

Jefferson Park United Neighbors (JPUN)
Land Use Committee (LUC)
October 13, 2010
Zocalo Conference Room
Minutes by: Fred Lai

<u>Attendees:</u>	<u>LUC Member</u>	<u>Presenter/Visitor</u>	<u>Project / Affiliation</u>
Fred Lai, Chair	X		
Kari-elin Mock	X		
Raf Espinoza	X		
Bill Seward	X		
Joe Boven	X		
Brian Ray		X	Jefferson Heights
Derek Ahrens		X	Resident
Katherine Meldrum		X	Resident
Robert Caskey		X	Resident
David Solomon		X	Resident
Rich Gonzales		X	Resident
Mark Temkin		X	Resident

6:39 PM – Meeting called to order. Sign-in sheet distributed.

General:

1. No voting quorum necessary for this meeting.

Update:

1. FL – 23rd Avenue Gateway – No update.
2. FL – 2785 Speer – No update.
3. FL – Element 47:
 - a. An update from Lex was included in the Agenda.
 - b. No movement on the project.
 - c. No updated materials.
 - d. DA – asked how many units were currently in the project. FL responded there are around 260 rental units.
 - e. KM – asked what kinds of comments were received from the City for the site submittal over a year ago.
 - f. JB – suggested contacting the media relations person at Spanos to find out more info.

New Business:

1. Rafael Espinoza has been voted in as the next Land Use Committee chair at the last General Meeting. He will take over starting in 2011. FL will stay involved at a sub-committee level.

Discussion:

1. Jefferson Heights (Brian Ray)
 - a. BR – hopes to address the issues of density and parking raised by JPUN
 - b. BR – has added more parking
 - c. BR – has reduced the number of units

- d. BR – overall the project contains less square footage
- e. BR – there will be fewer balconies on the east, resulting in less noise?
- f. BR – the units have gotten larger
- g. BR – recycling and trash have been screened and tucked into the building
- h. BR – units 1,3,7 face the park and are 900+ sf
- i. BR – units 4 and 6 are 1000 sf
- j. BR – unit 2 at the back is 1000+ sf
- k. BR – unit 2 could have a possible flex parking spot or a small yard
- l. BR – spoke with CPD to review PUD and believes the project still meets the criteria
- m. RE – does not want this iteration of the project in the neighborhood and that it is a step backwards from the previous presentation
- n. RE – still sees the increase in density over the current zoning
- o. RE – wonders what the project will be in 10 years
- p. RE – prefers the previous design for possible resale and sound issues
- q. RE – asked how trash will be serviced? – party agreement?, private service?, street pickup?
- r. RC – asked what surrounds where BR lives. BR responded that he is surrounded by R-2, mostly single occupant units, but this is a specific example.
- s. RC – informed that there is no parking along the south side of Jeff Park between 11-6 am
- t. JB – asked RE what kind of project he would like to see developed on the site. RE responded a triplex at the most, but current zoning would only allow a single family house to be built
- u. JB – is hearing mostly negative feedback about the project, but the same individuals also do not like the existing house on the site
- v. RE – is ok with the status quo and not trying to improve the site
- w. BS – informed that the City does not provide trash service for new buildings over 4 units or existing buildings over 7 units.
- x. JB – believes that the project is well designed and architecturally sound. He proposes taking the project to vote for support at General Membership although the chances of the project garnering enough support are slim
- y. RE – would like to better address the process for ownership requirement, LUC involvement, and project documentation
- z. BS – there is a question of chicken and egg process in dealing with CPD
- aa. KM – would like to see the R-2 comparison before presenting to General Membership
- bb. RG – asked why this project needs to be on this site? BR responded that the park is the major draw. The only other available park-front site is at 22nd and Eliot and it is UTU zoning.
- cc. MT – asked what the project footprint was? BR responded that it is approximately 35' x 80'.
- dd. DA – would like to see a comparative density analysis for park-facing properties. BR responded that the project compares well with JP Townhomes and is lower density than most of the new construction around the park.
- ee. RG – the center unit looks directly into his backyard and offers him no privacy. DA responded that any duplex or other new development will probably have an elevated deck and is also going to look into that backyard.
- ff. BR – is not ready to ask for a vote of support from LUC. He is going to develop two options for the next LUC meeting and ask for the vote next month.