Seattle Design Commission

Greg Nickels
Mayor

Karen Kiest
Chair

Tasha Atchison

Brendan Connolly

John Hoffman

Mary Johnston

Juanita LaFond

Dennis Ryan

Norie Sato

Darrell Vange

Darby Watson

Guillermo Romano
Executive Director

Valerie Kinast
Coordinator

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

March 6, 2008

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 4:00pm

Projects Reviewed
CarrAmerica Highland Street Vacation
Fire Station 38 – Ravenna-Bryant
Fire Station 39 – Lake City
Terry-Boren Project Block 103
Tim Gallagher, Superintendent Department of Parks and Recreation
Grace Crunican, Director SDOT

Commissioners Present
Karen Kiest, Chair
Tasha Atchison
Brendan Connolly
John Hoffman
Mary Johnston
Norie Sato
Darby Watson

Staff Present
Guillermo Romano
Valerie Kinast
Tom Iurino
Ian Macek

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

T: 206-615-1349
F: 206-233-7883

printed on recycled paper

06 March 2008	**Project:**	**CarrAmerica Highland Street Vacation**
	Phase:	Street Vacation: Public Benefits Phase
	Last Reviews:	12-07-2006, 9-21-2006
	Presenters:	Eric Anderson, Mulvanny G2 Architecture
		Greg Brower, The Berger Partnership PS
	Attendees:	Beverly Barnett, SDOT
		Rachel Dentel, Mulvanny G2 Architecture
		Al Gabay, Mulvanny G2 Architecture
		Michelle Jellison, Mulvanny G2 Architecture
		Greg Krape, Mulvanny G2 Architecture
		Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill, PS
		Scott Ringgold, DPD
		Kellen White, Mulvanny G2 Architecture

Time: 1.0 hours (SR 170/RS0610)

Action

The Commission thanks the team for their presentation, and unanimously approves the public benefits package as presented, conditional on seeing the project again, based on the following comments:

- **The Commission's initial concern was that the public benefits package would not be constructed until Phase II. However, the design team has clarified the fact that the vacation is conditionally approved dependent on the actual building of Phase II, and because the city will not be giving up the ROW without creating public benefit.**
- **Appreciate the well designed plaza and stairs which are more prominent and visible than before.**
- **Curious about the art elements and urge the team to involve an artist in these early, critical phases of design**
- **The roofs are a considerable part of the view corridor and treatments, such as green roofs, should be considered.**
- **The garage entry seems uncomfortably large and the team should consider reducing the number of lanes.**
- **Review the sidewalk treatment through the driveway entrance to make sure the pedestrian environment is clearly delineated.**
- **The ratio of green to pavement seems skewed to the hardscape, recommends more balance.**
- **Incorporate more pausing space within the context of the large scale stairs and create a "balance of choices" to enhance the pedestrian experience.**
- **The Commission has lingering concerns over the public vs. private nature of the space and urges the team to keep these spaces activated and inviting**
- **Appreciate accomplishment of providing a hill climb corridor connecting Queen Anne neighborhood to Lake Union.**
- **Urge proponent to continue working on giving Westlake Ave and Dexter Ave should have a stronger pedestrian interface.**

- **Reinforce past comments to extend their project, landscape plan and pedestrian improvements to the perimeter of their project and not solely the public plaza.**
- **Confirm the possibility of the sidewalk bulb pedestrian crossing at Dexter**

Note: Preliminary vote included (2) dissenting votes based on opinion that the development of the public benefits package is sufficient and the team should not return.

Proponent's Presentation
Project Background

The team originally provided three options for the vacation of Highland Drive:

1. No Vacation
2. Vacate street and put public amenity on top
3. Vacate street, but move public benefit to the south
    - Two iterations: one linear and the other playing with forms (chosen)

The chosen option includes the construction of three buildings and moving the public benefit to the south. Building development will be in two phases. Phase I includes Building A1 which aligns with the current property line. Highland Drive will continue its current configuration with improvements and on street parking. Phase II includes Buildings B1 and B2 as well as the construction of the public plaza.

With no existing pedestrian gathering spaces along Dexter Ave, this project can become an iconic part of the neighborhood. The design will include colored concrete, stone accents, a linear water feature, and the creation of levels of vegetation with layers and vertical elements. The view shed will be preserved, offering views of Lake Union. An elevator provides ADA and bicycle access with exits at Westlake Ave, plaza midpoint and Dexter Ave. Parking spaces will be removed adjacent to the crosswalk on Dexter Ave (pending SDOTs approval) to allow for enhanced

Figure 3: Section looking South

Figure 3: Section looking North

Figure 3: Site Plan

pedestrian safety. Building A1 is pulled back at the corner allowing views of the stairs and a sense of entry. The project will also have the opportunity to incorporate public art.

Public Benefit Summary:
19,500 sf (approx.) for public benefit
1,700 sf (approx.) of landscape
800 sf (approx.) of water feature

Public Comments
SDOT

- Concerns about parking garage entry
- Other revisions have been responsive to concerns, it is clear a pedestrian passage has been created.

Commissioners' Comments
Concerns- tying phasing of public benefits to later phasing of building

- Why aren't public benefits tied to Phase II project review instead of Phase I?
    - With such a large project, it gives context as to what is going on. The street vacation wouldn't be executed until phase two with conditional approval from council until the public benefit has been provided.
    - In Phase I the applicant is foregoing development area to take advantage of it during Phase II. Access will still be achieved from Highland Dr and will not require any structures to be built in Highland Dr ROW.
- Are there plans to regularize 8th Ave?
    - Part of work with SDOT is to look at that swath of asphalt. Two realignment studies are underway.
- Is the project developed sufficiently to approve the public benefit? Although the retail space is appreciated, the focus should be on public benefits.
- Artist involvement can be in a more fundamental way and should include someone who is very art savvy. Has artist been involved? It is a financial commitment.
    - The team has not talked with an artist, but realizes that the area would benefit from art opportunity. Owner is willing to make that commitment.
- Roof treatments should be considered as part of view corridor.
- Have green roofs or creating useable spaces been considered?
- Is SDOT on board with creating the enhanced pedestrian element on Dexter Ave?
    - SDOT has not reviewed this concept, and will have to buy into this
- Can there be two lanes of traffic exiting the parking rather than three?
    - Currently working with traffic engineer, do not want to impact the traffic light. The entrance/exit is also important for retail.
- Perhaps the team can look at pavement treatments for this area.
    - Have incorporated elements to soften that edge, but also opening it up to daylight.
- Westlake and Dexter: redesign entries to show pedestrian context. The garage at Seattle Center is a reference. The pedestrian environment cannot be interrupted.

- The amount of green vs. pavement is not balanced. Stairway is large compared to actual use by people. More of a visual than an actual use.
    - The steps were made broad enough so people can sit on them. In addition, the Design Review Board wanted the staircase to be open.
- The space doesn't look as relaxing as it could be
- Examples include Two Union and 1660 Eastlake, which is wonderful.
- Seating opportunities are a great idea, but a balance of choices is important. Many plazas and steps, but nothing between.
    - The thinking is to provide movable seating opportunities like 1660 Eastlake.
- The east building has moved to have a lower podium/pavilion. Also moved building A1 south a bit. Have kept main volumes of structures.
- Building B1 has a private corner spilling out into public space. Could it be public?
- More generous investment can be made at Dexter and Westlake such as either more spillovers of plaza into the ROWor art. Areas look plain as presented.
    - The project does extend into Dexter. Westlake has been a melting of public and private realm chose to sculpt buildings to enhance pedestrian experience.
- Previously asked to reach out to Dexter and Westlake and the project responds well to this.
- Will pedestrians feel the programmable space at the midpoint is a private retail space or a public throughway? Make sure navigation is visually clear.
- The space reads much more as public corridor than other examples. Hill climb is important to area and community.
- Would like to see the project again, even fairly soon. Clarify outstanding elements to determine what is in and what is out.
- What the team has provided is more than adequate.

06 March 2008	**Project:**	**Fire Station 38 – Ravenna-Bryant**
	Phase:	Design Development
	Last Reviews:	11-15-2007, 6-21-2007
	Presenters:	Keith Schreiber, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects
		Juliet Vong, Hough Beck & Baird
	Attendees:	Dove Alberg, Fleets and Facilities Department
		Molly Douce, Seattle Fire Department
		Patricia Hopper, Office of Arts & Cultural Affairs
		David Kunselman, Fleets and Facilities Department
		Mary Jo Lux, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects
		Cyril Vallee, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects

Time: 1.0 hours (SR 169/RS0609)

ACTION

The Commission thanks the team for their presentation and unanimously approves design development with the following comments:

- **Concerns with the west elevation and cascading feature including:**
  - **Eliminating windows in the cascade wall that may not be needed, thereby creating a backdrop for the art element.**
  - **Reflecting downspouts as a substantive design element to see how they relate to the rain garden.**
  - **Incorporating site drainage into rain garden collection points for better utilization of the system.**
  - **Resolving the relationship of the water to the ground plane, as well as the relationship of the artwork to the rain garden.**
  - **Choosing white metal as material for the cascade wall, which may become a maintenance and appearance issue over time.**
  - **Relationship of materials, especially block wall and metal distinction.**
- **Concerns over the second floor vaulted ceiling and its relation to floor functions.**
- **Recommend simplifying horizontal elements, such as sun screens.**
- **The landscape could be strengthened through groupings to fill out space.**
- **Appreciates the presence of the flag at the corner, but have concerns on further strengthening the corner to create a civic presence.**
- **The Commission would have liked to see elevations and sections that reflect the entire plan in addition to provided images. Design work would benefit from looking at a physical model.**

Proponent's Presentation

Project Background

The goal of this design phase was to simplify, integrate and strengthen the schematic design. The team focused on the curvilinear roof form and cascading water feature. The flagpole was moved to convey the idea of civic presence on the corner. The east elevation is built on the property line and incorporates a three hour firewall that will have changing

block texture to break up monotony. The art piece includes abstract tree forms along the west side. They will be two-dimensional on one side and appear flat on the other. LEED Silver status will be achieved by focusing on interior quality and materials selection for exterior.

Figure 6: East Perspective

Figure 6: South Perspective

The landscape along the north elevation has been used to soften that edge and will reflect the residential feeling of adjacent properties. Street trees have been removed from the west parking strip due to a major sewer line, and incorporated into the on-site landscaping. Draught tolerant plantings will be used throughout.

Figure 6: West Elevation

The rain garden is located along the western edge of the building. It will take an urban form using texture and color and will be a series of three cells that step down. This creates basins that allow water to sit and filtrate down; otherwise the concept would be a swale due to the site elevations. Water is taken through downspouts and into the rain garden where it can overflow from one cell to the next.

Commissioners' Comments

- Is the elevation or perspective more accurate in showing apparatus doors?
  - Elevation is more accurate in apparatus bay doors
- What type are the street trees?
  - Columnar Sweet Gum, due to rain garden concerns
- What is ceiling height on second floor? A section would be helpful.
  - Curvilinear truss joists are used so it will be 9ft at low point and 13ft at high in public spaces. It was a challenge on how to create through ventilation to operable windows in the back while still having noise barriers.
- How will the cascading idea on the west elevation work?
  - Standing seam roof pattern, water will come down face of building.
- What is the material used on the west elevation? Concern of water running down it over time.
  - Standing seam metal which will be white color. Act as canvas behind art.
- Elimination of the windows behind the art piece will make it more visible.
- Where are the downspouts located?

    - Not in plan, will be in corners and same metal as wall panels.
- Water is being channeled to the middle, but there are three basins. Could collection be simplified conceptually, seems like many steps to get the water where to go.
    - Most will go to middle, but some to the highest basin and some to lower. This will be achieved by having an integrated gutter system.
    - How sheeting interfaces with the ground plane may be able to be simplified in the central section
- The relationship between the block wall and the standing seam is important. Must have some differentiation.
    - Elements are not in the same plane.
- Are all three cells needed?
    - Needed three to reach green factor criteria. But not to reach peak flow, most of the water is taken by second and third cell. Trying to see if sheet-flow from rear lot can be put into first cell.
- Where are the magnolia trees located on the plan?
    - They are an accent tree on the east side of the apparatus bay.
- The landscape plan is still schematic, not in development stage. The chosen landscape should be represented on elevations. Where the edges are residential, either simplify or extend the materials
- How does the artwork meet the rain garden surface? The sculpture doesn't acknowledge that.
    - The base of the art feature will use materials so not affected by standing water, also looking at landscape treatments that could be incorporated.
- Appreciate simplicity at corner, but balance may be inconspicuous.
    - Firefighters indicated flagpole prominence at corner.
- There are many horizontal alignments, and how they relate to one another is a concern.

06 March 2008	**Project:**	**Fire Station 39 – Lake City**
	Phase:	Design Development
	Last Reviews:	12-07-2006, 7-06-2006, 12-16-2004
	Presenters:	Daniel Gero, Miller Hull Partnership
		Scott Wolf, Miller Hull Partnership
	Attendees:	Dove Alberg, Fleets and Facilities Department
		Frank Coulter, Fleets and Facilities Department
		Molly Douce, Seattle Fire Department
		Jason Huff, Office of Arts & Cultural Affairs
		David Kunselman, Fleets and Facilities Department
		Mary Jo Lux, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects
		Keith Schreiber, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects
		Cyril Vallee, Schreiber Starling & Lane Architects

Time: 1.0 hours (SR 169/RS0609)

ACTION

The Commission thanks the team for their presentation and unanimously approves design development with the following comments:

- **Appreciates the sketches of details concerning how the materials work with each other which respect commission's level of expertise.**
- **Disappointed by hose tower height reduction, but understand the reasons and appreciate working through the issues of the iconic element and how the tower works for the firefighters. Suggests considering the elimination of the tower as a cost saving mechanism that could benefit the project in other architectural aspects.**
- **Concern that with the loss of both tower height and transparency of apparatus bay doors the building will be less welcoming to public. Encourage designers to look at the doors more carefully**
- **Applauds LEED efforts and that the team is going beyond the minimum requirements**
- **Appreciates the art piece being integrated with building and that the artwork may function as a conduit between the rainwater and the ground.**
- **Appreciates west elevation depth and layering**
- **Encourages having an application on the hose tower to extend height, giving visual interest and a place for signage.**
- **Appreciates the refined landscape plan**
- **Applauds the West elevation as an intriguing and creative design.**
- **Strongly support the transparent, fast acting apparatus bay doors, and see as a top priority given budget concerns and loss of the hose tower height.**

Proponent's Presentation

Project Background

The team recently held a community meeting about the project. The new station was positively received, and the only concern was that the new building will displace the farmer's market. The city is looking at how to remedy this.

Figure 9: North Elevation

The team is working to resolve a few new issues. The tower is no longer noticeable from pedestrian view due to the FFD direction to reduce height from 50 ft to 35ft max. In addition, working to resolve door issues as transparency will no longer be the same as was previously presented because the fast acting door are to be bid as an additive alternate. The project is also looking at achieving LEED Gold by harvesting rainwater for toilet flushing. The team is working out issues concerning operations and maintenance of such fixtures.

Figure 9: South Elevation

The art piece has been relocated, and is now concentrated to one corner. The team felt it was still bulky, but perhaps an airy, lighter piece would work better. The final concept will be presented in April.

Figure 9: West Elevation

The project is working towards 90% design development in three weeks and will have cost estimates in early April.

Commissioners' Comments

- How will the number graphic translate with the smaller tower?
    - Incorporating it into the entrance area, or as an element seen through the window glazing instead.
- Support evolution of the art element.
- Impressed by new art location and expression. Now that it's inline with the tall tower, it could be the iconic piece.
- Art piece serves as functionally integrated part of the building
- Comfortable with the direction of the hose tower.
    - Approach to it will now change. Saw it as an iconic element before, as well as the functionality. Now its context in the project has changed as it will not be as visible. Taking the cost savings and incorporate into iconic elements elsewhere in project.

- The tower does have presence in rear elevation. Could move to front, but wisely have given artist that space.
    - From an operational standpoint the tower would not work in front.
- Seems 50ft tower worked functionally. Now the hose-drying function may be more difficult.
- Losing the tower and the transparency in the apparatus bay doors tips the balance away from being publicly inviting. Would suggest the doors be included in the bid and not additive alternate.
- Is it possible to put the number on the top of the tower?
    - It is doable, but how visible would it be and at what point? Would be more visible in the front.
- Appreciate detail sketches.
- West Elevation is bold and has a civic presence.
- What is the white material?
    - Concrete and CMU
- Have sun studies been done concerning the patio on the north side of the building?
    - Computer modeled sun studies have been done and show the patio is usually in shade, but feel the space will be used.
- Any refinement of the landscape architecture?
    - As part of the 'Materials and Resources' LEED credit using reclaimed elements in the rain garden and cistern from the city's salvage.
- Street trees included? Should be careful with all that is going on in south elevation.
- Landscape has been shown clearly in schematic design.
- May consider moving green roof panels to where they can be maintained more easily.
    - Green panels on the gasket are an additive alternate option.
- How likely is the green roof?
    - Will know when the cost numbers are back, it isn't necessary to meet planning requirements. Question if the city wants the green roof and maintain it.
- Support making the site as green as possible and not focusing on the green roof.
- Should show updated site plan.
- Sidewalk acting as a plaza space seen as positive

06 March 2008 **Project: Commission Business**

Time: 0.5 hours

Action Items

A. Timesheets

B. Minutes from 02-07-2008

- Unanimous Approval

Discussion Items

C. Outside Commitments Calendar – Romano

D. DC Retreat Follow-up – Romano

E. 40th Anniversary – Romano

F. SR-520 Mediation Update – Atchison

- Meetings on March 18th and 20th

06 March 2008	**Project:**	**Terry-Boren Project Block 103**
	Phase:	Design Development
	Last Reviews:	12-20-2007, 10-10-2007
	Presenters:	Tim Clemen, Walker Macy
		Hamilton Hazlehurst, Vulcan Inc.
		Wendy Pautz, LMN Architects
		Jamie Walker, Artist
	Attendees:	Beverly Barnett, SDOT
		Lyle Bicknell, DPD
		Dean Clark, LMN Architects
		Erik Perka, LMN Architects
		Pablo Schugurensky, Art Consultant
		Mary Anne Smith, LMN Architects

Time: 1.0 hours (SR 170/RS0610)

ACTION

Recusal: Darby Watson, works for LMN Architects

The Commission thanks the team for returning to present refinements to the public benefits package and the detail on the art component, and unanimously approves part two of a two part design development approval process with the following comments:

- **Appreciate the reduced impact of the alley and the south entrance of Building A.**
- **Encouraged by the sophistication of the landscape plan and the appropriate balance of spaces.**
- **Appreciate the buffer and separation of elements that enhance the public nature of the gathering space.**
- **Appreciates the increase of permeability by the reconfiguration of the lobby on the east side of the plaza.**
- **Greatly appreciate the style and content of the presentation, with before and after images and addressing previous Commission concerns including increased openness at Boren and Terry, relationship to Mercer St and the balance of public and private**
- **Appreciate the dynamism and scale of the art pieces with activity that will invite public interaction and touch and greatly encourage the art stepping out into the public ROW.**
- **Scale of the paving seems large. Possibly look at including finer textures or increased frequency of score joints, and also its relationship to the island elements.**
- **Encourage better placement of bike racks within the plaza in relation to art pieces.**

- **Appreciate the revisions and treatment of the Mercer St façade and the potential for different types of retail activity and also the attention to street level detail and awning opportunities.**
- **Appreciate how the current design addresses appropriate intimacy of scale and activity.**
- **Recognize the high level of stone craftsmanship and appreciate local stone choice.**

Proponent's Presentation
Project Background

An artist has been chosen for the project. The thought is that there will be a beacon piece that will be iconic for the area and become a landmark. It will be 12' tall and 6' wide and in relation to both buildings and landscape. The piece does protrude into the pedestrian right-of-way making it visible in relation to larger vistas. It will be fabricated out of aluminum with variations of textures. There is a grade change from Boren to Terry and the piece can reflect this change making it specific to this location.

Figure 12: Previous and Current Plaza Design

Figure 12: Public Art

Once entering the plaza another piece will be located in one of the landscape areas. It will be brightly colored and slightly more intimate than the larger piece. It will also be noticeable from windows above the plaza.

The team worked to provide activation along Mercer St. placing retail along it. Larger scale correlates with the scale of Mercer. The retail bays along Terry allow for signage at various heights and levels bringing tenant personality to the street. The courtyard makes entries back to the streetcar and to Terry.

Figure 12: View from courtyard

Building A has been pushed closer to Mercer, creating more plaza space that allows for seating areas and delineation between private and public space. Landscape schemes will fit in the space and create open airy feel to the courtyard. Landscaping on Terry has been reduced to give the street a 'woonerf' feel blending the street and sidewalk. Lobby entrances will have a window screen to conceal the private activities that are happening

within. The alley width has been reduced from 20' to 16', as well as curb cut to 12'. Pavement change in the alley will indicate to pedestrians the difference from plaza to vehicle access.

Seating types: tables associated with retail, fixed seats and movable seats.

Commissioners' Comments

- Thank you for responding to previous comments and visually displaying before and after photos
- Appreciate size and scale of art pieces for entering this project at this phase.
- Why screen private activity from the public experience? Enlivening the space depends on the interaction between the private and public.
    - Screening is used only where it will enhance the public experience, not along streets.
- What is the pavement?
    - Concrete scoring.
- May have more scoring than every 30ft indicated
    - Understand this and will respond to it.
- Islands are independent of the pattern, may want to think how they interact with the paving.
- Landscape island element fits well with art piece functionality.
- Oasis of good public space within the courtyard.
  Confused about island heights and where the sculpture is located.
    - The island where the art is located goes from 2ft to the ground plane. The piece will be elevated off the bench.
- The public art is a private element of art in a public setting and encourage it setting out into the public right of way, correlates with the design guidelines of Terry. Support interactive qualities of the art piece.
- Is there any lighting to be associated with the art pieces?
    - Nothing has been discussed in the preliminary stage. It will depend on the surface materials for the beacon piece and how the ambient light plays off it. The smaller piece will most likely not be lit.
- This project will depend on the incredible stonework with the tilted planes. Is it dry stacked stone?
    - The building is going for LEED, and people like the natural look which can be seen at 505 Union. It is a local stone and within project budget.
- Appreciate retail development. Customer service towards courtyard and larger retail towards mercer?
    - Retail is able to be divided along Mercer if needed.
- Was it along Mercer that the storeowners can use individual signage?
    - Along Terry Ave. There will be two elevations to mount signs and awnings. At Mercer it is fixed signage.
- The redesign addresses the openness at Terry and Boren

06 March 2008	**Project:**	**Tim Gallagher, Superintendent Parks and Recreation**
	Phase:	Update
	Presenters:	Tim Gallagher, Department of Parks and Recreation
	Attendees:	Bob Corwin, AICP

Time: 1.0 hours (SR 169/RS0605)

ACTION

The Design Commission welcomes you to the city, looks forward to working with you and offers the following comments:

- **The Commission would like the opportunity to participate with Parks in strategic planning.**
- **Appreciates comprehensive view of parks and open space as a network, and the scale with which the department looks at projects.**
- **Appreciates the challenges in change in departmental culture and effort to instill in staff that boards and commissions are here to help.**
- **Encourage interagency cooperation, and the offer Commission support in fostering oversight.**
- **Appreciate and support establishing clarity of overall responsibility for parks property.**
- **Welcome discussion on establishing new parks**
- **The Design Commission will work to become advocates for parks and open space**
- **Appreciates the attitude towards culture change and staff recognition, the idea to push for a new park levy and to interdepartmental cooperation.**

Proponent's Presentation

Project Background

Gallagher introduced himself as the new Superintendent of Parks and Recreation and gave a summary of his background and experiences. A main point he would like to bring to the department is environmental sustainability from the perspective of returning the planet to our children in better condition than it was received. Health and fitness in relation to obesity are issues that should be addressed from his standpoint. The social equity aspect of this challenge must be considered. He would like to see less structure and programming of parks. The new Parks strategic plan needs to be informed by a clear vision of where the city is going. There needs to be clarity as to the charge of the department, such as when it comes to trees and open space in the right of way if it relates to the vision of the department.

Commissioners' Comments

- Want Parks to excel, how can the DC help you? What should a park be?
    - The Parks Commission had no plan and no vision, working to correct that through strategic plan.
- The Design Commission is also reviewing trails and open space and how the city looks at these issues and defining the open space in the right-of-way.

    - Tree responsibility SPU, SDOT and Parks all doing the same thing. Parks should be the one managing open space and take responsibility.
- Thoughts on Park Levy for the fall and on Open Space 2100?
    - A parks levy this fall is not likely, however a recommendation has been given to the mayor to give consideration to extending the existing levy 1) $250 million worth of needs (updating playgrounds, community centers, open space) 2) if you extend it now it isn't a new tax, but will be if it's brought back later. However, the Parks scope only represents a small piece of the picture while the mayor has to consider all of the city's priorities.
- How does art fit into parks scenario?
    - Art is very important component, but typically gets cut when budgets are tight. Children need to be introduced to art and imaginative play and not just scheduled, structured activities.
- How are you dealing with the small amount of open space in Seattle after coming from LA County?
    - There are some differences, but the issues are the same. People believe parks are an extension of their backyard and identify them as part of their community. Seattle has a lot of passion especially when related to the neighborhoods of the city.
- Is there a movement to link park resources together and extending the neighborhood by reaching to others?
    - Bands of Green Plan is an important component that has been started. Other efforts are also in the works in collaboration with other departments.
- How can the commission respond to developers who believe open space is not taken care of?
    - With new leadership
- There has been development without an appropriate level of open space so the level of service isn't being achieved. What do we do?
    - Impact fees.
- What armature should be used to install these new open spaces? Is there a workable planning process to equitably distribute open space?
    - Impact fees do not correct deficiency; only provide parks to deal with new residency. The city is divided into zones that are split into areas depending on anticipating growth and money could only be spent there.
- How do you keep the wild parts wild?
    - Parks can be classified, and based on classification certain activities would or would not be allowed. Also looking into designating parks as wildlife sanctuaries.
- Has anything come to the floor as to how the DC can help you?
    - The DC can be an advocate and work to see the reality of the projects that come through.
- Would it help if the DC participated in strategic planning or problem solving?
    - It would be beneficial. Always helps to have another set of eyes looking at a project to find things that may not have been noticed before. Can arrange park schedule to fit with DC.

06 March 2008	**Project:**	**Grace Crunican, Director SDOT**
	Phase:	Update
	Last Reviews:	
	Presenters:	Grace Crunican, SDOT
	Attendees:	Bob Corwin, AICP
		Casey Hanewall, SDOT

Time: 1.0 hours (SR 169/RS0606)

ACTION

The Design Commission thanks you for the briefing, and offers the following comments:

- **On regards to Sound Transit University Station, the Commission supported the concept of a pedestrian bridge versus a tunnel between UW and Sound Transit and looks forward to further reviews. Would like to hear any concerns regarding this project or any similar to be able to understand and support City's vision or new policy decision with a better informed background.**
- **Look forward to work on the King St. Station area planning following the recent, long-awaited purchase**
- **Expressed its concern regarding the quality of the Thomas St. pedestrian bridge given the budget constraints, and shared the question raised, regarding phasing and budgeting so far.**
- **Encourage the consideration of the Commission in any early involvement on the large transportation projects through out the city. In particular in recent months the ones south of downtown, so that an urban design element is considered.**
- **Encourage our participation in the streetcar planning process and look forward to working with Ethan Malone in the definition of the network and project follow up.**

Proponent's Presentation

Project Background

Discussed Current SDOT projects:

- E. Marginal Way Grade Separation
- Spokane Street Viaduct Widening and Fourth Ave Off-Ramp Project
- SR-519 Intermodal Access Project
- Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
    - construction 2010
    - bike lanes
- Urban Mobility Plan
    - looking at mobility hubs
    - provide multiple avenues for people to use
- King Street Transportation Hub
    - process to rehabilitate all floors starting with ground floor

    - opportunity for office space on floors two and three
- Streetcar Network
    - looking at possible ridership
    - what destinations trying to connect
    - process will follow funding, not based on potential ridership
- Two-way Mercer and Valley Corridor
    - undergrounding utilities
- SR-520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
- University Link Light Rail & University Station Pedestrian Overpass
- Bridging the Gap
- Madison Street Bridge
- Pike and Pine Street Transit Improvements
- Westlake Transportation Hub

Commissioners' Comments

- Recommend efforts to support SDOT, increase reviews of projects to assist.
- Unifying elements among adjacent projects creates a sense of arrival.
- Fourth Ave Off-Ramp touch downs needed more design, especially with increasing number of people in the area.
- Thomas Street Bridge Pedestrian overpass: Design of the bridge in relation to the amount of money for the entire project. Concern there is too much structure for the budget.
- Is the part over Elliott necessary with nearby pedestrian lights? Is it the wisest use of the money?
- Possible workshop on King Street Station in conjunction with Livable South Downtown project. The DC will provide guidance as much as possible.
- Street car plan was beneficial. Would love to be able to participate with SDOT in early stages of plans.
- What would that role look like?
- DC can provide design expertise concerning the streetcar.