Exploration of Ideas for Yesler Terrace

Where are we in the process?

Testing the Yesler Terrace Planning Program

1) “How does the new Yesler Terrace feel?”
2) Consideration of the planning elements
3) Placed on the physical site

Yesler Terrace Planning Program

- **Total Site Area** *(includes ROW & open space)*
  - 39.6 Acres
- **Housing**
  - 3,000 - 5,000 Total Units
- **Office**
  - 800,000 - 1.2 million sq. ft.
- **Retail**
  - 25,000 - 100,000 sq. ft.
- **Open Space**
  - 5 - 8 acres
Concept Development Approach

What decisions are studied in Concepts?

Planning Concept

Concept Variables

- Planning Program
- Sustainable Strategies (future)
- Phasing Strategies (future)
- CRC Guiding Principles & Planning Concepts (evaluation)
What are the Concept Variables?

- **Vision**: Cohesive idea which embodies the essence of the concept
- **Bldg. Height & Massing**: Heights, locations & massing of building forms
- **Open Space**: Types, configurations, locations & amounts of open space
- **Circulation & Connections**: Street locations, types & character. Other connections to surrounding neighborhoods
- **Land Use**: Types, amounts and locations of land uses
- **Topography**: How all elements interact with the unique topography of the site
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**Concept Variables to be investigated tonight**

- **Vision**: Cohesive idea which embodies the essence of the concept
- **Circulation & Connections**: Street locations, types & character
- **Bldg. Height & Massing**: Heights, locations & massing of building forms
- **Land Use**: Types, amounts and locations of land uses
- **Open Space**: Types, configurations, locations & amounts of open space
- **Topography**: How all elements interact with the unique topography of the site
Exploration of Ideas for Yesler Terrace

Open Space and Building types to be considered

Open Space types

On the Ground
• Large Park/Commons
• Plaza
• Street
• Pocket Park
• Pathway/Sidewalk
• Small Yard
• Garden

Building types

Low-rise (under 35’)

Mid-rise (35’-75’)

High-rise (75’-150’)

Tower (above 150’)

[Images of different types of open spaces and buildings]
Tonight’s planning exercise

Planning Program for model exploration

**Housing**
- 4,000 Total Units (approximately 4.0 mil. sq. ft.)

**Office**
- 1.0 million sq. ft.

**Retail**
- 50,000 sq. ft.

**Open Space**
- 8 acres of public open space

**Parking**
- Structured parking below grade

**Building related Open Space**
- Approximately 15% of building site area
Model A: Mix of All Heights

Building Height & Massing

- Relative equal distribution of all building types
- Towers widely spaced near highest points on the site
- Similar height and massing of buildings adjacent to Harborview
- Large percentage of height & development along Boren
- Lower building heights along streets limit prolonged shadows falling across most streets
- Location of low and mid-rise buildings open the site to the southwest for views & sun access
- Building height & placement provide good sun access to most open spaces

Characteristics

- Pros
  - Wide variety of building choices
  - Variety of height provides visual interest
  - Moderate view potential
  - Variety of heights increases design options for views and sun access

- Cons
  - Mixed heights may not provide strong neighborhood identity or branding
  - Increasing shade from towers, high rise and mid rise buildings
  - View potential not maximized

Distribution of Total Residential Floor Area in Each Building Type

- Tower: >150’ 13%
- High: 75’ - 150’ 58%
- Mid: 35’ - 75’ 23%
- Low: <35’ 6%
Model A: Mix of All Heights

Open Space Configuration

Characteristics
• System of linear parks independent of the street network providing for pedestrian circulation
• Mid-size central plaza at NW quadrant of the site
• Connections to linear parks and plaza via the street network
• Private open spaces adjacent to buildings along the linear parks
• Open spaces located to help increase sun access for buildings

Pros
• Connects uses and districts along a pedestrian corridor
• May offer options to increase accessibility for elderly and disabled people

Cons
• Smaller open spaces have less impact
• Less opportunity for centralized community gardens
• Less opportunity for active recreational uses
**Model B: Minimal Height Variation: Mid- & High-Rises**

**Building Height & Massing**

**Characteristics**
- Relatively similar height and massing of building types across the site
- Average building height approximately 75’ – 120’
- Buildings set back from most streets to minimize shadows cast on streets
- Building placement provides distant views from streets
- Higher average building heights cast shadows for long periods of the day
- Building massing provides for courtyard open spaces in several locations
- Buildings height and massing at southwest portion of the site buffer impacts from I-5

**Pros**
- Some variety in building choices
- Scale of buildings may not be overwhelming
- Site topography allows views and sun access from upper floors

**Cons**
- Less variety of building choices
- Scale of buildings is ordinary
- Doesn’t provide strong neighborhood identity or branding
- Street relationship requires larger setbacks
- Site topography controls views, sun access and shadows
- Most street shading from mid- & high-rise buildings
- Open spaces may be shadowed by buildings
- Similar building heights limits design options for views and sun access

**Distribution of Total Residential Floor Area in Each Building Type**

- **Mid: 35’ - 75’**
  - 33%
- **High: 75’ - 150’**
  - 67%
Model B: Minimal Height Variation: Mid- & High-Rises

Open Space Configuration

Characteristics

- Open space organized along streets (green streets) integrating streets into the open space network
- Pocket and mid-size parks located adjacent to green streets to increase the perceived size of open spaces
- Private courtyard open spaces adjacent to pocket parks to create larger visual access
- Pocket parks located to increase sun access to buildings

Pros

- Provides opportunities for natural drainage systems
- Provides separation from vehicular traffic
- Creates landscaped pedestrian experience
- Connects uses and districts along green street
- Provides identifiable character

Cons

- Less opportunity for centralized community gardens
- Less opportunity for active recreational uses
- Smaller open spaces have less impact
- Wider right-of-way widths needed

Diagram of Green Streets & Pocket Parks

Open Space Configuration
**Model C: Towers with Low- & Mid-Rises**

**Building Height & Configuration**

**Characteristics**
- Building towers placed among a majority of low and mid-rise building types
- Towers widely spaced across the entire site
- Similar height and massing of buildings adjacent to Harborview
- Smaller amount of height & development along Boren
- Shadows cast by towers across streets and open spaces limited to a small portion of the day
- Building height and placement provide distant views across open spaces

**Pros**
- Low rise buildings are familiar to residents
- Towers provide strong neighborhood identity or branding
- Minimize street setbacks
- Maximizes view potential and sun access, increases value
- Towers cast slender shadows
- Minimal street shading from low rise and tower buildings

**Cons**
- Less variety of building choices
- Some residents don’t want to live in towers
- Towers cast long shadows
- Tower placement critical to maximize views and sun access

**Distribution of Total Residential Floor Area in Each Building Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Low: &lt;35'</th>
<th>Mid: 35' - 75'</th>
<th>Tower: &gt;150'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Configuration Diagram**

- Tower
- Mid
- Low

**Images**
- Low 11%
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**Model C: Towers with Low- & Mid-Rises**

**Open Space Configuration**

**Characteristics**
- Large central commons as the main organizer of the open space network
- Various activities accommodated in the central commons (i.e. gardens, play areas, gathering spaces)
- Satellite parks in each quadrant of the site linked by street and pedestrian connections
- Street network integrated with the central commons open space
- Visual connections to the central commons from many buildings across the site

**Pros**
- Provides opportunities for natural drainage systems
- Provides separation from vehicular traffic
- Creates landscaped pedestrian experience
- Connects uses and districts along green street
- Provides identifiable character

**Cons**
- Less opportunity for centralized community gardens
- Less opportunity for active recreational uses
- Smaller open spaces have less impact
- Wider right-of-way widths needed