

Email sent by Stan Laverman regarding zoning proposals

Alice Haugen

[show details](#) 7:02

to Stan, louise-from

PM (22 hours ago)

Hello - I was wondering if you have some time that would work for you to meet with me to discuss the protected slopes in the ravine. Thanks very much!

--

Peace +

Alice

Ring the bells that still can ring
Forget your perfect offering
There is a crack in everything
That's how the light gets in.

om **Mary Mathew**

[hide details](#) 6:49 PM (22 hours ago)

Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com>

to Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>

date Sun, Sep 19, 2010 at 6:49 PM

subject Re: TIME SENSITIVE: Request for open records

signed-rocketmail.com

by

Thanks, Stan. I will let others in my group know the status of your emails.

Mary Mathew Wilson

UH Place Website Manager

uhplace@rocketmail.com

308 Koser Avenue

University Heights, Iowa 52246-3002

(319) 936-2445

UH Place...the meeting place in University Heights

<http://uhplace.org>

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>

To: Mary Mathew Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com>

Sent: Sun, September 19, 2010 6:08:52 PM

- Hide quoted text -

Subject: Re: TIME SENSITIVE: Request for open records

- Hide quoted text -

Mary-

I haven't gotten my e-mails to Mike. He has requested that they all be put into one document and I haven't had time to accomplish this. It is my plan to work on that Monday evening. I have about 54 e-mails that broadly meeting the request you made.

Stan

On Sun, Sep 19, 2010 at 5:06 PM, Mary Mathew Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com> wrote:
Hi Stan,

I'm not seeing that there are any of your emails posted on the city website. Have you had a chance to send them to Mike for posting?

Thanks,

Mary

Mary Mathew Wilson
UH Place Website Manager
uhplace@rocketmail.com
308 Koser Avenue
University Heights, Iowa 52246-3002
(319) 936-2445
UH Place...the meeting place in University Heights
<http://uhplace.org>

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>
To: Mary Mathew Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Sun, September 12, 2010 8:32:44 PM
Subject: Re: TIME SENSITIVE: Request for open records

Hi Mary-

I have all my University Heights e-mails segregated and will comply with you request as soon as possible.

Stan

On Sat, Sep 11, 2010 at 3:13 PM, Mary Mathew Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor From,

I have heard from my fellow UH residents that several of our city councilors have publicly mentioned in casual conversation that they have received many, many more emails in support of the Maxwell plan for development of the St. Andrew Church property than emails opposing it. I, and other curious citizens, would like to see those emails and any other written communications

that you and the city council have received regarding the Maxwell zoning application by making them available to the public via posting them on the UH city website. It is my understanding that any and all correspondence is considered part of the public record surrounding this issue, and to which the public is guaranteed access by law. Is this not the case?

If so, this request for open records is based on my assumption that citizens have the right (under the Freedom of Information rules in the Iowa Code) to see these public records received by city officials via their university-heights.org email accounts or through other official routes since the [2nd Maxwell application \(filed on June 24, 2010\) became public record \(posted on the City website on July 1, 2010\).](#)

By correspondence, I mean all emails and other written communications from UH residents both in support of and in opposition to the Maxwell Plan, as well as all emails and other written communications pertaining to this matter that you and/or members of the council have received from individuals who reside outside of University Heights. I presume that it is also a legitimate "open records" request to ask to see any responses that you and the city council have sent in follow-up to any and all correspondence you have received regarding the Maxwell application, including to Mr. Maxwell, his attorney, his architect, realtors, or any others you've corresponded with in an official capacity.

I've noticed that you and city council members have been very careful to publicly report on your various meetings and conversations with the developer, his attorney, and others you've met with or spoken to along the way. I have also noticed that this accountability has not carried over to any sort of transparency concerning written communications you and/or the council have received or sent. Council members Yeggy and Haverkamp have talked to several people I know about the plethora of emails they're receiving in support of the Maxwell Plan, so now I am requesting that those emails and all others received and sent by our city officials with regard to this issue be made available to the public as open records.

If city officials will not provide the requested documents electronically (either through email or by posting them on the city website), I would like to request paper copies of the correspondence that will then be scanned and posted on UH Place as a matter of public record. Presumably, you and city council members have been passing these communications along to the city clerk to keep as part of the public record, so there must be a compendium of them being kept somewhere (?). It shouldn't be too difficult to round up this information and post it in a very visible way on the city website.

Mayor From, I would use this opportunity to respectfully remind you and the city council that all of you are public sector employees (public servants) who serve within a public sector organization. As a public sector organization, our UH city government exists to protect and serve its citizens. Our city government is owned by the people, and all of you were elected (with the exception of one councilor) as public servants to discharge your duties in the interest of the people of University Heights. I'm sure you are aware that you are accountable to the citizenry, not to outside interests nor to personal interests. I therefore respectfully request that you demonstrate this accountability by providing the citizenry of University Heights with access to open public records.

Speaking on behalf of myself and many other active citizens of University Heights, we expect and demand an open and transparent process and, at the moment, it is pretty clear that we are not getting it. This is not a high-stakes poker game in which the cards aren't shown until they're

played. What's at stake is of great concern to many of the citizens of University Heights; I'm sure you realize that.

I urge you to comply with this request to provide transparency of government through open records and would like to see action on this request occur no later than the end of the day on Monday, September 13th. Posting this information at the same time you post the agenda for the 9/14/2010 City Council meeting would be acceptable (I believe that would be no later than 7 PM on Monday, Sept. 13th). Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Mathew Wilson

Mary Mathew Wilson
UH Place Website Manager
uhplace@rocketmail.com
308 Koser Avenue
University Heights, Iowa 52246-3002
(319) 936-2445
UH Place...the meeting place in University Heights
<http://uhplace.org>

Note : Meeting didn't take place because of pressing work commitments. Called to postpone and phone conversation quickly revealed meeting was about unit count, an issue I was not going to discuss again. I chose not to meet. SML 9/20/2010

Jeff-

Kevin called yesterday and we have a meeting set up for Friday @ 11:30 in his office.

Stan

- Hide quoted text -

On Thu, Sep 2, 2010 at 8:36 AM, Jeff Maxwell <jmaxwell@maxwellconstructioninc.com> wrote:
Stan:

We have some encouraging changes we are anxious to show the Council; however, I would like to visit with you prior to showing them to the Council. Would it be possible to meet with you at your earliest convenience? Please give me a call on my cell at 319-631-1121 with a time.
Thanks again, Stan.

Jeff Maxwell

[show
details A](#)
ug 25

Stan Laverman

to Larry
Larry-

Thank you for following up this is very helpful. I'll ask JCCOG to assist me with this.

I share your same concerns about green space being removed at a later date to add more parking.

If you have any more thoughts please don't hesitate to send them on.

Stan

- Hide quoted text -

On Wed, Aug 25, 2010 at 5:20 PM, Wilson, Larry T <larry-wilson@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Good afternoon Stan--

Again, I appreciate your bold stand with the developer and his architect in trying to get them to soften the impacts of the development.

It was a bit rushed when I mentioned some thoughts about reducing the parking last night, so I thought I would send a quick e-note. If the parking is reduced as you are advocating, which is definitely a step I support in order to get more green area and reduce the sea of parking, there could be a couple of negative consequences if the type of commercial development allowed is not limited. If the parking is NOT adequate for the businesses permitted, it could push parking into the neighborhood or onto adjacent streets, especially for businesses like a restaurant with a bar which would have peak periods. Another consequence could be parking overflowing into the green area created by removing parking. This condition would set the stage for getting the council to add parking back into the created open area after development has occurred. In my view, the only way it will work well is to limit the businesses to those that create a low parking demand, such as the dentist office in the Moore building--it requires very little parking. Sharing parking among businesses having different business hours or peak business hours would help keep the total numbers down as well. Part of the agreement to reduce parking to less than required by UH ordinances, would need to include an agreement to limit business types to assure the parking would be adequate. JCCOG could help you develop a list of business types that have low parking needs. The Urban Land Institute has done such studies and JCCOG planners would be familiar with them.

Larry

Stan: I know of no other way to approach my "talking" with you than straight forward. I am not a lawyer and I speak what I think, for better or worse - so here goes. I was very disappointed in your remarks last night. At the August Council meeting you spoke up clearly - saying you thought it was your responsibility to protect the people of University Heights. You also said you had grave questions about the commercial aspects of the project and you definitely questioned Part III (the contingencies) saying that was a "deal breaker" for you. I applauded your forthrightness as did many folks after the meeting. You also argued with Monson about "wobble room" in the height of the buildings and size of the units.

Then last night you did a complete about face. You came out strongly for the commercial aspect, said you had no concerns about height, did not object to Monson's "wiggly room" and wavered on Part III, the contingencies.

Stan, If indeed you mean to do the best thing for University Heights citizens this is not the way to do it. You have waffled over the last two years.

I know this must be a tremendous burden on Council members. And I appreciate that you are doing research on some of the issues - like underground parking and green spaced needs. However now you seem to be only arguing about number of parking spaces above ground and not the total concept of drastically changing the makeup of University Heights. We could easily go forward with residential only and still maintain 1) less additional traffic; 2) more green space - especially not changing the ravine; 3) not changing the intersection which as was mentioned last night is working well (even Mike has to agree with that issue) 4) still accomplish the Council's goal (which appears to all of us as acquiring more money for University Heights). All of these issues could be addressed in a less drastic manner and still maintain a livable, comfortable community. Living where I do I am especially aware of the traffic issue watching cars, buses, trucks and bikes vying for that "straight ahead" lane on Melrose where you would have people turning into the commercial space.

But lastly I am particularly worried about Amendment III. Both the lawyers, Steve and Pat, agree this is needed to protect University Heights in the future. If the developer gets the zoning he wants he can do anything he wishes. Thus far I have not seen the council be strong in trying to rein him in. But what worries me most is the possibility of his "flipping" the property when he has purchased it. I know he said last night "It is not my intention" but unfortunately he has said other things that have been questionable. Has anyone on the Council looked into his building and financial background. I hear all kinds of rumors and would like the record to show that we (University Heights) knows the history of this developer. That is only good business practice and the information should be available to the public.

I appreciate all your hard work and efforts and am sure sometimes you just wish the whole thing would go away. I feel the same way. But you are a public administrator now and have the awesome responsibility of making a decision that once made cannot be un-made. It will affect people for another 75 years to come. Please consider all these things VERY carefully. I have faith that you can do this.

Thank you! Kathie

Dear Stan:

May I quote you on "800 sq ft condos if built remain vacant." in my e-mail letter to Maxwell and Monson supporting your amendments?

-Joe F.

800 sq ft condos if built remain vacant.

On Thu, Aug 12, 2010 at 8:36 AM, joseph frankel <joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Dear Stan:

Thanks for your swift reply!

Your occupation makes you superbly qualified to evaluate a proposal such as Maxwell's, and it makes me doubly confident of your judgements.

But you have roused my curiosity by writing "What I've seen in other developments is it doesn't work out that way".

How does it work out? My guess is that smaller units show a higher level of transiency than larger ones, and transiency increases wear and tear and lowers reputations.

Am I right? Or is it something else?

-Joe Frankel

P.S. Do you happen to know how I can get in contact with Jeff Maxwell by e-mail?

Dear Joe:

Thank you for your kind e-mail. I'll try to explain as best as I can.

First of all let me explain my background. Please excuse me if this is known to you. I am the senior housing inspector for the City of Iowa City. This is a relatively new position for me (6 months). I've moved up through the ranks and being a housing inspector for 6 years. In the whole scheme of things, not a long time. While my knowledge is more practical in nature I have sought education and training that makes me knowledgeable of buildings and design. As a housing inspector for the City of Iowa City I also am charged with enforcing sections of the zoning code. I'm not a person who is satisfied with knowing only small sections of code. I appreciate how they all work together. My greatest asset is I talk to people. I work with people in the building trade. I ask what's working, what's selling, and what they would do differently. I see what is theory and what the practical application of the theory is.

It's really not my place to tell the developer he can't build 800 sq ft units. He can. What I can say is you are allowed 80 units in this development, build them wisely. I agree with you that in theory that 800 sq ft units would be perfect for a medical student or young professional. What I've seen in other developments is it doesn't work out that way. The developer will need to adjust his unit size vs unit number to come up with the appropriate balance.

It's not the developer's responsibility to provide complete diversity in one development. We have diversity in our housing stock in the small homes, duplexes, small multi-family units located around the development. This development could provide an additional option with it's multi-family units.

I hope that answers your question and please feel free to e-mail me back if it doesn't. I've appreciated your comments in the public forums.

Stan

On Wed, Aug 11, 2010 at 7:01 PM, joseph frankel <joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Dear Stan:

I appreciated the amendments that you proposed yesterday evening at the UH Town Council meeting. It seemed to me that they were offered in a constructive spirit, to retain the essence of the Maxwell proposal (including the commercial space) while cutting down its excessive aspects.

I gathered that you offered three main substantive amendments (1) Reduce the maximum height of the rear building to 70 feet, thereby cutting it down to 5 stories rather than 6, (2) Drastically reduce surface parking, and (3) increase the minimum size of the residential units. Modifications (1) and (3) taken together would reduce the overall number of residential units from the 95 initially proposed to 80.

I strongly agree with your proposed amendments (1) and (2). They are remarkably in line with the recommendation informally made over a year ago by Stephanie Reyes, Policy Director with Greenbelt Alliance, a nonprofit organization that supports preservation of natural lands and good community planning in the San Francisco Bay Area.

"Greenbelt Alliance recommends developers gradually step up heights near existing neighborhoods - start with 2-3 stories near single family homes and taper up to 4-5 stories further away. This is somewhat challenging on this small site, but I still think there's room for improvement. You mentioned that they were proposing underground parking, which is fantastic. But the site map still shows a bunch of surface parking. If I were you, I'd propose the developer pretty much get rid of surface parking and spread the condos out over a larger surface area at only 5-story heights. That would step up more naturally from the 3-story retail arcade and perhaps be less scary for the neighbors."

The amendment of yours that puzzles me is the one to eliminate (or rather, enlarge) the 800 square-foot residential units in the front building Why? I can easily imagine the size of these 800-square foot units, because our home is an L-shaped 3-bedroom ranch of 1600 square feet. It could without enormous modification be split into two comfortable 1-bedroom units with small kitchens. So 800 square feet to me to be ideal for young professionals (medical residents) and

for widows or widowers who want something more elegant than a similar sized unit at Grandview Apts. Also, I liked Mr. Monson's argument for diversity of housing, i.e. not all for the very rich.

But I sense that you have some more cogent objection to the small units, and I am curious to know what it is before I go any further (such as writing to Mr. Maxwell for the first time, to urge him to accept your amendments).

Sincerely,

-Joe Frankel

Donald Baxter

to me

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 12

The red herring comes in because I believe there's no real to say that empirically that 95 units is too dense, while 80 units is not. This development should be dense compared to the remainder of University Heights. My assumption is that, at least early on, many of these units might not even be occupied year-round. Considering the large amount of pavement on the property as is, the development might not even cover as much topsoil as the church does now, considering the two rather large parking lots that exist on the property. Otherwise, my primary concern might be storm water run-off increasing.

My sensitivity to non-issues stalling this tactic is increased because of the letter I received from the citizens' group making their arguments against this project, including the statement that citizens could find do their own 'research' on the uhplace.org website. It's really appalling, Stan. While I realize that you're not responsible for that, my sensitivity is increased.

Best,

Donald Baxter

- Hide quoted text -

On Thu, Aug 12, 2010 at 6:57 AM, Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com> wrote:
Actually I took issue with the more than last minute changes and parking. 95 units is too dense for an in-fill development. If this was a stand alone development I wouldn't have an issue with it. I proposed an amendment that would allow 80 units. I also too issue with a proposal that is being sold to us as new fresh and green having 107 surface parking spaces in the core of the property. That is why I proposed an amendment that would only allow about 25% of the required parking spaces to be surface parking spaces. This wasn't don't as a stall tactic, it was done to address things that I see as real issues.

Stan

On Thu, Aug 12, 2010 at 12:01 AM, Donald Baxter <donald.baxter@gmail.com> wrote:
I think nitpicking this project on minor details regarding number of parking spaces and height restrictions constitutes bringing up red herring issues. In the long run, these are not issues that will make any real difference in the project but could be used as stalling tactics.

Thanks, Stan

On Wed, Aug 11, 2010 at 11:34 PM, Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com> wrote:

Mr. Baxter-

I don't understand your "Red Herring" comment on the press-citizen discussion. Can you enlighten me?

Thanks Donald!

Stan Laverman

--

Donald Baxter
316 Ridgeview Avenue
University Heights, Iowa 52246
319/337-0494
413/294-1280 (e-fax)

homepage: www.onanov.com

The economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment, not the other way around.
—Gaylord Nelson

Thank you Wally I appreciate the e-mail.

I do feel my responsibility is to the community first and I don't take it lightly. I also know that people don't always agree with me and I respect that.

My zoo and pony analogy... yeah I'm glad that didn't end up in the paper- it really seems to resonate with people! Honestly not my finest statement and I'm happy I didn't say anything worse.

Kevin did exactly what I expected him to do. He's good at what he does and I can respect him for that.

I'll have to take you up on that offer of a cold one sometime!

Stan

- Hide quoted text -

On Wed, Aug 11, 2010 at 5:32 PM, <wally@aol.com> wrote:

I thought you were really good last night and I say that even though we are not in 100% agreement on this. I still have doubts about the viability and necessity of the commercial portion of the project. I was really glad to hear you state your responsibility to the community first, which I believe in strongly.

I am in complete agreement with your zoo and pony analogy. I have said from the beginning that they knew at the onset of all this that we not be receptive to a 9 story project, but they presented it anyway hoping we would think they are nice guys by lowering to what was likely their real intention anyway.

I think if Kevin Monson were playing poker you could expect him to bluff, which is what I think he was doing. I also get a little tired of him talking about diversity. The whole community is diverse by its very nature, which in my view is one of the great aspects of living here.

Anyway good job and I hope this can be resolved in a manner that will bring us together - it seems there are some deep divisions.

Good Luck and come over to my place sometime for another cold one.

Wally

I empathize with you over the closing of Roosevelt. I couldn't understand the rationale and still don't think it was the right move, but such is life. I can still hope that this project does not happen. It was nice to hear from some "new faces" who are somewhat removed from the immediate area. It will be interesting to listen to the dialogue on the 24th. Thanks for taking time to respond.

Linda

- Hide quoted text -

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>

To: linddick <linddick@aol.com>

Sent: Wed, Aug 11, 2010 1:46 pm

Subject: Re: meeting re: zoning

Linda-

Thank you. The questions you ask are fair. I think you would be surprised by the number of people who support the full Maxwell proposal. I also know where you're coming from and why you feel the way you do. Last year the school board voted to close Roosevelt school. This was a decision that I was adamantly apposed to. In meeting after meeting the school board would hear from citizens who said this wasn't supposed to happen. The board still voted to close the school.

In a candid conversation after the fact a school board member shared with me that the e-mails and other correspondence received favored closing the school. My experience tells me this wasn't a lie.

I don't know how other council members are making their decisions. I would encourage you to ask them!

Take care and "enjoy" the hot evening-

Stan

On Wed, Aug 11, 2010 at 2:35 PM, <linddick@aol.com> wrote:

Stan:

I just want to let you know I appreciate the comments you made last night, and I hope you will continue to stick to your stance to not approve the Maxwell proposal unless they make the changes. Even then, I would hope you will vote against it. In surveying the crowd at the UAC, the majority of folks are opposed to this plan, yet I get the feeling the majority of the council members are in favor of the plan. Where are the folks they are "representing"? If we don't see any of the supporters attending the meetings, are there really that many in University Heights or are the elected officials just casting their vote based on personal feelings? Keep up the good work and communication.

Linda Fincham

Wilson, Larry T

to me

Good morning Stan-

You have obviously given a lot of thought to both of the St. Andrew development proposals discussed last night. I want to thank you for your bold stand in trying to get some compromise from the developers and I want you to know that your efforts are appreciated.

Larry

[Reply](#) [Forward](#)

Reply

Stan Laverman

to Larry

Larry-

Thank you for your e-mail and kind words. I'm looking forward to a quiet evening!

Stan

Stan Laverman

to Nancy

Thank you.

- Hide quoted text -

[show](#)
[details](#) A
ug 11

[show](#)
[details](#) A
ug 11

[show](#)
[details](#) A
ug 10

On Tue, Aug 10, 2010 at 2:09 PM, Nancy Barnes <nbarnes.kohout@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Mr. Laverman,

In response to your very pertinent inquiry as to how we and others who have expressed our preference for the Bauer plan even though the housing there would be quite dense, our answer is this: we feel it is the lesser of two evils, as others have told you as well. We would prefer a more modest development than even the Bauer plan envisions. We would MUCH prefer that. But if Bauer and Maxwell are the only possibilities to choose from, then Bauer's is "better." It's dense, yes, but at least it does not involve destroying the ravine, and for us that is a major point in its favor. It would also involve less of an increase in traffic on Melrose and nearby streets, and that too is extremely important to us. We have received copies of the messages sent to you by Myra Davis and Rosanne Hopper in reply to your question, and we echo their opinions strongly.

We would prefer that the church remain. If not, then something like Birkdale would be fine if there must be development. There, the landscape has been preserved and the architecture is charming. If not that, then maybe a reduced version of Bauer. And if not that, then, OK, Bauer. BUT NOT MAXWELL!

Sincerely,

Nancy Barnes-Kohout
Frank Kohout

Thanks Dan-

Do you have any thoughts on the Bauer proposal?

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 3:14 PM, Dan Moore <danmoore4@me.com> wrote:

[Reply](#) [Forward](#)

Reply

Dan Moore

to me
Hi Stan,

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 10

Thanks for taking the time to read my letter.

I support the Baur plan as a maximum for the zoning of that property. I still believe that UH is in the driver's seat on this if we only had the sense and courage to see it. We have the luxury of waiting for the perfect proposal to come along.

As this debate unfolded, anyone who spoke against the Maxwell plan was unfairly characterized as a NIMBY — against any development of any kind. I think the Bauer plan illustrates that there are reasonable alternatives to the Maxwell proposal that our neighbors are willing to accept.

Dan

Hi Stan--

The project has not advanced very far in the design phase, but it is listed as Design project at <http://facilities.uiowa.edu/pdc/projects/project-info.asp?ProjNumber=0182802>. It does not give much detail though. As far as I know, there are no designs for viewing yet. It will be located at the north side of the Finkbine Parking Lot, between it and the railroad west of the Finkbine Parking Lot access road off Hawkins Drive and will consume some of the lot. It is still shown on the UI Facilities Management Planning, Design and Construction website location map (attached), and at the above website address as being in the NE corner of the Finkbine Parking Lot (small yellow colored square), but the location has been changed to the location as mentioned above and as added to the attached map (larger orange square which I added).

Larry

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 10:27 AM

To: Wilson, Larry T

Subject: proposed U of Iowa west side power plant

- Show quoted text -



UIProjectsLocationMap 08-10-10.docx

119K [View](#) [Download](#)

[Reply](#) [Forward](#)

Reply

Stan Laverman

to Larry

That works- Thanks Larry,

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 10

David and Jacinda-

Thank you for emailing your comments regarding the potential redevelopment of St. Andrew site. The current Maxwell proposal has the front building down to 3 floors @ 38 feet. I would agree the 38 to 39 foot range fits into the neighborhood better.

I've been asking everyone why they support the Bauer proposal, however you've done that without prompting.

Thanks again-

Stan Laverman
- Show quoted text -

[Reply](#) [Forward](#)
David
Pedersen

David is not available to chat

Stan, thanks for clarifying that point. Good to know. DP

Reply

[show](#)
[details](#) August 10

Stan Laverman

to David

And in other news.... At the 11th hour they've increased the proposed height of the front building to 40' . I'll save my comments for tonight.

- Show quoted text -

Dear Stan,

Thanks for responding. With regard to the Pat Bauer proposal, we view it as the lesser of two evils. We still think that the density inherent in this proposal is too high.

The fact that Pat's proposal eliminates commercial is a big plus in our minds, especially with respect to traffic. In spite of this, it seems obvious that any development at the site of the church will dramatically increase traffic on Grand Ave., thus irrevocably changing the nature of our neighborhood for the worse.

Thanks again for your response.

Scott and Carol Ann Christiansen

- Hide quoted text -

----- Original Message -----

From: [Stan Laverman](#)

To: [Scott Christiansen](#)

Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 3:38 PM

Subject: Re: Pat Bauer proposal

Dear Scott and Carol Ann-

Thank you for taking the time to send us an e-mail. I understand your desire for the status quo and I'm wondering how comfortable you are with the Bauer proposal. What appeals to you about it? Why are you comfortable with that level of density? I understand the apprehension on Grand ave about more traffic of a small residential street. I'm not sure either plan has appropriately addressed how good design could eliminate that pressure. Thanks again for voicing you opinion. I hope we can come up with a compromise that satisfies most people.

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 10:52 AM, Scott Christiansen <s_christiansen@mchsi.com> wrote:
Dear Council members,

We are writing this to express our concurrence with letters written by Mary Mathew Wilson and Larry Wilson in support of Pat Bauer's proposal. Actually, our strong preference would be for the status quo, i.e., the church remaining where it is. In the event that the church does decide to proceed with the sale of the property, Pat Bauer's proposal seems like a very fair compromise that both sides to the dispute could and should agree to.

Sincerely yours,

Scott and Carol Ann Christiansen

HopsonRC@aol.com

to me

Stan

[show
details](#) Aug 9

To be completely honest I view the Bauer plan as the lesser of two evils. Trying to be mature and seeing all sides of the issue - I felt the compromise was worth supporting. Do I ultimately wish the church will vote to stay put? ABSOLUTELY!! The church has been a wonderful neighbor - I've enjoyed the youth group kids coming to our house on their scavenger hunts, I've enjoyed supporting all of their endeavors through the years. My second choice would be a 'Birkdale Part II' or something smaller and contained like that.

I feel even though the Bauer plan remains dense, there will be less traffic on Melrose without a commercial aspect to the building. Keeping the ravine intact is a huge selling point for me as well. Keeping the building as far back from Melrose is important to me and keeping sunset as is - is also important.

So, while The Bauer plan isn't something I would have considered last year - in light of compromise it is the best solution we have IF we have to have some development in that space.

I hope this has answered your questions - feel free to write back if you have anything further.

Thanks
Rosanne

Hello, Stan

Yes, I realize that the proposal is multifamily, but the size is less than the Maxwell plan and for that reason it is preferable. It also has no commercial (which I think would bring an unwanted aspect to our community). My first choice would be to keep the church where it is and to keep University Heights single family, but neither of the issues being voted on tomorrow night is consistent with that choice. I appreciate hearing from you and trust your decision to do what is right for University Heights.

Linda Fincham

- Hide quoted text -

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>

To: [linddick](mailto:linddick@aol.com) <linddick@aol.com>

Sent: Mon, Aug 9, 2010 1:35 pm

Subject: Re: rezoning decision

Ms. Fincham-

Thank you for your e-mail. Do you realize that the Bauer plan is not single-family? The proposed Bauer plan includes two multi-family buildings which are at a much higher density than single-family zoning.

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 5:08 PM, <linddick@aol.com> wrote:
To all Council members and Mayor,

I am writing to request that you vote to support the recommendations of the Zoning Committee to deny the Maxwell application and to approve the Bauer plan for the possible development of the St. Andrew property. With many of the residents of University Heights indicating their desire to keep University Heights a single family residential neighborhood as well as to eliminate the commercial aspect of the proposed changes, it seems imperative that these residents be represented with your vote to deny the Maxwell plan. Thank you for your service.

Linda Fincham
1475 Grand Ave.

Thanks Liesa-

You said many are willing to support the compromise. I would assume this is the Bauer proposal. Does that include you?

Also I think your math on the trips generated is mis-stated. There's not agreement between the 1500, 900 and 400.

I unfortunately was not able to attend the zoning commission meetings because of a previous commitment and family vacation. I was able to meet with Pat Bauer last night to gain his perspective. While Pat and I don't agree on everything I felt it was a productive meeting. I have not been contacted by the developer or any of his agents this past month. That's unfortunate for him.

There needs to be a compromise, hopefully we can get to a place that is agreeable to most people.

Stan Laverman
- Show quoted text -

[Reply](#) [Forward](#)

Reply

Liesa Parko

to me

Certainly that should be 600, not 400. Thanks for noting that.

Correct, the alternative plan approved by the Zoning Commission is the "Bauer proposal."

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 9

As I said, a development similar to the condos on the Neuzil property would be ideal. Something more imaginative and sensitive than the Maxwell proposal. But if it's the best UH can do, I would not oppose the scaled down version without the commercial component (the "Bauer proposal").

I do believe a far better plan would materialize if the council were willing to wait. But the council seems determined to approve the Maxwell proposal or something very, very close to it. And that's unfortunate.

tan Laverman

to William

[show](#)
[details](#) A
ug 9

<http://www.university-heights.org/BuildZoneSanit/zoning/StAndrewAlternativeProposal.pdf>

- Hide quoted text -

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 6:12 PM, Silverman, William <william-silverman@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Have not seen this. Where can I download a copy?

William B. Silverman MD FACG AGAF
Professor of Medicine
Division of Gastroenterology/Hepatology
Univeristy of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics
4553-A JCP
200 Hawkins Dr.
Iowa City IA 52242-1009
Tel: 319-384-9995
Fax:319-356-7918
william-silverman@uiowa.edu

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 6:11 PM

To: Silverman, William

Subject: Re: Maxwell Proposal

Mr Silverman-

Thank you for your input. Have you had a chance to see the Bauer option? Do you have an opinion on it?

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 6:05 PM, Silverman, William <william-silverman@uiowa.edu> wrote:

Dear Louise, Mike, Jim, Stan, Brennan and Pat:

I have read the Maxwell proposal (6 story/3 story /residential-commercial development) plan. While others may certainly choose to disagree, I do not believe that this would be in the best of the community to proceed in this direction.

I thank you for considering this.

Bill Silverman

1527 Oakcrest Ave.

Hettmansperger, Sue E

to me

Hello Mr. Laverman,

I prefer the site being left as is, but if the property is sold & must be developed, I feel that single family dwellings would fit in best to the character of our community. If that is not possible, I would opt for the next least intrusive and high density option. If there is no viable compromise less dense than the Bauer compromise, I would prefer Bauer's over what Maxwell has proposed.

Thank you for asking for clarification.

Sue

- Hide quoted text -

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 9

On 8/9/10 2:29 PM, "Stan Laverman" <slaverman@gmail.com> wrote:

- Hide quoted text -

Ms. Hettmansperger-

Thank you for your e-mail. I'd like to understand your support of the Bauer proposal. I understand your desire for a compromise and I find that commendable. What I don't understand is that if you believe the existing high density around us is threatening us how can you support the higher density of the Bauer proposal? Isn't it just more of the same?

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 10:53 AM, Hettmansperger, Sue E <sue-hettmansperger@uiowa.edu> wrote:

Dear City Council and Zoning Commission members,

I have been following the ongoing yearly discussions of development pressures that have occupied University Heights for the ten years I have lived here. Due to the charming nature of our housing stock and quiet residential feel of this very small single family cluster of homes, developers have pressured us continually from all sides to infill more and more land. The existing high density nature of what surrounds us at this point is already a threat to the quality of life and aesthetic charm of our community. I am opposed to the current Maxwell proposal for a PUD on the site of St. Andrews Church. As Maxwell stated in one of the meetings last year, "I don't care what you people think." And he doesn't care that his massive development is completely out of character with our existing community. I would prefer to re-think the future of the site if sold, and I am in favor of single-family dwellings similar to existing homes. If this is not possible, I would support scaled-back proposals such as the Bauer plan, though even that plan seems

too dense. Bauer is a brilliant supporter of our best interests and should be commended for his thoughtful approach to compromise.

Sincerely,
Sue Hettmansperger, Professor of Art, Univ. of Iowa
114 Highland Drive, 52246

Mary Mathew Wilson

to me

Hi Stan,

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 9

Well, I've heard from only a few who heard back from you, but perhaps you are still processing the feedback you're getting. Don't worry--If I did ask folks on my list to answer that question you told June you were asking everyone who supports the alternative plan, I would tell them to send their response directly to you--not to me. That way, there's no chance of any responses being "filtered" by me before getting to you. (Actually, I have to say that implication is perceived at this end as more of an insult than an attack, but perhaps you didn't mean it that way...) :) I'm really all about honesty and keeping things on the up and up.

Toward that end, here's the process I follow: I email folks and remind them to send feedback to our mayor and council people at the appropriate times and provide the email addresses they'll need so that they don't have to try and dig them out from the city website. That's the process...

I agree that it is wise to avoid an appearance of impropriety.

mmw

Mary Mathew Wilson
UH Place Website Manager
uhplace@rocketmail.com
308 Koser Avenue
University Heights, Iowa 52246-3002
(319) 936-2445
UH Place...the meeting place in University Heights
<http://uhplace.org>

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>
To: Mary Mathew Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com>
Cc: bravejune@gmail.com
Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 11:08:21 AM
Subject: Re: Fw: Did anyone else receive this question from Stan Laverman?

- Hide quoted text -

Yes Mary I have been asking everyone. I appreciate your offer however I feel unfiltered responses are better. Please don't take this as an attack, it's just a way to proceed without any appearance of impropriety.

Both your e-mail and Larry's were very substantial and before I responded I wanted to make sure I didn't have any additional questions. If you'd like to give me some feedback on that question I'd be happy to hear it.

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 10:49 AM, Mary Mathew

Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com> wrote:

Hi Stan,

Have you truly been asking the question you've posed to June (below) of others you've heard from who support the alternative proposal? I'm just wondering because I didn't hear back from you with a question like this after I sent my note to you in support the alternative proposal. Neither did Larry.

I'm checking to see if others on my mail list have received this question from you as you've claimed below. If this is some missing information you need to assist you, I'd be happy to help you gather additional input from people who've written to you in favor of the alternative proposal.

Just let me know,

Mary

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Mary Mathew Wilson <uhplace@rocketmail.com>

To:

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 10:19:54 AM

Subject: Did anyone else receive this question from Stan Laverman?

In response to her note to the mayor and council members, June Braverman received a question back from Stan Laverman (below) that he claims to be asking of everyone who expressed support of the alternative proposal. Did anyone else receive a similar note from Stan?

Thanks,

Mary

From: Stan Laverman [<mailto:slaverman@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, August 08, 2010 10:24 PM

To: June Braverman

Subject: Re: Bauer proposal

Ms. Braverman-

Thank you for your e-mail. I've been asking everyone who supports the Bauer proposal how that became comfortable or accepting of the density proposed. If you could answer that question for me I would appreciate it. Thank you- Stan Laverman

On Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 10:11 AM, June Braverman <bravejune@gmail.com> wrote:
I write to ask for your support of the Bauer Proposal for the St. Andrew property which was recommended to you by Planning and Zoning after a 4-1 vote. Thank you. June Braverman

Thank you for your response. -- AL

- Hide quoted text -

On Aug 8, 2010, at 8:51 PM, Stan Laverman wrote:

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Leff-

At this point I have no interest in suspending the three readings. A lack of planning on the developer's part is not reason enough to suspend the readings. Last time the readings were suspended because there was a general feeling that people were looking for closure. I don't get that sense this time. Brennan McGrath has also mentioned he is not interested in collapsing the readings at this point and alluded to the fact that there was one additional council member that felt the same as he did.

Stan Laverman

On Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 7:49 PM, Jan Leff <jaleff@mchsi.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor From and Councilors:

I am concerned about a possible path that this council could take as it takes action on the request of Jeff Maxwell to rezone and develop the St. Andrew Church property. This process involves voting on the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance. It is required that such ordinance must be voted on at three successive meetings unless the council votes by a super majority to suspend these rules by reducing such successive votes.

This requirement of three successive considerations is to provide ample time for the community members to become informed and to express their reactions to the proposed amendment ordinance.

This suspension of these rules should be used very sparingly and certainly not when the matter before the council is highly contested. To do otherwise would defeat the meaning and intent of these rules.

The controversy arising out of the Jeff Maxwell proposal has been very pronounced since it was first submitted in 2009 with a large portion of the community expressing concerns and objections to

the proposal. The zoning commission has now rejected this proposal both times it has been considered. But more importantly , a compromise development offered by Pat Bauer, introduced at the July 15, 2010 Zoning Commission hearing, has the potential for widespread support. However there has not been sufficient time to fully inform the community about the details of this proposal because of the short time period since its introduction and also because it has occurred during the months of July and August when so many people are gone. The Bauer proposal represents a compromise to the Maxwell development that provides the church with a potential buyer for a development that could have strong support within the community.

The magnitude of the impact of any development on our community is huge and should not reach this point of consideration until our citizens have had ample opportunity to become informed and to have the opportunity for the community input and discussion. Apparently Jeff Maxwell's agreement with the church has some form of deadline in August, but this time parameter should not trump the duty and obligation of the council to provide its citizens with reasonable opportunities to have input in matters that are so vital to the continuity of our community.

The community needs the opportunity to hear the Bauer proposal and to respond to it. I personally feel that it offers a very reasonable compromise that should be of real interest to potential developers of the St. Andrew property, even if, at this time, Mr. Maxwell says that he is not. I sincerely urge you to reject any proposal to suspend the rule of three successive considerations and to perform your function as a city councilor with dignity and respect.

Sincerely,
Al Leff

Ms. Prickman-

Thank you for your e-mail explaining why you support the Bauer plan. I appreciate what you've said about the community feel of University Heights and I'm sure we can get back to that because of the great people that live here.

I believe there is a need for a compromise. Hopefully we can work to achieve that Tuesday night.

Thanks again- Stan Laverman

- Hide quoted text -

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 1:53 PM, Rachel <rreyn1@yahoo.com> wrote:

Councilors,

I've written several letters on the issue of developing the St. Andrews property so I'm at a bit of a loss as to what to say in this one. But I can't stop writing because somewhere, deep down, I believe that my voice matters, at least as one of many voices being heard. I want to believe that we all count in this issue. And I firmly believe that if a community-wide vote were taken on the issue of the Maxwell development, this community would be solidly divided down the middle. The council election bore this out. My experience with my neighbors continues to bear this out. And I'm enormously saddened by this division.

My husband and I moved here nearly four years ago and were shocked to find such a welcoming community. We met neighbors that were so helpful and kind and friendly. We feel now as though many of our neighbors are family. This is not a common experience, and certainly not one to be taken for granted. In the past year, as debate on the Maxwell development has raged, that sense of trust and neighborliness has been eroded by suspicion and frustration. I want more than anything to restore the community that I moved into. No development is worth the destruction of a truly unique neighborhood.

And the beauty of the situation is, there is actually a nice compromise on the table. The Bauer plan offers high-density residences and higher tax revenues with the preservation of our neighborhood environment and the protection of the natural environment surrounding the property. I sincerely hope that you will consider healing the divisions in this community.

I believe that a developer is not in the position to decide how a community should be developed. We get that power. And I hope you see that we can decide what fits best on that property, and the other parties involved can figure out how to make the business of building on that property work. Please vote on Tuesday night for the Bauer compromise. It is a plan that we *all* can live with and take pride in.

Sincerely,
Rachel Prickman
321 Koser Ave.

tan Laverman

to Greg

[show
details](#) A

Greg-

This is very helpful thank you.

Stan

- Hide quoted text -

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 1:53 PM, Greg <colophonic@yahoo.com> wrote:

Stan,

The Bauer plan does two things the Maxwell plan does not (at least to my knowledge):

- 1) The Bauer plan does not include a commercial component. I'm not opposed to retail on principle, but a development of the kind proposed by Maxwell will not encourage businesses that will primarily serve the University Heights community.
- 2) The Bauer plan preserves the ravine, which is a protected area.

Additionally, it is also not yet subject to the shifting promises of an outside developer with a substantial profit motive. To me, density alone is not the only factor.

Thanks,
Greg

--- On **Mon, 8/9/10, Stan Laverman** <slaverman@gmail.com> wrote:

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Zoning Commission recommendation
To: "Greg" <colophonic@yahoo.com>
Date: Monday, August 9, 2010, 1:07 PM

Greg-

Thank you for your e-mail. I'm trying to gain a better understanding of why people are supporting the Bauer alternative plan. Can you explain to me why you became comfortable with the density being proposed? It's also possible that you're not comfortable with it at all. If you could get back to me on that I would appreciate it.

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 10:00 AM, Greg <colophonic@yahoo.com> wrote:

Councilors,

I am writing to urge you to respect the judgment of the Zoning Commission and reject the Maxwell development proposal at your upcoming Council meeting. The issue on the table is whether or not to re-zone that property, and I believe it should not be re-zoned. If it is, it should only be re-zoned to the extent that would allow the Bauer alternative plan to proceed.

This issue has been simmering for so long in our community now, leading to deep and increasingly personal divisions on both sides of the issue. To me, that is a clear indication that it is the wrong plan at the wrong time. Please act in accordance with our Zoning Commission and the feelings of half (at a minimum) of UH residents and reject this proposal, and begin to focus on re-building a sense of trust and community through your work as representative elected officials.

Sincerely,

Greg Prickman
321 Koser Ave.

tan Laverman
to ruppertdm

[show
details A
ug 9](#)

Mr. & Mrs. Ruppert-

Thank you for your e-mail explaining your position. I unfortunately was not able to attend the zoning commission meetings because of scheduled vacation and previous commitments. I did spend some time with Mr. Bauer Sunday evening. While we didn't agree on everything it was a worthwhile conversation for me. I have not had any contact with anyone representing Mr. Maxwell.

I agree with you on the need for a compromise. Hopefully we can get to a point that is agreeable to most.

Thanks again for explaining why you support the Bauer proposal.

Stan Laverman

- Hide quoted text -

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 1:42 PM, <ruppertdm@aol.com> wrote:

09 August 2010

Dear City Council Members:

RE: REZONING DECISION FOR THE SAINT ANDREW PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PROPERTY

Tomorrow evening's Council Meeting is an extremely important event for making the right decision that offers the opportunity for compromise that will provide and meet the needs of all University Heights citizens.

We believe that compromise is the key word in making the right decision.

We believe the Bauer compromise proposal offers more favorable aspects than that of the Maxwell proposal because it:

1. is a better fit for the U Heights Comprehensive Plan
2. complies with the recommendation of the Zoning Commission
3. eliminates the commercial development with unfavorable aspects and unknowns
4. allows for appropriate tax growth that more than adequately meets U Heights needs
5. keeps the same traffic flow and offers less increased traffic
6. maintains more green space especially the ravine, thus protecting the existing types of wild life
7. supports many who previously expressed their thoughts and ideas

Some citizens desired the commercial development for access to those services already (or about to be) offered by existing establishments. Some live near the building soon to be the Kaeding restaurant and some live not too far from Fareway and other businesses. University Hospital offers several places for coffee and refreshments as well as dining.

Both the Maxwell and Bauer proposals were presented at the Zoning Commission meeting on the 15th of July, 2010. Near the end of that meeting, Mr. Maxwell delivered an emotional speech identifying his willingness to work on a compromise. He, In fact, said he was going to go home and begin work that very evening. He also expressed a willingness to meet with some of the attendees to get ideas from them.

If members of the Council attended that meeting as well as the following Zoning Commission meeting on the 22nd of July, 2010, they most certainly must have been as dismayed as the rest of us. In responding to Mr. Zimmerman's questions, Mr. Maxwell had no compromises to offer or plans to do so.

Many of us would like to see Saint Andrew remain but have been willing to consider an alternative by supporting the Bauer proposal.

We trust the Council members will show their willingness to compromise as well and support the Bauer proposal. We submit our thanks to the Council for careful and thoughtful consideration.

Robert and Della Ruppert
314 Koser Avenue

Phone: 338-4811

tan Laverman

to ballard, bcc: Brennan

Thanks Steve it does.

- Hide quoted text -

[show](#)
[details](#) A
ug 9

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 11:32 AM, Steven E. Ballard <ballard@lefflaw.com> wrote:
Stan,

You may propose amendments. From a 'technical' parliamentary procedure standpoint, it would go something like this:

- Someone moves adoption of one of the proposed ordinances.
- Someone seconds the motion.
- Discussion ensues.
- During discussion, someone moves to amend the ordinance. It would be very helpful if there was a written amendment or at least something very specific (i.e., "strike these words" and/or "add these words"), as opposed to offering an amendment in "idea" form.
- Someone else seconds the motion to amend.
- Discussion ensues on the motion to amend.
- Vote occurs on the motion to amend.
- Further discussion on the main motion (either as amended or not, depending on the vote on the amendment).
- Vote occurs on the main motion.

Keep in mind that the proposed ordinance must be adopted 3 times in identical form. So, if there was adoption in August, you couldn't amend in September without starting the 3 readings over (or suspending the rules to collapse 3 into 2).

Hope that helps.

Steven E. Ballard
LEFF LAW FIRM, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 2447
222 South Linn Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52244-2447
office: 319/338-7551
cell: 319/430-3350
facsimile: 319/338-6902
e-mail: ballard@lefflaw.com

This message is intended only for the use of the person to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential and subject to the attorney-client privilege. It should not be forwarded to anyone else without the consent of the sender. If you received this message and are not the intended recipient, you have received this message in error. Please notify the person sending the message and destroy your copy and any attachments.

Since email messages sent between you and Leff Law Firm, L.L.P. and its employees are sent over the Internet, Leff Law Firm, L.L.P. cannot assure that such messages are secure. You should carefully consider the risks of email transmission of information to Leff Law Firm, L.L.P. that you consider to be confidential. If you are not comfortable with such risks, you may choose not to utilize email to communicate with Leff Law Firm, L.L.P.

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, including IRS Circular 230 Notice, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by any taxpayer, for the purpose of avoiding U.S. tax penalties.

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 11:19 AM
To: Steve Ballard
Subject: St Andrews Development

Steve-

Are we allowed to propose amendments to either of the two pdevelopment roposals or is this a straight up-down vote?

Stan

wallu@aol.com

to me

see you then...Wally

[show](#)
[details](#) A
ug 9

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>
To: wallu@aol.com
- Hide quoted text -
Sent: Sun, Aug 8, 2010 9:48 pm
Subject: Re: From Wally Heitman

Well my wife is going out so I guess that leaves me here with the kids!

How's 7 sound?

Stan

On Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 5:30 PM, <wallu@aol.com> wrote:
Monday evening would be great - do you want to come over or should I appear at your place with a couple of cold ones? Wally

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>
To: wallu@aol.com
Sent: Sun, Aug 8, 2010 2:39 pm
Subject: Re: From Wally Heitman

I'm meeting with Pat Bauer @ 7:00 p.m. tonight.

What does Monday evening look like for you?

On Wed, Aug 4, 2010 at 1:55 PM, <wallu@aol.com> wrote:

Are we still on for a beer summit? Let me know when is good for you. I work till 530pm. Wally

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>

To: wallu@aol.com

Sent: Fri, Jul 30, 2010 10:39 am

Subject: Re: From Wally Heitman

I think a beer summit would be a great idea. Life is a little hectic right now- and the earliest I can meet is late next week. How about we chat the middle of next week and see what we can do.

Thanks- Stan

On Thu, Jul 29, 2010 at 9:45 PM, <wallu@aol.com> wrote:

Stan - I would like to meet with you and talk about the development. We could meet wherever is convenient for you, including my deck with a beer or something similar.

Email or 351 3610.

Thanks Wally Heitman

edlundsc@aol.com

to me

Dear Stan,

I am still in favor of single family homes and would favor single family homes on the church property. However I am willing to compromise which I do not see from the council. Also, putting all of that traffic on our residential street will be a disaster.

Steve Hedlund

- Hide quoted text -

[show](#)
[details](#) Aug 9

-----Original Message-----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>

To: hedlundsc@aol.com

Sent: Sun, Aug 8, 2010 9:29 pm

Subject: Re: University Heights Council

Mr. & Mrs. Hedlund-

Thank you for your e-mail. One misconception that needs to be cleared up is the theoretical idea that 1500 cars would be dumped onto your neighborhood street. I'm willing to accept that any development will increase traffic and I was lead to believe there would be design elements put in place to prevent traffic from turning left onto Grand Ave. I'll have to verify that.

I understand your desire to keep University Heights predominately a single-family neighborhood. As such I then don't understand your support for the Pat Bauer plan. I hope you haven't been mis-lead on this one- It's most definitely not single-family in nature! If you are still comfortable with the Bauer plan, I'm wondering how you became comfortable with the increased density being proposed?

If I don't see you Tuesday night, maybe we'll see you at a later council meeting.

Stan Laverman

On Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 7:47 PM, <hedlundsc@aol.com> wrote:
University Heights Council,

I write this letter with a great sense of frustration, disappointment and anger. We do not think that most of you listening to what a large number of the citizens of University Heights have been saying to the council. I spent many years on the University Heights city council and we never would have treated a large group of citizens in this manner.

The zoning commission believes in the Pat Bauer plan and we think that that he has ideas that we could live with here in the neighborhood.

The Maxwell plan destroys the greenbelt that buffers the development and dumps 1500 cars a day on our quiet narrow residential street. In addition to the cars, we will have delivery trucks, garbage trucks, moving vans and etc on a small street. The light and noise pollution will be enormous.

How can you do this to us?
Why is the Maxwell plan the only plan?

The total disregard for your fellow University Heights is unforgivable.

Steve and Chris Hedlund (Long time residents who have worked here, raised their family here and hate to see the end of the single family tradition that we worked so hard to save.)

Pat Bauer

to me

[Likewise!](#)

[show
details](#) Aug 9

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, August 08, 2010 10:14 PM

- Hide quoted text -

To: Pat Bauer

Subject: Re: Able to Meet Sometime Today?

- Hide quoted text -

Pat-

Thanks for meeting today I appreciate the opportunity to converse and to agree and disagree on different issues.

Stan

On Fri, Aug 6, 2010 at 3:29 PM, <slaverman@gmail.com> wrote:
530 4076

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Pat Bauer" <pbb338koser@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Aug 2010 15:27:06 -0500
To: <slaverman@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Able to Meet Sometime Today?

Make sense to exchange cell phone numbers in case something comes up at either end?

319/331-8494

FYI ours gets used only when traveling so not a good way to reach us at other times.

From: slaverman@gmail.com [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 12:59 PM
To: Pat Bauer
Subject: Re: Able to Meet Sometime Today?

That would be perfect. See you there.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Pat Bauer" <pbb338koser@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Aug 2010 12:26:51 -0500
To: 'Stan Laverman' <slaverman@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Able to Meet Sometime Today?

Sure -- as indicated, expecting to be back by dinner time. How about 7:00 p.m. at City Hall?

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 11:55 AM
To: Pat Bauer
Subject: Re: Able to Meet Sometime Today?

Pat-

Can we try for Sunday?

Stan

On Fri, Aug 6, 2010 at 8:51 AM, Pat Bauer <pbb338koser@aol.com> wrote:
Stan,

Just checking back to see if anytime today works for you.

We should be back by dinner time Sunday if that'd be better.

City Hall is always convenient for me, but anywhere else also should be doable.

Pat

From: Pat Bauer [mailto:pbb338koser@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 3:57 PM
To: 'Stan Laverman'
Subject: RE: Available to Meet at Your Convenience

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 10:16 AM
To: Pat Bauer
Subject: Re: Available to Meet at Your Convenience

Things are a little hectic for me right now. AH life!

Know what you mean! ;-)

Next week late in the week I would like to set something up. I've also received an e-mail from Wally that he would like to meet, and I'm going to try and set that up too. Will Friday afternoon or Saturday sometime work for you?

Any time Friday afternoon is doable, but Saturday/Sunday we're heading into Chicago with our home-for-a-month-from-Cambodia son to spend some time with friends/family there.

If Friday shouldn't be workable, any time earlier in the week also is pretty open for me as of now.

Stan

On Tue, Jul 27, 2010 at 10:51 AM, Pat Bauer <pbb338koser@aol.com> wrote:
Very little today (afternoon or evening) or tomorrow (morning or afternoon).

I'm at a professional conference Wednesday evening through Friday noon, but after about 2:00 p.m. would be doable.

Either day this weekend or anytime next week should work.

Work number is 335-9014, home is 337-7446 -- appreciate you may have to squeeze this in between other things, and I'll do whatever I can to make things work.

From: slaverman@gmail.com [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2010 9:20 PM
To: Pat Bauer
Subject: Re: Available to Meet at Your Convenience

I appreciate the offer Pat and I will take you up on it. How much notice do you need?

Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

From: "Pat Bauer" <pbb338koser@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 2010 17:41:56 -0500
To: 'Stan Laverman' <slaverman@gmail.com>
Subject: Available to Meet at Your Convenience

Dear Stan,

I appreciate you may be swamped with all that accumulates while one is away, but want you to know that I'd be happy to meet you at City Hall at any time that'd be good for you to go through the material I presented at the Zoning Commission meetings.

As you may now, I did so with Mike and Pat and understand that you may want to touch base with them about how usefulness it was before getting back to me about this.

Best regards,

Pat

June Braverman

to me

[show
details](#) Aug 9

I am curious about the wording of your inquiry; my "comfort level" has to do with many aspects of the proposal including a lack of commercial establishments, increased traffic, the area's ecology et al.

From: Stan Laverman [mailto:slaverman@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 08, 2010 10:24 PM
To: June Braverman
Subject: Re: Bauer proposal
- Hide quoted text -

Ms. Braverman-

Thank you for your e-mail. I've been asking everyone who supports the Bauer proposal how that became comfortable or accepting of the density proposed. If you could answer that question for me I would appreciate it. Thank you- Stan Laverman

On Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 10:11 AM, June Braverman <bravejune@gmail.com> wrote:
I write to ask for your support of the Bauer Proposal for the St. Andrew property which was recommended to you by Planning and Zoning after a 4-1 vote. Thank you. June Braverman

Dear Ms. Barnes-Knout & Mr. Knout-

I appreciate your well written e-mail.

One thing I have been asking people that support the Bauer plan is how they
because comfortable or willing to accept the higher density proposed? If you could let me know
your thoughts on this I would appreciate it.

Stan Laverman

- Hide quoted text -

On Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 6:18 PM, Nancy Barnes <nbarnes.kohout@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Mayor From and Council Members Haverkamp, Lane, Laverman, McGrath and Yeggy,

We would like to urge you to vote to accept the Bauer alternative plan for the development of the
St. Andrew Church property and to reject Mr. Maxwell's plan, which the Zoning Commission did
do at its July 22 meeting.

The alternative plan is less massive and intrusive than the Maxwell plan, and it would fit far better
into our community. A smaller development such as the Bauer plan envisions would have fewer
residents and consequently fewer vehicles to increase traffic on our streets which is a major
concern of many present residents of our community. And a plan such as the Bauer plan would
be kinder to our local environment for it would not require the destruction of the east ravine, an
area that we believe should be preserved and protected according to our city ordinance number
128. The ravine is home to deer, wild turkeys and other creatures whose habitat would be
destroyed, thus driving the animals out or destroying them also. We humans, too, need the
natural environment of our green woods with their rich vegetal and animal wildlife in our lives.

The desire to lower our property taxes has been a major concern of many of us. However, as we
understand it, we cannot be sure that development of this property would result in a decrease in
property taxes for us anytime soon, for any TIF agreement, depending on how it is structured,
could delay the developer's tax payments to the city for several years.

In addition, Mr. Maxwell's plan to include commercial space in his development appeals to many
UH residents who thought, as Mr. Maxwell led us to believe, that that would mean
something welcome like a grocery store or a coffee shop. But he has acknowledged that
commercial space would be leased at high rates, that commercial real estate professionals
regard as too high for such businesses to be viable. Rather, such spaces would be affordable for
law offices or accounting firms perhaps, which would not enrich life in our community as such,
however pleasant the new lawyers, etc., might be as individuals. However, without Mr. Maxwell's
help we will soon have Nate Kaeding's new restaurant and coffee shop at the Melrose-Golfview
Avenue corner which we hope we will all be able to enjoy for a long time.

Our community has been quite divided on the matter of the Maxwell development plan - close to
evenly divided, we think. Approval of the Bauer plan for development could help bring us back
together around a very livable plan to truly enhance our small city. We hope you will carefully
consider the real virtues of the Bauer plan and accept it and reject the Maxwell plan which has
caused real discord among us.

Sincerely,

Nancy Barnes-Kohout
Frank Kohout

Ken Yeggy

[show details](#) August 8

to louisebob, mike-haverkamp, stan-laverman, Brennan, Pat, jimlane

Earlier this week I received a letter from Concerned Residents of University Heights requesting that residents provide their view of the proposed Maxwell development. My view is that the Maxwell Proposal is a reasonable proposal and I support this development. I do have issues with some of the points that were in the letter.

Our community is deeply and rather evenly divided over the Maxwell proposal for developing the St. Andrew property. Such extensive, dramatic, and controversial changes in our town should not be made without much broader support.

I'm not sure the community is as divided as some want to think. This is not an emotional issue for me - one group is going to win and one group is to lose. This decision is not going to ruin my life. If I don't like it I can rent my house and move somewhere else.

University Heights is in no way nearing financial collapse. Revenues have been keeping up with expenses, carryover balances generally have been in line with the Iowa League of Municipalities recommended target of 25%, and there is ample unused borrowing authority to fund any needed major capital improvements (e.g., street rebuilding).

This may be true now but I have concerns about the future. We might be able to survive but will never be able to do anything that will improve the city. To me this is kind of like living from paycheck to paycheck.

There is no guarantee that property taxes would decrease as a result of this development. The site could be developed in several different ways — all of which would bring in significant tax revenue. Although the developer has not provided specifics, it is possible that the TIF (Tax Increment Financing) could be structured so that University Heights would not receive any tax revenue for 10 years.

I find this statement to be a little misleading. The structure of the TIF could just as easily benefit the community. The TIF is negotiable and I have faith that our current city council are not going to give away the farm.

A coffee shop or grocery store would likely not be financially viable, as the developer indicated at a public meeting that commercial spaces would be leased at high rates that knowledgeable commercial real estate professionals view as far beyond those of competitive market rental rates. Nate Kaeding's new restaurant — opening where several grocery store/restaurant ventures have failed — will also serve as a coffee shop with wireless internet access (according to the Corridor Business Journal). It will need our support to survive.

I agree that a grocery store would not be financially viable - too much competition in the Iowa City area. As far as other business I'm sure there are many that would

survive. I have contacts in both the commercial real estate and the commercial banking business and will be asking them for input when we get some solid facts. Restaurants come and go; they have the highest failure rate of all new businesses. I don't really think that Nate Kaeding is depending solely upon this community for his success.

The Maxwell development would generate approximately 1500 additional car trips per day in our town, according to JCCOG (Johnson County Council of Governments). The commercial spaces in the development would generate well over 900 of those trips.

Has anybody taken into account how many trips on Melrose will be eliminated with the location of many of the UHIC clinics being moved to Coralville?

The development involves filling in the ravine, one of our few remaining green spaces and home to a variety of animals and birds. Large developments like this destroy habitat, and displace, even crush, wildlife (Humane Society of the US, All Animals, July/August 2010). UH Ordinance #128 protects sensitive slopes like the ravine.

It's the straightening of Sunset Street that involves filling in the ravine not the development project. And JCCOG is the group recommending the street realignment. I grew up on a farm in the 50's; back then there were fences and the fence rows were the best place to hunt pheasants. The fences are now gone and the pheasants moved to other locations; they were not crushed. The DNR will not let development take place without addressing the sensitive slope issue.

The reasons for the recent petition for a special election are not limited to the Maxwell development issue, which may be decided before the special election is held. Although some of the 89 residents who signed the petition are very concerned about the Maxwell development issue, others were fundamentally offended that the appointment to fill the Council vacancy did not reflect the views expressed by members of the public who spoke at the meeting or wrote to the Council, nor did the appointment reflect a desire to bring our community together on reasonable middle ground.

Prior to the last election I remember a flier that had a list of 6 candidates that all adhered to core principals, mostly about development. They ran as a slate and 5 of the candidates on that slate were defeated. I believe that the candidate chosen by the council should reflect the views of the community who elected the current council.

This year's proceedings (unlike those in 2009) have included reasonable and workable alternatives to the Maxwell development plan — alternatives that could be widely supported in our community. However, the City Council could effectively decide on the Maxwell plan at their August 10 meeting.

It might be an alternative proposal but I find it difficult to consider it workable. There is no supporting financial data; the plan wasn't even original just an altered

copy of the original Maxwell proposal. I don't see this as a plan but more as a diversion. Maybe every resident could offer a proposal and we can have a drawing for the winner.

Stan Laverman

to Brennan

Yeah collapsing them all into 1 would not be a good idea...

You around this week?

Stan

- Hide quoted text -

[show](#)
[details](#) Jul 26

On Mon, Jul 26, 2010 at 7:32 AM, Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com> wrote:
REALLY!

My only concern was condensing the vote from 3 to 1. I really want to talk, but if we don't table vote, we could at least talk some more before we move to the 2nd vote. I have had 2 councilors indicate they would not support a collapse, but we will see.

Thanks

Brennan

On Sun, Jul 25, 2010 at 10:58 PM, Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com> wrote:
Really? No one can meet in August before the meeting?

On Sun, Jul 25, 2010 at 6:09 PM, Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com> wrote:

Due to every one's busy schedule, and giving fair notice to the public, I would like to postpone this work session till after the August Meeting.

Please bring your calendars so we can find a date that works for everyone.

Thanks

Brennan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Brennan McGrath** <brennanmcg@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Jul 24, 2010 at 12:45 PM

Subject: Work Session?

To: Chris Anderson <chris-anderson@university-heights.org>, City Clerk <uhclerk@yahoo.com>, Mayor Louise From <louisebob@mchsi.com>, Pat Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>, Stan 'the Man' U Heights Council <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>, Steve Ballard U Heights Attorney <ballard@lefflaw.com>, jim-lane@university-heights.org

I'm wondering if we could schedule a public work session for the council to discuss the out come of the Planing and Zoning Commission before the August Meeting. Could we include Jeff Maxwell and Pat Bauer for questions?

I could attend a meeting August 2-4 in the evening.

Please let me know your thoughts and availability.

--

Here's to each and every day!

Brennan McGrath CSW
Johnson Brothers of Iowa
Restaurant Division Sales & Education
319-855-0050 cell/text
BMcGrath@johnsonbrothers.com
BrennanMcG@gmail.com

--

Here's to each and every day!

Brennan McGrath CSW
Johnson Brothers of Iowa
Restaurant Division Sales & Education
319-855-0050 cell/text
BMcGrath@johnsonbrothers.com
BrennanMcG@gmail.com

irene bowers

to mike-haverkamp, stan-laverman

I am writing to urge you to endorse the Bauer Plan at your August meeting. I have lived at 328 Koser Avenue in University Heights since 1961. It has been a wonderful place to live and I'm hoping you help keep it that way.

Thank you!

Irene Bowers

[show](#)
[details](#) J
ul 24

Pat-

Can you explain to me how you arrived at the density of the proposal you submitted for the St. Andrew property?

Thank you-

Stan Laverman

[Reply](#) [Forward](#)

Reply

[show](#)
[details](#) Jul
14

Bauer, Patrick B

to me

Dear Stan,

I not sure which question you're asking, so I'll answer both.

The density of the "4/2-Residential" potential modification was derived from the number of units indicated in the original proposal. For the rear building, that involved dropping the number of residential units (12 & 11) for the two "deleted" floors (I & II), and for the front building, it involved (a) dropping the number of residential units (14) on the one deleted floor (III) and "converting" the first floor from 6 commercial units to 18 residential units (based on the residential "load" of the retained second floor). See first attachment.

The logic behind my "existing R-1" density calculations is reflected in the e-mail copied below and accompanying attachments.

Please let me know of any concerns you might have about the appropriateness if the assumptions I've used.

Best regards,

Pat

From: Bauer, Patrick B

Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 1:05 PM

To: 'Steve Ballard'

Cc: 'louisebob@mchsi.com'

Subject: Density Calculation

Dear Steve,

The meeting notices you sent out last year included the following description of what'd be doable on the St. Andrew site (i) under existing zoning provisions (ii) without the construction of additional streets:

Present Zoning Restrictions. Without construction of additional streets, the present zoning ordinance would permit about 9 single-family residential homes for the entire area of the proposed development

In contrast, the memo I sent to the other commissioners yesterday evening included the following:

The four parcels included in the submitted and resubmitted proposals theoretically might accommodate approximately thirty single-family residences, but the effects of the ravine and streets probably would reduce that to something in the vicinity of no more than twenty-four single-family residences.

Obviously not something of fundamental importance, but I'll lay out below the path that got to my numbers, and also am copying this to John and Kent in case they're able to shed any light on the matter.

Best regards,

Pat

SIZE OF RELEVANT AREAS

(approximations based on Johnson County GIS drawing function (attachment, p. 1))

Existing St. Andrew Parcels (1017101006 & 1017101001) = 4.5 acres
Adjacent Hargrave Parcels (1016228001 & 1016228002) = .75 acres

THEORETICAL MAXIMUM

Overall area (5.25 acres x 43,560 sf = 228,690 sf) **divided by** UH R-1 minimum lot area of 7,500 sf (Ord. 79, § 9.A). = 30.492

PROBABLE PRACTICAL MAXIMUM

Area of existing St. Andrew Parcels (i.e., leaving off adjacent Hargrave parcels) = 4.5 acres **multiplied by** "effective factor" 5.2 for R-8 parcels taken from Iowa City staff report on Hendrickson Lytham Condominiums (attachment, p. 3)) = 23.4

Email sent by Brennan McGrath regarding zoning proposals

Emails Wanting Approval of the Maxwell Development:

dorothy whiston <dwhiston@mchsi.com>
To: brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org

Fri, Aug 6, 2010 at 8:02 PM

Dear Mr. McGrath:

I am disappointed that I have to write you again asking you in the strongest terms to conclude this whole long ordeal and approve the Maxwell residential/commercial proposal. But I have been asked by a recent mailing purportedly in the interest of "unity" to contact you and so I will.

The costs and benefits of the proposal have been chewed over at length and the close but clear majority of UH residents have weighed in that the balance favors the development. Last minute tinkering is not the appropriate path especially when it has the transparent purpose of making it impossible for our partners in the process, Maxwell and Saint Andrews, to move forward. As an aside, I want to say that the argument that we should "support" Nate Kaeding's new restaurant by prohibiting a new coffee shop in the development made me sputter in anger. It's bad policy and approaching bad faith.

So, one last time, please approve the development.

John Whiston

317 Mahaska Dr

PS I am authorized to say that my wife Dorothy agrees with that last request but thinks I am being intemperate, so please blame that all on me.

Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com>
To: dorothy whiston <dwhiston@mchsi.com>
Bcc: Patrick B Bauer <patrick-bauer@uiowa.edu>

Fri, Aug 6, 2010 at 9:18 PM

Mr. Whiston

Thank you for your input.

I hope to conduct a "work session" with the rest of council so we can put this to rest.

I'm not not sure if I agree with a clear majority is 51-52%. This is a very complicated issue, changing the very dynamic of University Heights as a single family owner occupied community.

I really don't understand your coffee shop issue. Please clairify.

Thank you again, and I welcome your input.

Brennan McGrath

i Sent from my Phone4
Brennan McGrath,CSW
319-855-0050
[Quoted text hidden]

dorothy whiston <dwhiston@mchsi.com>
To: Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 6, 2010 at 10:09 PM

Mr. McGrath,

Thank you for responding so quickly and so thoughtfully. I really don't think that this development works a significant change on the living conditions of the vast majority of our residents. It does not affect any dynamic. I am not even sure what a dynamic is. If indeed the development changes something, I am convinced that it will all in all be for the best. The best neighborhoods have some variation in who lives there and what they do while they are there. Very minimal higher density housing and a modest commercial site adds quite more than it subtracts. My point about the coffee shop is that I don't believe that government should be intimately involved in deciding which free enterprises win and which lose and I would hope that no promises of support were made to Mr. Kaeding when he decided to open his restaurant, which I intend to patronize, a lot. Again thank you for so be willing to engage with me about these issues.

John Whiston

From: Brennan McGrath [mailto:brennanmcg@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 9:19 PM
To: dorothy whiston
Subject: Re: please approve the current Maxwell proposal

[Quoted text hidden]

Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 7, 2010 at 1:09 AM

To: Patrick B Bauer <patrick-bauer@uiowa.edu>

i Sent from my Phone4
Brennan McGrath,CSW
319-855-0050

Begin forwarded message:

From: "dorothy whiston" <dwhiston@mchsi.com>
Date: August 6, 2010 10:09:35 PM CDT
To: "Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: please approve the current Maxwell proposal
[Quoted text hidden]

jjbmuss@aol.com <jjbmuss@aol.com>
To: brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org

Fri, Aug 27, 2010 at 9:24 AM

Brennan: I noted in the Gazette article about the St Andrew property that your objection to having commercial sites in the lower level was the fact that there are such properties in downtown Iowa City with vacancies and you don't want this to be the case in U Hts.
Hope you can check this further because it had been my understanding for several years that the owners of many of those properties in the Downtown Business Zone don't really care nor need occupancy of the first floor commercial space to be economically viable. They are built as they are due to the zoning code in that this configuration reduces, maybe eliminates, the need for off street parking for those buildings. Given the location and market, they are rental housing properties and financially exist quite well on the basis of the apartment rental units alone. Any rental from the commercial space is sheer "gravity". Obviously, this would not be the case in U Hts and I would believe the commercial space should be quite attractive and interest a very different customer than the downtown sites. I also believe that most such buildings in downtown IC are owned by the Clark family. They know what works successfully for them!

Hopefully, you can further educate yourself on this before upcoming meetings.

Thanks for your attention. Jerry Musser

Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com>
To: jjbmuss@aol.com

Fri, Aug 27, 2010 at 1:47 PM

Jerry,
Great to hear from you.
Its amazing what reporters will choose what report on, and people will choose to comment on.
Commercial Property is based in speculation, but I appreciate yours.
I did research with a local prominent commercial Realtor to get the information I have.
I would encourage you to attend the meetings and or read the public minutes to get the most accurate information on what is said in these meetings.
Take Care,
Brennan
[Quoted text hidden]

--

Here's to each and every day!

Brennan McGrath CSW
Johnson Brothers of Iowa
Restaurant Division Sales & Education
319-855-0050 cell/text
BMcGrath@johnsonbrothers.com
BrennanMcG@gmail.com

Email sent by Jim Lane regarding zoning proposals

RE: please approve the current Maxwell proposal

Thursday, September 16, 2010 10:02 PM

From:

"dorothy whiston" <dwhiston@mchsi.com>Add sender to Contacts

To:

jim-lane@university-heights.org

Dear Jim,

It's been a long ordeal and will probably hang on a bit longer, but good job on the St. Andrews rezoning.

John

[Go to Previous message](#) | [Go to Next message](#) | [Back to Messages](#)
[Mark as Unread](#) / [Print](#)

[Flag this message](#)

Re: a time to meet?

Thursday, September 16, 2010 11:07 AM

From:

[This sender is DomainKeys verified](#)

"Alice Haugen" <alice.haugen@gmail.com>[Add sender to Contacts](#)

To:

"jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com>

Cc:

"Patricia Yeggy" <patbirk@yahoo.com>

Great!

Pat, would you like to meet me there at 3:00, at 3:30 with Jim, or at the UH office at 3:00?

Alice

Peace+ Alice

On Sep 16, 2010, at 10:58 AM, jim lane <jimlane@yahoo.com> wrote:

I would prefer to meet at 3:30 today. Stella's is fine. Jim Lane

--- On **Thu, 9/16/10, Alice Haugen** <alice.haugen@gmail.com> wrote:

From: Alice Haugen <alice.haugen@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: a time to meet?
To: "Patricia Yeggy" <patbirk@yahoo.com>, "Jim Lane - Council" <jimlane@yahoo.com>
Date: Thursday, September 16, 2010, 10:51 AM

Both of those times work for me. Shall we meet at Stella?

My preference would be to meet with each of you individually. However, if that is not an option I will meet with you both at once.

On Thursday, September 16, 2010, Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Alice,
>
> Jim Lane and I can meet with you today. 3:00 or 3:30?
>
> Pat Yeggy
>
> Hello - I would appreciate a time to meet with you sometime soon to
> discuss the University Heights sensitive areas ordinance and protected
> slopes. I can meet at almost any time except Tuesdays during the day or
> Sunday mornings. Thank you.
> Sincerely,
>
> Alice Haugen

Thursday, September 16, 2010 7:19 AM

From:

"jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com> [Add sender to Contacts](#)

To:

"Renee LGoethe" <renee-goethe@uiowa.edu>

Renee, Thank you for your comments and support. Sorry you will not be able to make upcoming council meetings. Look forward to hearing from you in the future. Jim Lane

--- On **Wed, 9/15/10, Goethe, Renee L** <renee-goethe@uiowa.edu> wrote:

Re: Tuesday's meeting

Sunday, September 12, 2010 7:50 PM

From:

"jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com> [Add sender to Contacts](#)

To:

Wretmans@aol.com

Thanks for your comments and support for the Maxwell proposal. It will be an interesting meeting on Tuesday. Jim Lane

--- On **Sun, 9/12/10, Wretmans@aol.com** <Wretmans@aol.com> wrote:

From: Wretmans@aol.com <Wretmans@aol.com>

Subject: Tuesday's meeting

To: jim-lane@university-heights.org

Date: Sunday, September 12, 2010, 7:36 PM

Jim

We won't be able to attend Tuesday's City Council meeting because of work commitments, but wanted to let you know that we still fully support the Maxwell proposal.

We attended the Council work session a couple of weeks ago and came away even more convinced it is the right thing to do for our city. We believe the development will add to our city in many positive ways. In addition, the retail element of the proposal will be essential to the future financial viability of University Heights.

Thanks for your service to our community.

Deb & Rich Wretman

Number of units in Maxwell Proposal

Sunday, September 12, 2010 10:06 AM

From:

"jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com> [Add sender to Contacts](#)

To:

stan-laverman@university-heights.org

Stan, When I saw you yesterday I thought maybe I could grab you for a quick chat but there were too many other things going on, so I am emailing you this note. I wanted to give you some of my recent thinking and perspective. First I think the revisions to the parking looks very good. We get more green space and hopefully the new number of spaces is about right. Second, I agree with you that there are too many of these small units(<750sq.ft) and they need to combine a number of them into larger units. In my conversation with Marc Moen he indicated about 4-5 units he sold were combined by the owners which I think could occur with the Maxwell project. I am thinking about 1,000 and 2,000 square foot units being combined to 2,000-3,000 square foot units not just the combining of the smaller ones. We might look at a number of 87 units and assume that 6-8 others might be combined by the buyers (both larger and smaller units) which would get us in the range of 80 units. Just wanted to share my thoughts about this before the meeting. Jim Lane

Email sent by Pat Yeggy regarding zoning amendments

Re: The ravine

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: joseph frankel <joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu>

Hi Joe,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts and ideas about the ravine. I thought I might ask our engineer or someone at the assessor's office to estimate how much of the area's wooded area would be affected by the Maxwell development, and I think your estimate of "less than 5%" is pretty good.

I too thought the animals would move to avoid being crushed.

Drainage from a development will be detained and retained to "best management practices" standards so that drainage is controlled. I don't know what this involves, but imagine we will all get an education in the coming months. We want to preserve and enhance our native landscape to the highest degree possible anyway.

I'm glad you suggested looking at the area with google maps. I looked at it with bing maps "bird's eye view" too, which also gives one a good look at the terrain, plus you can spin around and look from all four sides.

Pat Yeggy

From: joseph frankel <joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Sat, August 7, 2010 1:01:23 PM

Subject: The ravine

Dear Mayor From and Council members:

I am writing you under the encouragement of a letter from the "Friends of the University Heights Community", concerning one of their "Facts about University Heights development". Fact No. 7 states "The development involves filling in the ravine, one of our few remaining green spaces and home to a variety of animals and birds".

Since I used to wander about in the woods downstream from said ravine, I checked this out this morning. First, I located University Heights in the satellite version of Google Maps (The overprint of streets is wrong, but I presume that the satellite photography is correct). U.H. is fortunate to share with the University of Iowa a substantial wooded area between the Athletic Club & St. Andrew's Church on the south, and the Finkbine Lot & the railroad tracks on the north.

If one compares this map to the map in the "One University Place" proposal provided on the UH website, you will see that the area to be filled in by the proposed development comprises at most 5 percent of the total forested area - probably less than that. It is the headwater of the central of three small valleys - the west valley starts between St. Andrews and Birkdale, and a third, shorter east valley has its head at 304 Sunset St.

To see the affected area more closely, magnify the satellite map and draw a line between 1504 Grand Avenue (where the avenue now bends) and the bus shed behind St. Andrews. The small triangular patch of woods south of that line is what would be filled - actually, about 2/3 of it, if you look at Maxwell's plan carefully.

What looks small on a map might be large in reality. I re-explored the whole area this morning, but it is (alas) very overgrown, and I don't recommend it - although there is some fine mature forest in the lower part of the valley.

It turns out that you can get a good sense of the area to be affected from the eastern border of the St. Andrew's property. Just go to a spot just above their bus shed and look down, and across to 1504 Grand Ave. There is an open patch of bramble (impassible!) at the bottom of a deep ravine. As best I can read the Maxwell plan, the filled in roadway would cross the ravine diagonally from NE to SW just above that open patch.

So what's in that area to be filled in? You can get a sense of that by scrambling down (carefully!) on a rough deer path starting from space #32 on the St. Andrews lot - or even just looking in from that spot on the lot or from the opposite side on Sunset Street. You will see a handsome old bur oak, and several black walnuts. A bit down the valley is a huge mature catalpa - not native to the area! I didn't see any animals or birds, but then I wasn't looking carefully, and it was too late in the morning for birds. I did surprise a deer and spot raccoon tracks further downstream.

So what do I conclude from this? The area to be filled in is small but of reasonably high quality, and because it is rather deep it will take a lot of fill to fill it. I suspect that the animals in the area will have the good sense to move downstream before getting crushed. But the overall "greenspace" that you can see on the Google satellite map will be only minimally reduced.

A more serious question relates to quality of the valley downstream from the development. Right now, the small streams in the valley look reasonably clear to me. But what will happen when the headwaters of one of these streams is converted into a steep embankment, and there is a 95-unit condominium with a paved parking lot built on top of it? The banks will have to be stabilized, probably by retaining walls as one sees at Birkdale, so that the stream valley does not become silted (as happened when the Finkbine Lot was built). There also has to be some adequate provision for controlled drainage down this greatly altered area, so that the stream remains clear.

Assuming that this can be worked out, I'll be bold and make a further suggestion. The greenspace should eventually become a nature preserve (with the hopeful cooperation of the University of Iowa, which owns half of it). The former informal trail along the ridge (starting at the northern dead-end of Sunset Street) should be cleared and re-opened, and a new trail built up the valley - making a loop like the lovely 1-mile loop trail in Ryerson's Woods, at the south edge of Iowa City. University Heights should devote some tax money to it - as our park - and Jeff Maxwell, as a recompense for the real damage done by his development (if it is approved), should provide some labor and perhaps some capital as well for the trail-building project. It should be accessible to all. It would then enhance his development and enhance the community - a win-win situation, that would more than compensate for the lost headwaters of one of the small streams in the UH/UI woodland.

-Joe Frankel

-- Joseph Frankel
323 Koser Ave,
Iowa City, IA 52246

UH storm sewer map

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Jeff Maxwell <jmaxwell@maxwellconstructioninc.com>

StormMap-1108.pdf (1231KB)

storm sewer map attached

Pat Yeggy

Dear John,

I'm glad to hear that you are in favor of moving forward with the Maxwell development (as are many other residents).

It's always encouraging to hear from supporters!!

Pat Yeggy

From: dorothy whiston <dwhiston@mchsi.com>

To: pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Fri, August 6, 2010 8:04:25 PM

Subject: please approve the current Maxwell proposal

Dear Pat,

I am disappointed that I have to write you again asking you in the strongest terms to conclude this whole long ordeal and approve the Maxwell residential/commercial proposal. But I have been asked by a recent mailing purportedly in the interest of "unity" to contact you and so I will.

The costs and benefits of the proposal have been chewed over at length and the close but clear majority of UH residents have weighed in that the balance favors the development. Last minute tinkering is not the appropriate path especially when it has the transparent purpose of making it impossible for our partners in the process, Maxwell and Saint Andrews, to move forward. As an aside, I want to say that the argument that we should "support" Nate Kaeding's new restaurant by prohibiting a new coffee shop in the development made me sputter in anger. It's bad policy and approaching bad faith.

So, one last time, please approve the development.

John Whiston
317 Mahaska Dr

PS I am authorized to say that my wife Dorothy agrees with that last request but thinks I am being intemperate, so please blame that all on me.

Re:

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Streif, John G" <John-Streif@hawkeyehealthcare.com>

Dear John,

I'm glad to hear that you are in favor of moving forward with the Maxwell development (as are many other residents).

It's always encouraging to hear from supporters!!

I thought that Jim Lane was by far the best candidate for city council.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Streif, John G" <John-Streif@hawkeyehealthcare.com>

To: "louise-from@university-heights.org" <louise-from@university-heights.org>; "mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org" <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>; "jim-lane@university-heights.org" <jim-lane@university-heights.org>; "stan-laverman@university-heights.org" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>; "brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org" <brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org>; "pat-yeggy@university-heights.org" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>

Sent: Thu, August 5, 2010 11:41:56 AM

Subject:

I support the appointment to fill the council vacancy as reflecting the views of the member being replaced and voted in. New appointment will reflect this community and feel the council did the correct thing.

I am also supportive of the development project for St. Andrews.

John Streif

Re: University Heights Building Code

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Liesa Parko <lkparko@yahoo.com>

Thank you for being concerned citizens and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Please pass on my thoughts to the Schmidts and Mrs. Rowley

Pat Yeggy

From: Liesa Parko <lkparko@yahoo.com>
To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org
Sent: Sun, August 8, 2010 10:28:07 AM
Subject: Fw: University Heights Building Code

I was asked to forward this message from the Schmidt family and Elizabeth Rowley.

Liesa Moore

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "RichSchmidtIA@msn.com" <RichSchmidtIA@msn.com>
To: lkparko@yahoo.com
Sent: Mon, August 2, 2010 7:44:39 AM
Subject: Fw: University Heights Building Code

Schmidt address is 207 Mahaska Dr. Rowley address is 216 Mahaska Dr

From: RichSchmidtIA@msn.com
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 7:36 AM
To: lkparko@yahoo.com
Subject: University Heights Building Code

We do not support a change in the building code. We do not want to become like Iowa City and look like the congested complex that was recently built on Benton Street next to the Muslim church.

Saint Andrew property has not been offered for sale until the congregation, Presbytery all concur on the sale. The division within the church has cost all of us at St. Andrew Presbyterian church, Why has the UH Council continued to pursue this property with Maxwell construction as the sole developer? Are you really acting as a good citizen?

Richard K. Schmidt
Mary L. Schmidt
Karla Schmidt

For our neighbor that does not have a computer, She wishes to put her support to not change the building code of University Heights.

Elizabeth Rowley

Re: Maxwell Development Proposal for the St Andrew Church Site Questions & Concerns

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>
From: ...
View Contact
To: "Wilson, Larry T" <larry-wilson@uiowa.edu>

Larry -

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I know I will read your letter several more times, as I value your knowledge and opinions above many others.

I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Wilson, Larry T" <larry-wilson@uiowa.edu>
To: "louise-from@university-heights.org" <louise-from@university-heights.org>; "mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org" <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>; "jim-lane@university-heights.org" <jim-lane@university-heights.org>; "stan-laverman@university-heights.org" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>; "brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org" <brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org>; "pat-yeggy@university-heights.org" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>
Sent: Sun, August 8, 2010 1:19:59 PM
Subject: FW: Maxwell Development Proposal for the St Andrew Church Site Questions & Concerns

Dear Council members--

I am writing to urge you to vote for the alternative development plan approved by the Zoning Commission 4 to 1 at their July 22 meeting. Based upon years of planning experience, I firmly believe that the Maxwell development proposal is much too dense to appropriately fit into the predominantly single-family UH neighborhood. I fully understand the importance of increasing the UH tax base, but believe the alternative proposal approved by the Zoning Commission provides a sufficient future tax base (as explained and verified by Pat Bauer's presentation at the July 22nd zoning meeting) while reasonably fitting proposed development into the surrounding single-family neighborhood and the rest of the UH community. The alternative plan recommends bridging the east ravine along Sunset rather than filling it in further reducing the development impact.

The alternative development proposal approved by the Zoning Commission incorporates the fully stated principles of smart growth better than the Maxwell proposal because it reasonably fits into the community (refer to the full smart growth principle statements in the attached smart growth document under "**Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place.**") The alternative proposal also represents an attempt at collaboration with the Maxwell team by the UH community as a development proposal that would reasonably fit into the character of the UH Neighborhood, which would respond to the development vision of at least half of the UH community and which would be a bridging element to reunite the evenly divided UH community. See the full text for smart growth principle "**Encourage Community and Stakeholder Collaboration**" in the attachment. The Maxwell team made no attempt at collaboration with the UH community and instead consistently presented the same plan as proposed in the beginning. Although comments were taken at public meetings, they resulted in no substantial change in the development plan. Furthermore, the ability to make the alternative plan feasible should not be

held hostage to an out-of-line commitment on the part of the developer to pay such a high price (\$4.3M) for the land which would clearly not be worth that amount without the change in zoning and the proposed high density development. The more reasonable density of the approved alternative plan would be feasible with an appropriate price paid for land purchase.

While the alternative proposal would provide quality housing for people of all income levels and provide a range of housing choices the same as the Maxwell plan, it does eliminate the mixing of commercial zoning into the development. The commercial development is eliminated for the purpose of reducing the large amount of parking required by UH regulations for commercial development and resulting traffic, and noise and other disturbances from commercial activities, thereby significantly reducing the impact of the entire development on the UH community. Additionally, Mr. Maxwell stated at the last zoning meeting that rental/lease rates for commercial space would be \$30/sq ft which he acknowledged would be too high a rate for coffee shops and other similar small businesses which would primarily serve the UH neighborhood. He indicated that the high rent/lease rate would be more applicable to higher end businesses such as attorneys' offices which would not be particularly oriented to the UH neighborhood. Therefore, according to Mr. Maxwell himself, the commercial development would not expressly serve the UH community. I earnestly and firmly believe that the tradeoff of no commercial for reduced hard-surface parking, more green space, preservation of the environmentally-sensitive ravine, traffic impact and total development impact is necessary and reasonable.

In reviewing the One University Place slideshow presented at the July 22nd zoning meeting and recently posted on the UH website, I find there are a number of discrepancies in the slides. I have e-mailed the letter below to Maxwell's architect Kevin Monson to request clarifications and answers to my questions, but I have not yet heard back. I collaborated with *UH Place* on the attached Principles of "Smart Growth Compared to Maxwell's Smart Growth Development" so I agree with the document.

Please read the information below and as attached, and vote in favor of the alternative development in order to bring our divided community back together and create a development that is truly in synch with the Smart Growth Network's *Principles of Smart Growth*.

Sincerely,

Larry

From: Wilson, Larry T

Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 5:30 PM

To: 'Kevin Monson'

Subject: One University Place July 15 Final PUD Submission PowerPoint Presentation Questions

Importance: High

Good afternoon Kevin--

The One University Place July 15 Final PUD Submission PowerPoint Presentation was recently placed on the University Heights website. In looking at the slides where I can view them a bit longer, I have some question items that I would like you to confirm or clarify.

I notice that in slide 17, which I believe is taken from about the location of the proposed Sunset St. access south of the Sunset and Grand Ave. intersection (which I believe is not from one of the 7 locations from which pictures were taken) The perspective makes both the low-rise and high-rise buildings look really far away. In reality, after constructed, they will appear to be much closer. In my experience, digital perspectives/renderings tend to provide

more of a realistic view of buildings than of the site features and tend to make buildings/objects appear to be further away. Can that be corrected?

It appears that on slides 28 & 29 (photo location 3), slides 31 & 32 (photo location 4), slides 34 & 35 (photo location 5) and slides 37 & 38 (photo location 6) existing trees are shown as screening the building, but aerial view (birdseye view) slide 19 and perspective slides 1, 14 & 16 show those existing trees along Melrose in front of the proposed building as removed. Trees shown in the perspective slides 1, 14 & 16 are between the sidewalk and curb where there currently are none and they are spaced differently than the existing trees, plus, the low-rise building is at sidewalk elevation which would require filling around the existing trees. It appears that all the trees along Melrose are future plantings (with the exception of the three trees shown on Site Plan slide 3 to be saved) and would require many years to mature. Slide 16 shows a couple of large deciduous trees that do not currently exist as well. Site Plan slide 3 seems also to confirm this and shows only the aforementioned trees to be saved, which I presume are the three large spruce trees. As mentioned at the last zoning meeting, almost all of the surrounding existing trees indicated in the various slides as providing screening are deciduous trees that would lose their leaves in the winter, which means they would be without leaves longer than with them. As discussed below, the existing trees along the west side of the current alignment of north Sunset and in the adjacent ravine will apparently not be there at all (after the ravine is filled in).

Another misleading element is that according to the Site Plan slide 3, which shows some preliminary proposed grading, specifically contours 770, 760 and 750, the ravine would be filled to north of the proposed new access road and the resulting toe of the new fill slope would extend northward almost to the north property line as indicated by the unlabeled contour 740. As best I can determine from the unlabeled existing contour lines, it looks like there would be about 30 feet of fill at the proposed 770 contour as it crosses the existing contour at the bottom of the ravine a bit north of the proposed access road. However, slides 37, 38 & 40 show the existing trees in the south end of the ravine from its beginning near Melrose to almost the St. Andrew north property line as remaining when they are indicated on the Site Plan slide 3 as being removed. The street trees shown on the Site Plan slide 3 along the west side of the realigned Sunset would be future plantings as well as the trees shown north of the proposed Sunset access road to about the St. Andrew north property line. These trees would require many years to mature into a significant screen. This also means that the existing trees shown on slide 40 as screening the view from Grand Ave. projected into the site would be removed.

In addition, the east ravine is shown in the UH Comprehensive Plan as a sensitive area and the slope and depth of the ravine would certainly qualify it for the UH Sensitive Areas Ordinance 128, Section 2, paragraph "E. Protected slope: Any slope rising forty percent (40%) or steeper over a run of 10 feet," and would require protection as specified under Section 3, paragraph C which follows:

"Protected Slopes: Any area designated as a protected slope shall not be graded and must remain in its existing state, except natural vegetation may be supplemented by other plant material.

Development activities may be allowed within areas containing protected slopes **previously altered by human activity** (which has not occurred) if a geologist or professional engineer can demonstrate to the University Heights City Council's satisfaction that development activity will not undermine the stability of the slope, and the City further determines the development activities are consistent with the intent of the Sensitive Areas Ordinance. Moreover, proposed development of such property shall be required to submit a development plan and grading plan, as well as a sensitive areas site plan, all of which must be approved by the University Heights City Council before commencement of any development."

I am very concerned about a site plan that is dependent upon filling the ravine when the ravine is designated as an area to be protected.

I should note that the smart growth principles submitted by Mr. Maxwell neglected to mention that in the Smart Growth: New State Legislation that Kent Ralston read at the last zoning meeting states under "Community character-Activities and development that are consistent with the character and architectural style of the community should be promoted. His (Mr. Maxwell's) smart grow principles as submitted also edited out some critical language about fitting a development into a neighborhood. Below is the complete statement for (Maxwell's) Principle 4 "Foster Distinctive Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place," with the **wording left out highlighted in yellow**. The submitted principle is misleading and should be corrected. I have attached the source document--just click on the highlighted paragraph for the full statement.

Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place

Smart growth encourages communities to craft a vision and set standards for development and construction which respond to community values of architectural beauty and distinctiveness, as well as expanded choices in housing and transportation. **It seeks to create interesting, unique communities which reflect the values and cultures of the people who reside there, and foster the types of physical environments which support a more cohesive community fabric. Smart growth promotes development which uses natural and man-made boundaries and landmarks to create a sense of defined neighborhoods, towns, and regions.** It encourages the construction and preservation of buildings which prove to be assets to a community over time, not only because of the services provided within, but because of the unique contribution they make on the outside to the look and feel of a city.

Guided by a vision of how and where to grow, communities are able to identify and utilize opportunities to make new development conform to their standards of distinctiveness and beauty. Contrary to the current mode of development, smart growth ensures that the value of infill and greenfield development is determined as much by their accessibility (by car or other means) as their physical orientation to and relationship with other buildings and open space. By creating high-quality communities with architectural and natural elements that reflect the interests of all residents, there is a greater likelihood that buildings (and therefore entire neighborhoods) will retain their economic vitality and value over time. In so doing, the infrastructure and natural resources used to create these areas will provide residents with a distinctive and beautiful place that they can call "home" for generations to come.

It is my understanding that Mr. Maxwell stated at the last zoning meeting that rental/lease rates (for commercial space) would be \$30/sq ft which he acknowledged would be too high a rate for coffee shops and other similar small businesses which would primarily serve the UH neighborhood. He indicated that the high rent/lease rate would be more applicable to higher end businesses such as attorneys' offices which would not be particularly oriented to the UH neighborhood . The Site Plan slide 3 continues to label the commercial as "neighborhood commercial" which does not seem to be the case.

I appreciate your help in answering/clarifying my questions.

Larry

Re: Please vote for the Bauer alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrew site

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Nancy Barnes <nbarnes.kohout@gmail.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Nancy Barnes <nbarnes.kohout@gmail.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Sun, August 8, 2010 6:18:07 PM

Subject: Please vote for the Bauer alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrew site

Dear Mayor From and Council Members Haverkamp, Lane, Laverman, McGrath and Yeggy,

We would like to urge you to vote to accept the Bauer alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrew Church property and to reject Mr. Maxwell's plan, which the Zoning Commission did do at its July 22 meeting.

The alternative plan is less massive and intrusive than the Maxwell plan, and it would fit far better into our community. A smaller development such as the Bauer plan envisions would have fewer residents and consequently fewer vehicles to increase traffic on our streets which is a major concern of many present residents of our community. And a plan such as the Bauer plan would be kinder to our local environment for it would not require the destruction of the east ravine, an area that we believe should be preserved and protected according to our city ordinance number 128. The ravine is home to deer, wild turkeys and other creatures whose habitat would be destroyed, thus driving the animals out or destroying them also. We humans, too, need the natural environment of our green woods with their rich vegetal and animal wildlife in our lives.

The desire to lower our property taxes has been a major concern of many of us. However, as we understand it, we cannot be sure that development of this property would result in a decrease in property taxes for us anytime soon, for any TIF agreement, depending on how it is structured, could delay the developer's tax payments to the city for several years.

In addition, Mr. Maxwell's plan to include commercial space in his development appeals to many UH residents who thought, as Mr. Maxwell led us to believe, that that would mean something welcome like a grocery store or a coffee shop. But he has acknowledged that commercial space would be leased at high rates, that commercial real estate professionals regard as too high for such businesses to be viable. Rather, such spaces would be affordable for law offices or accounting firms perhaps, which would not enrich life in our community as such, however pleasant the new lawyers, etc., might be as individuals. However, without Mr. Maxwell's help we will soon have Nate Kaeding's new restaurant and coffee shop at the Melrose-Golfview Avenue corner which we hope we will all be able to enjoy for a long time.

Our community has been quite divided on the matter of the Maxwell development plan - close to evenly divided, we think. Approval of the Bauer plan for development could help bring us back together around a very livable plan to truly enhance our small city. We hope you will carefully consider the real virtues of the Bauer plan and accept it and reject the Maxwell plan which has caused real discord among us.

Sincerely,

Nancy Barnes-Kohout
Frank Kohout

Re: approve the Bauer alternative proposal

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Eunice Hunzelman <ehunzelman@yahoo.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Eunice Hunzelman <ehunzelman@yahoo.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverhamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stanlaverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Sun, August 8, 2010 9:34:12 PM

Subject: approve the Bauer alternative proposal

We urge you to vote no for the Maxwell plan for developing the St. Andrew property.

If this plan is approved, it would increase the traffic by our home tremendously. We would no longer be living in the nice, quite neighborhood we live in now.

We would be in favor of the Bauer alternative proposal.

Russ and Eunice Hunzelman
1456 Grand Av.

Re: St. Andrew Property Development

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Jan Leff <jaleff@mchsi.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer.

I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

I have never been a proponent of collapsing votes. This issue is much too important for me to even consider it.

Pat Yeggy

From: Jan Leff <jaleff@mchsi.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Sun, August 8, 2010 7:49:45 PM

Subject: St. Andrew Property Development

Dear Mayor From and Councilors:

I am concerned about a possible path that this council could take as it takes action on the request of Jeff Maxwell to rezone and develop the St. Andrew Church property. This process involves voting on the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance. It is required that such ordinance must be voted on at three successive meetings unless the council votes by a super majority to suspend these rules by reducing such successive votes.

This requirement of three successive considerations is to provide ample time for the community members to become informed and to express their reactions to the proposed amendment ordinance. This suspension of these rules should be used very sparingly and certainly not when the matter before the council is highly contested. To do otherwise would defeat the meaning and intent of these rules.

The controversy arising out of the Jeff Maxwell proposal has been very pronounced since it was first submitted in 2009 with a large portion of the community expressing concerns and objections to the proposal. The zoning commission has now rejected this proposal both times it has been considered. But more importantly, a compromise development offered by Pat Bauer, introduced at the July 15, 2010 Zoning Commission hearing, has the potential for widespread support. However there has not been sufficient time to fully inform the community about the details of this proposal because of the short time period since its introduction and also because it has occurred during the months of July and August when so many people are gone. The Bauer proposal represents a compromise to the Maxwell development that provides the church with a potential buyer for a development that could have strong support within the community.

The magnitude of the impact of any development on our community is huge and should not reach this point of consideration until our citizens have had ample opportunity to become informed and to have the opportunity for the community input and discussion. Apparently Jeff Maxwell's agreement with the church has some form of deadline in August, but this time parameter should not trump the duty and obligation of the council to provide its citizens with reasonable opportunities to have input in matters that are so vital to the continuity of our community.

The community needs the opportunity to hear the Bauer proposal and to respond to it. I personally feel that it offers a very reasonable compromise that should be of real interest to potential developers of the St. Andrew property, even if, at this time, Mr. Maxwell says that he is not. I sincerely urge you to reject any proposal to suspend the rule of three successive considerations and to perform your function as a city councilor with dignity and respect.

Sincerely,

Al Leff

Re: University Heights Council

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: hedlundsc@aol.com

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I think the council listens to all sides of the issue. Just because residents of the proposed development may not speak in public, there are many of them, who also have opinions which they have expressed to me. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "hedlundsc@aol.com" <hedlundsc@aol.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

Sent: Sun, August 8, 2010 7:47:12 PM

Subject: University Heights Council

University Heights Council,

I write this letter with a great sense of frustration, disappointment and anger. We do not think that most of you listening to what a large number of the citizens of University Heights have been saying to the council. I spent many years on the University Heights city council and we never would have treated a large group of citizens in this manner.

The zoning commission believes in the Pat Bauer plan and we think that that he has ideas that we could live with here in the neighborhood.

The Maxwell plan destroys the greenbelt that buffers the development and dumps 1500 cars a day on our quiet narrow residential street. In addition to the cars, we will have delivery trucks, garbage trucks, moving vans and etc on a small street. The light and noise pollution will be enormous.

How can you do this to us?

Why is the Maxwell plan the only plan?

The total disregard for your fellow University Heights is unforgivable.

Steve and Chris Hedlund (Long time residents who have worked here, raised their family here and hate to see the end of the single family tradition that we worked so hard to save.)

Fw: The ravine

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Pat Yeggy <pat.yeggy@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: joseph frankel <joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Sat, August 7, 2010 1:01:23 PM

Subject: The ravine

Dear Mayor From and Council members:

I am writing you under the encouragement of a letter from the "Friends of the University

Heights Community", concerning one of their "Facts about University Heights development". Fact No. 7 states "The development involves filling in the ravine, one of our few remaining green spaces and home to a variety of animals and birds".

Since I used to wander about in the woods downstream from said ravine, I checked this out this morning. First, I located University Heights in the satellite version of Google Maps (The overprint of streets is wrong, but I presume that the satellite photography is correct). U.H. is fortunate to share with the University of Iowa a substantial wooded area between the Athletic Club & St. Andrew's Church on the south, and the Finkbine Lot & the railroad tracks on the north.

If one compares this map to the map in the "One University Place" proposal provided on the UH website, you will see that the area to be filled in by the proposed development comprises at most 5 percent of the total forested area - probably less than that. It is the headwater of the central of three small valleys - the west valley starts between St. Andrews and Birkdale, and a third, shorter east valley has its head at 304 Sunset St.

To see the affected area more closely, magnify the satellite map and draw a line between 1504 Grand Avenue (where the avenue now bends) and the bus shed behind St. Andrews. The small triangular patch of woods south of that line is what would be filled - actually, about 2/3 of it, if you look at Maxwell's plan carefully.

What looks small on a map might be large in reality. I re-explored the whole area this morning, but it is (alas) very overgrown, and I don't recommend it - although there is some fine mature forest in the lower part of the valley.

It turns out that you can get a good sense of the area to be affected from the eastern border of the St. Andrew's property. Just go to a spot just above their bus shed and look down, and across to 1504 Grand Ave. There is an open patch of bramble (impassible!) at the bottom of a deep ravine. As best I can read the Maxwell plan, the filled in roadway would cross the ravine diagonally from NE to SW just above that open patch.

So what's in that area to be filled in? You can get a sense of that by scrambling down (carefully!) on a rough deer path starting from space #32 on the St. Andrews lot - or even just looking in from that spot on the lot or from the opposite side on Sunset Street. You will see a handsome old bur oak, and several black walnuts. A bit down the valley is a huge mature catalpa - not native to the area! I didn't see any animals or birds, but then I wasn't looking carefully, and it was too late in the morning for birds. I did surprise a deer and spot raccoon tracks further downstream.

So what do I conclude from this? The area to be filled in is small but of reasonably high quality, and because it is rather deep it will take a lot of fill to fill it. I suspect that the animals in the area will have the good sense to move downstream before getting crushed. But the overall "greenspace" that you can see on the Google satellite map will be only minimally reduced.

A more serious question relates to quality of the valley downstream from the development. Right now, the small streams in the valley look reasonably clear to me. But what will happen when the headwaters of one of these streams is converted into a steep embankment, and there is a 95-unit condominium with a paved parking lot built on top of it? The banks will have to be stabilized, probably by retaining walls as one sees at Birkdale, so that the stream valley does not become silted (as happened when the Finkbine Lot was built). There also has to be some adequate provision for controlled drainage down this greatly altered area, so that the stream remains clear.

Assuming that this can be worked out, I'll be bold and make a further suggestion. The greenspace should eventually become a nature preserve (with the hopeful cooperation of the University of Iowa, which owns half of it). The former informal trail along the ridge (starting at the

northern dead-end of Sunset Street) should be cleared and re-opened, and a new trail built up the valley - making a loop like the lovely 1-mile loop trail in Ryerson's Woods, at the south edge of Iowa City. University Heights should devote some tax money to it - as our park - and Jeff Maxwell, as a recompense for the real damage done by his development (if it is approved), should provide some labor and perhaps some capital as well for the trail-building project. It should be accessible to all. It would then enhance his development and enhance the community - a win-win situation, that would more than compensate for the lost headwaters of one of the small streams in the UH/UI woodland.

-Joe Frankel

-- Joseph Frankel
323 Koser Ave,
Iowa City, IA 52246

Re: Council Vote

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: HopsonRC@aol.com

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "HopsonRC@aol.com" <HopsonRC@aol.com>

To: stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; louise-from@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org

Cc: mary-mathew-wilson@uiowa.edu

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 9:26:15 AM

Subject: Council Vote

Dear Mayor Louise From and Councilpersons Mike Haverkamp, Jim Lane, Stan Laverman, Brennan McGrath, and Pat Yeggy,

I am writing to urge you to accept the Zoning Commission's recommendation to approve the alternative (Bauer) plan for the rezoning and development of the St. Andrew church property and to reject the Maxwell plan (as the Zoning Commission did at its July 22nd meeting).

The alternative plan is a compromise that shows the residents of UHeights ARE willing to work together as a community. This plan allows for development but will keep our neighborhood with a similar feeling as it has now. A large portion of UHeights was originally against any development - and this proves that working together has allowed us to compromise. I won't go into any of the reasons why this works - as Mary Matthews Wilson's letter summarizes that beautifully. I think you should weigh heavily the sentiments from the residents that have lived here a long time and have invested in this community. These are the same people that will be here for years to come. The 'renters' are fleeting and don't have a real grasp on the situation or what it entails.

Pat Bauer gave a very professional, thoughtful presentation at the last zoning meeting. I really wish all of the council members would have attended. Quite frankly Mr. Bauer put Mr. Maxwell to shame and it became apparent that Mr. Maxwell had not done any of his homework. When asked point blank by a UH resident if he (Mr. Maxwell) had looked at the income figures on the Bauer plan he simply replied, "No". To me, this cavalier attitude either says that we don't deserve his time and/or why would he waste it on researching what the people want. OR, he simply doesn't have the knowledge base or felt it was not important enough. If the Maxwell/Monson team isn't organized at the beginning of a project - how can we expect them to be organized as it progresses?

You have a councilor who's house is on the historic registry and supports the society by placing it on tour every year. The proposed development is in direct contradiction to the ideals of a historic society. The lack of continuity in thinking perplexes me.

I, too urge you to follow the Zoning Commission's recommendation to approve the alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrews church property and I hope you make the Maxwell plan and all of the destructive ideas around and behind it a piece of history that we, as a community, will never want to revisit in the future.

Sincerely,

Rosanne Hopson

Re: Zoning Commission recommendation

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Greg <colophonic@yahoo.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Greg <colophonic@yahoo.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 10:00:11 AM

Subject: Zoning Commission recommendation

Councilors,

I am writing to urge you to respect the judgment of the Zoning Commission and reject the Maxwell development proposal at your upcoming Council meeting. The issue on the table is whether or not to re-zone that property, and I believe it should not be re-zoned. If it is, it should only be re-zoned to the extent that would allow the Bauer alternative plan to proceed.

This issue has been simmering for so long in our community now, leading to deep and increasingly personal divisions on both sides of the issue. To me, that is a clear indication that it is the wrong plan at the wrong time. Please act in accordance with our Zoning Commission and the feelings of half (at a minimum) of UH residents and reject this proposal, and begin to focus on re-building a sense of trust and community through your work as representative elected officials.

Sincerely,

Greg Prickman
321 Koser Ave.

Re: Maxwell proposal

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Hettmansperger, Sue E" <sue-hettmansperger@uiowa.edu>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Hettmansperger, Sue E" <sue-hettmansperger@uiowa.edu>

To: "louise-from@university-heights.org" <louise-from@university-heights.org>; "mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org" <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>; "jim-lane@university-heights.org" <jim-lane@university-heights.org>; "stan-laverman@university-heights.org" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>; "brennan-mcgrath@university-

heights.org" <brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org>; "pat-yeggy@university-heights.org" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>

Cc: "pbb338koser@aol.com" <pbb338koser@aol.com>; "wallu@aol.com" <wallu@aol.com>; "cathlane07@gmail.com" <cathlane07@gmail.com>; "wkrkar@aol.com" <wkrkar@aol.com>; "wallacegay@mchsi.com" <wallacegay@mchsi.com>

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 10:53:49 AM

Subject: Maxwell proposal

Dear City Council and Zoning Commission members,

I have been following the ongoing yearly discussions of development pressures that have occupied University Heights for the ten years I have lived here. Due to the charming nature of our housing stock and quiet residential feel of this very small single family cluster of homes, developers have pressured us continually from all sides to infill more and more land. The existing high density nature of what surrounds us at this point is already a threat to the quality of life and aesthetic charm of our community. I am opposed to the current Maxwell proposal for a PUD on the site of St. Andrews Church. As Maxwell stated in one of the meetings last year, "I don't care what you people think." And he doesn't care that his massive development is completely out of character with our existing community. I would prefer to re-think the future of the site if sold, and I am in favor of single-family dwellings similar to existing homes. If this is not possible, I would support scaled-back proposals such as the Bauer plan, though even that plan seems too dense. Bauer is a brilliant supporter of our best interests and should be commended for his thoughtful approach to compromise.

Sincerely,

Sue Hettmansperger, Professor of Art, Univ. of Iowa
114 Highland Drive, 52246

Re: to louise from, pat yeggy, & stan laverman: re facts about university heights development

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Bruell, Sue E" <sue-bruell@uiowa.edu>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Bruell, Sue E" <sue-bruell@uiowa.edu>

To: "louise-from@university-heights.org" <louise-from@university-heights.org>; "pat-yeggy@university-heights.org" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>; "stan-laverman@university-

heights.org" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>

Cc: "Bruell, Sue E" <sue-bruell@uiowa.edu>; "sbruell@yahoo.com" <sbruell@yahoo.com>

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 11:23:12 AM

Subject: to louise from, pat yeggy, & stan laverman: re facts about university heights development

Monday, August 09, 2010

Dear Louise, Pat, and Stan,

**I am unable to attend the meeting Tuesday night.
Please make my comments public to the group.**

I oppose the Maxwell development of the St. Andrew's property. It will potentially overload Melrose Avenue and other University Heights roadways at the busiest commuting times of the day.

I oppose the filling in of the ravine bordering the St. Andrew's property. The homeowners nearby deserve better from us, as does the wildlife that will be displaced.

I support "reasonable and workable alternatives to the Maxwell development plan," as noted in paragraph 9 in the blue flier, entitled "Friends of University Heights."

Thank you again for your tireless efforts and good works.

Regards,

**Sue Bruell
124 Koser Avenue**

Re: Support Maxwell Development

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Donald Baxter <donald.baxter@gmail.com>

Good letter, though you sure are in the minority!!
Here's mt stock answer:

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this

decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Donald Baxter <donald.baxter@gmail.com>
To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org
Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 12:07:56 PM
Subject: Support Maxwell Development

To the City Council of University Heights:

One thing we know about the future of University Heights is that it will change. It has changed just in the six years I have lived here. Our town has become more diverse, more rental-occupied and more congested; I actually see these as positive opportunities to be leveraged for community development. These trends will continue regardless of whether the Maxwell development is approved for the SAPC site. The challenges that University Heights faces, managed and planned for appropriately can represent a real opportunity to build a real town out of what many see as just another nice neighborhood in transition.

With those challenges in mind, I believe the Maxwell development represents a positive move for University Heights taking advantage of our proximity to UI and UIHC to build a community that will enhance our town's potential to be a walkable, cycleable and more transit-friendly community by adding much needed housing density and retail activity to University Heights.

I support the Maxwell Development as planned and urge the City Council to support the project. This project will add tremendous value to our community.

Sincerely,

Donald Baxter

--

Donald Baxter
316 Ridgeview Avenue
University Heights, Iowa 52246
319/337-0494
413/294-1280 (e-fax)

homepage: www.onanov.com

The economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment, not the other way around.
—Gaylord Nelson

Re: Maxwell Proposal

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Tracy, Roger" <roger-tracy@uiowa.edu>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Tracy, Roger" <roger-tracy@uiowa.edu>

To: mike-havercamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennanmcg@gmail.com; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 12:25:09 PM

Subject: FW: Maxwell Proposal

[UH City Council Members: For your information....Roger Tracy](#)

From: Tracy, Roger

Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 12:18 PM

To: 'louise-from@university-heights.org'

Subject: Maxwell Proposal

Mayor From :

Jinx Tracy and I favor the Bauer proposal as endorsed by the Zoning Commission on a 4 to 1 vote at its most recent meeting. We and the other owners on Birkdale summarily reject the Maxwell proposal. We encourage you and the other council members to listen to the Zoning commission's advice and pay attention to the wishes of your constituents.

Roger and Jinx Tracy
105 Birkdale Ct.

Re: Rezoning

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: ruppertdm@aol.com

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "rupperdm@aol.com" <rupperdm@aol.com>
To: mike-havercamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org
Cc: louise-from@university-heights.org
Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 1:42:43 PM
Subject: Rezoning

09 August 2010

Dear City Council Members:

RE: REZONING DECISION FOR THE SAINT ANDREW PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PROPERTY

Tomorrow evening's Council Meeting is an extremely important event for making the right decision that offers the opportunity for compromise that will provide and meet the needs of all University Heights citizens.

We believe that compromise is the key word in making the right decision.

We believe the Bauer compromise proposal offers more favorable aspects than that of the Maxwell proposal because it:

1. is a better fit for the U Heights Comprehensive Plan
2. complies with the recommendation of the Zoning Commission
3. eliminates the commercial development with unfavorable aspects and unknowns
4. allows for appropriate tax growth that more than adequately meets U Heights needs
5. keeps the same traffic flow and offers less increased traffic
6. maintains more green space especially the ravine, thus protecting the existing types of wild life
7. supports many who previously expressed their thoughts and ideas

Some citizens desired the commercial development for access to those services already (or about to be) offered by existing establishments. Some live near the building soon to be the Kaeding restaurant and some live not too far from Fareway and other businesses. University Hospital offers several places for coffee and refreshments as well as dining.

Both the Maxwell and Bauer proposals were presented at the Zoning Commission meeting on the 15th of July, 2010. Near the end of that meeting, Mr. Maxwell delivered an emotional speech identifying his willingness to work on a compromise. He, In fact, said he was going to go home and begin work that very evening. He also expressed a willingness to meet with some of the attendees to get ideas from them.

If members of the Council attended that meeting as well as the following Zoning Commission meeting on the 22nd of July, 2010, they most certainly must have been as dismayed as the rest of us. In responding to Mr. Zimmerman's questions, Mr. Maxwell had no compromises to offer or plans to do so.

Many of us would like to see Saint Andrew remain but have been willing to consider an alternative by supporting the Bauer proposal.

We trust the Council members will show their willingness to compromise as well and support the Bauer proposal. We submit our thanks to the Council for careful and thoughtful consideration.

Robert and Della Ruppert
314 Koser Avenue

Phone: 338-4811

Re: Upcoming re-zoning vote

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Rachel <rreyn1@yahoo.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Rachel <rreyn1@yahoo.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 1:53:40 PM

Subject: Upcoming re-zoning vote

Councilors,

I've written several letters on the issue of developing the St. Andrews property so I'm at a bit of a loss as to what to say in this one. But I can't stop writing because somewhere, deep down, I believe that my voice matters, at least as one of many voices being heard. I want to believe that we all count in this issue. And I firmly believe that if a community-wide vote were taken on the issue of the Maxwell development, this community would be solidly divided down the middle. The council election bore this out. My experience with my neighbors continues to bear this out. And I'm enormously saddened by this division.

My husband and I moved here nearly four years ago and were shocked to find such a welcoming community. We met neighbors that were so helpful and kind and friendly. We feel now as though many of our neighbors are family. This is not a common experience, and certainly not one to be taken for granted. In the past year, as debate on the Maxwell development has raged, that sense of trust and neighborliness has been eroded by suspicion and frustration. I want more than anything to restore the community that I moved into. No development is worth the destruction of a truly unique neighborhood.

And the beauty of the situation is, there is actually a nice compromise on the table. The Bauer plan offers high-density residences and higher tax revenues with the preservation of our neighborhood environment and the protection of the natural environment surrounding the property. I sincerely hope that you will consider healing the divisions in this community.

I believe that a developer is not in the position to decide how a community should be developed. We get that power. And I hope you see that we can decide what fits best on that property, and the other parties involved can figure out how to make the business of building on that property work. Please vote on Tuesday night for the Bauer compromise. It is a plan that we *all* can live with and take pride in.

Sincerely,
Rachel Prickman
321 Koser Ave.

Re: St. Andrew Site Development

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Dan Moore <danmoore4@me.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Dan Moore <danmoore4@me.com>

To: Louise From <louise-from@university-heights.org>; Stan Laverman <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-

heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 3:14:36 PM

Subject: St. Andrew Site Development

Re: rezoning decision

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: linddick@aol.com

Thank you, Linda. I know you are a concerned citizen and I appreciate you informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "linddick@aol.com" <linddick@aol.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 5:08:58 PM

Subject: rezoning decision

To all Council members and Mayor,

I am writing to request that you vote to support the recommendations of the Zoning Committee to deny the Maxwell application and to approve the Bauer plan for the possible development of the St. Andrew property. With many of the residents of University Heights indicating their desire to keep University Heights a single family residential neighborhood as well as to eliminate the commercial aspect of the proposed changes, it seems imperative that these residents be represented with your vote to deny the Maxwell plan. Thank you for your service.

Linda Fincham
1475 Grand Ave.

Re: To progress or regress, that is the ????

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Bob Hanson <bob.hanson@live.com>

Bob, thanks for your support!

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the

perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Bob Hanson <bob.hanson@live.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 5:22:24 PM

Subject: To progress or regress, that is the ????

Gentlepersons:

Tomorrow night you face a monumental decision. No, it's not really about the Maxwell application vs. the Pat Bauer proposal. Rather it's about whether the municipality of University Heights will move into the 21st century and progress by approving a viable, luxurious development or remain the University Heights of 1935. The problem with the latter alternative is that it is not 1935, it is 2010. Failure for this community to move forward will simply mean that more of the residential property in our little city will become rentals and the overall material condition of the community will decline.

The Bauer proposal is nothing more than a figment of someone's imagination. It tends to remind one of "The Emperor's Clothes" ----it's really not there. It is vaporware! No developer has expressed any interest in building it. It is not worth the paper upon which it was written. It exists only in the mind of Mr. Bauer and it nothing more than a political ploy designed to detract from the Maxwell plan---from which it was pilfered!

We fully recognize that the residents of University Heights that live in the general "St. Andrews neighborhood" oppose the Maxwell plan. However, let's be realistic. That group of people, The Friends of University Heights, represent about 10% of the University Heights voting population. That is a minority. They may be vocal, but they are the vocal minority. They cite many reasons for being opposed to the Maxwell plan. Unfortunately, most of their reasons are based upon speculation, not fact.

The major fact that we feel you must strongly consider in making your decision is quite simple. If the Maxwell application is defeated, what happens to the St. Andrews property should the congregation decide to move and sell as is speculated? We do not believe that it takes a rocket scientist to determine that the next "buyer-in-line" will be the University of Iowa. If/when that happens any degree of control that the city of University Heights has over what is constructed on that property goes down the drain. It could be a dormitory, it could be a parking lot, or whatever the university and the Board of Regents deems necessary, and it will not become a taxable entity.

We recognize that the Maxwell proposal is not perfect. But then, we don't live in a perfect world (even though some of our esteemed fellow residents seem to think that they

do). In our minds the Maxwell project is a viable opportunity for progress to take place in University Heights. In addition, it also affords the city council the opportunity to control how the project develops and over the covenants that govern its operation. Therefore we would encourage you all to approve the Maxwell application.

Respectfully,

Robert & Gloria Hanson
506 Mahaska Ct.

Re: Meeting

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

To: "pat-yeggy@university-heights.org" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 5:56:39 PM

Subject: Meeting

Dear Mayor From and City Council Members:

I urge you to vote for the Bauer plan and vote no for the Maxwell plan for re-zoning the St. Andrews Presbyterian Church property. The Maxwell plan is simply out of scale in our town in terms of the size of the buildings, number of units, number of new residents, and increased traffic on Melrose. Particularly out of character with our town, is number and location of commercial properties that will detract from the quiet and beauty of the neighborhood. We already have a commercial business in the form of a restaurant and coffee shop. I cannot imagine any other business that would be a benefit to our town. The prospect of seeing lighted signs for 6 new businesses on Melrose sinks my heart. Since the rent of these properties (at \$30 per square foot) is among the highest in Iowa City and out of scale with the neighborhood, there is a real danger that, in time, businesses would fail and the property would remain empty, inviting vandalism and other crime. This is an improvement to our community? No, it is a way of making money for the developer and architect.

I have looked at the Maxwell and Bauer plans, as well as the UH budget records of the past decade. If we have been able to successfully make improvements over the years, and are in an apparently good position to borrow money as before, why do we need more money? If we

already have the means to make the necessary improvements to our town's infrastructure, what else is there of equal importance that we cannot currently pay for? Amenities? I have heard secondhand of a councilor's idea of hiring an arborist for the city. I have heard myself a councilor wishing we had money for our yearly Chatauqua. These are nothing more than extras; extravagances, really. In all of the meetings I have attended in the last two years, all of the documents I have read on the UH website, and copies of emails expressing support or opposition to the Maxwell plan, I have not heard of a single benefit to our community other than having a coffee shop (which is not financially viable) and more tax revenue. What is it precisely that these proponents of the Maxwell plan wish to do with that revenue? Whatever it is, is it worth the harm done to our neighbors near the site? We must consider the impact on these residents. Will not the Maxwell development detract from our neighbors' sense of quiet, space, and beauty? What of the value of the houses? How many of us who were attracted to the quiet elegance of our town would move across the street from such a site?

I am personally offended by the ways in which Maxwell and Munson have been consistently portraying the development in the best possible light, hoping to downplay and obscure any potentially negative aspects. This might work in other communities, but ours is populated by people in the university and hospital whose jobs are to read and evaluate what a writer or speaker is trying to say and what one is trying to suppress. All of the people I have talked to share the view that both men are trying to obscure and misrepresent the facts, while at the same time refusing to cooperate with the residents and consider a compromise solution. I do not feel that either man would keep the city's best interests at heart in the actual development and building of the project. We must remember that they are proposing a way to make money for themselves, not to improve the quality of life in our town.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Fritts
Associate Professor
School of Music
University of Iowa
114 Highland Drive

Re: Maxwell Proposal

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Silverman, William" <william-silverman@uiowa.edu>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Silverman, William" <william-silverman@uiowa.edu>
To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org
Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 6:05:31 PM
Subject: Maxwell Proposal

Dear Louise, Mike, Jim, Stan, Brennan and Pat:

I have read the Maxwell proposal (6 story/3 story /residential-commercial development) plan. While others may certainly choose to disagree, I do not believe that this would be in the best of the community to proceed in this direction.

I thank you for considering this.

Bill Silverman

1527 Oakcrest Ave.

Re: Maxwell, Bauer proposals

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: David Pedersen <dpedersen63@gmail.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: David Pedersen <dpedersen63@gmail.com>
To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org
Cc: louise-from@university-heights.org
Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 10:05:03 PM
Subject: Maxwell, Bauer proposals

Dear University Heights City Council Members,

We're writing to express our support for the Bauer alternative proposal for the St. Andrew site, the proposal that the Zoning Commission approved at its July 22 meeting.

A few thoughts:

- We prefer the "4-2" aspect of the Bauer proposal, with the rear building at 55 feet and

the front building at 39 feet (which is only a few feet above the current 35-foot limit currently in UH); in our view, the size of these structures would be more in line with the surrounding neighborhood. This compares to the "6-3" (76- and 54-foot-tall buildings) aspect of the Maxwell proposal. The sheer size of the Maxwell development plan would, in our view, dominate and diminish the neighborhood.

- We're not in favor of the commercial development component of the Maxwell plan. We're not convinced that additional commercial development is necessary. We're also concerned about the increase in traffic and noise that commercial development at the St. Andrew site will bring. The Bauer proposal eliminates the commercial component, which then reduces the need for all the parking spaces--which, in effect, could help preserve the ravine. We feel that maintaining the protected areas in UH is important.

- Finally, we can accept 74 units as proposed in the Bauer plan (which is only 19 units less than the Maxwell proposal) because it represents a reasonable compromise. It would allow for development of the St. Andrew site, and it could also serve as a positive step toward bringing our community "back together."

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
David & Jacinda Pedersen
309 Sunset Street

Re: St. Andrew Development 2

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Liesa Parko <lkparko@yahoo.com>

Thank you for being a concerned citizen and informing the council of your thoughts about the proposed redevelopment at St Andrew. I read each letter I receive to understand the perspective of the writer. I did not run for this seat without knowing the lasting importance this decision would have on our city.

Pat Yeggy

From: Liesa Parko <lkparko@yahoo.com>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org

Sent: Mon, August 9, 2010 5:23:52 PM

Subject: St. Andrew Development 2

Attached is my letter (with the numerical error corrected) regarding the [St. Andrew site](#) development.

Liesa Moore

Re: Another short pro-development screed

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Collins, Dave" <david-collins@uiowa.edu>

Thanks for your support!!

Pat Yeggy

From: "Collins, Dave" <david-collins@uiowa.edu>

To: louise-from@university-heights.org; mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org; jim-lane@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Sent: Tue, August 10, 2010 4:30:38 PM

Subject: Another short pro-development screed

Hi everybody! I'm Dave Collins, and I live over on highland Drive. I'd just like to drop a note with y'all about how much I like the Maxwell proposal. Love the design, love the commercial aspect...the elevations seem to indicate a fairly minimal impact on the neighborhood – even if the intersection needs to be redone, only a very small bite would be taken out of that ravine, there. I've been encouraged to address a few of the misleading or outright false statements that appear in the interestingly-titled broadside "Facts about University Heights Development," but frankly, I don't see much point; I suspect I have little power to change minds at this stage of the proceedings. At the bottom of it, though, I'm commanded to ask you all to support responsible and reasonable development and protect the quality of life for all residents of our unique town; I hope you'll approve the Maxwell proposal and do exactly that.

Profoundest imaginable thanks

Dave Collins

103 Highland Dr.

Re: City Council work session

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: "Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

Mr Fritts -

Thanks you for voicing your opinion about the meeting and the St Andrew plans. Your comments deserve a thoughtful reply, which I can not devote a reasonable amount of time to at the moment.

I will respond after the City's 75th anniversary celebration this weekend, sometime at the beginning of next week.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

To: Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wed, August 25, 2010 11:43:07 AM

Subject: City Council work session

Dear Ms. Yeggy,

I attended the work session last night. I am sorry that I was not able to hear everything you said. I hope you will try to speak up a little more loudly, as it is difficult to understand a person's conversational speaking voice from the seats in the hall.

You mentioned something about our founding fathers' observation that from University Heights, one can see several miles around. I am not sure why that is important to the matter at hand. If it means that this view can be seen from the 6-story building, I am not sure how that benefits the citizens of our town. I was also puzzled at your statement that our town consists of 4 smaller towns with in it. I have never heard anyone make such a claim about any town under any circumstances. It seemed to be a weak rationale for building a high-density, multi-use development that ostensibly has a negative impact on only 1 of the 4 towns. This seems a very odd thing to say, especially since residents in all parts of our town are so strongly opposed to the Maxwell plan. How does the concept of 4 towns lessen the impact of this development on the citizens from all parts of University Heights? Putting forth of these issues as ways of strengthening the argument for the Maxwell plan seems as if grasping at straws. I would like to know, instead, how this development helps our town in more concrete ways, such as increasing tax revenues and how you would propose to use that money?

I am glad that you brought up the issue of flipping. However, Maxwell's answer was unsatisfactory on its own. If he did plan on flipping the property, wouldn't he give the same answer? Surely, if he intended to flip the property, his proposal would have unanimously been denied. I ask you, and the other council members, to look into his background to see if he has flipped other properties and what impact that had on the neighbors.

I appreciate your service to University Heights.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Fritts
114 Highland Drive

Re: City Council work session

...

Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

From: ...

[View Contact](#)

To: Lawrence N Fritts <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

Mr Fritts,

While looking through my emails I see that I left this as a draft and didn't realize until now that I didn't send it off to you. I sincerely apologize for this.

I am sorry that you couldn't hear well last night. Some of that is due to the nature of work sessions. They are for the benefit of those around the table, even though open to the public. I think it would be especially hard to hear what was said by anyone a member of the audience was sitting behind. Also remember, as Mike said, it's not natural to speak very loudly when the person you're addressing is sitting so close.

I do think that our town is more a collection of neighborhoods than a "real" town. To me a town has to be more than some houses. This is why I referred to our 3 neighborhoods (Subdivision 1, Subdivision 2 and Melrose Park) (which is a simplification as it's a bit more complicated than that really) and that the St Andrew site was a good place for a 4th neighborhood.

This 4th neighborhood is our opportunity to insure the survival of University Heights as an independent community. It is very important to me that we remain independent.

I do think that our town needs the increased revenue that this project would mean. No one is saying that we'll run out of money tomorrow. I think "crunch time" is about ten years off, but further study is needed.

Talk to any city finance director about running a city with residential property tax as your main source of revenue. You can barely keep up and can never do anything (for want of a better word) nice. You rely on elected officials to do work that other cities have staff to do.

I worked with Pat Bauer on the Analysis of UH Financial Information and I am confident that the information included in this report is correct. It is, however, information about the last ten years. It is more difficult to predict what we will need in the next ten years, but we will work on that. Some analyses are already in the works.

I know that there are residents in all parts of town that are opposed to the redevelopment, but there are residents in all parts of town that support the redevelopment too. The last election showed that a slight majority wants redevelopment; never-the-less it was still a majority. I see that those opposed to redevelopment were at first shocked that their candidates weren't elected. Then they mention how close the election was. Next it was that it's fifty-fifty, and now some even state that "more than half" are opposed.

If this project goes forward, I don't think the city will ever have so much revenue that the council will have to dream up silly ways to spend it nor do I see a big reduction in property taxes for the rest of us. I would like a return to the days when the \$8.10 levy rate was enough to finance our operation.

As for what to do with "extra" money, I haven't given that a lot of thought. I think I am the person you referred to who wanted to hire an arborist and if there was "extra" money I might suggest using some of it for that. Even a city the size of University Heights can reduce the impact of climate change with a sensible tree planting program. And reduced winter heating and summer cooling costs would save resources. (When the Koser Bros started University Heights they planted 400 trees and 600 fruit trees.)

Then again, unless I am elected to many, many more terms I don't expect to be a party to deciding how to allocate any of the revenue from this.

Thank you for your interest in our City, and I hope I have answered you to your satisfaction.

Pat Yeggy

From: "Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

To: Patricia Yeggy <patbirk@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wed, August 25, 2010 11:43:07 AM

Subject: City Council work session

Dear Ms. Yeggy,

I attended the work session last night. I am sorry that I was not able to hear everything you said. I hope you will try to speak up a little more loudly, as it is difficult to understand a person's conversational speaking voice from the seats in the hall.

You mentioned something about our founding fathers' observation that from University Heights, one can see several miles around. I am not sure why that is important to the matter at hand. If it means that this view can be seen from the 6-story building, I am not sure how that benefits the citizens of our town. I was also puzzled at your statement that our town consists of 4 smaller towns with in it. I have never heard anyone make such a claim about any town under any circumstances. It seemed to be a weak rationale for building a high-density, multi-use development that ostensibly has a negative impact on only 1 of the 4 towns. This seems a very odd thing to say, especially since residents in all parts of our town are so strongly opposed to the Maxwell plan. How does the concept of 4 towns lessen the impact of this development on the citizens from all parts of University Heights? Putting forth of these issues as ways of strengthening the argument for the Maxwell plan seems as if grasping at straws. I would like to know, instead, how this development helps our town in more concrete ways, such as increasing tax revenues and how you would propose to use that money?

I am glad that you brought up the issue of flipping. However, Maxwell's answer was unsatisfactory on its own. If he did plan on flipping the property, wouldn't he give the same answer? Surely, if he intended to flip the property, his proposal would have unanimously been denied. I ask you, and the other council members, to look into his background to see if he has flipped other properties and what impact that had on the neighbors.

I appreciate your service to University Heights.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Fritts
114 Highland Drive

Re-zoning decision

Inbox | X

Reply

[zlatko anguelov](#) Dear Mayor From and city councilors, There is a feeling in the community that...

Aug 8

[zlatko anguelov](#) Loading... Aug 8

[zlatko anguelov](#)

show details Aug

to brennan-mcgrath, louise-from, mike-havercamp, me, stan-laverman, jim-lane,

8

Dear Mayor From and city councilors,

There is a feeling in the community that you're heading precipitously toward a decision on the two re-zoning proposals that is counter the common sense and the preferences of a significant majority of UH citizens. The Zoning commission has clearly voted in favor of the Bauer proposal. There are unsolved issues regarding the election of the substitute councilor and a petition to force a special election. Summer is time where most people take vacations and don't pay much attention. All these factors seem to be in favor of your unanimous desire to approve Maxwell proposal no matter what

I'm hereby joining the voices of all those who are in favor of the reasonable and well-thought Bauer proposal, and I do hope that you (except one) were elected to listen to the community voices and to weigh all the aspects of an issue with such long-term and irreparable consequences for UH instead of rushing to a decision that may burden your conscience for ever.

Respectfully,

ZLATKO ANGUELOV

--

zlatko anguelov
207 golfview avenue

iowa city, ia 52246
319-351-8778

Email sent by Mike Haverkamp regarding St. Andrew's development

Re: Finance expertise

Date: Wed, 04 Aug 2010 19:47:46 +0000

To: Peter Fisher pfisher@IOWAPOLICYPROJECT.ORG

Perfect! I'll see you then.

-Mike

On Wed, 4 Aug 2010 14:32:32 -0500

Peter Fisher <pfisher@IOWAPOLICYPROJECT.ORG> wrote:
We are in Old Brick. Monday at 3:00 should work if you want to stop by.

On Wed, Aug 4, 2010 at 2:31 PM, <mayhem@inav.net> wrote:

Not at all, actually even though we meet next Tuesday evening, any proposal would have to pass three times, and I don't see us collapsing the 2nd and 3rd readings. Since we meet monthly there would be plenty of time to look over the information.

I work for the ICCSD and am teaching workshops at our CAO building downtown from 8:30 to 2:30 on Monday. Could we get together at 3:00? Is your office on campus?

-Mike

On Wed, 4 Aug 2010 13:34:28 -0500

Peter Fisher <pfisher@IOWAPOLICYPROJECT.ORG> wrote:

Mike: I would be happy to visit with you soon, but this week does not work.

I have a report to get out today, and then am gone THurs. and Fri.

Would

Monday be too late?

Peter Fisher

On Tue, Aug 3, 2010 at 10:33 AM, <mayhem@inav.net> wrote:

Dr. Fisher,

John Yapp (as you can read below) recommended you as a person to talk to regarding public finance and taxes. I am on the city council of University Heights and next week we will be hearing the first reading of a potential rezoning request that could have some major impacts on our community. I'd like to set up a time with you, if possible, to look at our community budget history, review some information regarding our housing stock, etc. and get your impressions or estimates regarding future trends. Is there any time this week we might be able to get together?

I appreciate your consideration of this request.

-Mike Haverkamp
UH city councilor

On Tue, 3 Aug 2010 09:58:39 -0500
"John Yapp" <John-Yapp@iowa-city.org> wrote:

Mike:

The best person I can think of would be Peter Fisher with the Iowa Policy Project - he is an expert on public taxes and finance. Here is his info:

*Peter Fisher, Research Director
Budget & Tax, Economic Opportunity
Peter holds a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Peter is a national expert on public finance and has served as a consultant to the Iowa Dept. of Economic Development, the State of Ohio, and the Iowa Business Council. His reports are regularly published in State Tax Notes and refereed journals. His recent book Grading Places: What Do the Business Climate Rankings Really Tell Us? was published by the Economic Policy Institute in 2005. Peter is a professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Iowa.*

*Peter provides overall supervision for IPP research activities. He is directly involved in research, writing and outreach on state tax and budget issues. He has authored or co-authored the majority of Iowa Fiscal Partnership reports and guest opinions on state tax policy.
Email: pfisher (at) iowapolicyproject.org*

*The Iowa Policy Project website is:
<http://www.iowapolicyproject.org/WhoWeAre.html>*

If Peter cannot help you directly, he may have a research assistant who can. After all, they are funded by the Public. Hope this helps,

John

-----Original Message-----

From: mayhem@inav.net [<mailto:mayhem@inav.net>] Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 4:09 PM
To: John Yapp
Subject: Finance expertise

John,

Is there anyone at the state level (or perhaps at a Regents Institution) that if I gave them our budget history, property values, etc. that would be in a position to make some estimates regarding financial trends? I'd appreciate your insight.

-Mike

--

Peter Fisher
Research Director
The Iowa Policy Project
319-338-0773

-- Peter Fisher
Research Director
The Iowa Policy Project
319-338-0773

Re: hi

Date: Mon, 09 Aug 2010 01:11:42 +0000

To: "June Braverman" <bravejune@gmail.com>Hey June,

I got this one and an earlier one. I'm reading them all carefully and reviewing lots of documents as well. See you on Tuesday.

-Mike

On Sun, 8 Aug 2010 18:59:33 -0500

"June Braverman" <bravejune@gmail.com> wrote:
Sent off two emails to you re the Bauer plan which came back so I am trying once more-abbreviated this time because I am sure you know I totally agree with the vote of the P & Z group last week and find this a viable alternative. Hope you will agree! Thanks-June

Email today

Date: Mon, 09 Aug 2010 01:18:04 +0000 **To:** brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org,
pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

Hey Brennan and Pat,

Apparently my UH mail was giving bounceback messages earlier today. Here are the email's I've received today, if either of you have gotten any not on my list go ahead and forward them to me at

mayhem@zeus.ia.net

Thanks!

-Mike

Larry Wilson
Mary Mathew Wilson
June Braverman
Nancy Barnes
Jan Leff

Re: Bauer Plan

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 01:51:21 +0000 **To:** irene bowers ireneebowers@yahoo.com

Irene,

I appreciate hearing from you. I have been waiting to reply to email regarding devleopment until I had spent as much time as possible evaluating both plans. Here is what I can say right now:

I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday?s meeting to hear more about them. -Mike

On Sat, 24 Jul 2010 10:16:19 -0700 (PDT)

irene bowers <ireneebowers@yahoo.com> wrote:

I am writing to urge you to endorse the Bauer Plan at your August meeting.

I have lived at 328 Koser Avenue in University Heights since 1961. It has been a wonderful place to live and I'm hoping you help keep it that way.

Thank you!

Irene Bowers

Re: Melrose development

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 01:54:55 +0000 **To:** Jeff Edberg Jeff@icrealestate.com

Dear Jeff,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 2 Aug 2010 05:42:34 -0700

Jeff Edberg <Jeff@icrealestate.com> wrote:
Dear Mayor and councilors,

I have co signed a letter prepared by Dan & Liesa Moore which seems pretty sane and logical to me. I actually favor the existing density of the parcel on Melrose at Sunset with similar density as Birkdale Court, but with the push for this particular development and developer, I don't think that would gain much support.

Maxwell's original proposal would be a mistake. It would inexorably change our town and would minimize the safety and serenity we now enjoy. This atmosphere we enjoy is due to your and your predecessors wisdom and forethought.

The Bauer plan, although a higher density than I would like to see, is workable and I will support it. He has addressed many of the grosser objections of the original Maxwell plan and he has really tried to think about this issue and come up with something lasting that would work here in U Heights. I appreciate his efforts on behalf of our town.

I am unable to attend Tuesday meetings as that is designated as family time in my household, but please note my opinions on this very important issue.

Thank you for your attention and for your service.

*Jeff Edberg
337 Highland Dr.*

Re: council pick

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 01:59:10 +0000 **To:** "Carol Christiansen"
c_christiansen@mchsi.com

Dear Carol Ann,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike

On Fri, 6 Aug 2010 16:31:56 -0500

"Carol Christiansen" <c_christiansen@mchsi.com> wrote:

Mike,

I was not able to get my signature on the recent mailer dated August 2. I would like to let you know that Scott and I are very much in agreement with the letter. I really feel that the council has stopped listening to it's constituents and are following the mayor like sheep. It may sound harsh, but our frustration level is very high. It's like talking to brick walls. "My mind is made up. Don't confuse me with the facts." I just returned from Omaha. Friends drove us around Omaha to see the changes. The thing they kept pointing out is all of the condos that had been built that are sitting empty year after year. Some, they said, were rented out to students for a semester or two and then they're gone. One of the other friends asked where they got their groceries. Well, there'd been a couple of grocery stores but they'd gone out of business. No one could afford them. So, just as everyone else does, the condo dwellers still must drive to the stores. The only retail that seemed to be able to make a go of it are the Quick Trip type stores. Since Scott and I have both owned our own businesses, we have a pretty good idea what it takes to make them successful. That location just is not a place for retail! The way things have been handled by the church, Maxwell, and the council, have left many residents very suspicious of the future actions of the POWERS THAT BE. Please keep in mind the feelings of the people who will be most impacted by your decisions.

Thanks for serving.

Carol Ann Christiansen

Re: Please approve the current Maxwell proposal

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:02:23 +0000 **To:** "dorothy whiston"

<dwhiston@mchsi.com>

John and Dorothy,

Thanks for the note, I appreciate getting one that can make me laugh out loud. In the interest of fairness, I'll put down what I've been sendig to everyone else:

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development

proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them.

-Mike Haverkamp

On Fri, 6 Aug 2010 19:57:14 -0500

"dorothy whiston" <dwhiston@mchsi.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Haverkamp:

I am disappointed that I have to write you again asking you in the strongest terms to conclude this whole long ordeal and approve the Maxwell residential/commercial proposal. But I have been asked by a recent mailing purportedly in the interest of "unity" to contact you and so I will.

The costs and benefits of the proposal have been chewed over at length and the close but clear majority of UH residents have weighed in that the balance favors the development. Last minute tinkering is not the appropriate path especially when it has the transparent purpose of making it impossible for our partners in the process, Maxwell and Saint Andrews, to move forward. As an aside, I want to say that the argument that we should "support" Nate Kaeding's new restaurant by prohibiting a new coffee shop in the development made me sputter in anger. It's bad policy and approaching bad faith.

So, one last time, please approve the development.

John Whiston

317 Mahaska Dr

PS I am authorized to say that my wife Dorothy agrees with that last request but thinks I am being intemperate, so please blame that all on me.

Re: The ravine

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:08:12 +0000 **To:** joseph frankel joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu

Joe,

Thanks for perhaps the most informative letter I've yet received on this subject! I appreciate hard data, and empirical observation. If you ever want to walk the ravine in the winter, my family has 4 sets of snow shoes and that is when we often walk all three ravines from head to tail. We love going back there.

In the interest of fairness I'll also tell you what I'm sending to everyone who has written:

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Sat, 7 Aug 2010 13:01:23 -0500

joseph frankel <joseph-frankel@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Dear Mayor From and Council members:

I am writing you under the encouragement of a letter from the "Friends of the University Heights Community", concerning one of their "Facts about University Heights development". Fact No. 7 states "The development involves filling in the ravine, one of our few remaining green spaces and home to a variety of animals and birds".

Since I used to wander about in the woods downstream from said ravine, I checked this out this morning. First, I located University Heights in the satellite version of Google Maps (The overprint of streets is wrong, but I presume that the satellite photography is correct). U.H. is fortunate to share with the University of Iowa a substantial wooded area between the Athletic Club & St. Andrew's Church on the south, and the Finkbine Lot & the railroad tracks on the north.

If one compares this map to the map in the "One University Place" proposal provided on the UH website, you will see that the area to be filled in by the proposed development comprises at most 5 percent of

the total forested area - probably less than that. It is the headwater of the central of three small valleys - the west valley starts between St. Andrews and Birkdale, and a third, shorter east valley has its head at 304 Sunset St.

To see the affected area more closely, magnify the satellite map and draw a line between 1504 Grand Avenue (where the avenue now bends) and the bus shed behind St. Andrews. The small triangular patch of woods south of that line is what would be filled - actually, about 2/3 of it, if you look at Maxwell's plan carefully.

What looks small on a map might be large in reality. I re-explored the whole area this morning, but it is (alas) very overgrown, and I don't recommend it - although there is some fine mature forest in the lower part of the valley.

It turns out that you can get a good sense of the area to be affected from the eastern border of the St. Andrew's property. Just go to a spot just above their bus shed and look down, and across to 1504 Grand Ave. There is an open patch of bramble (impassible!) at the bottom of a deep ravine. As best I can read the Maxwell plan, the filled in roadway would cross the ravine diagonally from NE to SW just above that open patch.

So what's in that area to be filled in? You can get a sense of that by scrambling down (carefully!) on a rough deer path starting from space #32 on the St. Andrews lot - or even just looking in from that spot on the lot or from the opposite side on Sunset Street. You will see a handsome old bur oak, and several black walnuts. A bit down the valley is a huge mature catalpa - not native to the area! I didn't see any animals or birds, but then I wasn't looking carefully, and it was too late in the morning for birds. I did surprise a deer and spot raccoon tracks further downstream.

So what do I conclude from this? The area to be filled in is small but of reasonably high quality, and because it is rather deep it will take a lot of fill to fill it. I suspect that the animals in the area will have the good sense to move downstream before getting crushed. But the overall "greenspace" that you can see on the Google satellite map will be only minimally reduced.

A more serious question relates to quality of the valley downstream from the development. Right now, the small streams in the valley look reasonably clear to me. But what will happen when the headwaters of one of these streams is converted into a steep embankment, and there is a 95-unit condominium with a paved parking lot built on top of it? The banks will have to be stabilized, probably by retaining walls as one sees at Birkdale, so that the stream valley does not become silted (as happened when the Finkbine Lot was built). There also has to be some adequate provision for controlled drainage down this greatly altered area, so that the stream remains clear.

Assuming that this can be worked out, I'll be bold and make a further suggestion. The greenspace should eventually become a nature preserve (with the hopeful cooperation of the University of Iowa, which owns half of it). The former informal trail along the ridge (starting at the northern dead-end of Sunset Street) should be cleared and re-opened,

and a new trail built up the valley - making a loop like the lovely 1-mile loop trail in Ryerson's Woods, at the south edge of Iowa City. University Heights should devote some tax money to it - as our park - and Jeff Maxwell, as a recompense for the real damage done by his development (if it is approved), should provide some labor and perhaps some capital as well for the trail-building project. It should be accessible to all. It would then enhance his development and enhance the community - a win-win situation, that would more than compensate for the lost headwaters of one of the small streams in the UH/UI woodland.

-Joe Frankel

-- Joseph Frankel
323 Koser Ave,
Iowa City, IA 52246

Re: FW: Maxwell Development Proposal for the St Andrew Church Site Questions & Concerns

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:21:42 +0000 **To:** "Wilson, Larry T" <larry-wilson@uiowa.edu>, uhplace@rocketmail.com

Dear Larry and Mary,

I'd like to respond to both of your emails sent on August 8. I have read them both very carefully. To give you an idea of how I am evaluating both proposals, here is what I'm telling people:

I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike

On Sun, 8 Aug 2010 13:19:59 -0500

"Wilson, Larry T" <larry-wilson@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Dear Council members--

I am writing to urge you to vote for the alternative development plan approved by the Zoning Commission 4 to 1 at their July 22 meeting. Based upon years of planning experience, I firmly believe that the Maxwell development proposal is much too dense to appropriately fit into the predominantly single-family UH neighborhood. I fully understand the importance of increasing the UH tax base, but believe the alternative proposal approved by the Zoning Commission provides a sufficient future tax base (as explained and verified by Pat Bauer's presentation at the July 22nd zoning meeting) while reasonably fitting proposed development into the surrounding single-family neighborhood and the rest of the UH community. The alternative plan recommends bridging the east ravine along Sunset rather than filling it in further reducing the development impact.

The alternative development proposal approved by the Zoning Commission incorporates the fully stated principles of smart growth better than the Maxwell proposal because it reasonably fits into the community (refer to the full smart growth principle statements in the attached smart growth document under "Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place." The alternative proposal also represents an attempt at collaboration with the Maxwell team by the UH community as a development proposal that would reasonably fit into the character of the UH Neighborhood, which would respond to the development vision of at least half of the UH community and which would be a bridging element to reunite the evenly divided UH community. See the full text for smart growth principle "Encourage Community and Stakeholder Collaboration" in the attachment. The Maxwell team made no attempt at collaboration with the UH community and instead consistently presented the same plan as proposed in the beginning. Although comments were taken at public meetings, they resulted in no substantial change in the development plan. Furthermore, the ability to make the alternative plan feasible should not be held hostage to an out-of-line commitment on the part of the developer to pay such a high price (\$4.3M) for the land which would clearly not be worth that amount without the change in zoning and the proposed high density development. The more reasonable density of the approved alternative plan would be feasible with an appropriate price paid for land purchase.

While the alternative proposal would provide quality housing for people of all income levels and provide a range of housing choices the same as the Maxwell plan, it does eliminate the mixing of commercial zoning into the development. The commercial development is eliminated for the purpose of reducing the large amount of parking required by UH regulations for commercial development and resulting traffic, and noise and other disturbances from commercial activities, thereby significantly reducing the impact of the entire development on the UH community. Additionally, Mr. Maxwell stated at the last zoning meeting that rental/lease rates for commercial space would be \$30/sq ft which he acknowledged would be too high a rate for coffee shops and other similar small businesses which would primarily serve the UH neighborhood. He indicated that the high rent/lease rate would be more applicable to higher end businesses such as attorneys' offices which would not be particularly oriented to the UH neighborhood. Therefore, according to Mr. Maxwell himself, the commercial development would not expressly serve the UH community. I earnestly and firmly believe that the tradeoff of no commercial for reduced hard-surface parking, more green space, preservation of the environmentally-sensitive ravine,

traffic impact and total development impact is necessary and reasonable.

In reviewing the One University Place slideshow presented at the July 22nd zoning meeting and recently posted on the UH website, I find there are a number of discrepancies in the slides. I have e-mailed the letter below to Maxwell's architect Kevin Monson to request clarifications and answers to my questions, but I have not yet heard back. I collaborated with UH Place on the attached Principles of "Smart Growth Compared to Maxwell's Smart Growth Development" so I agree with the document.

Please read the information below and as attached, and vote in favor of the alternative development in order to bring our divided community back together and create a development that is truly in synch with the Smart Growth Network's Principles of Smart Growth.

Sincerely,

Larry

From: Wilson, Larry T
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 5:30 PM
To: 'Kevin Monson'
Subject: One University Place July 15 Final PUD Submission PowerPoint Presentation Questions
Importance: High

Good afternoon Kevin--

The One University Place July 15 Final PUD Submission PowerPoint Presentation was recently placed on the University Heights website. In looking at the slides where I can view them a bit longer, I have some question items that I would like you to confirm or clarify.

I notice that in slide 17, which I believe is taken from about the location of the proposed Sunset St. access south of the Sunset and Grand Ave. intersection (which I believe is not from one of the 7 locations from which pictures were taken) The perspective makes both the low-rise and high-rise buildings look really far away. In reality, after constructed, they will appear to be much closer. In my experience, digital perspectives/renderings tend to provide more of a realistic view of buildings than of the site features and tend to make buildings/objects appear to be further away. Can that be corrected?

It appears that on slides 28 & 29 (photo location 3), slides 31 & 32 (photo location 4), slides 34 & 35 (photo location 5) and slides 37 & 38 (photo location 6) existing trees are shown as screening the building, but aerial view (birdseye view) slide 19 and perspective slides 1, 14 & 16 show those existing trees along Melrose in front of the proposed building as removed. Trees shown in the perspective slides 1, 14 & 16 are between the sidewalk and curb where there currently are none and they are spaced differently than the existing trees, plus, the

low-rise building is at sidewalk elevation which would require filling around the existing trees. It appears that all the trees along Melrose are future plantings (with the exception of the three trees shown on Site Plan slide 3 to be saved) and would require many years to mature. Slide 16 shows a couple of large deciduous trees that do not currently exist as well. Site Plan slide 3 seems also to confirm this and shows only the aforementioned trees to be saved, which I presume are the three large spruce trees. As mentioned at the last zoning meeting, almost all of the surrounding existing trees indicated in the various slides as providing screening are deciduous trees that would lose their leaves in the winter, which means they would be without leaves longer than with them. As discussed below, the existing trees along the west side of the current alignment of north Sunset and in the adjacent ravine will apparently not be there at all (after the ravine is filled in).

Another misleading element is that according to the Site Plan slide 3, which shows some preliminary proposed grading, specifically contours 770, 760 and 750, the ravine would be filled to north of the proposed new access road and the resulting toe of the new fill slope would extend northward almost to the north property line as indicated by the unlabeled contour 740. As best I can determine from the unlabeled existing contour lines, it looks like there would be about 30 feet of fill at the proposed 770 contour as it crosses the existing contour at the bottom of the ravine a bit north of the proposed access road. However, slides 37, 38 & 40 show the existing trees in the south end of the ravine from its beginning near Melrose to almost the St. Andrew north property line as remaining when they are indicated on the Site Plan slide 3 as being removed. The street trees shown on the Site Plan slide 3 along the west side of the realigned Sunset would be future plantings as well as the trees shown north of the proposed Sunset access road to about the St. Andrew north property line. These trees would require many years to mature into a significant screen. This also means that the existing trees shown on slide 40 as screening the view from Grand Ave. projected into the site would be removed.

In addition, the east ravine is shown in the UH Comprehensive Plan as a sensitive area and the slope and depth of the ravine would certainly qualify it for the UH Sensitive Areas Ordinance 128, Section 2, paragraph "E. Protected slope: Any slope rising forty percent (40%) or steeper over a run of 10 feet," and would require protection as specified under Section 3, paragraph C which follows:

"Protected Slopes: Any area designated as a protected slope shall not be graded and must remain in its existing state, except natural vegetation may be supplemented by other plant material.

Development activities may be allowed within areas containing protected slopes previously altered by human activity (which has not occurred) if a geologist or professional engineer can demonstrate to the University Heights City Council's satisfaction that development activity will not undermine the stability of the slope, and the City further determines the development activities are consistent with the intent of the

Sensitive Areas Ordinance. Moreover, proposed development of such property shall be required to submit a development plan and grading plan, as well as a sensitive areas site plan, all of which must be approved by the University Heights City Council before commencement of any development."

I am very concerned about a site plan that is dependent upon filling the ravine when the ravine is designated as an area to be protected.

I should note that the smart growth principles submitted by Mr. Maxwell neglected to mention that in the Smart Growth: New State Legislation that Kent Ralston read at the last zoning meeting states under "Community character-Activities and development that are consistent with the character and architectural style of the community should be promoted. His (Mr. Maxwell's) smart grow principles as submitted also edited out some critical language about fitting a development into a neighborhood. Below is the complete statement for (Maxwell's) Principle 4 "Foster Distinctive Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place," with the wording left out highlighted in yellow. The submitted principle is misleading and should be corrected. I have attached the source document--just click on the highlighted paragraph for the full statement.

Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place

Smart growth encourages communities to craft a vision and set standards for development and construction which respond to community values of architectural beauty and distinctiveness, as well as expanded choices in housing and transportation. It seeks to create interesting, unique communities which reflect the values and cultures of the people who reside there, and foster the types of physical environments which support a more cohesive community fabric. Smart growth promotes development which uses natural and man-made boundaries and landmarks to create a sense of defined neighborhoods, towns, and regions. It encourages the construction and preservation of buildings which prove to be assets to a community over time, not only because of the services provided within, but because of the unique contribution they make on the outside to the look and feel of a city.

Guided by a vision of how and where to grow, communities are able to identify and utilize opportunities to make new development conform to their standards of distinctiveness and beauty. Contrary to the current mode of development, smart growth ensures that the value of infill and greenfield development is determined as much by their accessibility (by car or other means) as their physical orientation to and relationship with other buildings and open space. By creating high-quality communities with architectural and natural elements that reflect the interests of all residents, there is a greater likelihood that buildings (and therefore entire neighborhoods) will retain their

economic vitality and value over time. In so doing, the infrastructure and natural resources used to create these areas will provide residents with a distinctive and beautiful place that they can call "home" for generations to come.

It is my understanding that Mr. Maxwell stated at the last zoning meeting that rental/lease rates (for commercial space) would be \$30/sq ft which he acknowledged would be too high a rate for coffee shops and other similar small businesses which would primarily serve the UH neighborhood. He indicated that the high rent/lease rate would be more applicable to higher end businesses such as attorneys' offices which would not be particularly oriented to the UH neighborhood . The Site Plan slide 3 continues to label the commercial as "neighborhood commercial" which does not seem to be the case.

I appreciate your help in answering/clarifying my questions.

Larry

Re: Please vote for the Bauer alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrew site
Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:28:50 +0000 **To:** Nancy Barnes nbarnes.kohout@gmail.com

Dear Frank and Nancy,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Sun, 8 Aug 2010 18:18:07 -0500

Nancy Barnes <nbarnes.kohout@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor From and Council Members Haverkamp, Lane, Laverman, McGrath and Yeggy,

We would like to urge you to vote to accept the Bauer alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrew Church property and to reject Mr. Maxwell's plan, which the Zoning Commission did do at its July 22 meeting.

The alternative plan is less massive and intrusive than the Maxwell plan, and it would fit far better into our community. A smaller development such as the Bauer plan envisions would have fewer residents and consequently fewer vehicles to increase traffic on our streets which is a major concern of many present residents of our community. And a plan such as the Bauer plan would be kinder to our local environment for it would not require the destruction of the east ravine, an area that we believe should be preserved and protected according to our city ordinance number 128. The ravine is home to deer, wild turkeys and other creatures whose habitat would be destroyed, thus driving the animals out or destroying them also. We humans, too, need the natural environment of our green woods with their rich vegetal and animal wildlife in our lives.

The desire to lower our property taxes has been a major concern of many of us. However, as we understand it, we cannot be sure that development of this property would result in a decrease in property taxes for us anytime soon, for any TIF agreement, depending on how it is structured, could delay the developer's tax payments to the city for several years.

In addition, Mr. Maxwell's plan to include commercial space in his development appeals to many UH residents who thought, as Mr. Maxwell led us to believe, that that would mean something welcome like a grocery store or a coffee shop. But he has acknowledged that commercial space would be leased at high rates, that commercial real estate professionals regard as too high for such businesses to be viable. Rather, such spaces would be affordable for law offices or accounting firms perhaps, which would not enrich life in our community as such, however pleasant the new lawyers, etc., might be as individuals. However, without Mr. Maxwell's help we will soon have Nate Kaeding's new restaurant and coffee shop at the Melrose-Golfview Avenue corner which we hope we will all be able to enjoy for a long time.

Our community has been quite divided on the matter of the Maxwell development plan - close to evenly divided, we think. Approval of the Bauer plan for development could help bring us back together around a very livable

plan to truly enhance our small city. We hope you will carefully consider the real virtues of the Bauer plan and accept it and reject the Maxwell plan which has caused real discord among us.

Sincerely,

*Nancy Barnes-Kohout
Frank Kohout*

Re: St. Andrew Property Development

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:35:32 +0000 **To:** Jan Leff <jaleff@mchsi.com>

Dear Al,

I don't foresee collapsing any readings for either of the ordinance proposals. I fully agree that three separate readings with public input and council input as to possible changes will be a necessity. As I respond to email and letters regarding the ordinance proposals I've tried to outline my decision making process:

I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. Sincerely,

-Mike Haverkamp

On Sun, 8 Aug 2010 19:49:45 -0500

Jan Leff <jaleff@mchsi.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor From and Councilors:

I am concerned about a possible path that this council could take as it takes action on the request of Jeff Maxwell to rezone and develop the St. Andrew Church property. This process involves voting on the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance. It is required that such ordinance must be voted on at three successive meetings unless the council votes by a super majority to suspend these rules by reducing such successive votes.

This requirement of three successive considerations is to provide ample time for the community members to become informed and to express their reactions to the proposed amendment ordinance. This suspension of these rules should be used very sparingly and certainly not when the matter before the council is highly contested. To do otherwise would defeat the meaning and intent of these rules.

The controversy arising out of the Jeff Maxwell proposal has been very pronounced since it was first submitted in 2009 with a large portion of the community expressing concerns and objections to the proposal. The

zoning commission has now rejected this proposal both times it has been considered. But more importantly , a compromise development offered by Pat Bauer, introduced at the July 15, 2010 Zoning Commission hearing, has the potential for widespread support. However there has not been sufficient time to fully inform the community about the details of this proposal because of the short time period since its introduction and also because it has occurred during the months of July and August when so many people are gone. The Bauer proposal represents a compromise to the Maxwell development that provides the church with a potential buyer for a development that could have strong support within the community. The magnitude of the impact of any development on our community is huge and should not reach this point of consideration until our citizens have had ample opportunity to become informed and to have the opportunity for the community input and discussion. Apparently Jeff Maxwell's agreement with the church has some form of deadline in August, but this time parameter should not trump the duty and obligation of the council to provide its citizens with reasonable opportunities to have input in matters that are so vital to the continuity of our community. The community needs the opportunity to hear the Bauer proposal and to respond to it. I personally feel that it offers a very reasonable compromise that should be of real interest to potential developers of the St. Andrew property, even if, at this time, Mr. Maxwell says that he is not. I sincerely urge you to reject any proposal to suspend the rule of three successive considerations and to perform your function as a city councilor with dignity and respect.

Sincerely,

Al Leff

Re: Council Vote

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:37:10 +0000 **To:** HopsonRC@aol.com

Dear Rosanne,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 10:26:15 EDT
HopsonRC@aol.com wrote:

Dear Mayor Louise From and Councilpersons Mike Haverkamp, Jim Lane,

Stan Laverman, Brennan McGrath, and Pat Yeggy,

I am writing to urge you to accept the Zoning Commission's recommendation to approve the alternative (Bauer) plan for the rezoning and development of the St. Andrew church property and to reject the Maxwell plan (as the Zoning Commission did at its July 22nd meeting).

The alternative plan is a compromise that shows the residents of UHeights ARE willing to work together as a community. This plan allows for development but will keep our neighborhood with a similar feeling as it has now. A large portion of UHeights was originally against any development - and this proves that working together has allowed us to compromise. I won't go into any of the reasons why this works - as Mary Matthews Wilson's letter summarizes that beautifully. I think you should weigh heavily the sentiments from the residents that have lived here a long time and have invested in this community. These are the same people that will be here for years to come. The 'renters' are fleeting and don't have a real grasp on the situation or what it entails. Pat Bauer gave a very professional, thoughtful presentation at the last zoning meeting. I really wish all of the council members would have attended. Quite frankly Mr. Bauer put Mr. Maxwell to shame and it became apparent that Mr. Maxwell had not done any of his homework. When asked point blank by a UH resident if he (Mr. Maxwell) had looked at the income figures on the Bauer plan he simply replied, "No". To me, this cavalier attitude either says that we don't deserve his time and/or why would he waste it on researching what the people want. OR, he simply doesn't have the knowledge base or felt it was not important enough. If the Maxwell/Monson team isn't organized at the beginning of a project - how can we expect them to be organized as it progresses?

You have a councilor who's house is on the historic registry and supports the society by placing it on tour every year. The proposed development is in direct contradiction to the ideals of a historic society. The lack of continuity in thinking perplexes me. I, too urge you to follow the Zoning Commission's recommendation to approve the alternative plan for the development of the St. Andrews church property and I hope you make the Maxwell plan and all of the destructive ideas around and behind it a piece of history that we, as a community, will never want to revisit in the future.

Sincerely,

Rosanne Hopson

Re: Zoning Commission recommendation

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:38:54 +0000 **To:** Greg <colophonic@yahoo.com>

Dear Greg,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan

- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 08:00:11 -0700 (PDT)
Greg <colophonice@yahoo.com> wrote:

Councilors,

I am writing to urge you to respect the judgment of the Zoning Commission and reject the Maxwell development proposal at your upcoming Council meeting. The issue on the table is whether or not to re-zone that property, and I believe it should not be re-zoned. If it is, it should only be re-zoned to the extent that would allow the Bauer alternative plan to proceed.

This issue has been simmering for so long in our community now, leading to deep and increasingly personal divisions on both sides of the issue. To me, that is a clear indication that it is the wrong plan at the wrong time. Please act in accordance with our Zoning Commission and the feelings of half (at a minimum) of UH residents and reject this proposal, and begin to focus on re-building a sense of trust and community through your work as representative elected officials.

Sincerely,

*Greg Prickman
321 Koser Ave.*

Re: Support Maxwell Development

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:44:58 +0000 **To:** Donald Baxter donald.baxter@gmail.com

Hey Donald,

Here's my boilerplate answer I've been sending:

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 12:07:56 -0500

Donald Baxter <donald.baxter@gmail.com> wrote:
To the City Council of University Heights:

One thing we know about the future of University Heights is that it will change. It has changed just in the six years I have lived here. Our town has become more diverse, more rental-occupied and more congested; I actually see these as positive opportunities to be leveraged for community development. These trends will continue regardless of whether the Maxwell development is approved for the SAPC site. The challenges that University Heights faces, managed and planned for appropriately can represent a real opportunity to build a real town out of what many see as just another nice neighborhood in transition.

With those challenges in mind, I believe the Maxwell development represents a positive move for University Heights taking advantage of our proximity to UI and UIHC to build a community that will enhance our town's potential to be a walkable, cycleable and more transit-friendly community by adding much needed housing density and retail activity to University Heights.

I support the Maxwell Development as planned and urge the City Council to support the project. This project will add tremendous value to our community.

Sincerely,

Donald Baxter

-- Donald Baxter
316 Ridgeview Avenue
University Heights, Iowa 52246
319/337-0494
413/294-1280 (e-fax)

homepage: www.onanov.com

The economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment, not the other way around.

?Gaylord Nelson

Re: Upcoming re-zoning vote

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:49:55 +0000 To: Rachel <rreyn1@yahoo.com>

Dear Rachel,

My answer to you will be very similar to the one I just sent your husband, and is in fact how I've been replying to every email I've received. I have carefully read every email sent directly as well as all correspondence to the zoning commission, as well.

I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 11:53:40 -0700 (PDT)

Rachel <rreyn1@yahoo.com> wrote:

Councilors,

I've written several letters on the issue of developing the St. Andrews property so I'm at a bit of a loss as to what to say in this one. But I can't stop writing because somewhere, deep down, I believe that my voice matters, at least as one of many voices being heard. I want to believe that we all count in this issue. And I firmly believe that if a community-wide vote were taken on the issue of the Maxwell development, this community would be solidly divided down the middle. The council election bore this out. My experience with my neighbors continues to bear this out. And I'm enormously saddened by this division.

My husband and I moved here nearly four years ago and were shocked to find such a welcoming community. We met neighbors that were so helpful and kind and friendly. We feel now as though many of our neighbors are family. This is not a common experience, and certainly not one to be taken for granted. In the past year, as debate on the Maxwell development has raged, that sense of trust and neighborliness has been eroded by suspicion and frustration. I want more than anything to restore the community that I moved into. No development is worth the destruction of a truly unique neighborhood.

And the beauty of the situation is, there is actually a nice compromise on the table. The Bauer plan offers high-density residences and higher tax revenues with the preservation of our neighborhood environment and the protection of the natural environment surrounding the property. I sincerely hope that you will consider healing the divisions in this community.

I believe that a developer is not in the position to decide how a

community should be developed. We get that power. And I hope you see that we can decide what fits best on that property, and the other parties involved can figure out how to make the business of building on that property work. Please vote on Tuesday night for the Bauer compromise. It is a plan that we all can live with and take pride in.

*Sincerely,
Rachel Prickman
321 Koser Ave.*

Re: St. Andrew Site Development

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:57:05 +0000 **To:** Dan Moore <danmoore4@me.com>, lkparko@yahoo.com

Dear Dan and Liesa,

I want to take this opportunity to thank both of you for your letters outlining your positions on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 09 Aug 2010 15:14:36 -0500
Dan Moore <danmoore4@me.com> wrote:

Re: rezoning decision

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 02:58:15 +0000 **To:** linddick@aol.com

Dear Linda,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 18:08:58 -0400 (EDT)
linddick@aol.com wrote:
To all Council members and Mayor,

I am writing to request that you vote to support the recommendations of the Zoning Committee to deny the Maxwell application and to approve the Bauer plan for the possible development of the St. Andrew property. With many of the residents of University Heights indicating their desire to keep University Heights a single family residential neighborhood as well as to eliminate the commercial aspect of the proposed changes, it seems imperative that these residents be represented with your vote to deny the Maxwell plan. Thank you for your service.

Linda Fincham
1475 Grand Ave.

Re: To progress or regress, that is the ????

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 03:01:10 +0000 **To:** Bob Hanson bob.hanson@live.com

Dear Bob and Gloria,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 17:22:24 -0500
Bob Hanson <bob.hanson@live.com> wrote:

Gentlepersons:

Tomorrow night you face a monumental decision. No, it's not really about the Maxwell application vs. the Pat Bauer proposal. Rather it's about whether the municipality of University Heights will move into the 21st century and progress by approving a viable, luxurious development or remain the University Heights of 1935. The problem with the latter alternative is that it is not 1935, it is 2010. Failure for this community to move forward will simply mean that more of the residential property in our little city will become rentals and the overall material condition of the community will decline.

The Bauer proposal is nothing more than a figment of someone's imagination. It tends to remind one of "The Emperor's Clothes"----it's really not there. It is vaporware! No developer has expressed any interest in building it. It is not worth the paper upon which it was written. It exists only in the mind of Mr. Bauer and it nothing more than a political ploy designed to detract from the Maxwell plan---from which it was pilfered!

We fully recognize that the residents of University Heights that live in the general "St. Andrews neighborhood" oppose the Maxwell plan. However, let's be realistic. That group of people, The Friends of University Heights, represent about 10% of the University Heights voting population. That is a minority. They may be vocal, but they are the vocal minority. They cite many reasons for being opposed to the Maxwell plan. Unfortunately, most of their reasons are based upon speculation, not fact.

The major fact that we feel you must strongly consider in making your decision is quite simple. If the Maxwell application is defeated, what happens to the St. Andrews property should the congregation decide to move and sell as is speculated? We do not believe that it takes a rocket scientist to determine that the next "buyer-in-line" will be the University of Iowa. If/when that happens any degree of control that the city of University Heights has over what is constructed on that property goes down the drain. It could be a dormitory, it could be a parking lot, or whatever the university and the Board of Regents deems necessary, and it will not become a taxable entity.

We recognize that the Maxwell proposal is not perfect. But then, we don't live in a perfect world (even though some of our esteemed fellow residents seem to think that they do). In our minds the Maxwell project is a viable opportunity for progress to take place in University Heights. In addition, it also affords the city council the opportunity to control how the project develops and over the covenants that govern its operation. Therefore we would encourage you all to approve the Maxwell application.

Respectfully,

*Robert & Gloria Hanson
506 Mahaska Ct.*

Re: St. Andrew Development 2

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 03:03:53 +0000 **To:** Liesa Parko lkparko@yahoo.com

Thanks, Liesa,

I thought 400 looked low, but given how many numbers I've looked at in the past month...

-Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 15:23:52 -0700 (PDT)

Liesa Parko <lkparko@yahoo.com> wrote:

Attached is my letter (with the numerical error corrected) regarding the St. Andrew site development.

Liesa Moore

Re: Meeting

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 03:08:25 +0000 **To:** "Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu>

Dear Larry,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 17:54:46 -0500

"Fritts, Lawrence N" <lawrence-fritts@uiowa.edu> wrote:

Dear Mayor From and City Council Members:

I urge you to vote for the Bauer plan and vote no for the Maxwell plan for re-zoning the St. Andrews Presbyterian Church property. The Maxwell plan is simply out of scale in our town in terms of the size of the buildings, number of units, number of new residents, and increased traffic on Melrose. Particularly out of character with our town, is number and location of commercial properties that will detract from the quiet and beauty of the neighborhood. We already have a commercial business in the form of a restaurant and coffee shop. I cannot imagine any other business that would be a benefit to our town. The prospect of seeing lighted signs for 6 new businesses on Melrose sinks my heart. Since the rent of these properties (at \$30 per square foot) is among the highest in Iowa City and out of scale with the neighborhood, there is a real danger that, in time, businesses would fail and the property would remain empty, inviting vandalism and other crime. This is an improvement to our community? No, it is a way of making money for the developer and architect.

I have looked at the Maxwell and Bauer plans, as well as the UH budget records of the past decade. If we have been able to successfully make improvements over the years, and are in an apparently good position to borrow money as before, why do we need more money? If we already have the means to make the necessary improvements to our town's infrastructure, what else is there of equal importance that we cannot currently pay for? Amenities? I have heard secondhand of a councilor's idea of hiring an arborist for the city. I have heard myself a councilor wishing we had money for our yearly Chataqua. These are nothing more than extras; extravagances, really. In all of the meetings I have attended in the last two years, all of the documents I have read

on the UH website, and copies of emails expressing support or opposition to the Maxwell plan, I have not heard of a single benefit to our community other than having a coffee shop (which is not financially viable) and more tax revenue. What is it precisely that these proponents of the Maxwell plan wish to do with that revenue? Whatever it is, is it worth the harm done to our neighbors near the site? We must consider the impact on these residents. Will not the Maxwell development detract from our neighbors? sense of quiet, space, and beauty? What of the value of the houses? How many of us who were attracted to the quiet elegance of our town would move across the street from such a site?

I am personally offended by the ways in which Maxwell and Munson have been consistently portraying the development in the best possible light, hoping to downplay and obscure any potentially negative aspects. This might work in other communities, but ours is populated by people in the university and hospital whose jobs are to read and evaluate what a writer or speaker is trying to say and what one is trying to suppress. All of the people I have talked to share the view that both men are trying to obscure and misrepresent the facts, while at the same time refusing to cooperate with the residents and consider a compromise solution. I do not feel that either man would keep the city's best interests at heart in the actual development and building of the project. We must remember that they are proposing a way to make money for themselves, not to improve the quality of life in our town.

Sincerely,

*Lawrence Fritts
Associate Professor
School of Music
University of Iowa
114 Highland Drive*

Re: Maxwell Proposal

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 03:10:16 +0000 **To:** "Silverman, William" <william-silverman@uiowa.edu>

Dear Bill,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 18:05:31 -0500

"Silverman, William" <william-silverman@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Dear Louise, Mike, Jim, Stan, Brennan and Pat:

I have read the Maxwell proposal (6 story/3 story /residential-commercial development) plan. While others may certainly choose to disagree, I do not believe that this would be in the best of the community to proceed in this direction. I thank you for considering this.

Bill Silverman
1527 Oakcrest Ave.

Re: Maxwell Development

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 03:12:23 +0000 **To:** Cathie Payvandi Payvandi@mchsi.com

Dear Cathie,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 20:49:43 -0500

Cathie Payvandi <Payvandi@mchsi.com> wrote:

The course of conversation over the Maxwell Development project has gone on far too long. -- The majority of citizens in the UH community have made their wishes known to zoning representatives as well as to the council members and yet, it seems, this discussion continues. Please know that for all the reasons that have been repeated over and over again, the Maxwell project needs to find another site and when all the conversation comes to a conclusion, I would urge the Council to listen to the UH community and act according to wishes of the constituents that you represent.
cathie payvandi

Re: Maxwell, Bauer proposals

Date: Tue, 10 Aug 2010 03:15:12 +0000 **To:** David Pedersen dpedersen63@gmail.com

Dear David and Jacinda,

Thank you for your letter outlining your position on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- ? State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- ? UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- ? JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- ? Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- ? Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Mon, 9 Aug 2010 22:05:03 -0500

David Pedersen <dpedersen63@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear University Heights City Council Members,

We're writing to express our support for the Bauer alternative proposal for the St. Andrew site, the proposal that the Zoning Commission approved at its July 22 meeting.

A few thoughts:

- We prefer the "4-2" aspect of the Bauer proposal, with the rear building at 55 feet and the front building at 39 feet (which is only a few feet above the current 35-foot limit currently in UH); in our view, the size of these structures would be more in line with the surrounding neighborhood. This compares to the "6-3" (76- and 54-foot-tall buildings) aspect of the Maxwell proposal. The sheer size of the Maxwell development plan would, in our view, dominate and diminish the neighborhood.

- We're not in favor of the commercial development component of the Maxwell plan. We're not convinced that additional commercial development is necessary. We're also concerned about the increase in traffic and noise that commercial development at the St. Andrew site will bring. The Bauer proposal eliminates the commercial component, which then reduces the need for all the parking spaces--which, in effect, could help preserve the ravine. We feel that maintaining the protected areas in UH is important.

- Finally, we can accept 74 units as proposed in the Bauer plan (which is only 19 units less than the Maxwell proposal) because it represents a

reasonable compromise. It would allow for development of the St. Andrew site, and it could also serve as a positive step toward bringing our community "back together."

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
David & Jacinda Pedersen
309 Sunset Street

Re: Proposed UH Development Plan **Date:** Tue, 10 Aug 2010 15:52:07 +0000 **To:**
"Quezada, Silvia" squezada@Aegonusa.com

Dear Sylvia,

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your letter outlining your positions on the development proposals to be addressed at the August city council meeting. I have been spending a great deal of time looking into many aspects of both proposals. My guidelines in this analysis have been focused on, but not limited to:

- State law regarding Smart Growth principles
- UH 2010 Comprehensive Plan
- JCCOG Staff Reports for both proposals
- Zoning Commission Minutes and communication
- Input from UH citizens

I can honestly say that right now I have major questions about both proposals. Like you I look forward to Tuesday's meeting to hear more about them. -Mike Haverkamp

On Tue, 10 Aug 2010 09:34:33 -0500
"Quezada, Silvia" <squezada@Aegonusa.com> wrote:
August 10, 2010

Re: Proposed UH Development Plan/Public Comment

Dear Mayor From and Council Members:

I am writing in support of the mixed residential and commercial use plan option under current consideration for the following reasons:

(a) Down Sizing Options I've seen neighbors sell their single-family homes and down-size to smaller condos out in Coralville. It makes sense for a town to have a section of its jurisdiction set-up to accommodate folks who down-size or don't want a huge "stamp" to take care for. The brick condos on Sunset Ave. are not a fair counterpoint to toss out. They lack realty pizzazz and are poorly organized, which translates to lower ROI.

(b) Mixed Use I support having a commercial strip with a public gathering place for UH town hall meetings, etc. I hate going to the IC Library for an interesting lecture. Having said this, the UH Council Members should take extraordinary caution (read: retain a very good lawyer) to negotiate "family-friendly" covenants over the types of

commerce to settle into the commercial section of the Maxwell plan. As we all know, if Maxwell projects a \$60 sq. ft. charge, but the market doesn't support that price, then, prices get adjusted to accommodate the market's ability.

(c) Revenue Refunds I like fiscal security. If this proposed development produces more revenue than what the town's accounting books call for, then give us a refund for years in which there is an excess.

(d) Modernize Services Improve the UH services. For example, in the City of Fairfax (CoF), VA (a small place like UH), the City supported tree planting efforts by procuring a variety of trees, which in turn it sold at discount to its residents to encourage greening the city. To date, CoF is a lush, sought after place to live in and folks pay top \$\$\$ to get in. Why stop there? UH can set up discounted rain barrels for residents to purchase help promote local conservation and run-off issues. Why not explore a limited lease to the Horn elementary West side grass property (on Emerald St) to bring to UH a small doggie park (open only on weekends or well after school hours), eh...? Lots of amenities to consider.

(e) Bad Boy UOI It's an open secret in UH/IC that the UOI is a terrible neighbor to have and doesn't pay property taxes. I don't believe the UOI would have this much discussion with UH if the opportunity to purchase and develop was presented to them. I prefer having a tax paying entity, subject to local jurisdiction rules develop this property.

I strongly urge the Council to adopt the first, mixed-use plan for development.

Sincerely,

Silvia Quezada
416 Ridgeview Ave

This message and any accompanying documents are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary and/or constitutes a trade secret. If a reader of this email is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are strictly prohibited from reading, disseminating, distributing, or copying this communication. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy the original transmission.

Re: Maxwell Proposal

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 2010 11:50:23 +0000 To: "Silverman, William" william-silverman@uiowa.edu

Bill,

We deferred action on both proposal (Maxwell and Bauer) until our September meeting. We also scheduled a work session of the council for August 24 to talk about both proposals. That's about as concise a summary I can give for a nearly 4 hour meeting.

-Mike Haverkamp

On Tue, 10 Aug 2010 18:32:11 -0500

"Silverman, William" <william-silverman@uiowa.edu> wrote:
Mike:

Still have patients to see tonight as I am on call. Will therefore miss the meeting. If you have a spare moment would you kindly let me know how the discussion went?

Thanks!

Bill

William B. Silverman MD FACG AGAF
Professor of Medicine
Division of Gastroenterology/Hepatology
Univeristy of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics
4553-A JCP
200 Hawkins Dr.
Iowa City IA 52242-1009
Tel: 319-384-9995
Fax:319-356-7918
william-silverman@uiowa.edu

-----Original Message-----

From: mayhem@inav.net [<mailto:mayhem@inav.net>] Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 10:10 PM
To: Silverman, William
Subject: Re: Maxwell Proposal

Re: Support Maxwell Development

Date: Wed, 11 Aug 2010 11:52:49 +0000 **To:** Donald Baxter
<donald.baxter@gmail.com>

Well the meeting was certainly surprising. Stan made amendment suggestions that led us to deferring action until September.

-Mike

On Tue, 10 Aug 2010 20:08:46 -0500

Donald Baxter <donald.baxter@gmail.com> wrote:
Here's Stan's boilerplate answer in case you need some inspiration :-)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Stan Laverman <slaverman@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 1:09 PM
Subject: Re: Support Maxwell Development
To: Donald Baxter <donald.baxter@gmail.com>

Mr. Baxter-

Thank you for your e-mail.

Stan Laverman

On Mon, Aug 9, 2010 at 12:07 PM, Donald Baxter
<donald.baxter@gmail.com>wrote:

University Heights

Date: Wed, 18 Aug 2010 12:16:13 +0000 **To:** pfisher@iowapolicyproject.org

Dr. Fisher,

You may have read in the PC last week that we deferred a decision on our zoning proposals. We have scheduled a work session for Tuesday August 24th at 7:00 PM at the St. Andrew's Church Fellowship Hall to discuss the proposals further. Would you be interested in coming to perhaps give a short comments regarding municipal finance in general with some specifics that may apply regarding potential commercial development? If you were available for questions as we talk that might be helpful too. Let me know if you're interested or available.

-Mike Haverkamp

Re: Information Peter Fisher at Work Session?

Date: Fri, 20 Aug 2010 03:58:23 +0000 **To:** Brennan McGrath brennanmcg@gmail.com

Brennan,

I stopped by the Iowa Policy Institute offices this afternoon. Fisher is out of town and not back until next week Wednesday. We could maybe get him for the September council meeting? If I hear from him I'll ask that.

-Mike

On Thu, 19 Aug 2010 12:45:33 -0500

Brennan McGrath <brennanmcg@gmail.com> wrote:

Mike,

Were you able to get in touch with Mr. Fisher. I called his office and have

had no response.

Thanks

Brennan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kent Ralston <Kent-Ralston@iowa-city.org>

Date: Tue, Aug 10, 2010 at 9:14 AM

Subject: Information

To: "brennanmcq@gmail.com" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>

Brennan - I spoke with John and we came to the conclusion that Peter Fisher

(or his staff) at the Iowa Policy Project would be your best bet for an analysis of the UH budget and a 101 on public finances. I have attached his information below.

Peter Fisher, Research Director
**Budget & Tax, Economic Opportunity **

Peter holds a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
*Peter is a national expert on public finance and has served as a consultant to the Iowa Dept. of Economic Development, the State of Ohio, and the Iowa Business Council. His reports are regularly published in State Tax Notes and refereed journals. His recent book *Grading Places: What Do the Business Climate Rankings Really Tell Us?* was published by the Economic Policy Institute in 2005. Peter is a professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Iowa.*

Peter provides overall supervision for IPP research activities. He is directly involved in research, writing and outreach on state tax and budget issues. He has authored or co-authored the majority of Iowa Fiscal Partnership reports and guest opinions on state tax policy.
Email:pfisher (at) iowapolicyproject.org **

The Iowa Policy Project website is:
<http://www.iowapolicyproject.org/WhoWeAre.html>

As we discussed this morning, I have also attached a link below that will take you to the Johnson County website; the site has contact information for our local elected officials.

<http://www.johnson-county.com/auditor/official/official.htm>

Hope this helps, if you need any additional information please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Kent A. Ralston, AICP
Assistant Transportation Planner
Johnson County Council of Governments
410 E. Washington St.
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
319.356.5253
www.jccog.org

-- Here's to each and every day!

Brennan McGrath CSW
Johnson Brothers of Iowa
Restaurant Division Sales & Education
319-855-0050 cell/text
BMcGrath@johnsonbrothers.com
BrennanMcG@gmail.com

Fri, September 17, 2010 12:08 am

To: "Belgum, Katherine G" <katherine-belgum@uiowa.edu>

Priority: Normal

Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file
Perfect!

-Mike

> Mike: Thanaks for the reply. Monday the 20th between 4 and 5 would be
> perfect. That is my "happy hour" time anyway. See you then Kathie

>

>

> From: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

> [mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org]

> Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2010 8:10 PM

> To: Belgum, Katherine G

> Subject: Re: the project

>

> Hey Kathie,
>
> I would like that, and your front porch sounds very good. Would next
> Monday the 20th be ok? I could come either from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM or at
> 7:00 PM.
>
> Let me know if that is good for you.
>
> -Mike
>
>> Mike: I would to talk with you one on one sometime within the next week.
>> You choose the time since you are a working man. My front porch could
>> be
>> the locale. Kathie
>
>

Date: Fri, September 17, 2010 2:29 pm
To: "Mary Lu Callahan" <mlcallahan@bluebottle.com>

Mary Lu,

Of course I remember you, and I appreciate the update on Ben. I ran into Will Hoyer several weeks ago, he is now working for the Iowa Policy Institute here at the UI. It hardly seems possible that I have students that old!

I also remembered that you grew up in UH, and I appreciate the support. The places you mention are all fondly remembered by many others, we just celebrated our 75th town birthday on Aug. 29. There was a parade and we held our annual Chautauqua celebration with it. If you go to the City website:

www.university-heights.org

You will see a link at the top of the page for the Diamond jubilee. There are lots of pictures of the celebration as well as historical information. Take a look at the history detectives portion and look up your old house. Consider writing a few memories and sending them in also.

-Mike

> Mike,
> Hope you remember me (by the way, Ben is doing fine, married, and
> doing a post-doc at Stanford). I have been following this development

> controversy from afar (PC online everyday), and I just wanted to
> commend you on your published comments and your position. When we come
> back to visit IC, actually the city looks good and invigorated, but
> you know, University Heights does not. It does look "old" and the
> housing stock reflects that (and old is not necessarily bad, but it
> looks a bit "worn"). To me, now living on Long Island where there is
> dense-pak of commercial and residential, the development that you can
> choose, and work to shape, is a great idea. Because change does come,
> and those who deny it will be overwhelmed some day. That Neuzil
> development, while in IC technically, will definitely impact U.
> Heights. That property is an old neighbor of my parents' house. And I
> would think some thoughtful commercial properties would be a great
> addition to the area. From growing up there I remember how the small
> grocery (Lausen's), the drug store (Boerner's) and the gift store
> (Leu's) were well-loved and well-used members of U. Heights.
> Anyway, please keep a stiff upper lip!
> Mary Lu Callahan
>

Date: Fri, September 17, 2010 4:01 pm
To: "zlatko anguelov" <zanguelov@gmail.com>
Priority: Normal
Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file

Zlatko-

That would work, I have a class at 1:30 could we meet at Stella at 11:45?

-Mike

> Mike, why not make it a lunch? Evenings are not a good time for me. Let's
> have a bite at the new restaurant on Thursday, 9/23. If this doesn't work
> for you, any noon time Mon through Wed the week thereafter works for me.

> ZLATKO

>

> On Fri, Sep 17, 2010 at 12:00 AM,
> <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>wrote:

>

>> Zlatko-

>>

>> I am sorry that I have frustrated you. I would be happy to have a
>> conversation with you. Next week would probably be my earliest time as I
>> have commitments through the weekend and early next week. Would Thursday
>> evening work for you? I will be free any time after 7:00 PM.

>>
>> Just to let you know I am continuing to gather and publish emails I just
>> put two more sets up tonight. I hope to have everything up through
>> Tuesday's meeting by this weekend.
>>
>> -Mike
>>
>> > Hi Mike,
>> >
>> > You strike me as a person with more integrity and intelligence than
>> any
>> of
>> > your peers in the council who support the Maxwell project or the
>> mayor.
>> > You
>> > are an educator of solid reputation, a good neighbor, and an exemplary
>> > father as far as I can judge. But at the same time you strike me also
>> as
>> a
>> > person who can talk for hours without saying anything, a master of
>> empty
>> > metaphors. But because of the former, I believe you and I may have a
>> > conversation.
>> >
>> > First off, you teach young children on a daily basis, and I'm puzzled
>> how
>> > you explain to them the facts of life and the logic that connects
>> those
>> > facts. Because in your public pronouncements regarding the contentious
>> > project, I have not found such a logic. Example: that you "love this
>> > community" sounds to me a groundless claim that has nothing to do with
>> the
>> > proposed development, particularly in view of the fierce opposition
>> that
>> > it
>> > is driving. Perception is everything, Mike, and my perception of this
>> > specific claim is that it cannot be justified. So, do you have one
>> type
>> of
>> > language in the class room and another at the council meetings?
>> >
>> > Next, I have tried so far to hear why you really support this
>> project--and

>> > this man, for that matter--and couldn't find anything in your speeches
>> or
>> > interviews that could serve as evidence of why. Your mainstay, the
>> waning
>> > budget situation, has never been supported by real numbers and a
>> > scientifically-based estimate. So what else? What else drives you and
>> the
>> > other three to follow Mayor From in her obsession?
>> >
>> > Further on, I understand that you have a record of preservationist.
>> How
>> do
>> > you reconcile this record and your devotion to historic preservation
>> with
>> > your groundless defense of a greed-driven destruction of a
>> neighborhood
>> > with
>> > a certain historic tradition? You certainly know that UH is not unique
>> in
>> > this kind of reach by big money because of good location and expected
>> > profit.
>> >
>> > Fourthly, I and most of my neighbors are absolutely flabbergasted by
>> the
>> > way
>> > you NEVER ANSWERED to what is being said in public meetings, emails,
>> and
>> > other types of communication. There can be two explanations, in my
>> mind:
>> > you
>> > either do not listen or you bypass people's arguments on purpose.
>> Which
>> > one
>> > is true, although both don't speak of "love for the community?" With
>> > people
>> > whom I love, I always listen, speak, and try to come to an agreement,
>> no
>> > matter how long it will take us.
>> >
>> > I would be really glad if you answered my questions, either in writing
>> or
>> > in
>> > an one-on-one conversation over lunch or coffee or whatever you

>> prefer.
>> > You
>> > may or may not publish this Email: i wouldn't mind if you do but I
>> don't
>> > insist on your doing it.
>> >
>> > To sum up, I'm still looking for an answer to this nagging question:
>> what
>> > is
>> > the real reason you support this project? You have not given anybody a
>> > satisfactory explanation.
>> >
>> > Best wishes,
>> > ZLATKO
>> >
>> > On Wed, Sep 15, 2010 at 8:21 PM,
>> > <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>wrote:
>> >
>> >> Zlatko-
>> >>
>> >> I am working on the compilation of emails and hope to be able to
>> begin
>> >> by
>> >> publishing the first set tonight (Wed. Sept. 15) after I get my
>> younger
>> >> daughter to bed. Now I need to go take her upstairs.
>> >>
>> >> -Mike Haverkamp
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> > Dear Ms From and council members,
>> >> >
>> >> > I'm writing after having acquainted myself with Mr. Ballard's
>> letter
>> >> to
>> >> > you
>> >> > dated September 13, and I demand that this email of mine become
>> public
>> >> > record ASAP. Time is of the essence, since it appears quite likely
>> >> that
>> >> > you
>> >> > intend to vote on the re-zoning proposals today.
>> >> >

>> >> > Ms. Mary Wilson's request had a specific purpose: to make evident
>> to
>> >> our
>> >> > community BEFORE your vote how many individuals are against Mr.
>> >> Maxwell's
>> >> > proposal and how many are for it, given that some council members
>> >> claimed
>> >> > without evidence that they have received many emails that favored
>> it.
>> >> The
>> >> > fact that you needed a lawyer's opinion before making your email
>> >> > correspondence with UH citizens--whom you serve--public reveals a
>> >> trend
>> >> > (and
>> >> > perhaps a concealed willingness) of non-transparency that has
>> >> surrounded
>> >> > this crucial issue since the beginning. As a matter of fact, WE
>> HAVE
>> >> NEVER
>> >> > HEARD A CLEARLY EXPRESSED OPINION on the issue by Ms.
Yeggy, Mr.
>> >> > Havenkamp,
>> >> > Mr. Lane, and Ms. From.
>> >> >
>> >> > I want specifically to address the case of Mr. Lane. In a situation
>> >> > when--given the lack of a quantifying tool--the UH community seems
>> >> divided
>> >> > on an issue of such vital--and with irreversible long-lasting
>> >> > effects--importance, a radical re-zoning of the nature demanded by
>> Mr.
>> >> > Maxwell *cannot and must not* be decided by the vote of a person
>> who
>> >> has
>> >> > not
>> >> > been elected to serve the community. And I'm thereby appealing to
>> Mr.
>> >> > Lane's
>> >> > conscience. You are in a double conflict, sir: one, you are not
>> >> authorized
>> >> > by us to represent our interests in our city government and second,
>> >> your
>> >> > wife is on the Zoning commission and voted in favor of Mr.
>> Maxwell's

>> >> > proposal.
>> >> >
>> >> > In a more general sense, the issue at stake is not about the small
>> >> print
>> >> > of
>> >> > the designs presented by Mr. Maxwell nor about the financial health
>> of
>> >> our
>> >> > city anymore, the issue is about accountability and the legitimacy
>> of
>> >> the
>> >> > council's actions. And in Ms. Wilson's letter requesting
>> >> > transparency--which, I repeat, is conspicuously lacking--she
>> clearly
>> >> > stated:
>> >> > "Our city government is owned by the people, and all of you were
>> >> elected
>> >> > (with the exception of one councilor) as public servants to
>> discharge
>> >> your
>> >> > duties in the interest of the people of University Heights. I'm
>> sure
>> >> you
>> >> > are aware that you are accountable to the citizenry, not to outside
>> >> > interests nor to personal interests." No matter what PC language we
>> >> use
>> >> in
>> >> > our official statements, on a personal level, it comes down to *the
>> >> > honesty
>> >> > and conscience of our public servants*.
>> >> >
>> >> > Besides, the time will soon come when this council has to be held
>> >> > accountable for things they have NOT done outside the re-zoning
>> issue.
>> >> > Since
>> >> > the beginning of this year, we haven't heard this council to have
>> >> acted
>> >> on
>> >> > any other matter of importance except the re-zoning.
>> >> >
>> >> > Once again, I appeal to all of you to postpone any action on the
>> >> disputed
>> >> > re-zoning matter until after the special elections are held. And I

>> >> expect
>> >> > Mr. Lane to recuse himself from any vote on re-zoning.
>> >> >
>> >> > Respectfully,
>> >> > ZLATKO ANGUELOV
>> >> > --
>> >> > zlatko anguelov
>> >> > 207 golfview avenue
>> >> > iowa city, ia 52246
>> >> > 319-351-8778

Date: Sat, September 18, 2010 9:16 am
To: "Patricia Yeggy" <pat.yeggy@gmail.com>
Priority: Normal
Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file

Perfect.

-Mike

> I'll come after - 11:00 perhaps?
>
> Pat
>
> On Sat, Sep 18, 2010 at 9:08 AM,
> <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>wrote:
>
>> If you want to come before you meet your SIL or after, I will be here.
>>
>> -Mike
>>
>> > Yes, I can come over.
>> >
>> > My schedule -
>> >
>> > Supposed to meet my S-I-L at 10:30 for coffee and go up and down my
>> street
>> > with Jim Lane at 3:00 to meet-and-greet constituents.
>> >
>> > What a good time?
>> >
>> > Pat
>> >

>> >
>> > On Sat, Sep 18, 2010 at 7:41 AM,
>> > <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>wrote:
>> >
>> >> Pat,
>> >>
>> >> Can you come over today to go over our email lists? I have finally
>> >> gotten
>> >> my last set collated. IF you bring a hard copy of the email list you
>> >> sent
>> >> with dates, that would be appreciated. Do you have a laptop? If so
>> bring
>> >> it along too.
>> >>
>> >> -Mike

Date: Sat, September 18, 2010 12:33 pm
To: "wally" <wallu@aol.com>
Priority: Normal
Options: [View Full Header](#) | [View Printable Version](#) | [Download this as a file](#)

Wally,

The calendar I forgot to check was my work one. I am scheduled to film the school board meeting Tuesday night. We could either do Wednesday at 6:15 (my band practices at 7:15) or Thursday at 7:00. If Wednesday is better for you I'd say lets meet at my house, If Thursday I could come to yours.

-Mike

> Sounds good for Tuesday. Let me know which works best for you - my coming
> to your house or vice versa. I don't have the kids problem to worry
> about so either way is fine. If I come to your place I will bring a
> couple cold ones. Phone 351 3610 Thanks Wally

>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org
> To: wally <wallu@aol.com>
> Sent: Fri, Sep 17, 2010 12:07 am

> Subject: Re: From Wally Heitman
>
>
> Wally,
> I appreciate your understanding, let's tentatively say 7:00 on Tuesday the
> 1st pending another check of my kids' schedules.
> -Mike
>> Mike -Thanks for the reply. No problem with the late response as I know
> these things do happen. Let me know when next week (except Wednesday)
> or
> Monday/Tuesday the week after would work for you. I work till 530 so
> sometime 7ish generally works best for me. Thanks Wally

>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org
> To: wallu@aol.com
> Sent: Tue, Sep 14, 2010 11:38 pm
> Subject: Re: From Wally Heitman

>
>
> Wally-
> I need to sincerely apologize to you, I just found this email right
> before
> onight's council meeting. I was hoping you would might be there so I
> ould explain personally what happened. I did issue a public apology at
> he meeting.
> I hope your offer still stands. I would be very happy to talk with you
> bout the development. I never turn down an offer that allows me to sit
> ut and have a beer along with discussion!
> Please let me know if there is a convenient time in the next week or so
> hen we could get together.

> -Mike

>
>
>
> Mike - I would like to meet with you and talk about the development.
> We
> could meet wherever is convenient for you, including my deck with a
> beer

> or something similar. Please let me know - email or 351 3610.
>
> Thanks Wally Heitman
>

Date: Sun, September 19, 2010 8:24 pm
To: "Mary Mathew Wilson" <uhplace@rocketmail.com>
Cc: stan-laverman@university-heights.org (more)
Priority: Normal
Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file

Hey Mary,

I'm pretty confident all email sent to council related to the zoning ordinance is posted. Pat Yeggy came over yesterday and we cross checked my list with a list she had already checked against Louise's list. The big issue we discovered yesterday was that there were quite a few emails that I didn't get because people were spelling "haverkamp" as "havercamp." That is one of the things that led to the additional postings for dates already posted.

I have collected all email I sent, as has Pat and Jim Lane. I don't have "sent email" yet from Stan or Brennan. I had planned to get everyone's and post it all together, but if Pat and Jim are OK with posting ours tonight I will do so. I've copied all of them on this email and will call them as well.

I will need to scan letters that have been received. The only letter I have is from Gretchen Blair, and I also got that electronically, I know Louise's list had two letters listed, I'll get a hold of them as soon as possible.

If any of this is unclear, please do not hesitate to email back or call me at 337-7180.

-Mike

> Dear Mike,
>
> I have viewed the multiple postings of emails and other communications
> placed on

> the city website over the past few days and am writing to confirm that
> nothing
> has been left out. Has everything been posted that was asked for in my
> Sept.
> 11th email request for open records to the mayor and council (and later
> recapitulated in the letter to the mayor and council from Steve Ballard)?
> If
> not, could you please describe what was left out and why?
>
> Thank you,
>
> Mary
> Mary Mathew Wilson
> UH Place Website Manager
> uhplace@rocketmail.com
> 308 Koser Avenue
> University Heights, Iowa 52246-3002
> (319) 936-2445
> UH Place...the meeting place in University Heights
> <http://uhplace.org>
>
>
>

Date: Sun, September 19, 2010 8:26 pm
To: "Alice Haugen" <alice.haugen@gmail.com>
Priority: Normal
Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file

Alice-

To be safe let's say town hall, if Stella doesn't look busy we can go in there, but I'm guessing you're right about the dinner crowd.

See you tomorrow.

-Mike

> 7:00 will work for me, then. I've been meeting some folks at Stella, but
> perhaps at 7:00 they will still be busy with dinner. I would be happy to
> meet there or at the town hall. Let me know your preference.

>
> On Fri, Sep 17, 2010 at 12:11 AM,

> <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>wrote:
>
>> Alice-
>>
>> Kathie picked the early time so 7:00 it is. Where would you like to
>> meet?
>>
>> -Mike
>>
>> > The time left after she chooses one would be fine. Thanks very much.
>> >
>> > On Wed, Sep 15, 2010 at 8:26 PM,
>> > <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>wrote:
>> >
>> >>
>> >> Alice-
>> >>
>> >> I would like that. I am at work between 8 and 4. I gave Cathie Belgum
>> >> the
>> >> choice of either 4:00 PM or 7:00 PM on Monday Sept. 20th. (She asked
>> >> first) Could we perhaps meet at the time she does not choose? If so,
>> >> I'll
>> >> let you know when I hear from her.
>> >>
>> >> Also thanks for the electronic version of your remarks. I appreciate
>> >> being
>> >> able to refer to them as well as the paper copy.
>> >>
>> >> -Mike Haverkamp
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Hello - I would appreciate a time to meet with you sometime soon to
>> >> discuss
>> >> the University Heights sensitive areas ordinance and protected
>> >> slopes. I
>> >> can
>> >> meet at almost any time except Tuesdays during the day or Sunday
>> >> mornings.
>> >> Thank you.
>>
> --
> Peace +
>

- > Alice
- >
- > Ring the bells that still can ring
- > Forget your perfect offering
- > There is a crack in everything
- > That's how the light gets in.
- >