



CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER MAJOR INSTITUTIONS CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center
Major Institutions Citizens Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 15

September 9, 2008

Seattle Children's Hospital
4800 Sand Point Way
Seattle, WA 98105
Wright Auditorium

Members

Karen Wolf, Chair
Catherine Hennings, Vice chair
Cheryl Kitchin
Delores Prichard
Myriam Muller
Kim O Dales
Doug Hanafin
Dr. Gina Trask
Michael S Omura
Wendy Paul
Yvette Moy
Robert Rosencrantz
Bob Lucas
Theresa Doherty
Shelley D. Hartnett

Alternates

Nicole Van Borkulo
Mike Wayte
Dr. Brice Semmens

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON
Scott Ringgold – DPD
Ruth Benfield – CHRMC

Members/Alternates Present

Myriam Muller	Dr. Gina Trask	Karen Wolf, Chair
Michael S Omura	Wendy Paul	Robert Rosencrantz
Theresa Doherty	Delores Pritchard	Cheryl Kitchin
Shelly Hartnett	Bob Lucas	Catherine Hennings

Ex Officio Members Present

Steve Sheppard – DON	Scott Ringgold - DPD	Ruth Benfield - CHRMC
----------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

Others Present (Staff and Guests)

See Attached Attendance Sheets

I. Welcome and Introductions and Housekeeping

Chair Karen Wolf called the meeting to order. Brief Introductions followed. The agenda was approved without changes.

II. Brief Discussion of Schedule

Steve Sheppard handed out a tentative schedule for future meetings. He noted that this meeting starts an intensive period for the committee. The CAC will begin its evaluation of the final plan starting October 14th. There will be three subsequent meetings to deal with this process. Mr. Sheppard noted that time frames are tight and that members will need to reserve time to quickly read and digest the various reports that members will receive. These include Children's Plan and supporting Final EIS and the Report of the Director of the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development. There was considerable discussion of possible meeting dates and a decision to have the Chair, Staff and Institution develop a schedule that would be reviewed at the next regular meeting.

III. Presentation on Streetscapes and Views of the Alternatives

Ruth Benfield stated that Children's staff and consultants will present views of the new alternatives as well as discuss these alternatives.

Editors Note: This presentation was done from a series of power point slides and was not easily translated into a written form. The power point presentation is attachment 1 to these meeting notes. As a result this discussion is somewhat truncated.

The project architect was introduced to lead the presentation. It was noted that the possible early availability of the Laruelon Terrace site has led to the development of a new alternative 7 and its subsequent modification to 7r. These represent an attempt to respond to some of the comments received from the CAC. Alternative 7r is an attempt to reduce the height and bulk of Alternative 7. In this alternative some of the nursing units are narrowed and pulled back somewhat from Sand Point. Retail like uses are now anticipated along Sand Point and near 40th. Greater development is also anticipated above the Train Building which allows the buildings on the Laurelton site to be slightly lower than in alternative 7. In addition the Hartman Building has been scaled back somewhat. Material changes and building design will also be used to assure that the buildings fit well into the area. Transit use is a critical focus for Children's.

Allyn Schumaker noted that the buildings would be set back ten feet from Sand Point Way. Above 40 feet the setback would increase an additional 35 to 40 feet with an additional setback at about 72 feet in height. The intent is to add pedestrian and retail-like amenities into this area. The Hartman frontage would be similarly set back. Setbacks also are included along 45th and 50th Street. Along NE 45th Street, the first three stories of the garage are exposed with the nursing towers set back. The roof area would be landscaped and would eventually meld into the hillside along NE 45th Street so that one could walk directly from grade out onto this rooftop garden area. Landscaped decks are located along NE 45th Street, 40th Avenue NE and portions of Sand Point Way NE. All of the setbacks would be heavily landscaped to soften their impacts to adjacent properties.

Height has also been reduced. In Alternative 7 the height was about 160 feet. Under Alternative 7r this is reduced by about a floor and the buildings have been made narrower. In addition buildings are depressed into the hillside somewhat more. This alternative only requires a 140 foot height and consideration would be given to a conditioning of the MIO 160 zone to 140 or so.

Alternative 8 anticipates that Hartman is not developed. Since the total square footage needed remains the same, development on the Laruelon Terrace Site is somewhat greater with building added above the garage on the intersection of 40th Avenue NE and NE 45th Street. 40th Avenue would become a green street.

Ruth Benfield noted Children's does not yet have the photo montage from Bryant and is working on this. She also noted that Children's is not backing away from its view that it has a twenty year need for a full 1,500,000 square feet of new development. This is Children's best level of projections. Children's will not build if there is no need. She noted that the hand-outs include an approximate phasing. It is the belief that only about 1,000,000 square feet would have to be built over the first ten years. She noted that in looking at the first phase the intention was to get the critical needs without necessarily tying Children's into the maximum height. Phase one would have about 200 beds.

Bob Lucas noted that the entrance to the emergency room is being relocated from Sand Point Way to 40th Staff. Miriam Muller stated that she is concerned with the function of 40th. Many residents use this as a major rout to Sand Point Way and putting a major entry to the garage and emergency department may create a major bottleneck at this location.

IV. Public Comments

Comments of Michael Perlman – Mr. Perlman noted that the CAC has been shown about a dozen alternatives, however to date the overall bulk and scale has remained the same with the building blocks being moved around but the overall size remaining the same. He suggested that the CAC not get bogged down looking at individual building blocks but instead look at the overall picture - whether there is a need for this level of development and whether it fits within this low-density neighborhood.

Comments of Ginny Sharrow – Ms. Sharrow stated that she sometimes feels as if she is being bullied. She stated that she agrees with Mr. Perlman about keeping focused on the need. There are also issue of noise and traffic congestion and asked the CAC to carefully consider these impacts.

Comments of Carol Eychaner - The fundamental issue is that the level of development is too large for this low-density community outside of an Urban Villiage. It may be well designed for a First Hill -type location but not for this location. She asked what the lot coverage and FAR was under alternative 7r. Children's staff responded that this was still being developed. She noted that dense plantings may block sun fro some residents and that great care needs to be taken to locate these appropriately. Sometime larger setbacks with less dense plantings are better.

Comments of Bob Farrell – Mr. Farrell stated that he is an attorney and owns a unit at the Laurelcrest Condominiums. He stated that he would be thrilled if Children's were to purchase the Laurelcrest Condominiums for replacement housing. He also got the sense after carefully reading he Draft EIS that Children's is not proposing housing replacement that would be in compliance with housing replacement requirements. Children's is proposing to team with Solid Ground. The Solid Ground proposal is that that group would build 52 units of housing for the homeless at Magnuson Park. This would be part of a 200 unit homeless project conceived in 1993 as part of the base re-use plan. Children's involvement in this project consists solely of a letter from the hospital that says that they will give Solid Ground \$600,000 towards that project if Children's closes on Laurel Terrace. The question is whether this is comparable housing. Under the Solid Ground lease from the City there is a condition that states that the property can only be used for the poor or infirm. This is not comparable to Laurel Terrace. The second issue is whether this project constitutes a replacement. This project has a long timeline. The CAC's comment letter was clear that any replacement housing had to be new and not in the current pipeline. This is not a replacement project.

The funding package is for \$13,600,000 project. Children's is proposing to contribute \$600,000 or 4.8% of the total project. The City will contribute \$4,800,000, the State about \$2,000,000 with many other funds too. The Hearing Examiner put a condition on a similar requirement that whatever was proposed must not include any public money. He suggested that the housing replacement plan should be real replacement housing.

Comments of Jeannie Hale – Ms. Hale stated that she was stunned with the alternatives presented. Children's is still maintaining the same height bulk and scale. She also stated that she was skeptical of the idea of conditions down from 160 to 140. Greater setbacks are also needed. She also endorsed the comments of Mr. Farrell.

V. Committee Discussion of Possible Phasing Planning

Robert Rosencrantz stated that Ms. Benfield had indicated a phase I lasting about 10 years and including just less than 1,000,000 square feet. He wondered if the CAC should think about including within its comments a regulatory agreement that required a check back prior to constructing the final 500,000 square feet. He stated that this kind of check in seemed reasonable to assure the community that actual mitigation is sufficient to allow moving forward. Karen Wolf stated that she too wanted such a phasing but that the key would be to determine reasonable conditions. She suggested the formation of a phasing sub-committee. Steve Sheppard noted that phasing could only be imposed as a council condition. In addition since the plans do not have expiration dates we will have to be careful not to essentially create a ten year plan. Scott Ringgold noted that there is an annual report process. Brief discussion of this idea followed.

Bob Lucas moved that the CAC form a sub-committee to look into issues related to phasing including any legal aspects of phasing. The motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Various members volunteered for the sub-committee.

Nicole Van Borkulo stated that she believed that Children's development might help revitalize the portion of Sand Point Way to the south where her office is located.

Brice Semmens passed out a version of his rendering of what the development might look like from his location. He noted that he and his neighbors have received mailings from Children's stating that the "view shed" has been saved. From his perspective this is not the case for many households. A couple of people got together to develop views to illustrate the problem. He also noted that there have been promises from Children's for similar views since April and the views have still not been put forward. Children's staff stated that a photo montage from this general location is being developed for the EIS.

Brice Semmens also noted that he still preferred that the Hartman Property not be incorporated into the MIO, but that the proposal to lower its height and save the redwoods is an improvement. Cheryl Kitchin stated that the issue is not whether the Hartman Site can currently be developed attractively, but what this signals for the future on the west side of Sand Point way. Children's might come back at a future date for a greater development on the site or in the broader area. Catherine Henning noted that the vote on Hartman had been very close for the CAC's initial comments and that this will clearly need a great deal more discussion.

VI. Adjournment

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