



APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Mike McGinn
Mayor

Diane Sugimura
Director, DPD

Marshall Foster
Planning Director, DPD

Mary Johnston
Chair

Andrew Barash

Julie Bassuk

Graham Black

Brendan Connolly

Lauren Hauck

Laurel Kunkler

Julie Parrett

Norie Sato

Donald Vehige

Guillermo Romano
Executive Director

Valerie Kinast
Coordinator

Tom Iurino
Senior Staff

May 6, 2010

Convened 8:30am
Adjourned 5:00pm

Projects Reviewed

South Transfer Station
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement
Fire Station 6
Maple Leaf Reservoir Park
Rainier Beach Community Center

Commissioners Present

Mary Johnston, Chair
Andrew Barash
Julie Bassuk
Graham Black
Lauren Hauck
Laurel Kunkler
Julie Parrett
Norie Sato
Donald Vehige

Staff Present

Guillermo Romano
Valerie Kinast
Tom Iurino
Jenny Hampton



**Department of Planning
and Development**
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
PO Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

TEL 206-615-1349
FAX 206-233-7883



May 6, 2010

Project: **Maple Leaf Reservoir Park**
Phase: Concept Design
Last Reviewed: N/A
Presenters: Katy Bang, Berger Partnership
 Greg Brower, Berger Partnership
 Kellee Jones, Parks and Recreation

Attendees: Donna Hartmann-Miller, Friends for Grater Maple Leaf Park
 Jason Huff, Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs
 Michael Shiosaki, Parks and Recreation

Time: 2:00pm-3:40pm

(000/RS0000)

ACTION

The Design Commission thanked the project team for the presentation and approved the design direction of the project unanimously. Of the various concepts that are being considered the Commission finds the Waves and Vista ideas most promising. The rooms that were created along Roosevelt were greeted as a nice solution. The following recommendations were provided by the Commission:

- **Locating the playfields at the south end of the site is the stronger solution.**
- **Continue considering access and connections to surrounding areas.**
- **Provide analysis and illustration of how the site relates to surrounding areas in the next presentation.**
- **Provide arguments for the preferred alternative in the next presentation.**
- **The Commission agrees with the designers that SPU fencing of facilities within the park should be more sensitive to their location and encourages Parks and SPU to work on appropriate alternatives that can still meet the need to protect our water supply.**
- **Consider making more visible the idea of standing “on the water.”**

Project Presentation

We are excited to present to you Maple Leaf Park. The footprint of the reservoir is going to be the same when it turns into a park. It is a Parks Levy project and has been allocated five million dollars.

The community open houses were successful. In February, the first public design meeting attracted 180 people. The group was divided into small groups to help develop concepts. The resulting concept document is about 50 pages. At an April 22nd meeting, we presented design concepts to 120 people. We are going through the comments, around 50 pages total. When bringing these plans to the community, we wanted to test our ideas to see how the community responded to certain elements and forms.

We will be meeting with SPU about what the constraints might be for the lid. We did get an artist on board. He is a Denver-based artist that will immerse himself in the Maple Leaf community.

Our site consists of the water tower in the corner, ball fields in another corner. There is a slope and existing vegetation in the corners as well. The primary access for SPU and will be mainly off of 85th Street. There will be structures which SPU will need to have access. There are also a lot of utilities that we need to consider when designing the grading and topography. We are working to integrate an existing raingarden that SPU designed.

For concepts, we asked the neighborhood to tell us who they are and what they might want for this space. We came up with three concepts to incorporate the program elements that the community wanted.

The first concept was Waves. We utilized soft patterns and soft shape and made forms that stretched across the lid and did not acknowledge the square form. We tested different forms of gathering spaces so that we could embrace some existing character of the space and expand it. There might be some elements: a skatepark, gathering spaces, circulation, and masking of SPU access. The waves evoke the idea of the movement of water, or a breeze moving through. These waves can be landscape plants or structures that have the same language. There are some strong views of the mountain and water for people. We incorporated an off leash areas into the scheme.



The second concept was the Commons. This concept was born from the quality of the neighborhood and its scale. We drew a diagram of all the possible routes of access and how this could play into the park's design. We started to break this patterning down into the park and how access might begin to shape space. We chose to use two strong access points and also used the SPU access pattern. We took the two playfields and put them on the lid. Recognizing the strength of the Roosevelt Ave. streetscape, we wanted to create spaces that replicate the adjacent scale and include gathering spaces, skate area, and a kids' play area, giving a promenade effect. The south end opened up so we used the gatehouse structure to frame this area creating rooms for the space. We did a quick study of parking and how best to integrate it into the park without having it dominate. We also put in a loop path that creates more of a softer edge.

The third and final concept was Vista, which was inspired by the fact that Maple Leaf is the second highest point in Seattle. We created view points and framed spaces from these areas. We created corridors where people can look at the views and how to mask the SPU access. The perimeter access has a variety of opportunities and a grand lawn in the middle. We are looking at putting the major open spaces along Roosevelt Ave. We wanted to take advantage of the slope for children's play. We relocated one ball field and created an opportunity for a gathering space. The area also contains a skatepark.

On all of these schemes, we have a list of common program elements. Some, but not all, of these included: teen space, kids play, children's garden, art, athletic fields. We really asked the community how we want to package this. All of the plans have continued the strong streetscape found on Roosevelt Ave. We are interested in incorporating edible gardens and water play. There could possibly be a ring of orchard trees.

Public Comments

Donna Hartman Miller, Friends of Greater Maple Leaf Park

The community and I are very pleased with the designs. There are some suggestions that we have:

- The Waves scheme was really liked as it has a natural feel and open space. This scheme also has an off leash area. This is number 2 on the list for the community.

- The Commons scheme is not as popular, the fields are not in a good location, however the connecting paths are excellent.
- The Vista scheme is popular because of safety issues. The skatepark location might not be the best placement. Drop off points are good and need to be reviewed for the ball field.

Commissioners' Comments & Questions

What's the next step for working with the community?

We are going to go back with a preferred alternative to get feedback from the neighborhood.

What is the context on the north and the east side of the park?

There are homes on the north side that share the property lines with the park. The issues with parking occur on the eastern edge. The school is vacant right now, but is going to be occupied soon. There is also a right of way that goes into the site. There is idea of reaching out more to the neighborhood and how that can extend to the edges.

What areas are where the SPU fences?

The primary SPU regulations that we are dealing with are fencing around the structures that are there. There is also access that we need to deal with, but is workable. There is conversation on doing some modest planting on the lid and what we can do on the lid might be more flexible, we need to know this. The slope restrictions also might be visual elements that can affect the design.

In past reservoir projects there had to be demarcation of the lid boundary, do you have to do this as well?

Yes.

You mentioned at one point synthetic material being used?

We have this very thin soil profile and the first 10 inches are SPU drainage etc.. There is a 1.5 percent slope on this lid, but it will not be able enough to drain away from site. The study of what you can do with that minimal profile, therefore the idea is that you can do synthetic. We are thinking that the concern of the maintenance budget and the synthetic might help with this as well.

Are there any bus stops nearby?

Yes.

What are the cost definitions on all three schemes?

The wave plan uses more of the existing, so it is more of the lower end. The commons would be on the higher end of the scheme because the grading has not been worked out.

The existing gazebo structure/arbor element, what is happening with this?

It is staying in all of the schemes, but we are making more connections with it.

Can you talk about 86th and access?

This is not a fully public right of way.

It would be great to have access for this park from all sides and how to make more connections outward. I think that the commons park is intriguing to how the street grid connects to this park.

On any of the schemes, would you be able to get the 200 ft dimension?

Yes.

Was there a big opinion about the structured fields?

Yes, but the specifics fluctuated. Multi-functioning fields might be better. The brief summary: of the 8 groups most favored the waves and vistas. There were some groups that did not like the active fields on the lids and some that did.

You need to draw at least a half block all the way around the park boundary; it will be key to look at the context and how these things fit together. It would give us more reason why we would choose one scheme over another. I think in the vista scheme, there could be more viewpoints than what is being presented here. On this park it could be powerful to understand the framework a bit more and how this works within the neighborhood. It would be good to bring back the scale.

I am having a hard time having an opinion because I need to have some context and analysis drawings. We need to have some critical connections and desired views and adjacent spaces.

I think in terms of selecting plans, I am intrigued by having the upper lid space active as that's not typical, but maybe a simplified space. I think the comments about the off leash park is right that it should not be next to the children's play area.

In terms of the play structure, I think that it is important to have kids be able to play on structures outside of the typical structures.

I appreciate the aspect of the commons as it has fingers that lead out to the neighborhood but I dislike where they are ending up at the center of a ball field.

I think that it is also important to see what your philosophy as a designer and what you believe should be important here.

Are there are weight limits for the lid?

Yes, they have calculated weight limits for the machines, but not for humans.

I think that what I would be looking for is more of an argument from you why this scheme over that. Suggesting to us that this is the kind of scheme and ideas that the community wants and it fits into the context in this way.

I think that one thing that is confusing me is not having a summary of the community concepts and site analysis.