

Wells, Chris

From: John Haugen-Wente [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 7:25 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: 418 Division

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Wells,

As residents of the Marquette neighborhood, we are writing to you because of concerns we have around the proposed rezoning of the property at 418 Division St.

While we are supporters of urban infill, we are concerned that a proposed rezoning of this property to Traditional Shopping/Commercial instead of Traditional Residential has the potential to act as a detriment to the character of the neighborhood, and serves as a negative precedent in regards to future development within residential area, making residential zoning status vulnerable, at best.

Specifically, we have concerns as to the density of the proposed development. From our understanding, the proposed buildings would be nearly double the recommended density of 40 units per acre. Such density dramatically changes the character of the neighborhood, leads to traffic and parking congestion, and dwarfs neighboring single-family housing units. Such density also raises traffic concerns as this development sits at the heart of a major neighborhood intersection for not only automobile traffic, but a highly trafficked bike and pedestrian path. The increased volume of cars would make this intersection less safe for all forms of traffic- with a particular concern as to the fact that this is a linking intersection to a school crossing and footpath for both Marquette and O'Keeffe school students.

With the nearby dramatic increase in development along the East Washington corridor, we feel that it is very necessary that we leave the character of nearby residential neighborhoods intact. Atwood Avenue has also seen a resurgence of development, and has brought many positives to the neighborhood, but there needs to be a buffer between these areas and the single family homes that were purchased by those of us that chose to dwell in an area free of larger, multi-complexed units.

We sincerely hope that you , and your colleagues will reconsider this proposed shift in zoning and leave this parcel with Traditional Residential status.

We appreciate your time and thoughtful consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kristin & John Haugen-Wente

[REDACTED] Clemons Ave.

Madison

Wells, Chris

From: Maura Taggart [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 8:33 PM
To: Wells, Chris; Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 418 Division Street development - oppose

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to clarify that as a resident, tax payer, and registered voter of the neighborhood in which the proposed development at 418 Division street, that I strongly oppose the rezoning of that location to TSS. I prefer that it remain as it is (residential and light industrial) or mixed use. But not TSS as is the Atwood street area.

The proposed development and re-zoning does not meet with the comprehensive plan developed by the neighborhood.

The traffic it will bring increases the risks at an already dangerous corner.

The bus routes do not support that size of a development.

The proposed development has no plan for affordable housing or green space.

It is on a highly used bike and walking route.

In the comprehensive plan this side of Eastwood was to remain residential.

I would like to allow for other proposals. Other builders have build reasonable units without commercial space.

The builder has not adhered to zoning plans in the past and I am not eager to risk another costly revision.

I have spoken to more than 2 dozen neighbors just over this labor day weekend who oppose this development.

I ask you to vote no to the rezoning proposal.

My expectations is that you honor the wishes of the neighborhood and vote no to the rezoning.

Thank you,
Maura Taggart

Wells, Chris

From: Marlisa Kopenski [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 5:01 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Comments on the proposed development of 418 Division Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Wells-

I am writing to you again about the proposed development of 418 Division Street. My family and I have lived at [REDACTED] Clemons Avenue for the last 12 years.

I am in favor of development at the corner of Division and Eastwood. However, I am opposed to rezoning it to commercial TSS. I believe it should be rezoned mixed use as having a residential feel is imperative to the development integrating into the neighborhood between Eastwood and the lake. In my estimation, zoning it TSS is potentially detrimental to our neighborhood for this development and any future development.

Additionally, I am aware that is development, as proposed, is in conflict with the Comprehensive Neighborhood Plan.

I would like to see the developer consider the desperate need for affordable housing in this area. And I would like to see the city support any development of that corner with thoughtful and proactive measures to control the resultant increase of traffic at an already chaotic intersection.

Thank you for considering my point of view.

Sincerely,

Marlisa Kopenski Condon

[REDACTED] Clemons Avenue
[REDACTED]

Wells, Chris

From: Gavney, Dale A [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 8:34 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Opposed to 418 Division Development (Zoning Change)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello, I'd like to make you aware of my opposition to the zoning change/proposed development at 418 Division. The development is out of line with the comprehensive plan in terms of density. If we approve such variances, we're not building the future we planned.

Thank you,

Dale Gavney
[REDACTED] Jenifer St. Madison
[REDACTED]

American Family Insurance Company | American Family Life Insurance Company | American Family Mutual Insurance Company | American Standard Insurance Company of Ohio | American Standard Insurance Company of Wisconsin | Midvale Indemnity Company | Home Office - 6000 American Parkway | Madison, WI 53783
Permanent General Assurance Corporation | Permanent General Assurance Corporation of Ohio | The General Automobile Insurance Company, Inc. DBA The General® | Home Office - 2636 Elm Hill Pike | Nashville, TN 37214 wholly owned subsidiaries of American Family Mutual Insurance Company

*If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this e-mail, any attachments and all copies.

Wells, Chris

From: julia vance [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 9:42 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Comments about proposed project at Capital Waters site

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to state that as a member of the affected neighborhood that I oppose this project as a commercial project or mixed commercial/residential zone. It is imperative that the residential nature of the neighborhood be preserved, specifically that there be an offset from the sidewalks that would not be required if the structure is commercial. I am thinking about the mixed use building on the corner of Baldwin and Willy street, where the stores below encroach up to the sidewalk. This is a single family neighborhood with front yards that provide that buffer for pedestrians and bicyclists.

This plan is also in conflict with the neighborhood's comprehensive plan and I am concerned about a large increase of residents in the neighborhood without supporting infrastructure like parking and pedestrian greenspaces. As with any new residential building, I am also very concerned that there is no plan to make the units affordable for those of low or moderate incomes. Planning for a smaller number of units is more in line with the neighborhood feel and primarily single family - triplex layout of the neighborhood.

My last concern is that this corner is very busy already with a confusing traffic pattern and a VERY busy bike route. Adding more activity to this corner will require significant traffic and pedestrian/bike changes to maintain some semblance of safety for the existing users of the bike path.

Respectfully,
Julia Vance
[REDACTED] Clemons Ave.

To be at peace, does not mean that you are amiss of every storm, it only means that you can find a calm within the storm.

Tanie Elizabeth

Wells, Chris

From: Stouder, Heather
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 10:08 AM
To: Ethington, Ruth
Cc: Wells, Chris
Subject: FW: Comment re: opposing rezoning of 418 Division Street item #43648
Attachments: Comment_43648.pdf

Ruth-

Could you please add the attached to Legistar for item 43648, prior to the Council meeting this evening?

Thanks!

Heather

From: Chris Lukas [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 9:49 AM
To: Stouder, Heather
Subject: Comment re: opposing rezoning of 418 Division Street item #43648

This comment is in regard to the proposed rezoning of 418 Division St. at the upcoming common council meeting. Please forward to all alders.

As a nearby resident, I oppose the rezoning of 418 Division St. to TSS (Traditional Shopping District). Generally from a neighborhood perspective, that property is in a low density residential area so that zoning category seems anomalous.

More specifically, the comprehensive plan specifically calls out that area and states "Buildings should be generally compatible in scale with existing residential and commercial buildings in the area." The adjacent surrounding area is identified as low-density residential on the comprehensive plan and zoned as TR-C4 and TR-V1.

Rezoning as TSS not only goes against the comprehensive plan in terms of density but also fails to take the surrounding zoning into account. If you feel the need to rezone the property, then it should not be an island of TSS and rather should be zoned TR-C4 or TR-V1 as befits the surroundings.

Thank you.

Chris Lukas
[REDACTED] Riverside Drive

Wells, Chris

From: Nathan Stade [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 10:50 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: 418 Division Development by Krupp

Chris,

Please include my comments in the notes to Madison Common Council for 9-6-16 meeting pertaining to redevelopment plan for 418 Division St.

All,

I have reviewed the plans to develop 418 Division St. and understand that we are at the end of what appears to be a “rubber stamp” process. Neighborhood input is unanimous and entirely negative. Even accounting for changes in the proposal after the first failure to pass the Plan Commission one must assume the developer does not have a copy of, or understand, the Neighborhood Plan as it flies in the face of every important facet of this well thought out and deliberately penned document many years in the making. Simply put, the proposal is far too big.

I am a neighborhood resident of 20 years who while biking, driving, and walking am impacting greatly by this councils decisions. I am disturbed by the freedom to ignore the values of residents when development is concerned and could vent for an extended period on the subject and specific developments. I will not do so in hopes many others attend the meeting tonight to voice concerns as well as write in to exercise their input. Instead I would like to address the specific area of safety as it pertains to development of this site.

Firstly, I work in the transportation industry and dispatch dozens of commercial vehicle to this and other neighborhoods in Madison. I have an understanding of traffic safety and the impact it has on everyday lives. As Madison’s population density has increased downtown we have modified and adapted our routing and delivery patterns to accommodate safe methods and practices and by and large have seen success in maintaining public safety. It can be done, and increased density is a reality (one that I also support). However, the current plan so far exceeds what has previously been deemed safe I am compelled to voice my disapproval. Here are a few specifics to why I feel the current plan compromises public safety.

-No accommodation has been made for the added vehicular traffic and in fact the proposal brings the structure so close to the sidewalk and roadway as to create unnecessary blind spots.

-The proposal seems to have not added any parking while exceeding limits on units. This creates need for on road parking in an area where it is already compromised. In the immediate vicinity there is no on road parking and the roadway is so narrow that it will not be an option. Where there is on road parking the roadways are so narrow that even in the summer when snow removal is not a concern traffic safety is compromised.

-The plan includes a free space for Fire Dept. access which allows them to operate in case of emergency but does so on a very busy street, and at it’s narrowest point. I believe the prudent choice here is to widen the roadway to match the existing needs not compromise it further and “kick the can” down the road so to speak. The current accommodation for fire access assumes a compromised position. This is the wrong way to approach the situation.

-The architects have chosen to draw the plan with the main entrance located on the busier of the two streets (Division) yet still close enough to the corner as to compromise both streets. It will compromise them as there has been no accommodation for drop-off, pick-up and /or delivery traffic. Many times this results in parking in No Parking areas with Hazard light flashing while one “just runs in for a second”. This is the reality and it is unsafe. What about UPS or FedEx or the Postal carrier? Where are they to part so as to promote a safe delivery of goods.

So, to sum up, the proposal puts forth a population density roughly 40% higher than planning research indicates is appropriate and safe while not just refusing to make accommodations for all the associated realities but further curtailing them. I live here and it’s mind boggling that we’ve gotten this far. I am in favor or development of this site. I am in favor of that development enhancing my home and neighborhood. And I am increasingly concerned that this proposal is so far removed from these values that I encourage each one of you to consider it as a resident of this neighborhood would. Those residents, and I, appose Mr. Krupp’s plan with no exceptions!

Please vote against Mr. Krupp's proposal and ask him (or others) to put forth a more appropriate plan for our neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my thoughts.

Sincerely,

Nathan Stade

█ Spaight St.

Madison, WI 53704

Wells, Chris

From: claire rynders [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 11:54 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 418 Division St zoning discussion

I oppose changing the zoning of the Capital Water Softener (418 Division St) as requested by Prime Urban Properties (Joseph Krupp) to accommodate the proposed project density under TSS.

Allowing TSS zoning for this property, isolated from other TSS properties, sets the precedent that the TSS zoning classification is appropriate in any part of the City when a developer wants a more intense use than what is permitted under present guidelines.

Prime Urban Properties proposed zoning change does not:

- *encourage and sustain the viability of Madison's mixed-use corridors, which sustain many of the City's traditional neighborhoods. Division or Helena not a mixed use corridor;
- * encourage appropriate transition between higher-intensity (41-60 per acre) to lower -density (16 per acre) area;
- *adhere with adopted goals, objectives, policies and recommendations of the guidelines of the Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan.

The area's high traffic situation with a heavy used bike-pedestrian intersection allows for an already chaotic and dangerous corner. The proposal for 78 units, 5x the current residential density and nearly 2x the 2009 Comprehensive Plan recommendation, adds 30-50 vehicle to Division/Eastwood/Helena congestion. Street cleaning and deliveries to Schoep's and Jenny Market already jeopardizes safety. (Isn't 30-50 parking slots also skimpy for 78 units?)

Please think Safety.

Bending the rules to accommodate Prime Urban Properties (Knupp) sets a precedent for future development for Division/Eastwood/Helena and beyond. Has TSS zoning ever been used in order for a developer to have a higher building/lesser setbacks/higher density or applied to any property not located on a street that has traditionally been a mixed-use corridor?

Other developers with fronts on Atwood Ave. and not in a mixed-use corridor have built reasonable housing in a similar space following present guidelines and are seemingly making money.

Please insist Prime Urban Properties follow present guidelines for the purposed Division/Eastwood/Helena development.

Thank you

Claire Rynders
[REDACTED] Clemons Ave

Wells, Chris

From: Rummel, Marsha
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 12:21 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Fwd: 418 Division St. Proposal

Keith gave me permission to share his email with the Council.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: September 6, 2016 at 9:37:46 AM CDT
To: district6@cityofmadison.com
Subject: 418 Division St. Proposal

Hi Marsha,

A group of us have been working towards getting this particular Krupp proposal rejected and we have been frustrated by a process that seems to favor the developer. Most of us have not been involved in the day to day operations of the city's business like you have been, so we are not familiar with the process. We are trying to get up to speed with and have made some progress, but we really need your help on this thing. We appreciate all you have done to help with this process and you are really good about setting up public meetings for the different proposals and projects we have seen come to fruition in this neighborhood.

Most of them have been good but some have issues that we are now seeing and feeling years down the road. An example is the Kennedy place building's underground parking ventilation system. I couldn't have imaged how irritating that constant low humming noise would be or that it would even be an issue when that building was being proposed (I really don't remember if this ventilation tower was even discussed during the proposals process). But I now wake up in the middle of the night quite often hearing what sounds like a car running outside my house only to find that it is just my constant noise companion, the ventilation fan. Most likely there is nothing I can do about this now since it is probably well within acceptable noise levels (vibration doesn't seem to count), so I'm stuck with this minor irritation. Minor things like this never seem to get fully discussed when these proposals come along, and that is a real shame that we are not getting these potential issues fully vetted. And that is what we fear is happening with this latest proposal.

The 418 Division st proposal has some real concerns for us, and if you have been paying attention to the public meetings on this proposal you have heard many if not most of the people in this neighborhood are opposed to this project. We all feel that this will be too much density for this particular intersection. With the Schoepps plant in operation at this intersection and with the truck and delivery traffic at the Jenifer st. Market as well, this area's traffic flow is a real mess right now. Division st. is a bus route as well as the main flow of pedestrian traffic for children going to and from school crossing that intersection into this neighborhood. This brings up huge safety issues that don't seem to be part of the discussion from the city planning dept. Adding 40 to 50 or more vehicles on a daily basis will not alleviate any issues we are having only exacerbate them.

This proposal also does not take into account the recommendations of the comprehensive plan for this neighborhood and that may be the thing that is most frustrating about this whole process. Why are we going to throw away a plan for this neighborhood that every other developer has followed and give Mr. Krupp free rein to do what he feels will make him the most money? Why is his proposal better than the next one to come along, and we all know that there could be many proposals for this site that would fit into the parameters of the comprehensive plan. Look at 280 Division st. for example, a 16 unit condominium unit built maybe 3 years ago and directly kitty corner across Eastwood and Atwood Ave.

from the Capital water softener building. This building fits the neighborhood like it has been there for years, it has very little if any impact on traffic and parking in this area. Then look at the project that Krupp is currently building next to Mont'y's. This project will add more cars into this neighborhood while displacing current parking at the restaurant. Again we are not sure what impact this will have for us in the future, but we can imagine it won't be good.

Because of these issues and issues that may arise from too much density at this particular intersection we are urging you, with overwhelming support from the neighbors, to oppose the re-zoning for this project. Mr. Krupp, how ever you feel about him, has done some good stuff in this neighborhood we credit him for that, but he has also become very wealthy from what he has done as well. And looking at the projects he has done in this area we see a pattern of pushing the limits on what he has been allowed to build. His project at 1st st. and Winnebago was so tight to the street he forced the city to have to later come back and widen that section of first st. directly in front of his building. When he built Kennedy Place on Atwood he was allowed to use the city's ability to condemn several properties so he could build that structure. I have heard rumors that he was able to do that same condemnation thing with his current project on Atwood. This really seems to us to be unacceptable for one developer to get whatever he wants without restraint. We feel this proposal was somehow pushed through the planning dept. without the sort of scrutiny applied to other developers and he is being rewarded unjustly if this proposal is approved. We are not against Mr. Krupp though we feel this particular proposal is not well suited for this intersection and we want to see another proposal that more fully adheres to the plan for this neighborhood. So, that is why we want you to either vote against this or abstain so we can get a better proposal for this site. Thank You

Keith Kobs
[REDACTED] Helena st

PS, I'm speaking for at least a hundred people in the hood who I have discussed this proposal with.

Wells, Chris

From: Rummel, Marsha
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 12:26 PM
To: Tiffany Novinska; Wells, Chris
Subject: Re: Opposition to 418 Division St rezoning/redevelopment

Thanks for the note Tiffany I will share your email with the Council

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 6, 2016, at 10:59 AM, Tiffany Novinska <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Marsha, I attended both neighborhood meetings and both planning commission meetings and registered my opposition. I have used the website location to write to the mayor. I am unable to attend the CC meeting tonight. My comments are below. Thank you, Tiffany

Contact the Mayor

Tiffany Novinska, thank you for contacting the Mayor.

Name:

Tiffany Novinska

Address:

[REDACTED] Sommers Ave

City:

Madison

State:

WI

Zip Code:

53704

Email:

[REDACTED]

Message:

I strongly oppose the currently proposed 418 Division St development mostly due to high density and the resulting traffic impacts to an already congested residential street. I believe this site should be redeveloped; however, not in the context of the current proposal and in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan. I applaud the two members of the planning commission who voted against this project citing its lack of adherence with the Comp Plan. Ironically, the 8/29 planning commission meeting began with an overview of planning process for 2017 Comp Plan; if tax dollars are spent on creating a plan, then it is ignored, what is the purpose of the plan? I am a lifelong resident of the [REDACTED] block of Sommers Ave and sincerely hope my concerns are heard, though at this point, I feel the city has ignored my concerns and those of many neighbors who have presented very detailed and methodical reasons why a smaller project would be quite welcome to this neighborhood and remain in compliance with the existing Comp plan. Please do not accept this zoning change. Thank you.

Wells, Chris

From: Tim Taggart [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 1:16 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 418 Division Street

As a resident of the Atwood and Marquette Neighborhood I would like you to know that I oppose the rezoning of the property at 418 Division Street. Long term zoning plans are made for a reason and to just change them randomly seems to defeat the purpose of doing a study and proposal for zoning in the first place. Please think long and hard before you just approve something that could bring many different issues to the forefront like: safety, green space, congestion, parking, future changes to other properties nearby if they pass.
Please vote no on the re-zoning.

Thank you and I apologize for using work email, as my personal email is not working.

Tags

Tim Taggart

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] W Dayton Street
Madison, WI 53715
Office- [REDACTED]
Cell- [REDACTED]
Fax- [REDACTED]

Wells, Chris

From: Kent & Ruth Hill [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 3:01 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 418 Division rezone

My name is Kent Hill, and I have been part of this neighborhood for over 70 years. I live at [REDACTED] Division. When Marsha (my alder) alerted the neighborhood that Joe Krupp had asked City Planning to approve a zoning change at 418 Division, I knew it was important I speak to the Planning Commission, and I did. I feel the same about speaking to the Council. The project does make sense, but before approving a rezoning, it's important to assess the interactions and impacts it will have on other entities. There will be a significant increase in the number of apartments on these two blocks, but more important is the presence of Schoeps across the street. As a young boy, I saw a small plant down the street, and at times went in for free ice cream. Today, I look out my front window and see a plant that covers the entire block.

At both Planning Commission meetings, I asked they not (rezone) and add 31 apartments to the 21 already on the 400 & 500 blocks, unless the city was willing to deal with the serious and complicated problems brought on by Schoeps presence on the street. I passed out 33 pictures to the commissioners to show what those problems look like. They saw semis too big for a residential street, kids maneuvering around semis as they head to Marquette, O'keefe and East High, a blind man with his dog and an elderly lady with her motorized cart navigating around the semis as they headed for Jenifer Street Market, bikers moving to the sidewalk to get through, then the many vendors (for Jenifer Market) looking for places to park among the semis, and lastly cars/buses waiting (some patiently, some not) to pass. I also shared a portion of what Police Officer Hennessey had to say in his incident report about noise and congestion: "semi truck parked on the street running loudly and blocking traffic for at least 15 minutes".

The Commission focused its attention not on Division as it exists today, but on how it exists in the "Adopted Land Use Plan". That plan does not include Schoeps (I don't think it says where it went; it's just gone). Without Schoeps, the density issue is solved and the Krupp proposal fits comfortably into the comprehensive plan. What it doesn't do is deal with the reality "on the ground" today.

Tonight the zoning issue is before the Council. What I would like you to do, if you approve the rezoning request, is add a provision that directs the city to assess and resolve the current issues facing the 400 & 500 blocks of Division Street.







Thanks,

Kent Hill