

From: [Latimer Burris, Amani](#)
To: gordian@nym.hush.com; [Punt, Colin](#); [Urban Design Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Hartmeyer project redesign and UDC approval
Date: Friday, January 5, 2024 3:23:52 PM

Thank you for your input. The neighborhood and community did bring up these issues to the developer during a meeting held in early December I believe it was.

The consensus, including myself, was that the balconies should remain. Simply put of the 15-20 people were there it was the only thing that everyone agreed upon. That said the developer standpoint was that keeping the balconies was outside of their budget.

I am not sure what the protocol is on this when you have a property that was approved under one condition and then this condition is significantly changed so I reached out to planning the planning department and was told that it's something that will be discussed at the planning commission.

I just got off the phone with I just got off the zoom call with both Kevin and Kyle and reiterated the communities want for the balconies. Their position was unfortunately it's not in the budget.

So I too would like to know what you're asking.

I know that they had said that Colin I just finished his report. I have not seen it so I am not sure if it addresses this issue.

Amani

Alder Amani

Amani Latimer Burris
City of Madison Alder, District 12
Text/Cell:(608)345-8747
Council Office: 608/266-4071
District 12 Website
Signup for District 12 emails
"Excuse any typos or errors, human here"

From: gordian@nym.hush.com <gordian@nym.hush.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 27, 2023 3:02:53 PM
To: Latimer Burris, Amani; Punt, Colin; Urban Design Comments
Subject: Hartmeyer project redesign and UDC approval

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Wed. Dec. 27, 2023

Alder Amani Latimer Burris,

I am surprised to learn that Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesign of its housing project on the former Hartmeyer property will not require approval from Madison's Urban Design Commission. The proposed changes to the buildings are a major alteration to a previously approved plan. Drawings comparing the original design and the redesign are available; they hardly look like drawings of the same buildings. [1 and 2] Footnotes refer to sources listed at the end of this message.

This message discusses redesigns of the senior housing building, proposed in Legistar 81251 [3], and of the family housing building, proposed in Legistar 81252 [4].

Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesigned housing project is much less appealing than the already approved design. Every unit's balcony would be removed. [5 and 6] The width of the sliding glass doors will be reduced by one-third. [5 and 6] A relatively open and inviting look would be replaced by a buttoned-up and forbidding appearance. [1 and 2] Any tenants who value convenient access to the outdoors in a private area would prefer a unit with a balcony. The much smaller glass doors would provide residents less light and ventilation. The balconies in the original, approved design would offer some protection from the sun and rain to the units below them. All changes in the redesigned project make the housing project less appealing.

BALCONIES REMOVED

Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesign removes all balconies from the apartment units. [5 and 6] This change reduces the square footage of private area in each unit by the area of the balcony. Residents would lose a convenient, private space where they could enjoy being outdoors. The courtyards in the housing development will not provide residents the same experience.

CANOPY EFFECT

Each balcony in the original, approved design shades the sliding glass door of the unit on the floor below it. This canopy effect protects the unit below from the sun and rain. Residents would be able to leave their doors open more often.

PASSIVE SOLAR COOLING

The shade provided by the balcony above an apartment would help to keep the lower apartment cooler. The same can be said of the projected eyebrow roof, which the redesign removes from the original, approved design. [5 and 6] Tenants will have less need to run fossil fuel powered air conditioners on hot days. The cooling effect is hard to quantify, but anyone who has found shade on a hot day knows that it is substantial.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a City of Madison policy goal:

"The City of Madison is committed to doing our part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and avoid the worst impacts of climate change. Madison has set the ambitious goal of reaching 100% renewable energy and net zero carbon emissions for city operations by 2030 and community-wide by 2050." [7]

A change in the design of the housing complex that reduces passive solar cooling is a step in the wrong direction.

NARROWER SLIDING GLASS DOORS

Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesign narrows the sliding glass doors in all apartment units. The sliding glass doors in the original, approved design are 50% wider than those in the proposed redesign. [5 and 6] The narrower doors will provide tenants less light and ventilation. The look and feeling of the apartment would be diminished by this design change.

DUE DILIGENCE

The purpose of the announced design changes is to reduce the developer's costs. We do not know whether other, less visible cost saving measures are contemplated. Cheaper appliances, fixtures, and materials would also save the developer money. Due diligence requires that the City verify that the original quality standards are maintained. The Urban Design Commission can call on City staff uniquely qualified to do that verification, but only if the Urban Design Commission must approve the developer's redesign.

CONCLUSION

Considering these issues might take the Urban Design Commission outside its comfort zone. However, only a little empathy is needed to make the happiness of the residents a prime consideration in judging the quality of the design of an apartment tower.

Thank you for considering this matter.

Don Lindsay

[1] Project Plans Senior Lot 1 Redesign July 13, 2023

[https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535065&GUID=40031513-462E-4CBA-80CA-AB614C32A90D](https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535065&GUID=40031513-462E-4CBA-80CA-AB614C32A90D;);

Accessed 20231220

[2] Project Plans Family Lot 2 Redesign July 13, 2023

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535066&GUID=039C5E29-306A-4090->

[B472-E4BFD9146AA6](#) ;

Accessed 20231220, 2023

[3] Legistar 81251 Senior Housing Redesign

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6449523&GUID=5060C81C-2F27-4EFC-9ACF-82688291B63C&Options=ID|Text|&Search=81251>

Accessed 20231220

[4] Legistar 81252 Family Housing Redesign

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6449524&GUID=A1D2C574-96B6-419A-8627-3199E9C66C3C&Options=ID|Text|&Search=81252>

Accessed 20231220

[5] Letter of Intent Senior Housing Legistar 81251

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535064&GUID=0A7901ED-D20A-4058-BB42-E5603D26AFE3> ;

Accessed 20231220

[6] Letter of Intent Family Housing Legistar 81252

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535068&GUID=9AA8F5C7-A5BB-49B7-BBF4-D25313C29570> ;

Accessed 20231220

[7] City of Madison Climate Goals

<https://www.cityofmadison.com/sustainability/climate>

Accessed 20231102

From: [Becky Leidner](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: 1/8/24 agenda items 4&5
Date: Sunday, January 7, 2024 9:22:34 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Plan Commission members,

Please oppose these major design changes to the Hartmayer development. In light of the many lessons of history and of recent problems with high-density housing in Madison, we should not turn blind eyes to the psychological harm done to people who are forced by socio-economic circumstances into these well-intentioned but misguided projects. We all need light, fresh air, and a feeling of open space for our comfort and health; commodities which are especially scarce in many-storied, multi-unit buildings. We also need to feel respected and valued, not treated as less deserving because we are less fortunate. People aren't stupid, and they know--and resent it--when corners (and balconies) are being cut at their expense in order to increase investors' profits.

Also, if we allow this change to go through, and as costs continue to rise, it will set a precedent for this developer and others to ask for approval of yet more economies, further eroding the quality of life for their residents. (A cynic might even wonder if it wasn't the developer's intention all along to include amenities in their plan they knew weren't affordable and then threaten to scuttle the project at the last minute if their changes aren't approved.)

Let's take this opportunity to learn from past mistakes and to show some empathy and concern. Please send the message that we care about creating humane, pleasant, livable housing for all of our neighbors.

Thank you,

Rebecca Leidner
1915 Spohn Ave,
Madison WI 53704

From: [Chris Elholm](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Don't approve agenda items 4 and 5, Legistar 81251 and 81252
Date: Monday, January 8, 2024 10:25:07 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

At the proposed development at 2007 Roth St., I strongly oppose shrinking the size of the apartments sliding doors from 9 to 6 feet and removal of all walk out balconies incorporated in the original building designs. PLAN COMMISSION, DO NOT APPROVE AT THIS TIME.

I think such a major design change calls for a new UDC review. Living in affordable housing/workforce housing/low income housing shouldn't mean sacrificing the amenity of balconies because the developer can't afford them. To me, that sounds like exploitation of future residents for the sake of profit. If the developer can't secure adequate funding to include balconies, a closer look at the entire design and budget must be reviewed and modified. What about eliminating the pool, reducing the height of each building by one story, and eliminating at least a third of the proposed parking spaces?

There's a quality of life aspect to living in highly dense high rise apartment buildings with balconies. They add living space to an apartment, provide room to sit outside without leaving an apartment, and provide much needed fresh air and circulation. Our Madison neighbors deserve and shouldn't be deprived of amenities because they can't afford market rate housing.

From: [Jennifer Argelander](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: items 4 and 5
Date: Monday, January 8, 2024 10:21:28 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Commissioners, Speaking for the Sherman Neighborhood Association as co-chair, SNA opposes Items 4 and 5 (Legistar #81251 and #81252) the proposed removal of the balconies, which would lessen the articulation of the building's façade and will affect the emotional and physical health of the residents. What was relatively open and inviting look would be replaced by an austere and dismal appearance. We request that you not approved this proposed change.

Removal of the balconies would reduce the square footage of private open space area in each unit. LAC says there is enough general open space if someone wants to go outside of the building. we disagree. Residents would lose a convenient, private space where they could enjoy being outside. The courtyards in the housing development will not provide residents the same experience.

Narrowing of the sliding glass doors from 9 ft to 6ft would provide residents with less light and ventilation. The need for the good ventilation is critical given that on other side of the unit will have parking which would add to the noise level and exhaust.

Balconies provide more natural light which improves mental and physical health. All renters deserve their own piece of outdoor space with sunshine and fresh air in their own unit. Seniors should not have to dress and take an elevator downstairs just to walk outside to get some fresh air and sun. They deserve the right to sit in their bathrobes and sip coffee in the morning or have a glass of wine in the evening. Parents should be able to do things in the apartment and allow the kids to get some sunshine on their own balcony under the parent's watchful eye.

The balconies in the original, approved design would offer some protection from the sun and rain to the units below them, as would the project eyebrow roof which is also proposed to be removed. These features would allow residents to be able to leave their doors open and more often. The balconies also offer passive solar cooling. The shade provided by the balcony above an apartment would help to keep the lower apartment cooler, thereby allowing for less need to run fossil fuel powered air conditioners on hot days. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a City of Madison policy goal.

The Common Council has voted \$6.25 million in TIF funding for the already approved project. Now the developer is abandoning those plans and offering a greatly diminished housing project. Given the above, these proposed changes **should not be approved** or it should be referred back to UDC. This is an obvious desperate attempt at cost saving measures to the detriment of those who would live there. Regardless of income, residents deserve the minimum of quality of life to have their own private access to open air, sunshine and outdoor beauty. The City has experienced failures in City developments such as with Tree Lane project and with the Meadowlands; it is time to be smarter in our developments. If keeping balconies prevent LAC from getting financing, then this project should not be built. Another kind of design should be put in this space. Thank you for your consideration.

From: gordian@nym.hush.com
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Oppose items 4 (Legistar 81251) and 5 (Legistar 81252)
Date: Saturday, January 6, 2024 2:08:05 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Sat. Jan. 6, 2024

Plan Commissioner members,

Please vote no on items 4 (Legistar 81251) and 5 (Legistar 81252).

Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesigned housing project is much less appealing than the already approved design. Every unit's balcony would be removed. [5 and 6] (Footnotes refer to sources listed at the end of this message.) The width of the sliding glass doors will be reduced by one-third. [5 and 6] Without the balconies, the articulation of the facade is greatly lessened. A relatively open and inviting look would be replaced by an austere and forbidding appearance. [1 and 2] Any tenants who value convenient access to the outdoors in a private area would prefer a unit with a balcony. The much smaller glass doors would provide residents less light and ventilation. The balconies in the original, approved design would offer some protection from the sun and rain to the units below them. The balconies also offer passive solar cooling. All changes in the redesigned project diminish the features and amenities of the housing project.

BALCONIES REMOVED

Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesign removes all balconies from the apartment units. [5 and 6] This change reduces the square footage of private area in each unit by the area of the balcony. Residents would lose a convenient, private space where they could enjoy being outdoors. The courtyards in the housing development will not provide residents the same experience.

NARROWER SLIDING GLASS DOORS

Lincoln Avenue Capital's redesign narrows the sliding glass doors in all apartment units. The sliding glass doors in the original, approved design are 50% wider than those in the proposed redesign. [5 and 6] The narrower doors will provide tenants less light and ventilation. The look and feeling of the apartment would be diminished by this design change.

CANOPY EFFECT

Each balcony in the original, approved design shades the sliding glass door of the unit on the floor below it. This canopy effect protects the unit below from the sun and rain.

The shade provided by the balcony above an apartment would help to keep the lower apartment cooler. The same can be said of the projected eyebrow roof, which the redesign removes from the original, approved design. [5 and 6] Because of this passive solar cooling, tenants will have less need to run fossil fuel powered air conditioners on hot days. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a City of Madison policy goal. [7]

CONCLUSION

The City of Madison Common Council has voted \$6.25 million in TIF funding for the already approved project. Now the developer is abandoning those plans and offering a greatly diminished housing project. The Plan Commission should reject the proposed redesign.

Thank you for considering this matter.

Don Lindsay

SOURCES

[1] Project Plans Senior Lot 1 Redesign July 13, 2023

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535065&GUID=40031513-462E-4CBA-80CA-AB614C32A90D>

Accessed 20231220

[2] Project Plans Family Lot 2 Redesign July 13, 2023

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535066&GUID=039C5E29-306A-4090-B472-E4BFD9146AA6>

Accessed 20231220, 2023

[3] Legistar 81251 Senior Housing Redesign

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6449523&GUID=5060C81C-2F27-4EFC-9ACF-82688291B63C&Options=ID|Text|&Search=81251>

Accessed 20231220

[4] Legistar 81252 Family Housing Redesign

<https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6449524&GUID=A1D2C574-96B6-419A->

[8627-3199E9C66C3C&Options=ID|Text|&Search=81252](#)

Accessed 20231220

[5] Letter of Intent Senior Housing Legistar 81251

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535064&GUID=0A7901ED-D20A-4058-BB42-E5603D26AFE3>

Accessed 20231220

[6] Letter of Intent Family Housing Legistar 81252

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12535068&GUID=9AA8F5C7-A5BB-49B7-BBF4-D25313C29570>

Accessed 20231220

[7] City of Madison Climate Goals

<https://www.cityofmadison.com/sustainability/climate>

Accessed 20231102

From: [Dorothy](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Subject: Plan Commission - agenda items # 4 and #5
Date: Saturday, January 6, 2024 12:32:52 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To: The Plan Commission

From: Dorothy Borchardt - 12th district resident

Date: 1/5/24

Re: Agenda items 4 & 5

I agree with the Sherman Neighborhood Association's position that Lincoln Avenue Capital's proposed cost cutting changes to eliminate the balconies shouldn't be approved. I'm requesting items 4 & 5 to be referred back to the Urban Design Commission's meeting on January 10, 2024, as a major alteration to a previous approved project. Lincoln Avenue Capital should consider reducing the size of the project to save cost. It is too large for a neighborhood that already has too many police calls.

Thank you for your time and consideration.