

Survey of TLNA Steering Committee Members for the Houden Proposal on the 700 block of E. Johnson

This survey of TLNA Steering Committee members was conducted via email in May 2017 after the committee had met 6 times. TLNA steering committees strive to include as many neighborhood voices as possible, so any neighbor who attended at least one committee meeting was allowed to complete the survey.

Neighbors who did not attend meetings were not solicited because the committee felt that they did not have sufficient background information to assess the fine details of the proposal and couldn't benefit from the perspectives of the developer, the City and other neighbors. Emails from many of those neighbors are summarized on the TLNA Development website for this project and can be found here:

http://www.tenneylapham.org/web-data/development/700ejohnson/Houden_comments.pdf

The proposal was at the time of the survey was evolving and continued to do so. The primary alteration after the survey was conducted was that one of the proposed three new apartment buildings was eliminated. Since then, the other major alteration is that the number of homes likely to be moved was reduced to two. Committee members were asked if their responses to the survey would change based on the alteration and none said "yes".

TIER I Issues/Concerns (these are overarching issues)

Issue/Concern	Attended at least 2 of last 3 committee meetings	Attended 1 or more committee meetings
The scale/mass of the new buildings...		
1. is just right.	3	6
2. should be reduced.	16	17
3. could be increased..	2	2
No Answer.	1	2
The height of the new buildings...		
1. is just right.	4	7
2. is too tall.	17	18
3. could be increased.	1	2
No Answer.	0	0
The proposed increase in density (living units per acre)...		
1. is just right.	5	7
2. is too large.	12	15
3. could be even greater.	5	5
No Answer.	0	0
The open space and/or variation of spaces between buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	5	8
2. should be larger.	15	16
3. could be less.	2	2
No Answer.	0	1
The 20' setback between the new buildings and the rear property line...		
1. is sufficient.	8	10
2. should be increased to generally match typical rear yard setbacks on the block.	13	15
No Answer.	1	2
Tearing down 5 houses and moving 4...		
1. is okay.	7	8
2. is okay, but tearing down and/or moving more is okay too.	2	3
3. is too many – should tear down or move fewer.	13	16
No Answer.	0	0

Moving a house to elsewhere in the neighborhood is...		
1. as good as keeping it in place.	8	10
2. not as good as keeping it in place.	14	17
No Answer.	0	0
Moving a house to elsewhere on the proposal site is...		
1. as good as keeping it in place.	15	19
2. not as good as keeping it in place.	7	8
No Answer.	0	0
The four commercial spaces in the proposal are...		
1. sufficient.	13	15
2. too many.	5	6
3. not enough.	3	5
No Answer.	1	1
Saving or moving 6 houses, plus committing to 8 units at 80% CMI is...		
1. a sufficient affordability component.	7	11
2. an insufficient affordability component.	15	16
No Answer.	0	0
Zero parking stalls for the 4 commercial spaces is...		
1. a problem.	11	14
2. not a problem.	11	13
No Answer.	0	0
80 underground parking stalls for 80 apartments is...		
1. sufficient.	13	18
2. insufficient.	0	0
3. too many.	9	9
No Answer.	0	0

TIER II Issues/Concerns these are issues related mostly to design

Issue/Concern	Attended at least 2 of last 3 committee meetings	Attended 1 or more committee meetings
Overall, the exterior design is...		
1. sufficient.	3	5
2. insufficient.	10	10
3. Overall, I like some exterior design aspects and dislike others.	8	11
No Answer.	1	1
The gabled mezzanine level...		
1. is a positive feature of the exterior design.	6	9
2. does not detract from the exterior design.	6	7
3. detracts from the exterior design.	5	5
No Answer.	5	6
The inter-building connectors between the 3 saved/moved buildings closest to Livingston are...		
1. appropriate.	2	5
2. inappropriate.	15	17
3. I need more information to make this determination.	4	4
No Answer.	1	1
The lack of space for future canopy-sized trees is...		
1. not a problem.	2	4
2. a problem.	19	22
No Answer.	1	1
The new buildings' material palette is going in the...		
1. right direction.	7	11
2. wrong direction.	11	11
No Answer.	4	5
The front façade design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	4	6
2. is insufficient.	4	4
3. has potential, but needs work.	5	7
4. needs more variation.	5	5
5. I need more information to make this determination.	2	3
No Answer.	2	2

The rear façade design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	3	5
2. is insufficient.	4	4
3. has potential, but needs work.	8	9
4. needs more variation.	1	2
5. I need more information to make this determination.	3	4
No Answer.	3	3
The side façades' design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	3	5
2. is insufficient.	1	1
3. has potential, but needs work.	6	6
4. I need more information to make this determination.	7	10
No Answer.	5	5
The new buildings' overall exterior design references...		
1. should be more contemporary.	0	0
2. are just right.	4	6
3. should reference older buildings.	6	7
4. should be transitional – referencing both new and old.	8	10
5. I need more information to make this determination.	1	1
No Answer.	3	3