

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

From: John Perkins [<mailto:perkinsj71@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 2:58 PM

To: Martin, Al; Ellingson, Susan

Subject: Comments regarding S. Park St. development proposals

Some comments I have regarding the new development proposals for the corner of S. Park and Drake Streets:

Ideal Body Shop property:

Although the developers have reworked this design (several times now), the 5-story extension to the west strikes me as the most objectionable aspect of this design. I'd much rather see the western edge of the 5-story section of building be moved another 20' east and make the building a flat 5 stories tall abutting Park St. if the 5 story section can't be brought down to 4 floors.

Although the 3-story section to the west is taller than most of the buildings around it, I like the desk insets and varied roofline around the outer edge, and I think some green space on the west side of the building is a good thing, to maintain a sort of buffer zone (albeit *small* buffer) to the homes along Drake and S. Brooks. Likewise, the small courtyard along Drake St. (where roofline drops) does help to visually break up the building's presence along Drake St., which I think is a good thing.

There is an incline along Drake St. heading west from Park St., which I do not think is accurately depicted in the renderings I've seen so far. I think it would be good for the architects to verify this detail in their renderings, so we all have a better picture of the end result, and if there are going to be any significant changes in heights of the building during the construction process.

Lane's Bakery property:

The current design strikes me as massive for the size of lot it is to be built on. The relatively flat 5 story exposure on all sides with more glass than other buildings along Park St. stick out to me in a negative way. I might be willing accept it if there were set-backs higher up on the east or west side (west side would help lessen its presence to neighboring homes, east side would improve the facade along Park St.

The developer was asked about his expected use of the alley to the north of this development. The developer told us traffic in and out of the underground parking would not use the alley, yet the entrance/exit to said parking is on the north side of the building (into the alley).

This makes me question how well the developer has thought out the current designs.

Both developments:

The type of development proposed sounds like it will bring in a number of living arrangements that would end up in 2-car households while the landlord would only be willing to provide space for one car per unit.

This parking situation strikes me as unacceptable in an area where on-street parking is already at a premium when alternate-side parking rules are in effect.

The developer for the Lane's Bakery site told the neighborhood most units would only have one car each because he is aiming for a "young professional" crowd and not a "student" clientèle. A recent interview with the Isthmus newspaper has the developer quoted as including students in his expected target market.

If both developers are going to get 1-car households as they try to suggest to the neighborhood they will, they should have no objection to being exempted from applying for residential parking permit applications. Although these permits do not apply during the overnight hours, the fact that the permits are not available at all would assist in reducing the number of cars owned by residents in the units.

Unfortunately, current criteria within planning and development do not automatically flag these developments as needing such parking permit exemptions.

John Perkins
1153 Emerald St.