

U-DISTRICT OPEN SPACE FORUM #1

MEETING SUMMARY

10-7-14

On October 7th 2014, the first of three “Open Space Forums” sponsored by the University District Partnership and the City of Seattle was held at Alder Hall in the University District (U District). The goal of this work is to create a community-owned plan for providing and improving public spaces and parks in the U District. The goals of the first meeting were to identify principles and guiding values, and identify possible functions and activities for U District Open Spaces.

The event, attended by more than 75 people, was facilitated by Milenko Matanovic and his colleagues from the Pomegranate Center. The meeting began with a short introduction by Doug Campbell representing the University District Partnership. After establishing the project criteria and ground rules for participation, the introduction was followed by two short presentations: “Planning in the U District 101” by Dave LaClergue, Area Planning Manager for the City of Seattle; and “Open Space 101” by John Owen and Zari Santner from MAKERS presenting a menu of possible improvements ranging from large public squares and rooftop parks to smaller scale elements such as community gardens, playgrounds, small sport courts, parklets, gathering places, street intersections and streets. Following these presentations, Milenko Matanovic facilitated a process in which the community contributed their ideas to two questions. The community responses are summarized below and itemized in the Appendix.

This document, along with public comment letters, will be posted at www.udistrictpartnership.org

*Question #1: What guiding **principles** or **values** do you propose for developing open space in the University District?*

The list of all ideas can be found in the appendix to this report. We organized comments into core themes:

Inclusiveness

- Parks and open spaces for all, welcoming to everyone of all ages and abilities
- Inclusiveness in the planning and design
- Collaboration between the University of Washington and the U District community
- Flexible and multiple uses

Safety

- Well managed spaces
- Activated by adjacent uses
- Clean, well-lit, monitored and maintained open spaces
- Welcoming and hospitable

Neighborhood identity

- Town center that defines identity
- Centrally located public space near the transit center
- U District becomes known as a neighborhood characterized by a network of open spaces
- Integrated art

Livability

- Activated 24 hours/day
- People have places to sit
- Spaces with public restrooms
- Work in all seasons
- Good solar exposure
- Creative and artful spaces
- Ephemeral/renewable art
- Water features
- Bike parking

Connectivity

- Co-location with transit
- Centrally located public space that serves as an identifying “town center” for the U-District
- Extend and link open spaces
- Way-finding
- Gateway to UW
- Good pedestrian connections

Connection to nature

- Spaces abundant with green and natural areas
- Support biodiversity and wildlife
- Passive water treatment
- Interaction with water and its sounds

Variety of spaces: from large to small, from active to quiet

- Destination spaces
- Pedestrian-only spaces
- Pedestrian meeting spaces
- Spaces for children
- Gardens
- Rooftop public spaces
- Public spaces on streets – increased ‘spaciness’
- Abundant green spaces
- Restful and relaxing spaces
- Gathering places
- Intimate seating and people-watching

*Question #2: Given the suggested guiding principles and values, what kind of **functions** and **activities** do you envision?*

A wide range of functions and activities were suggested, which are generally categorized into “Active” and “Passive” spaces. See attached appendix for the complete list. We organized comments into the following themes:

Socializing and meeting other people (Active Spaces)

- Street fairs
- Markets
- Sporting events
- Soap boxes
- Dance and exercise
- Demonstrations

Eating and drinking (Active Spaces)

- Dinner and drinks outside
- Food trucks
- Eat lunch

Musical performances or outdoor movies (Active Spaces)

- Outdoor movies and performances
- Street musicians

Playing for all ages (Active Spaces)

- Climbing wall
- Swings for adults
- Basketball court
- Features for people with disabilities

Sitting and relaxing (Passive Spaces)

- Napping or Sleeping
- Relaxing
- Reading
- Study in public (Wi-Fi)
- Sitting and observing; People watching

Interacting with nature (Passive Spaces)

- Places to learn about plants and nature
- Gardening
- Physical interaction with water and water sounds

At the end of the evening, participants were asked to identify any common themes that they heard from each other during the forum. A few additional themes were identified:

- A tension between the desire for places that are safe and orderly and the desire for places that are social and spontaneous.
- A tension between wanting vibrant populated spaces and spaces for calmness and quiet.
- A desire for both a centrally located 'heart' area and a wide range of connected spaces serving multiple functions
- The tension between preserving residential open spaces/backyards while accommodating thousands of new units in the next 20 years

NEXT:

Steering Group meetings: October 20 and November 12, 3:30pm

Community Forums: #2 October 30th and #3 December 3rd, Alder Hall 7pm

Minutes submitted by Milenko Matanovic and Eric Higbee of the Pomegranate Center.

Minutes reviewed and approved by the Steering Group on October 22, 2014.

For further information please contact Elizabeth McCoury, University District Partnership - elizabeth.mccoury@udistrictpartnership.org

APPENDIX

U-DISTRICT OPEN SPACE FORUM #1

MEETING NOTES

OCTOBER 7th, 2014

GROUND RULES:

- Everyone participates, together we know more
- Engage, not recruit
- Practice generosity
- No jargon
- Be positive; propose something better
- Be civil, no blaming, no accusations
- Be willing to change your mind when hearing new information
- Look for solutions where all can succeed

AGENDA:

1. Project and meeting goals
2. Project background
3. Project criteria and ground rules
4. Large group work
5. Review of findings
6. Next Steps

PROJECT CRITERIA:

- Build on, but not be restrained by, previous plans
- Plan for all generations
- Address safety as a serious consideration
- Consider long-term funding and maintenance feasibility
- Approach consistent with City regulations

COMMON THEMES:

- Places 'rooms' to be outside
- Safety
- Surprises
- Multi-functional
- 24 hours & night life
- Playful
- Multi-generational

- Abundant green spaces
- Connected to transit
- Balance activity and calm/quiet spaces
- Increase interaction between community members
- Reflect local identity
- Central space
- Amenities (restrooms etc.)
- Thoughtful

QUESTION #1 What guiding principles or values do you propose for developing open space in the University District?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Enhance livability/community (1) | 30. Make and experience art |
| 2. Open Space that serves everyone (4) | 31. Networked/connected |
| 3. Safe - well lit and monitored (9) | 32. Town center that defines identity (3) |
| 4. Inclusivity in the planning (1) | 33. Mitigates stress of transit |
| 5. Accessible to all | 34. Pedestrian only spaces |
| 6. Preserve green space and trees (2) | 35. Multi-generational (1) |
| 7. Destination place (2) | 36. Solar access (1) |
| 8. Respect diversity | 37. Clean/well maintained (4) |
| 9. Welcoming and encouraging to all
(especially non-motorized) | 38. People centered |
| 10. Business community | 39. Equity of disbursement |
| 11. People can sit – “sittable” (2) | 40. Nearby food |
| 12. Activated by adjacent uses | 41. Water feature and more art |
| 13. Good pedestrian connections (3) | 42. Mindful of surrounding
neighborhoods |
| 14. Well managed open spaces | 43. Monuments |
| 15. Open space in high density pedestrian
places | 44. Public space on streets – increase the
amount of “spaciness” (1) |
| 16. Welcoming to youth (2) | 45. More backyard & green private space |
| 17. Centrally located public space by
transit center (9) | 46. Connect with the University (1) |
| 18. Public restrooms (8) | 47. Rooftop public space |
| 19. Extend and link green spaces | 48. Way finding |
| 20. Residential open space and more side
yards | 49. All weather |
| 21. Activated 24 hours a day (1) | 50. Collaboration between UW and
community “Showcase Learning” |
| 22. Abundant green space (3) | 51. Garden spaces/ P-patches |
| 23. Sustainable/green/natural (3) | 52. Support biodiversity and wildlife |
| 24. Dog friendly | 53. Gateway to UW –
welcoming/hospitable |
| 25. Multi-seasonal (2) | 54. Financial viability |
| 26. Co-located with transit stations (1) | |
| 27. Creative and artful | |
| 28. Flexible and multiple uses (2) | |
| 29. Variation in size and busyness | |

(Parenthesis indicate the number of “checks” for each item – when a participant chose to endorse an existing idea rather than offer a new one)

*Question #2: Given the suggested guiding principles and values, what kind of **functions and activities** do you envision?*

1. Socialize (4)
2. Educational
3. Recreation/multi-functional (3)
4. Street fairs
5. Markets
6. Sporting events
7. Weather shelter
8. Big tree-scape
9. Restful
10. Dinner and drink outside (3)
11. Food Trucks (2)
12. Active spaces
13. Quiet/reading (1)
14. Outdoor games
15. Passive water treatment
16. Children's play space (1)
17. Protests (2)
18. Outdoor movies/musical performances (5)
19. Large space
20. Relaxing spaces
21. Gathering place
22. Band concerts (1)
23. Gardening
24. Farmers market
25. Playing for all ages (1)
26. Opportunities to sit & observe (2)
27. Napping / sleeping
28. Experiential for children
29. All ages learning
30. Safe – facilitate public protests
31. Eat lunch (3)
32. Physical interaction with/and sound of running water (3)
33. Pedestrian meeting space (1)
34. Interactive activities
35. Central place/meet someone new (1)
36. Soap boxes
37. Art displays
38. Climbing walls (1)

(Parenthesis indicate the number of "checks" for each item – when a participant chose to endorse an existing idea rather than offer a new one)