

Tour Guide: Bob C1 Group: Local Developer

Walking Tour Group Questions (3/25/08)

A. Does the group think this is an appropriate use for the property?

1. No – under used
2. No – under used
3. No (eyesore)
4. Yes – clean it up, façade
- more retail & parking
5. No – Not utilizing the creek & proximity to downtown...I recall hearing from several members that it was a good use as a City parking lot, includes mature shade trees.
6. No – Build more parking, not controversial cause it's already parking, good site for mixed use.

B. Does the group like the appearance of what is on the property?

1. No – bland, dull
2. No – ugly
3. No – not a small town feeling
4. No to building, yes to sign, yes historic sign
5. No – ugly, don't recall or understand this comment ok – older Chico, nice mature shade trees.
6. Yes as parking, unaesthetic architecture.

C. If you could wave a magic wand, what would appear on the property? Please be specific with regards to ground floor use, upper floor use and ultimate number of stories.

1. Better transition for downtown, retail, residential, & non res.
2. Keep bank, mixed use, multi-story building, vertical mixed-use.
3. Multi story, multi use redevelop entire block No Bars!!!!
4. Offices, mixed use, class hotel, clear block start over
5. Clear land. Build restaurants, living units, upstairs, creakside dining, mixed use, put in paths, housing.
6. Old style open market, living space above.

D. How would this new use relate to or support the rest of downtown?

1. Local, enhance appearance, less vehicle traffic.
2. Enhance appearance of downtown.
3. Continuous flow of (interest of north) downtown (into south downtown), local economy (continuation from north downtown into south downtown).
4. More T.O.T. local economy, bed space.
5. Support local economy, ease traffic, by access to creek, create sense of community.
6. Additional parking, local economy, more sue (?), regional pull.

E. Should the City provide regulatory or financial assistance to get this property developed in a manner consistent with what the community wants to see here?

1. Yes Regulatory,
2. Yes, zoning
3. Yes, regulatory
4. Yes, Zoning, regulatory, & financial
5. No – not enough funds
Yes – keep creek accessible.
6. Yes, Regulatory.