

ARB SPECIAL MEETING – 6/14/17

Public Comments

- The proposed code seems to be overkill considering there are less than 6 potential building areas. The Board should concentrate more on getting the existing historic structures filled. Adding more rules/regs will only hinder new businesses from filling existing buildings.
- On SE corner of Bridge/High, a street wall is permitted along Bridge. How does that interact with the 1.5 story permitted along the lane abutted to SF Residential
- Side streets and lanes too narrow to support proposed development (e.g. Spring Hill 10'4", Eberly 12'6"). Even if scaled back, how is traffic being addressed? E.g. close Spring Hill/Eberly to vehicle traffic at High as safety. Ways to reduce/eliminate through traffic on side streets and lanes.
- Address parking while permitting 50% coverage, drop connections (linkages)
- I like that you stepped down buildings on the rear lanes where adjacent to residential. Things I dislike:
 - 1- The proposed percentage of lot coverage appeared very dense in the examples.
 - 2- The "permitted enclosed connections" will create a wall of buildings that we would like to AVOID. Also, adequate parking requirements should be set forth in the code.
- Not enough room in alleys to walk + drive with 5 ft. setback. I'm worried about the historic buildings falling into disrepair. How can we incentivize business owners to rehab these buildings? I think the 7am-10pm is too restrictive on restaurants.
- I am pleased to know there will be no parking garage built in the historic district and that the buildings will not occupy more than 50% of the property.
- Comment 1: It would be helpful to take a holistic view, what does the city want the historic district to look like? Perhaps show a possible scenes (?) 10 years from now. How are actual historical buildings accommodated, this presentation is a good start but is a very specific issue.
- Comment 2: We could still use a traffic study, fire dept. review to bring the whole picture together.
- Glad to see stricter codes in place. Please keep with historic feel.
- It seems as if the new code will help keep Historic Downtown's charm. Please do everything you can to keep it visually similar to what it is and put in as much greenspace as possible.
- W. Bridge Street "development":
 - o Keep any new buildings no taller than 2 stories (like the historic area)

- Do not “cram them in” and create very high density and more traffic problems
- Keep the trees/keep it “green” with views
- Please allow/require sufficient parking on site for any new occupancy or building. Otherwise historic buildings may have to be raised for parking lots. Never create parking demand that leads to a parking garage south of 161.
 - What are current closing times for DVT(?), Tucci’s, etc?
 - Why do proposed new regs not start above SR 161 or at least at SR 161? What changes do you see coming for those areas? What addresses are at the south end of Core II?