

Broom Street Lofts SIP / Capitol West Project-Minutes-8/31/05

In attendance:

Neighborhood: Stefanie Moritz (chair), Jonathan Cooper, Rosemary Lee, Lee & Tom Brown, Dory Christensen, Nan & David Cheney, Peter Ostlind, Peggy LeMahieu (minutes)

Alexander Co.: Natalie Bock, Tom Miller, Bill White

Alder: Mike Vermeer

Meeting started promptly at 7 PM. People were asked to sign in and introductions took place.

Discussion of protocol (standard way to handle review of development proposals)
Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. will be presenting workshops on this in the fall. In the meantime, we have agreed to adhere to Capitol West Steering Committee Guiding Principles (copy attached).

1. Process to encourage dialogue, civility in order to allow everyone to speak.
2. “Participating in the Development Process—A Best Practices Guide.”—copies were distributed and can also be obtained at the Department of Planning and Development.

Discussion of objectives and timelines

We want to identify deliverable items at end of each meeting. The committee will need to consolidate our feedback to the developer in writing. The written feedback should consist of what we like and what we do not like; what we can support and what we can't. Alexander requested sufficient time to respond to the committee's written comments.

Discussion of scheduling and timeline

It was decided that the steering committee would meet every two weeks. Future meetings will take place on Thursday, September 15th, and Tuesday, September 27th, at 7:00 p.m. at Meriter Retirement Center.

- Issues identified after presentation could be used for future agenda items. One week from meeting give Alexander more specific list of issues.
- Target date for Alexander submittal of SIP? Will submit end of September. Wants approval by end of year, could live with January.
- Would need to be through with the committee/developer meetings by the end of September. If can't complete the necessary meetings before the end of October, would push the SIP to 2006.
- Urban Design and Plan Commission meetings in November/December.
- If unable to adhere to this timetable, may cause difficulty for the developer with Phase I financing and construction issues.
- Long discussion was held on the necessity of having a neighborhood meeting. It was thought to be important; question was when to hold it—now before we are too far in the process, in the middle, or at the end? (After meeting was over

discussion held on date for the neighborhood meeting. To be held on Thursday, September 21st at 7:30 p.m. at Meriter Main Gate. Ald. Verveer able to attend.)

- Developer was open to whatever they needed to do to have the process move forward smoothly.
- Developer promised to bring better drawings to the neighborhood meeting showing how the Lofts would look so that neighbors can visualize the block face after the trees are removed.
- Steering committee members were encouraged to visit the Capitol West Design Studio at Alexander's headquarters on Badger Rd., where there is a scale model and presentations of the various finish packages.

Developer's presentation

- Nate Novak and Tom Miller presented the initial drawings. Stated they were taking the existing site and with modifications turning it into an "urban residential feeling".
- Broom St. will have a small grade change.
- 5 foot change in 2 portions of the plan.
- Upper floor of each unit will have the same elevation.
- 10-foot distance between 345 W. Washington and Broom St. Lofts
- 13 feet to city right of way (just behind the sidewalk)
- Central lobby off Broom St.
- All the units will have parking in the parking structure in 345. Access to garage from outside and foyer areas.
- Landscaping front yards will match the original SIP approach, trees and shrubs not grass.
- Back area landscaping will consist of ground cover and plants 6" to small trees.
- Terrace will be 5-10 feet from each unit.

Phase I will take down all the buildings identified for demolition, including sites for future building phases. This includes the old nursing dorm. If the building isn't until Phase 2, grass will be planted (e.g., 333 W. Washington). This needs to be done so Washington Row can be constructed. Phase I to last approximately 18 months.

Comments from committee members

- Members appreciate the amount of detail
- Things looked good so far
- Dimensions of units were reviewed; unit #1, 1 BR unit 674 sq. ft., #2, 1 BR 700 sq. ft., #3 1 BR/study 852 sq. ft., #4 1 BR/study, 943 sq. ft., #5 1 BR 700 sq. ft., #6 2 BR 800 sq. ft., #7 2 BR/study, 1460 sq. ft.
- Members felt they needed to see a model to better understand it.
- Concern voiced over the encroachment onto public space by balconies/decks.

Capitol West Steering Committee Guiding Principles

- Steering committee members represent the interests of the Bassett District of Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc.
- Our goal is to help create the best possible development for the neighborhood and the City of Madison.
- The provisions of the Bassett Neighborhood Master Plan and other adopted city plans and policies with respect to land use and urban design, should guide us throughout our decision-making process.
- Committee members should become familiar with the document, “Participating in the Development Process—A Best Practices Guide for Developers, Neighborhoods & Policymakers” (June 2005, prepared by The City of Madison Dept. of Planning and Development, Planning Unit, and available from the Unit)
- Steering committee meetings are generally open to the public and the developer, but occasionally the committee may agree to meet in closed session, for example, to develop a position statement.
- Meetings will start and end promptly, and participants are encouraged to be on time.
- Open discussion will be encouraged at committee meetings in an effort to solicit everyone’s input regarding the project.
- Members are encouraged to be concise when speaking in order to best utilize the time available.
- Committee members will be respectful of each other’s opinions and will refrain from making derogatory comments. At times we will agree to disagree, but always in a civil manner.
- Minutes will be taken at each meeting, sent out via e-mail for members’ approval, and made available to the public once approved.
- The committee will prepare written questions and/or comments from time to time, which will be made available to the developer, appropriate city agencies, and the public.
- We will attempt to reach a consensus at the end of our process which reflects the majority opinion of the committee, but recognize that there may also be a minority position.

Broom Street Lofts SIP / Capitol West Project
Steering Committee Minutes, 9/15/05

Neighborhood representatives: Stefanie Moritz (chair), Jonathan Cooper, Rosemary Lee, Mike May, Peter Ostlind, Peggy LeMahieu (minutes)
Alexander Co.: Natalie Bock, Tom Miller, Bill White, Nate Novak (JJR)
Alder: Mike Verveer

The meeting started promptly at 7:00 p.m.

Attachments used during discussion: (1) Letter to Brad Murphy regarding Capitol West: Broom Street Lofts, (2) Capitol West Steering Committee – Feedback to the Developer from the 8/31/05 meeting, (3) Response to Steering Committee – Feedback to the Developer from the 8/31/05 Meeting.

1. The meeting started with a review of attachment #1. The distance between the Lofts and parking structure was reviewed (10 ft.). Alexander discussed why they chose the option they did. Option chosen for its least negative financial impact. In addition, a factor in their decision was the sprinkler requirement in the parking structure if the Lofts were moved closer. Alexander reiterated that their application had gone through the GDP and was approved with the 10 ft. distance between the two structures.
2. Attachment #2: The process-related comments in the first section did not require any response from the developer.
Under building related questions, the first dealt with the parking structure and its proximity to the Lofts (discussion covered above in paragraph #1).
3. (*Reference: Building-related questions #2 & 3*) There was much discussion on the appropriateness of the encroachment of the balconies into the 13-foot setback. Alexander Co. felt it was necessary to break up the building so it was more appealing. They rationalized it was permissible since it had been approved in the GDP. There were questions voiced by committee members concerning the height of the planned ornamental trees and their impact on the balconies. Committee members requested Alexander come up with a preservation plan that identifies how the existing large terrace trees would be saved and not damaged during Phase I construction. Alexander indicated they had a plan to handle this. Alexander Co. voiced the need for the balconies' depth to be at least 5'6" in order to have any practical use. It was suggested they recess the balconies into the building in order to prevent the overhang. Alexander Co. did not feel this gave the front of the building enough articulation. In addition, it would decrease the square footage. Alexander indicated that projection of balconies was a common practice in many other buildings downtown (e.g., Baskerville, Capitol Point). They thought it helped with the articulation of the buildings. Committee members questioned what would happen to the balconies if in future the city decided to purchase the rights to that portion of the setback. Members also raised the issue of what precedent it would set for the entire length of Broom Street. Alexander Co. felt this building would not necessarily establish a precedent. It was apparent that the balconies were a divisive issue in the design of the Lofts. A preliminary vote was taken by the committee members regarding support for the balcony encroachment. Two members supported it, two opposed it, and two were "on the fence." Thus there was no consensus on this issue.
4. (*Reference: building-related question #4*) Committee members voiced strong concern about the balcony encroachments into the right-of-way on the W. Washington side.

Alexander Co. indicated this same type of design had been used on the 306 W. Washington building in order to improve the articulation and this was the basis for its use in the Lofts. It was pointed out to Alexander Co. they were using precedent to rationalize the current balcony yet they indicated it would not necessarily exist on Broom Street. No agreement could be reached on this question amongst the parties.

5. (*Reference: building-related question #5*) Discussion was held on the general design and building materials. One committee member felt Alexander Co. should have developed several designs to present to the committee if they really wanted neighborhood input into design. Presenting one design was not thought to be a collaborative process. It was suggested Alexander look across the street to see what design elements could be pulled from the existing homes and reflected in the Lofts' design. Concern was voiced over the lack of anything other than right angles in the design. Alexander felt that they had addressed the transition issue in their choice of building materials and requested that committee members suggest specific design elements that would make the design more compatible with the neighborhood.
6. (*Reference: building-related question #6*) Alexander views a 4-5-story building as an appropriate transition between the height of the existing parking garage and the neighborhood homes across Broom Street. The recessed mezzanine would add square footage to the Lofts and Alexander views it as desirable. Due to time constraints, there was limited discussion on this issue but it appeared as if this may be an area subject to further negotiation with the neighborhood.
7. (*Reference: building-related question #7*) Would it be economically feasible to move the building back, remove the balcony issue by recessing them, eliminate the overhang on West Washington and eliminate the mezzanine? It was stated that decisions on each of these questions needed to be addressed for what they really were, a financial impact on Phase I versus all the other stated reasons. The design decisions may be relevant but were not the driving force. Steering committee members decided that they needed to meet independently of the developer to further discuss issues raised at this meeting. Alexander will do further work in the areas of building materials and landscaping.
8. The next steering committee meeting will be held on 9/20 at 6:00 p.m. at the residence of the Chair. Everyone was reminded of the upcoming neighborhood meeting on 9/21 at 7:30 p.m. in Meriter's Grand Hall (333 W. Main St.)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Broom Street Lofts SIP/Capitol West Development Steering Committee Meeting, 9/20/05

Present: Stefanie Moritz (chair), Jonathan Cooper, Mike May, Peter Ostlind
(Rosemary Lee provided input via e-mail)

Summary of Discussion

Agenda and format for neighborhood meeting on 9/21/05

Committee members agreed to the following agenda:

7:30—welcome by Alder Verveer

7:35—introductions

7:45—presentation by Alexander Co. (Power Point & boards)

8:15—reactions/comments by steering committee members

8:30—question & answer session

8:50—distribution of questionnaire/comment form

9:00—adjourn

We do not need to be out of the Grand Hall by 9 p.m. so if there are lots of questions we may run past that hour.

The chair distributed a draft questionnaire for comment. Members requested that two items be added. The questionnaire is appended to this summary.

Minutes of the neighborhood meeting will be taken and published in the usual places.

Discussion of major areas of disagreement within steering committee re. design issues

With respect to the projecting balconies, there is still no consensus that these should be conceded to the developer although most members are leaning towards using them as a negotiating tool in exchange for removal of the mezzanine floor. The objection is primarily a matter of principle. There is still concern about the precedent the balconies on the Broom St. side would set for the new 13-foot setback, and it is still unclear what would happen to the balconies if the City decides it needs to use the setback area in the future. It was pointed out that the developer has now reduced the total balcony area by half vs. earlier proposals, and that there are benefits to the balconies in terms of building articulation and as a resident amenity. There will be a questionnaire item relating to the balconies in an effort to discover the neighborhood's comfort level with this issue. The balconies on the Washington Ave. side are also problematic in that they project into the right-of-way although not over the sidewalk. The developer's rationale is that they mimic the balconies on the 309 building (which have SIP approval but still must go through the city's standard street encroachment process), and there is precedent for such projections in other buildings

downtown. Committee members will soon need to decide on a position re. the balconies, guided by input from the neighborhood meeting.

As referenced earlier, there is support within the committee for asking the developer to remove the mezzanine. As noted, the original proposal for the Broom St. building was three stories. It “grew” to four stories when the developer was not able to use as much of the setback as originally proposed. The mezzanine effectively makes a five-story building which is closer to the height of the parking garage and quite a bit taller than the existing houses across Broom Street. It is widely felt that the Lofts, as a transition element to the neighborhood, should be no taller than four stories. Committee members feel that the developer may be willing to negotiate on this issue in return for support of the balconies, which affect more of the living units. Again, there will be an item on the questionnaire asking how the neighborhood-at-large feels about the mezzanine.

Further questions for the developer

A discussion of design and materials issues quickly led to a series of questions about information shown on the plans and drawings submitted to date. Members compiled a list of 16 questions which will be forwarded to the developer:

- 1) Re. the horizontal (lap?) siding mentioned at the 9/15 meeting, we would like to see an example of what is being proposed.
- 2) We would like to have a more intensive discussion of the specific differences between Option A and Option B at our next meeting.
- 3) In Option B, do the outside corners of the windows wrap around as it appears in the drawing?
- 4) Please address the level of acoustic insulation for street noise mitigation.
- 5) Please further address the issue of compatibility between the balconies and the proposed ornamental trees. We still have concerns about this.
- 6) Are you proposing any fences, gates or raised planters at the sidewalk entrances to units or anywhere besides those shown in the rear yards? If so, what materials will be used?
- 7) How will garbage and recycling disposal and collection be handled for the Lofts?
- 8) What type of window glass will be used? Tinted?
- 9) Where will the air conditioning units be placed?
- 10) Please explain the difference in finishes between the IZ and market rate units.
- 11) What is the distance between the south side of the Lofts and the Main St. Justice building? Are there any windows on that south-facing wall?
- 12) Will there be a loading zone on Broom St. for move-in/outs and deliveries?
- 13) How soon will a terrace tree protection plan be available?
- 14) Do you plan a bus shelter at the corner of Broom St. & W. Washington?
- 15) Please address drainage/stormwater runoff issues for the rear of the Lofts.
- 16) At the rear of units 105/106, is there a passageway leading east? It's not clear from the drawing.

**Capitol West Broom Street Lofts Condominium Development
Neighborhood Questionnaire & Comments**

Name: _____ Street Address: _____

Neighborhood affiliation: ___ Bassett District ___ Other: _____

In your opinion, how does this development proposal rate in the following categories, using this scale:

1—excellent 2—satisfactory 3—unsatisfactory 4—not sure/no opinion

___ quality of architectural design?

___ design compatibility with surrounding neighborhood?

___ quality of proposed building materials?

___ four-story building (no mezzanine)?

___ four-story building **plus** mezzanine?

___ proposed balcony projections?

___ sufficient green space?

___ quality of landscaping?

___ pedestrian-friendly environment?

___ minimizes noise and light impact on surrounding neighborhood?

___ quality of life for future Broom St. Lofts residents?

___ overall quality of this development?

Specifically, what do you feel are the overall **positive** aspects of this development?
(please use the reverse side if you need more room for comments)

What do you feel are the overall **negative** aspects of this development?

**Broom Street Lofts SIP/Capitol West Project
Steering Committee Minutes – September 27, 2005**

Neighborhood representatives: Stefanie Moritz (chair), Jonathan Cooper, Peter Ostlind, Rosemary Lee, Dory Christensen, Peggy LeMahieu (minutes)
Alexander Company: Natalie Bock, Tom Miller, Nate Novak (JJR)
Alder Mike Verveer

Meeting started promptly at 7 p.m. Minutes of the last meeting were reviewed and no changes or corrections offered.

The committee discussed that Meriter will begin charging for the use of their meeting rooms as of October. The charges will be dependent on the room used and will range from \$20-\$75 per hour. We discussed other options and hoped we would be able to complete our work in the near future so the cost of a meeting room wouldn't become an issue.

Tom Miller reviewed the footprint of the building. The GDP established a four-story building with a mezzanine. The setbacks were also established with the GDP. The question was asked if there were specific setbacks and distances from the other buildings noted in the GDP. They were noted in an amendment to the GDP.

The remaining time was spent going over the latest set of questions submitted to Alexander Co. by the steering committee. (See attachment with questions and answers)

1. There was a question about the width of the horizontal lap siding. Was it similar to the homes on Washington Row and Broom St.? It appears to be narrower. Alexander is proposing a clear cedar. Discussion was held over the maintenance needed to prevent it from graying out and the building taking on a different appearance than the one originally intended. Discussion regarding alternatives to clear cedar (stained or painted). Alexander prefers the look of clear cedar. It was recommended the condo documents and assessment fees reflect the necessary cost to maintain the original appearance of the building.
2. There was a straw poll on the committee members' preferences for design option A or B. Most members preferred option B for its asymmetry, among other things. The mezzanine could be added to either option.
3. Tom Miller clarified that there are wrap-around windows in Option B.
4. Discussion concerning the types of materials to be used in the walls, floors etc, to eliminate noise heard between units. The materials proposed are the same type used in many condo buildings in the area, and Pete indicated the materials may not function as well as the developer hoped. Alexander will do some further research on this. Pete also noted that the specs need to state that there should be no penetrations through demising walls.

5. Tom and Nate brought additional photos of the type of proposed trees for in front of the buildings. They are presently looking at trees ranging from 12' to 20' in height. There was some discussion about the importance of appropriate pruning of the trees and shrubs to obtain the desired outcome regardless of the tree chosen.
6. Nate indicated that the plantings for the raised landscape beds would fill in within a year (approx.) Alexander was asked if the landscaping in front would have irrigation and Tom indicated that they would not favor it because of the cost.
7. The proposed plan for garbage pick-up was felt to need further thought and a second trash receptacle location was recommended. The current plan would not be convenient to the owners on the W. Washington end of the building. Alexander will study this further.

Since time was running short, Tom briefly went over Alexander's responses to the remaining questions (#8 through #16). The committee can revisit these at a future meeting if necessary.

Alexander's timeline is to make their formal SIP submittal on October 12th. This schedule will allow them to reach the City Council in early January. The committee requested that there be enough time for them to review the formal SIP submittal before the Urban Design Commission meeting, currently planned for November 2nd.

The meeting adjourned at 9 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 4th, at 7 p.m., at the Alexander Company's sales office.

Alexander Company 9/26/2005

Capitol West - Broom Street Lofts

**Response to: Capitol West Steering Committee—Questions for Alexander Co.
Received 9/21/05**

This document is a response to questions generated by the Bassett District Steering Committee at a meeting of September 20th 2005. The Development Team was not in attendance at this meeting but did receive the questions via e-mail on September 21st 2005. Each Steering Committee question is listed by number and is followed by the Alexander Company response in bold:

1) Re. the horizontal (lap?) siding mentioned at the 9/15 meeting, we would like to see an example of what is being proposed.

The Development Team will provide samples of the currently proposed cedar siding. In the interim please refer to the attached photograph of a building that has used this material in a similar fashion. We have studied this material in a vertical tongue-and-groove application and in a horizontal clapboard application. Our current preference is for a horizontal orientation so as to relate more directly to the clapboard siding used on many of the historic single family homes in the Bassett District.

2) We would like to have a more intensive discussion of the specific differences between Option A and Option B at our next meeting.

We will be prepared to discuss all alternate design proposals and options at the meeting of September 27th.

3) In Option B, do the outside corners of the windows wrap around as it appears in the drawing?

The current proposal for the windows in Option B does contemplate windows that wrap around the corner of each projecting bay.

4) Please address the level of acoustic insulation for street noise mitigation.

Sound transmission is an important issue regarding the design of the Broom Street Lofts. The condominium units will have double-pane glazing with aluminum frame windows and batt-fill insulation at the exterior wall to help mitigate noise infiltration. Additionally the units will incorporate a floor/ceiling assembly and demising-wall assembly specifically designed to limit sound transmission between units.

5) Please further address the issue of compatibility between the balconies and the proposed ornamental trees. We still have concerns about this.

Our proposal does include ornamental trees in the landscape beds in front of the building. We believe that through selection of the appropriately scaled trees, proper location of the trees within these beds (closer to the walk than to the building), and proper maintenance and pruning of the trees, that these trees will be an asset to the project and the neighborhood. Comments from the Steering Committee to date have encouraged us to look at smaller ornamental trees than those originally planned. A good example of our current thought on the scale of tree for this area is a dwarf tree called the Japanese Crimson Queen Maple (see attached photo). This tree when mature reaches a height of 10'-12'. We are open to suggestions from Steering committee members for ornamental trees neighbors would like to see at this location.

6) Are you proposing any fences, gates or raised planters at the sidewalk entrances to units or anywhere besides those shown in the rear yards? If so, what materials will be used?

We are proposing raised landscape beds that will have a 6"-12" concrete curb at the perimeter – this proposed curb will not encroach into the public right-of-way. We do not envision any fences or gates at the Broom Street side of the project. These planters will be planted with low ground cover, low hedges and ornamental trees as discussed above. If the Steering Committee has suggestions as to what type of plantings, or the configuration of the walks and raised landscape beds we would encourage input regarding these areas at this time.

7) How will garbage and recycling disposal and collection be handled for the Lofts?
Our current proposal includes a trash enclosure at the walk adjacent to the south stairwell – next to the Main Street Parking Ramp. This enclosure will house up to four 90-gallon garbage and recycling bins that will be wheeled to the street for pick-up by a private waste management contractor. We are currently revising our plan to ensure a 5' walk along the south end of the building for continuous access to the trash enclosure.

8) What type of window glass will be used? Tinted?
We are proposing clear double-pane, insulated glazing with a clear low-e film. Neither the glass nor the film will be tinted. In addition we are proposing spandrel glazing (back-painted glass) in specific locations to conceal building structure at the floor/ceiling assembly.

9) Where will the air conditioning units be placed?
If remote condensers are required for the HVAC system they will be located on the roof of the proposed Broom Street Lofts building. This is an approach similar to that utilized by the 4th Ward Lofts building - using individual condensers for each unit. If located on the roof, these condensers will be screened from view from the street by the parapet wall of the structure. Additionally, we are currently investigating an HVAC system that would include condensers within each condo unit, thus eliminating the requirement for roof-mounted condensers.

10) Please explain the difference in finishes between the IZ and market rate units.
The IZ finishes will match those approved for other Phase 1 components that incorporate IZ units. The finish package is the same package developed for Alexander Company market-rate apartment developments and includes laminate countertops, laminate cabinets, high-quality carpeting and pad, and vinyl flooring in the kitchens and bathrooms. We encourage the Steering Committee members to visit the Capitol West Design Center to review the IZ and Market Rate finish packages.

11) What is the distance between the south side of the Lofts and the Main St. Justice building? Are there any windows on that south-facing wall?
The proposed Broom Street Lofts Building is approximately 12' to 15' from the Main Street Justice Building. There will be a limited number of windows in this elevation to allow for morning lighting from the southeast; however these windows will be designed with privacy in mind.

12) Will there be a loading zone on Broom St. for move-in/outs and deliveries?
Yes, we are proposing a Loading Zone at the Broom Street location within the area currently designated for limited term public parking.

13) How soon will a terrace tree protection plan be available?
We will be working with the City to develop this plan; we expect a requirement similar to that included in the SIP for other Phase 1 components to be included in the conditions of approval for this SIP. The Alexander Company is committed to working directly with the City Forester to implement this plan as quickly as

possible.

14) Do you plan a bus shelter at the corner of Broom St. & W. Washington?

Our current proposal envisions a bench and refuse container similar to that provided at the Meriter bus stop one block to the south. We believe this is the most appropriate approach until such time that the City acquires the setback.

15) Please address drainage/storm water runoff issues for the rear of the Lofts.

There currently is storm drainage in this area that will be maintained and modified to include drainage of the patio areas. This is a below grade storm drainage system.

16) At the rear of units 105/106, is there a passageway leading east? It's not clear from the drawing.

Our most current proposal anticipates a connection directly from the Capitol Mews level to the patios at units 105 and 106. There is slight grade change at this location and a ramp or steps will be required.

Broom Street Lofts SIP / Capitol West Project
Steering Committee Minutes, 10/04/05
Alexander Company Design Studio

Neighborhood representatives: Stefanie Moritz (chair), Dory Christensen, Rosemary Lee, Mike May, Peter Ostlind & Jonathan Cooper (minutes)

Alexander Co.: Natalie Bock, Tom Miller, Nate Novak & Ed Freer (JJR)

The meeting began shortly after 7:00 p.m. with a closed session discussion by the neighborhood representatives regarding Rosemary Lee's letter of complaint to Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. officers and city staff. After consideration of a prepared statement on this issue, a general discussion regarding working together as a committee within the agreed-upon guidelines ensued and a consensus was reached that all committee members present would strive to adhere to those principles.

The neighborhood representatives then joined the Alexander Co. for an open session, beginning with a tour of the Alexander Co. design studio and an overview of the various materials, appliances, and finishes to be offered to purchasers of units in Capitol West.

The evening's discussion began with a focus on the balconies and the mezzanines, the two major issues on which the neighborhood has yet to reach a consensus. The Alexander Co. was asked if there was room for compromise on either of these points. Alexander Co. indicated that they recognize that compromise on both sides' parts will be necessary in order to be able to go to the city with a proposal acceptable to both Alexander Co. and the neighborhood.

Alexander Co. noted that for them the issue is one of both design and economics. They feel that they cannot lose the square footage that would be required to mitigate the incursion of the balconies into the Washington Ave. right-of-way and the Broom St. setback, the square footage the mezzanine would add to the upper units, and the articulation provided by the balconies, and still have a building for which the finances are workable. Alexander Co. hopes to reach agreement with the neighborhood so as to avoid the practice of negotiating away items without getting committee consensus before going to the city, which they felt was a problem with the Phase I process. Alexander Co. noted that they feel that there are areas of trade-off regarding the mezzanines and balconies that could allow the group to reach such an agreement and asked if the neighborhood representatives agreed.

Neighborhood members recognized that the balconies are a desirable amenity for potential purchasers and asked if it would be possible to design smaller balconies (French balconies) that would provide a design esthetic but which would not pose as much of an incursion problem. It was noted that the traffic level along Broom St. is likely not conducive to heavy use of those balconies. A general discussion of the balconies and the mezzanines ensued.

A neighborhood member noted that, due to time limitations, testimony by neighborhood residents at city meetings tends to focus on those areas where there are differences of opinion between the neighborhood and the developer, rather than the majority of the issues upon which all parties agree, and the question was raised as to how much agreement can be expected from the committee, as well as from individuals speaking on their own at city meetings.

Alexander Co. said they would like to get all outstanding issues on the table and the committee noted that there are several issues that the committee simply has not yet had time to consider. It was recognized, however, that the mezzanines and the balconies are the major outstanding issues

and several committee members stated that they felt there is room for compromise on these two points. It was suggested that the neighborhood members meet separately to talk about these two issues and try to come to some consensus now that we have a better sense of where compromise might be possible. The neighborhood members agreed to meet Thursday, Oct. 6, at 6:00 p.m. at Jo's Tazzina Café to try to come to a consensus on a compromise position.

The meeting adjourned shortly before 9:00 p.m.

**Broom St. Lofts/Capitol West Steering Committee
Minutes of 10/6/05 meeting held at Jo's Tazzina Café**

Committee members present: Stefanie Moritz (chair & minutes), Lee Brown, Jonathan Cooper, Rosemary Lee, Mike May, Pete Ostlind. Tom Brown also attended.

This was a special meeting called to discuss forming a consensus position regarding two issues associated with the Broom St. Lofts design: the balconies on Broom St. and W. Washington Ave., and the mezzanine.

The chair called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. and began by reviewing e-mail comments submitted by neighborhood members as well as steering committee members, and also the results of the questionnaire distributed at the Bassett neighborhood meeting held on 9/21/05 as they pertained to these two issues.

Each committee member was given the opportunity to voice his/her opinion, and it was apparent that many were not pleased with having to compromise at all on these two significant issues, but were willing to attempt a compromise position which would also be acceptable to the developer in the interests of moving the project forward.

Arguments presented for the balconies being retained:

- Would not necessarily set a precedent on Broom St.
- Would be a nice amenity for condo owners
- Would affect more condo owners than the mezzanine
- Would not pose a problem if city eventually decided it needed to use setback

Arguments presented against the balconies:

- Important to hold the line on the 13' setback in light of future development on Broom St.
- Would extend into the right-of-way on Washington Ave.—bad precedent
- Balconies are not likely to be much used on busy street faces
- Possible incursion into Capitol view corridor

Arguments presented for the mezzanine being retained:

- Will add to square footage for 4th floor unit owners
- 10' recession of mezzanine would make it not that obvious from street level
- Adds variety to building design
- May provide rooftop garden space
- Less concerned about setting a height precedent
- Neighborhood plan allows for taller buildings on east side of Broom St.

Arguments presented against the mezzanine:

- Too much height vs. the 2- to 3-story buildings across the street
- Would lead to height creep along Broom St.

The discussion basically came down to a choice between “a pair of evils”, as one member put it: the projecting balconies or the mezzanine. The chair tallied the results of members’ comments (including those of Dory Christensen, who sent in her “vote” by e-mail earlier in the day) and the results were:

In favor of mezzanine as presented in Option B, but no balcony incursions into the 13’ setback on Broom, and no balcony incursions past the property line on W. Washington Ave.: five votes (Brown, Christensen, Cooper, Moritz, Ostlind)

(It was noted that this position did not necessarily mean that there would be no balconies. The possibility of recessed balconies still exists.)

In favor of balconies as proposed by developer, but no mezzanine: one vote (May)

In favor of both balconies and mezzanine as proposed by developer: one vote (Lee)

The chair noted the majority opinion and asked the two dissenting members if they would be willing to go along with it in the interests of presenting a unanimous compromise recommendation to the Alexander Company. May agreed to do so. Lee initially said she would not, but after some discussion decided not to oppose the majority decision.

The chair thanked everyone for being willing to compromise, and will present the consensus recommendation to the Alexander Co.

The dates of October 20th and October 26th were suggested for a next meeting with the Alexander Co., and the chair will follow up on that.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

**Broom St. Lofts/Capitol West Steering Committee
Minutes of 10/26/05 meeting held at Meriter Main Gate**

Committee members present: Stefanie Moritz (chair), Pete Ostlind, Jonathan Cooper, Mike May, Lee Brown, Peggy LeMahieu (minutes)

Alexander Company: Tom Miller, Bill White

Other neighborhood residents present: Tom Brown, Rosemary Lee

Tom opened the meeting stating that the Alexander Company had been caught off guard by the committee's compromise position statement (sent via e-mail on October 7th) offering to accept the mezzanine floor in return for no balcony encroachment into the Washington Ave. right-of-way or Broom St. setback. He said he thought Alexander and the neighborhood were still in dialogue and negotiations and indicated he was surprised that the steering committee had sent the statement to city staff and the mayor's office. He stated since the position of the steering committee was not acceptable to the Alexander Company, he would like more interaction to see if there can be any further compromise. He indicated he thought there could be some movement on the balconies, possibly some on the mezzanine, but little ability to move on the setback encroachment issue.

Stefanie indicated the committee members were under the impression that they needed to adopt a position by October 12th, the date when Alexander was scheduled to submit its formal SIP application for the Lofts. They felt they were pressed for time to meet the developer's schedule and that the only options on the table were those presented by the developer at the October 4th meeting. The committee wanted to issue a written statement that would clearly state the neighborhood's compromise offer.

Tom stated he hoped a compromise could still be reached but said he wasn't hopeful if the neighborhood's position on the balconies was firm. The committee indicated it would like to come to mutual agreement as well, but Stefanie stated that the committee needed to represent the wishes of the neighborhood at large, and there was strong feeling expressed at the neighborhood forum and on the Bassett listserve that no encroachment should be allowed into the 13-foot setback. The compromise position was a good faith effort to negotiate with the developer and honor the wishes of the neighborhood.

If the committee and Alexander are able to reach a consensus compromise, Tom said that Alexander would be willing to eliminate the mezzanine. There would be an elevator penthouse 4 to 6 feet high, set back from the street and probably not visible at street level. There would be an 18-inch to 24-inch parapet wall to screen mechanicals. Alexander is willing to pull back the balconies on the Washington Ave. side (units 201, 301, 401) so that they do not project into the right-of-way. They are also willing to have two sets of balconies (units 201, 301 & 401, and 204, 304 & 404) recede back to the 13-foot setback line on the Broom St. side. These balconies would be 18 inches deep. The

remaining balconies on Broom St. (the 02, 03 and 05 units) would project 4 feet into the setback.

There was no consensus on the part of steering committee members whether to accept this compromise. Members felt that they needed to get more feedback from neighbors and will discuss the proposal further at a meeting on November 8th.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussion of Alexander's responses (dated 9/26/05 and 9/30/05) to steering committee questions:

Re. HVAC units, it has not been decided whether the units will be contained within the condo units or placed on the roof.

Solid core doors will be provided for inclusionary zoning units.

A meeting has been set with the City Forester to develop a terrace tree protection plan.

Pete stated that he could not support the loading area shown on drawing A1.1 because it would eliminate some street parking.

There will be no irrigation system for the landscaping on the Broom St. side.
There will be a lighting system.

A second trash enclosure location, possibly underneath the stairwell landing, is being explored at the north end of the Lofts, pending code issues.

Re. mitigation for street noise, Alexander is proposing smaller windows for ground floor units, thermally-insulated windows, gasketing doors, and 6-inch stud walls at the exterior, fully insulated.

The committee will again meet with the developer on Tuesday, November 8th, from 7 to 9 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

**Broom St. Lofts/Capitol West Steering Committee
Minutes of 11/08/05 meeting held at Meriter Main Gate**

Committee members present: Stefanie Moritz (chair & minutes), Jonathan Cooper, Mike May, Lee Brown
Alexander Company: Tom Miller, Bill White
Alder: Mike Verveer
Other neighborhood residents present: Rosemary Lee

Committee members met in closed session from 6 to 7 p.m. to discuss the Broom St. Lofts SIP documents and prepare questions for the developer.

At 7 p.m. the committee was joined by the representatives of the Alexander Company. Lee Brown was not able to remain for this part of the meeting.

Draft minutes of the October 26th meeting were distributed and approved with one correction from Tom Miller.

The meeting opened with a discussion of the major “sticking point” between the neighborhood and the developer: the encroachment of balconies into the Broom St. setback. Tom stated that the city’s residential zoning allows for certain types of encroachment “exceptions”, including balconies, and that is Alexander’s rationale for having the 4-foot encroachment. They do not view it as a precedent-setting feature of the design. Mike responded that he could accept an encroachment for an existing building or a historic building, such as the Loraine, but that he did not understand why there had to be an exception for new construction such as the Lofts.

A discussion of Alexander’s SIP submittal, dated 10/26, followed. Tom pointed out that the increase in the number of units in the 309 W. Washington building from 112 to 114 was considered a “minor alteration” and therefore subject to a separate city review process. Stefanie asked why the documents did not indicate a change from the GDP-approved 22 units for the Lofts. Tom said that the SIP allows the flexibility to go from 22 to the current 23 units.

Mike asked whether the increase in the total number of Phase I units resulted in a corresponding increase in the number of parking spaces. Tom said that he would provide further information documenting that enough parking spaces will be provided.

Tom was asked for more information on the landscape feature shown on drawing C102. He said it had not yet been designed but that it might be a raised bed of some sort. It would not include any signage or lighting.

Stefanie raised the issue of the loading/unloading zone shown on C102 and asked how many parking spaces would be lost if this were approved. Tom indicated that the length

of the zone would be 35 feet, resulting in a loss of 2 parking spaces. Jonathan inquired whether Alexander would be open to a compromise of only 1 dedicated space for passenger unloading, with the possibility of hooded meters in case more long-term loading/unloading were needed. Tom said that he might be open to this if the committee were willing to compromise on the balconies issue. He said that he wanted to avoid the problem of delivery vehicles double-parking on Broom Street. It was agreed that city staff would likely weigh in and decide this issue.

Tom was asked about the proposed north trash receptacles shown in C102. There are code issues but he does not feel that they are insurmountable. The stairwell will have sprinklers.

The committee reviewed the grading plan shown on C103. Tom explained that not every unit will be handicap-accessible because units 101, 103 and 105 will have steps. It is not required that every unit be ADA-compliant.

Drawing C104 shows sanitary sewers that may not be active. The developer will have to excavate and may have to encase them to protect from settlement of the building. Storm drainage will be directed out to W. Washington Ave.

It was noted that the landscape plan (C105) includes similar plant types to the rest of Phase I, chosen for their hardiness and low water requirements. The committee feels that the landscape firm, JJR, has the expertise to ensure good quality landscaping. Mike wanted to confirm that there will be an adequate budget for the watering and maintenance of landscaping since there will be no automatic sprinkler system. Tom said that they are still working on the condo documents but there will be a line item sufficient to maintain the landscaping as well as building exterior maintenance.

Tom explained the site lighting that would be provided, including three different types of light fixtures. Committee members pointed out that the bollards located in the Broom St. landscape beds may prove to be targets for vandalism since they are located close to the sidewalk. Stefanie asked whether porch lights would be provided, as a security feature, for first floor units. Tom will confirm the type of lights provided for all first-floor entry doors.

Tom was asked whether the wood frame balconies shown on drawing A1.1 would allow for grills. He said that there should be no problem since Alexander is planning sprinklers for the balconies, which will meet Fire Code requirements.

Tom confirmed the locations of the inclusionary zoning units: a 1-bedroom unit (108) and a 2-bedroom unit (106). The size of the 1-bedroom unit has been increased from 476 to 500 square feet to meet the city's IZ ordinance requirement.

Fireplaces will be optional for 1-bedroom units but standard for 2-bedroom units. The inclusionary zoning units will not have fireplaces.

Tom stated that Alexander intends to re-file its SIP application on November 9th in order to be on the Urban Design Commission agenda on November 16th. There will be only minor changes in the application. There was further discussion regarding the issue of the balconies. Tom indicated that the W. Washington Ave. balconies would not project into the right-of-way, but that Alexander still intended to have some balconies project into the Broom St. setback. Mike Verveer pointed out that at the November 2nd UDC meeting, one of the commissioners had asked city staff to investigate the balcony encroachment issue and report back to the Commission its finding. The staff's recommendation, when known, will be considered by the steering committee before reaching a final decision on a compromise regarding the balconies. Tom indicated that Alexander's compromise offer is still "on the table". Steering committee members will bring up the issue at the next Bassett District meeting on November 14th.

No further meetings are scheduled at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 p.m.