

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE UCMUD REVIEW MEETING SUMMARY

10th Street Flats/Clark Realty Capital (U-3348-12-1)

UCMUD Review Committee Meeting #3

February 20, 2014

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Karen Kumm Morris, Nancy Iacomini, Erik Gutshall, Steve Cole

MEETING AGENDA

This was the third meeting of the UCMUD Review Committee for the 10th Street Flats project. The agenda was to complete discussion on open space (including use of roof as open space) and transportation, and conclude any comments with the intention that the use permit would be heard by the Planning Commission and County Board in April. The applicant indicated that they are working with AACH, the abutting property owners, on the acquisition of their parcel which, should a deal be reached, would result in a redesign of the project to incorporate that parcel. UCMUD Review Committee members articulated that should this happen there would be a fourth meeting to discuss changes in design.

UCMUD DISCUSSION

Staff Comments

- Rooftop hood as previously designed is not permissible because it did not attach to the penthouse and therefore exceeded the 55 foot height restriction of the Sector Plan. Applicant has redesigned the rooftop hood to be an integrated element of the penthouse, thus allowing it as part of the penthouse.
- Uses – retail and personal services are required in the Sector Plan and live/work are permissible uses.
- Revisions to some of the live/work units have revised some of the recessed frontage.

Open Space (including use of roof):

- A question was asked whether given this will be the tallest building on the block, if there will be a rooftop lighting plan. Should be a standard condition.
- A question was asked about how the building will be screened from the south. The applicant mentioned a continuous architectural pattern on the rear of the building.
- How will people access the roof? The applicant responded that they are seeking a modification to the height of the elevator on the roof to allow people to access.

- Is there a zoning ordinance requirement to provide a 10 foot setback from a rear property line? Does this require a modification?
- Discussion of the appropriateness of the red façade color facing southwards.
- A question was asked about whether the space underneath the “eyebrow” façade element was accessible. The applicant replied that it was not, and that it would be used for mechanical storage.
- A comment was made that the commission will want to see a more detailed roof plan.
- Concern was expressed about noise levels from use of the roof and whether it will impact the abutting residential uses; a question was asked about whether use of the roof could be regulated such as limiting hours of use or whether it could be used for commercial purposes? Will there be a noise impact from the roof condensers? Applicant responded that there would be a screen wall for areas intended for resident use.
- Concern was expressed about the “eyebrow” façade element and whether it is a violation of the building height limitations.
- A question was asked about use of the ground-level courtyard on the rear of the building, and what features would be included. The developer gave an overview of the courtyard, touching on an informal dining area, a depressed open lawn area, a bike workshop, and a connection from the alley for bike users.
- 10% open space is required and proposal provides only 7.1% open space. Applicant is requesting a modification.
- A concern was expressed about the by-right 9th Road project (also developed by Clark) towering over and shadowing the subject courtyard.
- A question was asked about the terraces for the four rear facing “live/live” units. The developer responded that the terraces will have a four-foot lattice screen and a row of trees separating them from the courtyard.

Transportation:

- Staff gave an overview of the current County position on use of the alley, which is to keep two-way traffic intact, and to maintain the current situation whereby left turns into and out of the alley are restricted.
- Sector Plan calls for all ingress and egress access to be from the alley and not 10th Street. Proposal is to widen the existing 12 foot alley to 18 feet wide.
- Concern was expressed that residents would make left turns from the garage to go southbound on the alley and cut through the neighborhood.
- A question was asked about the character of the traffic generated by the development. The developer responded that there would not be a significant amount of truck traffic given the small amount of retail.
- Community members expressed concern about the accuracy of the trip generation numbers (12 peak hour vehicles per hour), and the mode split numbers (50% transit ridership) presented by the developer’s transportation consultant.
- Staff offered that should traffic congestion on the alley become a problem, the County could study the situation and make changes to the configuration and function of the alley

at that time based on a study. Staff also made clear that the alley function could not be conditioned as a part of the use permit because the alley is County-owned.

- Staff also explained reasoning behind the lack of support for permitting left turns into and out of the alley – that this function would result in stacking on 10th Road.
- Community members expressed general concern about adding additional vehicle trips to 9th Road. Even if the volumes were low, community members were concerned about disruption to current traffic patterns.
- Concern expressed over moving trucks idling in the alley.

Wrap-up

- Suggestion by a neighbor that the developer agree to install and maintain trees within the 10th Street median. This suggestion was echoed by several members.
- Community members reiterated concern about circulation issues and expressed dissatisfaction with the County position on the alley 2 way operations.
- A Review Committee member expressed the following opinions:
 - Concern about the blank wall on the rear property line
 - Concern about the building massing (too large)
 - Concern that the “eyebrow” elements would exceed height limitations
- A committee member encouraged the developer to continue talks with AACH regarding incorporating the abutting parcel to the south.
- Concern was reiterated regarding rooftop activities and noise, as well as building height.
- General concern was expressed about the number of modifications from the code being requested by the applicant
- A review committee member expressed:
 - Satisfaction with the architecture
 - Concern about the live/work and its compatibility with the UCMUD purpose
 - Concerns about garage clearance height for commercial vehicles
- A neighbor expressed:
 - Satisfied with the architecture
 - Concern about the rooftop use
 - Desire for a green roof
 - Greatest concern with the project is the circulation pattern, in specific the alley
- A review committee member expressed satisfaction with the proposed rooftop use, and commented that it is a nice amenity for tenants.
- A review committee member expressed:
 - Concern about the penthouse height
 - Concern about the rooftop use
 - Concern about the building massing
 - Mixed reviews about the architecture
- The review committee chair wrapped up with the following:
 - Concerns about the circulation pattern, in particular the alley
 - Desire for the developer to plant and maintain the 10th Street median

- Encourage the developer to pursue talks with AACH and if there is a revised proposal integrating AACH, this revision should come back to the UCMUD review committee.