

## **July 10, 2008 Downtown Committee Meeting Notes**

(continuation of 6/26/08 meeting)

### **Items of Committee Consensus on the Land Use Alternatives**

1. Lost Park – DRMU for the entire site north of 1<sup>st</sup> St. to have a vitality with ground-floor retail and active uses
2. The committee agreed to keeping the DRMU designation for the core area as shown on all three designations (exactly as shown on “A”)
3. CMU was agreed upon as suitable for the entire South DT area as shown on the 3 alternative maps. They also agreed that this area of CMU could accommodate densities up to 70du/acre.
4. RMU in the DT area should allow higher densities than the rest of the city (up to 50-70 du/acre)
5. The Committee agreed that the University of Phoenix block (between 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, Flume & Orient) should be planned with the rest of DT

### **Committee Members comments on the process:**

- Why aren't we seeing the results of the Downtown Access Charrette included?
- Cheryl is feeling frustrated that we don't have Mark to help create a vision for Downtown. She doesn't feel ready to make a decision today. Not happy with BAE report...thinks it's too biased by realtors.
- Alan thought the committee was going to be more durable and long-standing than just short-term input to the overall GP. Also thinks PMC has talked too much instead of listening to the committee, too unresponsive to Committee
- They want to plan well, not haphazard
- Mary feels disjointed from missing field trip. Her vision for this committee did include the work of today. But she only saw this as the beginning of the work of this committee. She also feels rushed, would prefer a leisurely, meaty discourse.
- TJ feels out of the loop. He thinks we started out the wrong way. Like we didn't shape a vision enough. Need to still decide what we want.
- Many felt like the vision needs to be better refined and documented
- TJ says we should make the GP loose enough to manipulate it later.
- Mary recognizes timeline, but wants it to be meaningful & that requires time. She doesn't want to see this group to end; she wants it to live on.

### **Unanimous Committee Opinions Outside of Land Use**

1. Unanimously agreed to slow downtown traffic and activate pedestrian use of downtown by reducing Main and Broadway to 2 lanes between 9<sup>th</sup> St & 1<sup>st</sup> St
2. Parking quantities and standards must be addressed through the GP

### **Chronological Meeting Notes**

- Mike Trollinder (of public) wants the committee to decide the street flow today
- Need to get more people on the street in DT as a destination, and planners to figure out how to make that happen.
- DT should be a destination, not a drive-through, so add wider sidewalks & 2-lane streets for Main & Broadway

- Alan's response- page 1, has land uses on the ground today. Housing stock on eastern flank of downtown, 8th&Pine to 5<sup>th</sup> & Flume is an opportunity site for RMU-HD, with market @ 8<sup>th</sup> & Pine as MUNC. The area now has ~ 9 du/ac. We need to double or triple that. 8<sup>th</sup> & 9<sup>th</sup> and Pine & Cypress couplets make a natural edge to Downtown. He especially likes RMU-HD for the east side of DT.
- Alan says only expand DT on the eastern side. John wants to expand all around
- City should adopt historic building code
- Cheryl mentioned that we need more pedestrian orientation, reduced traffic, more traffic calming, more parking options, sidewalks expanded
- Debra mentioned extending DRMU all the way to 9<sup>th</sup> St. and expand uses allowed, especially to allow more offices
- TJ likes the flexibility of the policies allowing some variety in uses within CMU and DRMU
- Committee agreed that CMU was an appropriate use for south DT.
- Merz thinks that at least a portion of DT should have arts/civic overlay districts, that allows a range of public friendly uses (art, dance theater) with incentives & policies to encourage (economic incentives). He then stated that it should be all across DT, not just a portion, and it would include studio space.
- Mary said the overlay should include live-work options, entertainment, etc...
- Cheryl said we need a mix of all of these options. To create a vibrant balance of live and work, retail and office...creates an "eyes-on-the-street" condition.
- John says we need to have a broader discussion of transit (corridors & links)
- We need both more offices and high density residential; add more density to the RMU part of Alt B.
- It was mentioned that parking lots should be allowed anywhere in DT
- Alan said we need more OMU, especially as a buffer between bars & residential
- Downtown should be bigger and designations should reflect that
- The greater context of and linkages to DT need to be considered
- Gateways need to be enhanced, especially the south
- Alan thinks everything marked RMU on B should be OMU, and then all the Res beyond that should go to RMU-HD
- PG&E substation north of 1<sup>st</sup> should be moved (under the water tower) to allow flow and development of its current site
- John said he wanted a basemap showing an even larger area around DT
- Glenda said CSUC would like Alt B to meet their DT office needs, and Committee wants to keep the university on DT
- Notes on how to develop the site adjacent to Lost Park:
  - Ensure the development also faces the creek and includes public access to the creek with walkways
  - It must be connected with the rest of DT
  - It will help the safety of DT
  - Some of the creek area should remain visible from 1<sup>st</sup> St
  - Parking needs to be addressed to allow development to occur
  - It should be connected with a bike path under Esplanade to connect w/ CSUC and behind the Morning Thunder center at Memorial Way

- Downtown should recognize CSUC's need for DT office space. So far they've been using lots along Salem. Alternate B best meets CSUC's needs.
- Constraints include non-visibility, environmental site constraints, parking
- Maybe move or have a farmers market to that area
- Consider changing the KCHO/CSUC research building site to OMU
- John thinks the KCHO building should go away, but CSUC doesn't plan to divest the building. They could consider retail on the ground floor of that site. TJ suggested a bookstore/retail store owned by CSUC.