

TIER I Issues/Concerns (these are overarching issues)

Issue/Concern	Attended at least 2 of last 3 committee meetings	Attended 1 or more committee meetings
The scale/mass of the new buildings...		
1. is just right.	3	6
2. should be reduced.	16	17
3. could be increased..	2	2
No Answer.	1	2
The height of the new buildings...		
1. is just right.	4	7
2. is too tall.	17	18
3. could be increased.	1	2
No Answer.	0	0
The proposed increase in density (living units per acre)...		
1. is just right.	5	7
2. is too large.	12	15
3. could be even greater.	5	5
No Answer.	0	0
The open space and/or variation of spaces between buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	5	8
2. should be larger.	15	16
3. could be less.	2	2
No Answer.	0	1
The 20' setback between the new buildings and the rear property line...		
1. is sufficient.	8	10
2. should be increased to generally match typical rear yard setbacks on the block.	13	15
No Answer.	1	2
Tearing down 5 houses and moving 4...		
1. is okay.	7	8
2. is okay, but tearing down and/or moving more is okay too.	2	3
3. is too many – should tear down or move fewer.	13	16
No Answer.	0	0

Moving a house to elsewhere in the neighborhood is...		
1. as good as keeping it in place.	8	10
2. not as good as keeping it in place.	14	17
No Answer.	0	0
Moving a house to elsewhere on the proposal site is...		
1. as good as keeping it in place.	15	19
2. not as good as keeping it in place.	7	8
No Answer.	0	0
The four commercial spaces in the proposal are...		
1. sufficient.	13	15
2. too many.	5	6
3. not enough.	3	5
No Answer.	1	1
Saving or moving 6 houses, plus committing to 8 units at 80% CMI is...		
1. a sufficient affordability component.	7	11
2. an insufficient affordability component.	15	16
No Answer.	0	0
Zero parking stalls for the 4 commercial spaces is...		
1. a problem.	11	14
2. not a problem.	11	13
No Answer.	0	0
80 underground parking stalls for 80 apartments is...		
1. sufficient.	13	18
2. insufficient.	0	0
3. too many.	9	9
No Answer.	0	0

TIER II Issues/Concerns these are issues related mostly to design

Issue/Concern	Attended at least 2 of last 3 committee meetings	Attended 1 or more committee meetings
Overall, the exterior design is...		
1. sufficient.	3	5
2. insufficient.	10	10
3. Overall, I like some exterior design aspects and dislike others.	8	11
No Answer.	1	1
The gabled mezzanine level...		
1. is a positive feature of the exterior design.	6	9
2. does not detract from the exterior design.	6	7
3. detracts from the exterior design.	5	5
No Answer.	5	6
The inter-building connectors between the 3 saved/moved buildings closest to Livingston are...		
1. appropriate.	2	5
2. inappropriate.	15	17
3. I need more information to make this determination.	4	4
No Answer.	1	1
The lack of space for future canopy-sized trees is...		
1. not a problem.	2	4
2. a problem.	19	22
No Answer.	1	1
The new buildings' material palette is going in the...		
1. right direction.	7	11
2. wrong direction.	11	11
No Answer.	4	5
The front façade design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	4	6
2. is insufficient.	4	4
3. has potential, but needs work.	5	7
4. needs more variation.	5	5
5. I need more information to make this determination.	2	3
No Answer.	2	2

The rear façade design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	3	5
2. is insufficient.	4	4
3. has potential, but needs work.	8	9
4. needs more variation.	1	2
5. I need more information to make this determination.	3	4
No Answer.	3	3
The side façades' design of the proposed new buildings...		
1. is sufficient.	3	5
2. is insufficient.	1	1
3. has potential, but needs work.	6	6
4. I need more information to make this determination.	7	10
No Answer.	5	5
The new buildings' overall exterior design references...		
1. should be more contemporary.	0	0
2. are just right.	4	6
3. should reference older buildings.	6	7
4. should be transitional – referencing both new and old.	8	10
5. I need more information to make this determination.	1	1
No Answer.	3	3