

Sunday, May 4th, 2003 SASYNA Council Meeting
7:00 PM to 10:30 PM
Draft Minutes Prepared May 5th by S. Klafka

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Council Members Present

Mark McFadden
Michael Jacob
Steve Klafka
Doug Johnson
Eric Schramm
Michael Barrett
Karen FASTER
Becky Steinhoff
Lou Host Jablonski
Alex Aulisi

Council Members Absent

John Steines

Approximately 15 neighborhood residents attended.

DISCUSSION OF TUESDAY, MAY 6TH, GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Betty and Alex will make lasagna

Eric will bring garlic bread.

Meeting topics include recent developments, ped flag program and airport impacts with Sharon Wisniewski attending on behalf of Kathy Falk.

DISCUSSION OF KENNEDY PLACE DEVELOPMENT ON ATWOOD

Application submitted to city for this development. Joe Krupp presentation at May council meeting. Project goes to Plan Commission on June 2nd, and Common Council on June 17th.

Betty - Noted lack of sufficient time for review of development projects.

Lou - City only considers projects after applications have been received. Official time table leaves little time for official neighborhood consideration.

DISCUSSION OF RAY O'VAC SITE DEVELOPMENT

Eric - Provided introduction.

Mike B. - Potential developers have submitted proposals. Council and neighborhood should have first crack at proposals in a planning charette, before the developers.

Mark - Unaware of any proposals but would contact Judy Olson.

DISCUSSION OF M&M DEVELOPMENT AT 2132 ATWOOD AVENUE

SASYNA review of project at council meetings.

Preparation of SASYNA letter to Plan Commission after March council meeting.

Outpouring of resident concerns in April and May.

Issues summarized in list provided in Klafka email and tonight's agenda handout.

Preparation of SASYNA letter at April 21st Plan Commission meeting.

Need for tonight's meeting to address SASYNA response and potential action at May 6th Common Council meeting.

Resident (Michael John) - Business development plan was tacked onto city funded neighborhood development plan. Steering committee was local developers. Plan written around properties owned by developers. He wants SASYNA to withdraw support for project. City planning staff think 1st floor retail is necessary. He wants Common Council to send project back to Plan Commission for another look at the street.

M&M (Connie Maxwell) - Business plan funded by numerous sources. Private donations when insufficient funds were available. Many public meetings were held to develop the plan.

Resident (Michael J.) - Primary neighborhood concerns are lack of 1st floor retail, scale and shadow on neighboring properties.

Resident - Concerned about size, including height and footprint, and big square block on corner.

Resident - Worked in 1992-94 Census Tract 20 plan with 18 monthly meetings. Included call for 1st floor retail and residential on second floor, with no mention of 3rd floor.

Connie - Project based on most recent plan. Provided history of property. M&M property for 15 years. Looked for commercial tenant. Almost had credit union. Lighten Up store did not succeed financially and did not pay rent. Supporters suggest proposal is an improvement to corner. In response to SASYNA, M&M added commercial to front.

Resident (Michael J.) - ABC glass was successful at location. Not viable commercial site due to M&M ownership.

Connie - Potential businesses included tattoo shop, laundromat, car wash, sub shop. These are not businesses M&M considered good for the neighborhood. In response to concerns they have moved project further back from adjacent rental property. New building height is 5 feet higher than nearby Nelson Building.

Resident - No specific information on height was provided.

Resident - Concerned about total height, including 3 floors and parapet to height a/c on roof. Most homes on block have attics but proposed building does not. He doesn't think proposed apartment building makes economic sense.

Lou- What is problem with density at proposed site?

Resident - Density adds marginalized neighbors.

Lou - Density is trade-off. Preserves existing homes rather than removing them for less density.

Resident - There are 17 owner occupied homes in the adjacent area. How much infill is acceptable. What are discussions with Bob Hanson (owner of adjacent buildings).

M&M (Connie) - Continuing discussions. If they had these existing buildings they would add windows to west side of proposed apartment building. If they obtained these buildings, they would improve the front. They have not plans for knocking down these buildings. Connie left at 8:05 pm.

Michael Jacob - Posed general question - What is desirable for this location?

Resident - Grey gabled building with three floors would better match neighborhood. Square building up to lot line is not appropriate. What does the neighborhood get in return for a concrete block? Will there will more concrete blocks on Atwood?

Betty - Connie says 3 stories buys a better building. Is there a way to step the building down?

Resident (Michael John) - M&M bought property at their own risk. They assume they could do a large non-commercial development. There is an incestuous relationship between developers Krupp and M&M. Doesn't believe Peder opinion on lack of commercial viability. Peder's concerns for profitability should be ignored. Better to build something crummy which can be knocked down in 10 years when commercial businesses are viable.

Resident (Tom) - SASYNA should ask Common Council to sent the project back to the Plan Commission to reconsider the project. The review process was flawed.

Lou - Gabled roofs will add mass to the building. There was a 1.5 year period to develop neighborhood plans but there was no energy to staff or enforce the plan. Need more energy to revisit the plan. This is a good building compared to elsewhere in the city with quality materials and detail. We do not have sufficient information to make trade offs in size versus quality. This building provides usable green space with balconies, rather than Randy Alexander-type suburban green space which is not usable. Density benefits the area and will allow area to demand more quality.

Resident (David) - Wants to live in an organic neighborhood. He likes Pasta Par Tutti building on Schenks Corners. (It is noted this building is three stories.) The physical size of the M&M building is too big. M&M building doesn't fit into the neighborhood.

Becky - Rather than discuss particulars, we should discuss how to proceed. We should tell the Common Council to refer this back to the Plan Commission.

Resident - Agrees with Becky. Parcel zoning should remain the same. As Krupp development goes forward, perhaps the corner will become more commercially viable.

Resident (Terry) - Immediate neighbors concerns were not addressed.

Alex - Council discussed the project at length, considered many issues and worked hard to improve the project.

Michael Jacob - Proposed that SASYNA ask the Common Council to send the project back to the Plan Commission. However, SASYNA needs specific issues to send back.

Resident (Tom) - Public concerns merits more review with more weight to the neighbors.

Michael Barrett - Question to Lou on 1st floor retail.

Lou - PUD zoning is flexible and not as stringent as others. This is a difficult corner due to one way traffic.

Eric Schramm - Neighbors need to stay involved with SASYNA as new development occurs. Immediate neighbors to M&M came too late in process to be most effective.

Resident - The proposed building is not in scale with the neighborhood. Neighbors were not included in the process. They were told 4 days notice was needed to submit written comments to Plan Commission. SASYNA recommendations in its letter were not followed by the Plan Commission.

Resident (Michael John) - This corner is very important as well as 2 blocks of commercial development. City staff inferred it would be fine to sent project back. City wants specific guidelines and demands from SASYNA.

Doug - Asked Mark about status of issues raised by Plan Commission.

Mark - Garbage collected and guest bike rack issues have been addressed. No resolution of issues on a/c noise and setback.

Doug - SASYNA is in the position of reacting to developer proposals with little power to change. Requirement for 1st floor retail will eliminate underground parking. On the whole, the proposed building is a good one, but needs to minimize its impacts on neighbors.

Karen - Willing to refer project back to Plan Commission.

Steve - Wants to see neighborhood improves. Requires innovative solutions. Project is a good addition to the corner. Original design was ugly and offered little to Atwood side. M&M made many

changes to improve the project including Atwood side live work units. Need specific issues to refer back to the Plan Commission.

Betty - Made a motion to ask the Common Council to refer the project back to the Plan Commission to address requirements for 1st floor commercial/retail, and scale of building taking into account parapet for hiding a/c units on roof.

Lou - Suggested having developer explore using 3rd floor set backs.

Michael Jacob - It is important to be specific and require rather than suggest 1st floor commercial/retail and use of set backs on 3rd floor.

There was discussion on “requiring” project changes rather than asking for an evaluation. Stating the changes should be a requirement was approved by a vote of 9 to 0, with one abstention.

There was discussion on requiring the footprint be minimized. This was not approved by the council.

Steve - Suggested wording should also add option for eliminating 3rd floor in addition to set backs.

Lou - Existing plans allow 3 floors so this suggestion would not be creditable to the Common Council.

Discussion of live/work units versus commercial/retail.

Resident (Tom) - Suggests the step backs on 3rd floor be provided on the north side near residents.

Mark - Summarized proposed letter to include 1st floor commercial/retail, stepped back 3rd floor on north side, include a/c height.

Michael Barrett - Suggested addition of energy and noise guidelines for a/c.

There was discussion on this proposal. It was approved by council vote 6 in favor, 3 against and two abstentions.

There was discussion on the final complete proposal. It was approved by council vote, 10 in favor, none against, with one abstention.

Resident - The proposed letter to the Common Council is not at odds to prior comments to Plan Commission.

Michael Barrett - SASYNA was polite to the Plan Commissions. They ignored us so it is necessary to be more loud and aggressive this time.

Michael Jacob - Discussed issue of conflict of interest as Mark McFadden was tenant of M&M. Thought Mark handled himself perfectly and did a great job.

Agreement by council members in attendance.

Mark - Made it clear he was not present during drafting of original letter to Plan Commission. He excused himself from any voting on this project.

Meeting ended at approximately 10:30 pm.