



**Seattle  
Design  
Commission**

**APPROVED  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
1 August 2002**

Gregory J. Nickels,  
*Mayor*

Donald Royse  
*Chair*

Tom Bykonen

Ralph Cipriani

Jack Mackie

Cary Moon

Iain M. Robertson

David Spiker

Sharon E. Sutton

Tory Laughlin Taylor

John Rahaim,  
*Executive Director*

Layne Cubell,  
*Commission Coordinator*

Projects Reviewed

High Point Library  
High Point Community Center Expansion  
Street Improvement Manual  
Transportation Discussion

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 5:00pm

Commissioners Present

Donald Royse, Chair  
Jack Mackie, Vice Chair  
Tom Bykonen  
Ralph Cipriani  
Cary Moon  
Iain M. Robertson  
David Spiker  
Sharon E. Sutton

Staff Present

John Rahaim  
Layne Cubell  
Brad Gassman  
Anna O'Connell



Department of Design,  
Construction & Land Use

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104-5070  
phone 206/233-7911  
fax 206/386-4039

---

**1 Aug 2002** Project: **High Point Library**

Phase: Design Development—Follow Up

Previous Reviews: 18 July 2002 (Design Development), 18 April 2002 (Schematic Design Update), 7 July 2000 (Schematics), 4 April 2000 (Pre-Design)

Presenter: Brad Miller, Selkirk Miller Hayashi Architects

Attendees: Alex Harris, Seattle Public Libraries  
Douglas Bailey, Seattle Public Libraries  
George Nemeth, Seattle Housing Authority  
Michael Jenkins, DCLU  
Vivian McLean

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00112)

**Action:** **The Commission appreciates the team’s concern for the project and their rapid response to the Commission’s comments of the last meeting, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Design Commission welcomes the team’s enhancement of the landscape design and meeting room fenestration;**
- **lauds the team’s approach to the landscape in which they have created usable exterior spaces;**
- **recommends that the team continue to develop the meeting room’s north and west elevations to enhance its civic presence and its relationship to the main body of the library;**
- **encourages the team to carry the courtyard pavement into the main entry as a gesture of integrating outdoor and indoor spaces;**
- **urges the team to reduce or eliminate the paving around the street trees at the northwest corner of the site; and**
- **confirms approval of the design development.**

The proponents focused further development of the High Point Library design development on enhancing outdoor spaces by looking at them in more detail; creating more transparency at the northwest corner for a more civic presence on the street; and lowering the windows, especially on the south side, to make it more kid friendly.

The issue of transparency was studied at the site level and at the building level. At the site level, the proponents wanted to take advantage of the corner location using landscape. They looked at several alternatives for landscape treatment. At the urban design scale, the landscape would be run the length of 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW in the form of a linear street park. The street park would consist of benches and 10’ planting strips that work around the existing trees, and would possibly entail relocation of the bus shelter. This creates a deep buffer for the library building.

In the second scheme a corner plaza is developed and the buffer and seating wall at the corner of the building are retained from the first scheme. The steps located at this corner in previous designs have been spread out to become more ramp-like to pull the sense of the entry plaza out onto the street.

The third alternative, which has become the preferred alternative, takes the second scheme further by using permeable pavers in the entry and bringing them up to the edge of the building. Architecturally, this scheme involves putting bay or larger windows at this corner bigger to create an immediate response at the personal, pedestrian scale rather than at the vehicular level. There is an opportunity to create seating around the trees in this corner where there is presently a bus shelter. In this scheme, the bus shelter is

relocated to the area between the library and health center. The proponents considered other alternatives for bus shelter placement: remove the bus shelter and use the benches under the trees in its place or move the shelter away from the building and closer to the street to be used as street furniture.

The objective for east courtyard was to better define the space. This is accomplished through landscaping and modifying the paving as it gets closer to the building and bringing unit pavers through the lobby to tie the outdoor spaces together. This also creates a welcome mat on the east side. The east courtyard is much quieter than the entry on 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW and is shaped to be a place for reading and social interaction. The 22' X 22" seating court is bound by a low concrete wall on one side and boulders are used to create smaller conversational areas. The courtyard and landscape create a buffer for the staff room and between the building and parking lot, giving a sense of retreat and separation.

The south courtyard consists of a seating wall with a planter and there is the potential to integrate another low seating wall. This space is meant to serve as a transition through which the plaza space is pulled into the entry.

The proponents looked at a number of alternatives for the building at the corner, ranging from glazing entire end of building to a projected corner bay window. The projected bay window in the meeting room would be longer on the north side rather than the west to avoid distractions from the traffic on 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW and to take advantage of north light. A bay would allow for the preservation of sufficient wall space in the meeting room for a white board and hanging/display space. Another potential architectural treatment is to let the brick dematerialize into vertical strips to create a complementary rhythm with the verticality of the trees. The team's preferred alternative is to develop a large, low bay window because it develops an indoor/outdoor relationship, provides a focal point in the meeting room, and affords a view to the northwest.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Appreciates the work that the design team has done and appreciates that the meeting room must be functional. It is important to be able to look out from the meeting room into the community and the proponents' device to create a visual connection at the northwest is a good way of doing this. Likes sweeping the plaza all the way through the building. Suggests that the proponents look at the intimacies in the back garden and bring some of that into the building.
- Would like to know if the team considered modifying the shape or configuration of the building itself. The sketches of the alternatives shown indicate landscape initiatives and changes in fenestration. Is not suggesting major changes in the configuration, just suggesting that proponents look at building frontally and apply the same studies that have been done on the elevation to massing configuration in order to best fit this piece with the rest of the building.
  - Proponents stated that they considered this and there is a way to reconfigure the volume, but it would mean changing the whole entry, public spaces, and circulation. Reconfiguration would allow entry to happen in northwest corner, which would be a civic gesture, but then the opportunity to create the entry spaces is lost. Have considered that option, but feel that the current plan offers benefits that would be lost in reconfiguring the volumes.
- Would like to see glazing on the southwest corner match that on the northwest corner to bring the building more together and bracket the building itself. It provides an open gesture that ties all three components of massing together. Would like to see more glazing brought into the meeting room as a way to identify the scheme and as an introduction to the meeting room.
  - A proponent from Seattle Public Libraries stated that she reacted differently to the

scheme in which there was the same amount of glazing on the south side of the entrance and the meeting room. Feels that the building then starts to look like a school with the glazing more fully occupying the elevation and that the interplay between different amounts of glazing on each side conveys the public presence of a library. Wants the building to be open and inviting to public, but also need the meeting room to work.

- As a purely aesthetic preference (as opposed a functional preference), likes the sketch showing a large window on the north and, when looking at the model, would like to see more glazing.
  - Proponents stated that they explored taking the panel of glazing south of the entrance and pushing it to the corner on the north. In looking at this option, preferred the solid corner that is strong, reflects the sun, and provides a warm backdrop over a transparent corner that says this is the main event.
- Would prefer more glazing on the 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW side, but feels that the changes in the landscaping, especially the addition of the hardscape, and the addition of the corner window have made a substantial difference. The flow created by the pavers going through the entrance is good and the small changes that have been made have an enormous impact to create a much more civic presence.
- Feels that the second alternative is too big of a statement and the gesture is covered by the trees so it gets lost. Agrees that the proponents preferred solution, alternative three, is preferable, but urges team to consider the amount of glass on south side.
- Feels that the landscaping is interesting and that the diagonal created from the front to the back of the building is powerful. Suggests that the paving be brought through the building to continue the sweeping gesture so that a person in the lobby will feel the same diagonal pull.
  - Proponents stated that it is possible to take the paving through as a frame and inset carpet or some other acoustical material within the frame.
- Believes that construction of the building itself will be a strain on the cedar trees and suggests that they will not survive in the preferred alternative because there is paving over their fibrous root systems.
  - Proponents pointed out that there is some existing paving underneath the trees at present and would like to know if it is better to pave right under the trees.
- Believes that paving must either be outside the drip line because these trees' roots are close to the surface and wide spread or very close to the tree and not out where feeder roots are as long as major roots are not cut through. Encourages team to consider that in many respects solid pavers are better than open pavers because they distribute the load.
- Feels that these trees are not attractive enough to be worth compromising the design, but understands that this is possibly a public relations/neighborhood issue. Believes that if proponents could show the promise of something that would be better, more attractive, and healthy for life of structure, he would support taking the trees out.
  - Proponents stated that this would be a PR issue.
- Suggests that the plaza all the way to the corner is not critical, so the trees could be kept. Applauds the team's work on the social spaces and connecting them to one another. Cautions them, if seating is put outside of the plaza, to be very mindful of its location.
- Is concerned about the meeting room's connection with the library and encourages team to consider

pushing in the opposite direction to make the room its own lantern on the corner. Suggests that the meeting room could not imitate the rest of library, i.e., maybe the roof is not the same form, but that it's its own piece that connects through.

- Suggests that from outside the function of the working wall as a drawing board, place where speakers stand, and so on, because it is a solid piece of structure, will be apparent and that this civic presence could be conveyed by bracketing with glazing.
- Would like to know if it's possible to bring paving into the right-of-way. Feels that the paving under the trees is not critical and bringing the pavers out onto the sidewalk would be an interesting gesture.
- Believes that the Commission does not typically encourage this, but since this is a public building it might be possible.
- Is concerned that, if the angle that is different than the sidewalk is kept, cutting the pavers to be fine points will be difficult and the points will break easily making for a messy transition. Suggests that team use a jagged line that the sidewalk is brought in slightly.
- Suggests that the paving at the corner is not necessary and could be eliminated.
- Would like to know how wide the planter in the seat wall at main plaza is.
  - Proponents stated that it is about 3' wide.
- Believes that this is not wide enough for plants to grow because it is west-facing and will be hot, dry, and windy and suggests that the plaza is big enough to make planting area wider.
- Would like to know if Seattle libraries fly the flag and, if so, whether the team considered the placement of a flagpole.
  - Proponent stated that Seattle libraries do not fly the flag.
- Believes that the first drawing is the strongest and that if the secondary and tertiary paving are eliminated, the main paving that goes into the library could be blended into the sidewalk. The corner could then be treated as the green, soft area and all of this would reinforce the notion of the oblique line going through the building.
  - Proponents stated that up until most recent iteration, figured that the bus shelter would remain on that corner. As it stands, the shelter is right between the trees and is a foreground element. Realize that it is an element of the urban landscape, but it is also another layer for consideration in trying to get transparency at the corner. Would like to know if the Commission has experience in working with Metro to move these.
- Recognizes that there was a program in which you could work with artists to do unique bus shelters, but the basic bus shelter structure is still used. Metro does encourage individual property owners to incorporate bus shelters into building, but it's too late to do this.
- Believes that many bus shelters are curbside rather than on the property side. Protection from weather needs to be on the street side and to the south and if you turn the bus shelter around, the glass will protect from southwest winds and rains.
- Suggests the team take the planter part out of seat wall/planter in the southwest courtyard, increase its width, and make it just a bench.
- Believes that the Commission's record is to encourage more civic gesture out on the public sidewalk

and would like the Commission to not be too constrained to push elements into the street to create a civic presence.

**Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- A member of the High Point community states that the cedars are an unusual tree that was put in the neighborhood by the University. Feels that taking them out would be a PR issue and that proponents would need to explain to the community that more suitable trees would replace the cedars.

---

**1 Aug 2002** Project: **High Point Community Center Expansion**

Phase: Schematic Design Update

Previous Review: 18 July 2002 (Schematic Design)

Presenters: Mark Johnson, Seattle Parks and Recreation  
Sam Cameron, Streeter ArchitectsAttendees: Michael Jenkins, DCLU  
Renzo Nakata, Nakano Associates

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00271)

**Action:** The Commission appreciates the team coming back so quickly and discussing the Parks Department's community center design principles in its presentation, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Design Commission believes there are still unresolved, competing design agendas with the project;
- feels that the mirrored plan creates an awkward plan relationship and encourages the team to explore other plan alternatives to link the existing and new elements of the building;
- urges the team to consider moving the building expansion slightly to the northwest to create more open space and better access to the south;
- does not approve the schematic design.

The *1999 Community Center Levy Program: Design Principles*, a document meant to help designers and reviewers get started, has three parts: five principles, a template for architectural space assignment, and design standards. The design principles, specifically, are the elements of the program with which the Parks Department feels the Commission can provide the most assistance. The principles are meant to drive how a center serves its community, the character of the places and spaces that compose the center, and the values that the community center should embody. The five principles are expression of community, recognition of context, connections, articulation, and sensory delight. Within the expression of community the team sought to look at location and movement, spatial expression, and developing a sense of community across generations. In terms of recognition of context, this is primarily a nod to the fact that community centers are now part of the urban fabric. Under the connections principle, the team wanted to relate the site to the city; relate human life and activities to the ecology of the site; relate building to immediate landscape; and relate the materials, including plant material, to the passage of time. In terms of articulation, the exterior should reveal the interior spaces activities and the building itself should create a sense of outdoor rooms. Sensory delight should include delight in spatial, thermal, and acoustic experiences, and plantings should stimulate the senses of smell and taste.

The design team looked at the site again at the macro level to help envision how the community center fits into the High Point Community. Previously, the community center has been used primarily by High Point residents, but the future vision is that it will be available to greater West Seattle. The community center is located at a low point on Parks Department property with Parks property surrounding the center to the south and east, and school district property to the north. The community center is hidden because it sits down in an embankment and is surrounded by vegetation.

One street, 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue, allows vehicular access to the site. Pedestrians, the primary users, access the site via 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue, go through the site at the south end, walk from the corner of 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Myrtle Street, and walk from the Hope V development to the east. Most people who use the community center itself come in via the adjacent playfields.

The design team's effort is to look at forms that will make the center a significant entity in the community and convey a civic character. The spatial relationships in the building and the main axis are the same as in the Commission's last review of this project.

The proponents have attempted to make a "front porch" feel at the entry so that the building is more welcoming. To achieve this, the entry is open and well lit, and the front has been kept transparent. The roof extends out over this space, but will be made of translucent panels or something that allows light to go through. There will also be seating here to make it more of a social space. In addition, as a response to the Commission's suggestion to simplify the floor plan, the wall at the entrance is continuous.

Because of programmatic issues, the location of the childcare center remains at the back. Parents have to check in at the front desk to pick up or drop off children and this scheme best suits that. The outdoor space at the southeast corner by the childcare center is the "back porch" and is framed by a 3' retaining wall. It is an extension of the spaces that open out onto it (childcare center and teen center) and it provides access to the playfields. It can also serve to accommodate overflow from the abutting two rooms. In terms of connecting interior and exterior spaces, the main axis is further emphasized and the paving pattern may be continued onto the back porch. To create visual stimulus, the team worked with different volumes, shapes, and textures throughout.

Terracing was added adjacent to the childcare center to allow for more solar access. In addition, some of the roof will be glazed. The southwest corner was squared off and the childcare center was pushed back to create a bigger façade.

Another scheme that addresses the east-west access that the Commission discussed last time has been explored in a cursory sketch.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Would like to know if the proponents talked with the school district about swapping property.
  - Proponents stated that this would add 1–2 years to the project.
  - Proponents stated that security could be an issue and that it might not be a good idea to invite people to come through the east-west axis when the community center is closed.
- Would like to know if the people coming for the bus stop going to be coming across the playfields.
  - Proponents stated that they would.
- Would like to know whether, because the storage room is in the hillside and the site slopes abruptly, the contours go around the west corner. Suggests that if that is the case, a premium is being paid for a little building and the corner may have to be shored.
  - Proponents stated that the contours do go around the corner. Further stated that they looked at siting the addition elsewhere, but at this location it turns out to be less expensive to operate over the life of the building.
- Would like to know whether, because there is no east-west axis/access, people will have to go around tennis courts. Would like to know if there is not an established path to the north.
  - Proponents stated that people would need to go around tennis courts and that there is no established path to the north. There is however, access across school district property to the east and north of the community center site.
- Would like to know how people will be funneled from parking lot to the social space and how they



will know where to go.

- Proponents stated that the paving pattern indicates direction in which to go. It is also the only place people can go and will be defined with planting and landscape. In addition, Parks Department has plans to do an art project at the entry.
- Is concerned that art for all community centers is in the interior not the exterior.
  - Proponents stated that artists doing work for community centers are supposed to respond to the scheme of the building and this art will focus on the outside.
- Would like to know how real the idea of creating an east-west axis that can be cut through is and is concerned that it would involve a lot more excavation and retaining wall costs. Would also like to know where, in elevation, the path is.
  - Proponents stated that creating the axis is possible and that the proposed path in that scheme begins at the top elevation and drops down 5'. The costs would be retaining the edge of the tennis court.
- Would like to know if there is anything architecturally positive to be gained from the retaining wall. Last time the design team discussed possibility of creating protected space surrounded by green outside the childcare center near that same zone and wonders if there is something positive like this that could be gained from the earth moving and retaining above and beyond just holding back earth.
  - Proponents stated that they would have to be careful because a 10' retaining wall is needed in order to make this a space for use specifically by the childcare center.
- Acknowledges that this would be more work and more costly, but the benefit would be a private space for the childcare center that receives south sun.
  - Proponents stated that if they brought the grade of the childcare room across to the tennis courts, the necessary 10' retaining wall along with the sun angle would only allow sun to enter the childcare room near ceiling level. Proponents stated that they have chosen to excavate in a way that expands the reception space at the east entry and allows for more daylight into childcare room and views outward at the kids' level. Further stated that they do not have space directly adjacent to the childcare center to provide ideal play space.
- Would like to know what the design team's changes are that address the Commission's previous comments and concerns.
  - Proponents stated that they are presenting a number of different schemes with different options that respond to the Commission's comments. In general volumes and forms were simplified and there is less articulation in the exterior walls of the building. One roof form for all of the spaces was created, and the existing roof was extended so it becomes a mirror image. A vertical element in the form of a series of skylights defines the east-west axis.
- Is concerned that the three major parts of the design, the mirror image idea, it being a one-story building, and building on the south side, do not work together. Feels that the team is always compromising and fighting the site and that one of those things should be let go. Believes that the child's area does not work if there is a sidewalk, the pedestrian route is a must, back porch is too cramped and not generous enough as back door, front plaza is not defined enough as a social space and is not inviting. Encourages proponents to talk with the Parks Department to find a solution.
  - Proponents stated that they are not starting with a clean slate and that they have been charged with making an addition to an existing community center. The Parks department has already made decisions such as locating the addition on the south side and the

proponents cannot change the site.

- Agrees that the design components are not working together and that the butterfly/mirror roof produces a dichotomy and is trapping them into an awkward form. It creates awkward plan relationships, problematic relationships with existing grade, and the team is not getting much return architecturally—for example, they are not getting bonuses like the sensory delight that the guidelines mention. Urges the team to consider throwing out the wing-shaped roof and possibly repeat slope from north to south to maintain the diagonal path of the roof, which would free up from constriction in plan.
  - Proponents stated that they have looked at the roof idea, but it does not work with the geometry of the building.
- Feels that this alternative would really put the childcare center in the basement.
- Is trying to find a way to keep the addition on the same site.
- Believes that it is not the roof shape, but the footprint that is problematic. Suggests that the whole building be slid up to gain space in back porch area.
  - Proponents stated that the roof is already at the setback.
- Feels that the roof could be resolved and that the footprint is more important. Feels that sliding the building would also address the issue of there being more space than necessary in the front, while the back porch is too small.
- Suggests that, from looking at the site plan, there is a lot of room between the building and the property line, which would allow for moving the addition.
- Would like to know if, although there appears to be room, the proponents can move the building given the setback code.
  - Proponents stated that, as it is, they will likely need an administrative conditional use permit because there are two institutions within 600' of each other so the door is already open to modifying requirements. Another aspect of this permit is it lets you play with the setback, however, if they change setback must mitigate impacts of having a building closer than code allows.
- Encourages proponents to follow up on moving addition and changing setback because it would allow for a lot more room between the childcare center and the back steps.
- Encourages team to also look at moving the childcare center slightly as per the Commission's suggestion last time because it would allow for more glazing on the east side and exposure to exterior.
- Is concerned that the roof is an unfriendly approach to the building because it's like walking into a sword. Urges the proponents to get rid of the points of the roof at the entrance and if mirror scheme is kept, then have the mirror be two different angles.
  - Proponents stated that they can look at getting rid of one point, but the one on the existing building would be difficult to remove from a structural standpoint.
- Would like to give proponents a chance to address issues that the Commission brought up. Suggests continue status of project and have the team come back.
- Urges the team to come back with diagrams and sketches on trace, not CAD drawings.

### **Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- Would like to know if the childcare center is new to the site or if it is replacing an existing childcare program.
  - Proponents stated that it is a completely new childcare facility that accommodates 27 children. The childcare program can accommodate more children if there is other space in

the community center to use, but there is dedicated space for 27 children.

---

**1 Aug 2002** Project: **Street Improvement Manual**  
Phase: Briefing  
Presenter: Kathleen Kern  
Attendees: Geri Beardsley, Legislative Department  
Lyle Bicknell, CityDesign  
Leo Kaarrekoski, SDOT

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00229)

**Action:** **The Commission appreciates the explanation of the team's good work, believes that the project is on track, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Design Commission encourages the team to pursue a different interpretation by the law department of the distinction between required minimum standards and recommended additional standards;**
- **recommends that the team expand the scope of the manual to include sign ordinances and the undergrounding of utilities;**
- **supports the use of the manual as an opportunity to compile all of the relevant information in one place;**
- **suggests that clear a diagram and explanation of what rules will have jurisdiction in what locations be place at the beginning of the manual;**
- **encourages the team to develop issues papers that are clear on policy;**
- **urges the team to hold the pedestrian experiences as a guiding principle throughout its work;**
- **encourages the team to have available, as part of web-based system, a graphic file of best and worst practices;**
- **urges the proponents to design a successful web-based system from the outset;**
- **encourages the team to work closely with the private sector to keep reminding everyone of the significance of good design as a contributor to the City's economic vitality; and**
- **recommends that the team hold workshops to inspire best practices.**

The *Street Improvement Manual* is in the process of being revised by city staff, a project lead by Barbara Gray. Last year, the scope and strategy for improving the manual were defined. A report was compiled that contained an analysis of what needed revision and how it would be revised, what the complex issues were, and who would be involved in the project. In addition, SDOT, DCLU, and SPU made revising the manual a priority and got two-year funding for the project.

This year, steps being taken include creating a work plan, structuring a project team and a process for getting input, and identifying best practices from other cities. Some of the lessons learned from the best practices study include the need for clarity, guidelines that tell the reader how to find other relevant policies, clear explanations of procedures, specific designation of street classifications, logical organization, and clear graphics.

The next step is to develop small issue papers on topics such as street classification, green streets, land-use codes, pedestrian streets, special districts, neighborhood master plans, and alternative procedures and variances i.e., alternative/natural drainage and alternative materials. The expected date of completion is

2004, but the approach will be to tackle pieces at a time and adopt these as the project progresses. The hope is that the manual will become a guiding document for every action done in the right-of-way.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Is disheartened by the opinion of the city's law department on what the City can do in terms of guidance versus mandate when other local governments have taken the posture of mandate for certain developments and would like to see the project team pursue this issue further.
- Feels that, in the big picture, the team is focusing on the public side and would like to see them look closely at the most progressive places where similar manuals are part of a broad, comprehensive strategy so that pieces would work together. There are two critical pieces that must work with this to get the full benefit of what we are trying to accomplish in the right-of-way: undergrounding of utilities and on-site sign ordinances in the private sector (cluttering of arterials hinders mobility).
- Took a different interpretation of the law department statement. Feels that the problem with existing regulations is how unclear they are, in part because there are guidelines, recommendations, and neighborhood plans apart from SDOT's actual requirements. Interpreted it to mean that the law department is saying you can only enforce what is actually on the books, which would force the City to clarify what is on the books.
- Believes that what the law department is saying is that you cannot put anything beyond the normal standards on the books. In the public right-of-way you cannot require additional standards for one area over another.
- Would like to know, in case studies, if there is a method for updating the manual is so it does not get out of date. Would also like to know if a visual databank of online resources is being included and what the distribution/audience of the issue papers is.
  - City staff stated that the issue papers address and spell out major policy issues and address different perspectives. They are intended to help the leadership team make decisions. Also stated that there will be a subscription system that will send out updates of the manual to subscribers. Had not thought of including visuals, but feels that it is a good suggestion.
- Urge the proponents to look for opportunities to bring in the private sector so they can see the benefit of changing the way the City does business and can see that it is a way of doing business.
- Encourages the team to keep the individual pedestrian experience as a guiding principle. While this does not apply to industrial areas, it does apply to arterials and suggests locating utilities under the street so they do not hinder the pedestrian experience.
  - City staff stated that they have learned from Portland, where pedestrian travel is the primary means of travel. In the next two months will develop a set of principles to which the manual will subscribe.
- Urges the team to be firm in the idea of having all the information in one place. With the complexity of the city, a diagram of what rules to follow where would also be useful. Also encourages the team to make a commitment from the outset to have a web-based system and work with web designers early on.
- Would like to know if there is a proposed new structure for the manual.

- City staff stated that they are basically starting from scratch and the manual will be restructured and contain new information.
- Suggests that draw in private sector and build into work plan a series of workshops directed at big developers that the City works with the most.

**1 August 2002 Commission Business**

- |                         |    |  |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| <b>ACTION ITEMS</b>     | A. | <u>TIMESHEETS</u>  |
|                         | B. | <u>MINUTES FROM 18 JULY 2002</u> —APPROVED                       |
|                         | C. | <u>VACATIONS CHECKLIST</u> —CUBELL                               |
| <b>DISCUSSION ITEMS</b> | D. | <u>NORTHGATE AND GASWORKS PARK CONSULTANT SELECTION</u> — CUBELL |
|                         | E. | <u>GET ENGAGED PROGRAM UPDATE</u> —CUBELL                        |
|                         | F. | <u>HIGH POINT UPDATE</u> —GASSMAN                                |
|                         | G. | <u>UDRC UPDATE</u> —CUBELL                                       |
| <b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>    | H. | <u>VIADUCT REVIEW SESSION</u> —WEEK OF 19 AUGUST 2002            |

---

**1 Aug 2002** Project: **Commission Business**

Phase: Staff Briefing

Time: 2.75 hours

**Summary: The Commission discussed the status of commissioners' outside commitments.**

**Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- David Spiker was on the selection panel for South Park, Greenwood, and Southwest libraries. The architect chosen for South Park Library is Johnston Architects; for Greenwood Library it is Buffalo Design; and for Southwest Library it is Olson Sundberg Kundig Allen Architects.
- Cary Moon reported on the selection panel for South Lake Union Park. Hargreaves Associates and Mithun will be designing the park.
- Sharon Sutton sat on the selection panel for the Jefferson Community Center and Lake City Civic Center. ARC Architects have been named the designers for Jefferson Community Center and Hewitt Architects have been selected for the Lake City Civic Center.
- The Commission also discussed ongoing commitments such as Design Commission representation on the Light Rail Review Panel and Public Art Advisory Panel.



---

1 Aug 2002 Project: **Transportation Discussion**  
Phase: Commission Business/Staff Briefings  
Attendees: Steve Pearce, SDOT  
Ethan Melone, SDOT  
Diane Sugimura, DCLU  
Kristian Kofoed, DCLU

Time: 2.5 hours (SDC Ref. # 219 | DC0023; 169 | DC00242)

**Summary: The Commission did not take an action.**

**Regarding the ETC/Monorail proposal, the Commission fully and explicitly supports the creation of public transit, at both local and regional levels, integrated into a comprehensive network of infrastructure serving a full range of transportation needs. They feel that the following issues should be addressed and resolved to public satisfaction before any final statutory authority is granted to ETC: impact on sightlines and views in the downtown core, impact on existing public right-of-way, clarification of the physical form of stations' guideways, and effectiveness of using the design-build process.**

**Regarding the Viaduct Seawall project, the Commission acknowledges the complexity of Seattle's waterfront and wonders whether the city has a vision of what they hope to achieve in terms of uses in this area. The Commission expressed concern that no one is, as yet, representing the public realm on the Viaduct project, and suggested that CityDesign could possibly play that role. The Commission looks forward to future updates on the funding and phasing scenarios now shaping the design alternatives.**

#### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Believes that the ETC has not addressed the impacts the Monorail will have on sightlines and views in the downtown core. The monorail, as it is proposed, ignores both the spirit and the intent of existing view corridor regulation and will have a significant negative effect on the current open space condition of downtown;
- Believes the proposed Monorail will have a significantly negative impact on the existing public right-of-way; the structure of the proposed system, particularly, some of the suggested stations, would cover streets, block sunlight, and complicate and confuse traffic and pedestrian flow;
- Does not believe the graphic representations made to date by ETC are adequate or accurate; clear, dimensionally accurate images should be produced and a full scale mock-up or computer-aided simulation of one station and a portion of the guideway should be produced prior to public vote;
- Does not believe that the design-build process will result in a quality public project;
- Recommends that, if the design-build system is used, stringent and absolute design specifications be established as part of the contract for construction as design guidelines are not effective in this situation and should not be used;

- Believes that the proposed monorail system must do what it has not done to date; it must transcend its basic technical nature and achieve the highest quality of civic design.
- Would like to clarify the Commission's role in the Monorail project and figure out how their concerns about this project can most effectively be conveyed.
- Agrees that a letter to the City and ETC, and an Op Ed piece to the local press might be the best method of communicating Commission's concerns and acknowledged that time was of the essence.
- Recognizes the complexity of Seattle's waterfront and wonders whether the city has a vision of what they hope to achieve in terms of uses in this area;
- Acknowledges that CityDesign staff has also recently gotten involved in helping the City think through what can and should happen at the waterfront.
- Recognizes that there are a variety of users and needs for public access on the waterfront.
- Are concerned that no one is, as yet, representing the public realm on the Viaduct project, and suggest that CityDesign could possibly play that role.