ADDITIONAL WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS ZONING COMMISSION

PDF PAGE	LAST	FIRST	ADDRESS	DATE
1	Belgum	Kathie	104 Sunset	5/4/09
3	Fincham	Linda	1475 Grand	5/5/09
4	Blair	Gretchen	51 Prospect	5/11/09
5	Wretman	Rich	386 Koser	5/12/09
6	Hedlund	Steven & Chris	1490 Grand	5/14/09
7	Baxter	Don	316 Ridgeview	5/16/09
8	Saehler	John	323 Highland	5/18/09

Memorandum

Date: May 4, 2009
To: University Heights Zoning Commission
Bauer, Robertson, Gay, Heitman, Lane
From: Kathie Belgum KB
Subject: Request for opposition to rezoning St. Andrew property

I have three points to mention.

I. The meeting on Wednesday April 29, 2009 brought out many citizens who stated their objections to the proposed Maxwell development. I think the objections were reasonable, clear, and sincerely stated; namely

Noise
Density
Traffic
Aesthetics - the proposed buildings do not fit in with the community
Lack of control by U Heights over the strip mall vendors

All of these points are reasons for prohibiting a zoning change.
Also the neighborhood canvass showed citizens want University Heights to remain a single family neighborhood.

II. The three speakers who were in favor of the project had only one issue which concerned them - money.

Steve Ballard, the University Heights attorney, provided us with information stating what could happen to the property owned by St. Andrew if it remained zoned single family, R1.

It could be divided into "at least" nine (9) single family plats - possibly even more if a culdesac design were used. This would provide additional tax money to U. Heights. Based on what Birkdale pays this would be a minimum of $43,000 +, possibly more. Mr. Ballard also states that this development could be accomplished <u>without</u> changing Sunset Street thus allow University Heights to remain a single family community and preserve the trees and natural environment we now have. The additional money would be pure "gravy" since St. Andrew never paid taxes.

III. At one point Kevin Monson. the architect for the project, mentioned that UIHC was moving certain departments out to Coralville to "ease congestion" on campus. However the UIHC 2007-2008 Annual Report which was just published (and delivered to my mail box on May 1, 2009) states imminent plans approved by the Board of Regents (on page 3) as:

1. A new wing added to the children's hospital connected to renovated facilities
2. An addition that will increase the numbers of private rooms hospital-wide
3. A new $30,000,000 Research facility of 200,000 sq. ft. just south of the Carver Biomedical Research Building.

All of this does not sound like cutting back to me, it sounds like more patients and employees, more congestion.

Can our elected representatives preserve our Community from spot zoning as others have done over the past and still provide a most desirable neighborhood in which to raise families. I think they can.

From: Linddick@aol.com [mailto:Linddick@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2009 10:06 PM
To: Bauer, Patrick B; WALLU@aol.com; WKRKAR@aol.com; wallacegay@mchsi.com; jlane07@mchsi.com
Subject: re-zoning request

Dear Zoning Commission Members:

I have a few thoughts regarding the rezoning of the St. Andrew property which is currently being considered.

First, if this is allowed, I have concerns about other developers requesting rezoning for the building of condominiums . This would create additional high density areas resulting in a drastic change in our community, and it would no longer be the neighborhood environment we have enjoyed in University Heights. Is the revenue more important than the quality of living now enjoyed by University Heights residents?

Second, though the commercial area/plaza is intended to bring people together, it is my concern that it will also attract undesirable activities. Have you considered that this could influence the crime rate in the community? Last week, while shopping at Hartig Drug just a short distance away, I experienced a "pan-handler" which makes me think that the "plaza" might be used by many non-residents who have time for loitering.

Another concern is the unknown of what exactly will happen with this property. I was surprised to read in the *Corridor Business Journal* today that a dog park is planned as well as a bridge across the ravine to the Athletic Club. What else is in store?

I greatly appreciate the time and consideration each of you is giving to our community. Thank you.

Linda Fincham
1475 Grand Ave.

From: Gretchen Blair [mailto:blairgh@inav.net]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 9:36 PM
To: Bauer, Patrick B
Subject: rezoning

Dear Pat, Bill, Weldon, Catherine and Karl,

I am writing to request you advise the University Heights council to vote against the Jeff Maxwell complex. I stand by all the concerns of the residents who spoke on 4/29 and see little virtue in those who spoke for the benefits which seemed to be solely money for taxes. Even if we would be fortunate enough to attract busineses of the quality I'm going to mention, I question whether they would bring enough support to remain viable. Using the corner of Melrose and Sunset as a reference point, less than a mile west we already have a decent dry cleaner, coffee shop and drugstore. A block east we have a very good restaurant. Less than a mile east we have two specialty grocery stores and restaurants and coffee shops galore. I'm also concerned this project would provide a slippery slope for more condo developments in the area, for instance if the Nate Moore property were to sell at some point. I urge you to advise the council to oppose this proposal and that we not be frightened of the next potential project (i.e. the university) should this not pass, but reasonably consider each new situation that arises at the St. Andrew site.

Thanks to each of you for volunteering your time to this important matter!

Gretchen Blair

From: Wretmans@aol.com [mailto:Wretmans@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2009 7:06 PM
To: Bauer, Patrick B
Cc: Wretmans@aol.com
Subject: St. Andrew Development

Pat

As you probably know by now, Deb and I have written in support of the Maxwell proposal to develop the St. Andrew property. We believe that the mixed-use approach will add to our community, not detract from it. In addition, we think this project has been well-thought-out; the developers aren't just throwing up a seven-story apartment building.

Last week on the U. Heights website, I read through all the comments people had sent in regarding the project. It was interesting to read the varying opinions.

As I read through them, one thought kept coming back to me: The decision on this development is **critical** to the future of University Heights over the long haul. We won't get to do this over in a couple of years..

If the Maxwell project is not approved, I have every reason to believe the University will purchase the property. When that happens, the fiscal viability of U. Heights has to be in jeopardy at some point down the line. We will never get the tax base back. How long will it be before we are "annexed"(there may be a better term here) by Iowa City?

Not long ago, I was talking about this project with a prominent Iowa City citizen (you would certainly recognize the name) and I was asked: "If this project doesn't go through, where does University Heights think it will be in 10 to 20 years?"

I have asked myself that question repeatedly since that conversation and can't come up with a good answer.

In the end, I agree with the well-written document Dell Richard submitted. He clearly gave this topic a great deal of thought, and I wholeheartedly agree with his conclusion: For the long-term future of University Heights, we need to approve the Maxwell proposal.

Rich Wretman

From: hedlundsc@aol.com [mailto:hedlundsc@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2009 12:31 PM
To: Bauer, Patrick B; wallu@aol.com; wallacegay@mchsi.com; jlane07@mchsi.com; wkrkar@aol.com; hedlundsc@aol.com
Subject: University Heights Concerns

Dear Zoning Commissiom Members,

As 34 year residents of University Heights that live in close proximity to the proposed St. Andrew rezoning we would like to voice our concerns.

1. We want to keep our neighborhood a single family dwelling neighborhood with safe,low traffic and children friendly streets.

2. A dense popuation will attract an unwanted element to our quiet neighborhood.

3. The size of the buildings will be out of character for our city. No matter how hard they try to hide them with their forty year old trees, they will loom in comparison to our one and two story houses.

4. We are concerned with the reputation that Wells andMaxwell have in their previous construction projects here and in nearby cities. We hope that their credentials have been carefully checked and not been blindsided by the money that is being waved in the eyes of the church.

5.There will be extensive tree removal in the ravine which will materially affect the privacy of homeowners living nearby.These existing trees have provided a sound buffer from traffic noise on Melrose. The loss of these trees will have a negative impact upon these homeowners and the value of their property.

6. The earthen fill will equal or exceed 30 feet in depth and thus will require extensive and thorough compaction of fill dirt in order to prevent major settlement under newly paved streets. What guarantee will be included in the construction contract that will protect and hold harmless University Heights in the event of settlement that caused breakup and failure of the new drives.

7. Since there is going to be large areas that are presently grass that will be covered with asphalt parking lots and concrete drives, where will all of the rainwater that now soaks into those areas go for runoff?

8. If Melrose Ave. is changed, has this been discussed with the City of Iowa City concerning the increase in traffic that will occur and the new intersection traffic signals?

Most of all we hope that you would take into consideration the feelings of your neighbors and vote against this project.

Thank you,
Steve and Chris Hedlund

From: Donald Baxter [mailto:donald@onanov.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 16, 2009 9:52 AM
To: louise-from@university-heights.org'; amy-moore@university-heights.org; david-giese@university-heights.org; stan-laverman@university-heights.org; brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; andy-dudler@university-heights.org; Bauer, Patrick B; wallacegay@mchsi.com; wallu@aol.com; jlane07@mchsi.com; wkrkar@aol.com
Subject: Redevelopment of SAPC property

To the Zoning Commission and the City Council of University Heights, Iowa:

I am writing to express my support of the proposal to redevelop the St. Andrews Presbyterian Church property as proposed by Jeff Maxwell.

While I would prefer to see more mixed income residential development of this site, I believe the proposal represents the sort of mixed use high-density development that I believe is appropriate for the St. Andrews parcel. I support the proposal because I believe that future low density development is irresponsible from a financial and environmental standpoint.

University Heights simply has no real independent future without additional tax revenues coming into the City. Since our town is completely built out, the only way to encourage additional tax revenues is through higher density redevelopment of existing parcels of land. It is my belief that University Heights certainly has no future unless the City is open and encouraging of just this sort of development. Yes, University Heights will gradually take on a more urban character. It seems to me that these changes will come either with or without the input of the residents of University Heights. It is our responsibility to direct and plan for this increase in density as responsibly as we are able.

Higher density development along the Melrose corridor (beginning and probably not ending with this project) will encourage our community to become less automobile-oriented and more transit, pedestrian, and bicycle friendly. Because of University Heights' proximity to a major employment center, this site is an ideal location for high density development that can coexist with the existing single family neighborhoods adjacent.

I believe this development will make University Heights a better place to live and I urge the members of the Zoning Commission and the members of the University Heights City Council to support the Maxwell development.

Donald Baxter | Donald Baxter Design
316 Ridgeview Avenue
Iowa City, IA 52246-1626
319.337.0494
413.294-1280 fax

http://onanov.com

To Whom It May Concern:

This a letter addressing my concerns about the property that St, Andrews church currently owns. It would be nice if the church would continue to stay in its current location, but that may not be the plan of the members. If they decide to sell, it would be my opinion that it would make sense to sell it to a developer who would need to adhere to the recommendations of the University Heights council and ordinances, when building in that area. University Heights would have some input and also a tax base in this scenario.

It would be my fear that if a developer is not allowed to work with the area, the University of Iowa would eventually purchase the area and develop it in any way they see fit. University Heights would receive no tax base and no say in what is developed in that area. Would we really like to see a dormitory there??

Sincerely,

John Saehler
Resident of University Heights