Community Design Workshop Summary

The workshop took place on 7/30/2019 at Pride Prep high school with approximately 20 attendees.

Visioning Activity
The project team developed an initial vision statement for the district based on the outcomes from recent/previous district planning efforts. Participants (split into four groups) were asked to discuss and refine the statement.

First Draft Vision Statement
The South University District is a dynamic neighborhood, where commerce, innovation, and industry interact. The district’s historic fabric provides a walkable framework that supports the creation of new places for people to live, work, and study, while the retail and freight corridor along Sherman Street continues to play a regional role in providing and conveying goods and services to the larger city.

Group 1 Revised Vision
The South University District is a dynamic mixed-use neighborhood, where commerce, innovation, and industry interact. The district’s historic fabric provides a walkable framework that supports the creation of new places for people to live, work, study, while the retail and freight corridor along Sprague Ave Sherman Street continue to play a critical regional role in providing and conveying goods and services to the larger city.

Group 2 Revised Vision
The South University District is a connected community that honors its past while preparing for the future. dynamic neighborhood, where commerce, innovation, and industry interact. The district’s historic, fabric provides a walkable framework (?) that supports the creation of new places for a diversity of people to live, work, study, and receive services, while the retail and freight corridor along Sprague Ave Sherman Street continues to play a regional role in providing and conveying goods and services to the larger city.

Group 3 Revised Vision
The South University District is a dynamic, mixed-use, residential neighborhood, where commerce, innovation, retail and industry interact. The district’s historic fabric provides a walkable framework that supports the creation of new places for a diversity of people to live, work and study, while the retail and freight corridor along Sherman Street corridor continues to provide access from the district to university campuses, South Hill, and the Hospital District. continue to play a regional role in providing and conveying goods and services to the larger city.

Group 4 Revised Vision
The South University District is a dynamic neighborhood, where commerce, innovation, and industry interact. The district’s historic fabric provides a walkable framework that supports the creation of new places for a diversity of people to live, work and study. while the retail and freight corridor along Sherman Street continue to play a regional role in providing and conveying goods and services to the larger city. The district maintains its distinct identity, making it easy to bike, walk, or bus, and protecting unique businesses in the neighborhood, encouraging suitability as the neighborhood changes.
Other statement notes:
• Multi-modal (biking + transit)
• Livability, people oriented
• Connectivity
• Distinct from downtown, but connected

**Education and Medical Services Focus Group**

Suggested vision statement edits come from a 7/31 stakeholder meeting.

*The South University District is a dynamic neighborhood, where commerce, innovation, and industry interact to provide a continuity of services. The district’s historic fabric provides walkable framework that supports the creation of new places for people to live, work, collaborate, play and learn-study, while Sherman Street provides a link between medical and educational institutions to the north and south continues to play a critical regional role in providing and conveying goods and services to the larger city.*

**Summary of input on the Vision**

• Incorporate residential/mixed use component of neighborhood in the opening sentence
• Emphasize diversity of people
• Add importance of north-south connections between to hospitals and universities and continuity of service between them
• Correct Sherman to Sprague in referring to east-west retail corridor
• Remove jargony language
• Emphasize the district’s unique identity
• Emphasize “learn” over “study”
Zoning and Community Design Exercise

MAKERS and City planning staff provided an overview presentation on existing zoning and community design provisions and provided instructions for small group exercises addressing the issues below:

1. Zoning
   a) Consider rezoning “West” (see map) from GC (General Commercial) to DTG (Downtown General)
   b) Retain GC zoning in “East”

Small group findings:
Group 1
   • No consensus (disagreements on zoning approach)

Group 2

Agreed on approach, but suggested adjusting the dividing line between DTG and GC as shown on map:
   • Shift boundary from Sprague to First to capture both sides of street
   • Shift east/west boundary from Sheridan to midblock between Sherman & Sheridan to avoid street boundary
Group 3

Agreed on approach, but suggested adjusting the dividing line between DTG and GC as shown on map (see dashed line as noted below):

- Shift boundary from Sprague to half-block south of First to capture all of Sprague and both sides of First
- Shift east/west boundary from Sheridan to midblock east of Sheridan to avoid street boundary
- Some group members preferred not to extend downtown zoning into the area.
- General preference for making zoning more favorable for mixed-use development; concern about “downtown label”

Group 4

- Apply DTG zoning in the entire district
2. **Block Frontages**

Participants were asked to consider the following block frontage approaches for Sherman and Sprague and identify other block frontages that warrant an approach that requires a pedestrian-friendly design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Require storefront design and prohibit ground floor residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Require pedestrian-friendly design (but not necessarily a storefront) and prohibit ground floor residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Require pedestrian-friendly design (but not necessarily a storefront) but don’t put restrictions on ground floor residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>No changes from current regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Other (please specify!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small group findings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Sherman &amp; Sprague: Require storefronts, prohibit ground floor residential along entire corridors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require pedestrian friendly design along new pedestrian bridge and plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Sherman &amp; Sprague: pedestrian-friendly design and prohibit ground floor residential along entire corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side streets: Require pedestrian-friendly design on green highlighted streets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Sherman &amp; Sprague: pedestrian-friendly design and prohibit ground floor residential along entire corridors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side streets: Require pedestrian-friendly design on green highlighted streets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Sprague: Require storefronts on three red highlighted blocks near Sherman.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherman and other parts of Sprague west of Grant: Require pedestrian-friendly design and prohibit ground floor residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side streets near Sherman: Require pedestrian-friendly design on green highlighted streets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Parking

Participants were asked to discuss the following options associated with parking-related standards.

a) Minimum off-street parking requirements for new uses in the district
   i) Keep existing requirements
   ii) Extend Downtown’s “No Parking Requirement” overlay (if so – to include which parts of the district (please mark on map)
   iii) Other?

b) Existing buildings/parking
   i) Don’t allow demolition of existing buildings to be replaced by surface parking (in “West” area OR all of the district)?

Small group findings:

Group 1
• No consensus

Group 2
• 3 votes to expand the downtown no minimum parking overlay to western area
• 1 vote to keep existing rules

Group 3
• Don’t install parking meters

Group 4
• Expand downtown’s “no required parking” overlay to the entire district
• Don’t allow tear-downs for parking lot construction (concern about university parking demand).

4. Site/building design

Participants were asked to discuss the following site and building design character approaches.

a) Adopt district specific design guidelines emphasizing:
   i) “Visible” sustainability/innovation
   ii) Industrial/modern
   iii) Other? (please specify)

b) Let the market dictate design character

Small group findings:

Group 1
• Let character emerge by itself. Retain existing buildings and heritage.

Group 2
• Yes, considering adopting district-specific design guidelines sustainability/innovation + brick
Group 3
• Skepticism about such design guidelines

Group 4
• No consensus

Conclusions
• All but one of the groups supported the zone change to DTG for much of the South University District.
• Broad support for pedestrian-friendly design standards on Sherman and Sprague and prohibition of ground-floor residential.
• Support for pedestrian friendly design on side streets, especially near the intersection of Sprague and Sherman.
• No broad consensus about parking standards, but some support for extending the downtown no minimum parking minimum overlay to the district.
• Design guidelines were not widely supported.