

Community Design Study for the Northgate Light Rail Station Area

Q1. Development Types: From the images below, pick your top three preferred development types for the Northgate transit center area.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Mid-Rise Office	18.0%	38
B. High-Rise Office	5.2%	11
C. Residential Low-Rise + Retail at Base	52.6%	111
D. Residential High-Rise + Retail at Base	26.5%	56
E. Residential Low-Rise + Residential at Base	30.3%	64
F. Residential High-Rise + Residential at Base	9.5%	20
G. Mid-Rise Office	9.5%	20
H. High-Rise Office	6.2%	13
I. Residential Mid-Rise + Residential at Base	18.5%	39
J. Residential High-Rise + Residential at Base	9.0%	19
K. Residential Mid-Rise + Retail at Base	61.6%	130
L. Residential High-Rise + Retail at Base	17.5%	37
	answered question	211
	skipped question	6

Q2. From the development type images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

Answer Options	Response Count
	140
answered question	140
skipped question	77

Q3. Public Spaces: From the images below, pick your top three preferred kinds of public spaces for the Northgate transit center area.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Residential Green Street (urban active edge)	35.2%	75
B. Residential Green Street (maximum greenery)	16.4%	35
C. Neighborhood Retail (brick, angle parking)	32.4%	69
D. Neighborhood Retail (retail district, wider)	16.0%	34
E. "Woonerf" Pedestrian-Oriented Street (urban paved)	55.4%	118
F. "Woonerf" Pedestrian-Oriented Street (residential, greened)	33.3%	71

Northgate Light Rail Station Area Survey

Public Responses/Comments

217 completed surveys

Analysis compiled 11/16/11

2. From the development type images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

I especially like the form of J, with towers that are set back from the street, but lower floor residential (or retail) that fronts on the sidewalk. I think that will make the streets feel more like neighborhood streets than downtown thoroughfares and addresses the concerns many people have with "density."

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C. Like the low profile of buildings so light can reach the area. Like the retail so it is welcoming with services for residents and visitors. Like the smaller residential so fewer people putting strain on infrastructure.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



They are all ugly. None of the buildings have modulated front walls with grass in front. None of them encourage going out and tossing a football around. None of them are walking-centric.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Dislike A,B, D, E because resembles downtown office density. Seems very out of character for Northgate.

10/8/2011 5:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C,K, L offer increased density with residential, which is important for creating vibrant atmosphere and activity after work hours. Not including residential in any potential development would create dead zones at night that would be unsafe.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K. Mixed use provides for housing and retail uses for both residents and visitors. Low to Mid-rise buildings seem appropriate for existing character of area.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



None of these show this, but I prefer a thriving street front retail with on street parking.

9/28/2011 9:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



B and K - too busy, not broken up enough at pedestrian level. Northgate needs more high-end retail at the base, more pedestrian friendly streetscapes.

9/28/2011 8:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I prefer homey, people-oriented spaces. This translates to low-rise buildings, brick rather than metal, with sidewalks, benches and trees.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K - like the change in scale and material from the very public base to the more private residential B & D - dislike the scale. seems inappropriate for this part of town G - like the materials used and the modern design

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



J. The base of the towers has a great pedestrian scale -- Higher density allows for more quality and activated green spaces below. The street seems shared between bikers, pedestrians and cars which seems very pleasant to experience.

9/13/2011 11:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High-rise should be residential. Commercial office should stay lower scale a sit is too broad.

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I chose similar styles in the mid rise style range (choices A, I and K) to provide greater density and a sense of destination, but not so big that it overshadows the local houses and businesses.

9/9/2011 2:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I,J,K Interesting bases, pedestrian scale, active at street with good modulation, amenities L- do not like static form top to bottom general- low rise does not seem to be best use of property general- for transit related developemnt residential focus seems more appropriate than office- hard to create an employment center away from the city center

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K--like the roof top garden

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



To keep housing affordable, I think the city should encourage high-density housing close to stores and transit. The mid-rise and high-rise office space seemed the most sterile of the options, and I think they might require the most extra parking spots. (There's no guarantee that workers would be able to access Northgate by transit, especially if there's not much residential space nearby -- and even if there is housing, workers rarely wind up living right next to work.)

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the trees. Like the increased natural light at street level with low or mid-rise buildings. Like mixed use. Like set backs or variable setbacks from street.

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Don't like high-rise (for our area or any other), period. And mid or high-rise "glass palaces" (A. and H.) are way overdone, as far as I'm concerned.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it's critical to activate the street level; example J seems to provide the most attractive articulation at this level, but the same could be done with a retail development, and that might attract more pedestrian traffic.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely prefer the retail at base. I believe a multi-use building makes more sense in the positive development of a community. Considering the area, it seems like a mid-rise make more sense, otherwise, this would be the only high-rise around and that might not be aesthetically pleasing.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



We need people for different times of the day/week. It would be best if there was a mix.

9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C - no Verizon, Starbucks, etc. Get small, local businesses

9/6/2011 2:51 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



E: I like the green space

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



J. There is a ton of existing retail. I'd like to see some residential high-rise somewhere in Seattle.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Density is good but I think the hi-rises disconnect people too much from the life at ground level. I would love to work in an office in the Northgate area instead of downtown, but I don't know if there's demand.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I dislike A, E & L because of the monolithic appearance/ presence. I like many of the other examples (ie C, D, J & K) for the opposite reason, where there is a lot of texture without being tacky mess of materials that don't make sense together. Also, I prefer the taller examples, housing or office, because building low-rise here would be a missed opportunity being so close to a transit hub.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No high rise. Anything over 12 stories is too tall for the area. There is no current high rise precedent. It would be architecturally disruptive of the landscape.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I believe that the look of the mid and low rise buildings will fit in with the architecture of Northgate area better than the high rise buildings. I also think it would be nice to encourage more people to live in Northgate with residential buildings, to help create a stronger community/neighborhood in Northgate.

8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All need parking for transit riders, tenants, shoppers, etc.

8/25/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle (& certainly the NG area) already have a surfeit of retail.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



roof top deck/gardens to help cut down CO2

8/25/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



d,l,j,h,d,etc Please..NO High -Rise anything !

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C-like the mixed uses D-seems out of scale for Northgate, though taller is better near a LRT station; err on the side of height and density here E-looks very inviting, comfortable, friendly; would be great as part of a taller, denser development F-great for providing lots of badly needed housing units near transit, though retail base would be better H-important to provide lots of jobs near transit as well as homes. this does that but needs a base that interfaces better with the street and pedestrian experience I & J-nice looking, and provide many housing units, but need retail base to serve the residents

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The residential mid and high rise would destroy the view for those who live there now; and are out of scale to the current way of living. The low rise is best since it allow more people to live in the area; hope that the rents are truly affordable to the times in which we live.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I feel like having a lot of commercial/retail around the station is healthy growth. I also think that the high density office space should be limited to downtown to make a downtown core so more poeple would use the light rail for commuting.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In general, I prefer mixed used and mid- to high-rise developments. Office and residential buildings should be at about the same scale. Street-level should be pedestrian- and transit-friendly, with retail/commercial activity. Cars should be a lower priority.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely want residential included at the base of any building, and would prefer higher end development to attract wealthier residents. I trust the designers to choose the most appropriate architectural style for the area.

8/25/2011 11:00 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



there does not seem to be a retail at base with residential AND office above (I would prefer both mid-rise and high-rise)

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



That the rent/lease would be too high for the average person.

8/25/2011 10:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think we don't have enough concentration of business activity to merit high rises, so with L,J, H, F, D & B, the feeling is a sense of displacement from downtown. Mid-rise photos (K, E, C) give a sense of activity and population that feels good. The high rises feel solitary/ lonely; the mid-rises feel vibrant and bustling. High rises can be infill later, after the bustling activity is established.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Letter A has street parking available

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate area needs more residents in the area to keep area vibrant, clean, and community oriented.

8/22/2011 11:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With rail and the transit center, we will be a major transit hub. Density is key to leveraging transit resources, and ground-level retail keeps the community active and walkable.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, L: these examples would bring a number of new local residents to the neighborhood which would lead to improved demand for local retail. Retail at the ground floor would improve street vitality and safety.

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle needs to develop more high-rise buildings in general. We've had a boom of new mid-rises and they're starting to look unoriginal and tacky.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High rise L J H are too big for the area.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Mid rise will blend more with the already existing Northgate buildings. Adding High rise buildings will be out of place.

8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K+L: I like retail at base b/c I feel it's a well thought out use of space. Plus, I fee like many people wouldn't want to live at base in a highly populated area.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A high-rise would not fit in with the rest of the area, please stay to a low or mid-rise.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Building setbacks should be deeper, like Vancouver B.C. This makes a more liveable neighborhood.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like Development image D; it has a very urban appearance that would offer an appealing contrast from the mall-dominated Northgate look.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A, B, G, and H make it feel less like a neighborhood and more like a mini downtown. Questions of safety as it seems like it would be busy during the day and overly quiet at night.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I - Like the broken down scale of the architectural mass. Scale at the street level is approachable, yet the entrance is removed from the main traffic flow. E. Like the incorporation of "park" and open space mixed within the dwelling units. Buildings are similar in style and material but individually diverse.

8/17/2011 7:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike - too high of construction

8/17/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I can't see any type of high-rise going up around Northgate, it just doesn't fit the neighborhood profile. I do like the Residential mid-rise + retail concept though.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NO HIGH RISE ANYTHING!!!!

8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All about the architecture and planting. Less Northgate mall cement block style and MORE regrade (angles, plants, thought) style architecture. High rises tend to end up lower rent while larger living spaces (lowrises) tend to be nicer and people take care of them better, which translates to happier neighborhood. Keep the mapleleaf love!

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Anything high-rise would not fit in with the surrounding area (B,D,F,J,L); lots of green space would be nice (E&J)

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Examples C and E are ugly, and G looks like a totally dead neighborhood to pedestrians on the ground. There are already lots of low-rise residential and mid-rise office buildings in this city- I don't see why more of them are desirable right next to a transit hub, rather than encouraging highest density residential and offices right where good transit is available.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Generally speaking, I am opposed to highrise buildings in this area because they undermine the "human scale" of development and the pedestrian experience.

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the ones with trees

8/17/2011 11:58 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like having retail at the base of any of the options.

8/17/2011 11:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The office mid-rise is a bad option because it will leave the vicinity dead during non-office-hours. Residential and residential/retail mixed will keep the area more vibrant (and probably safer) during evenings and weekends.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D and L are the same choice but different design.

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hi Rise is inappropriate for this area.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the look of High-Rise buildings in those pics. It makes the neighborhood look more urban, less boring.

8/17/2011 11:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



any of the high-rise options. it seems so out-of-place in this part of the city and obstructs views.

8/17/2011 11:11 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



any high rise will completely outscale all other buildings in the area.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems like the whole point of this is to get more people living closer to the transit center, so I'm definitely more in favor of having residential in these new developments.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer no high rises

8/15/2011 7:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 10:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:59 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't like the high-rise - too dense

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's hard to imagine big tall towers at Northgate.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C,E: Seem to preserve more of the 'neighborhood' feeling, provide housing and local business easy to access, seem to allow more trees and other green space. Other options will likely increase congestion even more, office (g,h) will bring more cars and congestion but not living space.

8/12/2011 7:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



grass and trees. This area will not support high rise development

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Nothing more than mid-rise

8/10/2011 9:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K I like footprint and the mixed use. Also allows for growth in the area

8/10/2011 6:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer all mid-rise combos. appropriate for density but not too urban

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The high rise buildings B, D, F, H, J and L all seem grossly out of proportion to the existing facilities at Northgate. The Northgate Library and Community Center serve as a

neighborhood hub and would be dwarfed by such large commercial development - losing their pedestrian appeal. I'd much rather see more pedestrian friendly development like C. The low-rise buildings also seem more appropriate for preserving what's left of what was once a beautiful creek habitat.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



L - and any of the other images it applies to: Building looms over street and there is no way to see the sky. Pedestrian s are hemmed in and the noise level goes way up. Who needs more retail space in this economy anyway? Theres so many failing stores and businesses theres too many empty units already and that leads to crime.

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



pedestrian/family friendly!

8/9/2011 9:03 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like mixed so that all ages might be in the same vicinity. Careful attention to new studies on street safety would be helpful in guiding lighthing and density.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D & J -- I like narrower, taller buildings that emphasize glass and windows. K -- I do not like squat, monolithic buildings that fill up an entire block.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C & D provide retail space that is difficult to fill. Another example of government trying to make a market where none exists or is needed.

8/9/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



E I like the integration of a park like environment w/ residential. Generally I do not want stark buildings and streets. This is not Singapore nor downtown Vancouver, BC. I would like to see greenery, water and curvy lines (not just N/S, E/W streets), integrated, some businesses but fewer big box or chain stores, and underground parking so people must walk. A place for a farmer's market day

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Greater use of transit by residents of the building in addition to retail drawing people from out of the neighborhood. The possibility of attracting more development of the same type.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't believe that high-rise buildings would work well in our area. I also like the idea of additional retail space around the light rail. The retail space offers more of an incentive for people to travel to Northgate.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High Rise anything blocks out the sun, which is hard enough to get these days

8/9/2011 9:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, H, L, and J - all high-rise are overpowering and too large for our area. They create a canyon effect - I much prefer low-rise, with or without retail.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I, J - Like TREES!, pedestrian space, apparent lower speed street, did I mention trees?

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



For all - good modulation, high density.

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Although retail space is available at the North Northgate site, it seems it is always better to have some type of retail space to encourage pedestrian traffic. Low rise buildings do not overwhelm the area and would blend in better to the neighborhood

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think high rise office or residential should be combined with green space. This increases density, but makes for a more enjoyable area for all.

8/9/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need offices to bring more business to Northgate area. We have enough retail stores around here.

8/9/2011 12:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike: Too tall for the area, blocking views west to the Olympics, south to downtown like: size-appropriate buildings, more non-mall businesses

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All of my top choices include retail space at the base. I think this mix of housing and retail best supports enhancing Northgate as a potential shopping destination. With the redeveloped mall, the new Thornton Place development, and the Target area development I feel adding to the retail appeal of the area builds on the existing strengths of the area. The question doesn't specify but I believe the survey is also interested in aesthetics of the design as well: I

strongly favor the combination of modern and classic materials and structure present in L and F. In contrast ultra modern Glass such as A and B contrast sharply with the existing architecture of the area.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K should have more trees and seating space.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More people and uses closer to the Light Rail station.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Affordable Businesses Dislike

Good Modulation Growth High Rise

Higher Inappropriate Landscaping Light Rail

Mid Rise Monolithic Noise Level

Northgate offer Parking

Pedestrian Scale Rent Retail Roof

Space Transit Center Ugly

Vancouver Vicinity Welcoming

4. From the public space images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

I especially like the form of J, with towers that are set back from the street, but lower floor residential (or retail) that fronts on the sidewalk. I think that will make the streets feel more like neighborhood streets than downtown thoroughfares and addresses the concerns many people have with "density."

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C. Like the low profile of buildings so light can reach the area. Like the retail so it is welcoming with services for residents and visitors. Like the smaller residential so fewer people putting strain on infrastructure.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



They are all ugly. None of the buildings have modulated front walls with grass in front. None of them encourage going out and tossing a football around. None of them are walking-centric.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Dislike A,B, D, E because resembles downtown office density. Seems very out of character for Northgate.

10/8/2011 5:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C,K, L offer increased density with residential, which is important for creating vibrant atmosphere and activity after work hours. Not including residential in any potential development would create dead zones at night that would be unsafe.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



K. Mixed use provides for housing and retail uses for both residents and visitors. Low to Mid-rise buildings seem appropriate for existing character of area.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



None of these show this, but I prefer a thriving street front retail with on street parking.

9/28/2011 9:02 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



B and K - too busy, not broken up enough at pedestrian level. Northgate needs more high-end retail at the base, more pedestrian friendly streetscapes.

9/28/2011 8:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I prefer homey, people-oriented spaces. This translates to low-rise buildings, brick rather than metal, with sidewalks, benches and trees.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K - like the change in scale and material from the very public base to the more private residential B & D - dislike the scale. seems inappropriate for this part of town G - like the materials used and the modern design

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



J. The base of the towers has a great pedestrian scale -- Higher density allows for more quality and activated green spaces below. The street seems shared between bikers, pedestrians and cars which seems very pleasant to experience.

9/13/2011 11:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High-rise should be residential. Commercial office should stay lower scale a sit is too broad.

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I chose similar styles in the mid rise style range (choices A, I and K) to provide greater density and a sense of destination, but not so big that it overshadows the local houses and businesses.

9/9/2011 2:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I,J,K Interesting bases, pedestrian scale, active at street with good modulation, amenities L- do not like static form top to bottom general- low rise does not seem to be best use of property general- for transit related developemnt residential focus seems more appropriate than office- hard to create an emplyment center away from the city center

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K--like the roof top garden

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



To keep housing affordable, I think the city should encourage high-density housing close to stores and transit. The mid-rise and high-rise office space seemed the most sterile of the options, and I think they might require the most extra parking spots. (There's no guarantee that workers would be able to access Northgate by transit, especially if there's not much residential space nearby -- and even if there is housing, workers rarely wind up living right next to work.)

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the trees. Like the increased natural light at street level with low or mid-rise buildings. Like mixed use. Like set backs or variable setbacks from street.

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Don't like high-rise (for our area or any other), period. And mid or high-rise "glass palaces" (A. and H.) are way overdone, as far as I'm concerned.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it's critical to activate the street level; example J seems to provide the most attractive articulation at this level, but the same could be done with a retail development, and that might attract more pedestrian traffic.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely prefer the retail at base. I believe a multi-use building makes more sense in the positive development of a community. Considering the area, it seems like a mid-rise make more sense, otherwise, this would be the only high-rise around and that might not be aesthetically pleasing.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need people for different times of the day/week. It would be best if there was a mix.

9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C - no Verizon, Starbucks, etc. Get small, local businesses

9/6/2011 2:51 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



E: I like the green space

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



J. There is a ton of existing retail. I'd like to see some residential high-rise somewhere in Seattle.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Density is good but I think the hi-rises disconnect people too much from the life at ground level. I would love to work in an office in the Northgate area instead of downtown, but I don't know if there's demand.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I dislike A, E & L because of the monolithic appearance/ presence. I like many of the other examples (ie C, D, J & K) for the opposite reason, where there is a lot of texture without being tacky mess of materials that don't make sense together. Also, I prefer the taller examples, housing or office, because building low-rise here would be a missed opportunity being so close to a transit hub.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



No high rise. Anything over 12 stories is too tall for the area. There is no current high rise precedent. It would be architecturally disruptive of the landscape.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I believe that the look of the mid and low rise buildings will fit in with the architecture of Northgate area better then the high rise buildings. I also think it would be nice to encourage more people to live in Northgate with residential buildings, to help create a stronger community/neighborhood in Northgate.

8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



All need parking for transit riders, tenants, shoppers, etc.

8/25/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle (& certainly the NG area) already have a surfeit of retail.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



roof top deck/gardens to help cut down CO2

8/25/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



d,l,j,h,d,etc Please..NO High -Rise anything !

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C-like the mixed uses D-seems out of scale for Northgate, though taller is better near a LRT station; err on the side of height and density here E-looks very inviting, comfortable, friendly; would be great as part of a taller, denser development F-great for providing lots of badly needed housing units near transit, though retail base would be better H-important to provide lots of jobs near transit as well as homes. this does that but needs a base that interfaces better with the street and pedestrian experience I & J-nice looking, and provide many housing units, but need retail base to serve the residents

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The residential mid and high rise would destroy the view for those who live there now; and are out of scale to the current way of living. The low rise is best since it allow more people to live in the area; hope that the rents are truly affordable to the times in which we live.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I feel like having a lot of commercial/retail around the station is healthy growth. I also think that the high density office space should be limited to downtown to make a downtown core so more poeple would use the light rail for commuting.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



In general, I prefer mixed used and mid- to high-rise developments. Office and residential buildings should be at about the same scale. Street-level should be pedestrian- and transit-friendly, with retail/commercial activity. Cars should be a lower priority.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely want residential included at the base of any building, and would prefer higher end development to attract wealthier residents. I trust the designers to choose the most appropriate architectural style for the area.

8/25/2011 11:00 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



there does not seem to be a retail at base with residential AND office above (I would prefer both mid-rise and high-rise)

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



That the rent/lease would be too high for the average person.

8/25/2011 10:02 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I think we don't have enough concentration of business activity to merit high rises, so with L, J, H, F, D & B, the feeling is a sense of displacement from downtown. Mid-rise photos (K, E, C) give a sense of activity and population that feels good. The high rises feel solitary/ lonely; the mid-rises feel vibrant and bustling. High rises can be infill later, after the bustling activity is established.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Letter A has street parking available

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate area needs more residents in the area to keep area vibrant, clean, and community oriented.

8/22/2011 11:25 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



With rail and the transit center, we will be a major transit hub. Density is key to leveraging transit resources, and ground-level retail keeps the community active and walkable.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, L: these examples would bring a number of new local residents to the neighborhood which would lead to improved demand for local retail. Retail at the ground floor would improve street vitality and safety.

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle needs to develop more high-rise buildings in general. We've had a boom of new mid-rises and they're starting to look unoriginal and tacky.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High rise L J H are too big for the area.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Mid rise will blend more with the already existing Northgate buildings. Adding High rise buildings will be out of place.

8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K+L: I like retail at base b/c I feel it's a well thought out use of space. Plus, I feel like many people wouldn't want to live at base in a highly populated area.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A high-rise would not fit in with the rest of the area, please stay to a low or mid-rise.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Building setbacks should be deeper, like Vancouver B.C. This makes a more liveable neighborhood.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like Development image D; it has a very urban appearance that would offer an appealing contrast from the mall-dominated Northgate look.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A, B, G, and H make it feel less like a neighborhood and more like a mini downtown. Questions of safety as it seems like it would be busy during the day and overly quiet at night.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I - Like the broken down scale of the architectural mass. Scale at the street level is approachable, yet the entrance is removed from the main traffic flow. E. Like the incorporation of "park" and open space mixed within the dwelling units. Buildings are similar in style and material but individually diverse.

8/17/2011 7:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike - too high of construction

8/17/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I can't see any type of high-rise going up around Northgate, it just doesn't fit the neighborhood profile. I do like the Residential mid-rise + retail concept though.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NO HIGH RISE ANYTHING!!!!

8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All about the architecture and planting. Less Northgate mall cement block style and MORE regrade (angles, plants, thought) style architecture. High rises tend to end up lower rent while larger living spaces (lowrises) tend to be nicer and people take care of them better, which translates to happier neighborhood. Keep the mapleleaf love!

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Anything high-rise would not fit in with the surrounding area (B,D,F,J,L); lots of green space would be nice (E&J)

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Examples C and E are ugly, and G looks like a totally dead neighborhood to pedestrians on the ground. There are already lots of low-rise residential and mid-rise office buildings in this city- I don't see why more of them are desirable right next to a transit hub, rather than encouraging highest density residential and offices right where good transit is available.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Generally speaking, I am opposed to highrise buildings in this area because they undermine the "human scale" of development and the pedestrian experience.

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the ones with trees

8/17/2011 11:58 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like having retail at the base of any of the options.
8/17/2011 11:43 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The office mid-rise is a bad option because it will leave the vicinity dead during non-office-hours. Residential and residential/retail mixed will keep the area more vibrant (and probably safer) during evenings and weekends.
8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



D and L are the same choice but different design.
8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Hi Rise is inappropriate for this area.
8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the look of High-Rise buildings in those pics. It makes the neighborhood look more urban, less boring.
8/17/2011 11:14 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



any of the high-rise options. it seems so out-of-place in this part of the city and obstructs views.
8/17/2011 11:11 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



any high rise will completely outscale all other buildings in the area.
8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems like the whole point of this is to get more people living closer to the transit center, so I'm definitely more in favor of having residential in these new developments.
8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer no high rises
8/15/2011 7:33 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.
8/14/2011 10:00 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.
8/14/2011 9:59 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't like the high-rise - too dense

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's hard to imagine big tall towers at Northgate.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C,E: Seem to preserve more of the 'neighborhood' feeling, provide housing and local business easy to access, seem to allow more trees and other green space. Other options will likely increase congestion even more, office (g,h) will bring more cars and congestion but not living space.

8/12/2011 7:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



grass and trees. This area will not support high rise development

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Nothing more than mid-rise

8/10/2011 9:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K I like footprint and the mixed use. Also allows for growth in the area

8/10/2011 6:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer all mid-rise combos. appropriate for density but not too urban

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The high rise buildings B, D, F, H, J and L all seem grossly out of proportion to the existing facilities at Northgate. The Northgate Library and Community Center serve as a neighborhood hub and would be dwarfed by such large commercial development - losing their pedestrian appeal. I'd much rather see more pedestrian friendly development like C. The low-rise buildings also seem more appropriate for preserving what's left of what was once a beautiful creek habitat.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



L - and any of the other images it applies to: Building looms over street and there is no way to see the sky. Pedestrian s are hemmed in and the noise level goes way up. Who needs

more retail space in this economy anyway? There's so many failing stores and businesses there's too many empty units already and that leads to crime.

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



pedestrian/family friendly!

8/9/2011 9:03 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like mixed so that all ages might be in the same vicinity. Careful attention to new studies on street safety would be helpful in guiding lighting and density.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D & J -- I like narrower, taller buildings that emphasize glass and windows. K -- I do not like squat, monolithic buildings that fill up an entire block.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C & D provide retail space that is difficult to fill. Another example of government trying to make a market where none exists or is needed.

8/9/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



E I like the integration of a park like environment w/ residential. Generally I do not want stark buildings and streets. This is not Singapore nor downtown Vancouver, BC. I would like to see greenery, water and curvy lines (not just N/S, E/W streets), integrated, some businesses but fewer big box or chain stores, and underground parking so people must walk. A place for a farmer's market day

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Greater use of transit by residents of the building in addition to retail drawing people from out of the neighborhood. The possibility of attracting more development of the same type.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't believe that high-rise buildings would work well in our area. I also like the idea of additional retail space around the light rail. The retail space offers more of an incentive for people to travel to Northgate.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High Rise anything blocks out the sun, which is hard enough to get these days

8/9/2011 9:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, H, L, and J - all high-rise are overpowering and too large for our area. They create a canyon effect - I much prefer low-rise, with or without retail.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I, J - Like TREES!, pedestrian space, apparent lower speed street, did I mention trees?

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



For all - good modulation, high density.

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Although retail space is available at the North Northgate site, it seems it is always better to have some type of retail space to encourage pedestrian traffic. Low rise buildings do not overwhelm the area and would blend in better to the neighborhood

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think high rise office or residential should be combined with green space. This increases density, but makes for a more enjoyable area for all.

8/9/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need offices to bring more business to Northgate area. We have enough retail stores around here.

8/9/2011 12:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike: Too tall for the area, blocking views west to the Olympics, south to downtown like: size-appropriate buildings, more non-mall businesses

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All of my top choices include retail space at the base. I think this mix of housing and retail best supports enhancing Northgate as a potential shopping destination. With the redeveloped mall, the new thorton Place development, and the Target area development I feel adding to the retail appeal of the area builds on the existing strengths of the area. The question doesnt specify but I believe the survey is also interested in aesthetics of the design as well: I strongly favor the combination of modern and classic materials and structure present in L and F. In contrast ultra modern Glass such as A and B contrast sharply with the existing architecture of the area.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K should have more trees and seating space.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More people and uses closer to the Light Rail station.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Cozy Dense Drive Green Greenery

Large Plaza Look Maintain Mall

Manipulative Questions Outdoor Outside

Park Pavement Pedestrian Places

Public Space Retail Safe Shoppers

Sidewalk Cafes Smaller Sun Trees Wide

Woonerf

7. Do you support building a pedestrian and bicycle crossing of Interstate 5? Why?

This is ESSENTIAL to connect North Seattle Community College and existing neighborhoods West of I-5 to the Station and the new development in the Northgate Station Area.

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends how hard it is to cross now. Seems pretty easy over 92nd and 85th.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Focus on making it easy (and obvious) to bicycle to where 92nd Street crosses I-90, and safe to do so. Also focus on teaching competent bicycling -- use of helmets, headlights, arm signals, et cetera, and eliminate bike lanes that overlap with open car doors.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Need to make the connections to bring in surrounding neighbors safely and in a fun and enjoyable way add art to it or greenery

10/8/2011 5:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This will further encourage the use of public transit, especially with a potential light rail stop.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Agree it is important to connect the Community College Campus and other residential and offices at the opposite side of the freeway. Doing so in a pedestrian friendly manner where one doesn't feel overwhelmed by the noise and views of traffic will be the challenge to the designer.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The crossing points at Northgate Way and at 92nd seem reasonably adequate, although something more direct to North Seattle Community College would be nice. But in making decisions about how to allocate funds, something "nice to have" may not make the cut.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 is a giant divide in this part of Seattle. I live on the eastern side here and am constantly walking and biking around with my kids. Currently the built environment around i-5 makes it completely undesirable to cross (it's dark and loud and dirty under where Northgate Way crosses the highway). I would love to get over there and reconnect the city and Greenlake and beyond!

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate Way is lousy for peds and 92nd is way up the damn hill.

9/15/2011 2:07 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



good investment in the long run. I-5 cuts off the use of northgate to a large population. Encourages people to walk and drive less.

9/13/2011 11:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NSCC

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



its time to focus on infrastructure to support multi-modal transportation options rather than cars this connection would provide excellent support of the train and bus station from the west side of I-5

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Can we make existing crossings more friendly to bike/ped with less expense?

9/7/2011 4:08 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need to encourage people to take transit by other means than driving a car to a paved park and ride.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Encourages exercise, increases safety, and reduces emissions.

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In general I strongly support more ped-bike infrastructure (right now, crossing I-5 is a tough slog for a biker or pedestrian), but I'm not familiar enough with the specifics to be able to support any particular project.

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I live west of I-5 and would love bike access to Northgate.

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If it's going to directly connect bike and other commuters with the new transit center, then I'm for it, for safety reasons.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North Seattle is a terrible place to bicycle due to narrow roads, very aggressive car traffic, and the problem of getting from one side of the interstate to the other. A crossing would be great, but then, you must also provide safe access to the crossing!

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are limited ways to get from one side of I-5 to the other and not all of those existing options are good. Improving those by adding a pedestrian/bicycle crossing of I-5 will make it easier for people to access Northgate, encourage increased use of non-motorized commute modes, and increase parking availability for people who have to drive.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This would be very helpful for those commuting to North Seattle Community College or to the Park and Ride.

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NSCC

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not directly important to me (I live on the east side of I-5) but I think the more we encourage foot/bike traffic into the area, the better.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Goods and services on the other side of freeway are not compelling BUT I think a crossing would make commuting via transit more attractive to those on foot. Crossing the freeway now would be an unpleasant, daunting effort.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are many areas of I-5 that cut off the ability of pedestrians and bikes to safely travel. There are many students going to NSCC that may use transit and need to cross I-5. There are a growing number of people walking in the area and it is currently set up for car traffic and not for safe pedestrian/bicycle use.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



connecting North Seattle Community College and the Northgate Transit Center would eliminate a transfer, save time for bus riders and increase ridership. Seems like a no brainer. An underpass was promised many years ago but like many things promised for this area it never happened.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



For safety, and to encourage ped. & bicycling. How 'bout a soft-surfaced jogging lane on the crossing? Make it attractive!!

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We already have enough trash migrating into the neighborhood from Aurora . The last thing I'd favor is adding access for the dirt-bags and scum that "hang out" at Northgate Mall.

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This is critical to make the best and most use of the light rail station as it's to be built against I-5. Without it, half the development potential, ridership potential, and affordability potential are lost. The existing crossings of I-5 are too far away to walk to, and though we have buses there, we should be moving people by foot where possible. NSCC and NW Hospital are important trip origins/destinations, and we should maximize their walkability to the station to reduce car trips. We must open the 1/2 mile radius from the station to TOD on both sides of the highway.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A strong link between the college and the transit center would be desirable in order to make it easier for more people from other parts of Seattle to access the options of the college. Further the nearest pedestrian crossings are Northgate Way (not very pedestrian friendly) and 92nd Street which doesn't have great pedestrian access.

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



1) Education/Job training access to the programs at NSCC---transit dependent-students now spend more travel time from Northgate TC to NSCC than it takes to get from Downtown to Northgate! 2) Healthy active transport options for residents and shoppers, employees, visitors and NSCC students, faculty, staff for the whole urban center to library, community center, transit, shopping, housing, etc 3) reduce road congestion and eliminate many short trips now made by car 4) increase transit ridership 5) create a beautiful gateway over an UGLY highway

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There's a crossing over at N.E. 92nd Street already and a way under the freeway at N.E. Northgate Way. It seems to me, as someone who walks a lot around the area, that's sufficient.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Reconnecting the neighborhoods, encouraging more development west of I-5

8/25/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It just make SENSE!.. 1/2 of the radius around the transit center is cut off by I-5. pedestrian/bike access is essential and NG Way and 92 Street are too far apart for anything other than to encourage car usage for those on the west side of I-5.

8/25/2011 11:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The closest crossings at 92nd and Northgate Way (not ped or bike friendly) are relatively far away from the station, especially with potential traffic to/from North Seattle Community College. I think a crossing is warranted.

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A direct link to North Seattle Community College and the surrounding neighborhoods is essential for residents/students on the west side of I-5 to leave their cars and bike/walk over to the light rail station.

8/25/2011 10:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A pedestrian bridge would greatly increase safety, in addition to reduce travel time, by foot, to the station. This allows people to access the station on their own power, rather than

be dependent on unreliable connecting buses. In addition, making it easier to walk to the station, means fewer parking spaces are required to meet demand.

8/24/2011 11:32 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Would help make northgate less "car-centric" and more "people-centric." However, I'd hope the other side of northgate would become more people friendly soon, too, as there's a lot of transient/unsavory activity that I don't want to draw from 99.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As a cyclist, it would be great to have another option of crossing I-5 and not necessarily needing to be on the sidewalk. Currently, I have to ride up to 115th street if I'm going North to cross, or down to 92nd. Northgate Way is too busy of a crossing to feel safe crossing while riding on the sidewalks. Mix in pedestrians and there's not much room for a bike.

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Light rail is going to be an expensive investment— don't short change it by skimping on a relatively cheap way to increase its walkshed.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Oh, please, please do this.

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Aren't there already enough underpasses and overpasses?

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What's there now is UGLY.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Easier access to NSCC.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't walk or bike much in that area.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It makes sense to connect with North Seattle Community College

8/18/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are already multiple ways to get a cross I-5 as a pedestrian or cyclist. I think there are other improvements that can be made that does not further disrupt I-5.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not sure the purpose. We have NE 92nd which most would use to access the NSCC. Who would use this bike/ped access? The students at NSCC. I would rather see funding go toward improving NE 92nd and other streets people already use.

8/17/2011 7:02 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's a show-stopper and just has to be a requirement. You won't get any buy-in from anyone on the west side of I-5 (including NSCC) without it!

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What the heck for? All the people going to the community college? Why can't we use the one that already exists? Spend the money on something useful.

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



would make it easier for the college kids to get to/from NSCC, and easier for us on the other side to get over to enjoy the campus

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is a high-traffic area & it is difficult to cross on foot- especially with cargo, stroller, dog, etc

8/17/2011 12:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The existing crossing at NE 92nd is not very far away, and a crossing between that location and Northgate Way is likely to be VERY expensive, and there is no indication that there is or will be sufficient bike traffic to justify it (save the money to build one in the U-District where there are more peds and bikes!)

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's actually very hard to cross I-5 by car, let alone by foot. Right now by foot you have to cross at 92nd or along Northgate Way (both are dangerous, and sidewalks are absent on major sections of both routes). An overpass would connect the station directly with North Seattle Community College and the public high school over there.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Connect it to the community college!

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Already exists at 95th and 103rd.

8/17/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because right now it is almost impossible.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There is lack of access across I-5 and the only portion that is extremely auto-dominated. It discourages bikes and peds. Providing an additional alternative will extend access to Northgate, the light rail station, and more. It's a major win for all. Personally, I prefer a tunnel.

8/17/2011 11:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are very few options for crossing I5 in the northgate area. 92nd Street is busy with hills and poor streets and sidewalks west of the freeway. Northgate Way is impossible by bike and unpleasant by foot.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With so many cyclist they need more access and laws to make it more safe-as it stands biking on streets and plugged in is seriously dangerous.

8/17/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With so many cyclist they need more access and laws to make it more safe-as it stands biking on streets and plugged in is seriously dangerous.

8/17/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This would be great; I am wondering where the bridge would be and whether the city could use the bridge over I-5 between Northgate Way and 125th.

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it is important that students at the college have easy access to the transit center, however, I understand that the costs are quite exhorbitant because of the steep dropoff on the west side of I-5, and that this must be weighed in the decision.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It would be nice to connect the comm. college.

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Makes sense, but there is already one on Norhtgate that goes under.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



northgate is a terrifying place to ride a bike, yet my kids and I would like to save gas by riding bikes in the neighborhood

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



the easier it is to get around the northgate area; the better. I 5 does split the neighborhood in half; more access increases the potential for growth on both sides of the interstate. Also more folks will be able to walk to retail instead of driving.

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It might be beneficial to build a crossing to connect the light rail with North Seattle Community College - but NE 92nd already sort of does that. How would a new crossing be beneficial? There's not much on the west side of I-5 that seems in need of connecting, other than the college.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because the nearest practical crossings are about a mile in each direction. Northgate way is completely impossible unless you want to get hit by a car.

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This is an absurd situation. The only way to NorthGate from the North Seattle Community College is under the freeway. If you go under the freeway you will see it is fenced and a lot of garbage has been accumulated, it is noisy and unfriendly to walk under. They need some brainstorming between the college president, Nordstrom, the mall administrator to make walking from West to East, East to West more sensible - a award winning bridge design. Many kids from the college would likely cross for lunch or shopping. Moreover, North Seattle seems to have a large percentage of foreign students who are used to great public transportation systems in their home countries and do not drive. It would be a more vibrant community to be able to walk between the college/greater Green Lake area. The other issue is the lighting under the freeway is poor and scary. The garbage accumulation is such that if one took a few pictures it would look identical to parts of East LA and should be an embarrassment to the Mayor. A bridge should be a #1 priority for the Northgate area to make it more liveable. It might even be used to evacuation purposes if need be. It could easily be monitored by Mall Security and or HD cameras and speakers that could tell kids to move along, etc.. It could even be monitored by any number of companies that offer computer monitored cameras that are trained to look for non standard behavior and notify actual security. Unfortunately we have to have this stuff nowadays.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More choices of crossing I-5 would be nice, but costs of building something above and beyond what already exists could be a stumbling block in these fiscally tight times.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'd like to see much more encouragement of walking and safer bike routes.

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 has divided the city for far too long. A bike/pedestrian overpass would help rectify this a little. Also, presumably many of the transit riders would be NSCC students. It is unreasonable to require them to brave the crazy traffic under the freeway at Northgate Way while adding to their commute time.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Facilitate these energy-saving, healthy alternatives to having to drive everywhere. Even where there are bike lanes on regular streets, it is hazardous to ride in many places, especially around Northgate.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Only safe crossing now at 92nd. Need way for bicycles and peds to get west of freeway.

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



USE THE N 92nd STREET OVERPASS! Why build another?!

8/9/2011 8:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A better crossing by Northgate way is needed. The current crossing under I-5 is dark, nosy and feels dangerous. I'm not sure if a new crossing is needed or if the current crossings (91st?; Northgate; and 115th?) need improvement.

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It would relieve some of the bicycle/pedestrian traffic going over NE 92nd

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Essential

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



where? It is already easy to cross at 95th next to NSCC by both foot and bike. The northgate/105 intersection could be improved I suppose. Coming to the Mall/transit area from the NE is currently the most difficult/least bike friendly direction.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends on where the crossing is. I think it might be helpful for students at the college.

8/8/2011 11:10 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Would rather we just take I-5 out. Its a lot of money to build a bridge over something that will be obsolete in the near future.

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Need to improve access from transit center to North Seattle Community College & neighborhood. This should be done ASAP - not wait until light rail station complete.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



It ties the Community College to the LRT.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



There is a substantial commercial district and college within biking/walking distance from the Mall and Transit center.. makes sense to find a way to better connect them. Right now it is maddening to try to get to anything on the west side of i5.

8/7/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



it's a over a mile to go around by Northgate way or 92nd. I don't walk to Northgate because of it. The community has always said no because they say it will be a drug hangout, but it's time to make it happen. If you are going to build something at northgate, you need easy access to it.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Because I think we should encourage more walking and biking...and safe ways to do it. Anything to decrease cars is a good thing.

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Easier access to the College. No need to take a bus from the transit center up and over 92nd to get to the college. Immediate west side neighborhood, west of I5, will not need to drive over to mall and transit center.

8/6/2011 11:13 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



We should make it as easy as possible for people to get out of their cars.

8/5/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The more we can engineer the city for non-car usage, the better.

8/5/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



it would be great for people who go to the community college or UW to be able to use the paths for commuting.

8/5/2011 9:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



While a pedestrian/bicycle crossing over I-5 would be great, ultimately, the dictating factor should be whether it is a cost effective use of our tax payer money. How many people would a crossing actually service? Probably not many. However, investing the same dollar amount in improving I-5 would benefit a huge amount of people. It is hard for me to support investing money in a project that very well may only benefit less than 5% of the community, regardless of how wonderful the improvement might be.

8/5/2011 7:28 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



because i suggested it before and was told by metro, the city, and sound transit that i was crazy.

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There seems to be decent pedestrian/bike crossings for I-5 around northgate.

8/4/2011 4:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not sure who would use it or where it would go. What is the actual walking distance between points?

8/4/2011 4:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it'd be great, although it is pretty expensive.

8/4/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



An even better concept would be an eventual transit overpass/connector ramp/freeway station connecting North Seattle Community College and the Northgate Transit Center/LINK station, including shared parking with North Seattle Community College in the form of some structured parking. Northgate will be the magnet for light rail for the area and providing feeder bus routes and easy parking for all would be a huge asset for the area.

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I5 is a huge barrier. Some means of crossing it seems absolutely necessary, otherwise your cutting off everyone who lives on the side opposite the station.

8/4/2011 11:35 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently one has to go quite a ways north or south to get from northgate cc to the transit center; doubling or tripling the distance; the transit center therefore does not effectively serve the college.

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This gives a much larger walkshed. There are no crossings b/w 92nd and Northgate Way.

8/4/2011 10:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If there is sidewalk connectivity on either side that links to the neighborhoods, otherwise it is an island or pedestrian oasis (much as the redesigned transit center was before the pedestrian activated light was put in.

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Access across 92nd and at Northgate way are too far to walk.

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



cost

8/4/2011 8:46 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The retail businesses in this area would benefit greatly from increased foot traffic, and residents would benefit from increased access to businesses, green spaces, etc.

8/4/2011 8:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 is a huge barrier to comm. college students.

8/4/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Even though I don't ride a bike, there needs to be a place where people can get across safely and quickly.

8/4/2011 6:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I bike commute and the roads are too busy with speeding drivers during the commute.

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



the transit center will serve folks on both sides of the freeway. The crossings at 125/145 are a ways away from Northgate and the Northgate crossing is very difficult with the freeway ramps on the right hand side.

8/4/2011 3:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



While I realize that there is little money for even a pedestrian only bridge, I would strongly recommend that the costs and benefits of a transit/bike/pedestrian bridge be studied. Given that we are looking at a large cable stayed bridge, what would be the incremental cost of adding transit to it? The time savings and reliability improvements to the many bus trips

that currently cross I-5 at 92nd or at Northgate Way could save many service hours and greatly enhance the feeder network into Northgate station. In addition, allowing transit on the bridge could set the stage for future BRT or light rail connecting Northgate with Ballard/Northwest Seattle.

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm not sure that the cost is worth it. On the other hand, I didn't buy a house that was on the west side of I-5 because transit options in that area were pretty dismal when compared to the east side of I-5.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Walking along Northgate Way to Meridian under the freeway feels very unsafe. It would be great to be able to get across the freeway to Meridian on a safe pedestrian/bike path.

8/3/2011 8:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As a frequent pedestrian in this exact neighborhood my choices to cross I-5 are at NE 92nd (great) and Northgate Way (I almost get run over every time I travel this route on foot). It is not safe and not to mention the fact that is a lot of ground to cover.

8/3/2011 8:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We can't afford it.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We can't afford it.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Without such a crossing, the transit stop is nearly useless for true (carless) green commuters from the west side of I-5. It would be so silly for them to have to trek back to 92nd St. to cross over -- I doubt many on foot would do so, although bikers might. It also makes the transit station MUCH more accessible to people with disabilities.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I used to live on Meridian and either walked under I-5 (on Northgate Way) or over I-5 at NE 92nd street to get to the transit area and/or shopping. While there is a large gap between these crossing points, the west side of I-5 isn't designed well to access an overpass (ie the college is wide and deep, the medical center is wide and deep, there are wooded and swampy areas, and you'd have to traverse business or multifamily parking lots to access the overpass). I also assume that an overpass would be expensive. It might be more cost effective to improve the Northgate Way underpass (clean up, art, lighting, landscaping) and the NE 92nd Street overpass (clean up, pedestrian scale lighting, art, etc)

8/3/2011 4:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There seems to be a lot of "noise" about bikes the past 4 years and lip service to walkers. Been asking for a 400 ft walkway on the street up from us but no action. Only one side a ditch and the other gravel 7-10 ft wide and folks park on it and on the street????

8/3/2011 4:17 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



When driving home I often take the overpass just north of Northgate that becomes 117th. It would be nice to have a bike, pedestrian only overpass. The one I drive is not very welcoming for pedestrians and is not very safe for bikers or children.

8/3/2011 4:12 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



SERIOUSLY?!?! That seems like such a waste of money! Improve the existing sidewalks under (and over) I-5, perhaps even separating them with barriers, but don't build a new crossing. Besides the incredible waste of money, they create safety issues for both I-5 as well as the people who use them (look at the Aurora example).

8/3/2011 3:22 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Access for pedestrians has been neglected and the sidewalks you have now are narrow, decaying, and too close to the street curbs. Need to find ways to stop cars at driveway access points and intersections. As a ped I feel 'invisible' sometimes.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's not currently safe.

8/3/2011 2:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Bike and pedestrian lanes encourage people not to drive which causes traffic congestion and is not environmentally friendly.

8/3/2011 2:51 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't think we have that many bicycles.

8/3/2011 2:46 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is difficult and time consuming to get between Licton Springs/NSCC and Northgate. A ped/bike bridge would reduce the number of cars driven to NSCC and would increase the amount of healthy activity in the Northgate area.

8/3/2011 2:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Activity Afford Aurora Bike Crossing

Development Easier East Side of I-5

Expensive Going Huge Barrier

Impossible Increase Makes Sense

Money to Build Nice North

Seattle Community College

NSCC Pedestrian Run Say Street

Overpass Surrounding Transit UGLY Usage

West Side of I-5

8. Do you think public agencies need to replace all commuter parking spaces that would be displaced by development at the transit center? Why?

The public should invest any/all available resources on actual public transit service and facilities to fulfill their core mission of moving people and goods. This is becoming an urban area and consequently, any investment in station access should focus on bike facilities (bike station), and additional local feeder transit service.

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends how many unused spaces there are now. Thornton creek seems to have a large commuter lot.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I park at Northgate everyday, but I would sacrifice the convenience of parking for a quality development. Alternatively, I can catch a connecting bus near my house or bike to Northgate.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With its orientation as a commuter center, adequate parking at Northgate will be important. Current commuter parking spaces are consistently overflowing. It seems parking for the existing retail/mall could be condensed (garage) or opened up to commuter parking during the day. That being said, an eye should be kept open for opportunities to reduce vehicular dependence in the area such as improving bike path and pedestrian connections.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The parking lots are always full with the current transit service, and neighboring businesses have signs saying "no park & ride parking" so it seems to already have spill-over. I walk to the transit center when I ride the bus, but the times I've tried picking someone up there in my car I haven't been able to find a parking spot.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you do not provide all the parking spaces, people will find a new and more environmentally sensitive way to get there. They will complain but they'll figure it out. If you provide all the parking spaces again, the need for parking will continue to grow. It will have no end. The more you make, the more you'll need to make. Let's not make it about cars! Let's make it about creating a new way of getting around!

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Those parking spaces sure seem to be heavily used by commuters.

9/15/2011 2:07 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I need more information. If current commuter parking spaces are near or at full usage, then yes, it is an important feature to keep.

9/9/2011 2:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



as long as we make it easy to drive and park people will not leave their cars if parking is maintained it should be paid parking

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No. Agencies need to think of ways to get people to transit centers by other means than personal vehicles.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People won't use the infrastructure if they can't find a place to park. Encouraging biking and walking is good, but can't be counted on to consistently reduce parking space usage. Also, the goal should be to increase usage of public transport--which, if successful, will likely require more--not less-- parking at transit centers.

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Let the market decide how much parking there should be.

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With less parking available, commuters will find another option (bus or bike).

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not necessarily--if more people can get to the new transit center easily without having to drive, then I think less parking would be just fine. But agencies need to provide the speed and connections needed to make this happen.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Parking could be eliminated if alternative means of access were thoughtfully developed--for example, world class bicycle infrastructure.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate will transition into a community that does not rely on P&R to fill buses but will provide transit-oriented residents and neighbors that could benefit from that P&R space being used for something with more value to them.

9/6/2011 4:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is a heavily used transit center that seems to fill up completely every morning. By adding additional service with the light rail and adding a pedestrian/bike crossing of I-5, some people may get there without their cars, but I suspect that even more people will drive there to access this improved service.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Already the parking lot is pretty full. Reducing spaces will discourage mass transit.

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In the short term it adds ridership. In the longer term it gives the government a way to meter and allot parking based on policy rather than hoping the market will what's wanted.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Park-and-rides are an essential service for getting people who would otherwise be driving (like me) onto public transit. A multi-hop transit trip is so much longer than a drive-to-transit that it's just not worth the hassle and delay. This is mostly because the buses are too infrequent and late. I don't know that they need to be replaced 1:1, but it should be comparable. I think it's okay to charge for this parking though!

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People will use transit more if there is parking. Simple fact.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I dont think all need to be replaced. I have never seen it completely full. Northgate Mall employees and Christmas shoppers usually fill in but I think replacing only some percentage is necessary. Parking isnt as important as transit.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate already suffers from a lot of car and bus congestion and air pollution. Reducing the number of commuter spaces would hopefully reduce the air pollution.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Transit and the addition of tenants and/or shoppers will add additional parking needs.

8/25/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need to do all in our power to encourage motorist use of public transit for a multitude of green reasons.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Parking is one of the worst land uses there is. Seattle in particular provides among the most parking spaces per car of any big US city. Parking should be scarce and priced. Land should be used for productive uses like homes, offices, shops, parks, etc--not car storage that pollutes the air and water. The current layout of NTC was designed for buses only; not trains. Buses don't offer the land development potential trains do; since people generally don't move or work next to bus stops, they have to be offered ways to drive to them. Not so with rail. Rail offers great development potential as lots of people want to live and work a short walk from the station. Buses will still serve Northgate, but it will become mainly a rail hub rather than a bus one. There will be less need for anyone to drive to/from Northgate when rail opens, and we should be moving people to and from rail by foot, bike, and bus as

much as we possibly can. Look at great TOD examples around the country like Arlington County, VA. We must add lots of homes, jobs, shops, etc. while reducing the amount of parking. Buildings in a quarter mile radius of the station should be capped at 1 parking space per housing unit.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This strongly depends on the transit development plans in the area. If you want people to use rail more, make it easier to mode switch at the transit center. Or provide more frequent shuttle type service to other parking areas nearby that are ok for park & ride use (SE corner of Northgate mall Parking lot for example)

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Use of all-electric fleet vehicles as a "car share asset" to the whole community (and as property of City Light as electric grid/load leveling infrastructure) should be prioritized

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The commuter parking spaces encourage and enable people to drive their automobiles there, on rainy days, and take the bus. And of course, it rains a lot in Seattle, from October through February.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The transit center should be designed to encourage commuters to arrive by bus and transfer to Link or express buses. If there is commuter parking, it should be structured and below-grade, or incorporated into parking structures in the development. Possibly shared with a mall or commercial center that has higher parking demand in evenings and weekends.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The only parking that public agencies should keep at Northgate is pay parking. Land is valuable.

8/25/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It depends on how much residential units will be in the area; if folks are driving to the new light rail station from further suburbs there should be, at this time anyway (until the extension to Lynnwood is built), be some capacity to handle the vehicles (hopefully not in the form of a surface lot or a aboveground parking garage) if the city/region truly wants to help shift modeshare.

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



- 1) The peak parking demand period for the mall is Saturday afternoons - for the train, it's weekdays. With appropriate sharing of parking with the mall, there should be plenty for all.
- 2) If more people live near the station and if the pedestrian bridge over the freeway is built,

fewer people accessing the station, percentage-wise, will need to drive. 3) Parking is ugly and an extremely unproductive use of land.

8/24/2011 11:32 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Whenever I leave the transit center on weekdays (around 3pm) the spots are full, and drivers are circling around looking for spots to park. If Seattle truly wants to reduce congestion and traffic, then people are going to need a spot to park to take the light rail or bus. It's not realistic to think that everyone who's going to take the light rail lives within walking/biking distance. And it's not realistic to think that people are going to take a bus to the transit center, then get on the light rail.

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As NG takes on more urban form, parking should begin to be phased out. That said, the transit serves a large enough area that it's not yet realistic to assume that many commuters have other choices. Hopefully rail stops further north and their associated P&Rs will alleviate this need.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Divert these funds to improved bike and transit projects. My sense is that most of the commuters at the transit station will be transferring from buses or walking there, rather than using it as a 'park and ride.'

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People need to park their cars. Removing parking spaces doesn't stop people from driving.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If the housing is affordable it shouldn't be a problem to live there and use community transit but what are the housing prices going to be like? I already can't afford where I'm living.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's great for people who live in neighborhoods that don't have easy transit options. Plus a lot of traffic starts around Norhtgate so it would be nice to have the option to get that far, park and take the train to the city.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't use the commuter parking spaces.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You need to make it as easy as possible to take public transportation. I use the P&R and commute to Bellevue to work, but if there wasn't parking available at the P&R, then I wouldn't take the bus. I don't feel safe biking/walking in the dark. Additionally, if I had to

take a bus to the P&R and then transfer, it would add too much time to my commute. Please save the parking spots!

8/18/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Offer better transit/walking etc options so that the need for parking/driving is reduced. None of the features above will be enjoyable if there is car traffic everywhere.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The transit center offers a means to lessen the amount of cars on the road. If people are always driving to the transit center, then the purpose of the transit center is being at least partially defeated. I believe that there will always be people who insist on driving to the transit center, so there should still be some parking. However, the amount of parking should suggest that driving is not the #1 option to get to the center.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you want people to take transit, they will need a way to get to the stop. There were issues in south seattle when there wasn't enough commuter parking. Commuters were competing with residents for parking...

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Park and ride north of target is already GONE and people DO actually need to Park and ride sometimes. A possible improvement: the 41 (which most people in Maple Leaf use for direct access to downtown) does not service the Maple Leaf area. However, it does DRIVE down 5th all day long. it would be nice if they stopped twice along the way to serve our neighborhood before they get on the freeway at 75th. It would eliminate a lot of commuter parking at the transit center. Metro would say that they are only supposed to drive down 5th during rush hour but that is a fabrication. They drive down 5th all day long. Just an idea to improve things in our area.

8/17/2011 7:02 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You must allow for commuter parking at the transit center. Bus service up in the north-end just won't support the required feed into the transit center.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Sure if it makes sense. There will need to be parking there otherwise the neighborhood parking will become a nightmare

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



How else will I get from my house to the transit center? I live over a mile away and the buses heading that way don't run as early in the morning as I would need them - I need to drive/park at the transit center.

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Promotes use of public transit & decreases congestion.

8/17/2011 12:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because the light rail stations are still so far apart, walking is still not a plausible option for getting to the stations, and taking buses to the stations is more pain than it's worth. If the parking spaces aren't replaced, there should be more secure, easy-to-use bike storage options at the station.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is well used and I'd rather people didn't need to drive the entire way, but it improvements to other systems make getting to the transit center without a car easier I'm more supportive of that.

8/17/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Ample parking should remain, but it's not reasonable to replace every single space that is lost. With proper bus connections and better bike access, parking spots should be less and less necessary if people find it easy to get to the train station by foot, bus, or bike. I suppose, then, it's either (a) provide ample foot/bus/bike connections or (b) provide ample parking spaces.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Bus service to the transit center from Meadowbrook/Wedgwood is awful. I have to drive to get to the Northgate transit center to take my bus to Redmond. Maybe replace with underground parking?

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No street parking as is.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not necessary. The place is already auto-dominated, we don't need to further encourage this as new development will increase this status. There should be a total net reduction.

8/17/2011 11:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



people are more likely to use public transit if they can drive to park. cross city buses can take too long.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is VERY important to replace all commuter parking spaces and keep them free so that people will have access to light rail and be inclined to use it.

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Unfortunately, we live in a society where people drive their cars EVERYWHERE. If we don't provide the spaces, the commuters will take up the spaces at Northgate Mall, then people who actually are supporting the mall will decide to shop elsewhere because it will no longer be convenient, or the commuters will park in the surrounding neighborhoods, taking up spaces where actual residents should be able to park their own cars.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I would like to see less traffic, more walking.

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Yes, people will use the light rail the best if there is parking for some.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because parking is necessary for people to access both transportation and to be able to patronize local businesses. Access is important so that businesses can succeed. And I believe strongly in small businesses.

8/12/2011 7:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you want people to use a transit center but have crappy bus service, they need a place to park

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People need to park. It would be a stupid idea to open up the area for commuting but then make it difficult to access the public transport. As it is now, people already have to park in the mall just to bus into work everyday. That's terrible. More public transit means more cars to accommodate those commuting to get to the light rail. I love public transport but I HATE PEOPLE WHO MAKE DRIVING AND PARKING IMPOSSIBLE. The development of one mode of transport MUST accompany the other.

8/10/2011 4:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



not sure what this means? What "public agencies"; who pays for this; why not plan on another parking garage for retail/commuter like the one near the mall/Pennys. parking needs to be provided or else how will people get to the light rail? Not everyone is able to bike.walk to the station.

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Yes. The commuter parking is already much tighter than it was before the Thorton Creek development went in. It doesn't do any good to have a light rail & bus hub there, if noone can get to it. I realize public transit is meant to discourage cars, but it's unrealistic to think people will get there by other means. It's not currently a particularly safe place to bike or walk.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you want people to park and ride you have to give them the option to do so!

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If a nice bike center was setup that would ameliorate some of the space losses. Unfortunately I hear folks drive all the way from Ballard to take advantage of the free parking at the Transit Center. Small commuter vans might make a difference during peak hours.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Public agencies should be promoting use of commuter parking for public transportation users. Losing spaces will not help congestion.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't fully understand the question but without doubt we need to have space for cars with the intention of discouraging the use of cars within the area. Kind of like the new towns of England in which one parked outside the center and then could walk or take local transportation into the area. This would be a long term project as currently all our systems are based on cars & speed.

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Instead, add better bus service. Who uses these parking spaces? People like me who live 2 miles away?

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I agree because I live in Northgate and the parking would just overflow onto our streets in residential areas which would probably increase vandalism, crime, and loitering around our houses.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Discourage driving. People can take the bus, walk or bike to the station.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Higher priority for a day care, park, transit oriented small business. Probably should start charging for non-carpool (single occupancy) commuter parking - this is in-city now.

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People all over the city and the world deal with construction issues daily. Northgate transit riders are NO DIFFERENT.

8/9/2011 8:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know the current fill rate of the existing parking spaces and whether increased traffic will result in more spaces needed with the new transit center. I do know that difficulty in finding spots will result in frustration and lower use of the transit center and surrounding area which will have a negative impact on revenue.

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are plenty of parking options in the Northgate area.

8/9/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Public space and transit centers are far more valuable than parked cars. Commuters that don't live on the line should ride the bus, or bike to it. Should provide ample bike and ride parking.

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently the transit center is succeeding in its role as a park and ride. Taking away that role diminishes the benefit of the development. Overall the development should increase parking demand in the area if it is successful. I recommend the city embrace that reality and find a way to tax or fee those spaces.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The point of this effort is to make NG a place of its own, not a dumping ground pass-through for those coming from elsewhere to downtown.

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There should be multistory parking for commuters. It is not clear to me how much should be paid for by public agencies. By charging for parking, it will encourage people to walk, bike, or take the bus to the light rail rather than driving.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Unless there are going to be increased and reliable bus connections, there needs to be commuter parking.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Somewhat. Parking spaces are a huge eyesore and can be a "Waste of space" if just left out in the open like what was behind Target here in Northgate. One would hope residential development would improve around the area to remove the need for cars eventually... it's a huge shame that the transit center is located in a commercial district and fenced in by I5 on one side... hugely limits any possibility of developing a residential neighborhood around it and improving accessibility. I say move the whole thing up Northgate way by the QFC in the middle of everything. Makes tons more sense. Tons. Why would anyone in the community using the system need this to be right next to a mall or freeway? Awful planning. Makes me sad.

8/7/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There aren't enough spaces as it is. If I want to park and ride at the transit center after 8:00, there are no spaces.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You are building more things that people will drive to and making less places to park....how do you think people are going to get there? The commuter parking is used now for people riding the bus...if you add the light rail, more will come to use that. If you have shops and living spaces there is not going to be enough parking anyway. YES you need to replace the parking or people will not use it. You already can't park there if you don't go to work early.

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There is no parking available now if you show up after 8:45 am. Those spaces need to be replaced!

8/6/2011 11:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Unless we have the infrastructure to get people to transit centers, I don't know how they'll use transit without driving there. So maybe start with parking, then as our transit system builds out, eliminate parking.

8/5/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As stated earlier, we live in an area where the preferred mode of transportation is by car thus you need to have enough parking spaces to accomodate. It is not practical to socially engineer an area to be anti car when the overwhelming majority of the tax payers use their cars.

8/5/2011 7:28 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



we can't all take transit to the station and there is no parking at the next nearest station.

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The parking is often full and with the removal of Northgate north P&R, I had to look to the main lot.

8/4/2011 4:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With parking limited at the station south of Northgate and no other station likely to be closer than 145th, Northgate will be the magnet station for most of North Seattle. Hence the concept of putting in the transit bridge across I-5 and sharing some of the huge real estate in the NSCC parking lot that is available and putting in some structured parking to dual utilize otherwise dead college space on evenings and weekends

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



as long as Metro is reducing and canceling bus routes people will need to 'drive' to their bus stop. To keep things green.

8/4/2011 11:44 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There needs to be enough parking to encourage people to use the transit, but in my experience there seems to be a lot of wasted space in the immediate area. It would be much nicer if it were possible to access with bikes or by foot, as it stands now the northgate area is a nightmare to navigate on bike...I live very nearby, but tend to avoid the whole area as its a hellish, frightening bike ride and a long, profoundly unpleasant walk.

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No--when rail reaches Northgate, bus service should be redistributed to improve E-W connections.

8/4/2011 10:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With better pedestrian infrastructure, this may not be as necessary, but if drivers cannot find a parking space, they will drive.

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We should improve ped and bike access to the station.

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't want our Northgate Community to begin looking like Capitol Hill in regards to parking, or complete lack thereof.

8/4/2011 8:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I would be concerned if there is much loss of parking because of impact on the neighborhood and a chance that the station would be less likely to be used by as many commuters.

8/4/2011 8:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The future of Northgate is not parking lots. Please, for crying out loud.

8/4/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends on how many are taken out, how many are used and how many we can do with.

8/4/2011 6:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More and more people are driving to Northgate and parking for transit. It is very hard to find parking right now and its already spilling into the neighborhoods. People are doing this because the outlining bus service isn't as frequent or as good and because of the price of gas.

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This question is worded in an awkward and confusing way. I wouldn't be surprised if many people vote in a way they did not mean to. My vote is meant to convey that I do not think that all the parking needs to be replaced. I don't know if "I strongly disagree that I think that public agencies should....." really means that. (?)

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What are the tradeoffs? Without knowing pros and cons, I can't answer this question.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Developing the transit center would not need to replace all of the parking spaces if public transportation to the transit center and pathways made getting to the transit center 1/2 as easy and convenient as driving to the center. Otherwise the parking spaces will be needed.

8/3/2011 8:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There should be some parking, but the whole point is to get people OUT of cars. Of course, since Metro is currently cutting bus service to Maple Leaf, many who would take bus to transit station will choose to drive.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is a strongly automotive focused neighborhood (likely due to I-5 and the Mall). As a pedestrian and sometimes bike commuter, I'm intimidated by the auto-centric road design. I usually drive to Northgate so I don't get run over. Unless there are other convenient options that allow people to make safe connections without driving (ie buses, bike lanes, sidewalks with vegetation or parking buffers between people and cars, etc) I think people will continue to drive and park in the Northgate area. If public agencies do not provide enough parking, an undue burden will be placed on the Mall or businesses/offices adjacent to the transit center.

8/3/2011 4:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



While I don't think they all need to be replaced, I don't want so few parking places that it is an excuse to not use the light rail.

8/3/2011 4:12 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We must stop encouraging auto traffic and pollution.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Should try to replace most, but not at the expense of meeting other goals (green streets, street life, etc.)

8/3/2011 2:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What's the point of having a transit center if people can't continue to use it. Some of us have to have our cars quickly available at the transit center to pick up kids, etc.

8/3/2011 2:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Where will they park?

8/3/2011 2:46 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Too many people drive to the transit center who should be riding the bus.

8/3/2011 2:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Community
Commuter Parking Depends
Downtown Green Infrastructure Light
Rail Market Necessary Nightmare
Northgate P&R Paid Parking Available
Parking Spaces Public
Transit Public Transportation Question Say

Shoppers Spots Station Street Strongly Term

Traffic Transit Center

11. Can you identify any barriers to pedestrian and bicycle movements near the transit center vicinity? Please describe.

No sidewalks on 92nd west of 5th.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is a long, high climb to get from Northgate to the top of 5th Avenue in Maple Leaf. It is not safe to trudge across an actively-used parking lot, unless the lot is designed like the University Village.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 to the West - the only place to cross is at Northgate Rd, Transit Center is 6-8 blocks south.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Walking from commuter garage to transit center via elevated bridge would help separate traffic and pedestrians.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently bikes are sharing the sidewalks north and east of the mall because the car traffic is so heavy and fast there. Even on foot, crossing Northgate Way doesn't feel quite safe. Maybe textured crossings would help.

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Buses that are waiting rather than picking up

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



blocks are very long, few places to pause when walking

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



traffic!

9/7/2011 4:08 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No dedicated bike lanes to get you safely through the traffic to the station. No bike station. Sidewalks are around the station but do not continue out into the neighborhood.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Neither 1st Ave NE nor 5th Ave NE south of Northgate Way are safe for bicycle traffic. The car traffic on both of these roads is very heavy, with many turning vehicles, often traveling in excess of the speed limits--1st Ave NE, particularly, with the freeway on and off ramps and the major mall access roads.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



1st Ave N is pretty hostile for bikes and pedestrians...

9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There aren't any pedestrians outside the mall.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The new sidewalk on 1st ave is a great improvement, thanks! It would be great if those sidewalks can be extended into the neighborhoods where funds are available.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are a significant amount of streets to cross to get anywhere further then the mall from the bus station and walking under the bridge over the interstate is sketchy at night.

8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There is really no good pedestrian access from the west side of I5 to the Northgate area. See 12 below.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



big parking lots/garages around the mall

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm concerned about traffic going north of transit center. Seems the only convenient route is to walk through the NG mall parking lot. What if you wanted to walk/bike under I-5 at northgate way? walk through the parking lot?

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NEED BRIDGE OVER I-5

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



None that I can see.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In Option I, The whole space overall looks a little more constricted.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 is a huge barrier. The Northgate Mall (and its parking lots) can also be a problem.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 for EVERYONE living WEST of the transit center.

8/25/2011 11:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



(i can't tell what the two options in question 2 are really showing) i-5, large existing parking lots

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



1) No good way to cross I-5 on foot without a long detour 2) 1st Ave needs bike lanes. The sidewalk is obstructed by telephone polls.

8/24/2011 11:32 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The huge hill & parking lot barricading northgate center off from the transit station feels like a psychological obstacle between people-activity and transit-activity. More pedestrian pathways and a welcoming sense from Ngate mall would help.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



cars!!!!

- 8/23/2011 7:08 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Safe bike parking and bike route to the transit center
8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- You mean besides I-5?
8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Nope
8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Don't understand question
8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- We don't need any more bike lanes.
8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- I strongly think that there should be a dedicated bike lane on 1st ave NE.
8/18/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- No, I can barely see the plans!
8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Hills, rain, too many cars!!!
8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- more sidewalks in the surrounding neighborhoods
8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- I can barely see/understand these visuals.
8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Safety from being hit by cars and buses is always the biggest barrier to bicycle commuting-
I love to ride my bike, but so far bike communtin has proved more dangerous than my
other hobby, rock climbing and mountaineering.
8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
-

Lack of sidewalks in neighborhood, poor ped crossing on Roosevelt, hills

8/17/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Safe bike lanes would need to be in place along every street within the vicinity of the transit center. Ideally, these should be separated from car traffic. Bikers are hard for buses to see, and there will be a lot of buses. Better crosswalk markings and pedestrian crossing lights, and possibly speed bumps, will be needed along 5th Ave near Group Health and south for a few blocks to make it plausible for Maple Leaf residents to walk to the station. The lack of sidewalks in Maple Leaf will also be an obstacle to more pedestrian use of the transit center (it can be risky walking on Maple Leaf streets).

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Poor visibility around parked/idling buses.

8/17/2011 10:57 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



continue sharrow/bike lanes on 100th and 103rd. 100th is in poor condition with parking and difficult to navigate by bike.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



There are no sidewalks just east of the transit center throughout Maple Leaf.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Fast, congested traffic and narrow sidewalks and streets

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



What's not a barrier - there are so many! Traffic on 5th, lack of bike lanes in the entire vicinity, there's also a constant jumble of traffic on NE Northgate Way from west of I-5 to NE 5th. There are also several awkward intersections do to traffic flow in and out of the mall. For pedestrians, the library and community center are pedestrian-friendly, but little else anywhere around the mall is.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Traffic lights that don't sense bikes, and heavy, rude traffic that can potentially kill us!

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The exit and entrance onto I-5 during rush hour times. How can bikes and pedestrians safely manage that congestion?

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Large mall parking lot lacks pedestrian islands/walways. I-5 blocks access. Missing sidewalks throughout N. Seattle.

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No sidewalks in surrounding residential neighborhood north of Maple Leaf

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The sidewalk on the East side of the mall (the street in front of library) is very poor and dangerous. It's too narrow for strollers.

8/9/2011 12:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Um why no comments on question 10? Those maps are hard to read. I think the differentiation between the options is a priority on creating a compelling gathering space versus a priority on fast effective transite. The name of the development should point to the correct answer; if the area doesn't deliver on fast reliable transport it will be a failure no water how wonderful of a spot to sip a latte and walk around is created.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Too many cars and not enough streets. (ironic)

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Blocks are way too large.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The giant mall. I5. Nothing to walk to.

8/7/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



sidewalks and bike lanes. Can't see the maps too small.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I can't see or understand the pictures well enoug

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no sidewalks, ample crazy drivers, interstate 5...

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Nothing yet, but clearly Northgate Mall will need some sort of pedestrian facility from the North station exit into the mall as opposed to their sidewalkless pedestrian unfriendly mall

parking lot-and hopefully that will be a covered pedestrian walkway (see Lougheed Mall/Skytrain Station up in BC)

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I5 is the main one.

8/4/2011 11:35 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently the landscaping and curbs offer no breaks, requiring one to go to either end and enter/exit where bus traffic & cars enter and exit. The real problem is actually the surrounding streets, which are very busy without adequate shoulders or bike lanes

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



crossing 100th is still a difficulty as the lights (3rd and 5th aves) are very far apart. The lack of sidewalks up into Maple Leaf makes the pedestrian commute perilous. It is difficult to get from 8th to the Transit Center.

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



limited bike lock facilities, pedestrian environment is not good

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



recent traffic deaths of cyclists prove cycling is still not safe in Seattle

8/4/2011 8:46 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Cars, places to lock my bike.

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Clear safe bike lanes will need to be established. Northgate is currently an unfriendly area for bikes.

8/4/2011 3:07 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5. Please build the ped bridge.

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



It's impossible to read these images, so I can't answer.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



high traffic volumes. limited storage for bikes.

8/3/2011 8:42 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



There need to be sidewalks near the transit station, and bike locking racks.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



5 lanes on 1st ave. Superblocks make it hard for pedestrians to access anything without a "hike." I-5 cuts off the west side of the neighborhood. I-5 on/off ramps (wide! and free rights often do not look out for pedestrians. Signals change quickly to speed up car access).

8/3/2011 4:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All the west side and N of the project have a H 5 so we are only talking about the south approach. can not enlarge the plans to see what is what.

8/3/2011 4:17 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no opinion -

8/3/2011 4:12 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know.

8/3/2011 3:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Are you referring to the diagrams above? I cannot see them clearly to answer this question or #10 either.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People driving to access the express lanes will still be eager to access the express lanes -- so measures should be put in place to accomodate both the pedestrians and those cars.

8/3/2011 2:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Forget bicycles

8/3/2011 2:46 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are too many cars. The station is too close to highway exits. All development in Northgate is too car-centric.

8/3/2011 2:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

[Bike Lanes](#) [Bike Path](#) [Bridge I-5](#) [Foot](#)
[Mall Parking](#) [North Side](#) [Northgate Way](#)
[Pedestrian](#) [Putting Say](#) [Sidewalks](#)
[Street](#) [Transit Center](#)

13. Which of the following pedestrian/bike bridge alignments across Interstate 5 do you prefer below? Why?

Can't tell from the images which alignment provides the most direct/ shortest distance walk to the station platform. Please mark my preference for the route that provides the shortest distance walk between the station platform and the majority of classrooms at NSCC.

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More interesting.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Meandering path would be more visually interesting for pedestrians and seem less elongated. Also provides closer access point to transit center. Cable stayed option is more visually interesting (less bulky) and provides more of an identifiable marker for the Northgate area. Stair in both schemes seems a little daunting unless it connects directly to light rail platform.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The path through the park looks a little more sensitive to the landscape.

9/28/2011 9:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Cable-stayed bridge, south alignment because north is too congested already, south alignment is cleaner looking and cable structure is much more eye-appealing and doesn't seem to interrupt the landscape as much.

9/28/2011 8:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Either will work as long as the steel truss bridge is not used. Spend some money and get a world class design for this important "gateway" structure.

9/27/2011 1:57 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Makes more sense with existing pedestrian/traffic infrastructure: there's a pedestrian and traffic signal at the intersection of 100th and 1st (the other location invites dashing across the road and isn't a location with existing east/west traffic), and sight-line from cars traveling west along 100th which creates more safety relative to the more-hidden north location in the parking lot.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North Seattle Community College has a beautiful campus. I like how the path meanders through the natural area. I also think that this north alignment will help serve both mall and transit center foot and bike traffic better.

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



closer to light rail station. Use Cable Stayed

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



north connection access point east of I-5 is better located for mall transit, connection to community beyond

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



more direct

9/7/2011 5:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seems more straight-forward.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More direct access for commuters

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Weakly prefer North -- curves may make for a longer walk-bike, but possibly a slightly more pleasant one.

- 9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Don't know enough about the area--
9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Cable-stayed
9/6/2011 5:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Looks like a more pleasant route, perhaps a gentler incline, as well.
9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Only a slight preference for the South Alignment because it appears to be quicker access... However, the North Alignment seems a bit more aesthetically pleasing and a nice route to ride/walk over the green space.
9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- A little more distinctive.. more interesting... closer on the station side to the station..
9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- It's right on target, more direct.
9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Better connection to the station
9/6/2011 10:51 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- More interesting design and bridge segment seems shorter so it may be less costly. Steel truss bridge is very ugly. Suspension is the way to go.
9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- It's more interesting.
8/31/2011 7:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- While North Alignment would be great for bicycles, a straight line is better for pedestrians. That way there is enough visibility for bikes also, less likely to hit pedestrians.
8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- I like the idea of not having to wait to cross a street at all.
8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Cable stayed bridge is more open and direct and therefore I think would be safer, visibility of others on the bridge and any other issues could be seen more easily. Basically I want the bridge crossing to be as safe as possible and those heavy steel trusses seem to crowd the path.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Apparently brings east end of bridge closest to Link and to NG shopping. (Not very clear from drawings!) Cable-stayed bridge much more attractive.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



get from point a to point b more efficiently. I prefer the cable-stayed bridge design.

8/25/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm not in favor of any bridge across I-5 !

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no preference, but connecting to a parking lot isn't ideal; bad ending point for walking and biking. wayfinding needed at both ends of the bridge. plan for the parking lot to be redeveloped and the bridge to connect to a clearer path to College Way/NSCC.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seems like you get off the bridge sooner and there is less bridge to build. I'd be interested to see which offers better travel time from college to link. Also, cable-stayed looks much more attractive.

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Continuous with street grid is more easily navigable and will feel safer and part of the overall neighborhood pedestrian infrastructure because it gives clear visual connection between destinations--As long as it also includes an above-grade segment over 1st avenue NE with an "L" shaped extension northward to directly connect with station mezzanine. Prefer Cable Stayed---Truss is clunky and claustrophobic

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North Seattle Community College students coming and going would probably use a south alignment more.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think the North Alignment compliments the nature around it more.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Provides more direct access to the Link station and transit center. I'd rather spend more time walking on the bridge near the pond than on the street next to I-5. The cable-stayed option is also much more visually appealing.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Efficiency of movement. A shorter route will attract more users. It doesn't need to look fancy. Build something that functions and will last at least 50 years.

8/25/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Why not come off 103rd Street access for the bridge? There is already city right of way.. 103rd would be easy access for the college, medical facilities, public facilities and residential areas around a pedestrian/bike bridge. The proposed alignment seems to suggest that NSCC will be the only one to use it.. or even if that is not the case, campus access can be limited by NSCC resulting in the general public having access issues.

8/25/2011 11:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hard to tell. Prefer curvy lines to straight, but I'd need to know more before making a final call.

8/25/2011 11:00 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know where these are relative to the light rail station so I can't answer this question.

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The cable stayed bridge is interesting aesthetically pleasing. The North alignment (if there is adequate lighting and security) is more interesting to me.

8/25/2011 10:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More "organic" look and feel. Plus, closer to busses.

8/25/2011 7:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because it's curvier. Much more inviting. And I like the cable bridge-- more airy and light. Less menacing.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Already at an intersection by 1st ave. But have the entrance be something that cyclists can ride up.

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North alignment appears to have better access from the North, with the same access from the West.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems safer. It isn't winding through the trees where someone can be hiding. It's a straight line so you can see what's coming.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no real preference - kind of hard to tell what the difference is in the photos

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Prefer look to cable bridge more and North alignment flows better.

8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks like it's more of a straight shot to the CC. Plus it would cost less.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Pedestrians have to back track with south alignment. Use a cable-stayed bridge, the truss is an eye sore.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



When I am walking (especially in the rain) I want to get to the bus shelter as fast as possible. A straight line is faster than curves.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Of course, the direct straight line of the south alignment is more efficient and will require less materials, and therefore, cost.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Straight view, no corners for potential safety issues.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Whichever is cheapest

8/17/2011 7:07 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Whichever is closer to the actual transit center. I prefer the steel truss design.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Can't read these well enuf on my phone. Like the cable bridge better.

8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Wow those look expensive. All that just for the Community College??? What about the rest of the city? Doesn't make sense...

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



it feels a bit more organic, like it's wrapping around the environment; the South alignment feels too structured

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Whichever is less steep and is wider. It also looks suspiciously like the bridges have 3 flights of stairs- it's unreasonable to expect bicyclists to carry bikes up 3 flights of stairs- many casual commuters have old, heavy bikes, and also it can be difficult to navigate areas with lots of pedestrians while carrying a bike, without hitting people (or dogs) with the bike. It also looks like there are 180 degree turns in the proposed bridge- that is also difficult to navigate with a bike- if when walking a bike, if the bridge is thick with a pedestrians, that is an easy way to accidentally knock someone over.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The figures below are unclear as to specific locations of the proposals. Cable stayed bridges seem more attractive, but I could live with the other types if costs dictate them.

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The North Alignment will be more beautiful with its curve; I worry about safety and criminal activity on both alignments, however, so I hope emergency phones and ample lighting will be part of whichever alignment is chosen. Definitely go with the cable-stayed bridge. It's very beautiful.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The South seems to get you closer to the transit center and it is a straight shot making the walk faster.

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Line of sight. For safety purposes.

8/17/2011 11:25 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Direct to NSCC

8/17/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



While I like the idea of the curved, meandering bridge, it seems like it might feel safer just being straight -- having a clean view of the whole bridge as you're walking.

8/17/2011 11:11 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If a bridge is to exist, there needs to be a ramp, not stairs. People won't use the bridge otherwise. I oppose any option that does not offer ramp access.

8/17/2011 11:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I actually prefer the curved, North Alignment for visual interest, but the straight, South Alignment would allow better sight lines for bike/pedestrian safety.

8/17/2011 10:57 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



keep pond green area for more meanderings. more likely to have bike/ped incidents with windy curves when people are hurrying to catch buses.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I prefer the North alignment because I live north of Northgate. Also, please make sure bikes can bike off the bridge without having to dismount and walk down stairs.

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to the mall as well.

8/14/2011 10:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to the mall as well.

8/14/2011 9:59 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to the mall as well.

8/14/2011 9:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



they seem about the same to me.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to where the buses leave from

8/10/2011 9:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It just seems more efficient, straightforward, and more in line with what people are already accustomed to with the access at 92nd.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The only one remotely practical for cyclists is the South Steel truss bridge, and even that is pretty crap on the mall side. Can't you do better ?

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Clean lines and design.

8/9/2011 9:03 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



more interesting, more reminiscent of other cities and not having a free way look to it, more user friendly with bends

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seems like the South Alignment is a shorter, more direct option.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Sorry I don't see what you mean by N or S alignment, it looks mostly E-W to me.

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More direct. Shorter walk.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It would be easier to get to the transit station.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the organic curviness

8/9/2011 9:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems to follow the contours of the land better. I don't seem to be able to "place a dot" on my choice of style - I prefer the cable-stayed bridge.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



shortest path

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More direct,, less invasive of the open space west of the freeway

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hard to tell on the map but looks like it takes the bikes closer to the center of Northgate,
Prefer cable style

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Neither, It is already easy to cross at 95th. Why is this needed at all? This is changing a 10 minute walk to a five minute walk right? I suppose the South alignment is cheaper and has less disruption of traffic on 1st so I support that more. The cables are much more attractive than the truss. A way to improve this proposal to me would be to extend the east end of the bridge to street level with more bridge. At least bike could use it as well then.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks more cost-efficient.

8/8/2011 11:10 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



connects directly to the street on the NG side. Less impact on the green space.

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North alignment encroaches on NSCC wetland. Also, south alignment connects more directly with the street (100th??), so will be more convenient and possibly safer for bicycle riders as well as pedestrians coming from the neighborhood to east.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to Northgate Mall.

8/7/2011 11:49 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Better access to whole northgate area.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is a direct path. Shorter distance. I think more people would use it.

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More interesting walk and ends up nearer to the transit center. Cable-stayed style more interesting to the eye.

8/6/2011 11:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm not great at reading these pictures but it would make sense to have a direct path to the station so people can easily pick up a bus or train.

8/5/2011 9:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



South is more direct (straight line) and is probably more cost effective as well. While I prefer the prettier cable stayed bridge, I think the steel truss bridge would be better as you can more easily put a cover over it so pedestrians don't end up getting soaked.

8/5/2011 7:28 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



straightforward

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know.

8/4/2011 4:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks shorter and cheaper (maybe?) No major problems either way.

8/4/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



with cable stayed bridge-more attractive and pleasant route, more visually appealing. Also, neither option presents the direct connection to the LINK station---bad! Keep the connection to the plaza level of the LINK station, as was presented at the 30% design presentation, let's not get cheap and regret it later. I find it hard to believe the additional cost wouldn't be worth the utility to the pedestrian and biking community!!!!!!

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't feel strongly about this one. I'd go with whichever option is cheaper.

8/4/2011 11:35 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



its shortwr, seems like it would be cheaper, hence more likely.

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't feel safe walking through North Seattle Community College's campus

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Direct access to the station.

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



less interference with pond

8/4/2011 8:46 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It looks to blend in with the surrounding environment more. I also like the cable-stayed bridge option as it is more aesthetically pleasing.

8/4/2011 8:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The walking distance after crossing the Freeway is less and the curve makes the bridge more interesting. I like the cables better than the steel but did not figure out how to place a dot.

8/4/2011 8:26 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to mall and residential area to the north.

8/4/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks a lot quicker and less money to build?

8/4/2011 6:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It looks shorter and more affordable. The cable version is very pretty, but I'd be happy with any pedestrian bridge

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



either are fine

8/4/2011 3:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Gut feeling. Wish I could see better exactly where those are....

8/3/2011 11:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I have no preference, but in both cases I think the bridge should land on the mezzanine level of the station itself (crossing over 1st ave) rather than ending a block away from the station. If the bridge extended all the way to the station, perhaps some of the costs could be recouped by avoiding building a separate elevator/stair tower west of 1st ave.

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



whichever is less expensive to install.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I am not particularly tied to either one so cost would be the factor, if price is equal there is something more attractive about North.

8/3/2011 8:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



and I like the cable style bridge. I like the straight bridge for security -- you can see the whole way over. It should be well lit, with security phones.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Access Alignment Ave

Bridge Cable Stayed Cheaper

Closer Connection Freeway Hard Idea

Interesting Looks Organic Parking

Path Pedestrian Infrastructure Pond Safe Safety

Station Straight Line Straightforward Transit

Center Whichever

14. Public Health - Improving Quality of Life What are your top three preferences for helping overall public health in Northgate? Pick three of the following. Other?

Ask: Is this a place where parents would want lots of children running around? A sustainable society has multiple generations of related people.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Making northgate area feel less connected to the freeway and more of an intimate, lively neighborhood will be important. Providing buffers from freeway noise (design buildings at west edge of mall parking lot, create public space between new buildings and mall, relocate vast parking areas to garages?)

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Besides transit, Northgate is becoming more residential. The new residents need to feel safe walking in their area, biking and as if they do not need a vehicle to live there.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



More park 'n ride parking.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



farmer's markets are great, but it would need to be open several days a week to make the space worth it. community gardens are available nearly 24/7. the single best thing you can do for outdoor air quality is slash the number of cars and amount of driving in the area. good, interesting places to walk or bike to, and comfortable, vibrant paths to walk or bike to them on, would really help get people active without cars.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



If you gather, they will come! I think with some opportunities for business investment (jobs), pedestrian access, nice gathering spaces & the ability to buy food/coffee right off of the gathering areas, you will turn this into a thriving area. Thanks for asking!

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Going to need to patrol the NSCC park if you put that big expensive bridge in. Otherwise its going to become a multi million dollar bridge to all the bum encampments out there.

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is prone to criminal activity. The transit station and pedestrian bridge will thus also be susceptible to criminal activity if measures are not taken in advance to proactively prevent criminality from taking hold. Lighting needs to be ample. Emergency phones need to be available (although not too conspicuous, as they can make an area feel dangerous unnecessarily). Foot and bike traffic needs to be high at all hours of the day. A high-end grocery store and middle class residential facilities will go a long way to making the area safe.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



If there was a way to bike safely from the North Haller Lake neighborhood to the Northgate 24 Hour Fitness and Northgate Library I might be more inclined to ride my bike instead of drive; currently I do not feel safe enough biking near the intersection of 5th Ave NE & Northgate Way. Is there some safe way to bike along Northgate Way or near there? I do not like biking by cars that are frequently turning so I end up driving myself. Incidentally, when I lived in Boulder, CO I biked all the time due to separate bike paths so I felt very safe being a cyclist; living in Seattle I pretty much drive everywhere and walk to close locations. I can't wait for the Northgate Light Rail Station!

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I would prefer to develop Northgate into a hub where I can do all my shopping. As it is now, I have to drive to the city or Bellevue for anything major. I would travel less if Northgate wasn't such an empty hub. Currently, the mall has limited shops that are pretty basic. I hope with more people transiting we can bring in more business while keeping the are safe and clean.

8/10/2011 4:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Thank you for providing on line survey. I live in the area but was unable to attend meeting d/t work

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Make the mall less car-dependent. You have to walk or bike through a sea of cars to get anywhere. And the traffic flow in the parking lot and on the streets around the mall is convoluted at best - particularly at the NW and SE corners of the mall.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In your rush to build upwards, please be aware that part of "quality of Life" is the need to see the sky, and the weather, and interact with what nature is left in the area. Northgate may be dominated by parking lots and asphalt but at least a person can see what sunshine there is, unlike the steel canyons downtown. Don't take that away from the people that live nearby!

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The was actually a well put together survey and I can tell a lot of thought has gone into it. Please have the city or community group okay a pickup of the garbage under the freeway underpass. If a stunning bridge overpass was put in, I think it would popularize the community college as well as living in the area. A bike lane could connect along to GreenLake if it was a safe one and pull people there on the weekends for recreational opportunities. I am also noticing that more and more folks will hike up to three miles for recreation even seniors. I think even some of the Mall businesses might throw in some philanthropic monies for the bridge. If the bridge and connecting infrastructure was really nice, I could see a symbiosis of computer science classes, and perhaps a few small IT satellite offices in the Northgate area such as Facebook. It has to have a good - highend? feel or they will not attract the high end knowlege workers. I also think another attraction would be some large East./West solar panels on the mall and then Green Advertising it as one of the first malls in America and one of the First Malls to undertake solar panel. It also shows that the mall is still vibrant. One other item, is seems like the remodeled mall is not bike friendly at all. Lastly, build the tunnel downtown. Mayor McSchwinn gives lawyers a bad name with his flip-flopping nuanced laywerspeak.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This was a fascinating survey causing me to think more about neighborhood planning.
Thanks

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Day care, with park for kids to go to.

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Please accelerate the light rail construction. Berlin did multiple links in 12 years and Shanghai in 3. Shouldn't take 10+ years to get one link to Northgate.

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I am surprised by the focus of this question on Public Health. The largest public health issue in this area is particulate matter from exshuast on I-5. I suppose transit in theory would affect that the most but I am skeptical that ridership could improve enough to make the PM10 drop. But to answer the spirit of the question, the largest difference that a large project could create for this area is an addition to the retail and commerce vibrancy. A good mental health boost!

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Thanks for asking!!! you people seem to be really thinking about how to make the community better and we appreciate it!

8/5/2011 9:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



affordable housing would be #4

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All of the above.

8/3/2011 8:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This questionnaire is highly flawed. It's a set up.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This questionnaire is highly flawed. It's a set up.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This transit station and all that goes with it should serve the needs of residents and commuters -- it should provide services that are a mixing-point for both of those constituencies. It should be inviting in a clean, modern way that will not look dated very soon. It should feel uplifting, even on rainy days. I have to add that it would be nice if there

was a taxi stand -- taxis are a better option than one's own car when bus, for some reason, is not an option. At the very least, could there be taxi numbers posted?

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



retired

8/3/2011 4:17 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Improve pedestrian safety by decreasing traffic congestion.

8/3/2011 3:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If there were a 4th option it would be 'access to healthy food' thank you.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

[Bike](#) [Food](#) [Northgate](#) [Option](#)

[Parking](#) [Public](#) [Questionnaire is Highly Flawed](#)
[Survey Thanks for Asking](#) [Traffic](#)
[Transit Station](#)

G. Sidewalk With Cafes (narrower)	11.7%	25
H. Sidewalk With Cafes (wider)	44.6%	95
I. Large Plaza (open and seating)	8.0%	17
J. Large Plaza (fountain, trees, seating)	15.0%	32
K. Pocket Park (enclosed, green)	17.8%	38
L. Pocket Park (open, street feature)	2.3%	5
	answered question	213
	skipped question	4

Q4. From the public space images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

Answer Options	Response Count
	109
answered question	109
skipped question	108

Q5. Public Features: From the images below, pick your top three preferred kinds of public features for the Northgate transit center area.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Bicycle and Walking Trails	48.8%	104
B. Playground	21.1%	45
C. Active Plaza	37.1%	79
D. Bike Station	31.5%	67
E. Farmer's Market	42.7%	91
F. Green Space	24.4%	52
G. Athletic Field	11.7%	25
H. Grocery Store	40.8%	87
I. Community Artwork	7.0%	15
J. Green Infrastructure	15.5%	33
K. Fire Station/Police/Post Office	7.5%	16
L. Community Garden	14.1%	30
	answered question	213
	skipped question	4

Q6. From the public feature images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

Answer Options	Response Count
-----------------------	-----------------------

answered question	90
skipped question	127

Q7. Do you support building a pedestrian and bicycle crossing of Interstate 5?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	58.1%	125
Agree	23.7%	51
Neutral/Don't Know	11.6%	25
Disagree	3.7%	8
Strongly Disagree	3.3%	7
Comments		125
	answered question	215
	skipped question	2

Q8. Do you think public agencies need to replace all commuter parking spaces that would be displaced by development at the transit center?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	28.0%	60
Agree	20.6%	44
Neutral/Don't Know	23.8%	51
Disagree	14.5%	31
Strongly Disagree	13.1%	28
Comments		112
	answered question	214
	skipped question	3

Q9. Which of these improvements would be most important in convincing you to use bus and light rail transit or use it more often?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Bus routes that get me closer to home	26.6%	55
More continuous sidewalks into my neighborhood	37.7%	78
A pedestrian/bicycle bridge that crosses Interstate 5	17.9%	37
More parking	15.0%	31
Buses and trains that come often enough, so I don't have to worry about schedules	73.9%	153
Light and security at the station, so I will feel safe	36.7%	76
Comments		60

answered question	207
skipped question	10

Q10. Which of the following options do you prefer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Option H: Connecting street brings two bus bays closer to station exit; more choices for buses to circulate.	42.8%	77
Option I: Bus bays on 1st Ave NE and on new 2nd Ave NE; pedestrian-only plaza at station exit.	57.2%	103
	answered question	180
	skipped question	37

Q11. Can you identify any barriers to pedestrian and bicycle movements near the transit center vicinity? Please describe.

Answer Options	Response Count
	79
answered question	79
skipped question	138

Q12. Can you identify any specific locations where pedestrian or bicycle route improvements should be made to help access to and from this area? Please describe.

Answer Options	Response Count
	61
answered question	61
skipped question	156

Q13. Which of the following pedestrian/bike bridge alignments across Interstate 5 do you prefer below?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
North Alignment	48.3%	83
South Alignment	50.6%	87
Comments		119
	answered question	172

skipped question

45

Q14. Public Health - Improving Quality of Life What are your top three preferences for helping overall public health in Northgate? Pick three of the following.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Safe, accessible conditions for walking and biking	73.6%	156
Safe, reliable transit	54.2%	115
Good air quality inside and outside buildings	15.1%	32
Noise level management	24.5%	52
Mixture of jobs and businesses	27.8%	59
Safe, inviting and accessible parks and open spaces	40.6%	86
Opportunities for social interaction	21.7%	46
Good quality and affordable housing	19.3%	41
Access to healthy food	26.4%	56
Access to healthcare and wellness services	5.2%	11
Comments		28
	answered question	212
	skipped question	5

Northgate Light Rail Station Area Survey

Public Responses/Comments

217 completed surveys

Analysis compiled 11/16/11

2. From the development type images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

I especially like the form of J, with towers that are set back from the street, but lower floor residential (or retail) that fronts on the sidewalk. I think that will make the streets feel more like neighborhood streets than downtown thoroughfares and addresses the concerns many people have with "density."

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C. Like the low profile of buildings so light can reach the area. Like the retail so it is welcoming with services for residents and visitors. Like the smaller residential so fewer people putting strain on infrastructure.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



They are all ugly. None of the buildings have modulated front walls with grass in front. None of them encourage going out and tossing a football around. None of them are walking-centric.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Dislike A,B, D, E because resembles downtown office density. Seems very out of character for Northgate.

10/8/2011 5:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C,K, L offer increased density with residential, which is important for creating vibrant atmosphere and activity after work hours. Not including residential in any potential development would create dead zones at night that would be unsafe.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K. Mixed use provides for housing and retail uses for both residents and visitors. Low to Mid-rise buildings seem appropriate for existing character of area.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



None of these show this, but I prefer a thriving street front retail with on street parking.

9/28/2011 9:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



B and K - too busy, not broken up enough at pedestrian level. Northgate needs more high-end retail at the base, more pedestrian friendly streetscapes.

9/28/2011 8:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I prefer homey, people-oriented spaces. This translates to low-rise buildings, brick rather than metal, with sidewalks, benches and trees.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K - like the change in scale and material from the very public base to the more private residential B & D - dislike the scale. seems inappropriate for this part of town G - like the materials used and the modern design

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



J. The base of the towers has a great pedestrian scale -- Higher density allows for more quality and activated green spaces below. The street seems shared between bikers, pedestrians and cars which seems very pleasant to experience.

9/13/2011 11:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High-rise should be residential. Commercial office should stay lower scale as it is too broad.

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I chose similar styles in the mid rise style range (choices A, I and K) to provide greater density and a sense of destination, but not so big that it overshadows the local houses and businesses.

9/9/2011 2:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I,J,K Interesting bases, pedestrian scale, active at street with good modulation, amenities L- do not like static form top to bottom general- low rise does not seem to be best use of property general- for transit related development residential focus seems more appropriate than office- hard to create an employment center away from the city center

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K--like the roof top garden

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



To keep housing affordable, I think the city should encourage high-density housing close to stores and transit. The mid-rise and high-rise office space seemed the most sterile of the options, and I think they might require the most extra parking spots. (There's no guarantee that workers would be able to access Northgate by transit, especially if there's not much residential space nearby -- and even if there is housing, workers rarely wind up living right next to work.)

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the trees. Like the increased natural light at street level with low or mid-rise buildings. Like mixed use. Like set backs or variable setbacks from street.

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Don't like high-rise (for our area or any other), period. And mid or high-rise "glass palaces" (A. and H.) are way overdone, as far as I'm concerned.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it's critical to activate the street level; example J seems to provide the most attractive articulation at this level, but the same could be done with a retail development, and that might attract more pedestrian traffic.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely prefer the retail at base. I believe a multi-use building makes more sense in the positive development of a community. Considering the area, it seems like a mid-rise make more sense, otherwise, this would be the only high-rise around and that might not be aesthetically pleasing.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



We need people for different times of the day/week. It would be best if there was a mix.

9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C - no Verizon, Starbucks, etc. Get small, local businesses

9/6/2011 2:51 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



E: I like the green space

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



J. There is a ton of existing retail. I'd like to see some residential high-rise somewhere in Seattle.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Density is good but I think the hi-rises disconnect people too much from the life at ground level. I would love to work in an office in the Northgate area instead of downtown, but I don't know if there's demand.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I dislike A, E & L because of the monolithic appearance/ presence. I like many of the other examples (ie C, D, J & K) for the opposite reason, where there is a lot of texture without being tacky mess of materials that don't make sense together. Also, I prefer the taller examples, housing or office, because building low-rise here would be a missed opportunity being so close to a transit hub.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No high rise. Anything over 12 stories is too tall for the area. There is no current high rise precedent. It would be architecturally disruptive of the landscape.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I believe that the look of the mid and low rise buildings will fit in with the architecture of Northgate area better than the high rise buildings. I also think it would be nice to encourage more people to live in Northgate with residential buildings, to help create a stronger community/neighborhood in Northgate.

8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All need parking for transit riders, tenants, shoppers, etc.

8/25/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle (& certainly the NG area) already have a surfeit of retail.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



roof top deck/gardens to help cut down CO2

8/25/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



d,l,j,h,d,etc Please..NO High -Rise anything !

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C-like the mixed uses D-seems out of scale for Northgate, though taller is better near a LRT station; err on the side of height and density here E-looks very inviting, comfortable, friendly; would be great as part of a taller, denser development F-great for providing lots of badly needed housing units near transit, though retail base would be better H-important to provide lots of jobs near transit as well as homes. this does that but needs a base that interfaces better with the street and pedestrian experience I & J-nice looking, and provide many housing units, but need retail base to serve the residents

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The residential mid and high rise would destroy the view for those who live there now; and are out of scale to the current way of living. The low rise is best since it allow more people to live in the area; hope that the rents are truly affordable to the times in which we live.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I feel like having a lot of commercial/retail around the station is healthy growth. I also think that the high density office space should be limited to downtown to make a downtown core so more poeple would use the light rail for commuting.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In general, I prefer mixed used and mid- to high-rise developments. Office and residential buildings should be at about the same scale. Street-level should be pedestrian- and transit-friendly, with retail/commercial activity. Cars should be a lower priority.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely want residential included at the base of any building, and would prefer higher end development to attract wealthier residents. I trust the designers to choose the most appropriate architectural style for the area.

8/25/2011 11:00 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



there does not seem to be a retail at base with residential AND office above (I would prefer both mid-rise and high-rise)

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



That the rent/lease would be too high for the average person.

8/25/2011 10:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think we don't have enough concentration of business activity to merit high rises, so with L,J, H, F, D & B, the feeling is a sense of displacement from downtown. Mid-rise photos (K, E, C) give a sense of activity and population that feels good. The high rises feel solitary/ lonely; the mid-rises feel vibrant and bustling. High rises can be infill later, after the bustling activity is established.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Letter A has street parking available

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate area needs more residents in the area to keep area vibrant, clean, and community oriented.

8/22/2011 11:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With rail and the transit center, we will be a major transit hub. Density is key to leveraging transit resources, and ground-level retail keeps the community active and walkable.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, L: these examples would bring a number of new local residents to the neighborhood which would lead to improved demand for local retail. Retail at the ground floor would improve street vitality and safety.

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle needs to develop more high-rise buildings in general. We've had a boom of new mid-rises and they're starting to look unoriginal and tacky.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High rise L J H are too big for the area.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Mid rise will blend more with the already existing Northgate buildings. Adding High rise buildings will be out of place.

8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K+L: I like retail at base b/c I feel it's a well thought out use of space. Plus, I fee like many people wouldn't want to live at base in a highly populated area.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A high-rise would not fit in with the rest of the area, please stay to a low or mid-rise.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Building setbacks should be deeper, like Vancouver B.C. This makes a more liveable neighborhood.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like Development image D; it has a very urban appearance that would offer an appealing contrast from the mall-dominated Northgate look.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A, B, G, and H make it feel less like a neighborhood and more like a mini downtown. Questions of safety as it seems like it would be busy during the day and overly quiet at night.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I - Like the broken down scale of the architectural mass. Scale at the street level is approachable, yet the entrance is removed from the main traffic flow. E. Like the incorporation of "park" and open space mixed within the dwelling units. Buildings are similar in style and material but individually diverse.

8/17/2011 7:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike - too high of construction

8/17/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I can't see any type of high-rise going up around Northgate, it just doesn't fit the neighborhood profile. I do like the Residential mid-rise + retail concept though.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NO HIGH RISE ANYTHING!!!!

8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All about the architecture and planting. Less Northgate mall cement block style and MORE regrade (angles, plants, thought) style architecture. High rises tend to end up lower rent while larger living spaces (lowrises) tend to be nicer and people take care of them better, which translates to happier neighborhood. Keep the mapleleaf love!

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Anything high-rise would not fit in with the surrounding area (B,D,F,J,L); lots of green space would be nice (E&J)

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Examples C and E are ugly, and G looks like a totally dead neighborhood to pedestrians on the ground. There are already lots of low-rise residential and mid-rise office buildings in this city- I don't see why more of them are desirable right next to a transit hub, rather than encouraging highest density residential and offices right where good transit is available.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Generally speaking, I am opposed to highrise buildings in this area because they undermine the "human scale" of development and the pedestrian experience.

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the ones with trees

8/17/2011 11:58 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like having retail at the base of any of the options.

8/17/2011 11:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The office mid-rise is a bad option because it will leave the vicinity dead during non-office-hours. Residential and residential/retail mixed will keep the area more vibrant (and probably safer) during evenings and weekends.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D and L are the same choice but different design.

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hi Rise is inappropriate for this area.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the look of High-Rise buildings in those pics. It makes the neighborhood look more urban, less boring.

8/17/2011 11:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



any of the high-rise options. it seems so out-of-place in this part of the city and obstructs views.

8/17/2011 11:11 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



any high rise will completely outscale all other buildings in the area.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems like the whole point of this is to get more people living closer to the transit center, so I'm definitely more in favor of having residential in these new developments.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer no high rises

8/15/2011 7:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 10:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:59 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't like the high-rise - too dense

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's hard to imagine big tall towers at Northgate.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C,E: Seem to preserve more of the 'neighborhood' feeling, provide housing and local business easy to access, seem to allow more trees and other green space. Other options will likely increase congestion even more, office (g,h) will bring more cars and congestion but not living space.

8/12/2011 7:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



grass and trees. This area will not support high rise development

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Nothing more than mid-rise

8/10/2011 9:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K I like footprint and the mixed use. Also allows for growth in the area

8/10/2011 6:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer all mid-rise combos. appropriate for density but not too urban

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The high rise buildings B, D, F, H, J and L all seem grossly out of proportion to the existing facilities at Northgate. The Northgate Library and Community Center serve as a

neighborhood hub and would be dwarfed by such large commercial development - losing their pedestrian appeal. I'd much rather see more pedestrian friendly development like C. The low-rise buildings also seem more appropriate for preserving what's left of what was once a beautiful creek habitat.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



L - and any of the other images it applies to: Building looms over street and there is no way to see the sky. Pedestrian s are hemmed in and the noise level goes way up. Who needs more retail space in this economy anyway? Theres so many failing stores and businesses theres too many empty units already and that leads to crime.

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



pedestrian/family friendly!

8/9/2011 9:03 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like mixed so that all ages might be in the same vicinity. Careful attention to new studies on street safety would be helpful in guiding lighthing and density.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D & J -- I like narrower, taller buildings that emphasize glass and windows. K -- I do not like squat, monolithic buildings that fill up an entire block.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C & D provide retail space that is difficult to fill. Another example of government trying to make a market where none exists or is needed.

8/9/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



E I like the integration of a park like environment w/ residential. Generally I do not want stark buildings and streets. This is not Singapore nor downtown Vancouver, BC. I would like to see greenery, water and curvy lines (not just N/S, E/W streets), integrated, some businesses but fewer big box or chain stores, and underground parking so people must walk. A place for a farmer's market day

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Greater use of transit by residents of the building in addition to retail drawing people from out of the neighborhood. The possibility of attracting more development of the same type.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't believe that high-rise buildings would work well in our area. I also like the idea of additional retail space around the light rail. The retail space offers more of an incentive for people to travel to Northgate.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High Rise anything blocks out the sun, which is hard enough to get these days

8/9/2011 9:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, H, L, and J - all high-rise are overpowering and too large for our area. They create a canyon effect - I much prefer low-rise, with or without retail.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I, J - Like TREES!, pedestrian space, apparent lower speed street, did I mention trees?

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



For all - good modulation, high density.

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Although retail space is available at the North Northgate site, it seems it is always better to have some type of retail space to encourage pedestrian traffic. Low rise buildings do not overwhelm the area and would blend in better to the neighborhood

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think high rise office or residential should be combined with green space. This increases density, but makes for a more enjoyable area for all.

8/9/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need offices to bring more business to Northgate area. We have enough retail stores around here.

8/9/2011 12:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike: Too tall for the area, blocking views west to the Olympics, south to downtown like: size-appropriate buildings, more non-mall businesses

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All of my top choices include retail space at the base. I think this mix of housing and retail best supports enhancing Northgate as a potential shopping destination. With the redeveloped mall, the new Thornton Place development, and the Target area development I feel adding to the retail appeal of the area builds on the existing strengths of the area. The question doesn't specify but I believe the survey is also interested in aesthetics of the design as well: I

strongly favor the combination of modern and classic materials and structure present in L and F. In contrast ultra modern Glass such as A and B contrast sharply with the existing architecture of the area.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K should have more trees and seating space.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More people and uses closer to the Light Rail station.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Affordable Businesses Dislike
Good Modulation Growth High Rise
Higher Inappropriate Landscaping Light Rail
Mid Rise Monolithic Noise Level
Northgate offer Parking
Pedestrian Scale Rent Retail Roof
Space Transit Center Ugly
Vancouver Vicinity Welcoming

4. From the public space images above, please let us know what you like or dislike about any of the examples (provide the letter with your like/dislike description).

I especially like the form of J, with towers that are set back from the street, but lower floor residential (or retail) that fronts on the sidewalk. I think that will make the streets feel more like neighborhood streets than downtown thoroughfares and addresses the concerns many people have with "density."

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C. Like the low profile of buildings so light can reach the area. Like the retail so it is welcoming with services for residents and visitors. Like the smaller residential so fewer people putting strain on infrastructure.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



They are all ugly. None of the buildings have modulated front walls with grass in front. None of them encourage going out and tossing a football around. None of them are walking-centric.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Dislike A,B, D, E because resembles downtown office density. Seems very out of character for Northgate.

10/8/2011 5:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C,K, L offer increased density with residential, which is important for creating vibrant atmosphere and activity after work hours. Not including residential in any potential development would create dead zones at night that would be unsafe.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



K. Mixed use provides for housing and retail uses for both residents and visitors. Low to Mid-rise buildings seem appropriate for existing character of area.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



None of these show this, but I prefer a thriving street front retail with on street parking.

9/28/2011 9:02 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



B and K - too busy, not broken up enough at pedestrian level. Northgate needs more high-end retail at the base, more pedestrian friendly streetscapes.

9/28/2011 8:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I prefer homey, people-oriented spaces. This translates to low-rise buildings, brick rather than metal, with sidewalks, benches and trees.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K - like the change in scale and material from the very public base to the more private residential B & D - dislike the scale. seems inappropriate for this part of town G - like the materials used and the modern design

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



J. The base of the towers has a great pedestrian scale -- Higher density allows for more quality and activated green spaces below. The street seems shared between bikers, pedestrians and cars which seems very pleasant to experience.

9/13/2011 11:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High-rise should be residential. Commercial office should stay lower scale a sit is too broad.

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I chose similar styles in the mid rise style range (choices A, I and K) to provide greater density and a sense of destination, but not so big that it overshadows the local houses and businesses.

9/9/2011 2:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I,J,K Interesting bases, pedestrian scale, active at street with good modulation, amenities L- do not like static form top to bottom general- low rise does not seem to be best use of property general- for transit related developemnt residential focus seems more appropriate than office- hard to create an emplyment center away from the city center

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K--like the roof top garden

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



To keep housing affordable, I think the city should encourage high-density housing close to stores and transit. The mid-rise and high-rise office space seemed the most sterile of the options, and I think they might require the most extra parking spots. (There's no guarantee that workers would be able to access Northgate by transit, especially if there's not much residential space nearby -- and even if there is housing, workers rarely wind up living right next to work.)

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the trees. Like the increased natural light at street level with low or mid-rise buildings. Like mixed use. Like set backs or variable setbacks from street.

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Don't like high-rise (for our area or any other), period. And mid or high-rise "glass palaces" (A. and H.) are way overdone, as far as I'm concerned.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it's critical to activate the street level; example J seems to provide the most attractive articulation at this level, but the same could be done with a retail development, and that might attract more pedestrian traffic.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely prefer the retail at base. I believe a multi-use building makes more sense in the positive development of a community. Considering the area, it seems like a mid-rise make more sense, otherwise, this would be the only high-rise around and that might not be aesthetically pleasing.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need people for different times of the day/week. It would be best if there was a mix.

9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C - no Verizon, Starbucks, etc. Get small, local businesses

9/6/2011 2:51 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



E: I like the green space

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



J. There is a ton of existing retail. I'd like to see some residential high-rise somewhere in Seattle.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Density is good but I think the hi-rises disconnect people too much from the life at ground level. I would love to work in an office in the Northgate area instead of downtown, but I don't know if there's demand.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I dislike A, E & L because of the monolithic appearance/ presence. I like many of the other examples (ie C, D, J & K) for the opposite reason, where there is a lot of texture without being tacky mess of materials that don't make sense together. Also, I prefer the taller examples, housing or office, because building low-rise here would be a missed opportunity being so close to a transit hub.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



No high rise. Anything over 12 stories is too tall for the area. There is no current high rise precedent. It would be architecturally disruptive of the landscape.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I believe that the look of the mid and low rise buildings will fit in with the architecture of Northgate area better then the high rise buildings. I also think it would be nice to encourage more people to live in Northgate with residential buildings, to help create a stronger community/neighborhood in Northgate.

8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



All need parking for transit riders, tenants, shoppers, etc.

8/25/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle (& certainly the NG area) already have a surfeit of retail.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



roof top deck/gardens to help cut down CO2

8/25/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



d,l,j,h,d,etc Please..NO High -Rise anything !

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



C-like the mixed uses D-seems out of scale for Northgate, though taller is better near a LRT station; err on the side of height and density here E-looks very inviting, comfortable, friendly; would be great as part of a taller, denser development F-great for providing lots of badly needed housing units near transit, though retail base would be better H-important to provide lots of jobs near transit as well as homes. this does that but needs a base that interfaces better with the street and pedestrian experience I & J-nice looking, and provide many housing units, but need retail base to serve the residents

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The residential mid and high rise would destroy the view for those who live there now; and are out of scale to the current way of living. The low rise is best since it allow more people to live in the area; hope that the rents are truly affordable to the times in which we live.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I feel like having a lot of commercial/retail around the station is healthy growth. I also think that the high density office space should be limited to downtown to make a downtown core so more poeple would use the light rail for commuting.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In general, I prefer mixed used and mid- to high-rise developments. Office and residential buildings should be at about the same scale. Street-level should be pedestrian- and transit-friendly, with retail/commercial activity. Cars should be a lower priority.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I definitely want residential included at the base of any building, and would prefer higher end development to attract wealthier residents. I trust the designers to choose the most appropriate architectural style for the area.

8/25/2011 11:00 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



there does not seem to be a retail at base with residential AND office above (I would prefer both mid-rise and high-rise)

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



That the rent/lease would be too high for the average person.

8/25/2011 10:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think we don't have enough concentration of business activity to merit high rises, so with L, J, H, F, D & B, the feeling is a sense of displacement from downtown. Mid-rise photos (K, E, C) give a sense of activity and population that feels good. The high rises feel solitary/ lonely; the mid-rises feel vibrant and bustling. High rises can be infill later, after the bustling activity is established.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Letter A has street parking available

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate area needs more residents in the area to keep area vibrant, clean, and community oriented.

8/22/2011 11:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With rail and the transit center, we will be a major transit hub. Density is key to leveraging transit resources, and ground-level retail keeps the community active and walkable.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, L: these examples would bring a number of new local residents to the neighborhood which would lead to improved demand for local retail. Retail at the ground floor would improve street vitality and safety.

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seattle needs to develop more high-rise buildings in general. We've had a boom of new mid-rises and they're starting to look unoriginal and tacky.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High rise L J H are too big for the area.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Mid rise will blend more with the already existing Northgate buildings. Adding High rise buildings will be out of place.

8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K+L: I like retail at base b/c I feel it's a well thought out use of space. Plus, I feel like many people wouldn't want to live at base in a highly populated area.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A high-rise would not fit in with the rest of the area, please stay to a low or mid-rise.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Building setbacks should be deeper, like Vancouver B.C. This makes a more liveable neighborhood.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like Development image D; it has a very urban appearance that would offer an appealing contrast from the mall-dominated Northgate look.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A, B, G, and H make it feel less like a neighborhood and more like a mini downtown. Questions of safety as it seems like it would be busy during the day and overly quiet at night.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I - Like the broken down scale of the architectural mass. Scale at the street level is approachable, yet the entrance is removed from the main traffic flow. E. Like the incorporation of "park" and open space mixed within the dwelling units. Buildings are similar in style and material but individually diverse.

8/17/2011 7:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike - too high of construction

8/17/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I can't see any type of high-rise going up around Northgate, it just doesn't fit the neighborhood profile. I do like the Residential mid-rise + retail concept though.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NO HIGH RISE ANYTHING!!!!

8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All about the architecture and planting. Less Northgate mall cement block style and MORE regrade (angles, plants, thought) style architecture. High rises tend to end up lower rent while larger living spaces (lowrises) tend to be nicer and people take care of them better, which translates to happier neighborhood. Keep the mapleleaf love!

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Anything high-rise would not fit in with the surrounding area (B,D,F,J,L); lots of green space would be nice (E&J)

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Examples C and E are ugly, and G looks like a totally dead neighborhood to pedestrians on the ground. There are already lots of low-rise residential and mid-rise office buildings in this city- I don't see why more of them are desirable right next to a transit hub, rather than encouraging highest density residential and offices right where good transit is available.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Generally speaking, I am opposed to highrise buildings in this area because they undermine the "human scale" of development and the pedestrian experience.

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Like the ones with trees

8/17/2011 11:58 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like having retail at the base of any of the options.

8/17/2011 11:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The office mid-rise is a bad option because it will leave the vicinity dead during non-office-hours. Residential and residential/retail mixed will keep the area more vibrant (and probably safer) during evenings and weekends.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D and L are the same choice but different design.

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hi Rise is inappropriate for this area.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the look of High-Rise buildings in those pics. It makes the neighborhood look more urban, less boring.

8/17/2011 11:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



any of the high-rise options. it seems so out-of-place in this part of the city and obstructs views.

8/17/2011 11:11 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



any high rise will completely outscale all other buildings in the area.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems like the whole point of this is to get more people living closer to the transit center, so I'm definitely more in favor of having residential in these new developments.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer no high rises

8/15/2011 7:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 10:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:59 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't like the high-rise - too dense

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the appearance of "I" the most but with retail base.

8/14/2011 9:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's hard to imagine big tall towers at Northgate.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C,E: Seem to preserve more of the 'neighborhood' feeling, provide housing and local business easy to access, seem to allow more trees and other green space. Other options will likely increase congestion even more, office (g,h) will bring more cars and congestion but not living space.

8/12/2011 7:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



grass and trees. This area will not support high rise development

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Nothing more than mid-rise

8/10/2011 9:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K I like footprint and the mixed use. Also allows for growth in the area

8/10/2011 6:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



prefer all mid-rise combos. appropriate for density but not too urban

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The high rise buildings B, D, F, H, J and L all seem grossly out of proportion to the existing facilities at Northgate. The Northgate Library and Community Center serve as a neighborhood hub and would be dwarfed by such large commercial development - losing their pedestrian appeal. I'd much rather see more pedestrian friendly development like C. The low-rise buildings also seem more appropriate for preserving what's left of what was once a beautiful creek habitat.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



L - and any of the other images it applies to: Building looms over street and there is no way to see the sky. Pedestrian s are hemmed in and the noise level goes way up. Who needs

more retail space in this economy anyway? There's so many failing stores and businesses there's too many empty units already and that leads to crime.

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



pedestrian/family friendly!

8/9/2011 9:03 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like mixed so that all ages might be in the same vicinity. Careful attention to new studies on street safety would be helpful in guiding lighting and density.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D & J -- I like narrower, taller buildings that emphasize glass and windows. K -- I do not like squat, monolithic buildings that fill up an entire block.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



C & D provide retail space that is difficult to fill. Another example of government trying to make a market where none exists or is needed.

8/9/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



E I like the integration of a park like environment w/ residential. Generally I do not want stark buildings and streets. This is not Singapore nor downtown Vancouver, BC. I would like to see greenery, water and curvy lines (not just N/S, E/W streets), integrated, some businesses but fewer big box or chain stores, and underground parking so people must walk. A place for a farmer's market day

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Greater use of transit by residents of the building in addition to retail drawing people from out of the neighborhood. The possibility of attracting more development of the same type.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't believe that high-rise buildings would work well in our area. I also like the idea of additional retail space around the light rail. The retail space offers more of an incentive for people to travel to Northgate.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



High Rise anything blocks out the sun, which is hard enough to get these days

8/9/2011 9:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



D, H, L, and J - all high-rise are overpowering and too large for our area. They create a canyon effect - I much prefer low-rise, with or without retail.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I, J - Like TREES!, pedestrian space, apparent lower speed street, did I mention trees?

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



For all - good modulation, high density.

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Although retail space is available at the North Northgate site, it seems it is always better to have some type of retail space to encourage pedestrian traffic. Low rise buildings do not overwhelm the area and would blend in better to the neighborhood

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think high rise office or residential should be combined with green space. This increases density, but makes for a more enjoyable area for all.

8/9/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need offices to bring more business to Northgate area. We have enough retail stores around here.

8/9/2011 12:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



dislike: Too tall for the area, blocking views west to the Olympics, south to downtown like: size-appropriate buildings, more non-mall businesses

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All of my top choices include retail space at the base. I think this mix of housing and retail best supports enhancing Northgate as a potential shopping destination. With the redeveloped mall, the new thorton Place development, and the Target area development I feel adding to the retail appeal of the area builds on the existing strengths of the area. The question doesnt specify but I believe the survey is also interested in aesthetics of the design as well: I strongly favor the combination of modern and classic materials and structure present in L and F. In contrast ultra modern Glass such as A and B contrast sharply with the existing architecture of the area.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



K should have more trees and seating space.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More people and uses closer to the Light Rail station.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Cozy Dense Drive Green Greenery

Large Plaza Look Maintain Mall

Manipulative Questions Outdoor Outside

Park Pavement Pedestrian Places

Public Space Retail Safe Shoppers

Sidewalk Cafes Smaller Sun Trees Wide

Woonerf

7. Do you support building a pedestrian and bicycle crossing of Interstate 5? Why?

This is ESSENTIAL to connect North Seattle Community College and existing neighborhoods West of I-5 to the Station and the new development in the Northgate Station Area.

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends how hard it is to cross now. Seems pretty easy over 92nd and 85th.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Focus on making it easy (and obvious) to bicycle to where 92nd Street crosses I-90, and safe to do so. Also focus on teaching competent bicycling -- use of helmets, headlights, arm signals, et cetera, and eliminate bike lanes that overlap with open car doors.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Need to make the connections to bring in surrounding neighbors safely and in a fun and enjoyable way add art to it or greenery

10/8/2011 5:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This will further encourage the use of public transit, especially with a potential light rail stop.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Agree it is important to connect the Community College Campus and other residential and offices at the opposite side of the freeway. Doing so in a pedestrian friendly manner where one doesn't feel overwhelmed by the noise and views of traffic will be the challenge to the designer.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The crossing points at Northgate Way and at 92nd seem reasonably adequate, although something more direct to North Seattle Community College would be nice. But in making decisions about how to allocate funds, something "nice to have" may not make the cut.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 is a giant divide in this part of Seattle. I live on the eastern side here and am constantly walking and biking around with my kids. Currently the built environment around i-5 makes it completely undesirable to cross (it's dark and loud and dirty under where Northgate Way crosses the highway). I would love to get over there and reconnect the city and Greenlake and beyond!

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate Way is lousy for peds and 92nd is way up the damn hill.

9/15/2011 2:07 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



good investment in the long run. I-5 cuts off the use of northgate to a large population. Encourages people to walk and drive less.

9/13/2011 11:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NSCC

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



its time to focus on infrastructure to support multi-modal transportation options rather than cars this connection would provide excellent support of the train and bus station from the west side of I-5

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Can we make existing crossings more friendly to bike/ped with less expense?

9/7/2011 4:08 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need to encourage people to take transit by other means than driving a car to a paved park and ride.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Encourages exercise, increases safety, and reduces emissions.

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In general I strongly support more ped-bike infrastructure (right now, crossing I-5 is a tough slog for a biker or pedestrian), but I'm not familiar enough with the specifics to be able to support any particular project.

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I live west of I-5 and would love bike access to Northgate.

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If it's going to directly connect bike and other commuters with the new transit center, then I'm for it, for safety reasons.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North Seattle is a terrible place to bicycle due to narrow roads, very aggressive car traffic, and the problem of getting from one side of the interstate to the other. A crossing would be great, but then, you must also provide safe access to the crossing!

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are limited ways to get from one side of I-5 to the other and not all of those existing options are good. Improving those by adding a pedestrian/bicycle crossing of I-5 will make it easier for people to access Northgate, encourage increased use of non-motorized commute modes, and increase parking availability for people who have to drive.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This would be very helpful for those commuting to North Seattle Community College or to the Park and Ride.

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NSCC

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not directly important to me (I live on the east side of I-5) but I think the more we encourage foot/bike traffic into the area, the better.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Goods and services on the other side of freeway are not compelling BUT I think a crossing would make commuting via transit more attractive to those on foot. Crossing the freeway now would be an unpleasant, daunting effort.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are many areas of I-5 that cut off the ability of pedestrians and bikes to safely travel. There are many students going to NSCC that may use transit and need to cross I-5. There are a growing number of people walking in the area and it is currently set up for car traffic and not for safe pedestrian/bicycle use.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



connecting North Seattle Community College and the Northgate Transit Center would eliminate a transfer, save time for bus riders and increase ridership. Seems like a no brainer. An underpass was promised many years ago but like many things promised for this area it never happened.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



For safety, and to encourage ped. & bicycling. How 'bout a soft-surfaced jogging lane on the crossing? Make it attractive!!

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We already have enough trash migrating into the neighborhood from Aurora . The last thing I'd favor is adding access for the dirt-bags and scum that "hang out" at Northgate Mall.

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This is critical to make the best and most use of the light rail station as it's to be built against I-5. Without it, half the development potential, ridership potential, and affordability potential are lost. The existing crossings of I-5 are too far away to walk to, and though we have buses there, we should be moving people by foot where possible. NSCC and NW Hospital are important trip origins/destinations, and we should maximize their walkability to the station to reduce car trips. We must open the 1/2 mile radius from the station to TOD on both sides of the highway.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A strong link between the college and the transit center would be desirable in order to make it easier for more people from other parts of Seattle to access the options of the college. Further the nearest pedestrian crossings are Northgate Way (not very pedestrian friendly) and 92nd Street which doesn't have great pedestrian access.

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



1) Education/Job training access to the programs at NSCC---transit dependent-students now spend more travel time from Northgate TC to NSCC than it takes to get from Downtown to Northgate! 2) Healthy active transport options for residents and shoppers, employees, visitors and NSCC students, faculty, staff for the whole urban center to library, community center, transit, shopping, housing, etc 3) reduce road congestion and eliminate many short trips now made by car 4) increase transit ridership 5) create a beautiful gateway over an UGLY highway

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There's a crossing over at N.E. 92nd Street already and a way under the freeway at N.E. Northgate Way. It seems to me, as someone who walks a lot around the area, that's sufficient.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Reconnecting the neighborhoods, encouraging more development west of I-5

8/25/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It just make SENSE!.. 1/2 of the radius around the transit center is cut off by I-5. pedestrian/bike access is essential and NG Way and 92 Street are too far apart for anything other than to encourage car usage for those on the west side of I-5.

8/25/2011 11:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The closest crossings at 92nd and Northgate Way (not ped or bike friendly) are relatively far away from the station, especially with potential traffic to/from North Seattle Comm. College. I think a crossing is warranted.

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A direct link to North Seattle Community College and the surrounding neighborhoods is essential for residents/students on the west side of I-5 to leave their cars and bike/walk over to the light rail station.

8/25/2011 10:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A pedestrian bridge would greatly increase safety, in addition to reduce travel time, by foot, to the station. This allows people to access the station on their own power, rather than

be dependent on unreliable connecting buses. In addition, making it easier to walk to the station, means fewer parking spaces are required to meet demand.

8/24/2011 11:32 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Would help make northgate less "car-centric" and more "people-centric." However, I'd hope the other side of northgate would become more people friendly soon, too, as there's a lot of transient/unsavory activity that I don't want to draw from 99.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As a cyclist, it would be great to have another option of crossing I-5 and not necessarily needing to be on the sidewalk. Currently, I have to ride up to 115th street if I'm going North to cross, or down to 92nd. Northgate Way is too busy of a crossing to feel safe crossing while riding on the sidewalks. Mix in pedestrians and there's not much room for a bike.

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Light rail is going to be an expensive investment— don't short change it by skimping on a relatively cheap way to increase its walkshed.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Oh, please, please do this.

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Aren't there already enough underpasses and overpasses?

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What's there now is UGLY.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Easier access to NSCC.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't walk or bike much in that area.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It makes sense to connect with North Seattle Community College

8/18/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are already multiple ways to get a cross I-5 as a pedestrian or cyclist. I think there are other improvements that can be made that does not further disrupt I-5.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not sure the purpose. We have NE 92nd which most would use to access the NSCC. Who would use this bike/ped access? The students at NSCC. I would rather see funding go toward improving NE 92nd and other streets people already use.

8/17/2011 7:02 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's a show-stopper and just has to be a requirement. You won't get any buy-in from anyone on the west side of I-5 (including NSCC) without it!

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What the heck for? All the people going to the community college? Why can't we use the one that already exists? Spend the money on something useful.

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



would make it easier for the college kids to get to/from NSCC, and easier for us on the other side to get over to enjoy the campus

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is a high-traffic area & it is difficult to cross on foot- especially with cargo, stroller, dog, etc

8/17/2011 12:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The existing crossing at NE 92nd is not very far away, and a crossing between that location and Northgate Way is likely to be VERY expensive, and there is no indication that there is or will be sufficient bike traffic to justify it (save the money to build one in the U-District where there are more peds and bikes!)

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's actually very hard to cross I-5 by car, let alone by foot. Right now by foot you have to cross at 92nd or along Northgate Way (both are dangerous, and sidewalks are absent on major sections of both routes). An overpass would connect the station directly with North Seattle Community College and the public high school over there.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Connect it to the community college!

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Already exists at 95th and 103rd.

8/17/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because right now it is almost impossible.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There is lack of access across I-5 and the only portion that is extremely auto-dominated. It discourages bikes and peds. Providing an additional alternative will extend access to Northgate, the light rail station, and more. It's a major win for all. Personally, I prefer a tunnel.

8/17/2011 11:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are very few options for crossing I5 in the northgate area. 92nd Street is busy with hills and poor streets and sidewalks west of the freeway. Northgate Way is impossible by bike and unpleasant by foot.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With so many cyclist they need more access and laws to make it more safe-as it stands biking on streets and plugged in is seriously dangerous.

8/17/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With so many cyclist they need more access and laws to make it more safe-as it stands biking on streets and plugged in is seriously dangerous.

8/17/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This would be great; I am wondering where the bridge would be and whether the city could use the bridge over I-5 between Northgate Way and 125th.

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it is important that students at the college have easy access to the transit center, however, I understand that the costs are quite exhorbitant because of the steep dropoff on the west side of I-5, and that this must be weighed in the decision.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It would be nice to connect the comm. college.

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Makes sense, but there is already one on Norhtgate that goes under.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



northgate is a terrifying place to ride a bike, yet my kids and I would like to save gas by riding bikes in the neighborhood

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



the easier it is to get around the northgate area; the better. I 5 does split the neighborhood in half; more access increases the potential for growth on both sides of the interstate. Also more folks will be able to walk to retail instead of driving.

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It might be beneficial to build a crossing to connect the light rail with North Seattle Community College - but NE 92nd already sort of does that. How would a new crossing be beneficial? There's not much on the west side of I-5 that seems in need of connecting, other than the college.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because the nearest practical crossings are about a mile in each direction. Northgate way is completely impossible unless you want to get hit by a car.

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This is an absurd situation. The only way to NorthGate from the North Seattle Community College is under the freeway. If you go under the freeway you will see it is fenced and a lot of garbage has been accumulated, it is noisy and unfriendly to walk under. They need some brainstorming between the college president, Nordstrom, the mall administrator to make walking from West to East, East to West more sensible - a award winning bridge design. Many kids from the college would likely cross for lunch or shopping. Moreover, North Seattle seems to have a large percentage of foreign students who are used to great public transportation systems in their home countries and do not drive. It would be a more vibrant community to be able to walk between the college/greater Green Lake area. The other issue is the lighting under the freeway is poor and scary. The garbage accumulation is such that if one took a few pictures it would look identical to parts of East LA and should be an embarrassment to the Mayor. A bridge should be a #1 priority for the Northgate area to make it more liveable. It might even be used to evacuation purposes if need be. It could easily be monitored by Mall Security and or HD cameras and speakers that could tell kids to move along, etc.. It could even be monitored by any number of companies that offer computer monitored cameras that are trained to look for non standard behavior and notify actual security. Unfortunately we have to have this stuff nowadays.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More choices of crossing I-5 would be nice, but costs of building something above and beyond what already exists could be a stumbling block in these fiscally tight times.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'd like to see much more encouragement of walking and safer bike routes.

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 has divided the city for far too long. A bike/pedestrian overpass would help rectify this a little. Also, presumably many of the transit riders would be NSCC students. It is unreasonable to require them to brave the crazy traffic under the freeway at Northgate Way while adding to their commute time.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Facilitate these energy-saving, healthy alternatives to having to drive everywhere. Even where there are bike lanes on regular streets, it is hazardous to ride in many places, especially around Northgate.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Only safe crossing now at 92nd. Need way for bicycles and peds to get west of freeway.

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



USE THE N 92nd STREET OVERPASS! Why build another?!

8/9/2011 8:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



A better crossing by Northgate way is needed. The current crossing under I-5 is dark, nosy and feels dangerous. I'm not sure if a new crossing is needed or if the current crossings (91st?; Northgate; and 115th?) need improvement.

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It would relieve some of the bicycle/pedestrian traffic going over NE 92nd

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Essential

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



where? It is already easy to cross at 95th next to NSCC by both foot and bike. The northgate/105 intersection could be improved I suppose. Coming to the Mall/transit area from the NE is currently the most difficult/least bike friendly direction.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends on where the crossing is. I think it might be helpful for students at the college.

8/8/2011 11:10 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Would rather we just take I-5 out. Its a lot of money to build a bridge over something that will be obsolete in the near future.

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Need to improve access from transit center to North Seattle Community College & neighborhood. This should be done ASAP - not wait until light rail station complete.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



It ties the Community College to the LRT.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



There is a substantial commercial district and college within biking/walking distance from the Mall and Transit center.. makes sense to find a way to better connect them. Right now it is maddening to try to get to anything on the west side of i5.

8/7/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



it's a over a mile to go around by Northgate way or 92nd. I don't walk to Northgate because of it. The community has always said no because they say it will be a drug hangout, but it's time to make it happen. If you are going to build something at northgate, you need easy access to it.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Because I think we should encourage more walking and biking...and safe ways to do it. Anything to decrease cars is a good thing.

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Easier access to the College. No need to take a bus from the transit center up and over 92nd to get to the college. Immediate west side neighborhood, west of I5, will not need to drive over to mall and transit center.

8/6/2011 11:13 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



We should make it as easy as possible for people to get out of their cars.

8/5/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The more we can engineer the city for non-car usage, the better.

8/5/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



it would be great for people who go to the community college or UW to be able to use the paths for commuting.

8/5/2011 9:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



While a pedestrian/bicycle crossing over I-5 would be great, ultimately, the dictating factor should be whether it is a cost effective use of our tax payer money. How many people would a crossing actually service? Probably not many. However, investing the same dollar amount in improving I-5 would benefit a huge amount of people. It is hard for me to support investing money in a project that very well may only benefit less than 5% of the community, regardless of how wonderful the improvement might be.

8/5/2011 7:28 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



because i suggested it before and was told by metro, the city, and sound transit that i was crazy.

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There seems to be decent pedestrian/bike crossings for I-5 around northgate.

8/4/2011 4:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not sure who would use it or where it would go. What is the actual walking distance between points?

8/4/2011 4:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think it'd be great, although it is pretty expensive.

8/4/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



An even better concept would be an eventual transit overpass/connector ramp/freeway station connecting North Seattle Community College and the Northgate Transit Center/LINK station, including shared parking with North Seattle Community College in the form of some structured parking. Northgate will be the magnet for light rail for the area and providing feeder bus routes and easy parking for all would be a huge asset for the area.

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I5 is a huge barrier. Some means of crossing it seems absolutely necessary, otherwise your cutting off everyone who lives on the side opposite the station.

8/4/2011 11:35 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently one has to go quite a ways north or south to get from northgate cc to the transit center; doubling or tripling the distance; the transit center therefore does not effectively serve the college.

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This gives a much larger walkshed. There are no crossings b/w 92nd and Northgate Way.

8/4/2011 10:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If there is sidewalk connectivity on either side that links to the neighborhoods, otherwise it is an island or pedestrian oasis (much as the redesigned transit center was before the pedestrian activated light was put in.

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Access across 92nd and at Northgate way are too far to walk.

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



cost

8/4/2011 8:46 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The retail businesses in this area would benefit greatly from increased foot traffic, and residents would benefit from increased access to businesses, green spaces, etc.

8/4/2011 8:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 is a huge barrier to comm. college students.

8/4/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Even though I don't ride a bike, there needs to be a place where people can get across safely and quickly.

8/4/2011 6:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I bike commute and the roads are too busy with speeding drivers during the commute.

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



the transit center will serve folks on both sides of the freeway. The crossings at 125/145 are a ways away from Northgate and the Northgate crossing is very difficult with the freeway ramps on the right hand side.

8/4/2011 3:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



While I realize that there is little money for even a pedestrian only bridge, I would strongly recommend that the costs and benefits of a transit/bike/pedestrian bridge be studied. Given that we are looking at a large cable stayed bridge, what would be the incremental cost of adding transit to it? The time savings and reliability improvements to the many bus trips

that currently cross I-5 at 92nd or at Northgate Way could save many service hours and greatly enhance the feeder network into Northgate station. In addition, allowing transit on the bridge could set the stage for future BRT or light rail connecting Northgate with Ballard/Northwest Seattle.

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm not sure that the cost is worth it. On the other hand, I didn't buy a house that was on the west side of I-5 because transit options in that area were pretty dismal when compared to the east side of I-5.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Walking along Northgate Way to Meridian under the freeway feels very unsafe. It would be great to be able to get across the freeway to Meridian on a safe pedestrian/bike path.

8/3/2011 8:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As a frequent pedestrian in this exact neighborhood my choices to cross I-5 are at NE 92nd (great) and Northgate Way (I almost get run over every time I travel this route on foot). It is not safe and not to mention the fact that is a lot of ground to cover.

8/3/2011 8:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We can't afford it.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We can't afford it.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Without such a crossing, the transit stop is nearly useless for true (carless) green commuters from the west side of I-5. It would be so silly for them to have to trek back to 92nd St. to cross over -- I doubt many on foot would do so, although bikers might. It also makes the transit station MUCH more accessible to people with disabilities.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I used to live on Meridian and either walked under I-5 (on Northgate Way) or over I-5 at NE 92nd street to get to the transit area and/or shopping. While there is a large gap between these crossing points, the west side of I-5 isn't designed well to access an overpass (ie the college is wide and deep, the medical center is wide and deep, there are wooded and swampy areas, and you'd have to traverse business or multifamily parking lots to access the overpass). I also assume that an overpass would be expensive. It might be more cost effective to improve the Northgate Way underpass (clean up, art, lighting, landscaping) and the NE 92nd Street overpass (clean up, pedestrian scale lighting, art, etc)

8/3/2011 4:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There seems to be a lot of "noise" about bikes the past 4 years and lip service to walkers. Been asking for a 400 ft walkway on the street up from us but no action. Only one side a ditch and the other gravel 7-10 ft wide and folks park on it and on the street????

8/3/2011 4:17 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



When driving home I often take the overpass just north of Northgate that becomes 117th. It would be nice to have a bike, pedestrian only overpass. The one I drive is not very welcoming for pedestrians and is not very safe for bikers or children.

8/3/2011 4:12 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



SERIOUSLY?!?! That seems like such a waste of money! Improve the existing sidewalks under (and over) I-5, perhaps even separating them with barriers, but don't build a new crossing. Besides the incredible waste of money, they create safety issues for both I-5 as well as the people who use them (look at the Aurora example).

8/3/2011 3:22 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Access for pedestrians has been neglected and the sidewalks you have now are narrow, decaying, and too close to the street curbs. Need to find ways to stop cars at driveway access points and intersections. As a ped I feel 'invisible' sometimes.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's not currently safe.

8/3/2011 2:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Bike and pedestrian lanes encourage people not to drive which causes traffic congestion and is not environmentally friendly.

8/3/2011 2:51 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't think we have that many bicycles.

8/3/2011 2:46 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is difficult and time consuming to get between Licton Springs/NSCC and Northgate. A ped/bike bridge would reduce the number of cars driven to NSCC and would increase the amount of healthy activity in the Northgate area.

8/3/2011 2:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Activity Afford Aurora Bike Crossing

Development Easier East Side of I-5

Expensive Going Huge Barrier

Impossible Increase Makes Sense

Money to Build Nice North

Seattle Community College

NSCC Pedestrian Run Say Street

Overpass Surrounding Transit UGLY Usage

West Side of I-5

8. Do you think public agencies need to replace all commuter parking spaces that would be displaced by development at the transit center? Why?

The public should invest any/all available resources on actual public transit service and facilities to fulfill their core mission of moving people and goods. This is becoming an urban area and consequently, any investment in station access should focus on bike facilities (bike station), and additional local feeder transit service.

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends how many unused spaces there are now. Thornton creek seems to have a large commuter lot.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I park at Northgate everyday, but I would sacrifice the convenience of parking for a quality development. Alternatively, I can catch a connecting bus near my house or bike to Northgate.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With its orientation as a commuter center, adequate parking at Northgate will be important. Current commuter parking spaces are consistently overflowing. It seems parking for the existing retail/mall could be condensed (garage) or opened up to commuter parking during the day. That being said, an eye should be kept open for opportunities to reduce vehicular dependence in the area such as improving bike path and pedestrian connections.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The parking lots are always full with the current transit service, and neighboring businesses have signs saying "no park & ride parking" so it seems to already have spill-over. I walk to the transit center when I ride the bus, but the times I've tried picking someone up there in my car I haven't been able to find a parking spot.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you do not provide all the parking spaces, people will find a new and more environmentally sensitive way to get there. They will complain but they'll figure it out. If you provide all the parking spaces again, the need for parking will continue to grow. It will have no end. The more you make, the more you'll need to make. Let's not make it about cars! Let's make it about creating a new way of getting around!

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Those parking spaces sure seem to be heavily used by commuters.

9/15/2011 2:07 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I need more information. If current commuter parking spaces are near or at full usage, then yes, it is an important feature to keep.

9/9/2011 2:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



as long as we make it easy to drive and park people will not leave their cars if parking is maintained it should be paid parking

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No. Agencies need to think of ways to get people to transit centers by other means than personal vehicles.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People won't use the infrastructure if they can't find a place to park. Encouraging biking and walking is good, but can't be counted on to consistently reduce parking space usage. Also, the goal should be to increase usage of public transport--which, if successful, will likely require more--not less-- parking at transit centers.

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Let the market decide how much parking there should be.

9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With less parking available, commuters will find another option (bus or bike).

9/6/2011 10:25 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not necessarily--if more people can get to the new transit center easily without having to drive, then I think less parking would be just fine. But agencies need to provide the speed and connections needed to make this happen.

9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Parking could be eliminated if alternative means of access were thoughtfully developed--for example, world class bicycle infrastructure.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate will transition into a community that does not rely on P&R to fill buses but will provide transit-oriented residents and neighbors that could benefit from that P&R space being used for something with more value to them.

9/6/2011 4:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is a heavily used transit center that seems to fill up completely every morning. By adding additional service with the light rail and adding a pedestrian/bike crossing of I-5, some people may get there without their cars, but I suspect that even more people will drive there to access this improved service.

9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Already the parking lot is pretty full. Reducing spaces will discourage mass transit.

9/6/2011 1:15 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In the short term it adds ridership. In the longer term it gives the government a way to meter and allot parking based on policy rather than hoping the market will what's wanted.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Park-and-rides are an essential service for getting people who would otherwise be driving (like me) onto public transit. A multi-hop transit trip is so much longer than a drive-to-transit that it's just not worth the hassle and delay. This is mostly because the buses are too infrequent and late. I don't know that they need to be replaced 1:1, but it should be comparable. I think it's okay to charge for this parking though!

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People will use transit more if there is parking. Simple fact.

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I dont think all need to be replaced. I have never seen it completely full. Northgate Mall employees and Christmas shoppers usually fill in but I think replacing only some percentage is necessary. Parking isnt as important as transit.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate already suffers from a lot of car and bus congestion and air pollution. Reducing the number of commuter spaces would hopefully reduce the air pollution.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Transit and the addition of tenants and/or shoppers will add additional parking needs.

8/25/2011 7:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We need to do all in our power to encourage motorist use of public transit for a multitude of green reasons.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Parking is one of the worst land uses there is. Seattle in particular provides among the most parking spaces per car of any big US city. Parking should be scarce and priced. Land should be used for productive uses like homes, offices, shops, parks, etc--not car storage that pollutes the air and water. The current layout of NTC was designed for buses only; not trains. Buses don't offer the land development potential trains do; since people generally don't move or work next to bus stops, they have to be offered ways to drive to them. Not so with rail. Rail offers great development potential as lots of people want to live and work a short walk from the station. Buses will still serve Northgate, but it will become mainly a rail hub rather than a bus one. There will be less need for anyone to drive to/from Northgate when rail opens, and we should be moving people to and from rail by foot, bike, and bus as

much as we possibly can. Look at great TOD examples around the country like Arlington County, VA. We must add lots of homes, jobs, shops, etc. while reducing the amount of parking. Buildings in a quarter mile radius of the station should be capped at 1 parking space per housing unit.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This strongly depends on the transit development plans in the area. If you want people to use rail more, make it easier to mode switch at the transit center. Or provide more frequent shuttle type service to other parking areas nearby that are ok for park & ride use (SE corner of Northgate mall Parking lot for example)

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Use of all-electric fleet vehicles as a "car share asset" to the whole community (and as property of City Light as electric grid/load leveling infrastructure) should be prioritized

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The commuter parking spaces encourage and enable people to drive their automobiles there, on rainy days, and take the bus. And of course, it rains a lot in Seattle, from October through February.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The transit center should be designed to encourage commuters to arrive by bus and transfer to Link or express buses. If there is commuter parking, it should be structured and below-grade, or incorporated into parking structures in the development. Possibly shared with a mall or commercial center that has higher parking demand in evenings and weekends.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The only parking that public agencies should keep at Northgate is pay parking. Land is valuable.

8/25/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It depends on how much residential units will be in the area; if folks are driving to the new light rail station from further suburbs there should be, at this time anyway (until the extension to Lynnwood is built), be some capacity to handle the vehicles (hopefully not in the form of a surface lot or a aboveground parking garage) if the city/region truly wants to help shift modeshare.

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



- 1) The peak parking demand period for the mall is Saturday afternoons - for the train, it's weekdays. With appropriate sharing of parking with the mall, there should be plenty for all.
- 2) If more people live near the station and if the pedestrian bridge over the freeway is built,

fewer people accessing the station, percentage-wise, will need to drive. 3) Parking is ugly and an extremely unproductive use of land.

8/24/2011 11:32 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Whenever I leave the transit center on weekdays (around 3pm) the spots are full, and drivers are circling around looking for spots to park. If Seattle truly wants to reduce congestion and traffic, then people are going to need a spot to park to take the light rail or bus. It's not realistic to think that everyone who's going to take the light rail lives within walking/biking distance. And it's not realistic to think that people are going to take a bus to the transit center, then get on the light rail.

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As NG takes on more urban form, parking should begin to be phased out. That said, the transit serves a large enough area that it's not yet realistic to assume that many commuters have other choices. Hopefully rail stops further north and their associated P&Rs will alleviate this need.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Divert these funds to improved bike and transit projects. My sense is that most of the commuters at the transit station will be transferring from buses or walking there, rather than using it as a 'park and ride.'

8/19/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People need to park their cars. Removing parking spaces doesn't stop people from driving.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If the housing is affordable it shouldn't be a problem to live there and use community transit but what are the housing prices going to be like? I already can't afford where I'm living.

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It's great for people who live in neighborhoods that don't have easy transit options. Plus a lot of traffic starts around Norhtgate so it would be nice to have the option to get that far, park and take the train to the city.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't use the commuter parking spaces.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You need to make it as easy as possible to take public transportation. I use the P&R and commute to Bellevue to work, but if there wasn't parking available at the P&R, then I wouldn't take the bus. I don't feel safe biking/walking in the dark. Additionally, if I had to

take a bus to the P&R and then transfer, it would add too much time to my commute. Please save the parking spots!

8/18/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Offer better transit/walking etc options so that the need for parking/driving is reduced. None of the features above will be enjoyable if there is car traffic everywhere.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The transit center offers a means to lessen the amount of cars on the road. If people are always driving to the transit center, then the purpose of the transit center is being at least partially defeated. I believe that there will always be people who insist on driving to the transit center, so there should still be some parking. However, the amount of parking should suggest that driving is not the #1 option to get to the center.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you want people to take transit, they will need a way to get to the stop. There were issues in south seattle when there wasn't enough commuter parking. Commuters were competing with residents for parking...

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Park and ride north of target is already GONE and people DO actually need to Park and ride sometimes. A possible improvement: the 41 (which most people in Maple Leaf use for direct access to downtown) does not service the Maple Leaf area. However, it does DRIVE down 5th all day long. it would be nice if they stopped twice along the way to serve our neighborhood before they get on the freeway at 75th. It would eliminate a lot of commuter parking at the transit center. Metro would say that they are only supposed to drive down 5th during rush hour but that is a fabrication. They drive down 5th all day long. Just an idea to improve things in our area.

8/17/2011 7:02 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You must allow for commuter parking at the transit center. Bus service up in the north-end just won't support the required feed into the transit center.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Sure if it makes sense. There will need to be parking there otherwise the neighborhood parking will become a nightmare

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



How else will I get from my house to the transit center? I live over a mile away and the buses heading that way don't run as early in the morning as I would need them - I need to drive/park at the transit center.

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Promotes use of public transit & decreases congestion.

8/17/2011 12:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because the light rail stations are still so far apart, walking is still not a plausible option for getting to the stations, and taking buses to the stations is more pain than it's worth. If the parking spaces aren't replaced, there should be more secure, easy-to-use bike storage options at the station.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is well used and I'd rather people didn't need to drive the entire way, but it improvements to other systems make getting to the transit center without a car easier I'm more supportive of that.

8/17/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Ample parking should remain, but it's not reasonable to replace every single space that is lost. With proper bus connections and better bike access, parking spots should be less and less necessary if people find it easy to get to the train station by foot, bus, or bike. I suppose, then, it's either (a) provide ample foot/bus/bike connections or (b) provide ample parking spaces.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Bus service to the transit center from Meadowbrook/Wedgwood is awful. I have to drive to get to the Northgate transit center to take my bus to Redmond. Maybe replace with underground parking?

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No street parking as is.

8/17/2011 11:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Not necessary. The place is already auto-dominated, we don't need to further encourage this as new development will increase this status. There should be a total net reduction.

8/17/2011 11:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



people are more likely to use public transit if they can drive to park. cross city buses can take too long.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is VERY important to replace all commuter parking spaces and keep them free so that people will have access to light rail and be inclined to use it.

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Unfortunately, we live in a society where people drive their cars EVERYWHERE. If we don't provide the spaces, the commuters will take up the spaces at Northgate Mall, then people who actually are supporting the mall will decide to shop elsewhere because it will no longer be convenient, or the commuters will park in the surrounding neighborhoods, taking up spaces where actual residents should be able to park their own cars.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I would like to see less traffic, more walking.

8/14/2011 9:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Yes, people will use the light rail the best if there is parking for some.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because parking is necessary for people to access both transportation and to be able to patronize local businesses. Access is important so that businesses can succeed. And I believe strongly in small businesses.

8/12/2011 7:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you want people to use a transit center but have crappy bus service, they need a place to park

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People need to park. It would be a stupid idea to open up the area for commuting but then make it difficult to access the public transport. As it is now, people already have to park in the mall just to bus into work everyday. That's terrible. More public transit means more cars to accommodate those commuting to get to the light rail. I love public transport but I HATE PEOPLE WHO MAKE DRIVING AND PARKING IMPOSSIBLE. The development of one mode of transport MUST accompany the other.

8/10/2011 4:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



not sure what this means? What "public agencies"; who pays for this; why not plan on another parking garage for retail/commuter like the one near the mall/Pennys. parking needs to be provided or else how will people get to the light rail? Not everyone is able to bike.walk to the station.

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Yes. The commuter parking is already much tighter than it was before the Thorton Creek development went in. It doesn't do any good to have a light rail & bus hub there, if noone can get to it. I realize public transit is meant to discourage cars, but it's unrealistic to think people will get there by other means. It's not currently a particularly safe place to bike or walk.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If you want people to park and ride you have to give them the option to do so!

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



If a nice bike center was setup that would ameliorate some of the space losses. Unfortunately I hear folks drive all the way from Ballard to take advantage of the free parking at the Transit Center. Small commuter vans might make a difference during peak hours.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Public agencies should be promoting use of commuter parking for public transportation users. Losing spaces will not help congestion.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't fully understand the question but without doubt we need to have space for cars with the intention of discouraging the use of cars within the area. Kind of like the new towns of England in which one parked outside the center and then could walk or take local transportation into the area. This would be a long term project as currently all our systems are based on cars & speed.

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Instead, add better bus service. Who uses these parking spaces? People like me who live 2 miles away?

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I agree because I live in Northgate and the parking would just overflow onto our streets in residential areas which would probably increase vandalism, crime, and loitering around our houses.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Discourage driving. People can take the bus, walk or bike to the station.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Higher priority for a day care, park, transit oriented small business. Probably should start charging for non-carpool (single occupancy) commuter parking - this is in-city now.

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



People all over the city and the world deal with construction issues daily. Northgate transit riders are NO DIFFERENT.

8/9/2011 8:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know the current fill rate of the existing parking spaces and whether increased traffic will result in more spaces needed with the new transit center. I do know that difficulty in finding spots will result in frustration and lower use of the transit center and surrounding area which will have a negative impact on revenue.

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are plenty of parking options in the Northgate area.

8/9/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Public space and transit centers are far more valuable than parked cars. Commuters that don't live on the line should ride the bus, or bike to it. Should provide ample bike and ride parking.

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently the transit center is succeeding in its role as a park and ride. Taking away that role diminishes the benefit of the development. Overall the development should increase parking demand in the area if it is successful. I recommend the city embrace that reality and find a way to tax or fee those spaces.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The point of this effort is to make NG a place of its own, not a dumping ground pass-through for those coming from elsewhere to downtown.

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There should be multistory parking for commuters. It is not clear to me how much should be paid for by public agencies. By charging for parking, it will encourage people to walk, bike, or take the bus to the light rail rather than driving.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Unless there are going to be increased and reliable bus connections, there needs to be commuter parking.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Somewhat. Parking spaces are a huge eyesore and can be a "Waste of space" if just left out in the open like what was behind Target here in Northgate. One would hope residential development would improve around the area to remove the need for cars eventually... it's a huge shame that the transit center is located in a commercial district and fenced in by I5 on one side... hugely limits any possibility of developing a residential neighborhood around it and improving accessibility. I say move the whole thing up Northgate way by the QFC in the middle of everything. Makes tons more sense. Tons. Why would anyone in the community using the system need this to be right next to a mall or freeway? Awful planning. Makes me sad.

8/7/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There aren't enough spaces as it is. If I want to park and ride at the transit center after 8:00, there are no spaces.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You are building more things that people will drive to and making less places to park....how do you think people are going to get there? The commuter parking is used now for people riding the bus...if you add the light rail, more will come to use that. If you have shops and living spaces there is not going to be enough parking anyway. YES you need to replace the parking or people will not use it. You already can't park there if you don't go to work early.

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There is no parking available now if you show up after 8:45 am. Those spaces need to be replaced!

8/6/2011 11:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Unless we have the infrastructure to get people to transit centers, I don't know how they'll use transit without driving there. So maybe start with parking, then as our transit system builds out, eliminate parking.

8/5/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



As stated earlier, we live in an area where the preferred mode of transportation is by car thus you need to have enough parking spaces to accomodate. It is not practical to socially engineer an area to be anti car when the overwhelming majority of the tax payers use their cars.

8/5/2011 7:28 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



we can't all take transit to the station and there is no parking at the next nearest station.

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The parking is often full and with the removal of Northgate north P&R, I had to look to the main lot.

8/4/2011 4:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With parking limited at the station south of Northgate and no other station likely to be closer than 145th, Northgate will be the magnet station for most of North Seattle. Hence the concept of putting in the transit bridge across I-5 and sharing some of the huge real estate in the NSCC parking lot that is available and putting in some structured parking to dual utilize otherwise dead college space on evenings and weekends

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



as long as Metro is reducing and canceling bus routes people will need to 'drive' to their bus stop. To keep things green.

8/4/2011 11:44 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There needs to be enough parking to encourage people to use the transit, but in my experience there seems to be a lot of wasted space in the immediate area. It would be much nicer if it were possible to access with bikes or by foot, as it stands now the northgate area is a nightmare to navigate on bike...I live very nearby, but tend to avoid the whole area as its a hellish, frightening bike ride and a long, profoundly unpleasant walk.

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No--when rail reaches Northgate, bus service should be redistributed to improve E-W connections.

8/4/2011 10:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



With better pedestrian infrastructure, this may not be as necessary, but if drivers cannot find a parking space, they will drive.

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We should improve ped and bike access to the station.

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't want our Northgate Community to begin looking like Capitol Hill in regards to parking, or complete lack thereof.

8/4/2011 8:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I would be concerned if there is much loss of parking because of impact on the neighborhood and a chance that the station would be less likely to be used by as many commuters.

8/4/2011 8:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The future of Northgate is not parking lots. Please, for crying out loud.

8/4/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Depends on how many are taken out, how many are used and how many we can do with.

8/4/2011 6:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More and more people are driving to Northgate and parking for transit. It is very hard to find parking right now and its already spilling into the neighborhoods. People are doing this because the outlining bus service isn't as frequent or as good and because of the price of gas.

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This question is worded in an awkward and confusing way. I wouldn't be surprised if many people vote in a way they did not mean to. My vote is meant to convey that I do not think that all the parking needs to be replaced. I don't know if "I strongly disagree that I think that public agencies should....." really means that. (?)

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What are the tradeoffs? Without knowing pros and cons, I can't answer this question.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Developing the transit center would not need to replace all of the parking spaces if public transportation to the transit center and pathways made getting to the transit center 1/2 as easy and convenient as driving to the center. Otherwise the parking spaces will be needed.

8/3/2011 8:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There should be some parking, but the whole point is to get people OUT of cars. Of course, since Metro is currently cutting bus service to Maple Leaf, many who would take bus to transit station will choose to drive.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is a strongly automotive focused neighborhood (likely due to I-5 and the Mall). As a pedestrian and sometimes bike commuter, I'm intimidated by the auto-centric road design. I usually drive to Northgate so I don't get run over. Unless there are other convenient options that allow people to make safe connections without driving (ie buses, bike lanes, sidewalks with vegetation or parking buffers between people and cars, etc) I think people will continue to drive and park in the Northgate area. If public agencies do not provide enough parking, an undue burden will be placed on the Mall or businesses/offices adjacent to the transit center.

8/3/2011 4:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



While I don't think they all need to be replaced, I don't want so few parking places that it is an excuse to not use the light rail.

8/3/2011 4:12 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



We must stop encouraging auto traffic and pollution.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Should try to replace most, but not at the expense of meeting other goals (green streets, street life, etc.)

8/3/2011 2:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



What's the point of having a transit center if people can't continue to use it. Some of us have to have our cars quickly available at the transit center to pick up kids, etc.

8/3/2011 2:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Where will they park?

8/3/2011 2:46 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Too many people drive to the transit center who should be riding the bus.

8/3/2011 2:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Community
Commuter Parking Depends
Downtown Green Infrastructure Light
Rail Market Necessary Nightmare
Northgate P&R Paid Parking Available
Parking Spaces Public
Transit Public Transportation Question Say

Shoppers Spots Station Street Strongly Term

Traffic Transit Center

11. Can you identify any barriers to pedestrian and bicycle movements near the transit center vicinity? Please describe.

No sidewalks on 92nd west of 5th.

10/27/2011 9:45 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is a long, high climb to get from Northgate to the top of 5th Avenue in Maple Leaf. It is not safe to trudge across an actively-used parking lot, unless the lot is designed like the University Village.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 to the West - the only place to cross is at Northgate Rd, Transit Center is 6-8 blocks south.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Walking from commuter garage to transit center via elevated bridge would help separate traffic and pedestrians.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently bikes are sharing the sidewalks north and east of the mall because the car traffic is so heavy and fast there. Even on foot, crossing Northgate Way doesn't feel quite safe. Maybe textured crossings would help.

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Buses that are waiting rather than picking up

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



blocks are very long, few places to pause when walking

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



traffic!

9/7/2011 4:08 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No dedicated bike lanes to get you safely through the traffic to the station. No bike station. Sidewalks are around the station but do not continue out into the neighborhood.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Neither 1st Ave NE nor 5th Ave NE south of Northgate Way are safe for bicycle traffic. The car traffic on both of these roads is very heavy, with many turning vehicles, often traveling in excess of the speed limits--1st Ave NE, particularly, with the freeway on and off ramps and the major mall access roads.

9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



1st Ave N is pretty hostile for bikes and pedestrians...

9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There aren't any pedestrians outside the mall.

9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The new sidewalk on 1st ave is a great improvement, thanks! It would be great if those sidewalks can be extended into the neighborhoods where funds are available.

9/4/2011 11:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no

9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are a significant amount of streets to cross to get anywhere further then the mall from the bus station and walking under the bridge over the interstate is sketchy at night.

8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There is really no good pedestrian access from the west side of I5 to the Northgate area. See 12 below.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



big parking lots/garages around the mall

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm concerned about traffic going north of transit center. Seems the only convenient route is to walk through the NG mall parking lot. What if you wanted to walk/bike under I-5 at northgate way? walk through the parking lot?

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



NEED BRIDGE OVER I-5

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



None that I can see.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In Option I, The whole space overall looks a little more constricted.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 is a huge barrier. The Northgate Mall (and its parking lots) can also be a problem.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5 for EVERYONE living WEST of the transit center.

8/25/2011 11:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



(i can't tell what the two options in question 2 are really showing) i-5, large existing parking lots

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



1) No good way to cross I-5 on foot without a long detour 2) 1st Ave needs bike lanes. The sidewalk is obstructed by telephone polls.

8/24/2011 11:32 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The huge hill & parking lot barricading northgate center off from the transit station feels like a psychological obstacle between people-activity and transit-activity. More pedestrian pathways and a welcoming sense from Ngate mall would help.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



cars!!!!

- 8/23/2011 7:08 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Safe bike parking and bike route to the transit center
8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- You mean besides I-5?
8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Nope
8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Don't understand question
8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- We don't need any more bike lanes.
8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- I strongly think that there should be a dedicated bike lane on 1st ave NE.
8/18/2011 7:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- No, I can barely see the plans!
8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Hills, rain, too many cars!!!
8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- more sidewalks in the surrounding neighborhoods
8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- I can barely see/understand these visuals.
8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
- Safety from being hit by cars and buses is always the biggest barrier to bicycle commuting-
I love to ride my bike, but so far bike communtin has proved more dangerous than my
other hobby, rock climbing and mountaineering.
8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
-

Lack of sidewalks in neighborhood, poor ped crossing on Roosevelt, hills

8/17/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Safe bike lanes would need to be in place along every street within the vicinity of the transit center. Ideally, these should be separated from car traffic. Bikers are hard for buses to see, and there will be a lot of buses. Better crosswalk markings and pedestrian crossing lights, and possibly speed bumps, will be needed along 5th Ave near Group Health and south for a few blocks to make it plausible for Maple Leaf residents to walk to the station. The lack of sidewalks in Maple Leaf will also be an obstacle to more pedestrian use of the transit center (it can be risky walking on Maple Leaf streets).

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Poor visibility around parked/idling buses.

8/17/2011 10:57 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



continue sharrow/bike lanes on 100th and 103rd. 100th is in poor condition with parking and difficult to navigate by bike.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



There are no sidewalks just east of the transit center throughout Maple Leaf.

8/16/2011 8:24 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Fast, congested traffic and narrow sidewalks and streets

8/10/2011 11:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



What's not a barrier - there are so many! Traffic on 5th, lack of bike lanes in the entire vicinity, there's also a constant jumble of traffic on NE Northgate Way from west of I-5 to NE 5th. There are also several awkward intersections do to traffic flow in and out of the mall. For pedestrians, the library and community center are pedestrian-friendly, but little else anywhere around the mall is.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Traffic lights that don't sense bikes, and heavy, rude traffic that can potentially kill us!

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The exit and entrance onto I-5 during rush hour times. How can bikes and pedestrians safely manage that congestion?

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Large mall parking lot lacks pedestrian islands/walways. I-5 blocks access. Missing sidewalks throughout N. Seattle.

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



No sidewalks in surrounding residential neighborhood north of Maple Leaf

8/9/2011 8:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The sidewalk on the East side of the mall (the street in front of library) is very poor and dangerous. It's too narrow for strollers.

8/9/2011 12:33 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Um why no comments on question 10? Those maps are hard to read. I think the differentiation between the options is a priority on creating a compelling gathering space versus a priority on fast effective transite. The name of the development should point to the correct answer; if the area doesn't deliver on fast reliable transport it will be a failure no water how wonderful of a spot to sip a latte and walk around is created.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Too many cars and not enough streets. (ironic)

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Blocks are way too large.

8/7/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The giant mall. I5. Nothing to walk to.

8/7/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



sidewalks and bike lanes. Can't see the maps too small.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I can't see or understand the pictures well enoug

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no sidewalks, ample crazy drivers, interstate 5...

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Nothing yet, but clearly Northgate Mall will need some sort of pedestrian facility from the North station exit into the mall as opposed to their sidewalkless pedestrian unfriendly mall

parking lot-and hopefully that will be a covered pedestrian walkway (see Lougheed Mall/Skytrain Station up in BC)

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I5 is the main one.

8/4/2011 11:35 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Currently the landscaping and curbs offer no breaks, requiring one to go to either end and enter/exit where bus traffic & cars enter and exit. The real problem is actually the surrounding streets, which are very busy without adequate shoulders or bike lanes

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



crossing 100th is still a difficulty as the lights (3rd and 5th aves) are very far apart. The lack of sidewalks up into Maple Leaf makes the pedestrian commute perilous. It is difficult to get from 8th to the Transit Center.

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



limited bike lock facilities, pedestrian environment is not good

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



recent traffic deaths of cyclists prove cycling is still not safe in Seattle

8/4/2011 8:46 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Cars, places to lock my bike.

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Clear safe bike lanes will need to be established. Northgate is currently an unfriendly area for bikes.

8/4/2011 3:07 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I-5. Please build the ped bridge.

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



It's impossible to read these images, so I can't answer.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



high traffic volumes. limited storage for bikes.

8/3/2011 8:42 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



There need to be sidewalks near the transit station, and bike locking racks.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



5 lanes on 1st ave. Superblocks make it hard for pedestrians to access anything without a "hike." I-5 cuts off the west side of the neighborhood. I-5 on/off ramps (wide! and free rights often do not look out for pedestrians. Signals change quickly to speed up car access).

8/3/2011 4:33 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All the west side and N of the project have a H 5 so we are only talking about the south approach. can not enlarge the plans to see what is what.

8/3/2011 4:17 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no opinion -

8/3/2011 4:12 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know.

8/3/2011 3:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Are you referring to the diagrams above? I cannot see them clearly to answer this question or #10 either.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



People driving to access the express lanes will still be eager to access the express lanes -- so measures should be put in place to accomodate both the pedestrians and those cars.

8/3/2011 2:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Forget bicycles

8/3/2011 2:46 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



There are too many cars. The station is too close to highway exits. All development in Northgate is too car-centric.

8/3/2011 2:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

[Bike Lanes](#) [Bike Path](#) [Bridge I-5](#) [Foot](#)
[Mall Parking](#) [North Side](#) [Northgate Way](#)
[Pedestrian](#) [Putting Say](#) [Sidewalks](#)
[Street](#) [Transit Center](#)

13. Which of the following pedestrian/bike bridge alignments across Interstate 5 do you prefer below? Why?

Can't tell from the images which alignment provides the most direct/ shortest distance walk to the station platform. Please mark my preference for the route that provides the shortest distance walk between the station platform and the majority of classrooms at NSCC.

11/9/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More interesting.

9/28/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Meandering path would be more visually interesting for pedestrians and seem less elongated. Also provides closer access point to transit center. Cable stayed option is more visually interesting (less bulky) and provides more of an identifiable marker for the Northgate area. Stair in both schemes seems a little daunting unless it connects directly to light rail platform.

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The path through the park looks a little more sensitive to the landscape.

9/28/2011 9:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Cable-stayed bridge, south alignment because north is too congested already, south alignment is cleaner looking and cable structure is much more eye-appealing and doesn't seem to interrupt the landscape as much.

9/28/2011 8:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Either will work as long as the steel truss bridge is not used. Spend some money and get a world class design for this important "gateway" structure.

9/27/2011 1:57 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Makes more sense with existing pedestrian/traffic infrastructure: there's a pedestrian and traffic signal at the intersection of 100th and 1st (the other location invites dashing across the road and isn't a location with existing east/west traffic), and sight-line from cars traveling west along 100th which creates more safety relative to the more-hidden north location in the parking lot.

9/20/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North Seattle Community College has a beautiful campus. I like how the path meanders through the natural area. I also think that this north alignment will help serve both mall and transit center foot and bike traffic better.

9/20/2011 12:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



closer to light rail station. Use Cable Stayed

9/13/2011 3:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



north connection access point east of I-5 is better located for mall transit, connection to community beyond

9/9/2011 9:37 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



more direct

9/7/2011 5:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seems more straight-forward.

9/7/2011 10:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More direct access for commuters

9/7/2011 10:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Weakly prefer North -- curves may make for a longer walk-bike, but possibly a slightly more pleasant one.

- 9/6/2011 10:50 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
Don't know enough about the area--
- 9/6/2011 5:38 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
Cable-stayed
- 9/6/2011 5:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
Looks like a more pleasant route, perhaps a gentler incline, as well.
- 9/6/2011 4:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
Only a slight preference for the South Alignment because it appears to be quicker access... However, the North Alignment seems a bit more aesthetically pleasing and a nice route to ride/walk over the green space.
- 9/6/2011 3:47 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
A little more distinctive.. more interesting... closer on the station side to the station..
- 9/6/2011 3:09 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
It's right on target, more direct.
- 9/6/2011 11:22 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
Better connection to the station
- 9/6/2011 10:51 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
More interesting design and bridge segment seems shorter so it may be less costly. Steel truss bridge is very ugly. Suspension is the way to go.
- 9/2/2011 4:23 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
It's more interesting.
- 8/31/2011 7:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
While North Alignment would be great for bicycles, a straight line is better for pedestrians. That way there is enough visibility for bikes also, less likely to hit pedestrians.
- 8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼
I like the idea of not having to wait to cross a street at all.
- 8/26/2011 3:18 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Cable stayed bridge is more open and direct and therefore I think would be safer, visibility of others on the bridge and any other issues could be seen more easily. Basically I want the bridge crossing to be as safe as possible and those heavy steel trusses seem to crowd the path.

8/25/2011 11:39 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Apparently brings east end of bridge closest to Link and to NG shopping. (Not very clear from drawings!) Cable-stayed bridge much more attractive.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



get from point a to point b more efficiently. I prefer the cable-stayed bridge design.

8/25/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm not in favor of any bridge across I-5 !

8/25/2011 12:38 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no preference, but connecting to a parking lot isn't ideal; bad ending point for walking and biking. wayfinding needed at both ends of the bridge. plan for the parking lot to be redeveloped and the bridge to connect to a clearer path to College Way/NSCC.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seems like you get off the bridge sooner and there is less bridge to build. I'd be interested to see which offers better travel time from college to link. Also, cable-stayed looks much more attractive.

8/25/2011 11:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Continuous with street grid is more easily navigable and will feel safer and part of the overall neighborhood pedestrian infrastructure because it gives clear visual connection between destinations--As long as it also includes an above-grade segment over 1st avenue NE with an "L" shaped extension northward to directly connect with station mezzanine. Prefer Cable Stayed---Truss is clunky and claustrophobic

8/25/2011 11:36 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North Seattle Community College students coming and going would probably use a south alignment more.

8/25/2011 11:16 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I think the North Alignment compliments the nature around it more.

8/25/2011 11:12 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Provides more direct access to the Link station and transit center. I'd rather spend more time walking on the bridge near the pond than on the street next to I-5. The cable-stayed option is also much more visually appealing.

8/25/2011 11:06 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Efficiency of movement. A shorter route will attract more users. It doesn't need to look fancy. Build something that functions and will last at least 50 years.

8/25/2011 11:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Why not come off 103rd Street access for the bridge? There is already city right of way.. 103rd would be easy access for the college, medical facilities, public facilities and residential areas around a pedestrian/bike bridge. The proposed alignment seems to suggest that NSCC will be the only one to use it.. or even if that is not the case, campus access can be limited by NSCC resulting in the general public having access issues.

8/25/2011 11:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hard to tell. Prefer curvy lines to straight, but I'd need to know more before making a final call.

8/25/2011 11:00 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know where these are relative to the light rail station so I can't answer this question.

8/25/2011 10:56 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The cable stayed bridge is interesting aesthetically pleasing. The North alignment (if there is adequate lighting and security) is more interesting to me.

8/25/2011 10:53 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More "organic" look and feel. Plus, closer to busses.

8/25/2011 7:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Because it's curvier. Much more inviting. And I like the cable bridge-- more airy and light. Less menacing.

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Already at an intersection by 1st ave. But have the entrance be something that cyclists can ride up.

8/23/2011 6:03 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North alignment appears to have better access from the North, with the same access from the West.

8/22/2011 7:54 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems safer. It isn't winding through the trees where someone can be hiding. It's a straight line so you can see what's coming.

8/19/2011 3:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



no real preference - kind of hard to tell what the difference is in the photos

8/18/2011 5:52 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Prefer look to cable bridge more and North alignment flows better.

8/18/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks like it's more of a straight shot to the CC. Plus it would cost less.

8/18/2011 2:40 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Pedestrians have to back track with south alignment. Use a cable-stayed bridge, the truss is an eye sore.

8/18/2011 12:43 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



When I am walking (especially in the rain) I want to get to the bus shelter as fast as possible. A straight line is faster than curves.

8/18/2011 6:20 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Of course, the direct straight line of the south alignment is more efficient and will require less materials, and therefore, cost.

8/18/2011 12:02 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Straight view, no corners for potential safety issues.

8/17/2011 10:16 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Whichever is cheapest

8/17/2011 7:07 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Whichever is closer to the actual transit center. I prefer the steel truss design.

8/17/2011 2:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Can't read these well enuf on my phone. Like the cable bridge better.

8/17/2011 2:39 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Wow those look expensive. All that just for the Community College??? What about the rest of the city? Doesn't make sense...

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



it feels a bit more organic, like it's wrapping around the environment; the South alignment feels too structured

8/17/2011 1:01 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Whichever is less steep and is wider. It also looks suspiciously like the bridges have 3 flights of stairs- it's unreasonable to expect bicyclists to carry bikes up 3 flights of stairs- many casual commuters have old, heavy bikes, and also it can be difficult to navigate areas with lots of pedestrians while carrying a bike, without hitting people (or dogs) with the bike. It also looks like there are 180 degree turns in the proposed bridge- that is also difficult to navigate with a bike- if when walking a bike, if the bridge is thick with a pedestrians, that is an easy way to accidentally knock someone over.

8/17/2011 12:23 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The figures below are unclear as to specific locations of the proposals. Cable stayed bridges seem more attractive, but I could live with the other types if costs dictate them.

8/17/2011 12:14 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The North Alignment will be more beautiful with its curve; I worry about safety and criminal activity on both alignments, however, so I hope emergency phones and ample lighting will be part of whichever alignment is chosen. Definitely go with the cable-stayed bridge. It's very beautiful.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



The South seems to get you closer to the transit center and it is a straight shot making the walk faster.

8/17/2011 11:37 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Line of sight. For safety purposes.

8/17/2011 11:25 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Direct to NSCC

8/17/2011 11:20 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



While I like the idea of the curved, meandering bridge, it seems like it might feel safer just being straight -- having a clean view of the whole bridge as you're walking.

8/17/2011 11:11 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If a bridge is to exist, there needs to be a ramp, not stairs. People won't use the bridge otherwise. I oppose any option that does not offer ramp access.

8/17/2011 11:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I actually prefer the curved, North Alignment for visual interest, but the straight, South Alignment would allow better sight lines for bike/pedestrian safety.

8/17/2011 10:57 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



keep pond green area for more meanderings. more likely to have bike/ped incidents with windy curves when people are hurrying to catch buses.

8/17/2011 10:52 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I prefer the North alignment because I live north of Northgate. Also, please make sure bikes can bike off the bridge without having to dismount and walk down stairs.

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to the mall as well.

8/14/2011 10:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to the mall as well.

8/14/2011 9:59 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to the mall as well.

8/14/2011 9:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



they seem about the same to me.

8/14/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to where the buses leave from

8/10/2011 9:01 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It just seems more efficient, straightforward, and more in line with what people are already accustomed to with the access at 92nd.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The only one remotely practical for cyclists is the South Steel truss bridge, and even that is pretty crap on the mall side. Can't you do better ?

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Clean lines and design.

8/9/2011 9:03 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



more interesting, more reminiscent of other cities and not having a free way look to it, more user friendly with bends

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Seems like the South Alignment is a shorter, more direct option.

8/9/2011 3:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Sorry I don't see what you mean by N or S alignment, it looks mostly E-W to me.

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More direct. Shorter walk.

8/9/2011 10:48 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It would be easier to get to the transit station.

8/9/2011 10:01 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I like the organic curviness

8/9/2011 9:42 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It seems to follow the contours of the land better. I don't seem to be able to "place a dot" on my choice of style - I prefer the cable-stayed bridge.

8/9/2011 8:39 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



shortest path

8/9/2011 8:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More direct,, less invasive of the open space west of the freeway

8/8/2011 5:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Hard to tell on the map but looks like it takes the bikes closer to the center of Northgate,
Prefer cable style

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Neither, It is already easy to cross at 95th. Why is this needed at all? This is changing a 10 minute walk to a five minute walk right? I suppose the South alignment is cheaper and has less disruption of traffic on 1st so I support that more. The cables are much more attractive than the truss. A way to improve this proposal to me would be to extend the east end of the bridge to street level with more bridge. At least bike could use it as well then.

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks more cost-efficient.

8/8/2011 11:10 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



connects directly to the street on the NG side. Less impact on the green space.

8/8/2011 10:30 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



North alignment encroaches on NSCC wetland. Also, south alignment connects more directly with the street (100th??), so will be more convenient and possibly safer for bicycle riders as well as pedestrians coming from the neighborhood to east.

8/8/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to Northgate Mall.

8/7/2011 11:49 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Better access to whole northgate area.

8/6/2011 6:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It is a direct path. Shorter distance. I think more people would use it.

8/6/2011 12:25 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



More interesting walk and ends up nearer to the transit center. Cable-stayed style more interesting to the eye.

8/6/2011 11:13 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I'm not great at reading these pictures but it would make sense to have a direct path to the station so people can easily pick up a bus or train.

8/5/2011 9:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



South is more direct (straight line) and is probably more cost effective as well. While I prefer the prettier cable stayed bridge, I think the steel truss bridge would be better as you can more easily put a cover over it so pedestrians don't end up getting soaked.

8/5/2011 7:28 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



straightforward

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't know.

8/4/2011 4:34 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks shorter and cheaper (maybe?) No major problems either way.

8/4/2011 2:37 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



with cable stayed bridge-more attractive and pleasant route, more visually appealing. Also, neither option presents the direct connection to the LINK station---bad! Keep the connection to the plaza level of the LINK station, as was presented at the 30% design presentation, let's not get cheap and regret it later. I find it hard to believe the additional cost wouldn't be worth the utility to the pedestrian and biking community!!!!!!

8/4/2011 12:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't feel strongly about this one. I'd go with whichever option is cheaper.

8/4/2011 11:35 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



its shortwr, seems like it would be cheaper, hence more likely.

8/4/2011 10:47 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I don't feel safe walking through North Seattle Community College's campus

8/4/2011 9:40 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Direct access to the station.

8/4/2011 9:17 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



less interference with pond

8/4/2011 8:46 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It looks to blend in with the surrounding environment more. I also like the cable-stayed bridge option as it is more aesthetically pleasing.

8/4/2011 8:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The walking distance after crossing the Freeway is less and the curve makes the bridge more interesting. I like the cables better than the steel but did not figure out how to place a dot.

8/4/2011 8:26 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Closer to mall and residential area to the north.

8/4/2011 7:41 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Looks a lot quicker and less money to build?

8/4/2011 6:45 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



It looks shorter and more affordable. The cable version is very pretty, but I'd be happy with any pedestrian bridge

8/4/2011 6:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



either are fine

8/4/2011 3:07 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Gut feeling. Wish I could see better exactly where those are....

8/3/2011 11:30 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I have no preference, but in both cases I think the bridge should land on the mezzanine level of the station itself (crossing over 1st ave) rather than ending a block away from the station. If the bridge extended all the way to the station, perhaps some of the costs could be recouped by avoiding building a separate elevator/stair tower west of 1st ave.

8/3/2011 9:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



whichever is less expensive to install.

8/3/2011 8:55 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I am not particularly tied to either one so cost would be the factor, if price is equal there is something more attractive about North.

8/3/2011 8:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



and I like the cable style bridge. I like the straight bridge for security -- you can see the whole way over. It should be well lit, with security phones.

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

Access Alignment Ave

Bridge Cable Stayed Cheaper

Closer Connection Freeway Hard Idea

Interesting Looks Organic Parking

Path Pedestrian Infrastructure Pond Safe Safety

Station Straight Line Straightforward Transit

Center Whichever

14. Public Health - Improving Quality of Life What are your top three preferences for helping overall public health in Northgate? Pick three of the following. Other?

Ask: Is this a place where parents would want lots of children running around? A sustainable society has multiple generations of related people.

10/20/2011 6:44 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Making northgate area feel less connected to the freeway and more of an intimate, lively neighborhood will be important. Providing buffers from freeway noise (design buildings at west edge of mall parking lot, create public space between new buildings and mall, relocate vast parking areas to garages?)

9/28/2011 10:05 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Besides transit, Northgate is becoming more residential. The new residents need to feel safe walking in their area, biking and as if they do not need a vehicle to live there.

8/31/2011 2:49 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



More park 'n ride parking.

8/25/2011 3:04 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



farmer's markets are great, but it would need to be open several days a week to make the space worth it. community gardens are available nearly 24/7. the single best thing you can do for outdoor air quality is slash the number of cars and amount of driving in the area. good, interesting places to walk or bike to, and comfortable, vibrant paths to walk or bike to them on, would really help get people active without cars.

8/25/2011 12:21 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



If you gather, they will come! I think with some opportunities for business investment (jobs), pedestrian access, nice gathering spaces & the ability to buy food/coffee right off of the gathering areas, you will turn this into a thriving area. Thanks for asking!

8/23/2011 10:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Going to need to patrol the NSCC park if you put that big expensive bridge in. Otherwise its going to become a multi million dollar bridge to all the bum encampments out there.

8/17/2011 1:11 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



Northgate is prone to criminal activity. The transit station and pedestrian bridge will thus also be susceptible to criminal activity if measures are not taken in advance to proactively prevent criminality from taking hold. Lighting needs to be ample. Emergency phones need to be available (although not too conspicuous, as they can make an area feel dangerous unnecessarily). Foot and bike traffic needs to be high at all hours of the day. A high-end grocery store and middle class residential facilities will go a long way to making the area safe.

8/17/2011 11:40 AM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



If there was a way to bike safely from the North Haller Lake neighborhood to the Northgate 24 Hour Fitness and Northgate Library I might be more inclined to ride my bike instead of drive; currently I do not feel safe enough biking near the intersection of 5th Ave NE & Northgate Way. Is there some safe way to bike along Northgate Way or near there? I do not like biking by cars that are frequently turning so I end up driving myself. Incidentally, when I lived in Boulder, CO I biked all the time due to separate bike paths so I felt very safe being a cyclist; living in Seattle I pretty much drive everywhere and walk to close locations. I can't wait for the Northgate Light Rail Station!

8/16/2011 4:56 PM [View Responses](#)[Categorize As](#) ▼



I would prefer to develop Northgate into a hub where I can do all my shopping. As it is now, I have to drive to the city or Bellevue for anything major. I would travel less if Northgate wasn't such an empty hub. Currently, the mall has limited shops that are pretty basic. I hope with more people transiting we can bring in more business while keeping the are safe and clean.

8/10/2011 4:19 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Thank you for providing on line survey. I live in the area but was unable to attend meeting d/t work

8/9/2011 11:58 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Make the mall less car-dependent. You have to walk or bike through a sea of cars to get anywhere. And the traffic flow in the parking lot and on the streets around the mall is convoluted at best - particularly at the NW and SE corners of the mall.

8/9/2011 11:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



In your rush to build upwards, please be aware that part of "quality of Life" is the need to see the sky, and the weather, and interact with what nature is left in the area. Northgate may be dominated by parking lots and asphalt but at least a person can see what sunshine there is, unlike the steel canyons downtown. Don't take that away from the people that live nearby!

8/9/2011 10:41 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



The was actually a well put together survey and I can tell a lot of thought has gone into it. Please have the city or community group okay a pickup of the garbage under the freeway underpass. If a stunning bridge overpass was put in, I think it would popularize the community college as well as living in the area. A bike lane could connect along to GreenLake if it was a safe one and pull people there on the weekends for recreational opportunities. I am also noticing that more and more folks will hike up to three miles for recreation even seniors. I think even some of the Mall businesses might throw in some philanthropic monies for the bridge. If the bridge and connecting infrastructure was really nice, I could see a symbiosis of computer science classes, and perhaps a few small IT satellite offices in the Northgate area such as Facebook. It has to have a good - highend? feel or they will not attract the high end knowlege workers. I also think another attraction would be some large East./West solar panels on the mall and then Green Advertising it as one of the first malls in America and one of the First Malls to undertake solar panel. It also shows that the mall is still vibrant. One other item, is seems like the remodeled mall is not bike friendly at all. Lastly, build the tunnel downtown. Mayor McSchwinn gives lawyers a bad name with his flip-flopping nuanced laywerspeak.

8/9/2011 4:20 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This was a fascinating survey causing me to think more about neighborhood planning.
Thanks

8/9/2011 10:59 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Day care, with park for kids to go to.

8/9/2011 8:29 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Please accelerate the light rail construction. Berlin did multiple links in 12 years and Shanghai in 3. Shouldn't take 10+ years to get one link to Northgate.

8/8/2011 4:42 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



I am surprised by the focus of this question on Public Health. The largest public health issue in this area is particulate matter from exshuast on I-5. I suppose transit in theory would affect that the most but I am skeptical that ridership could improve enough to make the PM10 drop. But to answer the spirit of the question, the largest difference that a large project could create for this area is an addition to the retail and commerce vibrancy. A good mental health boost!

8/8/2011 12:31 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Thanks for asking!!! you people seem to be really thinking about how to make the community better and we appreciate it!

8/5/2011 9:55 AM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



affordable housing would be #4

8/4/2011 6:53 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



All of the above.

8/3/2011 8:36 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This questionnaire is highly flawed. It's a set up.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This questionnaire is highly flawed. It's a set up.

8/3/2011 6:27 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



This transit station and all that goes with it should serve the needs of residents and commuters -- it should provide services that are a mixing-point for both of those constituencies. It should be inviting in a clean, modern way that will not look dated very soon. It should feel uplifting, even on rainy days. I have to add that it would be nice if there

was a taxi stand -- taxis are a better option than one's own car when bus, for some reason, is not an option. At the very least, could there be taxi numbers posted?

8/3/2011 5:00 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



retired

8/3/2011 4:17 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



You will just do what you want and then jam it to us we have no say but thanks for asking.

8/3/2011 3:56 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



Improve pedestrian safety by decreasing traffic congestion.

8/3/2011 3:10 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼



If there were a 4th option it would be 'access to healthy food' thank you.

8/3/2011 3:06 PM [View Responses](#) [Categorize As](#) ▼

[Bike](#) [Food](#) [Northgate](#) [Option](#)

[Parking](#) [Public](#) [Questionnaire is Highly Flawed](#)
[Survey Thanks for Asking](#) [Traffic](#)
[Transit Station](#)