



Seattle
Design
Commission

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

21 March 2002

Gregory J. Nickels,
Mayor

Donald Royse
Chair

Tom Bykonen

Ralph Cipriani

Jack Mackie

Cary Moon

Iain M. Robertson

David Spiker

Sharon E. Sutton

Tory Laughlin Taylor

John Rahaim,
Executive Director

Layne Cubell,
Commission Coordinator

Projects Reviewed

Lake City Multi-modal Transportation
Seattle Transportation Neighborhood Projects
Libraries for All (LFA) Branch Update
CityDesign Update
Pro Parks Art Plan
Pro Parks Update

Convened: 8:30am

Commissioners Present

Jack Mackie, Vice Chair
Tom Bykonen
Cary Moon
Iain M. Robertson
David Spiker
Sharon E. Sutton
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Adjourned: 4:30pm

Staff Present

John Rahaim
Layne Cubell
Brad Gassman
Sally MacGregor



Department of Design,
Construction & Land Use

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

21 Mar 2002 Project: **Lake City Multi-modal Transportation**
Phase: Follow-Up Briefing
Previous Reviews: 1 March 2001 (Briefing), 20 July 2000 (Briefing)
Presenters: Shane Dewald, Seattle Transportation
Ted Rees, Seattle Transportation
Steve Resnick, Seattle Public Utilities
Attendees: Lyle Bicknell, CityDesign
Peg Nielsen, Seattle Transportation
Ruri Yampolsky, Seattle Arts Commission

Time: 1.25 hours (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00216)

Action: The Commission appreciates the design direction of the proposed streetscape improvements and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Design Commission applauds Seattle Transportation's efforts to balance the issues and concerns of so many groups, including Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT), King County Metro, the community residents, local business owners, and regional commuters using Lake City Way;
- recognizes public transit as a regional transportation solution, and hopes that the team will continue to realize this through the street improvements;
- encourages the team to clearly define the distinction between regional and local traffic and how these have driven the design of the streetscape improvements;
- supports the strategic addition of street trees, recognizing competing interests regarding the placement of these trees;
- feels that the pedestrian improvements should highlight the crossing at Thornton Creek through innovative design solutions that recognize this larger ecological feature;
- hopes that the pedestrian improvements continue to reinforce the notion that pedestrians are most vulnerable in these locations and these improvements should be considered as safety measures;
- hopes that the streetscape design reinforces some primary pedestrian safety improvements, including:
 - clear crossing zones with improved refuge areas;
 - buffers between the pedestrians and the road; and
- encourages Seattle Transportation to make pedestrian improvements that strengthen the east west crossings of Lake City Way, and would like these east west crossings explored through section drawings;
- continues to offer support to Seattle Transportation as the best steward of the city's transportation needs; and
- would like to see this project again in the future to better understand the connections to area neighborhoods.

Seattle Transportation staff reviewed proposed improvements for Lake City Way from I-5 to 145th Street Northeast. Seattle Transportation is working with Metropolitan King County (METRO) and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to coordinate several concurrent transportation improvement projects. Staff explained the scope of work for Phase I of the Lake City Way Improvement Project.

- An asphalt overlay of the existing Lake City Way roadway, from I-5 to 145th Street Northeast;
- Curb, gutter, and sidewalk will be constructed along the west side of Lake City Way between Northgate Way and 123rd Street Northeast;
- The traffic signal system along the length of the Lake City Way corridor will be upgraded to support more efficient transit signal priority;
- Sidewalk, lighting, drainage, and bus zone improvements will be constructed at the intersection of Lake City Way and 24th Avenue Northeast to improve passenger waiting area;
- An analysis of alternatives for the development of additional left turn capacity at the intersection of 15th Avenue Northeast and 80th Street Northeast will be completed by the City;
- Access management improvements will be implemented along the Lake City Way Northeast corridor to resolve accident problems and movement conflicts;
- A detailed site field check will be conducted by the City at intersections of 123rd Street Northeast and 30th Avenue Northeast to determine the feasibility of constructing a northbound peak transit queue jump;
- An additional southbound queue jump will be constructed at 130th Street Northeast, but no additional parking removal would be required;
- Transit Priority Request (TPR) equipment will be installed at up to fifteen signalized intersections on Lake City Way between I-5 and 145th Street Northeast; Seattle Transportation is working with METRO to do this; and
- Bus shelters, lighting, and other improvements in the immediate area of the bus zone, including those that improve access for passengers with disabilities will be constructed.

Seattle Transportation is also working with the Seattle Arts Commission on the opportunities for 1% for Art. The artist selection will be in June, and these opportunities will be tied to areas with significant pedestrian improvements.

Seattle Transportation reviewed the pedestrian improvements on Lake City Way between Northgate Way and 123rd Street Northeast. Seattle Transportation is working with the community to identify trees with desirable canopies, and those that can be planted in the minimum amount of sidewalk space. However, Lake City Way is an arterial corridor, and WSDOT is currently developing design guidelines for this corridor to follow the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines. These guidelines describe street trees as a safety hazard for vehicles, and require ten feet of clearance for landscape improvements; these guidelines are contradictory to Seattle Transportation's goals. Seattle Transportation believes that local jurisdictions, which include professionals, can determine the most appropriate street improvements for the area. Seattle Transportation has not yet identified the amount of space that will be afforded by the transportation improvements. However, if there is room for landscape improvements, Seattle Transportation would prefer street trees, rather than a median. The streetscape improvements and street trees will also be coordinated with underground utilities.

The design for the Thornton Creek ravine has not been completed yet, but typical street trees may not be planted here. However, the streetscape improvements at this crossing will relate to the creek.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know Lake City Way's role in the transportation system. Would like to know if this is a regional arterial.
 - Proponents stated that this is a State Route, which causes some conflicts between the many stakeholders. WSDOT would like to make mobility improvements, Seattle Transportation would like to make local improvements for Lake City, and METRO would like to make transit route improvements. Further stated that the improvement project is a balance between regional needs and local needs.
- Would like to know why proponents have expressed an interest in reduced speeds, and if these changes will allow Lake City Way to continue to serve regional and local needs. Recognizes that this arterial is a hybrid that needs to address many types of users. Would like the proponents to explain the goals of these improvements.
- Would like to know the nature of the pedestrian needs that will be addressed through this improvement project. Recognizes that Lake City Way is very wide, and would like to know how the east west connections would be improved.
 - Proponents stated that there are some sidewalks along Lake City Way, but not from Northgate Way to 123rd Street Northeast; a sidewalk would be constructed there. Further stated that most of the intersections along Lake City Way have signalized crossings. Further stated that a pedestrian refuge area at 140th Street Northeast may be constructed as well.
- Would like to know if there would be limited access express buses along this route. Would like to know if the extra lanes would be for public transit only.
 - Proponents stated that the extra right-hand lane would not be an HOV lane, and carpools would not be able to use this lane. Further stated that the extra lane would be for use by transit, and would provide turning access intersecting streets and businesses along Lake City Way.
- Would like to know WSDOT's position on existing medians.
 - Proponents stated that WSDOT has developed conceptual sketches. Crash-tested barriers would be required along medians with trees, and essentially, the median would be raised to the height of a jersey barrier. These would not be appropriate for pedestrian refuge. Further stated that these requirements would increase the cost of tree plantings within medians.
- Would like to know if the community is involved.
 - Proponents stated that improvements are designed to meet City standards, and take advantage of existing street design. Thornton Creek Alliance is excited about these improvements. However, local car dealerships are concerned about view restrictions caused by tree canopies. Further stated that some members of the community are concerned about tree debris. Further stated that there has not been one on one interaction with the community.
- Recognizes that the Seattle Transportation team has balanced so many concerns from different groups. Would like to know what the Design Commission could do to support the project's goals.
 - Proponents stated that they are requesting comments on the WSDOT design guidelines. Seattle Transportation will respond to the draft guidelines, as will the City of Bellevue and the City of Spokane.

- Would like to know if Seattle Transportation is would advocate for more local control.
 - Proponents stated that they would, and these street design guidelines could affect so many streets in the city, such as State Route 99. Further stated that there is extensive community involvement from this diverse community. However, the local businesses do not typically agree with the general community members regarding some of the streetscape improvements. Further stated that Seattle Transportation is speaking to each business owner, to gather opinions.
- Would like to know if a landowner removes a street tree.
 - Proponents stated that the City can impose a legal fine.
- Recognizes that the three blocks south of Thornton Creek are so different from other sections of Lake City Way, and the dominance of the automobile is so apparent. Encourages proponents to plant trees in the interest of pedestrian safety, and believes that pedestrians are much more vulnerable than those in automobiles.
 - Proponents stated that there is a sea of pavement in this area, and heat radiates from this surface. The street trees are an improvement in the most important area of the public realm, and are the City standard.
- Would like to know if the team has completed pedestrian counts in the areas that do contain sidewalks. Believes that it is important for the local needs to be balanced with the regional needs. Hopes that Seattle Transportation will identify primary pedestrian routes. Feels that this information would be important for Seattle Transportation's response to WSDOT's draft guidelines.
 - Proponents stated that there are other team members, not present, who have focused on some of these specific physical features in this landscape. The team is coordinating with King County and WSDOT; there will be a pedestrian refuge area at 140th Street Northeast. Further stated that Seattle Transportation's response to WSDOT's draft guidelines would not focus on a specific project. Further stated that the design for Lake City Way includes the sidewalk as an important pedestrian feature, recognizing that, although pedestrian volumes are not high now, they may be in the future, and these improvements may also encourage pedestrian use along this corridor.
- Remains confused about the local specific design issues. Would like to know how these guidelines coordinate with the purpose and needs of this specific road. Believes that on-street parking, not considered in these improvements, would improve pedestrian safety, providing a buffer between the pedestrians and the traffic. Would like to know why the on-street parking will be removed. Recognizes that many of the businesses along this section of Lake City Way are not pedestrian oriented, and believes that most of the pedestrian traffic moves along the east-west corridors. Is not convinced about the need for street trees along the north-south corridor of Lake City Way. Recognizes that there are many complicated issues.
 - Proponents stated that the team has been trying to balance on-street parking with the need for a transit lane. Further stated that these lanes could potentially be used for parking during off-peak hours. Further stated that the team investigated an opportunity for curb bulbs, to improve the visibility of pedestrians, but these would conflict with the transit lanes. Further stated that the community supports increased street tree plantings.
- Would like to know how the Lake City Way Improvement Project coordinates with the local neighborhood plan.
 - Proponents stated that these improvements for the local community coordinate well with the regional need for this transportation corridor. Further stated that while these improvements address street tree plantings and vehicle safety, WSDOT also would like

Lake City Way to continue to function as a stated route.

- Encourages the proponents to focus on the east-west crossings, rather than north-south pedestrian improvements. Urges the proponents to recognize that bus riders become pedestrians once they get off the bus, and while the Lake City Way improvements address this transit corridor, it must also address the community's needs to get home once they get off the bus; this route may include a need to cross Lake City Way.
- Recognizes that the team, through these improvements, is trying to address irreconcilable differences. Agrees that the east-west connections must be addressed, but hopes that the north-south improvements are not discarded to do so. Supports the north-south improvements.
- Recognizes that Jackson Park detention pond is at the end of Thornton Creek. Encourages the team to look for opportunities for connections to these improvements.

21 Mar 2002 Project: Seattle Transportation Neighborhood Projects

Phase: Briefing

Presenters: Peter Lagerway, Seattle Transportation
Shauna Walgren, Seattle TransportationAttendee: Lyle Bicknell, CityDesign
Michael McGinn, Greenwood Community Council

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00268)

Action: The Commission appreciates the interesting and pertinent briefing on neighborhood traffic-calming projects and small pedestrian improvement projects and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Design Commission feels that this work is essential to the urban fabric;**
- **appreciates Seattle Transportation's efforts to strengthen community-based design initiatives by working with other agencies;**
- **commends the team's efforts to meet community needs with available resources to provide the maximum benefit;**
- **appreciates the team's flexibility to work with neighborhood planning groups to maintain appropriate priorities;**
- **appreciates the team's efforts to balance competing demands equitably throughout Seattle with limited and finite resources; and**
- **looks forward to future periodic updates.**

Seattle Transportation presented a briefing on neighborhood traffic-calming projects and small pedestrian improvement projects.

Seattle Transportation Traffic Calming Improvements

Seattle Transportation's Traffic Calming Program is nationally recognized. Typically, thirty traffic calming devices are installed per year, to reduce speed, volume, and the number of collisions. There are many steps that precede the actual construction of traffic-calming devices. Initially, there is interest from community members. Concerns about local traffic speed are documented by a neighborhood speed watch, during which the community records speeds on the streets under consideration. Education and enforcement of local speed limits follow, through the incorporation of signs and other measures. Seattle Transportation evaluates the safety record of each location based on collision history, speed data, and traffic volume counts. If traffic calming devices are needed, there are many options. Traffic circles reduce collisions by 90 per cent, and sometimes reduce volumes. Chicanes, two or three curb bulbs that alternate from one side of the street to the other, reduce the street to one lane; these are effective to reduce mid-block speeds and may reduce volumes. Speed humps are most effective in high speed locations, and really only affect average speeds. Diverters are also used to reduce volumes.

In 2002, there is funding for twenty speed watch projects and ten traffic circles, but there are no funds for mid-block traffic projects. The Neighborhood Street Funds (NSF), Seattle Transportation funds, and the Cumulative Reserve Funds (CRF), Department of Neighborhood funds, are also used to fund these projects, for a combined total of 1.5 million dollars. The District Councils prioritize the projects at District Council meetings. Over a three-year period, the District Council, using NSF, called for 51 traffic calming devices, 26 pedestrian improvements, 10 maintenance projects, and 6 other neighborhood improvements (a median or a large CIP project), and 1 traffic mobility project.

Seattle Transportation presented some example traffic calming projects. At Madison Street and 20th Avenue, Seattle Transportation worked with the community to make improvements to the business

district, improve pedestrian crossings, and create a focal point in the urban village. Neighborhood Matching Funds were also used for the art component of this project.

2002 NSF funding will allow for 16 traffic calming devices, 6 curb bulbs, 2 walkways, and 2 other projects. Funding for 2003 is uncertain. The communities depend on this program for to build the high-priority projects.

Seattle Transportation Pedestrian Improvements

Small, different types of pedestrian improvements are completed each year, and Seattle Transportation explained how these projects are prioritized. Seattle Transportation targets pedestrian routes near social service areas, commercial areas, and schools. Many signage improvements are made near schools and the main pedestrian routes to these schools; these are updated every year. Seattle Transportation completed an inventory to identify needed improvements. Seattle Transportation has begun to incorporate bright green signs, which are more visible than typical black on yellow signs. A national study has been completed, which identifies the typical conditions of safe and unsafe crosswalks. This study also compared data regarding average daily traffic (ADT), the number of lanes, and the traffic speeds. Different improvements were identified in the study. Seattle Transportation developed a Five-Year Work Plan to update non-signalized crossings to meet the current standards.

Seattle Transportation has also prioritized the need for sidewalk replacement, and continues to address street trees that cause problems. A large pit is required for street trees, but the sidewalk must remain ADA accessible. Seattle Transportation hopes to address at least one neighborhood commercial area per year.

Seattle Transportation also reviewed improvements for bicycle lanes. Signing for existing bicycle lanes may be improved, and bicycle lanes may be added as well. If a street is four lanes, the street may be reduced to three lanes, with the incorporation of a new bicycle lane.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Would like to know why Seattle Transportation improves school crosswalks that are manned by crossing guards.
 - Proponents stated that these crosswalks are still dangerous, and people do not always stop for crossing guards.
- Recognizes that some traffic calming measures in neighborhoods could confuse drivers who are unfamiliar with the area. Would like to know if signage is incorporated with the installation of diverters.
 - Proponents stated that those using shortcuts are typically people who are familiar with the neighborhood, and Seattle Transportation no longer typically constructs diverters. Further stated that arterials do not all have the capacity to support the traffic of the non-arterials. Further stated that a serious traffic study was completed in Capitol Hill, and many diverters were installed. These caused many problems, and Seattle Transportation has reconsidered the use of these traffic calming devices.
- Recognizes that community District Councils are used to prioritize projects. Would like to know if this is effective.
 - Proponents stated that this process has been in place for five years. For some communities, it works well, but in others, it does not. It depends on the organization of the District Councils. Typically, the partnership between the District Council and Seattle Transportation is great.

- Would like to know if there are varying levels of organization within the District Councils.
 - Proponents stated that, last year, Seattle Transportation encouraged the District Councils to work with planning organizations. Further stated that Seattle Transportation needs to geographically balance the identification of improvement opportunities and allocation of funds.
- Is excited to hear this type of advocacy. Would like to know which streets are within Seattle Transportation's purview.
 - Proponents stated that residential streets and arterials are within Seattle Transportation's purview, and there are different policies for different types of streets.
- Would like to know if pedestrian advocacy is common throughout Seattle Transportation. Would like to know if these types of improvements are made only in residential areas.
 - Proponents stated that more pedestrian improvements are typically made on arterials, and these typically include curb bulbs, ramps, and sidewalk repair.
- Would like to know the budget for these pedestrian improvements, relative to Seattle Transportation's departmental budget.
 - Proponents stated that some of these pedestrian improvements can be made by piggy-backing other development projects or private development projects. Agreed that pedestrian safety improvements should be more of a departmental priority. Further stated that there are differences between policy and budget decisions. For instance, Seattle Transportation addresses along street and cross street improvements, but these are not always determined by budget decisions. Further stated that street improvements may never end, but bicycle trails may be completed; therefore, there could be a shift in the funding pendulum.
- Believes that the pedestrian experience is ultimately determined by the design of the public realm. Would like to know if this is an active, priority policy within the design guidelines at Seattle Transportation. Would like to know if the policy states this clearly.
 - Proponents stated that this thinking is typically related to individual people within Seattle Transportation. Further stated that these policy statements can be found within Seattle Transportation's Strategic Transportation Plan. Further stated that the strength of these statements relates to leadership, and the strength of these statements could change, with the goals of the leader. Further stated that the departmental mission could shift.
- Would like to know how mobility needs are balanced with pedestrian safety and experience.
 - Proponents stated that this balance is never clear-cut. There is always a balance between different issues and a competition for space. Further stated that Seattle Transportation tries to identify a variety of opportunities, and tries to integrate these improvements with other changes. Further stated that every bus stop begins and ends with a pedestrian trip.

21 Mar 2002 Project: Libraries for All (LFA) Branch Update

Phase: Briefing

Previous Reviews: 15 March 2001 (Update on branch additions and renovations), 18 May 2000 (Briefing on Branches)

Presenter: Alex Harris, Seattle Public Libraries

Attendees: Jess Harris, Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU)
Michael McGinn, Greenwood Community Council
Tim Morrison, Finance Policy and Budget, Department of Finance

Time: 1.25 hours (SDC Ref. # 222 | DC00013)

Discussion Summary: The Commission appreciates this timely briefing and the explanation of the complex public engagement process for the design of branch libraries. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- **The Design Commission appreciates Seattle Public Libraries' (SPL) exploration of alternative approaches to siting, internal program, and design, in order to address a myriad of community concerns and work on co-location options with various public agencies;**
- **in revisiting the thoughtful design goals for the Libraries for All (LFA) program, hopes that site design and urban design needs will be better defined and explored early in the project, before programmatic elements begin to define the branch library designs;**
- **commends SPL for attempts to develop mixed-use projects, whenever appropriate;**
- **urges SPL to clearly define the design team's role, as design professionals, to the communities, and hopes that through this process, the functional and programmatic requirements are integrated with the aesthetic decisions;**
- **recognizing that branch libraries are important civic projects, hopes that SPL will balance present-day local community concerns with bold, long-term visions for a 21st Century library system, without reliance in historicism; and**
- **continues to enthusiastically support the LFA program.**

The Director of Seattle Public Library's (Libraries for All) LFA program provided an update on branch development pursued by the LFA program. Currently, there are twenty-seven branch library projects underway. The historic libraries will be reviewed by the Landmarks Board review process. The Director reviewed the LFA architectural design goals, which reflects some of the Design Commission's own goals.

- Residents can be proud of what their investment of public resources has purchased; enduring quality, civic presence, and distinguished design that is compatible with communities and urban contexts.
- Historic buildings, old and new, will be sensitively preserved. Additions will honor historic quality and will not detract from buildings.
- All libraries will be clearly identifiable as a welcoming public facility, even if co-located with other public or private functions. The libraries will be equally accessible in the broadest sense.
- Buildings' design and siting should speak to users of all ages and from many different cultures in our community.

- Art will be incorporated to add depth and visual interest to the buildings.
- Designs will reflect an awareness of the landscape and site influences.
- Designs will consciously and carefully use light and materials, reflecting the region and environmental sensitivity.
- Public awareness of design processes and opportunities for involvement will be extensive. Buildings will function effectively as libraries and workplaces.
- Buildings will be flexible to respond to changing technology, demographics, and needs.

The LFA community process includes many steps. First, there are community members on the design team selection board. Additionally, Seattle Public Library (SPL) hosts a “Hopes and Dreams” meeting for each branch library project, in order identify the library needs of a specific community and explore the initial ideas for design and art. Then, there are two or more meetings with the community throughout the design process, the end of schematic design and the end of design development. Furthermore, there are many active “Friends of” library groups. Typically, the community involvement is consistent. SPL posts meeting notices in the neighborhoods, hosts many open houses, and accept comment cards. Some branch libraries present many siting concerns and issues; in these cases, there may be a community liaison meeting. The branch managers for each project also provide many good resources for community connections. The Citizens Implementation Review Panel (CIRP) is a fourteen-member committee with representatives from the entire city. CIRP meets once a month, attends community meetings, and acts as a steward for LFA branch library program.

LFA web page has been used extensively as a public information tool.

The Director updated the Commission on the status of each branch library project.

- Capitol Hill and Delridge Libraries are both under construction.
- Eleven libraries are in various stages of design. Four projects are currently working on design team selection.
- SPL is working on site selection and acquisition for various projects, including Northgate and South Park.

The Director updated the Commission on the siting process for the branch libraries. Some projects have proven to be more difficult than others. The site acquisition processes for many of the libraries has been fairly uncontroversial. Some branch libraries have been or will be co-located with other projects, including Holly Park. The Delridge branch library will be co-located with affordable housing. The branch libraries in Ballard, Beacon Hill, and Capitol Hill will be co-located with Neighborhood Service Centers. Ballard will also be co-located with a bank branch; it is difficult for SPL to co-locate with private entities. The co-location projects sometimes require additional staff time, and there is also a need to maintain a civic presence within the community.

While there is a temporary facility for the Central Library, there will not be temporary locations for branch libraries.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Feels that the memo to the Library Board of Trustees from SPL, clarifying SPL’s position on two-story libraries and structured parking does not clearly explain why the staff lounge or offices cannot be on the second floor.
 - Proponent stated that they are investigating this as an alternative, specifically in the case

of the Greenwood library. Further stated that the design team for the Greenwood library is working on design alternatives, incorporating a mezzanine with some library uses and program.

- Recognizing that many of the branch library sites are constrained and urban in nature, feels that SPL should explore two stories within libraries. Hopes that SPL will realize the positive spatial conditions created by these design changes, such as height and volume. Believes that this could be a positive condition in SPL's analysis.
 - Proponent stated that originally, the mechanical services were to be located on the second floor, at the Greenwood branch library. This would provide greater height over the main area. Agreed that two stories would provide new opportunities.
- Feels that the Commission often has some concerns with the design teams' urban design analysis of the project sites, particularly the relationship between pedestrian usage and sidewalks. Feels that the design teams are often thinking about the internal needs of the library and the form of the building, more than the relationship between pedestrians and their movement through and around the project. Wishes that the initial analysis would address the visual connection to the neighborhood, the social uses and characteristics of the site (including, but not limited to, pick-up and drop-off waiting areas). Would like to know how the design process could change, to better address these issues.
 - Proponent stated that when the site allows, SPL and the design team try to provide some exterior social spaces. Further stated that some sites are more accommodating than others. Throughout the consultant selection process, SPL and the consultant selection team look for firms that recognize the urban design issues for a particular project.
- Is concerned that branch libraries are often designed for drivers. Recognizing that branch libraries serve local communities, would like to know if this standard has changed or will change with the construction of the new branch libraries.
 - Proponent stated that SPL has worked with the Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU) to reduce the required number of parking spaces, when justified. Further stated that SPL is currently surveying library users to determine the number of drivers, bus transit users, and the number of pedestrians coming to the library. Many of the library sites are constrained. The parking difficulties, the increased cost of land, and the cost of structured parking are considered and balanced throughout the site selection process. Further stated that some patrons do come by car, particularly those with many children.
- Feels that it is important for the design team to consider the site issues from the beginning of the project. Hopes that the landscape architecture team work begins before the building design and form begins to take shape.
- Commends SPL for the work they have done to date, to improve communities. Feels that the SPL is brave to work with so many groups.
- Realizes that consensus on the design of all of the branch libraries may never be reached, in terms of the aesthetics of the design, but hopes that there is consensus that the program needs are addressed.
 - Proponent stated that the Library Board often addresses these concerns, and the board recognizes that the designs may never please everyone, but would like to move forward with every project positively.
- Feels that there is a need to unite the program and aesthetics throughout the design process.

Recognizes that this must be an educational process, opening up people's minds to the possibilities.

- Proponent agreed and stated that the Greenwood branch library is an example. The loading function was originally designed to be located on the street, instead of inside the parking garage. To bring the loading function into the parking, the bulk of the building and the relationship between the building and the street would worsen.
- Feels that the community participation process should address the function and massing of the building, and is concerned that communities approach the design of the building with preconceived notions of styles.
 - Proponent stated that SPL expects the design teams to respond to the context, but feels that SPL and the community cannot dictate the style of the building. Feels that this would be insulting to the design team.
- Appreciates SPL's willingness to address a number of concerns. Recognizing that the access issue has been such a significant concern in the past, hopes that the need to address pedestrian access to the branch libraries should be formulated as a design principle.
- Agrees that SPL should remain as open as possible, to the question of style, but suggests that the Design Commission could take a position on the style of the libraries. Feels that a design goal of the program should be "design contemporary libraries," rather than urging design teams to design libraries to appear historic. Recognizes that the Carnegie libraries were constructed as contemporary structures when they were originally built. Feels that the Commission could take a stand relative to this issue, and educate the public about how contemporary urban design and architecture can relate to a local context.
 - Proponent stated that architects are reluctant to design buildings that replicate an historic building.
- Believes that a branch library's new role in the community needs to be addressed through the design goals.
- Would like to know what the Commission could do better.
 - Proponent stated that the Commission is helpful. Further stated that if there are any community concerns or issues, please inform SPL so that the larger issue can be addressed. Further stated that it is helpful to have Commission support for the LFA program and projects.

Key Visitor Comments and Concerns

- Michael McGinn, a representative from the Greenwood Community Council stated that the Commission is asking many good questions about the role of the library and urban design. Does not fault SPL for the neighborhood community process in that it provides opportunity for input, but feels that the communities' expectations of what a library should be in a neighborhood setting, and SPL's ability to meet these expectations is a problem. Recognizes that the Greenwood community was hoping for a library located within a retail setting, with the potential for co-location and mixed uses within the building. Recognizes that a library is a civic building, and sidewalk and social spaces address the civic needs. Feels that SPL does not recognize these needs, and focuses on the interior program and needs of the library. Feels that SPL does not have the power to meet these larger expectations, either in staff, budget, but most importantly, the desire to do so. The Library Board believes that accomplishing urban village goals is nice, if it can be accommodated, but has no commitment to doing so.

- A representative from the Department of Finance, who is working on the budget analysis for the operating and maintenance costs for SPL, stated that the budget pressures on the SPL are intense. Feels that these restrictions could be long-term. Encourages the Commission to take this into consideration when making comments that affect the staffing needs.
- A representative from the Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU) affirmed SPL statements about branch library parking considerations. Stated that the branch library projects continue to request development standard waivers either through the Administrative Conditional Use process or via City Council

21 March 2002 Commission Business

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| ACTION ITEMS | A. | <u>TIMESHEETS</u> |
| | B. | <u>MINUTES FROM 7 MARCH 2002</u> - APPROVED |
| DISCUSSION ITEMS | C. | <u>OUTSIDE COMMITMENT UPDATES</u> - CUBELL |
| | D. | <u>LAKE CITY GARAGE CONSULTANT SELECTION PANEL</u> |
| | E. | <u>DESIGN REVIEW UPDATE</u> - GASSMAN |
| ANNOUNCEMENTS | F. | <u>SANDPOINT MAGNUSON PARK DESIGN WORKSHOP</u> ,
SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 9 AM- 11:30 AM |

21 Mar 2002 Project: CityDesign Update

Presenter: John Rahaim, Director, CityDesign

Time: .75 hour

CityDesign staff presented an update on current CityDesign activities.

The Street Improvement Manual may hopefully become a City document, setting street design standards. Funding for a full-time position was approved, and other City departments have allocated funds to begin rewriting this manual, while Seattle Transportation will be the lead City department. Ultimately, the Street Improvement Manual would be completed in three years, and will include design standards and development procedures.

The Wayfinding program is also moving forward, and funding has been committed to manage the next phase of this project. Barbara Gray will be working half-time on this project.

The Strategic Planning Office will be reorganized, and will be reduced to become an executive policy office. Some planners will move to Seattle Transportation, and others may move to Department of Design, Construction, and Land Use (DCLU), but jobs will also be lost. The reorganization will provide an opportunity to have an integrated planning function within the city, but at DCLU. Through these changes, the planning function within the city will be cohesive. The Seattle Planning Commission is the stewards of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, and the Planning Commission and staff have some concerns about these changes, as they too might become a part of DCLU.

Through the implementation of these changes, CityDesign's organization will also be clarified and refined. CityDesign will be structured into four groups, Design Review Board staff, the Design Commission staff, an urban design group, and an education and outreach group.

CityDesign also hopes to begin examining the neighborhood planning processes, and how these plans coordinate with the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan, which identified different growth targets in different areas of the region.

CityDesign continues to review the Design Review Program, which is unique, as this program could bridge the gap between the non-regulatory efforts of DCLU (including CityDesign) and the regulatory, permitting component of DCLU.

Staff also provided an update on CityDesign's continuing efforts to strengthen its education and outreach program; additional staffing would be required. Design education and outreach is integral to fulfilling CityDesign's mission, both building on and supporting the strategic urban design work and project review updates.

Staff also briefed the Commission on recent collaborative efforts with the Planning Commission in reviewing early on major transportation projects, such as the Viaduct/Seawall replacement and the ETC/Monorail. The Viaduct design and planning efforts clearly indicate a need for waterfront planning.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Is concerned that the Street Improvement Manual (SIM) does not explicitly describe the design standards and needs for neighborhood streets.

- Staff stated that there is no list for street classifications in the SIM, and the design standards do not directly relate to the type of street. Further stated that there are differences between this and the Land Use Code.
- Would like to know if the new planning functions and organization of DCLU will relate to the Department of Neighborhoods.
 - Staff stated that they would, and stated that the relationship between the City departments and Seattle's neighborhoods is very important.
- Is concerned that the clarity of City departmental goals is lacking, noting earlier discussion relating to pedestrian improvements within neighborhoods, and why these are encouraged by individuals within Seattle Transportation, rather than Seattle Transportation policy.
- Would like to know if the Planning Commission will begin to have a more powerful role.
 - Staff stated that, hopefully, the Planning Commission would begin to have a more powerful role, as stewards of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Would like to know if a Planning Commissioner or a Design Commissioner is on the selection committee for the new Executive Director for DCLU.
 - Staff stated that the number of committee members was identified by Mayor Nickels, and the committee is composed of attorneys, developers, an architect, and others. Further stated that CityDesign has suggested that a Commissioner should be on the selection committee.

21 Mar 2002 Project: Pro Parks Art Plan

Phase: Briefing

Previous Reviews: 1 November 2001 (Briefing)

Presenter: Carolyn Law, Seattle Arts Commission/ Department of Parks and Recreation

Attendees: Wendy Ceccherelli, Department of Parks and Recreation
Marilynne Gardner, City Budget Office, Department of Finance
Barbara Goldstein, Seattle Arts Commission

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00270)

Action: The Commission thanked the artist-in-residence at the Department of Parks and Recreation, funded by the Seattle Arts Commission, for the briefing on the comprehensive art plan for Pro Parks and Community Center projects.

- The Commission appreciates the thorough response to previous Commission comments;
- supports the analytical notion of parks as a layering of activities, and hopes that artists will use these complex layers as a medium;
- hopes that this art plan will offer an opportunity to expand the practice of site-specific art to consider various media and social conditions;
- supports the comprehensive four-tier approach and the art plan's concern for adaptability across the city;
- particularly supports the incorporation of the writers' residency as a new means of expression for the built environment and hopes that writing projects are distributed broadly;
- supports the arts planner's efforts to reconsider parks as opportunities for cross-generational and cross-cultural experiences;
- encourages the use of examples that are of similar scale to the sites that have been identified throughout parks in Seattle;
- applauds the Seattle Arts Commission residency programs; and
- will not review the art plan again, but looks forward to reviewing the products of this plan, as they are brought forward through Pro Parks Levy and Community Center Levy projects.

Carolyn Law is the Seattle Arts Commission artist-in-residence for the Seattle Parks Department. She is working to take a citywide perspective on current and upcoming Parks Department Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) and Pro Parks projects, to identify opportunities for artist involvement and 1% for Art projects. The Arts Planner presented the draft Art Plan, which has been reviewed by the Public Art Advisory Committee and Ken Bounds, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation. The Art Plan was an opportunity to address the scope and schedule of the Pro Parks Levy.

The Arts Planner began by examining the Parks Department's mission and visiting many of the Parks Department's sites. Through these investigations, she began to focus on the experience of parks for all members of Seattle's community, recognizing that these experiences are changed, due to so many factors. While each park would be experienced individually, a series of these projects would be linked throughout the city to provide an additional unique experience.

The primary vision for the artwork projects is to create unique, interactive places of meaning and

imagination that use nature as a primary resource and medium. These places will momentarily remove people from the urban backdrop to experience the natural world. - Draft Arts Plan

The art interventions will provide a conversation with the full layer of activities in the park, and will be interactive. These interventions will also be tied to the character of the park, with the entire park site as the focus of the intervention.

Arts Plan Recommendations

Major Projects- *The bulk of these funds will go to the development of major arts projects that address this vision in a significant and extraordinary fashion at selected major park sites in all sectors of the city.*

General Art Opportunity Fund- *A second program will create a General Arts Fund for smaller scale art projects. This fund builds flexibility to develop unique, integrated artwork in significant parks that vary in character from the major project parks. It will allow artwork to address shifting priorities and emerging potential as parkland is acquired during the life of the levy. It will also enable the Parks Department to tap the talent of emerging artists. General Art Fund programs will also be spread throughout the city.*

In-house Parks Department Projects- *A third program will be create an annual fund for in-house Parks Department projects that allows staff and design consultants to add aesthetic components using rosters of pre-qualified artists.*

Writer-in-residence- *There will be a writer-in-residence program to develop written work that can be used to enhance the communication of Parks Department's mission and stories, enliven a range of written materials developed and used for public and community interactions between Parks department staff and the public. - Draft Arts Plan*

The arts planner has developed a list of proposed sites for these interventions, which are distributed throughout the city; this list includes Lincoln Park, Jefferson Park, Watercrest Park, and Dexter Pit Park.

The arts planner presented slides of many inspiring national and international examples that use nature and the environment of the site as the primary medium.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Appreciates the presentation. Believes this arts plan is very exciting, and looks forward to the implementation of these ideas.
 - Proponent stated that working in-residence at the Parks Department was integral to this process. There were many opportunities for constant conversation. Proponent stated that there would be a comprehensive review in the future, with the Parks Department and the communities to develop clear language and clarification of future development.
- Recognizes that many of the example projects are located in controlled sites, in which the client has most of the control over the design. Feels that parks in Seattle are different, and would like to know how the integrity of the work would be maintained throughout the design process. Hopes that the “Seattle process” does not erode the work.
 - Proponent stated that the strength of these works is found in the conceptual framework of the pieces. Plans to work with the Parks Department, so that they can describe to themselves and to the communities the purpose of these projects, so the language is consistent; everyone would be learning at the same time. Hopes that the in-residence program continues through the implementation, to ensure a truly collaborative process.
- Is concerned that about the neighborhood’s influence on the designs, rather than the Parks Department.

- Proponent stated that the community would be present through the definition of the scope of the project, and the artist interview and selection process. Further stated that these discussions should address large characteristics, rather than a prescriptive description of the project. Further stated that all levels of the Parks Department work with the community at various times.
- Feels that the example project images represent many sites that are very large in scale. Is concerned that these images could promote false expectations. Feels that these art interventions could be equally exciting, but of a smaller scale.
- Would like to know if the structure of the arts plan is too rigid for the artists, or if it is not rigid enough.
 - Commissioner Mackie, artist representative stated that the arts plan is not too rigid. Further stated that it will be very important to educate and inform the selection panel.
- Through the implementation of the Arts Plan, feels that there should be some information that is unique, in terms of the direction to the artist. Appreciates the notion of nature as a resource, and encourages the arts planner to also include “an exploration of the layering of uses as medium.” Recognizes that the parks are used, and there are use levels, and believes that the arts plan could be more descriptive of ranges and mediums that artist could explore.
 - Proponent agreed and stated that the description “interactive” could be expanded to include these ideas.
- Recognizes that a goal of the arts plan was “to combine a comprehensive vision of the role of art in Seattle’s growing parks system,” and would like the arts planner to explain how this would be achieved.
 - Proponent stated that this would be realized in the qualities of the projects, but would also be described by the arts plan vision. Further stated that these projects would create a journey throughout the city, enriched by a variety of types of experiences.
- Would like the arts planner to describe the multi-sensory aspects of these projects.
 - Proponent stated that it is the way an artist could extrapolate from the different experiences, such as walking through a reserve of old growth. Further stated that there are certain associations related to the experience of art, and these art interventions would not solely be visual experiences.
- Hopes that people will be able to develop a language for art and parks. Hopes that the arts plan vision and ideas affect every stage of the process, even after the arts plan is completed. Encourages the arts planner to consider the amplification of people and the urban environment as a goal of the interventions, in addition to encouraging people to get lost in the environment.
 - Proponent stated that the arts plan is considered a workbook. Proponent agreed and stated that this executive summary does not represent all of the items addressed in the full arts plan, and some of these concerns are addressed in the full arts plan.
- Encourages proponent to speak to the multi-generational experience and how the scale considerations of the pieces would affect these experiences. Encourages the arts planner to also consider ADA accessibility, and how this would affect the experiences.
 - Proponent agreed and stated that these, hopefully, people would revisit these sites multiple times throughout their life.

- Would like the arts planner to explain the relationship between the artist selection and the site.
 - Proponent stated that the artist would be selected site by site, and the park site selection would be coordinated under the larger ideas of the art plan.
- Recognizes that the arts plan is very ambitious and aggressive, but the budget would not be as large or aggressive. Encourages the arts planner to carefully examine opportunities, and hopes that some of the art interventions would be considered primary construction pieces of these parks.
 - Proponent agreed and stated that she is working with Seattle City Light and Seattle Public Utilities to identify some project adjacencies. Further stated that, in some cases, the park construction budget and the art budget would be merged considerably.

21 Mar 2002 Project: Pro Parks Update

Phase: Update

Previous Reviews: 3 May 2001 (Briefing), 5 October 2000 (Parks Development and Levy Implementation Briefing)

Presenter: Michael Shiosaki, Department of Parks and Recreation

Attendees: Marilynne Gardner, Department of Finance
Karen Gordon, Department of Neighborhoods, Landmarks Board

Time: 1.5 hours (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00226)

Action: The Commission appreciates the general update and the continuing engaging dialogue on the Pro Parks program. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Commission encourages the Department of Parks and Recreation to refine its consultant selection process, and would like to offer assistance in shaping future Request for Qualifications for major projects to encourage involvement by more conceptual and inventive designers;
- encourages the Parks Department to study successful examples outside of Seattle, to investigate the design process for these projects relative to criteria definition, consultant selection, and project implementation, with clarification and explanation from an outside consultant;
- encourages the Parks Department to allow designers to address the role of public parks in urban environments in the 21st Century, whether the focus is social change, ecology, spurring development, or other ideals;
- encourages the Parks Department to develop design goals or principles for all Pro Parks projects, as well as design guidelines for each specific project, using Seattle Public Library's Libraries for All program as a model, since it has a similar focus and view;
- encourages the Parks Department to strengthen the public process for Pro Parks projects, with these goals in mind:
 - to clarify the role and purview of the community in the review of park designs, support the role of the professional designer, and clarify the responsibilities of the Parks Department;
 - to ensure that the meetings are well facilitated;
- through the public process and the design process, hopes that present-day community concerns are balanced with bold visions for parks as places for exploration for all Seattle residents; and
- hopes that the Pro Parks Art Plan is embraced by project managers and integrated in the full design process, rather than art being treated as merely an additive component.

The Development and Planning Manager from the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department) presented an update on the current stages and processes of the Pro Parks Levy program. The funds appropriated from this levy were available for use beginning in June of 2001. This is an eight-year levy. Because it is a levy, rather than a bond, the incoming funds and the projects funded by the levy must be sequenced very carefully.

While the Pro Parks Levy does include acquisition and development of new projects, it also includes

enhanced park maintenance, educational programming at the zoo, environmental stewardship programs, and opportunity funds. The opportunity funds provide funds for citizen-nominated park development projects and properties for purchase as parks, particularly to address opportunities and projects not identified at the time the levy passed.

The Pro Parks Levy program established a sixteen-member oversight committee, appointed by the Mayor and City Council. This committee provides recommendations and oversight for the overall financial responsibilities of this program, and the plans for implementation. Initially, the oversight committee prioritized the projects and developed a work plan for the first eighteen months. Parks Department, working with the oversight committee, needs to define the scope of improvements for these projects. The community process is important for these efforts. There is also an internal review process within the Parks Department, called Committee for Operational Review and Evaluation (CORE). CORE works to determine how an individual project would coordinate with the Parks Department standards. Some parks may be reviewed by the Parks Board; this typically occurs if there is a particularly contentious issue related to a project. In some cases, a master plan must be approved by the City Council.

The Parks Department has hired additional staff, including people with a design background.

The Pro Parks team has continued to address comments and concerns from the last Commission meeting. The Commission suggested that the Parks Department should take a broader, intellectual design approach to some of these projects. Typically, the community concerns relate to programmatic concerns, such as a need for a ball field. Parks Department recognizes the challenge to address these concerns.

The Parks Department explained the consultant selection process. The City's Roster Program allows an opportunity to work with smaller, innovative design firms. The Parks Department uses this roster (which has eighty categories) to identify firms for smaller projects; Parks Department staff and community members work together in this selection process. For larger projects, the Parks Department issues a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). Parks Department staff typically design the ball fields or smaller paths.

Through the Pro Parks Levy Program, the Parks Department has also focused on the sustainability and maintenance requirements of parks. Internal reviews will analyze these concerns, and if a project cannot be maintained efficiently, Parks Department will reconsider those developments or improvements.

The Development and Planning Manager updated the Commission on the status of various projects.

- Washington Park Arboretum- The Master Plan and EIS were approved after a seven-year process. Levy funds will be used to begin implementation.
- I-5 Open Space- This project includes undeveloped right-of-way (under I-5) that would connect Eastlake with north Capital Hill. Parks Department is working with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to determine the potential for this project. This site is approximately seven and a half acres, and is steeply sloped.
- Ballard Municipal Center Park Development- There is a concept plan, completed a few years ago. This would be a two-acre park, kitty-corner from the future library.
- Gas Works Park Improvements- Levy funds are needed to plan the improvements for the northwest area of the park and the connections between this park and Wallingford.
- Cheasty Boulevard Improvements- This is located in the Beacon Hill area. A Project Advisory Team (PAT) has been established for this project. This is one of the historic Olmsted Boulevards, and connects the V.A. Hospital and Beacon Avenue. Levy funds would be used to improve trail connections, right-of-way improvements and traffic calming devices.

- Boren/ Pike/ Pine Park Improvements- Neighborhood Matching Funds (NMF) were used to fund the concept plan. Levy funds will lead this project into design development.
- Judkins Park Improvement Plan- This would be completed in three phases. The soccer field has been funded. The parking area needs to be repaired. Other improvements would be made to the sports facility, so it can be used for other community events.
- Jefferson Park Pathway Development- These improvements would provide connections to the middle school, play fields, Beacon Avenue, the Community Center, and the V.A. Hospital.
- Wallingford Steps Development- This project includes a portion of implementation, as the housing development to the east will not be moving forward. This implementation of this project will be phased.

Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns

- Is concerned that the massing and vegetation planting of Jefferson Park does not clearly define the hierarchy of space within the park.
- Encourages the Parks Department to reflect on and rethink the design process and how this process addresses the role of parks in the 21st century.
 - Proponent stated that the role of parks in the 21st century is a complicated investigation, without an easy answer. The Parks Department considers this to be a challenge for further exploration through future park design and development and further coordination with the Design Commission.
- Would like the proponent to explain some of the bigger goals for these projects, especially for larger parks, such as South Lake Union Park, and would like to know if they are identified in the design guidelines.
 - Proponent stated that this update was meant to be a broad overview of the many Pro Parks Levy projects. Further stated that Commission members have been on Project Advisory Teams (PAT).
- Feels that there are no easy answers and recognizes that these projects and improvements are part of a long continuum of work underway in Seattle. Recognizes that the Parks Department is often at the mercy, to some extent, of the neighborhoods. On the other hand, the Parks Department has an opportunity to address things in a new way, and hopes that the Parks Department takes advantage of these new opportunities to look at things in with a broad approach.
- Was a member of the Jefferson Park PAT. Hopes that there are ways to minimize the negative effects of the community participation, which usually results in a laundry list of programmatic needs and wants. Hopes that the Parks Department can clarify the role of the community input to the communities. Recognizes that meeting facilitation is an entire area of expertise.
 - Proponent stated that the Parks Department sometimes hires meeting facilitators, sometimes, meeting facilitation is part of the consultants' abilities, and sometimes, Parks Department staff facilitates meetings. Currently, managers are being trained to facilitate meetings. Many of the Pro Parks Levy projects have come from Neighborhood Plans.
- Recognizes there are many challenges related to the management of these projects.
- Would like the Parks Department to ask the communities what they want or hope for, as a minimum, encouraging the community members to use broad ideas and description. As the project is addressed

by the design team, hopes that they are encouraged to address these needs with a strong concept. Feels that the Parks Department can explain the community's role to the community.

- Recognizes this fascinating conversation reflects a national conversation that re-asserts the professional authority over the community process. Recognizes that there are three players in the conversation, including the Parks Department, the community, and the professional designer. Feels that the Parks Department should ask more of the designers, recognizing that they profess to be the expert. Hopes that the professionals can be an advocate for their design, while listening to and incorporating the hopes of the community. Feels that many consultants listen to and record the community input, but do nothing to use these comments to address the design.
- Encourages the Parks Department to examine the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for some project outside of Seattle as a potential model. Believes that the language of some of the other RFQ attract design teams with the big ideas.
- Recognizes that the Parks Department, as the main client, should support the design teams and consultants, and set the bar higher for the consultants. Feels that Parks Department should stand up for the consultants as the design team for the project. Encourages the Parks Department to use other cities as examples.
 - Proponent agreed, and stated that the Parks Department often spends time responding to letters that state “you didn’t listen to me.”
- Feels that the consultants should begin the design process with an educational component, explaining “this is what a park could be, and still meet the minimum programmatic requirements desired by the community.”
 - Proponent agreed, and stated that concrete descriptions, concrete examples, and direct language, rather than broader, conceptual ideas would be helpful to project managers.
- Believes that the goals of the parks could be very similar to the SPL branch library goals. Agrees that it is nice to begin each project with a clearly articulated set of goals. Encourages the proponent to examine the SPL LFA design goals.
- Recalls the previous presentation, which used a variety of national and international examples. Encourages the team to examine national and international park and landscape projects. Through many of these examples, the difference between art and park was indistinguishable. Feels that the examples should relate the specific problem at hand showing an alternative to the typical response.
- Recognizes that form is not the primary concern, but form and ecology are not necessarily in conflict with each other. Feels that some ecological improvements should be made in conjunction with the formal improvements (e.g. Cheasty Boulevard) in this process.