



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

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Meeting # 19

December 9, 2008

Seattle Children's Hospital
4800 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98105
Sound Cafe

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

Members

Karen Wolf, Chair
Catherine Hennings, Vice chair
Cheryl Kitchin
Dolores 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	Nichol Van Borkulo	Karen Wolf, Chair
Michael S Omura	Wendy Paul	Robert Rosencrantz
Theresa Doherty	Dolores Pritchard	Cheryl Kitchin
Bob Lucas	Catherine Hennings	Brice Semmens
Mike Wayte	Doug Hanafin	Karen Wolf
Kim O Dales	Dr. Gina Trask	Yvette Moy
Mike Wayte		

Ex Officio Members Present

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

Others Present (Staff and Guests)

See Attached Attendance Sheets

I. Welcome, Introductions and House keeping

Karen Wolf opened the meeting. Introductions followed. Ms. Wolf noted that there was a full agenda with the major item being a discussion and possible decision on the inclusion of the Hartmann Building into the MIO. Steve Sheppard briefly went over the future schedule. He noted that the meeting on January 6, 2009 will be a public hearing to allow committee members an opportunity to hear from the community prior to the Committee making its major decisions. Mr. Sheppard noted that members have all past minutes and reminded them of the importance of reviewing these and getting his comments. Mr. Sheppard thanked members of the community for their diligence attending these meeting.

II. Distribution of and Presentation on the Draft Analysis, Recommendation and Determination of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development

Scott Ringgold was introduced to distribute and discuss the Draft Analysis, Recommendation and Determination of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development. He stated that he would explain the purpose of the draft report and summarize its draft recommendations. He noted that this draft contains seven sections:

1. Background information on the project including application history, a description of the project site, CAC and public comments.
2. General purpose, vision and goals of the Master Plan.

3. Final Master Plan's program elements.
4. Analyzes the Final Master Plan's compliance with Major Institution policies and code including an analysis of impacts and recommended mitigation subject to 23.69.032e.
5. Analyzes the Final Master Plan's compliance with applicable rezone criteria.
6. Summarizes SEPA Analysis and refers to mitigations.
7. Summarizes the various analyses and lists all the conditions the Director recommends.

He noted that as CAC is pretty familiar with the background materials and description of the proposed action, contained in Sections 1 – 3, and 6 he would focus on Sections to 4, 5 and 7.

One of the major areas for evaluation is the boundary expansions. The Seattle Municipal Code Section 23.69.028 requires a rezone whenever a major institution Master Plan would increase heights or expand boundaries. In this case a rezone analysis is required for the Laurelon Terrace and Hartmann Building sites. This section of the report is relatively detailed and includes an evaluation of many of the standard criteria for rezone analyses. In addition it looks at additional criteria associated with Major Institution overlays as required in The Seattle Municipal Code Section 23.69.124, including: boundaries, height as well as CAC input.

He noted that there are 35 conditions were recommended as part of report. He then read through the list of those conditions that he felt were most important to discuss tonight as follows:

- Create a standing advisory committee.
- Reduce height limits on the Laurelon Terrace site to 140' with increased upper level setbacks
- Enhanced design guidelines used as vehicle that SAC can then apply during their review of individual projects.
- Completion of a formal agreement to ensure replacement housing including: creation of at least 136 replacement units to be located in Northeast Seattle
- Requirements that replacement housing be new and not rehabilitate existing units;
- Stipulations that replacement housing should remain affordable for 50 years.

There should be a construction management plan to address the following issues: construction impacts, noise, and mitigation of traffic, transportation and parking impacts on arterial and surrounding neighborhoods. Mitigation of impacts on the pedestrian network and there should be mitigation of impacts with more than one project outline in the Master Plan or outlined under "Concurrent Construction".

He also noted that there are specific conditionings related to SEPA, some of which include:

- Asbestos and lead surveys prior to demolition at Hartman Housing
- Truck traffic restrictions during peak hour traffic
- Limitations on construction hours according to a construction noise management plan.
- Onsite transit bicycle and pedestrian improvements
- Infrastructure improvement – Penny Drive and Sandpoint Way NE; 48th Avenue NE and Sandpoint Way including creation of connectivity between the Burke-Gilman Trail and Children's across the Hartmann site as well as enhancements of the Sandpoint Way NE street frontage, sidewalks.
- Requirements for an enhanced TMP to achieve 30% single occupancy vehicle mode sharer.
- Contributions installation to traffic signals at 40th Ave NE and NE 55th Street as well as at 40th Avenue NE and NE 65th St.
- Contribution of half a million dollars to build an intelligent transportation system to facilitate movement through Montlake Blvd. corridor, NE 25th St., Sandpoint Way NE, NE 50th St.
- There would be a pro rata contribution, estimated at approximately \$1.4 million, to funding NE Seattle Transportation improvement projects identified in the University area transportation area action strategy; Sandpoint Way NE pedestrian study and the City of Seattle bicycle master plan.

- A contribution of \$2 million for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in NE Seattle over the life of the Master Plan's development

Mr. Ringgold identified several areas that he hoped the CAC would assist with

III. Committee Questions and Answers Concerning the Draft Analysis, Recommendation and Determination of the Director of the Department of Planning and Development

Robert Rosencrantz observed that the CAC has spent a great deal of time focusing on phasing but that he didn't see this reflected in DPD's Draft Report. Scott Ringgold replied that the EIS covers it and that he is open to additional input from the CAC.

Mr. Rosencrantz also note that the language on page 53 related housing replacement Stated that "Children's can meet this obligation by making the payment in the form of a grant or equity sufficient to cause the construction of at least 136 replacement housing units". He stated that here and elsewhere the language concerning this topic is confusing. After further discussion he recommended that a significant amount of work was still needed here.

Mr. Ringgold noted that there were some areas left blank in the report where possible additional CAC comments of recommendations would be referenced. Committee members expressed some confusion concerning the nature of CAC comment, and asked Mr. Sheppard for clarification. Mr. Sheppard stated that the CAC will have two functions. First, the CAC is expected to offer comments to DPD on his report concerning areas where we agree, disagree and take exception to recommendations in the report. The CAC's second task is to complete its own report. This report is the last item completed. But the code directs that the CAC share its initial draft directions with DPD so that they can evaluate the CAC's positions. DPD may reference CAC positions or not. He noted that since the CAC has not reached agreement on most of its major recommendations it will be difficult for DPD to reference them.

Ms. Wolf advised CAC members have to remember their comments to Mr. Ringgold; it is not mutually exclusive of the final report. As they decide on issues, they will give comments formally to DPD but those are the same issues and conditions they will be putting in their final report as well.

Mr. Ringgold discussed height along 40th Avenue NE. He noted that there is a recommendation in the report to create an upper-level setback along 40th Avenue NE. He noted that the proposed MIO 160 next to what is NC30 zone across 40th as well as L3 was significant and that DPD was proposing an upper-level setback where development within 40 feet of the street was limited to a height of 50 feet. This would create better transition in scale. It was later noted that this would also apply to the area along Sand Point Way south of Penny Drive.

Myriam Muller asked how DPD settled upon a MIO 140 for the majority of the Laurelon Site. Mr. Ringgold stated that this was established through an analysis of conditions on either side of 40th.

Mr. Sheppard asked if the incorporation of the plinth along 40th and Sandpoint, additional 40' setback, for upper stories above 50', require any changes or modifications to the existing plan or is it just recognizing what is in the maps in terms of existing.

Michael Omura stated that DPD's objectives might better be accomplished by establishing a different MIO arrangement rather than having an upper level setback. Committee members generally agreed with this as a preferred direction.

Doug Hanafin asked if the scheme contained in the Director's Report basically codifies the building arrangements shown in the new alternative 7R. Mr. Ringgold cautions that the placement of the illustrated buildings are vague and also that the development standards are what rule not the schematic building

locations, so you don't want to focus too much on the proposed drawings. You want to think about what rules are in place that allows you to build in certain ways.

Steve Sheppard stated that Mr. Ringgold is correct and also cautioned that what rules the actual development is the MIO heights and setbacks, not the illustrative designs shown in the Final Plan. If the CAC members conclude that the specific placement of structures is critical for view protection then you should increase setback, or create MIO heights that constrain development to something very similar to what is shown in 7R

There was additional discussion by the committee that re-iterated committee members desire to see the building envelopes match the schematic drawings as closely as possible.

IV. Public Comment:

Comments of Stacy Faw – Ms. Faw stated that she has been working in a partnership with Children's for over four years and has been inspired by this experience to volunteer more to her community and consider what was most important in life. She stated that in her opinion this was not concern over traffic or building heights and that she continues to support the mission and expansion of Children's

Comments of James Mirel – Mr. Mirel stated that he appreciates the benefits of Children's Hospital and supports the need for expansion.

Comment of Terri Herrera – Ms. Herrera stated that she is resident of Redmond; has daughter who was patient at Children's. She noted that she had heard that some in the community have stated that this development is "big business". She disagreed and stated that she supported the expansion. She noted that when her child was treated at Children's she gained a great appreciation of the treatment, but the most important thing was that her child did not lose the feeling of "childhood".

Comments of Jim Madden: Mr. Madden stated that he wished to discuss traffic. He noted that he has not heard of plans that will improve Sand Point sufficiently to allow access and wonders how people will get through the area with 8100 more trips expected when hospital has expanded. In addition the proposed Transit center may actually result in more traffic. Everyone supports the mission of Children's, but this isn't the only hospital as there are two other children's hospitals within 250 miles.

Comments of Anne Leavitt - Ms. Leavitt stated that she is a long-term Laurelhurst resident and strongly supports expansion and recent alternatives. This support became quite personal when her daughter was treated for cancer at Children's. She stated that she believes that Laurelhurst neighbors have been kept well informed and input listened to. Alternative 7 makes sense; they support it.

Comments of Jeannie Hale - Ms. Hale stated that as the president of the Laurelhurst Community Club Children's is a good neighbor. First, we are here to talk about development standards and the level of expansion and tonight's main topic is the Hartman property and should major institution boundaries be expanded. The major institution team for the LCC put together several proposed motions for the CAC to consider relating to development standards and hopes that someone on the committee will offer the motions. These are: 1) do not support expansion of the major institution boundaries to include Hartmann. That action violates the City's comprehensive plan, the Major Institution plan. 2) Retain the existing multi-family low rise housing on the site; and 3.) Utilize the Hartmann site as the replacement housing site. Almost 100 units could be developed. Putting money into low income housing at Magnuson Park is not comparable to the loss of moderate income housing. She also stated that it was unfortunate that the CAC received DPD's report tonight as they haven't had a chance to review and study it. It is unfair to put it on you and expect you to digest it in 10 minutes.

Comments of Mark Hallenbeck - Mr. Hallenbeck stated that he is the director Washington State Transportation Center. He is happy about changes from transportation perspective. Change will happen. What Children's has put in means you have some say about making change much better. UW has implemented the best campus transportation program in the country. This has impacted traffic volumes and how people come to campus; volumes are down. Children's has duplicated what has gone on at UW and this very impressive. He talked about intelligent transportation system – that it won't help in some cases. What Children's is putting into the system really takes away all the growth; a wonderful benefit to the community.

Comments of Joy Scott – Ms. Scott stated that she sees a need to separate our positive feelings about the hospital from concerns over the size of the proposed expansion's destroying the area. She read the following statement into the record.

Hospital expansion to the Hartmann Property is not only illegal in itself according to specific land use code rezone criteria, but such expansion would be the camel's nose within the tent for future hospital expansion in the neighborhood. Recall that many years ago when Children's Hospital was first built, the general understanding in the neighborhood was that it would never expand its original building. It is imperative that the Hartmann property be used to develop essential nearby multi-family housing to replace that which will be destroyed under current proposed hospital expansion plan. The Hospital's statements about possible similar development at the former Sand Point Air base are unacceptable for many reasons.

Non-profit does not mean what it sounds like. Non-profit simply means that the organization is not taxed on its profits as other businesses are. Children's Hospital is a business and as such makes a profit and also as a business is in competition with other institutions in the community that offer the same services. Business expands to make a profit, thus the supposed need for the hospitals expansion is not based on a realistic need for patient care, but on the desire for hospital profit.

Comments of Lynn Ferguson - Ms. Ferguson stated that she is Co-chair of NE District Council and that they support LCC position. We do not support expansion across Sand Point Way to the Hartmann Property. Initially expansion to Laurelton was not being proposed, but Hartmann was. Now both are on the table. There are real impacts on the neighborhood associated with the loss of moderate-cost housing at Laurelton. The boundary expansion to the Hartmann property would lead to institutional sprawl and overwhelm surrounding properties. In the case of Harborview Medical Center, the City Council decided that the replacement housing had to be in the vicinity of the lost housing. Magnuson is simply too far away to satisfy such a condition. Hartmann would accommodate close to 100 units. Replacement housing should be required to be in place prior to the demolition of Laurelton and there should be conditions of how this housing is financed.

Comments of Doreen Cato - Ms. Cato stated that she is the Executive Director at First Place. First Place provides services, food, and housing for homeless families or those at risk of becoming homeless. The organization also provides healthcare in cooperation with Seattle Children's. Seattle Public Schools identifies over 2000 children who are homeless in this area. Children's hospital serves both Seattle and the Eastside. Children's hospital needs to expand to provide the level of services that they have in the past. .

Comments Dara Craven: Ms. Craven stated that in 2003 she and her daughter became homeless. During that time she was driving as a delivery person. One day her daughter went into an asthma attack while they were driving. She went to Harborview where she waited choking and gagging for three hours. Then she was transferred to Children's where she receive care that allowed her to breath finally. She strongly supports both the pension of Children's and the provision of replacement housing. There are a lot of children in the same plight as she and her daughter were.

Comments of Mike O'Brien - Mr. O'brien sated that he is the Chair, Cascade Chapter of Sierra Club which is addressing climate change. The solution to this problem lies in Cities and should concentrate growth in Cities and reduce carbon footprint. Answer to sustainable future is not stopping growth but working with it to figure

out how it can be done in the smartest, most sustainable way. Specifically as it relates to design and transportation, the process and product has delivered a high bar and that is the goal we should shoot for. Transportation plan: investing in biking, transit, and employee incentives is positive standard. Children's has done an outstanding job investing in transportation alternatives.

Comments of Joe Loveland - Mr. Loveland stated that he supports the Major Institution Master Plan. He is a Professor of Architecture at the University of Washington and Director of Innovative Design Laboratory. He previously noted that Children's Hospital uses energy at almost twice the rate of average European hospitals and challenged hospital and design team to double their size but not increase the energy use at all. In the new plan, the Master Plan adopts the idea of the 2030 challenge which will actually reduce the total amount of energy that the hospital uses today even though it has doubled in size. He stated that this is impressive

Comments of Amy Woodruff - Laurelon resident; is pleased with turn of events. Magnuson Park is only 2 ½ miles away – not too far from Laurelon site. The Hospital is doing acceptable job in planning and in involving the community in general.

Comments of Bill Sire – Mr. Sire stated Children's is expanding and is not going away and urged the CAC to focus on the Development Standards.

Comments of Carrie Lassen – Ms. Lassen stated that she supported the LCC recommendation on Hartmann property.

IV. Hartmann Property

Editor's Note: Mr. Ringgold's presentation was directed to a series of drawings and was not easily summarized.

Scott Ringgold noted that the CAC had asked what the impact of developing Hartmann under the MIO and various possible non-institutional zoning might be. He went through matrix that showed zoning under the proposed MIO; Multi family Lowrise 3 and Neighborhood Commercial NC3. He noted that under NC3 development might be, similar to MIO as you can have various heights. Under Lowrise 3, development would be more constrained and limited mainly to residential uses

Considering a rezone to NC3 – he hasn't gone through the analysis yet but on the face of it there are some criteria that seem to favor a rezone here but need to do analysis related to NC3. Under NC3 commercial uses could be located in the facility, including Medical office and lot coverage could be up to 100%. He noted that there would be a complex upper floor setback system. There would be no open space required.

Cheryl Kitchin stated that she had thought the part of the reason we asked for this analysis was because the hospital said if we did include Hartman as part of the MIO there would be this transportation hub. What does that mean? This doesn't seem to answer that question.

Michael Omura noted that the depiction of the MIO 65' height is misleading. The drawing show a height that does not go up as the site slopes up as is shown under the NC3. Mr. Ringgold responded that this is the same issue that was discussed earlier. Height does parallel grade and that if the CAC wants to preclude this then it would need to condition Hartmann development.

Gina Trask asked what the likelihood of a successful rezone to NC 3 might be. Scott Ringgold noted that this was a political decision and that it was unclear what height might be considered reasonable and rezones is that they are a high risk proposition. They are time-intensive, tie up resources, and are unpredictable.

Ms. Trask asked Brice Semmens what he might propose. He stated that he would like to see development no greater than 30 feet in height. People in his block will be looking at that building. Right now he doesn't see anything but trees.

Other noted that one possible compromise might be to leave it in the MIO but either have it designated MIO 37, or establish significant conditions.

Theresa Doherty asked Ms. Trask if her position was that leaving it in the MIO would provide greater control. Ms. Trask responded affirmatively, but that one of her concerns was whether jumping the MIO across Sand Point Way would eventually lead to further Children's expansion to nearby properties

Steve Sheppard responded that there was a similar situation at Seattle University where they expanded across 12th Avenue in the area between James, Court and Cherry in 1996. The community had similar concerns to Ms. Trask's. The community negotiated conditions in the Seattle University Master Plan that limited further purchases in the area. The CAC could recommend that Children's not pursue any further boundary expansions on that side until such a time as they have used all their development potential under the plan. He also noted that any expansion of the boundaries necessitates a major amendment process which is essentially going through this entire process again.

Scott Ringgold noted that DPD considers the Hartmann as contiguous to the campus across the right of way which is perfectly fine if you have two facing properties across rights of way. It happens regularly with other institutions. "Boundaries for an MIO district shall correspond with the main contiguous major institution campus; property separated only by a street, alley or other right of way shall be considered contiguous". DPD looks at that as contiguous.

Karen Wolf stated that it is important to note that looking at land use along the Sandpoint corridor and look at that old brick building and that the property is definitely underutilized even given its current zoning. Re-development on this site is probably inevitable. The question is, "does it redevelop under the MIO where we as a committee and community have a great deal of input or does it develop under its current zoning or does it go for rezone?" Given that the building adjacent is about 100' in height the possibility of a rezone on a major arterial is likely. As someone who lives very near this site, the connection to the Burke Gilman trail is a huge commitment and if the building can be pushed down the slope rather than at the top; that too would be an advantage. It also gives us the ability to keep the trees.

Ruth Benfield stated that the transit center on this site is very important to Children' efforts to achieve their 30% single occupancy vehicle

Karen Wolf asked that members discuss their views on this issue.

Robert Rosencrantz stated that he was one of those who had opposed the expansion onto the Hartmann site. That and that he similarly opposed expansion t the Hartmann site

Myriam Muller stated that in the interest in time she felt the Committee should simply vote on the issue.

Theresa Doherty moved:

That the Hartmann site be included in the Children's hospital MIO.

The motion was seconded.

Theresa Doherty spoke to her motion. She stated having Hartmann in the MIO gives us control and influence. In looking at the three, this would be less impactful to the neighborhood.

Myriam Muller stated that she opposes the motion. Children's shouldn't be allowed to leapfrog Sand Point Way and thinks they will continue expand and that his neighborhood will be destroyed as they buy up buildings.

Members asked if the vote should go forward without a discussion of conditions. Steve Sheppard suggested that the initial motion be kept clean and that conditions be established later as a separate motion.

Members agreed to do so.

Mike Wayte noted that he would be voting tonight as the alternate for Kim O Dales and stated that She had informed him that she was not in favor of including Hartmann into the Major Institution. It is a major institution and it is in a single family residential area. Look at what the NE Council has said and take into consideration everything. It is a major institution – it is for medical office and medical retail and a fancy bus stop. At least from what I've seen – there are some aspects to having housing there that we are going to lose in terms of affordability etc.

Brice Semmens state that height is an issue and liked idea of setback. Ambivalent – NC3 worries him. He prefers to leave it as is or use as housing. L3 zoning is fine with him – that keeps it out of sight and out of mind for his neighborhood. He felt that in terms of the phasing Hartmann should be put at the end of the process rather than in the 2nd phase. That is reasonable given that a lot of people on this committee have reservations about the institution moving across Sandpoint and given that the phasing is designed to make sure that the need is there before the building happens. It seems of putting that leapfrog off until the end of this process is a good idea. There is already a plan to build on the existing footprint of the campus office space that functionally would do the same thing as Hartman. That is reasonable shift.

Bob Lucas noted that he proposed delay of construction at Hartmann until phase 4 but was convinced by Ruth Benfield that it won't work. Ruth explained that Hartmann needed to be in the earlier phase to accommodate the garage demolition.

Catherine Henning stated that she supported the inclusion of Hartmann in the MIO both to accommodate the development of the transit center and direct connections to the Burke Gilman trail.

The Question was called. And a vote was taken by show of hands.

The vote was: 9 in favor; 6 opposed, none abstaining.

The motion passed.

Karen Wolf stated that the next meeting would include a detailed discussing of conditions on inclusion of the Hartmann Property in the MIO as well as the start of discussions on height, bulk and scale.

V. Adjournment

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