position.

Discussion then proceeded to the upper level setback in Section EE. Dylan Glosecki moved

The upper level setback above 37 feet as shown on Section EE page 29 of the Final Master Plans on section EE, be increased from 10 feet to 15 feet.

The motion was seconded. No further discussion occurred.

The Committee was polled. Votes were as follows.

Elliot Smith	Yes
David Letrondo	Yes
Linda Carrol	No
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Patrick Angus	Yes
Ashleigh Kilcup	Yes

The vote was 5 in favor and 1 oppose. A quorum being present and a majority of those present having voted in the affirmative, the motion passed.

The Committee began discussion regarding setbacks above 65 ft. Patrick Angus suggested there be an additional 5 foot setback above 65 feet in elevation. Linda Carrol responded this seem to be so far above the street level and such a small change it would be insignificant.

It was moved:

An additional setback be established above 65 feet for Section EE shown on page 29 of the Final Master Plan, making the total setback 15 feet above 65 feet.

The motion was seconded. No further discussion occurred.

The Committee was polled. Votes were as follows:

Elliot Smith	Yes
David Letrondo	No
Linda Carrol	No
Dylan Glosecki	Yes
Patrick Angus	Yes
Ashleigh Kilcup	No

The vote was 3 in favor and 3 oppose. A majority of those present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion failed. Mr. Sheppard mentioned a majority is needed in order for the motion to pass, a tie vote indicates a fail.

III. Public Comments

The floor was opened for public comments.

Comments from Troy Meyer: Mr. Meyer mentioned he wanted to make the Committee to be aware Sabey/Swedish is attempting to harass the neighborhood, and requested to a meeting with Sabey/Swedish/Providence in order to iron out any disagreements regarding this expansion and its impacts to the neighborhood.

Comments from Ellen Sollod: Ms. Sollod stated the setback discussion is very disturbing. It is no laughing matter. She provided photos of Sabey developments elsewhere. She stated she opposes a two-story skybridge. She also described how Swedish/Sabey/Providence requested certain exceptions to the square footage is very out of scale from the neighborhood. Setbacks should be greatly increased. Along 15th Avenue an upper-level setback of 80 feet above a certain level should be considered.

Comments from Larry Knopp: Mr. Knopp the only time he had spoken about this issue was about a year and a half ago and has been asking the same questions. What is the compelling rationale for the proposed shape of the MIO boundary? No answers were ever given regarding this. He had similar concerns regarding heights and setbacks. He questioned the recommendations from the Director's draft report and would like to find more information regarding the rationale for the proposed MIMP and how it benefits the larger community in report.

Comments from Murray Anderson: Mr. Anderson expressed his frustration about the whole process. The Committee does not seem to listen to the neighborhood. All he hears is what Swedish wants and how to make them happy. Who is making the neighborhood happy? Neighbors have consistently stated their opposition to this proposal. The CAC seems to ignore these comments. The Committee needs to acknowledge this opposition to the height, scale and setbacks. Without doing so the Committee is failing to fulfill its purpose.

Comments from Vicki Schiantarelli: Ms. Schiantarelli noted in the recent past the Hearing Examiner had overturned Sabey's proposal for development along 18th Avenue. Sabey then proceeded to file appeals with the superior court and listed some of the neighbors who had opposed them as parties to this appeal. This was disconcerting to neighbors.

The Transportation Management Plan and creates hostile relationship among the neighborhood. She mentioned how Swedish/Sabey talked about patient parking ratio and questioned why about 85% is devoted to employees and non-patient care. This calls into question the use of the MIO for hospital use. She informed the Committee she finds it very difficult to get on to Cherry during rush hour. Backed ups occur all the way to 23rd Avenue and she has had to use alternate routes. The situation is bad now. It will only get worse with this proposal.

Comments from Colleen Pike: Ms. Pike stated she is from Seattle University and Seattle University's supports the Swedish proposals with some specific conditions. Ms. Pike mentioned Seattle University would ask for proper mitigation on future developments and its adverse impacts as well as the design and noise impacts among the residents of the campus. Ms. Pike also commented the University recognizes building heights around campus and concerns regarding traffic impacts and safety around campus.

IV. Continued Discussion of Setbacks

The Committee decided to continue discussion regarding setbacks. Members noted there are a few members available at tonight's meeting. And suggested continue the setbacks discussion be deferred. After brief further discussion, the Committee proceeded to discuss section FF. Members noted the existing setback were accepted for the existing garage. However in the event development is added above the excising garage, a ten-foot setback is proposed. Members suggested increasing this to 15 feet. Mr. Jex stated this might work but anything beyond 15 feet would present problems

related to the existing structural bays for the garage structure. The structure was designed to accept development above it. Swedish is trying to keep with previous designs and act responsibly. Staff noted there was a conscious decision to limit height at this location to 65 feet.

It was moved:

The setbacks as shown for Section FF in the Draft Master Plan be endorsed by the Committee.

Steve Sheppard noted the upper-level setback on Section EE is 15 feet.

No second was put forward.

Dylan Glosecki moved:

The setback for any new development above the garage be increased to 15 feet above 37 feet to match along Section EE.

The motion was seconded.

In the event the garage is demolished would make a setback of 10 feet from ground level to 37 feet and 15 feet above 37 feet.

The Committee was polled by show of hands. The vote was unanimous and the motion passed.

Mr. Sheppard informed the Committee that he would summarize what was discussed at this meeting regarding setbacks and asked the Committee members for clarification. Mr. Sheppard mentioned there will not be enough time to discuss and review the draft Director's report so he informed the Committee to submit their comments to him prior to the next meeting...

Mr. Sheppard noted comments during the public comment periods neighbors do not believe the Committee is not listening to them and little or no progress is being made. He acknowledged is challenging and that the various parties are still far apart. Neither the CAC nor the Swedish positions appear acceptable to the neighbors who are commenting. Mr. Sheppard commented he understands the sensitivity of those discussions. But progress has been made. Changes have occurred.

Mr. Sheppard commented the Committee's position on the Director's report be determined at the next meeting. Mr. Sheppard suggested for the meeting to start at 5:30 pm next week and go until 9:30 pm in order to finalize the discussion on the Director's report. He mentioned the Committee cannot make any decisions online; decisions concerning recommendations must be made at an open public meeting.

Mr. Sheppard informed the Committee the report is available at the DON website for the Committee members to download and make comments to it. Mr. Sheppard will compile all of the individual comments and be available to CAC to review.

The Committee agreed to intensively discuss the draft Director's report at the next meeting.

V. Adjournment

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