

SAPCC Land Use Committee Meeting

March 4, 2021 via ZOOM

7:00 p.m. - 9:08 p.m.

Present: Em Rodriguez, Karen Nelson, Walker Johnston, Bob Straughn, Ray Bryan, Amanda Longely, Sherman Eagles, Roger Purdy

Guests: Christine Courtney, Nick Studenski, Matt Privratsky

Agenda Items:

Roger moves we accept the minutes from January and February, Ray seconds. All are in favor; **the motion passes.**

Nick and Christine are both interested in becoming members of the committee and they've attended for two meetings.

- Roger moves that we send their names on the board to be approved by the committee. Ray seconds. All are in favor; **the motion passes.**
- This should be an item on the consent agenda!

1. Unified Design Guidelines - Roger/Bob 30 mins

There have been some additions from Prospect Park; most of their additions are specific to them being a historic neighborhood and don't apply as much to our neighborhood.

Sherm clarifies where we are in the process: the guidelines as we've passed them without the Prospect Park additions, presented as an amendment to the 10 year plan at the Planning Commission tomorrow morning at that meeting. We assume it will be approved and included.

Bob: there's been some slight rearrangement and wordsmithing but otherwise nothing super new.

Sherm: the letter (to the Planning Commission) covers a bit about the engagement we had when we worked on the 10 year plan and some framing around why we want to update the document to include the revised standards.

Bruce Jacobson and Bob and Roger and others have been working on a pamphlet to give to developers; laying out outcomes and expectations around intended use

- Page 1: History & Context, and goals of the UDS process
 - Perk for developers is that it means they're all competing on the same playing field, in a sense, if they're going to develop in the neighborhood

- Page 2 & 3: guidelines themselves
- Page 4: Project Review Process (speaks to our expectations for developers, why it's important)
- Some small edits, otherwise we like it

Still need to run it by Towerside and Prospect Park.

Possible next step: meeting with Anton and Mitra's office to discuss how we can get this in front of developers as they're doing the site plan review.

Amanda: could we get this to developers even before the site plan review, to folks/realtors when they sell land? — yes, this resonates with many of us.

2. Construction Noise/Sound Variance issues - general discussion

Matt from Mitra's office is here to listen to folks' comments. Some people have emailed Kathryn about complaints; Catherine Reid Day has seen comments on social media as well.

- Karen worries that future projects that we are excited about may get prevented because neighbors have had such a bad experience with this development/construction process.

Matt introduces some nuance to the challenges: the shorter hours we give them (Kraus Anderson), the longer the noise will take place. It's inherently messy. But right now they are going longer than they're allotted time, Ray adds—if the hours indeed were supposed to be shortened (instead of just moved from 8-6). Matt is going to follow up about that.

Nick asks if there's anything we can do—Matt says the process is different for different developments (different techniques used for example). It was surprising that Kraus Anderson didn't file the sound variance in advance; good reminder for us (/city council) to remind developers to do that in advance vs. having the community deal with that.

- Roger responds to Nick: the design standards don't address noise. **Our issue/frustration is the lack of communication**; why weren't we notified, why didn't KA or someone at the city inform us about this...

Moving forward, we (city plan review people, and potentially LU committee, too) need to be proactive about asking developers if sheet pile driving—or other things that are part of temporary construction process—is going to be used in the process, especially when things are temporary during construction and not a part of the final plans (which makes them less apparent as being needed to “flag”). Matt is going to put this on the city's agenda.

Sherm: Can we get notification that a site plan review is happening well in advance of that happening? Like, when they're distributed to the city departments? So that we can be more proactive? Site plan doesn't involve a lot of neighborhood participation...

- Matt: city gets notification when we get it—we all want more advance notice for projects. Matt is going to look into that if it's possible.

Are they being fined?

- This certainly makes a case for it. Technically, the process worked according to the rules. However, Karen argues that this was a predictable issue because pile driving is always going to be that loud
- Yes, and, Matt says no developer would do this on purpose because they lost 3 weeks of work.

Matt is going to check on Paster and Exeter (these developments); recognizing that it's a challenge to be in this neighborhood because this part of the city has consistently more development than anywhere else.

Matt's going to talk to DSI & site review plan. Interested in advantages and the disadvantages and/or any alternatives for sheet pile driving.

How do we enforce/suggest affordability when developers don't need a variance. We incentivize it, or require it. 4d program could be scaled a little bit; do we need to make the tax break better (some developers say 4d isn't enough)? Inclusionary zoning is a heavier lift

Matt on Frogtown decision: the location of the project matters a lot. Importance of acknowledging that. Site specificity; why did Wilder not play a role in who they're selling it to. It's getting appealed to council on the 17th.

3. Raymond/Charles TG update - Sherm (10 min)

Alarms Products Distributors building sold to Terra Firma, who is very interested and supportive of the park, expected to close at the end of this month. So that's good news!

Some background info: transportation committee set up a working group to make Charles more ped/bicycle friendly. This had folks dreaming to create a more intentional park/flexible open space. Matt/Mitra's office has been supportive of it. It will take a while for anything to happen. Use discretion in talking about this.

4. Curfew/Franklin update (shelved) - Roger (5 min)

Non-update... We anticipated a presentation from David; they've paused the project for the time being, citing current environment, needing to focus resources on other projects

5. 2424 Territorial (Exeter) - Karen

They're proceeding as planned, everything is down. We had some drawings when they came to us, but we haven't seen a full site plan. Hopefully we can take a look at that soon.

6. Paster/2227 Update - Karen

Karen included the site plans just to see. They have lots of bike parking, apparently—so that's a win!

7. New park at Westgate - Environ Comm meet with Parks people

The Environment Committee meeting had Parks folks present: Parks followed up with Cap Region, they have their plan figured out for 2 years so there's nothing they can do. Environment Comm. were interested in contamination during construction, and plant species etc.

Matt is excited about this project. Roger: Big concern about stormwater management—several people wrote to Liz from Parks about the importance of stormwater management under that park. Parks people said that should have been brought up when Dominion properties were built—which it was, Roger says, but the city didn't have resources to do it at that point and they said they'd have to do it later. Alas.

Meeting a