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Traffic restricted streets offer new possibilities for creatively integrating social space with the private realm. Children play in the right-of-way in this European woonerf.
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Streets often constitute up to 1/3 of the land use in a city yet, in our municipal landscape they are often treated as utilitarian corridors rather than vital public spaces. This chapter looks at two street typologies that challenge this axiom: Woonerfs and Transit Malls. Both of which seek to balance the functional need for movement of people and goods with the basic desire we share as individuals and communities for opportunities for social interaction and cultural exchange.

“Imagine driving down a street with no traffic lights, stop signs, lane dividers, or sidewalks. Pedestrians, cyclists, and playing children wander about the road at will, and trees and flowers are planted in the right-of-way. How do you avoid hitting anyone—or anything? Simple. You slow down, maintain eye contact with people around you, and stay alert.”

–Sierra Magazine January/February 2005

Residents living on Anna's Straat in Utrecht set up temporary shelters to watch the Euro 2000 soccer championships.
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“...Designing streets so that walking, cycling, social activities, children’s play, parking and local car traffic could all share the same space struck me as such an eminently sensible idea...”
–Ben Hamilto

 Streets for People
Woonerfs are streets built with high quality urban design where the boundary between people space and car space is intentionally blurred. In doing so, the pedestrian space is extended from the sidewalk, and into the traffic zone. Whereas in a normal street, pedestrians are made to feel like guests in the cars space when they cross the street, woonerfs reverse this axiom. By designing high quality urban spaces, drivers moving through a woonerf are made to feel like guests and modify their behavior accordingly.

In Seattle and other American cities, coercive strategies are generally used to ensure safe driving in neighborhoods. Such tactics include extensive signage, traffic markings and of course traffic laws along with a fleet of traffic cops to enforce them. These methods are costly, create lackluster streets and are largely ineffective. Indeed since people tend to drive as fast as they feel they can control their vehicles, some of our tools for traffic engineering such as lane striping may encourage unsafe driving.

Rather than coerce people into driving safely, woonerfs incent them to do so by using design cues. They achieve this by using the principle of ambiguity. For example, by planting trees in the right-of-way, eliminating curbs or eliminating the grade separation between sidewalk and street and/or using angled parking to carve out pocket community spaces like gardens, seating or children’s play areas, woonerfs send an implicit message to drivers: Slow down.
European studies have shown that woonerfs are significantly safer than traditional street configurations and surprisingly do not compromise travel time in residential settings. This is because, by eliminating stop signs, drivers are able to maintain a steady if slow constant speed that is similar to the average speed traveled in start/stop traffic over equivalent distances.

Essential Elements
Woonerfs offer a way for planners and designers to curb the deleterious effects cars can have on neighborhood streets.

There are several methods employed by woonerf designers use to reclaim the street right of way:

- Obscure sight lines
- Plant trees or place other features in the right of way
- Install detailed, intricate paving patterns
- Eliminate the grade separation between sidewalk and the carriage way
Challenges
Woonerfs offer an exciting lens through which planners and designers can rethink the neighborhood street and interest in replicating this European model for streets continues to grow in the United States. There are challenges that have surfaced by American attempts at building Woonerfs in the different urban context of American towns and cities. Designers should expect to grapple with how to provide access for emergency vehicles, and will need to pay attention to accessibility issues for people with disabilities. Current engineering standards can for example render it impossible to build woonerfs in many American cities. None of these issues is insurmountable. Brookline, Massachusetts, and West Palm Beach, Florida have for example successfully implemented woonerf projects. The idea is likely to continue to spread to more north American cities.

Possible / Implementation and funding Mechanisms
Green Street Projects
SPU stormwater projects
Incremental implementation following street maintenance, utility work and large construction bonds
Neighborhood matching funds
The mayors proposed downtown open space impact fee

Possible / Opportunities for Pilot Projects
UW Campus Expansion, especially the more urban southeast campus
South Lake Union redevelopement
Downtown Alleys
Yesler Terrace Reconstruction

Evolution of a System
1. Traffic flows separate calmed residential areas.
2. Major arteries are adapted to overcome severance.
3. The city as a coherent social zone; traffic volumes determined by environmental capacity
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Transit malls can be effective tools to ensure the efficient movement of transit in congested urban corridors while providing quality pedestrian and in some cases, retail environments.

With the recent closure of the bus tunnel to renovate it for light rail, Seattle has created the nascent underpinnings of a transit mall along Third Ave. downtown. Third Ave. is uniquely situated for this role as it runs the length of downtown and is roughly equidistant from the water and I-5. The new “3rd Ave. transit spine” was initially conceived as be a transit-only street throughout the day, but the city caved at the last minute and the street currently acts as a transit mall solely during peak commute times when private cars are effectively restricted from the street.

Whether or not the street will remain a transit mall when the bus tunnel reopens remains to be seen. However the City Center Circulation Report, a policy document available on SDOT’s website that was written in 2003 calls for the street to remain a bus only corridor.

Should the city choose to keep the street as a bus way, an opportunity exists to enhance the public realm with urban design treatments. Unique paving, street trees and street furniture a la San Francisco’s Market Street or the Portland Transit Mall (see case study), can cement the 3rd Ave. as Downtwon Seattle’s Main St. Such a move would make 3rd Ave. a true spine for the city both as an organizational framework for our bus system as well as in the mental maps of the residents and denizens who inhabit our downtown.
Case Study Portland:
The Portland Transit Mall was created in 1977 as the culmination of a two pronged strategy to improve transit flow downtown and spark downtown development, especially retail. Limited car access was provided in one lane on some parts of the transit-priority streets but on-street parking was removed and replaced with widened sidewalks, lavish street furniture, public art, fountains and street trees.

While the commercial space on did not develop to the degree city officials had hoped, transit flow was greatly enhanced. There have been issues with business owners along the mall wanting on-street parking. The city recently studied increasing parking supply, but decided against it because the street space was needed for a future light rail expansion.

Over time, the city has continued to tweak the transit mall's design and is currently undergoing a design process to update the corridor.
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