

Notes

Day 2: Sat. July 26, 2008

10-12 p.m. (Noon)

**“Adapting Woodstock” Charrette
July 25 and 26, 2008
Adapting Woodstock Farm at Inspiration Point**

“Woodstock Farm at Inspiration Point” Name used by Dave Christensen in reference to successful 04’ ALEA application

Dave Christensen: Review of ten “Guiding principles” formulated by Day 1 participants.

Jonathan Schilk: Pt. of access not moved due to time constraint. JS consulted with Pacific Survey Engineering (PSE) during day 1. Given the constraints, they were of the opinion that the driveway configuration as depicted is the best it can be, agreed plan allowed for reasonable driveway width and additional room for peds, revisions done after day 1, proposed driveway width could come down to 16 ft. with 3 “bump outs.”

Audience concerned with how driveway realignment will affect elms

Jonathan Schilk: Existing grade to meet min. hwy curves when overlaid, existing grade, 10 ft. of fill, retaining wall to contain fill to prevent need for embankment, “trying to follow the grade,” review of retaining wall vs. no retaining wall, retaining wall would be 10 ft., existing grade meets Chuckanut at 22%, some pts would require 14 ft. fill

Lisa Law: If didn’t do parking lot, how far down to make entrance grade appropriate?

Jonathan Schilk: Just to deal w/ entrance, grade extends down to same pt. with or without parking lot

Patricia Decker: Anyway to not widen driveway?

Jonathan Schilk: Trust that engineers put in minimum width requirements, will ask engineers again about radius on north end of entrance, narrowing starts to create impacts.

Patricia Decker: Phase alternative to address entry issue, neck down driveway, to let other vehicles know they're coming, remove bump outs, work on 9-12 ft. driveway, so it's just one lane, to see whether or not able to keep any trees in the alle. "Break over" safety issue, people acknowledge need to change grade in order to enter drive safely, otherwise minimize width of, and minimize impact of fill in adjacent areas, other issue with alle, if there's any way to save alle that would be best.

Jonathan Schilk: Need big footings for ten foot wall, review of 16 ft. section vs. 22 ft. section diagrams, extend out reasonable embankment from side to allow for 2 ft. space for peds. Grade would meet center of alle and still impact the elms even at 16 ft.

Patricia Decker: What about reducing to 12?

Jonathan Schilk: **Would have to run scenario**

Patricia Decker: Possibility to replant elms?

Jonathan Schilk: The plans portray trees planted on widened driveway, root systems no doubt extend to opposite side of driveway. The elms could probably be replanted.

David Scherrer: Possibility of one way entrance, one way exit?

Jonathan Schilk: Turning radius for fire engine access a problem. Just 12 ft. in still has to meet radius.

Tim Wahl: What about managed parking, no right turns out, only enter site from the north? If favoring “programmed activities” might accommodate, eliminates huge amt. of pavement, allows people from south to turn around at trailhead, could potentially shave off a lot of cost.

Sue Ellen: Doesn’t think person going up from south will turn around at N. Chuckanut trailhead to come back.

Dave Christensen: What do you think we should do?

Sue Ellen: Limited access, keep main part of driveway relatively the same

Mark Eilberg: What about a one-car lift?!

David Scherrer: Doesn’t think the driveway is that big of an issue.

Don Hunger: What are social expectations of site ingress/egress managed by partners of city? Expectation can change to one way in one way out.

Patricia Decker: Don’t allow any turn around and let people come out, may be preferable to let people turn right

Amy Schilk: Limiting vehicular traffic to upper portion of farm would be good, provide for more mgt.

Dave Christensen: Still a driveway connection issue

Dennis Bailey: Would DOT allow left turn into drive from south? Easier to go to Trailhead, turn around and come back.

David Scherrer: Thinks keeping it difficult for cars to enter site isn’t a bad thing

Earl Cilley: Thinks loop idea is important, huge ADA problem, way to allow old people and kids to safely be dropped off, safely allow for driveway to remain more the same the further down drive you go.

Patricia Decker: Keep peds. off of driveway, keep on permeable pavement to min. width of drive

Sue Ellen: Doesn't want to discourage out of town visitors

Tim Wahl: Tourism funds are shifting towards Inspiration Pt. concepts

Don Hunger: If the site's to be considered a *destination*, then we have to stick with Jonathan Schilk's plan.

Georgie Bailey: Auto access not top priority, doesn't want to see elms removed. Thinks it will change character of site.

Dave Christensen: Changing driveway isn't optional.

Lisa Botcher-Law: If only dealing with upper part of drive don't have to go down as far to maintain grade?

Jonathan Schilk: will TALK to engineers about ordinance compliance and potential compromises re:

< NARROWING PROFILE, still thinks need 20 ft. extension, maybe steepen from 15 to 18, still better than 22!

Tim Wahl: Do we need left turn in north bound in and do we need right turn in? ONLY ENTER FROM NORTH??

Patricia Decker: Round about for way to access from south, to minimize footprint of drive in and out, change top of grade to whatever is safe and meets state standards.

Earl Cilley: Mention of Yosemite Nat. Park, one way in.

Paul Barkley: Start at N. Chuckanut Trailhead parking lot, take a historic railroad to site!

David Scherrer: How about a little interpretive center/café at end of proposed parking overlook on bluff??

John Rawlins: What about reversing one way in one way out?

Andy Law: Flat area next to driveway on elms side, would eliminate 3:1 slope,

Patricia Decker: Losing trees next to entrance not as bad as losing all

Tim Wahl: Review of proposed trail system: pink areas: flat plaza area for gathering, walkway straight to bluff, handicap accessible with no elevation change, loops are great, different gateways, connecting back to CA, wide or narrow? Wider trail attached to Chuckanut Dr. or train shuttle! ADL funds recreation and conservation office for trail funding; coming from Chuckanut village, skirting around outside, tie back into interurban, Teddy Bear link: little sections that would be bolted onto route, ability to come onto site at any tide level, segregating rental/private use areas, "income centers", path up Woodstock Cr., Clark's property might be an option, interurban is still awkward, but new foot trail will go straight from trailhead to site. Higher route is still attached to state hwy. Concrete half bridge, could move more people and bikes, small cars. Pink areas could be organic, flat areas, gardens.

Jonathan Schilk: Terraces drop down at 4 ft. intervals, but in my opinion run counter to honoring contours of site

Crowd nods in agreement...

David Scherrer: Keep slope by Gates Lee, maybe put a deck off house,

Tim Wahl: ADA to consider for handicap access

Dave Christensen: Areas near prehistoric should be quiet and contemplative

<New improvements and modifications need to be sympathetic to existing site features, no transient housing/overnight stays beyond caretakers

Sue Ellen: That will be a limitation to artists, etc., not being integrated works against cultural residential program

Possible overnight for arts events, etc?

Don Hunger: Overnight guest vs. overnight volunteers, if overnight stay supports site use.

Patricia Decker: IF related to purpose of use of property overnight stays should be considered

Mark Eilberg: Issues related to overnight stays: maid service, kitchen codes

Sue Ellen: Don't want it to be a B&B, but programmatic use should be considered

Dave Christensen: Revision: "***transient housing allowed for onsite programming use***" (modified from current version)

Dave Christensen: Gates-Lee house strengthen architectural qualities throughout house, using all floors

Barn: review of barn diagrams (mezzanine)

Amy Schilder: Barn basement modify for more space, dumbwaiter, etc.

John Rawlins: Concerned with expense to insulate barn without changing interior

Sue Ellen: Still likes idea for central shelter in chicken house studio

Lisa Botcher-Law: How about open up chicken house to outside, concrete floor, maintain look?

Dave Christensen: Seek NR nomination

Don Hunger: Any analysis of leveling certain structures? Does NR put certain restrictions on changes to site structures?

Dave Christensen: Want structures to look the same while utilizing new technology

Don Hunger: Solar panels allowed?

Patricia Decker: Maybe, if not really visible

Don Hunger: Need to look at each building to determine potential modifications. As an organizational facilitator I couldn't use structures in present condition, would want to remodel, but if constrained by NR would that be possible?

Tim Wahl: Not sure whether local listing would be as strict as Katie F. says

Don Hunger: Wants to lead by example, wants to allow for possibility of taking down a building and replicating it in a new way using sustainable technology.

Tim Wahl: Need to remember need for ancillary spaces, can't take all of those spaces away.

Dave Christensen: Determine rentable flat areas for user functions, any proposed events need to fit in with **TRANQUILITY** of site. Property uses should provide for efficient systems in dealing with sewage, water, etc.

Encourage public private partnerships and finance, should be accessed by public Environmental/Cultural learning functions

Allison Roberts: Where does removing trees to restore past vistas stand? Environmental part could be contrary to removing trees.

Tim Wahl: Original environment had fewer trees.

Dave Christensen: Is everybody happy with the results?

Nods and smiles....