

## Comments received from Broad Street Redevelopment Public Meeting #3 (June 8, 2016)

### Architecture

- Not fake like New York, New York in Las Vegas. Make it authentic.
- The look is appealing; Mass of building is better when smaller
- The color is important; More brick and more like downtown buildings
- 4 stories would be a challenge for the community
- Wall of building on the water side not good
- No architectural style
- Height combo good
- Architecture not unique
- Architecture good; seen in N. Carolina; stands out.
- Elevations appealing
- Likes façade

### Site Design and Layout

- Could Broad Street be relocated? Move it to the East
- Nature and the setting is Number 1
- The distance from the walking path to the building is too short
- Keep the trees; The trees – the heritage trees are important
- Break the building into 2-3 buildings
- Why not keep Broad Street and move it to the East
- Treatment along Grand Street should continue
- Is proposed plaza public?
- Need 20 foot distance between path and buildings
- Concern about the retaining wall
- Loose the dog park. The City recently removed a dog park from it CIP because there wasn't the support for it.

### Parking

- Parking should be underground if possible
- Too much parking
- Parking is not sufficient for commercial and retail
- Put some of your parking underground
- Parking lot on Grand Street side of the development seems a waste of good/prime building space
- Parking lot looks like a commercial lot
- Utilize Broad Street for parking. There has to be a way to design the site so that it looks more urban and less suburban, specifically in regards to parking.

### Miscellaneous

- Still more work to be done
- Eliminate commercial for more residential units
- Work at the site should be tied in to the renovations at the Auto Repair Building on Broad