



Yesler Terrace CRC Meeting May 13, 2009



EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
CONCEPT AVERAGE SCORE:	3.44	3.15	3.26	4.06	3.11	4.31	3.57	3.16	3.60
Number of variables with scores below 3.0:	3/29	8/29	3/29	--	6/29	1/29	--	7/29	--

Between 10 and 13 CRC members completed the evaluation.
 Between 4 and 6 Residents completed the evaluation, some concept variables were only evaluated by two Residents.
 Yellow highlighted boxes represent scores that were below 3.0.
 Pink highlighted boxes represent scores that were greater than 0.5 above other concepts.



Yesler Terrace CRC Meeting May 13, 2009



EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
1. TOPOGRAPHY: Which approach to regrading the southern portion of the site improves the future Yesler Terrace?									
Topography creates strong connections to surrounding neighborhoods.	3.1	2.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	4.5	3.3	3.1	3.9
Topography creates strong connections within Yesler Terrace.	3.6	3.3	3.5	4.3	4.0	4.5	3.8	3.2	3.8
View opportunities are preserved and enhanced.	3.5	3.3	3.5	4.5	2.3	4.5	3.8	3.2	3.8
TOPOGRAPHY AVERAGE SCORE:	3.4	3.1	3.5	4.2	3.3	4.5	3.6	3.2	3.8

Concept C scored consistently higher in creating stronger connections to surrounding neighborhoods.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
2. LAND USE - RETAIL: Which locations for retail improves the future Yesler Terrace?									
Retail locations create strong connections to surrounding neighborhoods	3.3	3.5	2.8	3.5	3.0	4.7	3.4	3.4	3.4
Retail locations create strong connections within Yesler Terrace	3.8	2.8	3.5	4.3	2.7	4.7	3.9	2.7	3.8
Provide effective locations for small and micro-businesses.	3.4	2.9	3.3	4.0	3.0	4.2	3.5	2.9	3.4
LAND USE - RETAIL AVERAGE SCORE:	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.9	2.9	4.5	3.6	3.0	3.5

Concept C scored lower in creating strong connections to surrounding neighborhoods by the CRC, significantly higher with Residents.
 Concept B scored significantly lower in creating strong connections within Yesler Terrace and for small and micro-business locations.

Concept Strengths:

- Concentration of retail at Boren and Yesler in Concept B.
- Dispersal and location of retail to residential space in Concept C. Encourages vibrant neighborhood during day.

Concept Weaknesses:

- Concept B is very sensitive to the relocation of the streetcar alignment.
- Concept C may not attract retail businesses.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
3. LAND USE - OFFICE: Which locations for office improves the future Yesler Terrace?									
Office locations create strong connections to surrounding neighborhoods	3.7	3.1	3.2	4.3	3.0	4.7	3.8	3.1	3.7
Office locations provide an integrated mix of land uses.	3.2	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.3	4.5	3.1	2.9	3.4
Office locations are economically sustainable. (This will be evaluated at a later time)									
Project phasing accommodates reasonable parcel sizes and economic ...									
LAND USE - OFFICE AVERAGE SCORE:	3.4	2.9	3.1	3.6	3.1	4.6	3.5	3.0	3.6

Concept A scored higher for Office locations by the CRC, Concept C scored higher for Office locations by the Residents.

Concept Strengths:

- Office is located in one area in Concept A and doesn't leave closed buildings at night.
- Office locations by Harborview and Boren continues existing neighborhood patterns in Concept B.
- Low office near freeway buffers air pollution and noise in Concept C, keep low to protect views.

Concept Weaknesses:

- Location of office in Concept A is a concern for night time activity.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
4. CIRCULATION: Which circulation pattern improves the future Yesler Terrace?									
Circulation patterns create a walkable neighborhood.	4.2	3.5	3.7	4.3	3.0	4.3	4.2	3.4	3.9
Circulation strengthens Broadway as a primary north-south vehicular ...	3.5	2.2	3.1	3.5	3.5	4.7	3.5	2.5	3.6
Circulation strengthens Yesler Way as a primary east-west vehicular ...	4.3	3.8	3.8	4.8	3.7	4.2	4.4	3.8	3.9
The street grid integrates Yesler Terrace with the surrounding community.	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.5	3.3	4.5	4.0	3.6	3.9
Views are preserved and enhanced from the public rights-of-ways.	3.3	2.9	3.6	4.5	3.5	4.5	3.6	3.1	3.9
CIRCULATION AVERAGE SCORE:	3.8	3.2	3.6	4.3	3.4	4.4	3.9	3.3	3.8

Concept A scored higher in strengthening Yesler Way circulation.
 Concept B scored lower than other Concepts in preserving views from public rights-of-way and Broadway circulation.

Concept Strengths:

- Concept A grid is similar to other Seattle neighborhoods.
- Concept B has less streets but more trail/path possibilities.
- Concept C promenade from Harborview to LS is intriguing. Good for pedestrians.

Concept Weaknesses:

- Broadway dead end in Concept A seems like a waste of space and not safe.
- Concept C has higher slopes for pedestrians and provides less connection for cars.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
5. OPEN SPACE: Which open space approach improves the future Yesler Terrace?									
A variety of multiple-use open space sizes are provided to support a ... Include provisions for community gatherings and celebrations. Use urban gardens as activity centers to promote community building.	3.9	3.3	3.4	4.0	2.8	2.8	3.9	3.1	3.2
Uses and activities around the intersection of Yesler and Broadway ...	3.9	3.1	3.1	4.7	3.3	4.5	4.1	3.1	3.6
Open spaces are connected to the circulation network.	3.9	3.1	3.1	4.7	2.8	4.7	4.1	3.0	3.6
There is a clear hierarchy of overlapping public and private open spaces ...	3.6	3.0	3.2	4.7	2.0	4.3	3.9	2.9	3.6
Views are preserved and enhanced from public open spaces.	2.8	3.8	3.2	4.7	4.0	4.2	3.2	3.6	3.5
OPEN SPACE AVERAGE SCORE:	3.6	3.3	3.2	4.5	3.0	4.1	3.8	3.2	3.5

Concept A scored higher than the other two concepts overall except for view preservation.

Concept Strengths:

Concept C has great play and safe spaces for children. Community garden location near market.

Concept Weaknesses:

Concept A open space on street seems less child friendly, conflicts with cars and humans. Concerns with eyes on the street and no hidden spaces.

Open space configuration in Concept C leaves questions about safety at night, walkability between tall buildings.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
6. HEIGHT / MASSING: Which Height / Massing approach improves the future Yesler Terrace?									
Building heights and massing creates strong connections to surrounding ...	3.2	2.6	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.3	3.3	2.7	3.4
Building heights and massing creates strong connections within ...	3.8	3.3	2.9	4.0	3.5	4.2	3.8	3.4	3.3
Views are preserved and enhanced from buildings.	3.3	2.9	3.2	4.0	3.5	4.3	3.4	3.1	3.6
Views are preserved and enhanced between buildings.	3.0	3.1	3.1	4.5	2.3	4.5	3.2	2.9	3.6
Building locations and types provides a range of housing opportunities ...	3.4	3.6	3.3	4.7	3.5	4.5	3.7	3.6	3.7
Building locations and types enhance neighborhood character ...	3.3	3.2	3.1	4.0	3.0	4.5	3.5	3.1	3.6
HEIGHT / MASSING AVERAGE SCORE:	3.3	3.1	3.1	4.2	3.1	4.4	3.5	3.1	3.5

Concept A scored higher for creating strong connections within Yesler Terrace by the CRC.

Concept C scored higher for preserving views between buildings.

Concept **Strengths**:

Concept B provides choices of heights for living spaces.

Concept C gives everyone a choice of housing heights. Maximizes views and sunlight – looking south.

Concept **Weaknesses**:

Concept A east/west orientation of buildings blocks sun. Two buildings at south end block views significantly.

Concept B east/west orientation of buildings blocks sun. Towers shouldn't block views of other towers.

Shading and landscaping concerns with building heights and spacing. Spreading high rises out is less appealing.



Yesler Terrace CRC Meeting May 13, 2009



EVALUATION CRITERIA	CRC responses			Community responses			CRC & Community responses		
	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C	Concept A	Concept B	Concept C
Rate how well each concept satisfies the criteria for the project. In each of the GOLD boxes place a number between 1 and 5. 1 = least support of the criteria 5 = most support of the criteria									
7. CONNECTIONS / EDGES: Which approach better connects Yesler Terrace to adjacent neighborhoods? Evaluate Quality / Strength of Connections from Yesler Terrace:									
North (Harborview Hospital)	2.8	3.6	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.1	3.7	4.1
South (Little Saigon and International District)	2.9	3.2	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.5	3.1	3.5	3.9
East (12th Avenue and Squire Park)	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.4
West (Downtown)	3.2	3.5	3.3	4.3	3.8	4.2	3.4	3.6	3.6
Community gateways are highlighted.	3.2	3.6	3.7	4.7	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.8
CONNECTIONS / EDGES AVERAGE SCORE:	3.1	3.5	3.6	4.2	3.7	4.2	3.3	3.5	3.8

Concept C, and Concept B to a lesser extent, scored significantly higher in the quality and strength of north and south connections by the CRC.

Concept **Strengths**:

Concept A provides a good downtown connection. High rises create a formal entry from downtown.

Concept B provides a great connection with the proposed lid over the freeway.

Concept C provides a good bridge to Main Street.

Concept **Weaknesses**:

Buildings on Boren are isolated in Concept B and C.



Yesler Terrace CRC Meeting

May 13, 2009



General Comments:

- Cul-de-sacs and dead ends are not safe.
 - Concerns with the location of the 561 replacement public housing units.
 - Seismic concerns of building proximities and sway.
 - Concerns with roadway slopes and snow issues.
 - Concept C is the best one.
-
- It's difficult to create a sense of community in a building with an elevator, and the more stories, the more difficult.
 - Concerned that the retail spaces be conducive to a neighborhood business feel.
 - Concerned that Yesler Terrace be walkable, safe and well-lit.
 - Neighborhood will be, without question, much darker and shadowed by buildings.
 - Consider phasing impacts.
 - All options provide excessive opportunity to avoid lights on 12th and Boren by cutting through on interior streets.
 - Building heights exceed most surrounding neighborhoods thus detracting from the connection to surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Small retail should be all over the site, this would be better for residents.
 - Ground-related housing for singles and others; seniors and disabled.
 - Consider Little Saigon and International District changes for future development.
 - The children's playground should be located in the center of the community.
 - Consider low level pedestrian scale lighting.
 - Pet accommodations, design for a pet friendly environment.
 - Instead of selling land for development, consider long term (50 to 99 year) leases to maintain land in public ownership.
 - SHA needs to assist the City with the streetcar alignment and stop decision.



Yesler Terrace CRC Meeting

May 13, 2009



General Questions

- Why deadend Broadway? *We believe the slopes will prevent a vehicular connection to Jackson Street from Yesler Terrace. All concepts will provide at least a pedestrian connection to Jackson Street.*
- Is a central market feasible? *We believe a central market can be accommodated in all concepts.*
- Is it really walkable to retail from homes? *We believe retail locations within Yesler Terrace will be within a five to ten minute walk from any home. We are committed to provide safe and easy access for the elderly and disabled populations.*
- What is the hierarchy of open space? *This refers to the progression of open space from private open spaces (decks, yards, balconies) to semi-private open spaces (building related courtyards, private streets) to small public spaces (small parks, streets) to large public spaces (community parks, public plazas).*
- Are there playgrounds and athletic centers? *Public open spaces will be programmed for a variety of uses and users. The Community Center will remain. There could be a private athletic facility that leases space in a new building.*
- Are concepts sensitive to changes in streetcar alignment? *Any concept will be affected by the streetcar alignment and location of a terminal. We provide some flexibility by designing spaces on the ground floor that can be used for a variety of uses in those locations.*
- What will happen to the existing park? *The Community Center will remain. The existing baseball field will be replaced with other uses.*

General Questions (continued)

- What will happen to the existing park? *The Community Center will remain. The existing baseball field will be replaced with other uses.*
- Are there resident opportunities for small businesses at office/ground floor spaces? *We are evaluating how to accommodate small businesses in the redevelopment plans for Yesler Terrace.*
- Will SHA/service providers provide an office locator ensuring that space is established for services that are accessible? *This is unknown at this time. SHA is committed to working with area service providers on future needs throughout this process.*
- Do concepts take into account tree preservation and its impacts? *Not at this time. As we get more specific about these concepts we will explore tree preservation impacts. We will be doing more work on a tree survey in the near future.*
- Will the Jesse Epstein Building and Steam Plant be preserved? *A determination has not been made to preserve these two buildings at this time.*
- How will SHA ensure that housing types/choices are spread out equitably? *All concepts allow a wide variety of housing types and styles. As we move forward we are confident that the social integration section in the guiding principles will be achieved.*
- Will market rate housing be in the high rises? *There will be a variety of housing types and styles for all economic levels. SHA has committed that their housing will be located in townhouses, low-rise and mid-rise buildings.*
- Where is the parking? *The parking will be predominately underground.*
- Will senior housing be below the third level? *It will depend on the building and it's location.*
- Can you add retail opportunities for residents near Harborview? *There is a possibility of including retail in this area depending on market conditions and Board direction on this issue.*