May 20, 2021

To: Reuter Walton  
ESG Architects  
The Kenefick Family

Re: 695 Grand Avenue Questions from 5/5/21 ZLU Committee Meeting

Thank you for attending our Zoning & Land Use Committee meeting on Wednesday 5/5/21. The discussion was nuanced, thoughtful, and very much appreciated by our board and neighbors.

We discussed the development further at our ZLU and Board meetings last week, and have some follow-up questions:

1. Massing and Visual Impact

The neighborhood remains concerned about the proposed massing and visual impact of the building. In response to questions about height and setbacks, the architect primarily made the case for the desirability of a 5 story mixed use building rather than its feasibility.

We would like to understand, clearly, what could realistically be done to further reduce the massing and visual impact of the building from its current proposal. Specifically:

(a) Is a shorter building based on the current site plan financially feasible? If so, how could such a building be configured and what trade-offs would be necessary to reduce the height?
(b) Are further setbacks and/or stepbacks financially feasible, either in combination with or as an alternative to a reduction in height?
(c) Is reducing or eliminating the underground parking level and/or the structured surface parking a viable route to reducing unit counts and thereby overall building mass? If so, what trade-offs would be necessary?
(d) Which of the options identified in (a), (b), and (c), if any, would the development team be willing to consider in order to mitigate remaining concerns?

2. Presentation / Traffic Circulation Plans

We would appreciate a copy of the presentation deck from the 5/11/21 meeting, including the new proposed traffic circulation that came out of your discussions with the City. Also, could you share the proposed monthly rental fee for an underground parking space?
3. Shadow Studies

Per our request at the meeting, we would appreciate a copy of the shadow studies presented to the committee, including additional detail in the following areas:

(a) Shadowing of the three alternate configurations (U, H, Inverted-U) that were presented, for the Winter Solstice morning, solar noon and afternoon.
(b) The Winter Solstice slides for the proposed u-shaped configuration, zoomed out to clearly show the difference in impact between 3 and 5 stories (these were presented at the second public meeting but were zoomed in).
(c) The proposed u-shaped configuration, showing the impact on shadows of meeting the T3 stepback requirements when abutting residential districts, as detailed in footnote (e) to the T district dimensional standards table at §66.331.
(d) Have you been able to establish grade on-site? Can the shadow studies requested above be shown with actual heights at all building edges in relation to the on-site slope?

4. Construction Impacts

At our committee meeting, Ari Parritz committed to follow up with surrounding neighbors to go into more detail about potential construction impacts and the plan to manage them. What are the next steps here and can we help facilitate?

5. Timing

We would like to ensure that we are able to publicize and allocate sufficient time in our hearing and meeting schedule to consider this application. Is it still the development team’s intention to submit the rezoning application by approx. 5/27/21 to meet the next rolling cut-off? If not, can you indicate a revised timeline?

Thank you and kind regards,

Simon Taghioff
Chair, Zoning & Land Use Committee
The Summit Hill Association (D16)