

From: mrummel@sbcglobal.net [mailto:mrummyel@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Saturday, November 04, 2006 5:03 PM

Subject: 301 Livingston at Plan Com Monday/Council Tuesday/MNA Wed

Members of MNA's preservation and development committee (Johanna Coenen, Peter Wolff, John Martens, myself) were joined by Bill Patterson (a member of the ad hoc n'hood committee that worked with Scott Lewis in phase 2), and several new Board members -Paul Sager, Tariq Pasha and John Coleman- in a meeting last week with Scott Lewis, John Sutton and Doug the other architect.

We reviewed the project and decided to recommend to the MNA Board and Plan Commission our conditional approval of the project.

We will attend the Plan Commission meeting on Monday to report our discussion with the understanding that our committee doesn't have the final say. If the project passes Plan Com, it may get approved by the Council on Tuesday, without the developers having attended an MNA Board meeting.

I will invite the developers to present the project plan to our meeting on Wednesday 11/8. Scott communicated to me via email that Doug (sorry I didn't catch his last name) has already incorporated some of the comments they received from us into the project. I'm not sure how this will play out, as the design has already been approved by Urban Design.

Here are our conditions for support:

1. The committee will continue to meet with the developer's team to address issues of the project's use of the city's right of way along the bike path corridor: the landscaping plan and how it will relate to an existing prairie garden that John Coleman has tended for years with the city's approval, a proposed bike/ped path through the prairie plantings to the property, the proposed patio adjacent to the commercial frontage on Livingston, and the inclusion of bike parking. The use of the ROW is outside the PUD approval process and will require separate approvals from the Parks Dept. Other issues outside of the PUD include the installation of angled parking and the reconstruction of the bike path crossing at Livingston as a 'tabletop'.

2. Enhance the aesthetic relationship of the northern side of the building to the bike path as called for in the ERC Plan. a) Consider more design elements around the door on the western end of the building, such as an overhang and more architectural elements. This door will likely be used by residents who are bike commuters as well as residents wanting to use the landscaped area for social uses. b) Consider adding windows or some other design element as way to add interest to the upper levels of eastern wall above the patio area which is rather blank.

3. Increase articulation on the southern side of the building above the garage entrance. There is a lack of interplay between the materials that is used elsewhere in the project. It's 'boring'.

4. Encourage the developer to incorporate green technology, including solar panels, into the design/construction of the building.

The committee discussed the concern raised at Plan Com two weeks ago about the lack of 3BR units. The developer argued that in his assessment, the location of the building so close to MGE, did not make for a likely place for a family to rent. They pointed out that they will be providing rental units at a range of 40-60% of area median income, well below requirements of the inclusionary zoning ordinance for rental units. The majority of the units will be 1BRs. The committee supported the affordability levels but did not ask for 3BRs as a condition of support.

Marsha