Neighbors of Belknap Lookout Development Committee Meeting Notes Saturday November 11, 2017

Committee Members Present: Elianna Bootzin Angel Gonzalez Todd Leinberger

Don Rietema Loren Sturrus Gretchen Warnimont

Note: Dean Rosendall was present in his role with CopperRock.

Committee Members Absent: Brian Bremer Kristi DeKraker

- 1. What happened? Loren established that things went wrong on three fronts. We need improvements ourselves: the process we have articulated needs to get posted on our website along with a point of contact. We need better communication (both ways) with both the city and developers. We also need to define roles within the development committee, including tasks to be completed by the chair. Dean apologized. The facts are these: the first phase of the Belknap Bluffs project on Fairview was reviewed by the committee and approved before October of 2016. The view from the front (street) was important, as were modesty walls to hide garages, contours, number of units, materials, the fact that they would be owner occupied, the size, the cottage feel, and the context as it harmonized with the neighbors. It passed planning commission. Later the same happened with phase two, where again our focus was on the street. Both phases included project type discussion, the question of affordability was raised and discarded in favar of a high end product for this particular project and location. Angel noted that he was a no vote on the second phase because he expected changes at the city. After the second phase was approved, building A in phase one changed, adding parking and reducing density. It was considered a significant change, so the development committee was provided an opportunity to view and critique it before approval by the city. We supported the change. There are still questions over what constitutes a significant change. This fall, we noticed that the renderings had changed online. Dean clarified that they had intended the new look to be cedar siding due to buyer request, but the rendering looked bad and it was not what the city was supposed to issue a permit for. Those further changes have since been scrapped. They now intend to copy the phase two look for the rear buildings over to phase one, which the city can approve administratively; this is essentially what was intended before the extra change/erroneous permit. Loren pointed out that both the city and Dean should have brought it to us. Angel reiterated that we should expect changes from the city. We agreed that phase two important aspects were modesty walls on garages, materials (brick, masonry), footings, etc. After working with the neighborhood, projects meet with the city and make adjustments needed to accommodate services like trash and snow removal, infrastructure, and so forth. Gretchen mentioned the importance of making decisions in the best interest of the community as well as expecting accountability, integrity, and upholding the ASP. Angel requested we send a letter to the city which Loren suggested we could write as a group; one specific might be to ask them to encourage digital renderings. Don pointed out that the project reduced density, kept character, and has diversity of architecture. Angel would not be open to endorsing the current look today. Loren would be, and would recommend taking it to the board next with the objective of moving on.
- 2. What is proposed? Dean showed a 3-D model for the rear buildings in phase one (B&C) with hardie board samples. He mentioned the balcony units would use a stainless steel finish. The sloped roofs are for water management; there is no gutter, so it naturally flows to water the greenspace behind each building. Inside, some buyers want vaulted ceilings; outside, there is a feel of walking in under a canopy. We inquired why the phase two look should be transferred to phase one instead of vice versa. It is not clear how to sell this

change to neighbors who worked hard on phase one and loved the brick look that fits in the existing neighborhood. It's important to note that the streetside hasn't changed, which was the biggest issue; other concerns originally discussed included traffic and not seeing the garages from the street. Dean noted that there are tall plantings blocking the view of the first garage of the rear buildings; he would be happy to change to a lattice with vines if further screening is necessary. Todd highlighted the current level of trust in the community. Elianna pointed out the preparatory materials suggest neighborhood support is not needed for the planning department to administratively approve the post-hearing changes.

3. What to do? It was generally agreed that more neighbors needed a chance to know about the proposed changes. Some items considered were making the next (already scheduled) meeting a public open house. Loren suggested moving the issue to the board for review or for permission for the development committee to make the final decision at its next meeting. Ultimately no decision was made on supporting or opposing the project, or on decision making steps. Elianna did invite Dean to set up a display at the annual meeting on Tuesday and plans to follow up with Kristin at the city on Monday.