

**Notes**  
**TLNA Steering Committee Meeting for**  
**T. Wall Enterprises Proposal for the Reynolds Crane Lot**  
**16 Dec 2014, Constellation Community Room, 10 N. Livingston**

Attendees:

Patrick Heck, TLNA Development Committee Chair

T. Wall Enterprises Team

Terrence Wall

Zi Chong

Joseph Lee (JLA Architects)

Bob McGaigue (JLA Architects)

Steering Committee Members

Patty Prime, TLNA President

Richard Linster

Jo Drury

Bob Klebba

Karla Handel

Pat Kelly

Neighbors

Daniel Parker

Alder Zellers and Heather Stouder from the City Planning sent their regrets - both had conflicts.

Patrick Heck reiterated the charge of the Steering Committee – The process is collaborative and should reflect the hopes and wishes of the neighborhood. The Committee should discuss both positive and negative aspects of the proposal and the result should be a win-win for all involved.

At the end of the process, the Committee will issue summary findings to the TLNA Council. Historically, a TLNA Steering Committee has summarized the Committee's work and findings and sent that on to the full TLNA Council who then votes on some level of support for a proposed development. The Council typically has these options: (1) recommend, (2) recommend with conditions (3) take a neutral position or (4) reject. It is possible for the Steering Committee to take a stance too and forward that onto the Council, but typically the Committee issues only synthesized, summary findings.

Terrence Wall asked how the Steering Committee's makeup is determined. Patrick said that generally, those who attended the first neighborhood meeting on a project and subsequently volunteer for the Committee are chosen. In addition, any neighbors who contact him saying they are interested can join, but all should attend the first Steering Committee meeting (today's meeting). If they do not attend the first meeting, they can still be on the Steering Committee, but they must keep up with the project's details via the website so that we don't go over the same issues multiple times.

Patrick detailed the path that this development proposal will take from this point forward:

The developers will make a formal submittal to the City followed by consideration by the Urban Design Commission, the Landmarks Commission and the Plan Commission. The Plan Commission will consider the Conditional Uses required for the project. This proposal is not required to go before the Common Council.

Prior to or simultaneous with various City committees, the TLNA Council will be considering the proposal and make a recommendation to the City, typically before the proposal gets very far along in the City process.

Richard Linster asked what their expected schedule was for City submittal. Based on their responses and the City Planning schedule, these estimates were discussed:

Submittal – 4 Feb 2015  
Landmarks - TBD  
UDC – 25 Mar 2015  
Plan Commission – 6 April 2015  
Start construction - May to July 2015  
Open about 12 months later

Terrence described their two-phase construction approach: The E. Mifflin portion of the building (Phase I) would be constructed in 2015-2016 with the E. Dayton portion (Phase II) being commencing as soon as Phase I was completed.

Terrence and Joe Lee (project architect) presented new design ideas to the committee (see link to developer's 12/16/2014 drawings here:  
<http://www.danenet.org/tlna/web-data/development/700mifflinwall.htm>

They presented preliminary gabled roof ideas for the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of E. Dayton, which many felt would fit in well with the existing neighborhood of single-family homes and 2- and 3-flat rentals. Several options for exterior facade styles were also presented, as well as drawings for the E. Mifflin and E. Dayton façades, both with less modern porches than the Westwood design. The Dayton façade could be less contemporary than the Mifflin façade, if the neighborhood wants that. Both façade ideas include pillars on 1<sup>st</sup> floor patios supporting the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balconies. One option for exterior portions was a dark blue material. Generally, the design is less contemporary and less boxy than the Westwood version. The building's general footprint, height and features remain mostly the same as the previously presented designs. Committee members asked to see some examples of potential exterior materials since it was not easy to appreciate them in the drawings – the developers agreed to provide those at the next steering committee meeting.

The new design includes 12 3-bdrm apartments, so the total number of units has dropped from 196 to 189. There would also be approximately 38 studios, 86 1-bdrm and 53 2-bdrm. Richard Linster asked about the likely mix of tenants. Terrence answered that they expect a mix of tenants, that will be partially determined by the unit mix, but should not be so different than their other properties: 50% are 30+ years old, 55% make upwards of \$60k per year and half of that 55% make more than \$80k per year.

Karla Handel asked how tall the building would actually be. Would it be 4.5 stories due to the half-story of the parking level being above ground? How will it compare to Das Kronenberg? The developers will bring some drawings to the next meeting to better answer how tall the building will be compared to nearby structures.

Richard Linster said he liked having a different, less contemporary façade on Dayton. Terrence said that the gabled roofs will make the buildings fit in and feel shorter than they actually are. Generally, the committee seemed to approve of the gabled roof concept on Dayton. Some expressed a desire to have gabled roofs on Mifflin too, but Terrence said that 4-storied gabled roofs would look odd; 3-

stories is the typical maximum height for gabled roofs. Karla Handel added that she felt that the flat roofs had less height, therefore might be preferable.

Terrence said if different facades were chosen for Dayton and Mifflin, the dividing line would likely be near the parking ramp entrance on Livingston. The base material around both sections could be the same in order to unite them design-wise. Some other aspects could extend between both façade types for the same reason.

Bob Klebba and Pat Kelly both said they preferred 3 stories along Mifflin in order to reduce the canyon effect on the bike boulevard and to further respect the neighborhood. Terrence said they would explore the possibility of moving the front-most sections of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor on Mifflin to the Dayton side. This would make the sections that jut out the most on both Dayton and Mifflin 3 stories with the remainder being 4 stories. He made no promises, but Joe Lee agreed that they could explore it.

Terrence said that the water reservoir parking lot is unattractive – the Livingston-side tenants will look over that – wishes the City would fix that up. Almost all traffic will enter/exit on Livingston, although there will be a parking level entrance facing Blount. This will be a service and alternate entrance – tenants will typically not use it, so most traffic will be on Livingston.

The units will all be handicap accessible, but 2% will be Type B accessible, i.e., will have complete wheelchair accessibility, bars, etc.

If they allow dogs, they will as in their other properties, install dog waste stations. Typically, they limit the number of units that are allowed to have dogs to 25% of all units.

Comments from the 3 Dec. neighborhood meeting were then discussed in no particular order. Both positive comments and questions/issues were presented. Input that was received by the Steering Committee Chair via email after the neighborhood meeting was included.

Note: A number of “votes” indicates the number of contacts/comments that were received prior to the steering committee meeting, if more than one.

#### Generally Positive:

- Appreciates the removal of the 5<sup>th</sup> floor (2 votes)
- Thoughtful design
- Glad there are 3-bedroom units for families
- Likes the plan a lot, glad to have more development.
- Community Car, electric car charging stations, B-Cycle station – yes, they are open to these.
- Large Little Library idea

#### Questions/Issues:

- Increase in car traffic on the Bike boulevard (3 votes)
- Concern - No affordable housing component (2 votes)
- Owner-occupied and single family options possible?
- Green space concerns – not enough in the neighborhood
- Too many apartments being built for the market to bear (2 votes)
- Too many high-end apartments for the market to bear (2 votes)
- Building needs to better respect the bike blvd and nearby historic buildings

Can they enclose the pool with a glass roof? – response – not feasible, but a nice idea.  
 Reynolds Park view to the Capitol must be preserved – can they lower it to 3 stories? (2 votes)  
 Protect iconic Capitol views from all of neighborhood  
 Need to show lines of sight to appreciate impact on views  
 Can they have bike repair facilities like The Galaxie?  
 What is actual building height – close to the top floor of Das Kronenberg? – perhaps too tall?  
 Needs to be 3 stories on Mifflin to fit in with the back of Constellation.  
 Could it have a more residential feel on Mifflin?  
 Reduce number of parking spots to < 1 per unit  
 Car traffic at Livingston and Mifflin is already a concern – will make it worse  
 Dog waste is piling up in the neighborhood – can they have a dog waste station? (2 votes)  
 Could they turn the building 180 degrees so that the U is facing Livingston, thereby opening up the courtyard to the neighborhood, like older apartment buildings in big cities?  
 Include innovative elements that enhance the use of Reynolds Park?  
 Wants the design to fit in with the older nearby buildings  
 Prefer that a park be built on this land, or at least on part of it (3 votes)

Additional positives and questions/issues were brought up by the Steering Committee. Discussion of those new items and some of the above items ensued. Some are listed below:

1. Pat Kelly asked about how they can keep more traffic off the bike blvd. Speed bumps on Mifflin were one suggestion for calming traffic on Mifflin. Pat suggested that the developers join TLNA in advocating for a safer bike blvd with traffic calming and/or traffic diversion efforts. Terrence was amenable to the idea. Karla said that traffic trying to get to/from Blount Street was also a problem.
2. Views of the Capitol from Reynolds Park and other points were discussed. The developers will try to produce some line of sight drawings to show how views will be impacted by the proposed building.
3. Pat Kelly asked if the building would look like the recent T. Wall Enterprises development near Fish Hatchery and Park Street. Terrence said that there were very small setbacks there and there were no exterior courtyard features as planned with this building, so it would appear less imposing.
4. How can they promote the usage of Reynolds Park? Terrence said again that the park impact fees should somehow be steered towards the local neighborhood and Reynolds Park rather than the larger Park District. The increase in neighborhood population means that there will be more park usage, so this neighborhood should get more of the park fees.
5. Jo Drury asked if the parking fees would be included in monthly rent. Terrence said he was open to including or not including, with the latter being typical. Terrence suggested that there might be a way for all tenants to have car decals and somehow disincentivize parking on the street.
6. Patty Prime asked if they would somehow provide building access for delivering TLNA newsletters. Terrence said that was no problem – it could also possibly be distributed electronically. Patty also asked if he was open to underwriting a one-year TLNA membership for new tenants @\$10 per membership. He said he was open to that too.
7. It was asked if the building would have HVAC equipment on top, thereby making it even taller. He said no, they are using “magic packs” so most of the HVAC systems are in-unit.
8. Terrence reiterated that they do not do affordable housing developments or include that component. That usually requires tax credits or some form of public money that complicates their process too much. There are other developers, e.g., Stone House, who specialize in that market, but it is not what they do and they don’t plan to do it.

Wrapping up, Patrick Heck suggested that the developer needs to further consider any issues that be addressed or cannot be addressed. The Steering Committee will also need to make sure all issues have presented and discussed.

The committee agreed to meet again on **Monday, January 12, 2015 at 7:00pm** in the Constellation Community Room. T. Wall and Joe Lee will bring more detailed drawings of the building's relationship to nearby structures and options for moving the front of the Mifflin Street 4<sup>th</sup> floor to Dayton. Other design options and materials will be presented and discussed.