ADVISORY GROUP & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
Proposed Heights for Fannon Street/Route 1 Parcel

Fannon - South Triangle
- BE - Maintain 45' initiated in OT to the North; set back sim. to Park Rd. BUT - difficult to visualize w/o more detail + w/o delaying Plan.
- BF - B Are landowners cont. templating additional contrib? (deed) - Park improvements lower path currently required in Plan
- KM - Concerned about late timing of hear presentations concept.

JF/City options for process.
- Take Plan to PCRC as is, but provide options a separate matter for PCRC to consider.
- DF - Prefer that AG decide.
- MW - imp to consider parcel as part of whole plan, not sep.
- imp to complete park improv't on site; like crescendo of heights
- BF - More willing to consider up to Rte 1 (85') & expanding, but 12' is too close to park + high term.

Cmty -
+ Strength 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 + proper owner: limiting the blog envelope limits the social, community + economic benefits of the property.
+ Seems that Whole A is set up to benefit developers not community + heights in plan - mismatch up by too tall.
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- Average density seems incorrect—difficult to calculate or understand. Est Oakville is 7 times denser than Del Ray.
- Out of scale w/Del Ray nhbd!
- Traffic concerns
- Similar to above
- Concerned about changes that have occurred since Dec. (perceived)
- Density of Oakville is same as DR.
- Nhhd streets narrow—concerned about impacts.
- So Triangle—what is the use? Concern about too much residential + net drain on 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 height setback/relationship to other blgs.
- More setback adj to park—perhaps more hit on Rte 1 agreeable.

Aq—allow 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—Motel 8 space—senior center.
AG - Plan - final input
Miw - in favor of bike lanes - esp. in contrast to Py.
+ add language encouraging provision of community space (shared MTH space).
P - architecture will be a 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 a look at rain gardens
+ architecture - incumbent on staff to be vigilant

KM - generally 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 historic/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
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PM - generally in support, incl.
- DRBA - positive
- 2 key issues: connectivity of ped/bike access & biz
- retain it/nduring biz
- personal concerns abt traffic esp @ Glebe/Rte 1/Lawrence
- keep an eye on accommodating
  - trucks - access - mitigating impacts
PP - endorsing plan
DF - imp to integrate comm. about integrating indoor comm.

- Has there been more dev't on park plan since approval by PRC?
  - small changes.
- will there be an opp. to review/prov. input on park plan b/f it goes to PC.
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