

**Complete notes of Discussion**

Exercise 1: Evaluation of the following development scenarios:

**1. Current zoning: Sites A1, A2 and C are NC3P-40(65), sites B1 and B2 are NC3P-40, site D split between NC3P-40(65) and MIO 105**

- Current zoning should be preserved – when parcels along Broadway were upzoned originally, there were no public benefits involved and this was wrong
  - Preserves the character of the neighborhood
  - Want to preserve views from up the hill (higher buildings could affect views)
  - Tall buildings do not always lead to successful developments
  - Concerns with sun exposure (or lack thereof) if zoning were to change
- Especially necessary to preserve existing zoning adjacent to 10<sup>th</sup> Ave E – mainly single family homes and some low rise apartment complexes – like that it is a different micro climate and would like to preserve the neighborhood character
- There will be massive change coming to Broadway no matter what happens with zoning
- If we keep zoning as is, then we are missing a great opportunity to make this place great and bring new life to Capitol Hill and Broadway
- Site C affects influences the park and plaza the most in terms of sun exposure
  - Site C could be lower heights and push taller buildings to site A1
- Would like to selectively increase height parcel by parcel
  - Amenities/affordable housing/increase in density will benefit the area
  - Need to increase pedestrian accessibility with increase in heights
  - Hope that LRT and development will increase economic development in area
  - Like the push/pull idea in regards to solar lighting and creating spaces where people want to be (no dark corners ), space needs activation
  - Can carve back corners of buildings for light and views
- Would like to see a solar study from all four seasons and in AM and PM – not sure if 10-20 additional feet would make a huge difference in terms of sun exposure/shadows

**2. Raise heights on sites A, B and C. Sites A1 and A2 to NC3P-85, A2, sites B1 and B2 to NC3-65, site C to NC3P-85**

- How will the buildings relate to the street? do not want to see vertical suburbs
- 7-8 stories do not interact with the street
- Want to see a strong presence for LGBT and tourists. Want to see Capitol Hill become more of a tourist place – tourism wayfinding system and a landmark. An element of height could provide that destination to the neighborhood
  - New development will bring change to neighborhood, need some kind of gateway to Capitol Hill or landmark
- Building materials: like stone/brick/masonry

**3. Move heights and mass around the sites. A1 to NC3P-125, A2 to NC3P-85, B1 to NC3P-65, B2 with 3 story cap, site C to NC3P-85.**

- Like hierarchy of heights – taller in northern portions of site and gradually decrease in height as get closer to Cal Anderson Park
- Like B2 to be lower in height – then can easily see trees and view to park from northern portion of the development area
  - Trees should be present throughout
  - Think of it as an expansion of Cal Anderson park
- Not sure about going to 3-stories in B2 – might be detrimental to adjacency of park
- B2 – not as attractive to developers?
- Sites B1 and B2 could have terraced buildings or row house type of development to better interact with east side of 10<sup>th</sup> Ave E
- Need good edge design to help integrate B@ and the park
- B2 could be a 1-story community/cultural building with smaller footprint, and then B1 could be increased in footprint area and provide more housing options
- B2 and C could also be thought of like Central Park in NYC – tall buildings affront on the park and really create the boundaries
- A1 is where a majority of the pedestrian will enter the LRT station and should be higher than 85'
- LGBT center should be located on one of the edges so easily accessible by pedestrians and visible – this is a focus for the community
- Flow from station entrances and street life – what is the focal point in this area?
- Wayfinding needs to be a large element
- Tall buildings will not make the area unique
- Variation in heights will be more attractive and interesting for the neighborhood
- Activities need to be programmed and have to provide a balance throughout the day – need exciting and viable first floor uses
- Need a working combination of height/uses/people/activity
- Would like to see wind/sun/view studies (impacts) with each scenario (though especially for those promoting much taller buildings) – would need that kind of information before can really state which scenario is favorable

**4. Sites A2 and C remain at existing zoning – NC3P-40(65). Site B2 is limited to 3 stories. Height limits are raised on sites Site B1 and A1. B1 to NC3P-65, A1 to NC3P-160' with a maximum tower floor plate.**

- Would like to see the topography of Cal Anderson Park on elevation maps – will help to better understand park interaction with new development
- Tall and skinny buildings – there is a sweet point for developers to make the building pencil out or become a failure
- If A1 were to be a much taller building, would like to see modulation so not so straight up and tall – need some interesting features and step-backs. Potentially set-back more on the plaza side, depending upon sun studies

- Mixed reviews about the newer development along Broadway – street has a different feel depending upon the heights of the buildings
- People might be confused with only 1 tall building in the entire neighborhood
  - Others in the group think that even 1 tall building will make this area unique and a destination
- Mid-block pedestrian access is necessary to split up the Broadway block
- Whole area at the north entrance is not so nice – cars entering off of John and unsure about the space (Nagle Alley) between John St and Nagle plaza
- Pedestrian “alley” consideration: between A1 and A2, if traveling southbound on Broadway, providing sightlines diagonally across to see Nagle plaza and Cal Anderson Park (see diagram), this would draw people to wander and experience the retail through the alley and provide another venue for pedestrian movement
  - Plaza and park are destinations
  - Will create better dialogue and flow from Broadway and John corner to plaza and park

#### Exercise 2: Evaluation and design of options: Streetscape, Public Realm and Design Quality

##### Notes of Discussion

###### *Related to building facades and design*

- First floor retail along Broadway – retail likes corner (intersection) lots - more potential for foot traffic from all directions
- 10<sup>th</sup> Ave E – could be row houses to incorporate the feel and character of the east side of the street. Make more family friendly and a good transition from taller buildings on Site A towards L3
  - Is this a semi-private space?
  - Woonerf style?
- Change of grade difference from Broadway to Nagle Plaza – could design like re-use of loading docks in Yaletown, Vancouver BC. Restaurants could overlook the farmer’s market /plaza space, and help activate throughout the day and night – have overhead weather protection and heaters for outdoor seating
- Do we need a pedestrian walk way through developable sites of B1 and B2? Continuous façade would be more attractive to a market rate developer

###### *Related to the pedestrian environment and streetscapes*

- Could enlarge development footprint of site A2 or C if are able to vacate Denny and build on it
  - Other group members like to keep the grid system intact and allow Denny as a flexible space
- Streetscape along Broadway – would like to see trees and planting strip and potentially rain gardens
- Had trouble imagining what the space between B1 footprint, the alley, and station entrance at Broadway and John and Nagle Plaza feel and act. Should there be retail on the west side of site B1? Would people be walking there?

- Think will be important to have some walking/pedestrian space from north station exit to Nagle plaza, through the alley. This gray space needs to be figured out. There should be some green features to tie into the plaza and then the park. See it as less green to the north of the development sites and gradually getting greener as the flow moves you south to Cal Anderson Park

*Related to plaza elements*

- Occidental Park is a good example of the amount of space and “shared space” – certain times of day, vehicles can drive on it
- Times Square ticket booth/bleachers example is something we can think about to incorporate into the plaza/ventilation shaft
- Plaza needs to be utilized day and night – needs to have activation
- Believe that the farmer’s market at Nagle Place should have some permanent stalls and some temporary
  - Tacoma farmer’s market has a combination of built stalls and temporary stalls
  - Bainbridge farmer’s market is also another example we should look at
  - Quincy Market in Boston
  - Could expand to Denny Way as well
- Need to have some green features on vent shaft
- Plaza is an urban experience, might not need many green features, but perhaps some to visually connect with Cal Anderson Park
- Weather protection is necessary with our climate
  - Awnings that can expand and contract
  - Farmer’s market – would like weather protection as well as the ability to have sunlight shine through the protection – clear material/glass?
  - An arcade to provide the protection already built into the building

*Related to E Denny*

- Paving treatments – bring same design from plaza out to Denny way to create a real sense of place
- To differentiate space, either raise the vehicular area or go with a curbless environment on Denny
- Pedestrian feel along Denny to the west of Broadway is quite different from the east of Broadway. Residential street east of Broadway and should feel nice and pleasant to walk along – closure of Denny would definitely help the character of the street

*Related to Uses*

- Cal Poly has a triangular shaped building, could we and be able to tie all design features into it. Perhaps a different shaped building will draw people to Capitol Hill and create that destination
- Temporary parking for Farmer’s Market trucks to load and unload – they cannot remain in plaza, where will they go?
- Parking for vehicles (resident’s and retail) – group could not come to consensus

- Shared parking strategy?
- Need a 21<sup>st</sup> century parking strategy, need to get lenders on board with financing
- Parking should be decoupled from rental units – allow the resident’s decide if they want to pay for parking space or not – a strategy to keep rental costs lower – better for affordable housing units
- Must have spaces allocated for a zipcar
- Automated parking tower to preserve the footprint of a parking garage
- No parking?
- Very limited parking?
- Parking to be accessed off of John? Or off of 10<sup>th</sup>?
- Parking should be accessed off of John as 10<sup>th</sup> Ave E is a residential street and designated bike blvd – might have to restrict turning movements off of John as so close to Broadway/John intersection
- Affordable housing dispersed throughout the site or kept separate from market rate? Should be throughout the site