



**Seattle  
Design  
Commission**

**APPROVED  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
6 December 2001**

Greg 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

Jefferson Park Site Plan  
Woodland Park Zoo Discovery Village  
Seattle Center Open Space Restoration  
Harrison Street  
Jackson Park Detention Pond

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 2:30pm

Commissioners Present

Donald Royse  
Tom Bykonen  
Ralph Cipriani  
Jack Mackie  
Cary Moon  
Iain M. Robertson  
David Spiker  
Sharon E. Sutton  
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Staff Present

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

---

**6 Dec 2001** Project: **Jefferson Park Site Plan**

Phase: Briefing

Previous Reviews: 15 February 2001 (Briefing)

Presenters: Don Bullard, Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department)  
Dennis Meyer, Portico GroupAttendees: Robert Hinrix, Jefferson Park Alliance  
Frederica Merrell, Jefferson Park Alliance

Time: 1.5 hours (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00212)

**Action:** The Commission appreciates the briefing and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

- The Design Commission supports the overall design approach of the site plan and general layout of components;
- applauds the proponents' ability to reach consensus and identify a preferred alternative for the site plan, while working with many different groups and interested parties;
- commends the team for the improved open spaces and the long-range vision of the park, represented in this design;
- is concerned that the design is driven by the accommodation of distinct program elements and appears to be a collage of visual ideas, urges the team to unify the site plan design through a bolder form-driving gesture or single overarching concept;
- encourages the team to develop a powerful expression of water, to reflect the history of the park;
- encourages the team to use vegetation to clearly shape the open spaces and views in the park;
- encourages the team to apply greater rigor to the geometric order of the plan and to extend the straight pedestrian promenade along Beacon Avenue to support the contrast between this perimeter path and the curvilinear paths within the park;
- supports the design team's proposal for an elevated prospect and pedestrian bridge at the northwest corner of the site, but urges the design team to retain the existing edge of the reservoir and strong geometry at this location while forging a better connection to the neighborhood;
- hopes that SPU and the Parks Department will use a comparative life-cycle cost analysis and recognize safety concerns in considering a permanent, hard covering of the reservoir to be a priority; and
- urges the design team and the Parks Department to recognize that the site plan will be implemented incrementally, and hopes that the plan can express this flexibility.

Jefferson Park is located on Beacon Hill. The Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department) updated the Commission on the development of the site plan concept design. The design team and the Project Advisory Team (PAT) worked together with the community and others to identify a preferred

alternative for the site plan. The initial three alternatives were developed to respond to goals set forth by the Beacon Hill neighborhood plan, which was approved by the City Council. The consensus plan is based on the input and comments of three meetings. The north reservoir will be covered to become a park, and the second reservoir will also be covered. Because Jefferson Park is unique, and promotes a variety of activities and uses, meadows and planted edges will be used to unite the different areas of the park also provide links to surrounding uses, such as the Asa Mercer Middle School.

The existing 7,000 square foot, three-story community center is the heart of the activities of the park, and is not ADA accessible. The improvements and expansion of this community center would be phased. A new gym would be built to the west of the existing community center, which is on Beacon Avenue; these facilities would be linked by a breezeway. Beacon Hill is the entrance to the park, and this facility should be improved to provide a significant street presence.

The northeast corner of the park is an active area, and the design would link and invite this activity south and west, throughout the full park. The park would contain pastoral areas in addition to small, intimate social spaces. The children's play area, an active social gathering space, would be surrounded by outdoor seating.

Water, an historical focal point of Jefferson Park, will be used throughout the design. A water sculpture will be the point of origin for an interactive play stream. A wetland area will become a transition zone to frame the public space.

The pedestrian circulation into and throughout the park will be improved through the new site plan, and the entries throughout many edges of the park will be improved. There will be a promenade along the Beacon Avenue edge of the park. This promenade will be used to host a variety of community activities that will celebrate the community and the history of the park. The grading of the site will improve the connection between Beacon Avenue and the reservoirs. There is a meandering path that circulates around the golf course; this path addresses the slopes within the park and provides ADA accessibility. The path leads to the summit of the park and refers to the Olmsted design.

The south reservoir will be lidded with a soft lid in the short term, but the site plan represents the long-term goals for the design of the park. The design of the surrounding grades and plantings will be such that they will be complementary to a hard covering, when this is implemented in the future.

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

- Would like to know if the platform for the reservoir will still be elevated.
  - Proponents stated it would be elevated, and the surrounding grade will be relative to the height of the platform of the reservoir.
- Would like to know if a chain-link fence would continue along the path, past the golf course.
  - Proponents stated that they have spoken with Seattle Golf, regarding innovative fence examples found in Portland. Further stated that there are safety concerns to consider, especially as there is a school in the vicinity. The perimeter fence would remain between the walkway and the golf course, and the design team has suggested that there would not be a fence on the west and south, and vehicles would be blocked by bollards.
- Would like to know if the driving range and lawn bowling area would remain, in the proposed site plan.
  - Proponents stated that both of these areas would remain, and the pedestrian path would link the lawn bowling area to other public areas of the park. Further stated that the

height of the net would be 140 feet, which is twice as tall as it is now.

- Would like to know the thickness of the soft covering. Recognizing that this covering has been proposed for security reasons, is concerned that this covering would be easy to penetrate, and would not deter people who intend to access the reservoir. Believes that a soft covering is a not an appropriate solution, and it need to be replaced. Recognizes that the soft covering will be less expensive in the short run, but will cost the City even more money in the long run.
- Would like to know if the mound at the northwest corner would be part of the pedestrian path.
  - Proponents stated that this northwest corner offers the most incredible views in Jefferson Park. The slope drops seventy feet away from this point. The importance of this spot was recognized, as meeting attendees claimed this to be the second most favorite spot in the park. Further stated that the Spokane Street crossing is dangerous. The design team would like to acknowledge the former corner with an observation point and a sculptural pedestrian bridge that would connect to the unused right-of-way on the other side of Spokane Street. The observation point would be fifty feet higher than the intersection.
- Believes that the mound will be an important part of the park, but feels that the round shape does not relate to the adjacent streets or the meadow nearby. Believes that the shape of the mound should respond to the adjacent meadow.
- Encourages the team to retain the edge of the reservoir. Believes that an interesting path along the great hillside could lead to this spectacular corner. Believes that the design of the observation point should encourage people to walk around and experience the edge, rather than standing at a single observation point.
- Agrees that the hillside should be re-graded as a terrace to bring people up the hillside.
- Commends the team for the compelling presentation. Appreciates the explanation of the circulation and vegetation. Encourages the team to use the vegetation as massing to shape the spaces coherently. Believes that there could be many different types of experiences.
- Does not believe that the Olmsted vision should be the only means by which the design team shapes the circulation. Appreciates the Long, straight access to the community center. Believes that straight connections should be used elsewhere, in conjunction with vegetation, to create dignified axes elsewhere.
- Believes that the perspective depicts clear geometries that are not represented in the plan. Recognizing that the experience of the park is meant to be informal, but feels that clear, defined edges should be used to shape the spaces and improve the rigor of the plan.
- Feels that the path between the entry to the park and Asa Mercer Middle School is difficult to distinguish. Believes that this path should be more distinct than the other paths.
- Does not understand the concepts driving the design. Is concerned that the intent to create certain experiences within the park has produced a design with discrete experiences without a general, cohesive idea. Believes that the team has not fully realized the opportunities that the site provides. Would like the team to explain the main visceral experience of the site. Recognizing that the design team is trying to meet the needs of every constituent, would like the design team to express a larger vision.

- Would like the design team to explain the site context and relationship beyond the Jefferson Park site. Believes that the design should address that which is across the streets from the site.
- Is concerned that program is driving the design, making the site plan very compartmentalized.
- Appreciates the design concepts based on the use of water at the site, but feels that this relationship should be addressed inventively.
  - Proponents stated that the community center is a focal point and there would be a water geyser creating the wetland ring around the central area of activity. Further stated that water drainage would be used to create a sculpture element at Fifteenth Avenue, celebrating the daylighting of the water.
- Believes that there should be a water feature that relates to Elliott Bay, one of the striking views from the park.
  - Proponents stated that the arched area at the observation point would strengthen this connection.
- Recognizes that many of the components in the park would not have funding. Believes that the site plan should also be considered a development plan, listing many of the possibilities, framed within a fluid and flexible framework. Believes that this matrix could be used to determine future development.
  - Proponents stated that the Parks Department has approximately a third of the funding for this site. Further stated that the 35 million-dollar site plan project estimate does not include the hardcover for the south reservoir.
- Believes that the elements within the park are in the right place, including the location of the community center and the connections between spaces within the park. Believes that the spatial vocabulary should be bold. Feels that this can be achieved while maintaining comfortable spaces within the park.

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

- A representative from the Jefferson Park Alliance stated that the Project Advisory Team (PAT) is currently working well, as the group members are familiar with each other. Is concerned that key pieces of the design will not be completed before the PAT is disbanded. Believes that the comprehensive elements of the design and a definition of the design vocabulary should be completed before individual projects are started and completed. Believes that a comprehensive parking analysis should be completed. Believes that the parking resources should be determined, so that they are managed better.

---

**6 Dec 2001** Project: **Woodland Park Zoo Discovery Village**

Phase: Conceptual Design

Previous Review: 1 July 1999 (Pre-Design), 19 August 1999 (Conceptual)

Presenters: Bert Gregory, Mithun  
Gary Lee, CLR Design  
Jim Maxwell, Woodland Park Zoo  
Mike Waller, Woodland Park ZooAttendees: Sean Cryan, Mithun  
Greg Dykstra, CLR Design  
David Goldberg, Mithun  
Dan Phillips, Woodland Park Zoo

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00068)

**Actions:** **The Commission thanked the team for the presentation and discussion about the Discovery Village and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission applauded the innovative efforts of the Parks Department and Zoo Society to revolutionize the experience and perception of zoos, in general, through more engaging exhibits;**
- **encourages the team and the consultants to bring this same innovation to the Discovery Village design;**
- **appreciates the changes in the Woodland Park Zoo administration, and urges the Zoo to continue to work closely with the neighbors of this large institution;**
- **approves the Discovery Village design principles and looks forward to their physical manifestation as the project design develops;**
- **believes that this is a place in which children should learn lifelong lessons on habitat and Discovery Village can intensify visitors' relationship with and responsibility for the environment;**
- **feels that breathtaking, visceral experiences are crucial to that form of engagement;**
- **believes that historic preservation should also be a teaching tool and urges the team to show how and explain outdated exhibitry, such as that of the primate house; and**
- **at the next presentation, would like the design team to present the existing conditions, including an analysis of the surrounding context of the Woodland Park Zoo.**

City Council is reviewing a draft agreement that would transfer the management of Woodland Park Zoo (Zoo) to Zoological Society (Zoo Society). The Zoo Society will be required to follow the long-range plan currently in place. The Discovery Village design program has been evolving since the summer of 1999. The design team is now ready to begin design. This project represents changes and a new direction by which zoos are experienced and used. The design team for Discovery Village represents strong sensitivity to place, knowledge of sustainable building design, and has an extensive history with the Zoo.

The long-range plan is an adaptation of the Zoo's 1976 plan, developing the physical context to represent or become the biomes of the animals. The ecology of the land will be improved to better represent the animals. The circulation is an important consideration of the site design, as the landscape within the Zoo dominates. The main circulation loop is the primary path that connects to the main entry at the south, and leads to secondary paths. Some areas of the Zoo, such as the southwest, are underused, because they are harder to find. The circulation concept will be enhanced through the implementation of the Long Range Plan.

The long-range plan for the Zoo was presented to the public for EIS review, for an opportunity to examine parking solutions, and the mass and scale of a number of potential and proposed projects. The Discovery Village is an attraction based on an idea to interpret exhibits through a variety of programs. The structures within Discovery Village would have potentially exceeded the thirty-five foot tall height limit of this residential zone. However, the program, offices, galleries, and other functions have been broken up into smaller structures to reduce the size and scale of these buildings. Some of the business access points, away from the internal management, will represent the beginning of a new campus ecology and an exhibit to showcase building, living, and working in a sustainable manner. The water and energy use will be innovative, and the siting contributes to a larger vision of conservation.

The Zoo's mission: "Woodland Park Zoo is a conservation and education institution demonstrating the value, beauty and interdependence of all living things.

"Connections" is an important design guideline for future development of the Zoo, and will be used to encourage people to relate to their world and the activities throughout the world. The Discovery Village will incorporate landscape and site features, a science learning center, a changing gallery, a biome, an amphitheater, pony rides, an animal support facility, and Zoo offices. The nature of a biome, a regional ecosystem, will be used to drive the development of the design. The Discovery Village will represent a northwest biome, explaining how Seattle lives and operates in their own biome. Additional design principles will also inform the design of the Discovery Village: conservation, education, interdependence, collaboration, and fun. The development of conservation goals will also enforce the design:

- demonstrate the value, beauty, and interdependence of all living things;
- become a powerful force in changing people's understanding of wildlife and critical need for protecting habitats and species for the survival of the planet
- provide a strong message as a world-class design and learning center for global conservation;
- represent a compelling theme for the Zoo hub for expanded conservation and education programming; and
- "walk the talk."

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

- Would like to know the meaning of the term "biome."
  - Proponents stated that the term denotes a cohesive ecosystem with related parts and similar features; "grasslands" is a biome.
- Encourages the team to incorporate "breathtaking, visceral experience for children" as a physical design guideline for the Discovery Village.

- Hopes that “the sense of personal responsibility” becomes one of the conservation goals. Believes that the Zoo has an opportunity to teach children about responsibility to the environment, and enhance conservation.
- Would like to know the future location of freight delivery.
  - Proponents stated that the design team is rethinking this concern. There are multiple entry points for delivery. Further stated that the relationship of the new west entry takes these concerns into consideration. The parking entry, delivery entries, pedestrian access, and work entries would be separated, to enhance each of these individual entries. A delivery entry and minor service hub would be located to the north of Discovery Village, to service the changing exhibit gallery and food service operations. This would provide service access to the future biome and desert building. Key areas for delivery would remain at 50<sup>th</sup> Street and Fremont Avenue, with some delivery at 59<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Would like to know why the main delivery entry would be near the Discovery Village.
  - Proponents stated that this delivery entry would only serve the facilities within that immediate area.
- Would like to know if the west entry would become more important.
  - Proponents stated that the Zoo currently has three entries, but a single entry would be easiest to manage and control. In the future, there would be only two entries. The west entry would serve people parking in the north lot, who would access the Zoo by coming down a pleasant path, a pedestrian access for those coming from bus on Phinney Avenue, and new, adjacent parking facilities. The west entrance would become the secondary entry, potentially the primary entry. Further stated that there would be additional parking studies.
- Encourages the design team to think of connectivity within a global framework, and encourages the Zoo to consider connections beyond the zoo. Would like the design team to explain the connection to the neighborhood.
  - Proponents stated that the connections at the various edges of the zoo are disparate. The long-term plan expresses the need for a unified language for this perimeter, and how it fits within the neighborhood. There are many conflicting issues at the perimeter of the zoo, because fences are required in some locations. The urban context along Phinney Avenue varies between residences, small-scale business, and restaurants, and the design team would like to continue to use a natural buffer edge. Further stated that the residents of the adjacent neighborhoods are concerned about views and noise. The design must resolve the conflict between visual continuity and the screening of views.
  - Proponents explained that the zoo is surrounded on three sides by arterials, the main access to the zoo and parking areas is from these arterials. 59<sup>th</sup> Street is the only residential street, but is also one of the east-west access points between Aurora Avenue and Ballard. The parking areas will be screened and shielded with trees, and the existing rose garden will remain accessible to the public.
- Encourages the design team to explain how the design principles and conservation goals will be implemented, as they are not spatially descriptive.
  - Proponents stated that the design would explain the conservation goals through use and conservation of resources in the design. Visitors would also be educated through and

explanation of the decisions that were made in the design of the Discovery Village. The design would relate and respond to the forces of nature, especially in terms of the relationship between the architectural form and the sun. Further stated that there would be many opportunities for visitors to understand that they maintain an interdependent relationship with their environment.

- Believes that a building, constructed to represent a biome, which is a natural ecosystem, contains an inherent contradiction to address. Would like to know how the design team would resolve the nature of this architectural intervention.
  - Proponents stated that this intervention, a connection to nature, would address these broad issues. Further stated that the Discovery Village would be a showcase of humans as animals and how humans can build systems responsibly in the northwest environments.
- Recognizes that, in previous discussions, the Zoo suggested that part of the primate house could possibly remain, to show how these facilities were previously constructed.
  - Proponents stated that they have examined the structure and they have spoken with Historic Seattle, but the facility must be removed. The facility is in poor condition and would need to be modified. This facility would be viable if the space were flexible; some of the materials from the primate house may be recycled.
- Would like to know if the neighborhood would be able to use any of the spaces in the Discovery Village for community events.
  - Proponents stated that the siting of the administrative functions at the north edge offers some opportunities to provide gathering space.
- Looks forward to the Discovery Village. Is concerned about how children will experience the exhibit if all of the buildings are separated. Would like to know how children would experience the space, entering and exiting exhibits. Appreciates the idea of a northwest biome and would like to know how this would be exhibited and integrated with other buildings of the exhibit.
  - Proponents stated that the Discovery Village design team is very excited about the children's' experience. Further stated that children, ages one to three are an important consideration in zoo exhibit design, so the design team is excited about developing an emphasis on family interpretive exhibits. The design team hopes to develop an exhibit in which children immediately understand some of the concepts about the biome, simply by experiencing the exhibit. Further stated that the design team would present developed ideas to the Design Commission at a future presentation.
- Would like to see a plan of the existing conditions and the conceptual framework of the current zoo. Believes that the development of the design and intervention should work from this context. Believes that the zoo, as an institutional function, does not have a permeable edge.
- Would like to know how the long-range plan of 1976 is developing. Recognizes that previously, the educational approach taken in zoos was very paternalistic. Through a new, revolutionary approach, with environmentalism as a priority, believes that zoos should work from a phenomenological view of nature, recognizing that nature is not static, but is a complex system with different opportunities to interact with the environment.
  - Proponents stated that they look forward to working with some of these ideas, and stated

that the way the zoo cares for the animals affects the way the zoo and visitors interact with the animals. Further stated that the design principles would be manifested in the building design, and the exhibits would not be institutional experiences. Further stated that there are and would be educational programs beyond the city and the zoo to link children with environmental programs in their own communities.

- Appreciates the African Village and Savannah exhibit, and believes that children respond to this exhibit amazingly.
- Looks forward to seeing the connections made between non-Northwest native animals and the northwest biome in this Discovery Village exhibit.
- Recognizes human's changing nature and relationship with animals and wildlife. Believes that the depiction of this relationship would be naïve if humans' responsibility for this wildlife is not emphasized. Believes that this is an appropriate opportunity to how these connections, and the non-traditional relationships and influences should be explained. Believes that the big picture should be explained. Is concerned that human forces are undermining that which we are trying to celebrate.
  - Proponents stated that there are zoo exhibits on zero population growth. The first step should be the creation of an emotional bond between children and nature. Further stated that, at many workshops, there was discussion about the need to teach children how to see, and create that first connection.
- Would like to know why the Pony Ring will still be included in the Discovery Village.
  - Proponents stated that this is an opportunity to for pre-teen children to experience the animals, and this 4-H program is very successful.

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

- A former Design Commissioner stated that the primate house represents an important "lesson learned," and believes that there should be an interpretive exhibit explaining how zoos have evolved since this type of exhibit. Hopes that the Discovery Village guiding principles will promote concrete and abstract connections and learning threads, so people come back again and again. Hopes that this synergy is at the core of all of the principles.

**6 Dec 2001      Commission Business**

- ACTION ITEMS**
- A.    TIMESHEETS
- B.    MINUTES FROM 1 NOVEMBER 2001- APPROVED
- DISCUSSION ITEMS**
- C.    OUTSIDE COMMITMENT UPDATES- CUBELL
- D.    NEW ADMINISTRATION BRIEFINGS- RAHAIM
- ANNOUNCEMENTS**
- E.    ETC/ MONORAIL WORK SESSIONS-  
         DECEMBER AND JANUARY- CUBELL
- F.    HIGH POINT JOINT COMMITTEE REVIEW  
         DECEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2001 6:30 PM- 8:30 PM  
         HOLLY HALL, 3204 SW HOLLY STREET
- G.    ARCADE MAGAZINE RECEPTION  
         DECEMBER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 5 PM – 7 PM  
         BENAROYA HALL, NORDSTROM RECITAL HALL

---

**6 Dec 2001** Project: **Seattle Center Open Space Restoration Harrison Street**

Phase: Schematic Design

Presenters: Jill Crary, Seattle Center  
Shelley Yapp, Seattle Center

Attendees: Lyle Bicknell, CityDesign

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00260)

**Action:** **The Commission thanked the team for the presentation and appreciates the opportunity to review this small project. The Commission would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission encourages the team to rethink the project by simplifying the overall approach to the wall design and then adding details that are complementary to this overall theme and responsive to the context;**
- **encourages the team to engage an artist who would consider this project a significant opportunity to create a unique, distinct project;**
- **urges the team to protect the ends of the walls, and suggests that the wall could be framed with piers which would help to create strong openings as gateways;**
- **urges the team to consider the existing tree roots, as they design the footings for the wall;**
- **requests that the design incorporate social spaces and opportunities for seating; and**
- **would like to see the project again.**

The site of this project, which has been proposed to improve one of Seattle Center's edges, is Harrison Street, between Fifth Avenue and Fourth Avenue. This eastern edge provides an entry between the parking area and the Experience Music Project (EMP). This is a fast-paced, small project incorporating a low-cost fence that screens the parking area from EMP. Because this is a small public works process, the Seattle Center team hopes to begin construction documents soon after the schematic design has been reviewed and approved.

There are some existing trees at the site, and the Seattle Center team hopes to improve the space by creating layers with a colorful wall, rather than additional vegetation. The wall will soften the hard edges of the site and respond to the characters of EMP and the full campus. There will be openings and curb cuts to allow pedestrian access. The wall will be approximately five feet and eleven inches tall, and will weave in and out of the existing trees and vegetation. There will be openings in the wall to provide a view through and express the depth of the wall. The wall will be cool gray brick, with colored accent tiles throughout the wall. Seattle Center hopes to complete the wall before the Folk Life Festival.

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

- Would like the proponents to explain the intent of the wall.
  - Proponents stated that the wall would soften and obscure the parking lot, adding interest and dimension to this harsh edge. Further stated that the wall would create a sense of entry at this edge. This may also be a location for a reader board at this entry of the campus.

- Would like to know the length of the wall. Would like to know if the wall extends to the corner of Fifth Avenue and Harrison Street.
  - Proponents stated that the wall would be the length of a half-block, approximately 120 feet. Proponents stated that the wall does not extend to this corner, but the wall ends at Harrison Street and a street that accesses the parking lot, parallel to Fifth Avenue.
- Feels that the wall should extend further east toward Fifth Avenue.
  - Proponent stated that the budget does is not sufficient for the structure to extend to the corner. Further stated that the school district building is at this corner, and there is significant landscaping in this area.
- Would like to know why the wall is six feet tall, if it is not meant to provide security.
  - Proponents stated that the wall is meant to block the view of the parking lot. Further stated that the wall varies in height from four feet to six feet.
- Recognizes that, throughout Seattle Center, there are many beautiful examples of knee-high walls with beautiful vegetation. Encourages the team to consider these examples as they develop the design of this wall.
  - Proponents stated that the design incorporates the existing trees and some openings to create layers of design interest.
- Believes that the ideas driving the design of the wall are in conflict, as the wall is meant to provide enclosure at this edge, blocking the view of the parking lot, but the team expresses a need for the wall to be transparent as well, through openings and varying heights.
  - Proponents stated that some of the openings are meant to provide access to Seattle Center from the parking lot. Further stated that transparent elements have included in the wall itself to add interest and art into the design.
- Is concerned that portions of the wall are next to a driveway. Recognizes that many brick buildings and bricks are protected from impact by bollards. Believes that the loose ends of the walls should be protected by piers or reinforced columns. Feels that the ends appear to stop arbitrarily.
- Is concerned that the wall's trench foundation would cut through the roots of the trees.
  - Proponents stated that pin piles would support the wall.
- Believes that the design incorporates too many small details, for such a small project. Recognizes that this edge leads to the "funhouse" area of Seattle Center. Believes that the architectural character of the wall should reflect this and the design should be playful. Recognizes that the Fifth Avenue edge, near EMP lacks vegetation, and feels that the wall along Harrison Street should emphasize the existing trees, without planting additional "growies" at the base of the wall. Encourages the team to simplify the design.
- Is not comfortable amidst hard surfaces and walls without softness. Believes that plain walls begs for graffiti, and this wall should be nurtured to become part of Seattle Center. Feels that this edge should be landscaped in the same manner as the rest of Seattle Center.
- Encourages the team to simplify the design of the wall, and retain the proposed landscape design.
- Believes that this area is not like the rest of Seattle Center, and a few plants would get lost, when

planted against this wall.

- Encourages the team to develop the big gesture of the wall. Feels that the wall should be experienced from a great distance, while maintaining the tactile qualities of the materials.
- Is concerned that this project would be built from the schematic design stage, without design development. Believes that the undulation, in plan is an appropriate idea, but feels that the materials should be of the same character as the Fun Forest Amusement Park or the EMP, rather than brick.
- Believes that this is an appropriate area for benches. Encourages the team to hang benches from the wall, as it curves toward the sidewalk, because there aren't any seating areas near the EMP entrance at this corner.
- Encourages the team to examine various examples of fences throughout Seattle. Recommends the Broad Street substation, the substation fence at Union Street and Western Avenue, and the Pioneer Square bus tunnel entrance. Believes that the fence should be robust, with personality.
- Believes that the design is fragmented. Feels that the wall should be an inviting screen, with some seating areas, but the design must be strong and bold. Recognizing that there are many small details that do not provide the needed connection into Seattle Center.
- Recognizes that the Design Commission offered many similar comments for the Seattle Center Skate Park across the street, and this facility is beautiful. Recognizes that there is a challenge and a need to resolve the edges, and connections to neighbors. Feels that there should be a gesture to the Skate Park, blurring the distinction from some of the neighbors.

---

**6 Dec 2001** Project: **Jackson Park Detention Pond**

Phase: Design Development

Previous Review: 17 August 2000 (Schematics)

Presenter: Gavin Patterson, Seattle Public Utilities

Time: .75 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00178)

**Action:** **The Commission appreciates the presentation and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission encourages SPU to continue to identify ways to prevent contaminants from entering the creek and the ponds;**
- **encourages the team to include aerators in the ponds to further improve the water quality;**
- **urges the proponent to incorporate educational information at the site that expresses the function and process of the detention ponds through visual and interpretational means;**
- **encourages the team to reconsider the vegetation choices, and recommends the use of alders; and**
- **urges the team to continue to refer to the actions from the Commission meeting on August 17, 2000.**

The Jackson Park detention ponds will be located at the southwest corner Jackson Park Golf Course on the east side of I-5, south of 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is working with the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks Department) to comply with the golf course Master Plan. Thornton Creek, a typical urban creek, is experiencing flooding problems in this area due to increasing urbanization. Golf course fairways will be relocated to accommodate these ponds. The creek will become wider than the existing channel. Water will be passing through to the ponds constantly, even when there are no storms. While these ponds will serve as water hazards, they will also meet the irrigation needs for the golf course. The water levels will remain fairly consistent (summer level will be approximately four feet higher than winter level to maximize irrigation storage and flood storage capacity, respectively). The edge of the ponds will primarily be planted with grass, and native plants will be planted only where they will not obstruct golf play. The entire length of the creek through the golf course will be planted with native plants of varying heights, depending on their location relative to City Light transmission lines and the golf fairways.

The design of the Jackson Park detention pond has changed in response to previous Design Commission actions. SPU will examine the contaminants of the golf course and fertilizer, and establish a baseline standard for the water quality; there is a City policy regarding the reduction of pesticides. The buffer edge around the creek will also begin to filter the water; there will not be significant buffers around the ponds. There will be aerators in the pond to improve the water quality. Fish access to the creek and the first ponds will not be impeded by barriers on this site; there are some fish passage barriers downstream, but these will not be addressed by this project, as they are not within City property. WSDOT is working to determine detention options for the run-off along I-5.

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

- Would like to know if WSDOT is concerned about pollutants within the I-5 runoff.
  - Proponent stated that WSDOT is concerned about flooding, but have not addressed

contamination concerns. Further stated that there are no immediate solutions to the pollutants from I-5.

- Would like to know if the plants at the edge of the stream would be removed.
  - Proponent stated that the ponds would be lined with rock wall terraces, and the entire creek would be lined with plants. The shading of the creek would be a positive, intentional result of the work. A landscape architect will determine the plant material and other landscape design.
- Would like to know if there will be images or other informational signage to explain the role of the detention ponds. Would like to know if the detention process will be apparent. Recognizes that signs alone do not make the process visible, nor does it express how the detention ponds function or allow people to discover the process on their own.
  - Proponent stated that there would be informational signage for the golfers, but as this is a golf course, it is not a public site or park, with many opportunities for educational material. The open ponds and the diversion structure, components of the detention system, would be visible, while the connecting pipes would be buried to prevent conflict with golf play.
- Would like to know how people will be deterred from the off-limit riparian areas.
  - Proponent stated that it would not be possible to completely limit access, as there will not be a barrier. This area would be considered wetlands, but golfers may try to retrieve balls from this area.
- Would like to know who will maintain this detention system.
  - Proponent stated that SPU would initially maintain this site, including the drainage, creek, landscaping, and infrastructure. Further stated that the Parks Department may be responsible for the care of the riparian vegetation after the initial establishment period, approximately three years.
- Is concerned that people would want to get into the water.
  - Proponent stated that the golf course is fast-paced, and lingering is discouraged by patrolling golf rangers. It is very unlikely that a golfer would want to wade into a four to eight foot deep pond. Further stated that a person might step into the creek.
- Is not convinced that sitka spruce is an appropriate choice for vegetation. Believes that alder would be appropriate in this area; this species would improve the quality of the soil.
- Would like to know if hyper-accumulators would be appropriate in this area. Would like to know if SPU is familiar with types of plants that neutralize harmful heavy metals and pollutants; the pollutants can be harvested by collecting parts of the plant.
  - Proponent is familiar with this concept. Permitting agencies (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Corps of Engineers, etc.) require native plantings in the creek channel and buffer, and the most effective hyper-accumulators are not native to this area.
- Encourages the team to consider this an open space and examine other planting approaches that take into account long-term maintenance issues.