

OTR RAP SESSION II

Thursday November 2, 2006

Community Comments and Suggestions to the Music Hall Garage Design Plans

1. What do you think about the view from Washington Park?
 - a. The view from the park must be redesigned. A façade of nineteenth to early twentieth century style would make it all work.
 - b. It is all wonderful!
 - c. Would you consider any sort of top to the elevators to relate to the rooflines of the two adjacent historic buildings?
 - d. I like the glass feature but the garage itself does not blend well with the historic buildings.
 - e. The internal connections to both buildings are nice but they radically alter interior movements inside both historic buildings with ticket offices.
 - f. The plans take people off the streets, which is desirable.
 - g. Do more to lesson the massive scale of the garage if possible.
 - h. Reflection (within reason) would be good.
 - i. Horizontal and vertical scale good
 - j. The plan does not promote 'exploration' and does not reflect an urban environment which is hopefully the future of the park filled of restaurants and other destination amenities.
 - k. The harmonious flow of steeples and arches is broken by a rectilinear 'box'.
 - l. A 'seblance' of steeple/arch through glass etching or coloring may be in keeping with site conditions.
 - m. Scale of open glass to detailed surroundings draws attention to itself.
 - n. Invite public through eye-level, pedestrian friendly amenities (not stainless steel and glass concrete)
 - o. Good concept. I like the glass and the stainless steel, but the street linearity is dull. It distracts from the ornateness of Music Hall and the sturdiness of Memorial Hall.
 - p. Another attempt does need to be made to pick up architectural details from the two halls to blend in the garage better.
 - q. Lower the profile of the garage. Go partly underground.
 - r. The garage elevator towers dominate too much. Adding offices on top of the garage may dwarf Music Hall and Memorial Hall.
 - s. Exciting view.
 - t. The use of transparent and modern glass to connect Music Hall with Memorial Hall is a great idea!!
 - u. I think it attracts the new professional moving in the area.

- v. The garage glass is too overpowering from the Washington Park perspective.
 - w. The new does not fit in with the existing structures. Put the garage underground.
2. What do you think about the view from Central Parkway?
- a. The contemporary architecture in OTR is traditionally historic. The new style looks odd and does not modernize the block. It looks out of place.
 - b. The steel over powers the brick. Try to find a way to “blend” better.
 - c. Woven steel shingling is only compatible with glass non masonry. Use materials compatible with the surrounding building.
3. What do you think about the view from Grant Street?
- a. Walls are proportioned to match existing structures is a good start. It’s not so expensive to add string courses and pilasters to avoid alien flat planes.
4. What do you think about the exit and entrance?
- a. As far as putting offices or anything else above the parking spaces please keep it shorter than existing building.
 - b. The garage should not be taller than any of the buildings already on the block.
 - c. Does the garage go above the Pipefitters as illustrated here?
5. What comments do you have on: water features, granite/brick, glass, others?
- a. Lose the glass and steel. Use brick and stone.
 - b. A glass façade does not impress me and especially between brick and granite (historic) structures. Perhaps an amber tint to the glass would soften the start to disconnect between the existing structures.
 - c. I do not have a problem with the glass.
 - d. Transparency of the glass is good.
6. What is your overall impression of Music Hall Square?
- a. Wonderful idea. Still have some details to work out.
 - b. I do like the physical connections with the existing structures. Outside connections should be maintained too.
 - c. Beautiful. Can we think of reasons to keep people here after performances? Restaurants!
 - d. Why not make sidewalks?
 - e. Where was the community in the decision making process? Or at least an advising board of architects?
 - f. This idea of projecting an image on glass on façade does not seem to be in keeping with neither the era nor the existing architecture.
 - g. The new garage needs to be timeless and not contemporary. A combination of glass and brick would be far more sympathetic to historical OTR.

- h. OTR is a pedestrian first neighborhood. The street level plaza is nice, but the idea of keeping people from getting outside into the area differs from the atmosphere of OTR.
 - i. The design of garage permits Music Hall and Memorial Hall to remain as the architectural icons
 - j. Go back to the drawing board, with replicating the aesthetics of current OTR architecture as the essential element.
 - k. Do not connect anything so people will have to go out into the neighborhood.
 - l. Overall the program is good. Connections, entry, visible elevators, protecting performances. However, the building is not neutral, it seems unchallenged. It makes me wish there was more brainstorming. It seems like a cop-out. There are many opportunities to integrate vicinity rhythm/materials from the adjacent structures. Integrate modern with the existing environment.
7. What other comments do you have for us?
- a. It looks good when view from Elm St.
 - b. There is a temptation to ruin the “neutrality” by breaking up the walkways to the park. Stay back from sidewalks and it’s a win.
 - c. If the garage were here first would both halls be “neutral” with respect to it? The design is not neutral.
 - d. I agree with the person who mentioned principle eight “Ensure that infill and new construction strengthens the streetscape and blends into the historic neighborhood character. The design fails to integrate into the Charm of the old world OTR.
 - e. I would like a building that corrects the existing structure with the new garage but does not exclude the outside environment with an enclosed structure.
 - f. The idea of a relatively safe walkway within the garage is interesting.
 - g. Is this a way to bring poor people into the city and never have to get out of their cars? What about the community?
 - h. Will construction interfere with performances at either hall?
 - i. I wish you would reconsider the idea to have an internal connection from the garage to Music hall. The street is the heartbeat of a city. People should engage the street and approach Music Hall as it was designed. The internal connection is a suburban idea, and it does not respect the street and Washington Park.
 - j. Provide safe pedestrian walkways on each level of garage.
 - k. Please consider “camouflaging” any garage with a façade in the grand old style!
 - l. Don’t like putting an upper level entryway into Memorial Hall. Leave this building as she is.
 - m. Who will run or own the garage? The city or a private parking group?
 - n. How many jobs will this generate?
 - o. Will you collaborate with drop inn centers so residents get jobs?

- p. I have concerns about the safety of the pedestrians when everyone who is using this lot tries to leave at the same time. Maybe more entrances.
 - q. What are the provisions for ongoing maintenance? Dirty windows, shabby or dirty elevator shafts visible from front?
 - r. That comment about being able to know if you are going to be mugged was out of line. I have been living here and never been mugged.
 - s. Why are you cutting poor people from the community? By keeping everyone inside ... so what if it is cold or raining! Poor people should interact!!! It is a community.
8. Feedback on 3CDC's role in OTR.
- a. 3CDC has changed the definition of affordable to \$150,000 to 300,000 to buy a loft. Who is this affordable for? Certainly not for the current residents of OTR.
 - b. 3CDC criminalizes the current residents of OTR and Washington Park area. An example of this would be their reasoning for displacing the residents of 1318/1316 saying that they bought the property because the building had 1,500 calls to the police for drugs, drinking, etc. and was not an asset to the community.
 - c. Whose interests are being pursued? Why is 3CDC not concerned with preserving the community already present in OTR?
 - d. You are displacing poor people!
 - e. If 3CDC is private how is it legal that a private institution defines public space?
 - f. I've lived in Cincinnati for eight and a half years, and OTR for five and a half. My observation is that people living in OTR (new residents)(and I assume downtown as well) are of a different mindset than people in the rest of the city. By this, I mean, Cincinnatians are very insular... they're born here, raised here, educated and work here. Even if they go away for college on what not, they return to their neighborhoods. I've never experienced a loyalty to high school like I have in Cincinnati. Anyway, for us newer OTR residents I see and know that many of us are not from Cincinnati. We're not clique-ish like so many others are. This paradigm creates a unique community in our city. A place for 'outsiders' to be and live, and welcome new outsiders with enthusiasm rather than suspicion.
9. Feedback on Development Principles
- a. Why is there not a principle to protect and preserve the current residents?
 - b. How do you define diversity?
 - c. Where does 3CDC derive its authority from?
 - d. How is 3CDC legitimate?
 - e. How is it accountable to low-income residents of OTR?