

From: Greg [mailto:colophonic@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 10:19 PM

To: pbb338koser@aol.com; wallu@aol.com; cathlane07@gmail.com; wkrkar@aol.com; wallacegay@mchsi.com

Subject: Comment on Rezoning proposal

Members of the Zoning Commission,

My family moved to University Heights less than five years ago. One of the things that attracted us to this area is its stability, its long traditions and neighborhood feeling. The Maxwell proposal currently under consideration has created a rift in the fabric of this community, one we particularly feel as we want to support our neighbors, while also considering the long-term future of this city, which we very much hope to be a part of. Our concern isn't having a place to retire, it's having a stable and peaceful community in which to raise our children.

If rezoning and future development of the St. Andrews property goes forward, we would like to see the Zoning Commission support the Bauer alternative plan as the upper limit of building height, population density, traffic load, and environmental impact.

The Zoning Commission has the chance to set a reasonable, community-focused precedent with this decision.

Greg and Rachel Prickman
321 Koser Ave.

From: Alice Haugen [mailto:alice.haugen@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 11:18 AM

To: pbb338koser@aol.com; wallu@aol.com; cathlane07@gmail.com; wkrkar@aol.com; wallacegay@mchsi.com

Subject: St. Andrew development plans; major benefits of the Bauer alternative

Dear Zoning Commissioners,

This note is to express my strong preference for the Bauer plan for the St. Andrew's site. This alternative has numerous advantages:

1. Lower profile means less disturbance of the surrounding skyline, and less impact on neighbors
2. No commercial units means less need for parking, more green space preserved, and less impact on traffic
3. Bridge over the ravine means less impact on one of the few environmentally sensitive parts of University Heights.
4. Large number of residential units provides large addition to the tax base of University Heights

I would still prefer to see a dog leg extension off of Sunset, making a five way intersection and no impact on the ravine, but a bridge is far less disruptive and the location of it as proposed means that if it should turn out that traffic increases more than expected that Grand Avenue could be made for local traffic only. I hope the commissioners appreciate how widely used Grand Avenue is by many pedestrians, many from outside the immediate neighborhood. As we live at 1483 Grand we see them quite frequently and it would be sad to harm one of the better pedestrian paths in University Heights. The new wider sidewalks will still be adjacent to Melrose and be exposed to traffic so they will not reduce the value of Grand Avenue to pedestrians.

I am also not persuaded that University Heights is in any particularly dire straits that require major action, but the proposed alternative is a compromise position that addresses many of the concerns on both sides and has great potential for resolving this situation in a way that will allow people to come together again.

The desire for a coffee shop, that was often mentioned to justify commercial units in the SAP development, has been addressed by the new restaurant which will be open for breakfast and onward and will have wireless. Thus the desire for a local gathering place is being addressed.

--

Peace +

Alice

From: Thomas Haugen [mailto:thomas-haugen@uiowa.edu]
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 1:05 PM
To: pbb338koser@aol.com; wallu@aol.com; cathlane07@gmail.com; wkrkar@aol.com; wallacegay@mchsi.com
Subject: St. Andrew development plans; major benefits of the Bauer alternative

Dear Zoning Commissioners,

I want to express my strong preference for the Bauer plan for the St. Andrew's site. This alternative has numerous advantages:

1. Lower profile means less disturbance of the surrounding skyline, and less impact on neighbors. Most months of the year, the deciduous trees will not block this nuisance from residents.
2. No commercial units means less need for parking, more green space preserved, and less impact on traffic, less conflict between business and community interests
3. A Bridge over the ravine means less impact on one of the few environmentally sensitive parts of University Heights.
4. Large number of residential units provides large addition to the tax base of University Heights

I would still prefer to see a dog leg extension off of Sunset, making a five way intersection and no impact on the ravine, but a bridge is far less disruptive and the location of it as proposed means that if it should turn out that traffic increases more than expected that Grand Avenue could be made for local traffic only. I hope the commissioners appreciate how widely used Grand Avenue is by many pedestrians, many from outside the immediate neighborhood. As we live at 1483 Grand we see them quite frequently and it would be sad to harm one of the better pedestrian paths in University Heights. The new wider sidewalks on Melrose are exposed to traffic. Walking next to traffic is not pleasant, so they will not reduce the value of Grand Avenue to pedestrians.

I am also not persuaded that University Heights is in any particularly dire straits that require major action, but the proposed alternative is a compromise position that addresses many of the concerns on both sides and has great potential for resolving this situation in a way that will allow people to come together again.

The desire for a coffee shop, that was often mentioned to justify commercial units in the SAP development, has been addressed by the new restaurant which will be open for breakfast and onward and will have wireless. Thus the desire for a local gathering place is being addressed.

Also the possibility of a grocery store is not desirable. Having lived in University heights for over 20 years, I know that the previous grocers were never viable even when there was not a Fareway grocery nearby as we now have.

I am concerned at the prospect of the city being required to deal on an ongoing basis with profit

driven businesses. Business owners will not necessarily share the concerns of University heights residents. I would prefer that all units in the new development be owner residents so they have a stake in the community as a place to live.

--

Thanks for your consideration

Tom Haugen
1483 Grand Ave

7-22-2010

TO Pat
FROM Jane Swails
RE Meeting tonight

Is it possible for you to enlighten us tonight as to what continued “control” the zoning commission/city council will have over the Maxwell Project if the rezoning request is approved?

- Restricting the size and type of retail outlet (No tattoo shops, Laundromats, Smoke shops, an outlet for liquor be it a bar or retail (anything that could become a “hang-out”).
- Regulating the renting or resale if a business goes belly-up.
- Restricting the hours of business – both open time and closing time and perhaps days of the week (Sunday exclusion, for example).
- IF a coffee shop goes in – NO DRIVE UP WINDOW
OR
any type of business with a drive up window
- If a business with several franchises purchases a space, is the use of the space at the discretion of the purchaser if he chooses to switch gears.
- * Does U Heights have input into the development of the condominium association rules etc.
- * What if the condos are not all sold and the retail element fails – who is responsible for upkeep.

There are soooooo many variables it is boggling my mind and I am sure the same is for others. I guess I am asking for some kind of assurance that the citizenry still has some kind of input and control over what happens to where we live and own property. Who has the responsibility for the above few issues? A committee appointed by the mayor or is it the council? If it is not appropriate to address this type of question that I put to the zoning committee at tonight’s meeting – I do understand.
Thanks for all your hard hard work on the zoning commission.