# Draft Meeting Notes

Members in attendance: Nancy Amidei, Stephen Antupit, Rebecca Barnes, Chuck Broches, David Cohanim, Dan Eernissee, Anne Gantt, Mark Griffin, Ron Moe-Lobeda, George Petrie, Miles Richardson, Ruedi Risler, Matt Roewe, Alfred Mustey Shiga, Scott Soules, Ryan Thomas, Patty Whisler Also in attendance: Kateri Schlessman, Adam Hested

Staff in Attendance: Brian Scott (facilitator), Susan McLain (Seattle Department of Planning and Development-DPD), Radhika Nair (DPD), Tony Mazzella (Seattle Department of Transportation)

At this meeting, working group members and other participants worked in small groups to identify the potential character of neighborhood subareas, and to identify corridors and desired connections between neighborhood areas.

After an initial presentation of background information by staff, participants were asked to respond to two questions:

- Name 3-5 subareas of the District, and describe their character
- Identify three classification of streets, and describe the nature of these streets

The discussion during meeting #2 built upon the group's June 7 meeting, when group members discussed existing neighborhood assets and needs, desired neighborhood improvements and amenities that can be accommodated through the physical environment, potential building heights, and social needs.



# Summary of "What We Heard" from DPD Staff, part 1

# Summary of "What We Heard" from DPD Staff, part 2



#### **Reviewing Background Information**

Susan gave PowerPoint presentation with a handful of slides highlighting information including rightof-way info (including ped designation & green streets), land use patterns (property ownership, projects in the pipeline, Sound Transit properties), and UW info (particularly for West Campus +). The full presentation can be found on the DPD project web site.

Rebecca Barnes, University of Washington architect, expanded on some of the University's development plans for the future:

## 1. Student Housing village

The University is increasing the amount of housing it provides to students by adding more dorms in the Campus Parkway area. These new additions, some of which are already functioning, will feature new designs that incorporate uses such as grocery stores within buildings. Upcoming buildings will have urban farming components in between the actual structures.

• Question from the group – How many total students today? Answer: The west campus is expected to grow from 3,070 today to 5,050 in 2020. By 2020, the west campus will accommodate 50% of on-campus housing for students.

## 2. New park near shoreline

The UW is planning to relocate its police headquarters from its current shoreline location. This will free-up space for the current Sakuma Viewpoint Park to be expanded along the waterfront.

- Question from the group: what is the character of this new park? Rebecca said the park will include passive use of the shoreline consistent with the mitigation action taken by the SR 520 project. Through the mitigation agreement, the land will eventually be transferred to the Seattle Parks Department. Susan noted there will be a separate planning process for the park by the Seattle Parks Department.
- 3. Acquisition of Land for partnership for workforce housing with Children's The Curve project is a partnership project between Children's Hospital and the UW. The project will include new housing that is being developed as part of mitigation for loss of housing near expanded Children's Hospital. Priority for housing will be given for UW/Children's but some amount of housing will also be open to the public. The Seattle City Council mandated the same mix of unit types as the displaced housing. So the Curve will include two & three bedroom units. Children's and UW though intend to provide a longer term of unit affordability than is frequently required for affordable housing programs in the city.

- Question from the group: is this building being currently constructed? No a project by Avalon Bay (approximately 290new units) is currently under construction east of the Curve.
- 4. Ideas for neighborhood subareas from the University District

Rebecca described several neighborhood sub-areas that include: University District neighborhood, Brooklyn station area, University District West, Eastlake gateway, Campus Parkway, West Campus, and Portage Bay waterfront.

Following this discussion, Tony Mazzella spoke briefly about street types and their use as guidelines for design in the Right of Way Improvements Manual. Tony also provided some information about the priority corridor planning for the U District identified by the Transit Master Plan.

Questions from the group: clarifying questions about the differences between Street Types and Street Classifications and the tools available for change of either. Tony indicated the planning process underway for the Urban Design Framework could recommend changes to the Street Types designations. However, the City traffic engineer would need to recommend a change in street classifications. Susan noted that a map of street classifications can be found in the Existing Conditions Report found on the web site.

The role of the priority corridor, is it for streetcar or buses? Tony: This is rapid street car serving commuter markets unlike the South Lake Union one which makes many more stops. Work on the corridor not likely to be implemented in the near future. Currently adopted plan backed by analysis.

#### **Report-Back from Small Groups**

<u>Group 1</u>. Dan Eernissee reported back for group 1.

North-South corridors could be seen in the following way:

- Ave Influence: slow travel and pedestrians, churches, social services, small businesses
- Roosevelt influence: faster travel, vehicle capacity, larger commercial businesses
- Brooklyn: a green street, slower paced with an emphasis on pedestrians
- 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would complement Brooklyn by providing an important bicycle travel connection north-south.
- 5) Roosevelt/11<sup>th</sup> couplet: business corridors

East-West 50<sup>th</sup> crosses the freeway. Consider re-channelizing this roadway, possible road diet on 50<sup>th</sup>.

The group noted that additional height/density around the station would complement the pedestrian activity along the Ave

Southwest area of the District: zoning could provide an incentive for improving the quality of construction and development in this area.



## Group 2. Mark Griffin reported back for Group 2.

Mark noted that most people in the group said they hang-out along the Ave and along Roosevelt to a certain extent. Some of the groups' conclusions included:

Diversity the U District with more private companies and a stronger commercial presence north of 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE.

North of NE 50<sup>th</sup> existing zoning has encouraged property owners to rent, but not improve, their properties.

- North of 55<sup>th</sup>: future character is generally single family or cottages.
- South of 55<sup>th</sup>: character has transitioned into rental uses in general.

In the Southwest corner of the district: freeway noise makes this area loud. The question is how to stimulate development in this area

for 1) lab space/ commercial uses that can construct buildings that mitigate noise and/or 2) up-zone for residential.



Group 3. Chuck Broches reported for Group 3.

The group discussed the potential trolley line and how to tie-in transit with the future light rail station. It would be good to know what is happening with transit service after light rail in implemented. The group suggested local-serving shuttle service along the Ave to connect light rail with local services.

Ave north of 47<sup>th</sup>: potential for more density to serve young professionals.

Needed: better connectivity between Wallingford and the U District.

In the SW corner of the District: the group suggested rezones/up-zones to improve the quality of the housing stock and encourage more ownership.

Parking. The group suggested a comprehensive parking strategy to help retail grow and expand.

Transit. The group suggested a grid of transit connection instead of transit primarily on the Ave.



## **General Discussion Points**

- Transportation corridors are form-givers
- Low rise zoning in the north and in the southwest portion of the district does not provide enough incentive or height for change to happen. Going higher and denser and not suppressing investment is important for the overall health of the district
- High density would work well around station since the UW is a regional and major employment center.
- Roosevelt residents tend to patronize businesses in the northern portion of the Ave, Trader Joes etc., around Roosevelt.
- Primarily ground -related residential along with single family, neighborhood commercial and live-work would work well north of 50<sup>th</sup>.
- There is an established retail use on southern portions of the Ave , we should preserved that and focus on how we can develop "North Ave"
- The Ave needs to be revitalized. North Ave can be destination retail
- The Ave would benefit from mixed use density and diversity of residents
- The Ave can be thought of as two sections North residential with neighborhood commercial and South UW, regional and office market
- Brooklyn station can function as an integrated transportation hub for neighborhoods
- Connection between Eastlake, Fred Hutch and research is important
- Diversity of daytime population is important
- University a great asset but not porous enough along the western edge
- Eastlake Gateway area: land noise, no views, impact of the freeway. UW Lab space or commercial space can mitigate noise better and may be a good fit for this area
- Brooklyn is currently a green street but might be a candidate as a transit mall or street that integrates feeder trolleys or other transit with the light rail system

Big Idea

- Crossing Interstate 5 is very important. A big idea for the group: a lid over I-5 between 45<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup>. This would allow full freeway access for vehicles and eliminate conflicts between pedestrians, bicycle and automobiles
- Other participants said the lid idea is not realistic. Several people proposed different mechanism for building a lid or significant pedestrian crossing of I-5: LID, incentive through development, Parks levy, CIP, or mitigation as part of a larger project that is planned by the State or other government agency.

