

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

PROPOSED HEIGHTS FOR FANNON STREET/ROUTE 1 PARCEL

FANNON - SOUTH TRIANGLE

- DF - Maintain 45' initiated in OT to the North; set back sim. to Park Rd. BUT - difficult to visualize w/out more detail + w/out delaying Plan.
- BF - ~~B~~ Are landowners cont-emplating additional contributions (don) - Park improvements - lower path currently required in Plan
- KM - Concerned about late timing of ~~hear~~ presenting the concept.

JF/City - options for process.
 Take Plan to P&CC as is, but provide options a separate Matter for P&CC to consider

DF - Prefer that AG decide.

MW - imp to consider parcel as part of whole plan, not sep. imp to complete park improving the site; like crescendo of height

BF - More willing to consider ↑ ht on Rte 1 (85ft) and expanding, but 12' is too close to park + high berm.

Comty -

- + straight of plan is stepping up
- + East side of Rte 1 is NOT what we had envisioned; prefer stepping / not all the same.
- 45' along park 65' on Rte 1
- + property owner: limiting the bldg envelope limits the social, community + economic benefits of the property.
- + Seems that whole Δ is set up to benefit developers not community shouldn't be accommodating dev's.
- + heights in plan - mismatch w/ PY - too tall.

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

PROPOSED HEIGHTS FOR FANNON STREET/ROUTE 1 PARCEL

- Average density ^{provided} seems incorrect + difficult to calculate or understand. ~~is~~ Oakville is 7 times denser than Del Ray.

- out of scale w/ Del Ray nhood!
- traffic concerns
- similar to above
- concerned about changes that have occurred since Dec. (perceived)
- density of Oakville is same as DR.
- n'hood streets narrow - concerned about impacts.
- So. Triangle - what's the use? ^{concerned} about too much residential + net drain on ~~the~~ City. diff to decide w/out knowing

- MW - favor allowing commercial on the So. Triangle.
- PM - like mixed use
- BF - want to protect the Park - would prefer not to "activate" w/ retail. But good to encourage office.
- DF - fine to allow commercial.
- Consensus on flexibility of use
- HT -
- MW - can we agree on parameters to guide a future decision on ht/setback/relationship to other bldgs.
- ^{measures} More setback adj to park
- perhaps more ht on Rte 1 w/ variety

AQ - allow ~~of~~ flex of uses

- increase setback adj to Park
- continue 45' line
- consider possibility for some flexibility w/ ht on Rte 1

Community -

- Consider concerns about density
- Consider shifting ratio of office to residential - more office to address concerns about density
- Why do we give up so much ahead of time?
- LIBRARY - support an indoor community space - Satellite Library space - Meeting Space - services

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

VISION PLAN/DESIGN GUIDELINES – AG ENDORSEMENT/COMMENTS

AG - Plan - final input
MW - in favor of bike ^{paths} lanes ^{esp in contrast to PY.}
+ add language encouraging provision of ^{indoor} community space (shared Mtg space).
P + architecture - will be an critical element to pay attn to going forward.
DF + have done a pretty good job w/transitions/setbacks
+ good job w/park. Need to add or look at rain gardens
+ architecture - incumbent on staff etc to be vigilant

KM - genly support plan
- appreciate transitions
- still some concern abt traffic
BF - suppt Plan
- architecture - critical to break up massing.
- ensure ground level open space is consolidated usable/attractive
- Glebe/Rte 1/Oakville St critical intersection

FF - suppt plan
- retain history/character as possible
- work to retain n-serving It industrial biz.
- emph. good implem. of plan for Park
- Consider allow priv. res. to be included in Plan

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

VISION PLAN/DESIGN GUIDELINES – AG ENDORSEMENT/COMMENTS

PM - generally in support, incl.
- DRBA -
- 2 key ^{positive} issues: connectivity of ped/bike access ~~to~~ btw
- retain it / enduring biz
- personal concerns abt traffic esp @ Giebe/Rt 1 / Laverne
- keep an eye on accomodating trucks - access - Mitigate - service impacts

PP - endorsing plan

DF - impt to integrate comm. about integrating indoor comm.

- has there been more devt on park plan since approved by PRC? - small changes.
- will there be an opp. to review/prov. input on park plan b/f it goes to PC.

ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK PRESENTATION ON ARCHITECTURE

Comments on Architecture Presentation:

- LEED certification
- Design has lost vitality
- Concerned about “lighted tower”; the extra 15’ shouldn’t be lit
- Seems like a rectangular solid – no setbacks or ins/outs perceived
- What’s the final height?
- It is the tallest building; sets a precedent for a waiver
- Would like to see a signature building. This doesn’t seem exciting or signature
- Next time show setbacks/angles