Appendix E Design Charrette Summary Report By

Lynn A. Mandarano, Ph.D., P.E., Assistant Professor, Department of Community and Regional Planning

On November 14 and 15, 2006, the Temple University Center for Sustainable Communities Project Team (Project Team) conducted a Design Charrette for the Fort Washington Flooding and Transportation Improvement Study. The purpose of the Design Charrette was to introduce local stakeholders to the study and to solicit feedback on potential flooding and transportation improvements. Information collected from the Design Charrette also was used to create design principles that will guide the remainder of the Project Team's efforts.



November 15, 2006

Part I – Summary of Visual Preference Survey

A – Stormwater Management Alternatives

SW1A – Grassy Swale



Preferred by 0 participants and 3 undecided

Comments:

- Grass swale results in less standing water
- Less attractive
- Easier to maintain but requires more routing maintenance
- Less expensive to maintain
- Less efficient

SW1B - Vegetated Swale



Preferred by 10 and 3 undecided

Comments:

- Conceals stormwater management
- Less visual impact
- Plants absorb nutrients
- Gravel over sand is more permeable
- System is more expensive to build?
- Low maintenance
- Can let it go wild this is not a manicured office park
- Locating this type of BMP is an issue due to road salt
- Need and education program for maintenance
- Do leaves get stuck?
- More efficient

SW2A - Detention Basin



Preferred by 5 participants and 4 undecided

Comments:

- Less attractive
- More feasible

SW3A - Natural Retention Basin



Preferred by 4 and 4 undecided

Comments: None SW2B - Naturalized Detention Basin



Preferred by 5 participants and 4 undecided

Comments:

- Natural aesthetic is more pleasing
- Cannot see concrete
- Looks like it should be on a farm or in a park
- Looks unkempt
- Need educational signage

SW3B – "Urbanized" Retention Basin



Preferred by 6 and 4 undecided

Comments:

- Retention basins do not have to be naturalized
- Can be a water feature that office

park users 'use'

SW4A - Porous Paved Parking Lot



Preferred by 0 and 2 undecided

Comments:

- What are maintenance requirements?
- Cannot have small leaves around may clog pores
- Cannot use sand to manage snow and ice as it may clog pores
- What about weigh of trucks?
- Does this require a change in the ordinance?

SW5A – Underground/Parking Detention Gallery



Preferred by 1, 1 preferred both and 2 undecided

Comments:

Too expensive

SW4B – Porous Paved Parking Bays



Preferred by 12 and 2 undecided

Comments: - Same as for SW4A

SW5B – Porous Pavement with Porous Pavers



Preferred by 10, 1 preferred both and 2 undecided

Comments:

 Bioretention area serves parking only, would need bigger bioretention for building and parking

SW6A – Cisterns



Preferred by 4 participants, 1 preferred both and 2 undecided

Comments:

- What would be the water quality of runoff from roof
- We could not reuse runoff from roof too many geese





Preferred by 5, 1 preferred both and 2 undecided

Comments:

– None

SW7A - Bio-retention Roof Runoff



Preferred by 5, 3 preferred both and 1 undecided

Comments:

– None

SW7B - Green Roof with Public Areas

Preferred by 3, 3 preferred both and 1 undecided

Comments: – None

Page E - 5

B – Transportation Improvements

T1A – Tree-lined Boulevard with Raised Bike Lane



Preferred by 0, 5 undecided

Comments:

- There are many turns in the Office Park and the island would interfere

T1A – Tree-line Boulevard with Designated Bike Lane



Preferred by 6 and 5 undecided.

Comments:

- There are many turns in the Office Park and the island would interfere
- Do not like bike lane in roadway

T2A – Internal Street/Parking Layout



Preferred by 1

Comments: – None

T2B – Internal Street/Parking Layout



Preferred by 12

Comments:

- More applicable to Dresher and not Office Park
- Does not fit in Office Park
- Might fit along perimeter of Office Park

T3A - Multi-storied Parking



Preferred by none

Comments:

– None

T4A – Pedestrian Walkway



Preferred by 9 and 3 preferred both

Comments:

 Both alternatives would work in different areas of the Office Park

T3B - Multi-storied Parking



Preferred by 14

Comments

Cannot tell that it is a parking garage

T4B – Pedestrian Walkway/Plaza



Preferred by 1 and 3 preferred both

Comments:

Too much impervious surface
Opportunities for both

T5A – Raised Crosswalk



Preferred by none

Comments:

– None

T6A – Traffic Calming with Signage



Preferred by 2, 2 preferred by and 1 undecided

Comments:

 Visual, gets the message across, but hits driver over the head

T5B – Raised Crosswalk



Preferred by 13

Comments:

- Raised crosswalk should go in high traffic areas
- Island should have bio-infiltration
- Do not need many crosswalks
- Should be places strategically near restaurants and other amenities
- Raised concern about impact on emergency vehicles

T6B – Traffic Calming with Roundabout



Preferred by 7, 2 preferred both and 1 undecided

Comments:

- Not fond of roundabouts they are all over NJ
- Visually more pleasing that sign

 $T7A-Street\ Stormwater\ Management/\\With\ Curb$



Preferred by 0 and 2 preferred both

Comments:

 Raised concerns that pedestrians might fall into basin T7B – Street Stormwater Management/ Curbless



Preferred by 12 and 2 preferred both

Comments:

 Road salt would be an issue with deciding where to locate and with plant selection

T8A – Riverside Path – Designed



Preferred by 0

Comments: – None

T8B - Riverside Path - Nature Trail



Preferred by 13 Comments: – None

C – Built Environment

BE1A – Surface Parking



Preferred by 5

Comments:

 Raised concerns that high grasses would create a safety issues especially at night

BE1B – Surface Parking



Preferred by 9

Comments:

 Preferred low vegetation due to safety issue

BE2A - Structured Parking



Preferred by 6 and 3 undecided

Comments:

- Preferred more enclosed look

BE2B - Structured Parking



Preferred by 5 and 3 undecided

Comments: – None





Preferred by 6 and 4 both

Comments:

– None

BE4A – Building Height 5 Story



Preferred by all

Comments:

- Like mixed use on first floor
- Mix of building heights is appropriate

BE3B – Building Types



Preferred by 4 and 4 both

Comments – None

BE4B – Building Height 3 Story



Preferred by none

Comments: Same

BE5A – Building – Single Use



Preferred by None

Comments:

– None

BE5B - Building - Mixed Use



Preferred by all

Comments:

- Appropriate along perimeter of Office park
- Set back from street with sidewalk for first floor retail

BE6A – Building Architecture



Preferred by 14

Comments:

Visually appealing but probably more expensive

BE6B-Architecture



Preferred by none

Comments: – None





Preferred by 14

Comments:

- Raised concern about mosquitoes

BE7B – Landscape



Preferred by none

Comments: – None



No preference

Comments

 Both are applicable but would need to be appropriately sited. For example, more active gathering spaces should be located along perimeter. BE8B – Public Areas



No preference

Comments – Same

Part II - Ranking of Priority Concerns

During the first session of the Charrette, participants were asked to brainstorm regarding the types of improvements they would like to see incorporated into Office Park's future assuming development occurring over a 20 year time. After brainstorming, participants broke out into groups to identify, as a team, the most important initiatives.

On the following night, teams were provided a list of initiatives, which were grouped into three categories, and asked to score each item's priority and feasibility using a scale of 10-0 (10 for highest and 0).

The table on the following page highlights the final ranking of each of these initiatives.

	Priority	Feasibility	Average
Transportation Improvements	Nälik	Kälik	Nalik
Infrastructure: roads lighting signage trees	0.33	8.00	8 67
hridges	7.55	8.00	0.07
Encourage Public Transportation	6.67	10.00	8 33
Redesign Repair and Ungrade Quality of	9.67	6.67	8.17
Roads	2.07	0.07	0.17
Better Public Transportation: connectivity	8.33	6.33	7.33
Susquehanna Road Bridge	8.67	2.67	5.67
Better Transportation Connectivity: w/in	6.67	3.33	5.00
Office Park and w/surrounding area, grid			
network, additional transportation options (i.e.,			
monorail)			
Stormwater Management			
Appropriate Use of BMPs	9.33	8.67	9
Add Vegetation (i.e, trees) as a stormwater tool	8.33	9.50	8.92
and amenity			
Sewage Treatment Plant: relocate and upgrade	9.67	8.00	8.83
Flood Warning System: signage, gates,	8.33	8.67	8.50
alternate routes			
Regional Approach to Stormwater	9.00	8.00	8.50
Management: back flow prevention			
Greenway Along Pine Run w/ regional	8.33	7.67	8.00
stormwater detention			
Widen Creeks, Dredge, Improve Flood	8.33	6.33	7.33
Management			
Create Ponds	6.67	8.00	7.33
Automated Pumping of Floodwaters	3.33	1.33	2.33
Small Hydroelectric Dam	1.33	1.00	1.17
Built Environment/Other			
Jogging/Walking Paths	9.00	9.33	9.17
Better Signage, Gateway, Identity	9.00	9.33	9.17
Gateways, Way-finding, Streetscape, Lighting	9.67	8.67	9.17
Taller Buildings	8.00	9.67	8.83
Mixed Use Development	9.00	6.00	7.50
Structured Parking: reduce footprint of parking	8.00	6.00	7.00
Make Office Park a Destination	6.67	6.00	6.33

Table of Priority Concerns, Feasibility and Average Ranks

Part III – Design Principles

The following design principles were derived from the results documented in this summary report as well as discussions during the two-day charrette.

Make Connections

- Improve quality of current road system
- Create better connections within the Office Park and to the surrounding community resources (i.e., neighborhoods, infrastructure, train station etc.)
- Increase accessibility, mobility and diversity of transportation uses

Improve Flood Water Management and Public Safety

- Improve flood water management and enhance flood warning and evacuation system
- Reduce development in floodplain
- Apply a variety of stormwater best management practices
- Restore ecological function of waterways and floodplains while providing for public amenities

Enrich the Sense of Place

- Use infrastructure (i.e., lighting, signage, walking paths...) to improve Office Park visibility and way finding
- Improve visibility and extended usage of Office Park by other users by incorporating more amenities/mixed uses, along Office Park perimeter, that meet the needs of Office Park users and residents
- Use natural features (i.e., trees, landscaping, water features) to enhance aesthetics and natural environment as well as to provide public amenities for exercise, recreation and nature-based activities.