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The Design Commission thanked SPU for their presentation and in depth discussion of the varied complexity of issues involved in the North Transfer Station Project. Five general concepts were presented. One (Concept 10) was limited to the existing footprint on the site west of Carr Pl N. and the others combined all the sites and vacated Carr Pl N. If the full site is to be developed, SPU would need to receive a rezone from the City Council and likely vacate Carr Pl N. Commissioners acknowledge the benefits of both not rezoning as well as the full build out option that would move the city closer to its “Zero-Waste” goals as well as provide needed amenities for the city and the neighborhood. The Commissioners encouraged SPU to remember that the City of Seattle population is sophisticated, and would respond to why design decisions would be driven based on where the city could be in fifty years. The Commissioners made the following recommendations and comments:

- Think outside the box when designing edges, mixed community amenities and connections, especially with respect to the rezoned areas (C240, bldg 1540 and Carr Pl N.).
- Develop a more robust story involving the community, amenities and urban design that rivals the engineering and technical aspects of the facility.
- Carefully consider how to use innovation and imagination to design for the future (i.e. a design that anticipates the phasing in of future waste treatment modes and technologies). Consider celebrating the waste process in the siting and build-out strategies and use new strategies and education to allow citizens to learn more.
- Consider how the separated aspects of the design could be more connected.
- Design vibrant edges, so that the edges are not simply buffers. Carr Place N. parking lot provides opportunities for a great and perhaps innovative community amenity. If facilities (such as recycling) are ultimately located at edges of the site, below surrounding streets, then consider making vertically mixed use buildings, where the lower level serves the transfer station and upper levels create opportunities for active, pedestrian-friendly street fronts.
- Think about future program and site phasing, especially if Concept 10 (existing footprint) is chosen. Put some more design energy into this option in case this is the one selected, as it seems less developed than the others. Study how property could be taken over at a later date to expand the facility to meet more of SPU’s goals and so the end result will not seem like a “patch job”. In the meantime, be imaginative in interim uses for the existing property and what additional amenity for the community could be made of the Carr Place parking lot.
- Do what’s best long-term for Seattle rather than looking just at budgets, complexities of rezoning or other more short term concerns; Seattle is sophisticated and can understand the need for expansion.
Reduce the number of stalls required on-site as there appears to be ample parking in the neighborhood.