

From: JDS  
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 2:38 PM  
To: Rummel, Marsha;  
Cc: Mark Kueppers; Stouder, Heather; Matt Hildebrandt  
Subject: 330 E. Wilson St. Revised Development Proposal

Dear Members of the Plan Commission and Alder Rummel,

The First Settlement Neighborhood has shared with the development team three key concerns (reiterated below) and desired to work with the development team to reach a suitable compromise so that we could see 330 E. Wilson St. redeveloped. Though changes have been made to the building's skin we do not believe the proposed building is compatible with its context. Our top two concerns continue to go unaddressed by this latest revision.

1. The proportion and relationship of the building in context with surrounding buildings.

Without accurate and complete information it is not possible to make a fair determination of the building's compatibility with its context. We continue to question the accuracy of elevations submitted (e.g., the distance of the proposed building to the neighboring retaining wall in the elevations is ~15 feet but in the plan it is only ~5 feet - which is correct?). This also leads us to question the renderings since, our understanding is from the project's architect, that they are based on these elevations. We are disappointed that the rendering of the E.

Wilson and S. Hancock St. corner continues to have a tree blocking the view of the Klueter Apartment building despite repeated requests that the view include the Klueter building for comparison. This context is critical for understanding the proposed building's proportion with its much smaller neighbor. A building with a smaller volume and architectural components having proportions and relationships that reflect the scale and design of neighboring buildings would better fit the context of this site.

2. The building's affect on the view shed down S. Hancock St.

We are disappointed that the developer has not explored any options that change the building's volume to mitigate its intrusion and negative impact on this protected view. At this time of year, it is ever so clear how the view will be walled in by this substantial building. A building that is setback and/or has its upper floors stepped back would better fit the context of this site.

3. The building's visual interest and palette of materials given its location on a highly visible corner.

Though the modern design continues to cause concern, the addition of masonry elements in place of some of the metal panels, the larger windows and the de-emphasis of elevator tower continue to improve the design. More traditional architectural elements and design would better fit the context of this site.

During the Downtown Plan (DTP) process, we desired for this parcel to be 4 stories because of its relationship to the Klueter and surrounding buildings and the importance of the open and traditional feel of the view down S. Hancock St. We were told that the DTP's height limit map wasn't intended to be that specific/fined grained, but the conditional use would allow the neighborhood the ability to request consideration of compatibility for redevelopment proposals in specific areas such as this. We remain particularly concerned about the compatibility of the proposed redevelopment with the traditional and historical neighboring buildings. This isn't a site that we see as having an evolving context as in other areas of the downtown. This new building will need to coexist with its neighbors for generations.

We recognize that we need to be flexible for this site to be redeveloped, but we are disappointed that the developer has been inflexible with respect to our top two concerns. We ask that you refer the project to a future meeting and request the applicant to continue to work with the neighborhood on these two concerns.

Sincerely,  
Jim Skrentny, Chair of First Settlement Neighborhood

P.S. My apologies for not being able to attend the meeting tonight. The end of the semester at the UW and preparation of a 7:45 am final exam tomorrow prevents me from being able to attend.

-----  
**From:** Rummel, Marsha  
**Sent:** Monday, December 15, 2014 2:56 PM  
**To:** Stouder, Heather; Cornwell, Katherine  
**Cc:** JDS; Kevin Page; Mark Kueppers; Matt Hildebrandt  
**Subject:** 330 E Wilson St at Plan Commission

Dear Plan Commissioners-

I met recently with members of the First Settlement Steering Committee to review the addendum to the staff report and the 57 conditions. The following is a summary of what we discussed with some of my own additional thoughts thrown in.

The neighbors I spoke with appreciate all the work that has gone into the evolution of this proposal since April, they agree the design has improved. I share that opinion, There is general support for redevelopment at higher densities than the existing building. Neighbors are generally happy with the masonry and support two brick colors. While I share the concerns expressed by UDC Chair Dick Wagner about the role of staff in design approval, I agreed with the staff recommendation and like the masonry better and would support two colors of brick.

Now that we have gotten the issue of building materials mostly resolved, please address the ongoing neighborhood concerns about the height, lack of stepbacks and pinching of the S

Hancock viewshed to the lake identified in the Downtown Plan Views and Vistas map (p32). These concerns remain. Neither UDC and PC have asked that the developer address these concerns. I ask that you look carefully at that.

The conditional use is triggered at 4 stories so I believe the PC must make findings about 6 stories even if the DT height map permits 6 stories at this parcel. Everyone understands the developer is utilizing a small parcel. But neighbors would like to see a setback along the northern facade facing the Kleuter condo.

In addition, we would all like to know what the building will look with the surrounding context shown on the north facade. Neighbors in the historic Kleuter building will lose their view of the lake, but the developer hasn't provided any renderings of what they actually will see to the south looking at the new construction. I asked Kevin Page for a view of the north side with context photos this weekend. I hope that can be provided for tonight's meeting.

I have heard many times that redevelopment of the Rubin's site across E Wilson will mean that the lake views will be diminished. But if you visit the site you will see that much of the street view from the public sidewalk on S Hancock is the Water Utility's Crowley Station/Well 17. Mark Kuepper's photo attached to his letter shows clearly that if the Rubin's annex were redeveloped, it would not diminish the street view from S Hancock, but the new building will. So if this proposal is approved, the PC should make a finding that you think it meets the standards in spite of the DT plan recommendation to protect S Hancock views. The viewsheds to the lake were a major focus of the Downtown Plan

Finally there was a request to make sure that HVAC penetrations be allowed in balcony areas only.

FSN Chair Jim Skrentny has asked for a referral to work on outstanding issues raised by FSN and Kleuter neighbors. I would support referral.

Regarding the conditions, here are some specific comments the group discussed-

1. Delete this condition and install a fence per condition 39. "As part of the approval, the Plan Commission waives the requirement for a district boundary screening fence between this property and the property to the northwest at 140 South Hancock Street, as noted in Zoning Condition No. 41. The retaining wall in this location serves as a sufficient screen, and would also make the construction of a fence very difficult."

2. Support two brick colors, although gray and beige seem to me to be an uninspired color palette. "Final plans submitted for review and approval by staff shall include elevations and floor plans consistent with the renderings submitted on December 10, 2014. Elevations shall include a detailed schedule of materials to include standard sized brick and color specifications for all materials"

9. Please identify any trees in the ROW you expect to be preserved. "The construction of this building will require removal and replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and possibly other parts of the City's infrastructure." Street trees are part of city infrastructure and should not be unnecessarily lost because of construction staging.

20. Please require the replacement of the tree on S Hancock ROW if there is room to grow a tree. "All street tree locations and tree species within the right of way shall be reviewed and approved by City Forestry.... Approval and permitting of any tree removal or replacement shall be obtained from the City Forester and/or the Board of Public Works prior to the approval of the site plan (POLICY)"

31. Please make sure there is sufficient outdoor/visitor bike parking! Can you shift the bike parking on S Hancock closer to E Wilson but keep landscaping on both sides? When I look at the proposed shrubs, I see a collection point for litter, was there any thought to raising the planting area? . "Provide a minimum of 37 bike parking spaces distributed as both Short Term and Long Term bicycle parking, as required per sec. 28.141(4) and 28.141(11). Provide a detail of the bike rack design including wall mounts. Guest stalls shall be short term..."

39. Add language that the fence should be erected on top of the stone retaining wall. Add language that the stone wall should be inspected and repaired if condition warrants. Neighbors believe both the retaining wall and the fence should be retained as part of the condition to insure that residents in the new building are shielded from vehicle lights entering the Kleuter drive aisle. They would also like to see the developer protect the tree along the wall "Sec. 28.142 (8) requires district boundary screening for the abutting residential property. An indication that a fence exists is included on the plan set, but it is not clear if this fence is on the subject property, or meets the minimum requirements for screening. Provide detail on this fence, noting the fence must be in the subject property and must be a minimum 6'-8' in height."

40. Neighbors would prefer 4' setback. "The setback of the building to the side (northeast) property line has not been provided. Clearly label the setbacks of the building on the final plan sets."

41. Show screening of mechanicals to insure noise impacts reduced is an important quality of life concern. "Rooftop mechanical units are proposed, but the screening detail has not been provided, as required per sec. 28.071(3)(h)."

Marsha

---

**From:** Mark Kueppers  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 14, 2014 11:26 PM  
**To:** Rummel, Marsha; Stouder, Heather;  
**Cc:** Michael Harrison; Jordan Peterson  
**Subject:** 330 E. Wilson Street Redevelopment

Members of the Plan Commission, City Staff and Alder Rummel:

On behalf of the Hancock Court Homeowners Association (HCHA) I am writing to share feedback on the recent re-development proposal for 330 E. Wilson Street. The Association includes residents from the following on S. Hancock Street (15 units) - 132, 134, 136, 138, 140B, 140 C, 142 B, 142C, 144 #1, 144 #2, 146 #1, 146 #2, 148, 150, 152. Our Association welcomes a new development at this location and sees considerable potential with the concept that has been promoted by this current development team.

Unfortunately, we (unanimously) are unable to support the current proposal due to significant unaddressed concerns. I've outlined the primary concerns voiced by our Association below:

- **View Shed:** This remains a significant concern for our association. The renderings provide little effort to illustrate the impact of this development on the view shed down South Hancock St. - especially during the many months when there is little to no foliage. I've provided photos for your review (see attached) that demonstrate the current view shed. As you project the proposed development it is clear that the view shed is greatly impacted and the building is significantly out of context.
- **Building Height & Massing:** This development is situated next to a historic building (Kleuter) that has applied for Landmark status. The proposed 6 stories with no step or set back does not integrate with the rest of the neighborhood. The neighborhood welcomes a significant re-development (even a 5 story building which would represent more than a 250% increase in massing over the current building). However no justification has been provided as to why 6 stories is needed. The downtown plan allows for a building of 4 + 2 stories in this zone. We respect the downtown plan and yet ask, just because it is allowable does it mean that it is necessary or appropriate?
- **Parking:** The association was deeply disappointed that the development team has continued to prioritize parking at the expense of looking at options to either provide a step back/set back or reduction in building height.

In addition to the technical concerns outlined above, we have also been disappointed by the development team's unwillingness to support the neighborhood in illustrating the impact on adjacent property owners.

In a meeting with the development team on Nov. 21st we asked for accurate renderings of the redevelopment proposal from a view down South Hancock (and from the parking lot of the affected neighbors on South Hancock Street). Additionally, we asked for the large tree to be removed from the development's renderings (appears on the corner of E. Wilson and S. Hancock). This tree doesn't exist and it manipulates the picture's context (covering the Kleuter building behind it). The development team promised those changes would be made and have not been good to their word. That limits our ability to propose well thought out screening fence options and other feedback that would ensure a successful project.

It has been disheartening that the development team and city haven't worked to protect key neighborhood characteristics that are deeply valued by the community. We ask that you voice our concerns. We understand the importance of redevelopment. We are not here to stand in the way. We submit this feedback in an effort to generate a project that all of us can feel proud of and support.

Thank you for your time and willingness to represent our association and neighborhoods concerns.

Take care,

Mark Kueppers  
President - Hancock Court Homeowners Association Board

Cc: HCHA Board & First Settlement District Chair

Note: Please share with any Plan Commission members that I may have missed.



View Shed – S Hancock

