To: Broadway Citizens Task Force  
From: Broadway Project Team  
Date: August 26, 2014  
RE: August 26, 2014 CTF Meeting Materials Regarding Alignment Alternatives in the Cherry to Warren Area

This memorandum discusses a southward shift as an alternative to the alignment presented to the citizen task force August 7th, 2014, and summarizes the likely change in property impacts that would result. Tierra Right-of-way Services has also reviewed the alternative alignment and has provided an initial assessment of what the impacts of the alternative alignment are likely to be.

**Background**

At the August 7th meeting, four plausible alignments for the west mile of the project (Euclid to Campbell) were presented. After discussing these options, the task force largely settled on an alignment that shifted the roadway northward but asked that the project team explore a southward shift through the Cherry-Warren area to determine if the impact to the north side can reasonably be reduced. Of particular concern were residences that are contributors to the Rincon Heights Historic District. The task force did recognize the importance of avoiding significant commercial impacts to the south side, particularly the Circle K (1602 E) where the impact should be minimized to avoid a potentially costly acquisition as well as a disrupting a functioning business.

**Alignment Alternatives**

In response, an alternative alignment through that area has been developed. Attached are drawings of both the previously proposed alignment and the alternative alignment. The first, “Alignment Alternative 1”, is largely Variation 2b presented August 7th. The second, “Alignment Alternative 2” reflects the southward shift described above.

Alternative Alignment 2 starts with a southward curve west of Cherry. The curve is located far enough eastward however to avoid impacting the existing parking for 1530 E Broadway. The length of this curve has been designed such that the tangent extension results in limiting the maximum width of right-of-way being taken from the Circle K parcel to 6’ provided that a 10’ sidewalk with no buffer is used. One parking space would be lost as would onsite circulation around the north end of the gas pumps. A 10’ sidewalk area is also used on the north side of Broadway to limit the extent of the impact.

This approach avoids four structures on the north side that would otherwise be directly impacted (1625 E thru 1647 E). Two of these are contributors to the Rincon Heights Historic District. All four have alley access and can function as residences but not for commercial purposes under current regulations.

As a result of this shift, four properties on the south side would become directly impacted (1628 E to 1646 E). These buildings would eligible as contributors if a district were to be formed on the south side. Three are residences and one is commercial. Two of the residences do not have access other than directly from Broadway.
The owner of these properties has expressed interest in combining them and several other parcels behind them to create a suitable site for redevelopment. The strip taken across the fronts of these properties is on the order of 15’. These parcels are currently 115’ to 125’ in depth. Under the Alignment Alternative 1, no acquisition from these parcels would be expected.

The 1700 Building (1700 E) would also be impacted under Alignment Alternative 2. Use of a 10’ sidewalk would avoid directly impacting the building. It would however lose at least two parking spaces and the landscaped buffer that currently exists between it and Broadway.

**Tierra’s Assessment**

Tierra Right-of-way has reviewed the alternative alignment and has provided the following input regarding Alignment Alternative 2:

*All of the northern parcels between Cherry and Warren appear to be residential homes with alley access in the rear. It appears the new alternative right-of-way line would impact 1615 E Broadway as well as the City-owned properties at 1601 E and 1611 E. The new right-of-way line would be at or very close to the front of the structure at 1625 E and 1629 E which may result in an argument for a full acquisition, or additional damages. Determination of this impact however would be based on the “market” and would be derived through the appraisal process.*

*The southern parcels also appear to all be residential homes except for 1602 E (Circle K) and 1628 E. These parcels do not have alley access. It appears the new right-of-way line would impact the structures at 1634 E and 1640 E, and would be very close to the front of the structures at 1628 and 1646. This could result in an argument for a full acquisition or additional damages. Again, actual determination of this impact based on the “market” would be derived through the appraisal process.*

*The Circle K circulation around the canopy and the northern pumps appear to be impacted by the additional proposed acquisition. This may result in an argument for a full acquisition or additional damages. Again however, determination of this impact would be derived through the appraisal process.*
Questions to Consider

In deciding between these alternatives, the task force should consider the following points:

1. What is the risk that Circle K and 1700 East Broadway become full acquisitions, and if they do how much would they cost? As Tierra noted, these questions will not be definitively answered until the actual acquisition process is underway some years out. Any decisions made now will necessarily be based on judgment and “best guesses” at this point.

2. What is the prospect that the historic and non-historic structures on the north side will in fact be preserved, given the economic factors that would exist? (In other words, what are their values as residential property compared to redeveloping these sites?).

3. Is preserving the four north side buildings worth giving up the landscaped buffer separating the sidewalks and the street? Other that preservation of historic structures, the performance measures adopted for this project are positively influenced by the landscape buffer.

4. What is the likelihood of parcels on both sides being acquired?
Alignment Alternative 2