

Jefferson Park United Neighbors (JPUN)
 Land Use Committee (LUC)
 November 10, 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		
Katherine Meldrum	X		
Derek Ahrens	X		
Brian Ray		X	Jefferson Heights
Tom Blyth		X	Resident
Cristin Couzens		X	Resident
Roger Treichler		X	Resident
Susan Treichler		X	Resident
Esther Meehan		X	2816 W. 25 th Ave

6:30 PM – Meeting called to order. Sign-in sheet distributed.

General:

1. All current voting members are present.
2. Vote to make Kat Meldrum full voting member of LUC – JB motion, KM second, passes 5-0.
3. Vote to make Derek Ahrens full voting member of LUC – KM motion, RE second, passes 6-0.

Update:

1. FL – 23rd Avenue Gateway – No update.
2. FL – 2785 Speer – last minute update from Lauren Brockman:
 “We are officially back in the market looking for a loan. We have submitted to HUD as well as ate visiting with numerous banks. We have received one term sheet that we are negotiating. If things continue in this fashion and nothing jumps out and changes in the economy we would anticipate a ground breaking the 2nd Q of 2011.
 I would like to point out that we would very much like to see the bronze statue located at the Speer building be relocated in Jefferson Park. Can your group initiate what is necessary to make this happen?”
3. FL – Element 47 – No update.

New Business:

1. Esther Meehan presented her proposal for a project at 2816 W. 25th Ave.
 - a. EM – proposing a pop-up project, adding a second floor at the back of the existing building.
 - b. EM – would need a variance to do the project. Property was originally zoned R-3 and is now GMU-3.
 - c. EM – zoning requires 3-foot side setback. Currently zero setback on west elevation.
 - d. RE – zoning code would probably favor variances to match existing roof line and setback.

- e. EM – the project is a small addition and has neighbor support from the immediate west and east property owners.
- f. EM – the property backs up to an apartment building.
- g. EM – the project has an overhang on the east elevation and zero setback on the west elevation.
- h. RE – a letter of support from JPUN will not be effective. Having the neighbors attend and show support at the zoning meeting would be more effective.
- i. RE – it looks like there is also a window issue on one of the elevations.
- j. EM – believes the project will help raise property values in the neighborhood.
- k. KM – would like to see a site plan.
- l. EM – would like to present at the next General Membership meeting.
- m. RE made a motion for a vote of support for EM to present at the next General Membership meeting in December. JB second. Motion passes 6-0.
- n. RE – wants to see a structural plan and site info presented at the meeting.
- o. KM – wants to see the due diligence presented for the project.

Discussion:

1. Jefferson Heights (Brian Ray)
 - a. BR – would like to present an Option A and Option B for LUC vote of support.
 - b. BR – a second option was designed to address concerns about the upper level deck.
 - c. BR – has reduced the square footage of the Level 2 center unit.
 - d. BR – has developed flexible options for the Level 2 units.
 - e. BR – Option B is slightly smaller at 6400 sf.
 - f. RE – asked if BR was aware of the PUD process, Article 9. RE believes that it states that the project can not pursue more than 4 units.
 - g. BR – believes he is allowed 2 units w/ 2 accessory buildings.
 - h. BR – Option B seems to be preferred by some neighbors.
 - i. BR – asked which option the committee prefers.
 - j. TB – stated that he is not in favor of either design.
 - k. RE – stated that density has always been the issue and not the design.
 - l. RT – stated that the west side of the block supports the added density.
 - m. KM – Jeff Park Townhomes were not intended to be precedence. The zoning code is what should take precedent.
 - n. JB – any presentation to LUC for this site would involve a rezone.
 - o. KM – LUC should understand the intent of the zoning code and how it benefits the neighborhood.
 - p. RE – JPUN support would not be enough to get past the PUD guidelines. The proposed project does not demonstrate any “unique or extraordinary circumstances.”
 - q. BR – believes his site is an unusual and irregular site, being long and narrow and having alleys on three sides.
 - r. DA – asked if BR had documentation for his correspondences with CPD. BR responded that he does but they are mostly notes and short emails.
 - s. RE – wanted to make a motion to write a letter of not supporting the project on merit of density. The motion fails.
 - t. BR – picks Option B for the LUC to vote for support to present at the next General Membership meeting.

- u. JB – makes the motion to vote for support of Option B and recommends that it be presented to General Membership at the December meeting. BS second.
 - i. Discussion – KM asked if recent discussion has addressed the building maintenance. BR – has had no further input but is open to submitting legal documents to accommodate requests.
 - ii. Motion passes 4-3.
 - iii. JB – would like to add an addendum that this issue is something that should be decided by the General Membership and not something that the LUC alone can decide.
- v. KM – we should mention the LUC discussion points at the beginning of the General Membership presentation and let everyone know that this has been on the LUC agenda for many meetings.

8:24 PM – Meeting adjourned