

Oakville Triangle/Route 1 Corridor Plan Advisory Group Meeting
August 17, 2015
Meeting Summary

AG Policy Discussion/Conclusions

- Senior Living Facility. Conclusion: Include as one of the possible land use options
 - Discussion:
 - Fits well in the community
 - Proximity to transit
 - Good to build in flexibility for all reasonable uses to be allowed
 - Add to list of possible uses, not necessarily mandate

- Bike lanes on north-south road/Oakville Street. Conclusion: Allow them to be considered but not required; should not be installed at the expense of parking.
 - Discussion:
 - People can currently ride on sidewalk
 - Would be similar to conditions on Del Ray Streets (no bike lanes)
 - Do not want to sacrifice parking to achieve

- Ruby Tucker Park timing. Conclusion: Bring forward to same timeframe as pedestrian crossing (6-10 years). When the funding is available in that timeframe – then make a decision based on highest need.
 - Discussion:
 - Make determination as to which is more needed when funding available

- Proposed Fannon/Route 1 Heights. Conclusion: Staff will bring back options for review at next meeting. Staff will also provide information on the change in the number of SF/units that would result if height is changed.
 - Discussion:
 - Consider 75' at corner rather than 85'
 - Concern about encroachment into the 45' band
 - Encourage a variety of heights
 - Provide options for review at the next advisory group meeting.
 - Provide information about how the changes impact the Plan analysis for topics such as transportation.

Next meeting (September 10):

- Review of specific topics that need final AG review
 - building height on southern portion of triangle
 - variety of building heights
 - appendix
- Final endorsement of Plan
- Review of Oakville DSUP/Architecture/Mount Jefferson Park SP

AG Specific Plan Comments by page # – these will be incorporated as applicable in either the Plan or DSUP/Zoning. (in addition, other non-substantive edits will be made for clarification as needed)

- Page 14 – concern re shared parking; make stronger statement of expectation
- Page 15 – identify maker space uses
- Page 16 – affordable housing/group home provisions – allow and incentivize;
- Page 20 – update chart re ped crossing and Ruby Tucker Park
- Page 37 – add clarification text for public street and ROW (lack of consistency throughout doc)
 - Streets and sidewalks are all to be dedicated as public
 - Add text about streets and sidewalks ROW
- Page 61 – revise graphic (bike share location at Stewart)

- Page 68 – 5.11 – 15’ may be too much; concern about transition when adjacent to home etc (revise language)
- Page 84 – add public art
- Page 85 – 5.106 lights shielded to avoid spillover to park
- Page 85 – are the standards consistent with infill?
- Page 99 – Neon/LED signs – add language referring to Ad Hoc group recommendations; allow signs to be on late into the night?
- Page 99 – 7.16 – clarify/confirm wayfinding is included
 - 7.31 “high intensity lights such as”

General

- LEED – part of DSUP
- Lighting – downward directed – avoid spillover
- Appendix – include anticipated number of residents; include allowed height and as-built in Potomac Yard?