

SEATTLE DESIGN COMMISSION REVIEWS OF THE HIGH POINT MASTER PLAN

This file contains the unedited approved minutes for five reviews of the High Point Master Plan conducted by the Seattle Design Commission on

- 15 November 2001 (Initial Briefing)
- 18 April 2002 (Update)
- 21 November 2002 (Street Vacation)
- 5 June 2003 (Open Space Plan Update)
- 18 September 2003 (Open Space Follow-up)

To see the minutes posted with graphics by the Seattle Design Commission, go to http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Commission/Project_Review_Meetings/Minutes/default.asp?year=2005 select year <all> select keyword <High Point Master Plan>.

For a critique of the High Point Master Plan, see

Pearce, Neal (2006, 24 September). High Point: Seattle's green community. The Seattle Times, Editorial/Opinion. [Available online at: http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/opinion/2003271360_peirce24.html].

15 Nov 2001 Project: **High Point Master Plan**
Phase: Initial Briefing
Presenters: Tom Phillips, Seattle Housing Authority
Brian Sullivan, Mithun
Attendees: Tammy Frederick, Seattle Transportation (SeaTran)
Kathy Gwilym, SvR Design Company
Bill Kreager, Mithun, Architects and Planners
Vince Lyons, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU)
Pete Marshall, Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department)
Carol Proud, DCLU Marilyn Senour, SeaTran
Peg Staeheli, SvR Design Company

Time: 1.5 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00253)

Summary: The Commission appreciates the direction that this project has taken and would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

Action The Commission appreciates the presentation of the overall project and its comprehensive approach to social, demographic, and community design goals. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

The Commission commends the intention of the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) to create a mixed income neighborhood in the truest sense;

appreciates the stated urban design intention of repairing the perceived tear in the West

Seattle planning fabric;

recommends that the team consider planning models that go beyond purely contextual paradigms, particularly along the east edge of the site;

recommends a planning concept that develops a clear hierarchy of public and private spatial zones;

recommends that, if possible, each residential unit has its own private outdoor space or direct access to outdoor space “owned” by the unit;

encourages the team to develop a series of focused and systematic design guidelines to coordinate and direct all future development;

urges the team to conduct a careful analysis of the topographic condition of the site to be used as a project form-giver, recognizing the impact of the storm water;

urges the team to develop management strategies to ensure the implementation and success of the social aspects of the project and its longterm viability as a coherent neighborhood;

recommends design consideration for transportation systems other than the private car; and

encourages the team to study the innovative SEA Streets project to ascertain its possible relevance to High Point.

High Point, in West Seattle on 35th Avenue Southwest, is the third major Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) redevelopment project in Seattle. SHA hopes to complete this project efficiently, recognizing lessons learned from previous developments. SHA will work with the community early and often, to recognize the main concerns early in the process, and to notify residents of the nature of the development. SHA hopes to identify a new name for this redevelopment project.

This will be a mixed-income community, while the number of low-income units will be increased; the number of homes at the High Point site will be increased by three hundred. Some of the original 1300 units were removed to provide space for a park and a school. An additional 250 low-income units will be developed off-site, in conjunction with this project. The architecture of the development will also be physically diverse. In addition to housing units, the development will contain management facilities, a senior center, additional community facilities, a neighborhood clinic, and the expansion of an existing community center. The site could also include a grocery store, with housing, along 35th Avenue Southwest, near a clinic.

To improve the physical design of High Point, and improve the relationship between this site and the West Seattle context, the team intends to stitch the street grid fabric into the surrounding grid. SHA will propose a rezone of the site, and the zoning map for Rainier Vista will serve as a model. This would improve the nature and distribution of the mixed income units. 35th Avenue Southwest links the site to the north and south, while Sylvan and Morgan Streets

provide connections down the steep wooded slope to the east. The existing streets are thirty-two feet wide. Some of the streets throughout the surrounding neighborhood are twenty-five feet wide, and residents of New Holly, another SHA redevelopment, feel that the twenty-five feet wide streets are safer. The existing buildings are placed throughout the open site with irregularity. There are many existing trees throughout the open site; the project team has documented the site with an arborist, to determine which trees should be removed. The northern edge of the site is very steep; the community park to the north recognizes the views to the city. The grade throughout the site is terraced.

In addition to site and history analysis, the project team has worked with the community to identify ways by which the project can be integrated into the West Seattle context. Currently, the physical design clearly identifies that this project is different, or that it is low-income. The community also identified traffic, neighborhood amenities, and the character of open space and public facilities as additional important considerations. The High Point redevelopment should connect to and take advantage of the existing West Seattle amenities. The master plan will ensure that 35th Avenue Southwest continues through the site as a primary north-south arterial. The project team has studied the architectural context, scale, and character to better identify the needs of the redevelopment.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

Commends the team for their efforts. Appreciates the magnitude and opportunity for this community redevelopment. Would like to emphasize the critical need to develop private front and back yards, including yards for rental units. Encourages the team to use the site planning as an opportunity to create private outdoor space for each unit.

Proponents recognized that, in the redevelopment of New Holly, there are yards. This has made a visible difference in the community and use of or participation within the open space. Further stated that the existing site topography provides many opportunities.

Encourages the design team to develop a systematic process or rules by which the site is laid out. There are many interesting constraints created by the slopes and terraced topography. Believes that the rules could be used to develop a hierarchy of spaces and wayfinding improvements, and that these rules could be used throughout the site. Hopes that there is no leftover space at the site.

Proponents stated that the site development is developed through an intent to improve livability. Recognizes that the east edge of the site, due to the topography, would not be integrated into the neighborhood.

Urges the team to recognize that low density is not required on the east side of the site.

Would like to know how the project team intends to address the terraced site. Would like to know if there would be extensive cut and fill.

Proponents stated that a significant part of the site is flat. Additionally, the terraced portions of the site contain flat areas above other flat areas; therefore, these relationships can be used to improve accessibility to units.

Would like to know the extent of the lessons learned through previous redevelopment projects. Would like the project team to talk about relocation concerns that have been raised in other projects, and would like to know how relocation of current residents would be addressed.

Proponents recognized the relocation difficulties that have been experienced at other sites. Rainier Vista, for example, would be phased, and there would also be a lottery to determine relocation priorities. Agreed that this is a difficult process, and some Rainier Vista residents would be moving to New Holly.

Further stated that there would be some flexibility, but the priority would be having available units. Recognized the team's goal to knit the development into the community. Urges the team to set the stage for future development in this area, and how this redevelopment would affect the future of West Seattle.

Proponents stated that the team is working with Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU) throughout the planning process to ensure that the project is responsive to the neighborhood plans and the needs throughout the next twenty years. Further recognized that this is an opportunity to introduce mixed-use development in the community. This should be a community facility that would meet the greater community's needs throughout the future.

Would like to know if the shape of the existing streets within High Point would remain. Believes that the current configuration of streets is amorphous, and blurs the relationships between public and private space. Is concerned that the open spaces are undefined and ambiguous.

Believes that the curving "suburban" streets do control speed, and straight grid promotes speeding cars. Is concerned that straightening the curved streets is in response to the notion that curved streets are a stigma of public housing. Would like to know if it is necessary to abandon the gentle pedestrian passage of the curved streets. Believes that the building locations and placement should be used to integrate High Point into the community.

Proponents stated that, due to the curved nature of the streets, wayfinding is also very difficult. Further stated that schemes with both alternatives would be completed to meet the SEPA requirements. The team would be able to compare a scheme incorporating curved streets and rectilinear streets. 4 Is convinced that the building orientation could clarify the spatial arrangement.

Recognizes that many of the concerns at the site could be addressed by curved or rectilinear streets, but prefers the rectilinear arrangement, as this improves wayfinding.

At a future presentation, would like the team to explain how the circulation would fit the existing SDC topography. Would like the team to present a further analysis of the land.

Proponents stated that these concerns had been addressed, but the team wanted to introduce the full Commission to the project, recognizing that some of the Commissioners have already reviewed the project.

Believes that basic street grids are efficient, and can be used to develop a hierarchy of land and spaces.

Believes that the street grid improves traffic flow. Believes that traffic control is also addressed by the width of the street. Recognizes the open nature of the site, and does not relate to the context. Believes that the topographical considerations should be central to the development of the master plan.

Would like the team to explain the scope of the master plan, and how this master plan is implemented, architecturally. Would like to know if different architects would be used to implement the master plan.

Proponents stated that Mithun would be completing the High Point Master Plan and the architectural design of the rental units only. Further stated that the master plan would identify different prototypes for the units, and the consultant is working with developers and builders to develop a master plan that would address the market appropriately. The master plan would be completed with these prototypes in mind. The planning consultant would also develop design guidelines specified for the site. Further stated that there would be different responses relative to context and other conditions of the residents (whether they are senior residents or families with children).

As the project develops, would like the team to further explain the hierarchy of spaces and units.

Recognizes that the presentation addresses physical needs and concerns. Hopes that the team recognizes that

this project is a catalyst, which will change and evolve over time. Encourages the team to speculate about the possible features of this site in the future, and determine what needs to be put in place to ensure that these features are accommodated in the future.

Proponents recognized that this would be a dynamic community, and the master plan would recognize the needs for multi-generational residents.

Recognizes that one of the best aspects of community building is the access to public areas and other communities of Seattle. Believes that there is typically a bias, when examining low-income housing, that easy access to public transportation should be provided. Recognizes that public transportation is not as extensive as it should be, to provide access to health care and education services. Encourages SHA to recognize opportunities to work with other departments in the city, public and private. Encourages SHA to examine the opportunities for car sharing programs; believes that this would be essential to strengthen the community. Believes that the scale of this project is sufficient for this type of car-sharing program.

Recognizes that the team has worked with an arborist to examine the trees. Believes that the land is much more significant. Does not believe that the master plan should go to extensive lengths to save the trees, if the grading is sacrificed for this effort. Believes that appropriate grading is more important than saving trees. Believes that the shape of the land is an important form-giver.

18 Apr 2002

Project: **High Point Master Plan**

Phase: Update

Previous Review: 15 November 2001 (Initial Briefing)

Presenters: Ray Hoffman, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

Miranda Maupin, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

Tom Phillips, Seattle Housing Authority (SHA)

Brian Sullivan, Mithun

Attendees: Beverly Barnett, Seattle Transportation

Lyle Bicknell, CityDesign

Alex Harris, Seattle Public Library

Michael Jenkins, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU)

Bill Kreager, Mithun

Peter Marshall, Department of Parks and Recreation

Time: 2 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00253)

Action: The Commission appreciates the update on this third major Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) redevelopment project and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

The Design Commission appreciates the comprehensive nature of analysis that has been completed to date;

commends the proponents and SPU for the intelligent analysis and design of the drainage system and its impacts on physical parameters, such as street design;

applauds the working agreements that SHA, SPU and Seattle Transportation are creating in order to implement this proposal;

recommends that 34th Avenue Southwest be mapped as a public right-of-way through the project, between Southwest Raymond and Graham Streets;

suggests that the new Park Street Southwest be continued and mapped as a public right-of-way through the proposed park between 31st Avenue and 32nd Place Southwest;

encourages the proponents to minimize the amount of paved surfaces and use permeable materials wherever possible; recommends that proponents use driveways for double access;

encourages the proponents to explore mixed-use opportunities in the senior housing buildings;

suggests further refinement of the proposed circulation improvements including enhanced pedestrian crossings along Sylvan Way;

recommends that a traffic signal be located at Morgan Street Southwest and 32nd Place Southwest; and

recommends approval of the schematic Master Plan.

High Point, in West Seattle on 35th Avenue Southwest, is the third major Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) redevelopment project in Seattle. This is a 120-acre planned community, and the proposal includes demolition for the existing 716 dwelling units and construction of a total of 1600 new dwelling units. The project team updated the Commission on the current status of the master plan. A joint review board, with members of the West Seattle Design Review Board and the Seattle Design Commission continues to review this project.

SHA is in the process of purchasing a repair shop on the northeast corner of 35th Avenue Southwest and Southwest Graham Street to improve the circulation on the mixed-use block which may include a grocery store. There are some lingering concerns. This project is federally funded, and there are no City funds for art. However, SHA would like to explore other options to fund an art component for the redevelopment, without using dedicated resources. SHA is excited about many exciting opportunities afforded by this project, as the 120 acres will become a clean slate, and an opportunity to rethink the configuration and placement of utilities in the area. Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is working with the project design team to address the surface water runoff through a sustainable design that mimics nature. The High Point Development sub-basin represents one-tenth of the Longfellow Creek basin. These innovative drainage solutions may be used in the future to guide standard SPU drainage design. This system will be analyzed not only to review the efficiency of this system, compared to a traditional drainage ditch, but the consequences of this type of system will be analyzed as well.

SPU's work on this natural drainage strategy will be completed in two phases, determining the feasibility of the system, and then the design of the technological and system components. Previously, the High Point City Team sponsors reviewed the preliminary strategy for the High Point redevelopment that included recommended street width hierarchy, potential porous pavement installation locations, and a surface drainage proposal for the entire site. The sponsors approved these elements of the natural drainage strategy:

Roadway and right-of-way width hierarchy

Interior residential: 25' street/ 56' r-o-w. The City team approved 25' wide roads with parking on both sides. This parking approval is a deviation from standard, but is critical in accommodating the multiple goals of the project on this site.

Selected residential: 28' street/ 56' r-o-w (with additional study requested for street adjacent to proposed community center to address additional traffic, parking, and pedestrian issues)

Perimeter streets: 32' street/ 60' r-o-w (Sylvan Way to be determined)

Potential Porous Pavement installations

Porous pavement is allowed for the following applications

- all sidewalks

- all alleys

- 1-3 blocks of street (curb to curb)

Natural system drainage

The following range of natural system options will be allowed for application throughout the site as indicated on the conceptual site plan:

- Shallow planting strip (typical grass lawn, 6-9" in depth, little ponding) This option assumes a cross slope rather than crowded roadway with surface drainage on one side of the street

- Bio-retention (landscaped, 18" depth, ponding during 2-yr.)

- Conveyance only (grass, depth varies, no ponding)

The site design and topography also responds to these natural systems drainage goals. The runoff from each block will be directed along the street edge to a catchment facility, rather than a channel, which is typical. Gravel storage for drainage may also be located underneath the pocket parks throughout the site. There may be some challenges with the marketability of the natural drainage strategy. Typically, the planting strip along the right-of-way is a play space for children, and there cannot be tripping hazards for the children. SPU is working with the SHA design team to address the marketability issues, so the planting strips function like a S.E.A. Street, but look and act like a typically historic planting strip.

The joint Design Review/ Design Commission team has reviewed the High Point Master Plan at different stages. The design team and the review team discussed the street layout and the street connections to the context. The plans presented today are have responded to the comments, concerns, and design guidelines of these previous meetings. This project is atypical, as the Design Review Board does not review master plans for large developments. This joint design review team worked to establish the design guidelines of the project and the appropriate street layout. The team continues to work on the design guidelines for the open spaces and natural features throughout the development, the distribution of amenities, street hierarchy, location of uses along the street, and zoning changes. The library and health clinic, at the northwest corner of the redevelopment site, will be reviewed separately.

The design team explained the master plan, which describes how the site is organized as a whole, the street layout and water drainage, the open space opportunities, the housing types and locations, and the proposed zoning

changes. The design team hopes to retain as many of the existing trees as possible.

Goals of the High Point Redevelopment Project

- Assure the short and long term well being of High Point residents with new opportunities for quality housing and self-sufficiency
- Reintegrate the High Point community into greater west Seattle
- Develop a mixed-income community enhanced by public amenities such as new trails, a new public library, grocery store, clinic, and more
- Build quality housing, safe streets, and environmentally sustainable infrastructure

There is a steep greenbelt to the southeast of the site, which creates a natural edge to the site. The community park and elementary school are to the southwest of the site. Sylvan Way is an arterial that goes through the middle of the site. Single family residential areas are to the north and the west of the site.

The design team presented the community planning goals, which suggest an opportunity to improve West Seattle, and the master plan responds to these goals. The job training services, library, health and dental clinic, and community facilities will all be located in the northwest corner of the site. These facilities would be located at 35th Avenue Southwest and Southwest Raymond Street, and are located at this edge to link High Point to the surrounding West Seattle community. The community heart, providing an identity to the High Point site, will be located at the intersection of 31st Avenue Southwest and Sylvan Way. The community center and the senior village will be located at this intersection, providing a front door and a sense of place. The new pond and adjacent park, at the northeast edge of the site, will connect with the local park, while the community park for High Point will be centrally located and adjacent to the community center.

The street grid will also change in response to the surrounding West Seattle context. While the street grid will be angled, in response to the existing topography, the streets will reconnect with corresponding streets beyond the High Point master plan site. The north-south streets will not connect at every instance. High Point Drive Southwest will be a major site street that forms an eastern edge to the community. The new streets will align with this street. While some streets will be pedestrian-oriented, the street grid and type will be based on the different housing types. The central east-west street will also continue through the park to provide a connection to the community center. These and other identifying changes will also improve the wayfinding for people moving through the site.

The community park would be adjacent to the community center, and across the street for the senior village. Small pocket parks throughout the High Point site will be located on each block, to provide a small open space for children and other residents surrounding the park. Major views to the north and the south will be emphasized at all street ends and view parks. This open space system will be connected by trails, and some trails will be flatter, for seniors.

The team explained the proposed housing types and distribution. The buildings would typically be two to three stories. The development would also include four hundred market-rate condominiums. Higher density buildings have been pushed to the edge, to maintain views. The team has proposed some zoning changes that are needed for the housing layout. The zoning for this site would change from L1 to L4. While the development would not be built for this density, L4 would be required for the desired building heights. The zoning would be L2 at the western edges of the development. For sale and rental housing would be mixed throughout the site.

Alleys will provide mid-block access to parking within the block. The entrance to these alleys will be framed with

carriage houses and smaller apartment buildings.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

Recognizes S.E.A. Streets as a precedent for this type of natural drainage strategy, and believes that, over time, the residents along these streets began to take responsibility for the long-term maintenance. Would like to know if the aggregate of non-traditional features would require additional maintenance by the City that would otherwise not be required by environmentally destructive systems. Is excited that SPU is moving in this direction. Recognizes that it may be difficult to implement these ideas in other locations, as this situation is ideal, and there is an opportunity to begin with a clean slate.

Proponents stated that there are a number of components of this process and proposal. SPU, through the Memorandum of Agreement, would identify maintenance responsibilities. In terms of the planting strip, from a vegetative management standpoint, it would be similar to other planting strips throughout the city. Further stated that the bio-retention system would be similar to a landscaped edge.

Would like to know what types of obligations, for the natural drainage strategy, are described in the Memorandum of Agreement.

Proponents stated that the commitments would be delineated and would include many things, including liability, operation and maintenance. The Memorandum of Agreement would outline requirements for each City department. After review, this Memorandum of Agreement would be revised, to fill the missing components. Further stated that, initially, there was not concurrence from all departments, especially concerning street widths. SPU would have the most responsibility.

Would like SHA to explain the system established to help the existing residents with relocation. Would like to know square footage specifics and financing systems.

Proponents stated that there is a relocation system in place. SHA tracks all of the existing residents and their housing locations, and an independent study keeps track of the residents for four years. Further stated that residents have a choice whether or not they would like to stay within the High Point development. Residents may also apply for a Section 8 voucher to move to another rental location, but retain the same rent. Further stated that this redevelopment is guided by federal rules. There will be no net loss for rental housing available to residents earning 30 percent of median income or less. Further stated that there will be a balance of mixed incomes throughout High Point.

Would like to know why the intersection at Southwest Graham Street and 35th Avenue Southwest is not a traditional perpendicular intersection.

Proponents stated that this is the historical alignment of the street, and SHA does not own the adjacent properties. Further stated that they would like to restore the alignment of the intersection if that were an option.

Believes that pedestrian safety should be a priority along Sylvan Way, as many senior citizens and children would be crossing and walking along this street. Believes that the intersection of Sylvan Way and Southwest Morgan Street should be as safe as possible.

Would like to know why the blocks seem small.

Proponents stated that the blocks would be six-hundred feet long, which is the size of a typical block, and are somewhat long. Further stated that this is typical for dense housing as it is more efficient.

Recognizes that the senior housing village is at the center of the community, and the master plan calls for a very large building, without much pedestrian activity. Would like to know if the path along this central area could

become more mixed-use, to encourage pedestrian activity.

Proponents stated that SHA hopes to locate senior citizens in a centralized, large building. Further stated that the building plan is flexible, and there could be an opportunity to incorporate different uses, but these changes would need to be approved by SHA. Further stated that Sylvan Way and 31st Avenue Southwest would be a busy intersection, which may not be as safe for children. The senior village is also located in close proximity to neighborhood amenities and public transportation. Further stated that the community strongly supports this organization.

As a member of the joint review board, recognizes that the revised street grid and connectivity issues have been addressed by the master plan, and these design changes have been in place for some time. Would like to know if the Commission feels that the street grid has been resolved.

Commends the design team for the resolution and connections created by the street grid. Feels that there should be improved east-west and north-south connections within the supermarket block, bounded by 35th Avenue, Southwest Raymond Street, Southwest Graham Street, and 31st Avenue. Believes that there should be a seamless connection between the housing and the commercial area to the west.

Believes that 34th Avenue Southwest should be reconnected through the site.

Commends the team for their level of research. Commends the design team for the integration of the drainage system with the street design. Appreciates the diagrammatic clarity of the system. Recognizes that each team has focused on their particular component, but the teams have all worked well together.

Recognizes that there are many opportunities for art funding. Believes that money used to implement many of the proposed systems and changes could be used to further the social systems and social connections in this project. Believes that SHA could coordinate with Seattle Public Utilities or Seattle Transportation on this matter.

Proponents stated that the City departments have not proposed any funding. Further stated that SHA is paying for all of the road and utility construction. Agreed that there are opportunities to coordinate with systems that will be built anyway.

Is concerned about the extent and width of the alley paving, and would like to know if shared driveways or other design changes would resolve this problem.

Proponents stated that the team would continue to work on this as the design develops. Further stated that carriage houses would frame the entry to these parking garages, reducing the view of the parking from the street.

21 Nov 2002

Project: **High Point Master Plan**

Phase: Street Vacation

Previous Review: 18 April 2002 (Update), 15 November 2001 (Initial Briefing)

Presenters: Miranda Maupin, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

Michael Jenkins, DCLU

Tom Phillips, Seattle Housing Authority

Brian Sullivan, Mithun Architects and Planners

Attendees: Miles Mayhew, DCLU

Beverly Barnett, SDOT

Kristin Kildall, University of Washington

Peg Staeheli, SvR

Time: 1.5 hours (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00253)

Action: The Commission strongly supports and applauds the participatory interactive process that is informing this complex project ensuring its unique character, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

The Design Commission strongly supports the urban design approach taken and the vision and realization of this plan based on the reintroduction of the historic street pattern and respect for the topography;

commends the active participation of SPU and the incredible opportunity that SHA has presented;

appreciates and recognize all of the pieces that had to come together in the contract rezone to manage density;

commends the design going forward and seeding the site for future design;

supports easement or dedication of new right-of-way at N. 34th St. and through the park at SW Eddy St.;

thanks Seattle Housing Authority for going far in integrating different types of units throughout the plan;

will support, in any way they can, the street design idiosyncrasies that will make the project work such as bulbing sidewalks to preserve trees and working with SDOT to create a pedestrian feel on Sylvan Way;

would like a follow-up session to be scheduled for an appropriate time to see open space designs in more detail;

supports putting bus stops where people live and where the community wants them;

fully supports the street vacation and the establishment of a new street pattern as is shown on the master plan;

recommends approval of the street vacations, with eight in favor and one abstention.

Seattle Public Utilities

Last time SPU presented to the Commission, several right-of-way issues were addressed: using narrow streets with historic dimensions of 25-foot wide and parking on either side; having a natural drainage system throughout the site; and using porous pavement in sidewalks and one to three of the streets, depending on underlying soils (the technicalities of this are still being studied). For the natural drainage systems, there are three menu options:

1. Shallow swales—designed to look like traditional planting strips, but they are slightly wider (about 11 ft.). They will be located in the interior of the site layout.
2. Vegetated swales—these are deeper than the shallow swales and a perennial planting palette will be used. These will be integrated into interior parks.
3. Conveyance swales—to be used in steeper areas as a means of surface conveyance.

Hydrology models have been used to assess the drainage and they estimate that each facility will treat about one block plus the associated right-of-way. The Department of Ecology is excited about including this kind of drainage into a dense urban area. Eco-revelatory art will be integrated into infrastructure such as manhole covers and slotted curbs, but they need to go back and look at funding and artist availability. Now the team is entering the regulatory gauntlet and planning ahead. SHA is developing only half the site and the rest is being developed as market-rate, so tools such as Director's Rules will be used.

Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use

The project is now in the MUP part of the process. There are three factors that play into this:

1. Contract rezone—going from LR 1 to LR 2 and LR 4
2. Subdivision—making up to 1411 lots that will be created in series of larger parent lots
3. Environmental review—SHA has completed the final EIS and the city needs to adopt this as part of the review

The challenge with the contract rezone is that most are done on site-specific projects and this is a large, 105-acre project comprised of many sites. The difficulty is how to analyze the impacts of such a project. The best way they have figured out is to have a joint Design Review and Design Commission panel. The guidelines or criteria for evaluating the impacts of the additional density and character of the streetscape are for the new system to mimic and add to the larger streetscape system. The contract rezone was taken to the hearing examiner who recommended approval of the preliminary plat and as a result the team can go ahead with infrastructure implementation.

DCLU has five major guidelines for the project:

1. Physical environment—because it is such a large site, response to the physical environment is challenging;
2. Pedestrian environment—creation of this is important because it will be radically changed with the new street layout;
3. Street system character—the goal is to retain street connectivity and create a sense of place by building on the

character of the neighborhood;

4. Context—creating a relationship to the surrounding neighborhood;
5. Open space network—open space character is part of the review of the subdivision
 - opportunities for place-making
 - determination of the character of the retention/detention pond
 - determination for what would, could, and should be provided for residents, especially children

In the process of writing the decision for this project, what DCLU needs from the Commission are recommendations on the subdivision and the contract rezone.

Seattle Housing Authority

What has emerged in this project is a plan that takes advantage of special features, in part in terms of water, but also in dealing with some other issues. With regard to the housing and relocation of current tenants, they are relocating people and developing in two phases. The tenants voted on which people would move first and who could stay during the first phase. All of the families who want to stay can be accommodated. There was not enough room to have all of those in the single units stay, but it is relatively easy to find places for them to live in West Seattle.

Sustainability is a primary goal of the project and proponents are aggressively participating in the Build Green program. They are currently soliciting for a general contractor and the contractor's willingness and ability to work in this program is a significant criterion.

SHA has brought in Pomegranate Center who have experience involving communities in terms of building projects. It is a priority to have a real community and they are holding spaces in parks where residents can participate in building an element of the park. There will be a more specific plan to implement this in about 2 ½ months. They have been meeting with residents on an ongoing basis to discuss different issues and the next meeting will address what they will do with pocket parks. This past summer they met with the community and had them vote on what they are looking for in the housing units. High Point Housing Redevelopment new construction phasing plan.

With regard to the mixed-use area along 35th and the right-of-way itself, they are negotiating with some users of the site to find ways to break down the barrier that 35th currently presents. They are hoping to supply the users with what they need because SHA knows that the joint review panel and others want this to be a public right-of-way.

SHA will create a community facility that will provide space for nonprofit organizations and social services. They have found one partner at this point, Head Start, to be located here, and they are talking with YMCA about it, as well.

Design guidelines, which will be site specific by block, will direct private builders. SHA has a contract with Mithun and Nakano Associates to create the guidelines for all sites that will be privately developed and they will have focus groups with prospective buyers to aid in creating the guidelines.

The team is currently negotiating with SDOT, but is almost through this process. They will be ready to start demolition of a nearby building and have been deconstructing it for a couple of weeks. In terms of relocating residents, the Evans School at the University of Washington will track residents to see what happens to them.

Mithun

The zoning conflicts on the site are that the remaining L4 area is condominiums and retirement homes. L2 lots will be placed around these to feather the high-density places into the surrounding lower density sites. The minimum and maximum numbers of units will be determined for each block. The maximum number of units is 1600, which is less than L1. In the subdivision plan there are dedicated alleys and easements, and the team is looking for an easement on 34th. Overall, there are more lots than units, but developers can build out an area to less than L2 density. This gives developers a chance to come in and readjust the blocks in a suitable arrangement.

The phasing is such that the north part of the site will be developed first and the south part of the site will be occupied during construction of phase 1. The site has been planned to have maximum integration of different kinds of buildings. In showing residents images of different building options, they found that people preferred a mix of market-rate and rental housing; carriage houses with alley entrances and narrow views into the alleys; public housing that looks like the market-rate housing; and two-story buildings. There is also a desire to save the major trees and the site is being planned with that in mind.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

Would like to know how they determine what kind of swale goes where; would like to know if it decided only by the kind of water that is being treated, or does use factor in as well.

Proponents stated that use is a major criterion. Whether there will be on-street parking High Point Housing Redevelopment zoning transitions sections and the types of soils and topography are also factors.

Would like to know what happened to the north-south connection on 34th.

Proponents stated that it is not at present a dedicated right-of-way. It is an unresolved issue and will be the topic of a hearing.

Would like to know the relationship between the Director's Rules and where these rules reside.

Proponents stated that a Director's Rule could be used to adopt site requirements outlined in an SPU-approved drainage basin plan that relates specifically to drainage in this subbasin. The rule is one of several tools the City can use to implement the drainage goals for this site over time.

Proponents stated that a Director's Rule will provide developers and City plan review staff with guidance in applying the drainage requirements within this subdivision. The Rule could be issued as a joint DCLU/SPU, and potentially SDOT, rule and be used by each department in reviewing future street improvement and building permit drainage plans.

Is concerned with the open spaces on the edges of the development and how they relate to the eastern edge of the corridor; would like to know how they will be defined so they are not co-opted by neighbors as side- or backyards. Feels that the edge needs to be given different kinds of consideration.

Proponents stated that is one of the purposes of the larger greenbelt. It is clearly a natural break with limited access. The project needs to be designed to discourage inappropriate use through the housing. Stated that along the Burke-Gilman Trail, adjacent residents throw yard waste onto the trail and feels that could happen at this edge, too.

Would like to know if the City estimates escrow accounts for street improvements and drainage infrastructure and have developers pay fees so the relevant agency is actually implementing the infrastructure improvements.

Proponents stated that it is a public investment and that the roads and natural drainage system will be developed in their entirety. Later, some of the costs will be passed on for things like mechanics, but SHA is responsible for creating the system to begin with.

Feels that in terms of overall Commission concerns, assuming the overall project evolves with the concept that has been agreed on, they perhaps should focus more on issues like massing, etc.

Proponents stated that guidelines have been developed to help answer some of these kinds of questions. The project goals need to be implemented over time.

Believes that there is concern from the joint panel about the ability of individual developers to change zoning. For example, will early developers have more opportunities to manipulate the overall density and have the site not end up as uniform as the drawings imply.

Proponents stated that there are issues with making sure the grain of the streetscape is implemented as they intend so a Property Use and Development Agreement (PUDA) will be used. The character of two-thirds of the development is that, while the proposed zoning is L4, the density is limited to L2 (1 lot/1200 ft²). That dictates the platting and development pattern and creates a clear sense of what the streetscape would or could be and the height limit will be consistently applied.

Would like to know what the overall loss of public housing will be.

Proponents stated that the number is going from 716 public housing units to 350, but they are committed to replacing housing with houses for people with less than 30 percent median income. The result will be the creation of more housing opportunities for low-income people.

Would like to clarify whether SHA is responsible for building 100 percent of the infrastructure.

Proponents stated that they are building the total infrastructure and all of the parks. The cost of this has been incorporated into the price of the lots they sell.

Would like to know if SHA will build some of the housing.

Proponents stated that SHA will build 600 units of rental housing. The other 116 units will be built by other nonprofits. Another 80 affordable for-sale homes will also be built and the remainder of the units will be market-rate.

Believes that it is good to include alleys, rights-of-way, and open spaces as part of the plan to solidify commitment to their location.

Proponents stated that they are trying to coordinate these and they anticipate that the vacations will go to council in February. The first piece is the preliminary subdivision and MUP and this goes to the hearing examiner. After this, the contract rezone is taken to council. This kind of vacation is different—we are not measuring the loss of right-of-way because right-of-way is being put back in. Thus, the key issues for the Design Commission to address are land use impacts such as adequacy of infrastructure, space for street parking, places for loading, and bus stops. There is also the question of how to fit all of these onto small streets. The possible impacts themselves include layout, density, balance between public and market-rate housing.

Would like to clarify whether the Commission's vacation action should focus on the urban design and community qualities of the new plan.

Proponents stated that what they would like the Commission to think about are character, mix of building types, orientation, and layout.

Proponents stated that there are a lot of design guidelines that speak specifically to 34th Ave. SW. The

two projects that flank it are subject to design review and they would like this to continue to inform the easement.

Supports the vacation and asks that the proponents come back when there are further development plans for the public spaces. Would like to add 34th Ave. to the list of things the Commission gives feedback for today.

Proponents stated that they will have to come back to at least the Design Review panel to discuss the mixed-use block because it is a separate MUP.

Proponents stated that one thing they neglected to mention needing support on are the tree preservation bulbs because some people do not like these. The trees here have been more thoroughly analyzed than those at New Holly phase 1. They worked to expand their information such as the critical root zone for specific trees and feel the tree preservation bulbs will work. Some trees will require mid-block curb bulbs, which technically are not allowed, but City Light and the Fire Department is willing to work with proponents on this. However, they do need some help getting SDOT to support this idea.

Proponents stated that the details on Sylvan Way are not finalized and they need help getting permission to put the bus stops where residents want them.

Would like to know if there are any private development lots for sale.

Proponents stated that there probably are not any for sale.

Believes that SHA does not have the ability to provide a percent funding model and suggests that SHA and developers look at appropriate opportunities to bring in artists. Recommends that the team find creative ways to get artists to work with spaces such as pocket parks.

Proponents stated that they can work this into the design guidelines.

Commends the team in trying to have bureaucracy design something that does not look like it's designed by bureaucracy. Feels that the subtleties such as saving trees, mix of uses, and sustainable infrastructure are all progressive moves. Encourages proponents not to write a detailed and dense proposal that does not allow flexibility and not be heavy handed.

Compliments the team on the continuous structuring of the project so that they are ending up with something very close to their original vision. Believes that the development will require management and maintenance. Would like proponents to go back to the previous action as well and keep the following recommendations from that in mind: "34th Ave. SW be mapped as a public right-of-way through the project, between SW Raymond St. and Graham St." and "the new Park St. SW be continued and mapped as a public right-of-way through the proposed park between 31st Ave. and 32nd Pl. SW."

5 June 2003 Project: **High Point Master Plan**
Phase: Open Space Plan Update
Previous Review: 21 November 2002 (Street Vacation), 18 April 2002 (Update), 15 November 2001 (Initial Briefing)
Presenters: Brian Sullivan, Mithun
Gail Staeger, Nakano Associates
Margarett Harrison, Mithun
Peg Staeheli, SvR
Attendees: Tammy Frederick, Seattle Dept. of Transportation
Lauren Hirt, Dept. of Design Construction, and Land Use
Michael Jenkins, Dept. of Design Construction, and Land Use
Meghan Montgomery, University of Washington
Heather Nickel, University of Washington
Lisa Nein, University of Washington
John Logan, University of Washington

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00253)

Action: **The Commission thanks the team for coming and would like to make the following comments and recommendations:**

The Design Commission commends the team on innovative, exemplary sustainability strategies including the scale of the natural drainage system and the use of deconstruction techniques;

encourages the team to have the goal for deconstruction be 100 percent;

applauds the simple and clear design standards being used for the neighborhood to help ensure the overall quality of the development, no matter who the designer or builder may be for subsequent blocks;

feels that the designers' development of a comprehensive open space plan is fundamentally strong and these recommendations are in the spirit of enhancing what the designers are already trying to achieve;

recommends that the team develop stronger identities for each of the different parks so that each has its own character, takes advantage of its own site conditions, and, in the end, feels like a unique place;

encourages proponents to further explore how residents will use the parks and occupy outdoor spaces, and have more direct intentions for what kind of public and social life will be generated in these space with less focus on the picturesque and pastoral;

feels that the relationship between the neighborhood center and park at the center of the

site is critical and looks forward to seeing strong connections between them;

recommends that the detention pond be viewed more as a working landscape and the design be more expressive of the pond's innovation rather than it being a pastoral landscape that looks like a natural pond;

suggest that there be no fence around the pond because if you put a fence around this pond, there might as well be one around Greenlake; and

suggests that proponents consider alleys as part of the open space network and do another layer of exploration into how they work.

There are several updates on the High Point development since the team's last presentation to the Commission:

The schedule has received full Council approval and the vacations and zoning have been cleared for construction.

Construction has begun on the neighborhood clinic and construction begins on the library this week.

The senior building across from the park is now going through the review process and will begin construction in December or January.

Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) put out an RFQ for development of the mixed-use site and will receive responses from developers this month.

Phase I site construction is beginning; the site has been fenced, abatement will be started soon, and demolition will be started in July.

Construction of housing will begin next spring or summer.

A pilot deconstruction project will occur onsite to see how feasible it is and to train people in deconstruction.

Mithun is developing design guidelines for High Point as well as Rainier and Holly Park III. They are creating these for the entire High Point plan as well as developing guidelines for each housing site.

There have been very few changes, if any, to the plan that the Commission approved. There are several roadway/street design issues. Last time the Commission recommended that an easement be put in right-of-way to create a 34th St. connection; the team did this and the easement was approved. In addition, the Commission recommended an easement for Eddy St., but Council did not approve this. They were concerned that the road would be a mismatch between users with cars in the same area where children would be going to the park. Sylvan Way, which will be in place in Phase II, is still being worked through with SDOT. The duplexes have a narrow strip of pavement in between and in front that opens up so that cars can be parked away from the front of the houses. Landscape is being used to break down the scale of the duplexes.

Several sustainability strategies are being used for the housing. Some homes are being deconstructed rather than demolished. The team is using "healthy homes" guidelines, which addresses issues for people with asthma and other respiratory problems. They are looking for additional funds for this project and the goal is to have 50 healthy homes onsite because there is a high percentage of families dealing with these issues in this population. Saving trees is a priority in the project and they are looking at ways to reuse those that must be taken out onsite. The team is looking to use these trees in building the new housing, the community center, the finishing of other buildings. In addition, the project's artist may use some of the trees. There are some invisible sustainable methods that the team is using such as enhancing the soil; installing low-pollen, native, and drought-tolerant plants; and eliminating

pesticides and chemical fertilizers.

The High Point project will be the first urban natural drainage system. The planning of this system is moving into the technical phase and is working well. One key goal is to design one that not only works, but is constructible and affordable. The pond is extremely flexible and is primarily a storm water pond rather than a water quality pond. Most of the water quality issues are being addressed within the blocks. The types of swales that are being used are brassline, shallow (for water quality), and vegetated. SPU is funding an artist, Bruce Meyers, who has worked on other city projects such as Discovery Park Nature Center. He will work to integrate art throughout the site. The theme will be dealing with water and addressing the neighborhood as the high point of Seattle and as a gathering area. Elements that translate into drainage such as inlets and the corridor to the pond will be the focus of the art. The art plan will be going to the Arts Commission in June or early July.

The park block is from SW Morgan St. and Sylvan Way SW to SW Raymond St. The design team pulled the houses back by SW Raymond St. to open up the street and have green space in front. The team is keeping with the original concepts for development of the open spaces. There will be view points in the park near the pond. There is a hierarchy in the parks with the larger ones being the central community park and the stormwater park and the smaller ones being the three neighborhood parks and a series of pocket parks. The streetscapes connect all of the parks and the landscape architecture team is using unique ground plane plantings to identify the associations. There is also a streetscape hierarchy that is being blended with the existing physical setting. The streets are green to the east, becoming more urban to the west. In the park blocks, the streets have a lot of trees with strong color and a somewhat formal feel. The residential streets have more variety, but there is still a pattern.

The community and stormwater parks are at the schematic level. The community park is the visual and activity heart of the community. Activities in the park will range from special events and large gatherings to everyday use by residents. Water passes through the park; water is expressed in an urban way to the west and becomes more naturalized as it passes through. There is a gathering area with an overlook and terracing that serves as stepped seating. This space also serves as an amphitheater when there is an event. The park will have lighting, through connections, and play features such as spray pools. It will contain features that acknowledge the history and physical nature of the site as a high point. The Pomegranate Center will participate in getting community participation to create some of these features for the site.

The stormwater park has all the technical aspects for stormwater detention, but will be a natural, quiet space. There will be celebration of water, entry nodes, and linkages to the rest of the site. The space will have a half-court basketball court and a children's play area. The water will run through a stream (dry most of the year), vegetated swale, or runnel that connects with the pond. The play area will have primarily natural play features like boulders. There is a 20-foot grade change from the overlook to the pond. The ADA-accessible path around the pond is a half mile long and has series of destination spots for people to pause. A pump and running course of water will be use to aerate the pond. The park will also have a texture garden with boulders and moss, and a sunny lawn area for games and picnics. The pond is fenced, but there is a continuous zone of vegetation for water quality and to separate the water from the park.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

Would like to know if there are still p-patches here.

Proponents stated that there are in the stormwater park and there are also market gardens.

Likes the pattern of having three different types of spaces and would like to hear more about the unique

characteristics of each.

Proponents stated that the community commons park will have a lot of activity and active play of all different ages of children. It will have an indoor basketball court in the community center and an outdoor half-court and may have p-patches, trails, benches, and play areas. It is 2.8 acres and also has a small soccer field.

Proponents stated that the hierarchy is based on proximity to the houses. The pocket parks will not have any equipment and the neighborhood parks will have activity zones. Each park has a unique setting: the north park is by the pond and connects to Longfellow Creek via the Legacy Trail, and the south park is closer to the homes and more urban. Many of the smaller parks will not be built right away, but they are there in the plans as placeholders and the team will work with the community to build them.

Would like to know how Pomegranate Center is involved and how the gathering space in the community park relates to the community center.

Proponents stated that they are working with Pomegranate now. Pomegranate held a workshop with residents to paint fence pickets for the market gardens. The team is beginning to identify other elements that Pomegranate will be involved with; they will not be working on the design of, but components within the parks.

Proponents stated that they do not know enough about the community center to design the space around it yet, but there is a spatial zone where they see things coming together.

Is concerned with the use of the word “pastoral” to describe some of these landscapes, including the pond. Feels that the pond needs to tell its story, which is of human interventions. Encourages the team to design pocket parks as social spaces and not parks.

Encourages the landscape architects to shift gears and feels that there is so much in the site and it is a vibrant place that they are tiptoeing around. Would like to see them be explicit about their designs and be deliberate, bold, and aggressive to force something exciting to happen. Is unsure of the pastoral, too, and of having a strong social program in a pastoral setting. Feels that if there is a fence, it should not be visible.

Would like to the Commission to endorse the idea of deconstruction versus demolition and would like the goal to be deconstruction in the first phase, as well. Encourages the team to make sure there is a connection of the stormwater from the community park to the pond; does not see swale currently shown as conveyance swale. Feels that if there are unused open spaces, they could be made into pea-patches. Does not like the idea of having a fence and believes that if you have put a fence around this pond, then there needs to be one around Greenlake, too.

Encourages proponents to consider alleys another part of the open space and to use them to their fullest social possibilities. Feels that how the houses are laid out will determine the safety of the alleys.

Would like to know if the alleys are mapped as right-of-way.

Proponents stated that they are and they are part of the network of streets and open spaces.

Suggests the design teams think of all of the pocket parks as very different places with different issues.

Encourages the team to think more abstractly about all of these spaces and consider other language modes. As an example, suggests proponents look to Martha Schwartz’s project in Japan.

Is concerned about the re-creation of nature around the pond. Believes this is a working landscape and it should be shown as such. Longfellow Creek is the true natural drainage of the site.

18 Sep 2003

Project: **High Point Master Plan**

Phase: Open Space Follow-up

Previous Review: 5 June 2003 (Open Space Plan Update), 21 November 2002 (Street Vacation), 18 April 2002 (Update), 15 November 2001 (Initial Briefing)

Presenters: Tom Phillips, Seattle Housing Authority

Brian Sullivan, Mithun

Attendees: Margaret Harrison, Mithun

Gail Staeger, Nakano Associates

Brad Kurokawa, Nakano Associates

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 170 | DC00253)

Summary: The Commission appreciates the direction that this project has taken and would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

The Design Commission compliments the Seattle Housing Authority on seeing this project as a social venture, not just as a physical design, and appreciates that they have involved Pomegranate Center in the process;

compliments the team on the way in which systems have been integrated including the natural, physical and social systems and suggests that the use of this way of thinking might help to further generate forms for the design;

appreciates the way that circulation patterns and open space have been developed so that they are well linked and clearly allow people to move around the site and encourages the team to continue to think of open spaces as something that will be used by people of all ages and for all types of activity;

urges the team to further refine the pocket parks, and sees responding to particular on-site opportunities as the way to make them distinct and separate from each other;

encourages the team to continue to look at the alleys as walking spaces and as play spaces;

urges the team to look at the central parking lot and think of ways of better integrating its shape with the form of the adjacent community building so that it feels like they are part and parcel of the same larger space;

encourages the team to allow things to continue to happen on the site rather than try and proscribe all aspects of the design; in particular, feels that the inundation of the area around the pond could form a new textural pattern; and

commends the entire team on the arts plan for this project.

This is the final update on the open space plan for the High Point Master Plan. Construction is already beginning on

the pond and also some foundation work. As part of the sustainable plan for the project they are also deconstructing 20 units on site. Saving a number of trees on site is another component of the sustainable plan. Trees that are to be preserved have fences around them with dollar values of how much the contractors will need to pay if the trees are damaged. The Master Plan also calls for setting aside some trees that need to be removed, and using them as benches and art around the pond.

The team is working with Pomegranate center to develop a gathering place in the Community Park. The community will help design the space and also help to build it. This strategy of community involvement will help create a sense of community ownership of the public space. The community will also help to design the fence around the market garden.

Phase I of the master plan project will develop the portion of the site north of SW Eddy St. The open spaces are designed to create layers of public space of different scales and different degrees of intimacy. The public spaces include the Pond Park, the Community Park, and the pocket parks. All of the parks are linked by the open space system of the streets and alleys. Sylvan Way SW and 31st Ave SW will be developed as SEA streets that feed into the pond. These streets will be similar in concept to the SEA street built in North Seattle.

The project team has been focusing on four themes in their development of the High Point Master Plan:

- Emphasize connections
- Celebrate water
- Recognize existing and create new high points
- Integrate art

In emphasizing the connections the team would like to make connections within High Point and also to West Seattle. They would also like to improve the connections to neighborhood trails. To celebrate the water they are both integrating natural drainage systems into the neighborhood design, and also celebrating water with art and water play. Through recognizing and creating high points the team would like to make use of these as natural gathering places. The efforts to integrate art include working with existing boulders and trees which are on site, as well as casting designs into curb cuts and trench drains. The imagery in these castings will reflect natural themes such as fish and leaves.

One of the primary design elements of the master plan is the connection between the Community Park and the Pond Park. The Community Park is strategically located at the entry point to the neighborhood from many directions. There is also a building for seniors and a mixed use development immediately adjacent to the site.

The team wants to carry the theme of water and drainage between the Community Park and the Pond Park. Water won't flow continuously between the two parks because it will be collected periodically and filtered, but the team would like to show the runoff path that connects the two parks.

Eddy St will be developed as a wider and wilder street than the others. The goal is to bring in the natural landscape from the park at the east end of Eddy and make the street feel like an urban forest. There will be high points with vistas within both the Community Park and the Pond Park. In the Community Park the public face of the park will be on the west side. This will be a gathering area that faces the neighborhood center to the south.

There will be a mound at the north end of the public space High Point Phase I Plan which will become a destination point within the park. An amphitheatre will be developed on the south face of the mound which will face on to the public space.

A play zone will be developed to the NE of the neighborhood center. The play zone will include basketball, gravel beaches, and water play. The water from the runoff system will be daylighted in selected areas to activate the play zone. Further north on the Community Park site will be a multipurpose play area. The play area will be big enough for a small soccer game, but not large enough to have lights and structured competitions. The Community Park will be the active center of the site. People from many different age groups will use it.

North of the Community Park 31st Ave SW will take a loose free form shape that follows the path of the water draining from the SEA street toward the pond. At the important intersection of High Point Dr SW and 31st Ave SW the pattern of the water flow will be taken across the intersection. At the Pond Park a bowl has been created around the pond. This form attempts to be a natural extension of the existing land forms on the site. The space around the pond allows people to overlook the pond from all directions. The goal of the park design is to draw people from the intersection of High Point Dr and 31st Ave down to the pond. There will be an overlook between the intersection and the pond which will act as a destination to draw people into the park. There will also be a half court basketball court aimed at kids who are 10 years old and younger.

The pond will fluctuate from three feet deep to ten feet deep. There will be a path around the pond at both levels. The planting around the pond will be turf that is tolerant of the change in water level. Water will be re-circulated through the pond from the top of the hill near the overlook. There will be a series of weirs leading up the hill, connected to an overflow point. On the north side, which is the sunny side of the pond, there will be a terraced grass area for passive recreation.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

Questions how the plan addresses the Commission's previous recommendations, specifically the last six actions from the previous review.

In response to the recommendation to develop stronger identities for each of the parks; proponents explained that the Community Park is more activity based while the identity of the Pond Park is based on the strong natural landscape.

In response to the recommendation to further study the uses for the parks; proponents explained that they are trying to provide activities for all age groups. They also noted that the Pond Park will have more passive recreation spaces, while the Community Park will be more active.

In response to the recommendation not to build a fence around the pond; proponents explained that the fence will be very low and will be surrounded by planting.

Wonders what the darker buildings on the map indicate as opposed to the lighter buildings.

Proponents explained that the darker buildings are SHA affordable housing, tax credit housing, and public housing. The lighter buildings are market rate housing.

Is concerned that there are not active spaces for older kids, such as basketball courts and hard surfaces. Notes that this is a key group that SHA needs to work actively to engage in the community.

Proponents stated that there is a basketball court at the neighborhood center.

Suggests that pocket parks could have some hard surface areas.

Proponents noted that the pocket parks are programmed as passive recreation space. Proponents agreed that young adults are a critical group to engage. They are concerned that anywhere a full court basketball court is located it will tend to drive the other activities away. Proponents noted that they are sizing basketball courts for different age groups. They are locating the smaller courts, for younger kids, closer to the houses so they can be closer to their parents. The recreation spaces for teenagers will be located further away from the concentration of residences, so that teenagers can have the independence that they want.

Wonders how the pocket parks are each unique.

Proponents explained that the pocket parks are not all the same shape. They also noted that some pocket parks have existing trees while others don't. They added that the planting patterns are different for each of the parks.

Feels that the alleys should be incorporated into the open space plan for the area. Notes that they will be the natural gathering place for the older kids and teenagers.

Proponents explained that the alleys are part of the existing street system. They stated that typically there is parking in the alleys and that back yards face on to them. They noted that there are low fences that separate the back yards from the alleys, but that they are not high enough to block visibility. They stated that the alleys are typically 16 foot paved right of ways and they the alleys provide additional connections into the pocket parks. Proponents imagine that children will use the alleys to play ball and ride their bikes.

Suggests that the parking lot adjacent to the neighborhood center could also be used as a plaza space, where people could gather for protests, or to have a bazaar.

Proponents stated that they have considered that this space could be used for a farmers market, or other public activities. They explained that they have not yet designed the parking lot to that level of detail.

Recommends that the parking lot could have a special paving material that would help facilitate its use other than as an area for parking cars.

Notes that gathering spaces feel better when they are embraced by buildings. Suggests that the configuration of the neighborhood center should be considered further in relation to the parking lot in order to develop a stronger relationship between the two.

Feels that the design team didn't push the design of the parks to be as dynamic as they possibly could be. Suggests that the parks could be more funky and unique. For example one pocket park could be a secret garden while another could be futuristic.

Suggests that the plan should allow for things to happen in the future, and recognize that it won't all be designed right now.

Questions how many times the terraced lawn to the north of the pond is a lawn, and how many times the pond will fill up.

Proponents stated that the pond will only fluctuate to its highest level for a couple of hours. They explained that the high level is designed for a two year storm, which means that it will probably reach that level only once a year. They added that they are developing a lawn that can tolerate this fluctuation.