

DRAFT
JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING
Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Revised 11/1/01 - 19 of 21 PAT Members Responding

Park Vision - Draft

Jefferson Park will be a place of great beauty that welcomes members of the neighborhood, city and visitors with a mixture of quiet and active facilities, where community interaction is encouraged. It will:

- Celebrate the cultural and ethnic diversity of the Beacon Hill neighborhood.
- Respect and respond to the traditions of the Olmsted legacy.
- Build upon the best physical characteristics of the site, especially the views.

Comments:.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Park Goals - Draft

Goals are derived from the park vision:

- Take advantage of the views, topographic changes, and property gained from retirement of one of the reservoirs
- Improve ease of access from surrounding neighborhood to park.
- Integrate the park and neighborhood
- Improve and increase accessibility to park spaces and activities
- Provide opportunities for people to express their cultural traditions and ethnic background.
- Balance local and regional uses
- Provide viewpoints with well-defined views of downtown, Elliott Bay and the Olympic mountains.
- Create a sense of seclusion, unfolding, revelation, spaciousness, mystery and excitement
- Provide places for restoration and relaxation
- Provide opportunities for a balanced mix of programmed and unprogramed activities
- Provide a variety of sports facilities
- Connect the spaces of the park with a network of trails

Comments:.....
.....

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 2 of 18

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 3 of 18

Park Design Elements

Please circle your response to each question. Also, identify key issues that should be discussed with the group - ones where there are differences of opinion.

Design elements are derived from the park goals:

1. Viewpoints

- | | | |
|----|--|------------------------|
| A. | Provide a viewpoint at the area north of the Lawn Bowling clubhouse - looking toward downtown, Elliott Bay and the Olympic Mountains? (Site of the Olmsted plan's Soundview Concourse) | Yes (10) No (2) |
| B. | Provide a viewpoint from the north reservoir site - looking toward downtown, Elliott Bay and the Olympics? | Yes(14) No (1) |
| C. | Provide a viewpoint in the vicinity of the existing community center - looking toward the west and northwest? | Yes (7) No (6) |

Considerations

Reservoir soft lid and fencing would not be attractive.

Comments:.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Park Character

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A. | Primarily pastoral, or | Yes(11) No (2) |
| | Primarily formal (geometric)? | Yes(4) No (7) |

Considerations

Two of the alternatives illustrate a pastoral park composed of open meadows defined by curvilinear paths and informal massing of shade trees. The third alternative illustrates a more geometric and formal layout composed of a circular meadow and a remnant of the existing reservoir embankment.

Comments:.....

.....
.....
.....

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 4 of 18

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

3. Walkways and Pedestrian Connections

- A. Support a Dakota & 15th crossing/park entry? **Yes(14) No(2)**
- B. Support a park entry at S. Nevada St. & Jefferson Field? **Yes(11) No(1)**
- C. Support a path along 16th between Jefferson Field & arboretum? **Yes(11) No(1)**
- D. Support a park entry at north end (maybe LaFayette Ave.)? **Yes(11) No(4)**
- E. Support a hierarchy of interconnected paths? **Yes(14) No(1)**
 - * Wide main paths
 - * Narrower secondary paths
- F. Provide a network of jogging paths? **Yes(14) No(4)**
- G. Support a meandering pathway around the 9-hole course? **Yes(13) No(1)**
- H. Support spending some ProParks money to relocate selected golf tees and greens to allow paths to meander? **Yes(5) No(6)**
- I. Retain 1911 roadway as a walking path/service drive? **Yes(9) No(2)**
- J. Support a path between Horticulture & Golf Maintenance? **Yes(10) No(3)**
- K. Improve pedestrian access between Beacon Avenue and Lawn Bowling Clubhouse? **Yes(14) No(3)**

Considerations

- * *Pathway at 9-hole course is specifically funded at \$516,000.*
- * *Meandering the path on the north and south sides of the 9-hole allow ADA accessibility without handrails. Careful analysis of path alignment and coordination with Seattle Golf's golf architect is necessary.*
- * *Relocating tees costs roughly \$5,000 each and relocating greens costs about \$45,000 each.*
- * *Seattle Golf has said that there has to be a fence between the 9-hole course and a perimeter path.*

Comments:.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. City Streets

- A. Support a traffic signal for a crosswalk at Dakota & 15th? **Yes(15) No(2)**
- B. Support eliminating free right turn lane at 15th & Spokane or other measures to enhance pedestrian safety at this intersection? **Yes(11) No(3)**

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 6 of 18

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| C. | Support traffic calming to reduce speed on 15th & Spokane? | Yes(9) No(3) |
| D. | Support spending some ProParks money on these improvements? | Yes(5) No(10) |
| E. | Support seeking Neighborhood Transportation funds for these improvements? | Yes(15) No(1) |

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Considerations:

Streets are under Seattle Transportation jurisdiction. Parks can join with the community in requesting changes, but is not directly responsible for making changes.

Comments:.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5. Arboretum

- A. Support arboretum having meadow areas defined with planting and curvilinear paths? **Yes(13)No(3)**
- B. Support preserving/framing views along arboretum paths? **Yes(10)No(3)**
- C. Support buying house at Dakota & 15th? **Yes(5) No(8)**
- D. Focus on native landscaping, or **Yes(8) No(3)**
Focus on non-native landscaping, perhaps reflecting the world-wide cultures present at Beacon Hill? **Yes(8) No(6)**

Considerations

Buying the house would help make Dakota a principal park entrance.

Comments:.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

6. North vs. South Reservoir

- A. Support converting the north reservoir to park space, or **Yes(15) No(3)**

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 8 of 18

Support converting the south reservoir to park space?

Yes(3) No(12)

Considerations:

SPU plans to decommission one of the two reservoirs in the near future and turn the site over to Parks for conversion to park land.

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

The primary advantages of converting the north reservoir to park are:

- * *A large contiguous park space:*
 - * *North reservoir - top edge to edge: 10.6 acres.*
 - * *North reservoir plus fenced area set 50 feet out: 14 acres.*
 - * *South reservoir - top edge to edge: 8.9 acres.*
 - * *South reservoir plus fenced area set 50 feet out: 12 acres.*
- * *Frontage on three adjoining streets.*
- * *Unobstructed territorial views.*
- * *Ample space at the community center.*
- * *Makes hard lid on the south reservoir obviously desirable & feasible.*

The primary disadvantage is that it does little to unite park spaces to the south.

The primary advantages of converting the south reservoir to park are:

- * *More opportunities to unite park spaces to the south.*
- * *More centralized park space.*
- * *Soft lid would be farther away from lawn bowling view point.*

The primary disadvantages are:

- * *No frontage on Beacon Ave. S and S. Spokane St. - more isolated.*
- * *Less acreage for park spaces.*
- * *More constricted at existing community center.*
- * *When a hard lid is funded, the steep embankments on the N, W & E would have to remain.*

Comments:.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6. Reservoir Soft Cover vs. Hard Lid

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|
| A. | Support soft cover only, or
Support soft cover with option for hard lid - if funding is secured? | Yes(1) No(12)
Yes(14) No(2) |
| B. | Should some ProParks money (say \$1 or 2 million) be allocated to help pay the cost of making park improvements on a hard lid? | Yes(11) No(4) |

Considerations

Seattle Public Utilities' has funding for a soft cover. A hard lid would cost approximately \$10-12 million more than a soft cover. While a hard lid would dramatically increase park

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 10 of 18

space and contribute to the unification of the north and south park areas, the Mayor and City Council would need to identify funding. Setting aside some ProParks funding for hard lid costs would demonstrate serious interest in seeing a hard lid constructed. Yet in the

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

current fiscal climate and with the recent desire to expedite installation of soft covers on all the reservoirs for security reasons, it seems highly unlikely that the City will have the funds necessary for a hard lid in the near future.

Comments:.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

7. Community Center

- A. Support minimal renovation - add gym to existing community center (fully funded at \$2,463,000), or **Yes(6) No(4)**
- Support substantial renovation - add gym and program space to existing community center, or **Yes(7) No(2)**
- Support new community center, or
- i. Located at about current location, or **Yes(9) No(2)**
- ii. Located near golf clubhouse? **Yes(1) No(7)**
- Support phased approach - minimal renovation and gym in short-term, and locate improvements to allow future expansion or construction of a new community center in the future when funding is available? **Yes(11) No(1)**

Considerations

- * *Minimal renovation is fully funded at \$2,463,000.*
- * *Substantial renovation is short about \$2,000,000.*
- * *New community center is short about \$4,000,000.*
- * *If "B" or "C" are chosen, community center work would be delayed until funding is secured.*

Comments:.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 12 of 18

.....
.....
.....
.....

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

8. Lawn Bowling Clubhouse

- A. Support relocation of clubhouse south of the greens, if funding permits? Yes(4) No(8)
- B. Support constructing a south entrance to lawn bowling to facilitate access for those parking on service drive or Beacon Ave? Yes(8) No(4)

Considerations:

In its present location the clubhouse blocks views from the greens and the surrounding area, although it does have nice views from inside. Shifting the building south of the greens would open up views, including views for people using the lawn bowling greens. It would also support a more direct relationship between lawn bowling and the golf facilities. Relocating the lawn bowling clubhouse would probably require shifting the access drive and some of the holes on the 9-hole course south.

Comments:.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

9. Parking

- A. Provide only minimum code-required parking at community Center (minimize use of park for parking), or Provide more than code-required parking? Yes(9) No(3)
Yes(7) No(9)
- B. Disperse parking around the edges of the park, or Consolidate parking at the community center? Yes(7) No(2)
Yes(2) No(8)
- C. Provide parking west of Jefferson Field, along 16th Ave, perhaps diagonal parking - which would require making the street one-way? Yes(9) No(1)
- D. Remove/minimize parking north of lawn bowling to expand park space with the territorial views and create replacement parking on the west and/or south side of lawn bowling (screen glare with landscaping)? Yes(7) No(3)

Considerations

There are approximately 150 stalls along the west side of Beacon Ave. S that are shared by the community center and Seattle Golf patrons. According to the Seattle Land Use and Zoning Code, a minimum of 18 stalls would be required for the minimal community center

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 14 of 18

renovation and a minimum of 38 stalls would be required for a major renovation or new community center. No spaces are required for general park space or ballfields.

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 16 of 18

JEFFERSON PARK SITE PLANNING

Consensus Plan Decision Tree

Page 18 of 18