

The applicant has expressed a clear challenge with grading the site and the presumed bedrock that makes sense. I think that keeping the existing site stairs is a good move in that it preserves a unique condition. I like the idea of pathway lighting playing up the stairs. Yet, the applicant has not expressed any reason why they can't meet the maximum lot size requirement. I urge Commission to consider the function of the regulation. In my mind, it would be to incentivize smaller lots / developments, leading to a more traditional, variegated development pattern. Why not enforce this? Then the developer would necessarily need to divide the building into two. This would be beneficial for future flexibility, public access across the site, fire department access, and would avoid a precedent that this regulation can be easily disregarded. If not enforced, I think it's in the public interest to ask for a trade-off. Perhaps, richer building materials like full-bed local stone, brick, terra-cotta, and metal, that will patina with grace, would be in order. Thin stone, board and batten, excessive fiber cement, and fake wood are not materials that will age with grace. The use of quality materials seems reasonable for such a prominent site and for a development with so many units (i.e. economy of scale). Additionally, there is no expressed hardship for a zero lot-line along Dawson. The designer should grapple with how to meet the intent of the SW district regulations along Dawson. Perhaps, units could wrap the parking garage facing Dawson and engage with a complete street. This may even increase the unit count.