
From: John Hilton [jd Hilton@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2009 2:51 PM
To: Pulcifer, Connie; Lloyd, Mark
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew
Subject: NCPOA comments on Near North Site Plan and PUD
Attachments: NCPOANearNorthMay242009.doc

Hi Connie & Mark,

I previously sent this message to Matt Kowalski, but learned that he's out of town all week. I'm hoping you can pass it along in a more timely fashion.

Last week, Peter Pollack met with Damian Farrell and Dale Sanders to review ideas being considered by the architects for possible revisions to the Near North Site Plan and PUD.

NCPOA's Area Committee met on Sunday and approved the following comments on the Site Plan and PUD, which are attached as a Word .doc file and also pasted below. We would appreciate your sharing them with Planning Commission in time for the June 2 packet.

thanks
John Hilton

[text follows]

NCPOA Comments to Planning Commission regarding Near North PUD and Site Plan

North Central is a YIMBY neighborhood. For fifty years, NCPOA has supported positive change and diversity in our neighborhood. We have actively participated in the City's planning process throughout that time, and have specifically been engaged in the future of this site for the past five years.

NCPOA opposes this project in its present form because it is incompatible with the neighborhood's zoning and the Central Area Plan, and would set a precedent that would permanently alter the character of the North Central area.

Nonetheless, as we have repeatedly told both Planning Commission and the developers, we *want* to make

5e(3)

affordable housing work on this site. We appreciate the specific feedback Planning Commission has provided the developers following your May 5 meeting. We would like to further clarify our position as well:

Height: the proposed height (up to 50 feet from the designated grade, and 58 feet from ground level) creates an imposing institutional feel in a block of two-story homes. In addition, it contradicts the A2D2 plan to have building height step down from the urban core. At no point should the building be more than 40' tall.

Stepbacks: On Main Street, the building's landscaping and façade should maintain a pedestrian friendly scale. A large retaining wall with a 50-foot tower above it is not acceptable. If the developers are allowed to build so close to the sidewalk, the retaining wall should step back, and the building's façade should also step back above the second floor. A setback at the rear would also be preferable.

Rear Setback: The requested rear setback of 18.5' requires neighbors to the East to use their rear yards as a buffer area. This is unacceptable. At no point should the rear setback be less than 30' from the rear lot line.

Diversity: This project would reduce the diversity of housing in our neighborhood. Because the workforce housing's income limit would exclude working couples, these units would be occupied primarily by single individuals. Such a concentration in one location is undesirable; a mix of unit sizes (bedrooms) would accommodate a wider range of households.

Floodway houses: While we still do not agree that the three houses located in the floodway need to be demolished, if the City requires their demolition, the subsequent management of the site is crucial. It must be designed and permanently managed to function as a safe, family friendly area. Programming, design, and management specifics must be spelled out in the PUD agreement and site plan.

Retail space: Adding a new retail space on this block without removing the existing one is not acceptable. If the developers continue to include a new space for the Summit Party Store in this project, the PUD and Site Plan must require removal of the store's existing building.

Parking and access: One need only visit the Summit Party Store at lunch time to recognize that the proposed parking is completely inadequate for the retail use, let alone the proposed office space. Traffic access

also has not been adequately addressed. As currently designed, both access and parking are extremely problematic.

In summary: NCPOA welcomes new neighbors. The North Central neighborhood already has a large amount of workforce and supportive housing, and we would be glad to have more under the management of Avalon Housing. A development responsive to these concerns would be a welcome addition to our neighborhood. We will be glad to meet with Planning Staff, Planning Commission, or the developers to discuss the above criteria.

From: Tom Fitzsimmons [thomasrfitzsimmons@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 4:36 PM
To: Kowalski, Matthew
Subject: Near North revision

Matt-

Please send me an electronic version of the revised plans for NENO when available. Thanks in advance.

It was disappointing to hear that this project looks so much better in the eyes of the City and its increased benefit due to the removal of the three floodway houses. It is still out of scale and character.

Per our conversation earlier I am following up on some of the continued and obvious problems with the plan:

- Overall building mass appears unchanged, or possibly larger.
 - Did the developers add additional square footage to the main building to make up for loss of three houses?
- Number of units has increased
- Additional office space has been added
- Height of the building has increased at various points as the developers simply shift massing around
- Rear of building is still very close, or closer?
 - Plans looked like rear setback was now 13'. Is this correct? Can we get the required setback per zoning of 55' shown on the plans? Their use of 15' and 30' setback is meaningless.
- Front of building is closer than 10' to front sidewalk with no stepback(s). By adding more height to the building closer to the front lot line the developers are creating more of a problem at the front.
 - Can we get the required front setback per zoning of 45' shown on the plans?
- Retail is still part of the plan, without first addressing the corner retail site (Summit Party Store).

The perceived benefits of this project may be real, but at the same time the cost to the neighborhood will be high. I look forward to seeing your staff report this Friday.

Tom Fitzsimmons

5e(4)