

From: [Bosek, Ralph](#)
To: [MacDonald, Paula L;](#)
CC:
Subject: FW: Temple Terrace Redevelopment
Date: Tuesday, December 13, 2005 4:54:25 PM
Attachments:

FYI.

-----Original Message-----

From: Neal Payton [mailto:npayton@tortigallas.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2005 12:09 AM
To: Bosek, Ralph
Cc: Paul Mortensen
Subject: RE: Temple Terrace Redevelopment

Ralph:

I have received the revised plan from Unicorp Development. I am addressing these comments to you and copying my colleague at Torti Gallas, Paul Mortensen, but you should feel free to share them with Unicorp, the City Council and with whomever you deem appropriate.

In general I applaud the strategy, which as I understand it, allows the supermarket to remain where they are for now, but reserves land for their eventual move if and when an urban design concept is agreed upon. This allows you to start with a win out of the box, without compromising the plan in its initial phases. If this first phase (which I assume is Block A) is done as well as I hope, the dynamics of this site will change so dramatically, that Sweet Bay may reconsider their position.

The rest of this memo will cover the details of the plan as I understand them from the sketch.

Block A: As far as I can tell none of my earlier recommendations regarding this block have been accepted, so I will remake them. The "Bullard Green" should disappear. It is a suburban gesture in an area that is the gateway to Downtown from the east. Bullard is not that busy a street. I would suggest, bringing the building to within 30'-35' of the curb line, allowing about 15' for trees in grates and a sidewalk and 15 -20' for a front lawn, with lead walks leading to ground floor entries to two-story type units on that edge of the building. Even better, would be if the

ground floor there could be a bit higher and allow for a flexible use (live or work). In such situation the lawn would give way in part to pavers. This would be a great place for offices for accountants, or insurance agents, or real estate agents, etc, but you could start with residences in the near term.

Not only does the Bullard Green create a rather ill-defined, amorphous and frankly unusable space it exposes the backs of the proposed retail/office buildings to view from Bullard.

As I also stated in my previous memo the two buildings along 56th street, do not adequately define the corners of Bullard and "A" Street. These buildings ideally would have small wings (so that they are slightly L-shaped to neck down the rather expansive opening for the alley/garage access lane.

The residential buildings should not have chamfered corners at Broadway. This is not an urbane treatment. These buildings should define corners. If site lines are dictating this chamfering, than I would argue that design speeds for the streets are way too high, here.

I am impressed that the developer is considering 6-stories out of the gate in this first phase. Frankly, I am surprised that the market can support the economics of this type of construction, but maybe it can. As you know we had originally considered that site for only 4-5 stories, and I am a wee bit nervous about the scale of such a large structure. It looks big in plan and at 6-stories it is going to seem imposing unless the architecture is superb! I am concerned that the plan, at least does not reflect any idiosyncrasy necessary for this large a building. If this is an indicator of the architecture to come, than that is not good. Moreover the transition between the mixed use buildings in along 56th Street, which at two-stories (one retail and one office) I assume will be about 35' in height and the residential buildings behind, which I assume will be more like 65' will be a bit awkward. That must be dealt with utilizing the principles of transition found in the Design Code. (where we showed how to transition to a high-rise building). One way to deal with this might be to have a focal element (a tower of some sort) at the corner of 56th and Bullard that would be closer in height to the residential buildings along Bullard. Bullard could handle a 6-storey building as I think can Broadway, However, the residential building along "A" street might be reduced to 4-stories, reflecting the more intimate cross section of that street. Bottom line, I would ask that the building be conceptually thought of as "series" of buildings (Code wise it will probably work that way anyway). It may ultimately be one building, but it needs to look less massive.

Block C: The Burger King has to be urbane. Use the McDonalds at the edge of Ybor City as the model. If it can't be that good, than you'll have a problem along 56th Street. It should appear as if is two stories (Ideally it really would be). The

bank should also be two stories and really read as part of the building heading east down “Main Street. I accept that “B” street is really a service alley. However, that means that the Burger King must be stretched to the north to cover the edge of the garage, and the alley opening should be as narrow as it can be. Right now there is just way too much leaky space.

Why does that future building along Main Street at Broadway have a big corner cut out of it? It absolutely kills the set-up to City Hall. Buildings define the “rooms” of the city. That building is allowing the room to leak out, and by doing so makes City Hall much less prominent. Again, corners should be well defined.

Block D: The height has been reduced (I think) which is good, but this is still a rather prosaic solution. I would suspect there is a way to make more complex building that is composed of units framing courtyards that allow greater transparency. I don’t know if there is a tradition of this in Tampa, but in Miami, there was a tradition of U-shaped buildings like this. There is a book called “Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles” by Stefanos Polyzoides, Roger Sherwood and James Tice that document this type of housing. The developer should get a copy of this. It is subtle and idiosyncratic building type and would be perfect along the river, as it would seem more in scale with the neighborhood. I’d hate to be the house next Building D with a two level garage looking at my side yard. Besides, wouldn’t you want to create a variety of residential types in your first phase or two? Right now every residential building in this plan is exactly the same, a flat off of a double loaded corridor. Why not some townhomes? Or courtyard homes, or something besides a flat. How is the market going to absorb so much of one type of building? Perhaps these are just placeholders, for a variety of building types but if a program and ultimately a pro-forma is being created by these place holders, than they become prescriptive rather immediately.

As for the future phases: Well the south side of Main Street must be retail on the ground floor. I assume that is what is proposed, but it is not indicated, and it needs to be.

I don’t know what is proposed along 56th Street on the ground floor, I think it could be residential, provided there is a front lawn of the type I described for Bullard?

How tall are these buildings? Why are they all the same building type. I assume that the pond is now staying, which is too bad, but something must be done to terminate the vista along that proposed new street that runs between City Hall and the pond and ends on someone’s one-story house. I doubt that the house at the end of that street is grand enough to adequately terminate the vista (Imagine sitting on your front porch there, Yikes)

To close, I want to reiterate that the big change, that of not committing to a brand

new suburban style supermarket in the middle of the site, is great! The rest of my comments, while they may seem tough, are things that are easily fixable, as this plan is fleshed out, however the issues must be brought up now, as the City needs to establish a threshold of quality that it expects from Day 1. It is also very important that the success of the entire undertaking will ride heavily on the shoulders of the first phase. It must be very, very well done and that is why I am being so tough.

I do hope that this memo is helpful to you, the developer and the City Council. Please extend my regards to everyone in Temple Terrace.

Neal

Neal I. Payton, AIA, Principal

Torti Gallas and Partners, Inc.

523 West 6th Street

Suite 212

Los Angeles, CA 90014

213-607-0070

213-607-0053 Direct Line

www.tortigallas.com
