

From: [Ron Shutvet](#)
To: [Urban Design Comments](#); baycreek@groups.io
Subject: Truman Olson Redevelopment Project
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 11:08:12 AM

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

Truman Olson Redevelopment Project Comments for the UDC and Plan Commission

Why can't this city give fair notice of design changes and a reasonable amount of time to provide public comments? The Bay Creek neighborhood only got a one day notice that the Truman Olson redevelopment project is going to be before the UDC this week for final approval. This is wrong and it has to stop. You need to postpone this agenda item until January to give the neighborhood a chance to comment on the "final" plans. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The ZOOM online meeting process excludes so many people from participating and the public participation process is falling apart. The UDC should require that all approvals for final approval should be publicly noticed and the "final plans" must be available for review by the public AT LEAST one week before any scheduled meeting for final approval before the UDC or Common Council. The city has rigged the process to effectively limit public participation and this has to stop. Sure, I can look at the city meeting agenda on a Friday afternoon and find out what the UDC is and then look through the whole thing to see if anything pertains to your neighborhood and then dig in more to find the plans. But why can't the city or our alder just let us know as soon as they know when a project is up for approval instead of making us always dig for the information all the time?

I look at these "final plans" and I see a redevelopment project that must have run out of money because a major part of the third, fourth and fifth floors and even part of the sixth floor look unfinished with all the cheap looking white washed lap siding on these upper floors. Even the back part of the sixth floor is ugly white. I thought that buildings in this UDC district are supposed to look equally attractive on all four sides not just on the front face of the building. I am tired of the way architects and developers are now using white as the color of the upper floors of buildings to make them look smaller. These white upper levels are not attractive and look really cheap compared to the rest of the building.

With hundreds of thousands of people trying to flee big city ghettos in this country and moving to smaller cities like Madison, you are just building more ghetto style redevelopment projects for them to live in when they get here. Where are all the children who you expect to be living here going to play? The 4000 square foot roof top open space is inadequate for the number of people expected to be living here. There is no suitable ground level greenspace for a play area anywhere on this property. If you are not going to provide adequate outdoor space for children to play then perhaps you should switch to mostly one bedroom apartments and gear the apartment units to single and older people. With 30 three bedroom units and 56 two bedroom apartments proposed in addition to the 64 one bedroom apartments, I expect at least 120 children and perhaps many more will be living in this

redevelopment project. I see nowhere for these children to play outside. The only elevators for the apartment units are near the grocery entrance area, funneling nearly all the ingress/egress movement to that area making it more crowded.

The parking structure has only one vehicle entrance/exit and the same is also the only pedestrian/bicycle entrance/exit. Does this meet fire code? All vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic is funneled to one area adjacent to the grocery store entrance. I see no area designated for grocery pickup or drop off and pickup of people who use other modes of transportation like ride sharing, Uber, or para transit services provided by the city or third parties. If there would be a vehicle fire near the parking structure entrance, how will people and vehicles get out of the parking structure? It would be advantageous to have a secondary entrance/exit to the parking structure that uses the south service road. The way it is designed now, EVERY VEHICLE that enters the parking structure will have to either park in a stall and then back out to leave or perform a dangerous Y-Turn to turn around and exit the parking structure when they find that all the parking stalls are taken.

The city, in its efforts to build denser redevelopment projects is building more future ghettos with nowhere decent for children to safely play outside or even inside. Look at the tiny proposed "Kids Nook" play area on the second floor. The nearby elevator and stairwell area is larger than the Kids Nook and the adjacent fitness room is three times larger. Pathetic. This project has morphed into a government subsidized low income housing project with an attached grocery store that just does not meet expectations.

The grocery store is going to be too small to serve this area of Madison. The parking structure is boxed in with an inadequate entrance/exit area that is going to be a bottleneck. Vehicle pickup and drop off for grocery customers and apartment residents will probably have to be performed out on Cedar Street with no canopy for protection from the elements. The developer and the city keep trying to fit more and more on this property but there just isn't enough space for all that is being proposed. Over half of the property is taken up by city street ROW and the parking structure. This parcel of land is too small for what is being attempted here. I suggest that the city or the developer purchase the vacant land parcels to the south and start over to create a better redevelopment project that includes that additional land. The grocery store needs an additional surface parking lot for those who are intimidated by a large, crowded, parking structure with only one entrance/exit and nowhere to turn around safely.

I don't like the way shadows are included in both the color and black and white elevation plans. It detracts from being able to visualize what the building will look like. You need to have a separate set of plans to show shadow effects on the property and adjoining properties. Also, some of the architectural elements of the building seem to be improperly labeled on the plans. For instance, the white lap fiber cement siding has the same description as the wood grained siding which is "Fiber cement wood siding Nichiha Vintagewood Color - Spruce" but I don't know of any spruce trees that are white. And what is the real size of the apartment windows? It looks like the window openings are larger than the actual windows making the smaller windows

look larger than they really are. Please include closeup detail of the windows so you can see the size of the actual window sashes compared to the window frame opening. It looks like there are large black or gray fill panels at the tops and some sides of all the windows that make the windows look larger than they really are. Tiny windows in addition to lack of greenspace and no balconies anywhere will make this apartment complex look like a large multi-level sardine can. Finally, the plans don't state the type of windows that will be used but if the windows are going to be black or dark colored, the window frames and sash should have an aluminum exterior as vinyl and composite windows will not hold up as well. I am not berating the black window frames and in fact like them and even the windows of my own home have black frames and sash. But I will warn you that black window frames will collect visible dust and dirt and look shabby quickly unless they are cleaned regularly.

If I have made any errors in my review of these "final plans" that I received on very short notice, I apologize. If I would have had more time to review the plans, I could have drafted a better list of concerns. If I seem angry or upset, it is because everyone in city government keeps dropping the ball when it comes to public participation in the design of redevelopment projects.

Ron Shutvet
Madison, WI

From: ajr@trumanol.com
To: baycreek@groups.io
Cc: rlm@trumanol.com
Subject: Re: [Bay Creek] Truman Olson Redevelopment Project
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 11:45:31 AM

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

All good points, Ron.
I am also confused by the white "spruce". Terribly ugly.
Dana

----- Original Message -----

From: Ron Shutev via groups.io <rprram@sol.com@groups.io>
To: urban@groups.io; city@madison.com; baycreek@groups.io
Sent: Wed, 02 Dec 2020 12:08:09 -0500 (EST)
Subject: [Bay Creek] Truman Olson Redevelopment Project

Truman Olson Redevelopment Project Comments for the UDC and Plan Commission

Why can't this city give fair notice of design changes and reasonable amount of time to provide public comments? The Bay Creek neighborhood only got a one day notice that the Truman Olson redevelopment project is going to be before the UDC this week for final approval. This is wrong and it has to stop. You need to postpone this agenda item until January to give the neighborhood a chance to comment on the "final" plans. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The ZOOM online meeting process excludes so many people from participating and the public participation process is falling apart. The UDC should require that all approval for final approval should be publicly noticed and the "final plans" must be available for review by the public AT LEAST one week before any scheduled meeting for final approval before the UDC or Common Council. The city has rigged the process to effectively limit public participation and this has to stop. Sure, I can look at the city meeting agenda on a Friday afternoon and find out what the UDC is and then look through the whole thing to see if anything pertains to your neighborhood and then dig in more to find the plans. But why can't the city or our alder just let us know as soon as they know when a project is up for approval instead of making us always dig for the information all the time? I look at these "final plans" and I see a redevelopment project that must have run out of money because a major part of the third, fourth and fifth floors and even part of the sixth floor look unfinished with all the cheap looking white washed lap siding on the upper floors. Even the back part of the sixth floor is ugly white. I thought that buildings in this UDC district are supposed to look equally attractive on all four sides not just on the front facade of the building. I am tired of the way architects and developers are now using white as the color of the upper floors of buildings to make them look smaller. These white upper levels are not attractive and look really cheap compared to the rest of the building.

With hundreds of thousands of people trying to flee big city ghettos in this country and moving to smaller cities like Madison, you are just building more ghetto style development projects for them to live in when they get here. Where are all the children who you expect to be living here going to play? The 4000 square foot roof top open space is inadequate for the number of people expected to be living here. There is no suitable ground level greenspace for play area anywhere on this property. If you are not going to provide adequate outdoor space for children to play then perhaps you should switch to mostly one bedroom apartments and gear the apartment units to single and older people. With 30 three bedroom units and 56 two bedroom apartments proposed in addition to the 64 one bedroom apartments, I expect at least 120 children and perhaps many more will be living in this redevelopment project. I see nowhere for these children to play outside. The only elevators for the apartment units are near the grocery entrance area, funneling nearly all the ingress/egress movement to that area making it more crowded.

The parking structure has only one vehicle entrance/exit and the same is also the only pedestrian/bicycle entrance/exit. Does this mean firecode? All vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic is funneled to one area adjacent to the grocery store entrance. I see no area designated for grocery pickup/drop off and pickup of people who use other modes of transportation like ride sharing, Uber, or para transit services provided by the city or third parties. If there would be a vehicle fire near the parking structure entrance, how will people and vehicles get out of the parking structure? It would be advantageous to have secondary entrance/exit to the parking structure? The nearby elevator and stairwell area is larger than the Kids Nook and the adjacent fitness room is three times larger. Pathetic. This project has morphed into a government subsidized low income housing project with an attached grocery store that just does not meet expectations.

The grocery store is going to be too small to serve this area of Madison. The parking structure is boxed in with an inadequate entrance/existence that is going to be a bottleneck. Vehicle pickup and drop off for grocery customers and apartment residents will probably have to be performed out on Cedar Street with no canopy for protection from the elements. The developer and the city keep trying to fit more and more on this property but there just isn't enough space for all that is being proposed. Over half of the property is taken up by city street ROW and the parking structure. This parcel of land is too small for what is being attempted here. I suspect that the city or the developer purchased vacant land parcels to the south and east over to create a better redevelopment project that includes that additional land. The grocery store requires an additional surface parking lot for those who are intimidated by a large, crowded, parking structure with only one entrance/exit and nowhere to turn around safely.

I don't like the way shadows are included in both the color and black and white elevation plans. It detracts from being able to visualize what the building will look like. You need to have a separate set of plans to show shadow effects on the property and adjoining properties. Also, some of the architectural elements of the building seem to be improperly labeled on the plans. For instance, the white lap fiber cement siding has the same description as the wood grained siding which is "Fiber cement wood siding, Nichiha Vintagewood Color - Spruce" but I don't know of any spruce trees that are white. And what is the real size of the apartment windows? It looks like the window openings are larger than the actual windows making the smaller windows look larger than they really are. Please include close up detail of the windows so you can see the size of the actual window sashes compared to the window frame opening. It looks like there are large black or gray fill panels at the top and some sides of all the windows that make the windows look larger than they really are. Tiny windows in addition to lack of greenspace and no balconies anywhere will make this apartment complex look like a large multi-level sardine can. Finally, the plans don't state the type of windows that will be used but if the windows are going to be black or dark colored, the window frames and sash should have an aluminum exterior as vinyl and composite windows will not hold up as well. I am not baring the windows of my own home have black frames and in fact like them and even the windows of my own home have black frames and sash. But I will warn you that black window frames will collect visible dust and dirt and look shabby quickly unless they are cleaned regularly.

IF I have made any errors in my review of these "final plans" that I received on very short notice, I apologize. If I would have had more time to review the plans, I could have drafted a better list of concerns. If I seem angry or upset, it's because everyone in city government keeps dropping the ball when it comes to public participation in the design of redevelopment projects.

Ron Shutev@Madison, WI

Groups.io Links: You receive all messages sent to this group.

View Reply Online (166): https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/g/baycreek/message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=Mute+This+Topic+https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----

3A_groupio_g_baycreek_message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=

3A_groupio_m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----

If you reply to a message it will go to the whole list rather than to the individual, despite what the "From:" line might say.

Please read our [Guidelines for Civil Discourse](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/g/baycreek/message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=Mute+This+Topic+https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----) at https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/g/baycreek/message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=Mute+This+Topic+https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----

Bay Creek website: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/g/baycreek/message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=Mute+This+Topic+https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----

Group Owner: baycreek@owner@groups.io
Unsubscribe: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/g/baycreek/message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=Mute+This+Topic+https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://groups.io/m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----

3A_groupio_g_baycreek_message/66&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1Th4Y1miXuaqUVvR8X1189P35aEgN6Dm6owLw2Yzg&c=

3A_groupio_m/7866766_5293615&d=DwIFgQ&c=byehdZZamMFQYYPZBAGUCDbIM9Q9wmaIM08cgJl&r=0Uz7u72aK1sH8u0_Wz9f9RQEkaublLN5SK_f72p6D4emcOMbNmZApNNZaf9&m=GMI1XVDIil_PBCy8NmZ20RgPBPAkRmBDdAvLrFxC9gg&r=1m1pBwfkUoJg9oJkCU3qy37gy-XV4b_Yh77w&c=-----

www.JostmB.net/miduo.com

From: [Dave Davis](#)
To: baycreek@groups.io; [Urban Design Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [Bay Creek] Truman Olson Redevelopment Project
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 1:51:01 PM
Attachments: [cdampdijlofohgdn.png](#)

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

Bravo, Ron. I agree with, and support, all of the points you have made and more. I would like to take this opportunity to point out a statement that was included in the Letter of Intent that the developer sent to the city along with it's land use application:

parking, and commercial space for the grocery store. With 153 total spaces, the parking ratio will be slightly more than one-to-one, typical for affordable housing developments. The newly constructed Cedar Street will also offer on-street parking spaces for customers and visitors of residents.

While the statement that "the parking ratio will be slightly more than one-to-one" is true in reference to parking for the 150 apartment units, it assumes that the grocery store **will not require any on-site parking**. While the community fought very hard for additional on-street parking on Cedar Street (the city's plan initially offered no on-street parking in favor of buffered bike lanes) the intent was never that such on-street public parking would be dedicated exclusively to use by this development.

Personally, I find it hard to believe that this project, in it's current state, has advanced as far as it has through the city's development review process.

On 12/2/2020 11:08 AM, Ron Shutvet via groups.io wrote:

Truman Olson Redevelopment Project Comments for the UDC and Plan Commission

Why can't this city give fair notice of design changes and a reasonable amount of time to provide public comments? The Bay Creek neighborhood only got a one day notice that the Truman Olson redevelopment project is going to be before the UDC this week for final approval. This is wrong and it has to stop. You need to postpone this agenda item until January to give the neighborhood a chance to comment on the "final" plans. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The ZOOM online meeting process excludes so many people from participating and the public participation process is falling apart. The UDC should require that all approvals for final approval should be publicly noticed and the "final plans" must be available for review by the public AT LEAST one week before any scheduled meeting for final approval before the UDC or Common Council. The city has rigged the process to effectively limit public participation and this has to stop. Sure, I can look at the city meeting agenda on a Friday afternoon and find out what the UDC is and then look through the whole thing to see if anything pertains to your neighborhood and then dig in more to find the plans. But why can't the city or our alder just let us know as soon as they know when a project is up for approval instead of making us always dig for the information all the time?

I look at these "final plans" and I see a redevelopment project that must have run out of money because a major part of the third, fourth and fifth floors and even part of the sixth floor look unfinished with all the cheap looking white washed lap siding on these upper floors. Even the back part of the sixth floor is ugly white. I

thought that buildings in this UDC district are supposed to look equally attractive on all four sides not just on the front face of the building. I am tired of the way architects and developers are now using white as the color of the upper floors of buildings to make them look smaller. These white upper levels are not attractive and look really cheap compared to the rest of the building.

With hundreds of thousands of people trying to flee big city ghettos in this country and moving to smaller cities like Madison, you are just building more ghetto style redevelopment projects for them to live in when they get here. Where are all the children who you expect to be living here going to play? The 4000 square foot roof top open space is inadequate for the number of people expected to be living here. There is no suitable ground level greenspace for a play area anywhere on this property. If you are not going to provide adequate outdoor space for children to play then perhaps you should switch to mostly one bedroom apartments and gear the apartment units to single and older people. With 30 three bedroom units and 56 two bedroom apartments proposed in addition to the 64 one bedroom apartments, I expect at least 120 children and perhaps many more will be living in this redevelopment project. I see nowhere for these children to play outside. The only elevators for the apartment units are near the grocery entrance area, funneling nearly all the ingress/egress movement to that area making it more crowded.

The parking structure has only one vehicle entrance/exit and the same is also the only pedestrian/bicycle entrance/exit. Does this meet fire code? All vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic is funneled to one area adjacent to the grocery store entrance. I see no area designated for grocery pickup or drop off and pickup of people who use other modes of transportation like ride sharing, Uber, or para transit services provided by the city or third parties. If there would be a vehicle fire near the parking structure entrance, how will people and vehicles get out of the parking structure? It would be advantageous to have a secondary entrance/exit to the parking structure that uses the south service road. The way it is designed now, EVERY VEHICLE that enters the parking structure will have to either park in a stall and then back out to leave or perform a dangerous Y-Turn to turn around and exit the parking structure when they find that all the parking stalls are taken.

The city, in its efforts to build denser redevelopment projects is building more future ghettos with nowhere decent for children to safely play outside or even inside. Look at the tiny proposed "Kids Nook" play area on the second floor. The nearby elevator and stairwell area is larger than the Kids Nook and the adjacent fitness room is three times larger. Pathetic. This project has morphed into a government subsidized low income housing project with an attached grocery store that just does not meet expectations.

The grocery store is going to be too small to serve this area of Madison. The parking structure is boxed in with an inadequate entrance/exit area that is going to be a bottleneck. Vehicle pickup and drop off for grocery customers and apartment residents will probably have to be performed out on Cedar Street with no canopy for protection from the elements. The developer and the city keep trying to fit more and more on this property but there just isn't enough space for all that is being proposed. Over half of the property is taken up by city street

ROW and the parking structure. This parcel of land is too small for what is being attempted here. I suggest that the city or the developer purchase the vacant land parcels to the south and start over to create a better redevelopment project that includes that additional land. The grocery store needs an additional surface parking lot for those who are intimidated by a large, crowded, parking structure with only one entrance/exit and nowhere to turn around safely.

I don't like the way shadows are included in both the color and black and white elevation plans. It detracts from being able to visualize what the building will look like. You need to have a separate set of plans to show shadow effects on the property and adjoining properties. Also, some of the architectural elements of the building seem to be improperly labeled on the plans. For instance, the white lap fiber cement siding has the same description as the wood grained siding which is "Fiber cement wood siding Nichiha Vintagewood Color - Spruce" but I don't know of any spruce trees that are white. And what is the real size of the apartment windows? It looks like the window openings are larger than the actual windows making the smaller windows look larger than they really are. Please include closeup detail of the windows so you can see the size of the actual window sashes compared to the window frame opening. It looks like there are large black or gray fill panels at the tops and some sides of all the windows that make the windows look larger than they really are. Tiny windows in addition to lack of greenspace and no balconies anywhere will make this apartment complex look like a large multi-level sardine can. Finally, the plans don't state the type of windows that will be used but if the windows are going to be black or dark colored, the window frames and sash should have an aluminum exterior as vinyl and composite windows will not hold up as well. I am not berating the black window frames and in fact like them and even the windows of my own home have black frames and sash. But I will warn you that black window frames will collect visible dust and dirt and look shabby quickly unless they are cleaned regularly.

If I have made any errors in my review of these "final plans" that I received on very short notice, I apologize. If I would have had more time to review the plans, I could have drafted a better list of concerns. If I seem angry or upset, it is because everyone in city government keeps dropping the ball when it comes to public participation in the design of redevelopment projects.

Ron Shutvet
Madison, WI

Groups.io Links:

You receive all messages sent to this group.

[View/Reply Online \(#66\)](#) | [Reply To Group](#) | [Reply To Sender](#) | [Mute This Topic](#) | [New Topic](#)

If you reply to a message it will go to the whole list rather than to the individual, despite what the "From:" line might say.

Please read our "Guidelines for Civil Discourse" at <http://baycreekmadison.org/bc-discourse.pdf> before posting.

Bay Creek website: <http://baycreekmadison.org>

[Your Subscription](#) | [Contact Group Owner](#) | [Unsubscribe \[davis_da@charter.net\]](#)

--
Dave Davis
210 Koster St
Madison, WI 53713
608 257-3305

From: [John Beeman](#)
To: baycreek@groups.io
Cc: [Urban Design Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [Bay Creek] Truman Olson Redevelopment Project
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 2:29:29 PM
Attachments: [cdampdiilofohqdn.png](#)

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

Ron and Dave,

Your comments tend to reinforce my impression that the TORP is an unfolding disaster. What can be done to rectify this situation?

John Beeman
Romnes Apartments

On Wed, Dec 2, 2020, 1:51 PM Dave Davis <davis_da@charter.net> wrote:

Bravo, Ron. I agree with, and support, all of the points you have made and more. I would like to take this opportunity to point out a statement that was included in the Letter of Intent that the developer sent to the city along with it's land use application:



While the statement that "the parking ratio will be slightly more than one-to-one" is true in reference to parking for the 150 apartment units, it assumes that the grocery store **will not require any on-site parking**. While the community fought very hard for additional on-street parking on Cedar Street (the city's plan initially offered no on-street parking in favor of buffered bike lanes) the intent was never that such on-street public parking would be dedicated exclusively to use by this development.

Personally, I find it hard to believe that this project, in it's current state, has advanced as far as it has through the city's development review process.

On 12/2/2020 11:08 AM, Ron Shutvet via groups.io wrote:

Truman Olson Redevelopment Project Comments for the UDC and Plan Commission

Why can't this city give fair notice of design changes and a reasonable amount of time to provide public comments? The Bay Creek neighborhood only got a one day notice that the Truman Olson redevelopment project is going to be before the UDC this week for final approval. This is wrong and it has to stop. You need to postpone this agenda item until January to give the neighborhood a chance to comment on the "final" plans. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The ZOOM online meeting process excludes so many people from participating and the public participation process is falling apart. The UDC should require that all approvals for final approval should be

publicly noticed and the “final plans” must be available for review by the public AT LEAST one week before any scheduled meeting for final approval before the UDC or Common Council. The city has rigged the process to effectively limit public participation and this has to stop. Sure, I can look at the city meeting agenda on a Friday afternoon and find out what the UDC is and then look through the whole thing to see if anything pertains to your neighborhood and then dig in more to find the plans. But why can't the city or our alder just let us know as soon as they know when a project is up for approval instead of making us always dig for the information all the time?

I look at these “final plans” and I see a redevelopment project that must have run out of money because a major part of the third, fourth and fifth floors and even part of the sixth floor look unfinished with all the cheap looking white washed lap siding on these upper floors. Even the back part of the sixth floor is ugly white. I thought that buildings in this UDC district are supposed to look equally attractive on all four sides not just on the front face of the building. I am tired of the way architects and developers are now using white as the color of the upper floors of buildings to make them look smaller. These white upper levels are not attractive and look really cheap compared to the rest of the building.

With hundreds of thousands of people trying to flee big city ghettos in this country and moving to smaller cities like Madison, you are just building more ghetto style redevelopment projects for them to live in when they get here. Where are all the children who you expect to be living here going to play? The 4000 square foot roof top open space is inadequate for the number of people expected to be living here. There is no suitable ground level greenspace for a play area anywhere on this property. If you are not going to provide adequate outdoor space for children to play then perhaps you should switch to mostly one bedroom apartments and gear the apartment units to single and older people. With 30 three bedroom units and 56 two bedroom apartments proposed in addition to the 64 one bedroom apartments, I expect at least 120 children and perhaps many more will be living in this redevelopment project. I see nowhere for these children to play outside. The only elevators for the apartment units are near the grocery entrance area, funneling nearly all the ingress/egress movement to that area making it more crowded.

The parking structure has only one vehicle entrance/exit and the same is also the only pedestrian/bicycle entrance/exit. Does this meet fire code? All vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic is funneled to one area adjacent to the grocery store entrance. I see no area designated for grocery pickup or drop off and pickup of people who use other modes of transportation like ride sharing, Uber, or para transit services provided by the city or third parties. If there would be a vehicle fire near the parking structure entrance, how will people and vehicles get out of the

parking structure? It would be advantageous to have a secondary entrance/exit to the parking structure that uses the south service road. The way it is designed now, EVERY VEHICLE that enters the parking structure will have to either park in a stall and then back out to leave or perform a dangerous Y-Turn to turn around and exit the parking structure when they find that all the parking stalls are taken.

The city, in its efforts to build denser redevelopment projects is building more future ghettos with nowhere decent for children to safely play outside or even inside. Look at the tiny proposed "Kids Nook" play area on the second floor. The nearby elevator and stairwell area is larger than the Kids Nook and the adjacent fitness room is three times larger. Pathetic. This project has morphed into a government subsidized low income housing project with an attached grocery store that just does not meet expectations.

The grocery store is going to be too small to serve this area of Madison. The parking structure is boxed in with an inadequate entrance/exit area that is going to be a bottleneck. Vehicle pickup and drop off for grocery customers and apartment residents will probably have to be performed out on Cedar Street with no canopy for protection from the elements. The developer and the city keep trying to fit more and more on this property but there just isn't enough space for all that is being proposed. Over half of the property is taken up by city street ROW and the parking structure. This parcel of land is too small for what is being attempted here. I suggest that the city or the developer purchase the vacant land parcels to the south and start over to create a better redevelopment project that includes that additional land. The grocery store needs an additional surface parking lot for those who are intimidated by a large, crowded, parking structure with only one entrance/exit and nowhere to turn around safely.

I don't like the way shadows are included in both the color and black and white elevation plans. It detracts from being able to visualize what the building will look like. You need to have a separate set of plans to show shadow effects on the property and adjoining properties. Also, some of the architectural elements of the building seem to be improperly labeled on the plans. For instance, the white lap fiber cement siding has the same description as the wood grained siding which is "Fiber cement wood siding Nichiha Vintagewood Color - Spruce" but I don't know of any spruce trees that are white. And what is the real size of the apartment windows? It looks like the window openings are larger than the actual windows making the smaller windows look larger than they really are. Please include closeup detail of the windows so you can see the size of the actual window sashes compared to the window frame opening. It looks like there are large black or gray fill panels at the tops and some sides of all the windows that make the windows look larger than they really are. Tiny windows in addition to lack of greenspace and

no balconies anywhere will make this apartment complex look like a large multi-level sardine can. Finally, the plans don't state the type of windows that will be used but if the windows are going to be black or dark colored, the window frames and sash should have an aluminum exterior as vinyl and composite windows will not hold up as well. I am not berating the black window frames and in fact like them and even the windows of my own home have black frames and sash. But I will warn you that black window frames will collect visible dust and dirt and look shabby quickly unless they are cleaned regularly.

If I have made any errors in my review of these "final plans" that I received on very short notice, I apologize. If I would have had more time to review the plans, I could have drafted a better list of concerns. If I seem angry or upset, it is because everyone in city government keeps dropping the ball when it comes to public participation in the design of redevelopment projects.

Ron Shutvet
Madison, WI

--

Dave Davis
210 Koster St
Madison, WI 53713
608 257-3305

Groups.io Links:

You receive all messages sent to this group.

[View/Reply Online \(#69\)](#) | [Reply To Group](#) | [Reply To Sender](#) | [Mute This Topic](#) | [New Topic](#)

If you reply to a message it will go to the whole list rather than to the individual, despite what the "From:" line might say.

Please read our "Guidelines for Civil Discourse" at <http://baycreekmadison.org/bc-discourse.pdf> before posting.

Bay Creek website: <http://baycreekmadison.org>

[Your Subscription](#) | [Contact Group Owner](#) | [Unsubscribe](#) [jbeeman53715@gmail.com]

From: [John Beeman](#)
To: baycreek@groups.io
Cc: [Urban Design Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [Bay Creek] Truman Olson Redevelopment Project
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 10:47:52 PM

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

I mistakenly sent this post to our previous listserv address earlier today. Apologies to those who are receiving it a second time.

Many wise and insightful things have been posted regarding Ron Shutvet's extremely ill advised and highly provocative use of the word "ghetto." At the very least he should have explained what he meant by that term. However, I believe there is merit to his fears that the TORP runs the risk of becoming yet another "dumping ground" for people of limited means. The City's track record on low-income people is, at best, decidedly uneven. (See Heartland Housing.) And I share his concerns about the negative impact the site's lack of greenspace and other amenities could have on its children. The current development team has not, in my admittedly imperfect judgment, addressed these concerns in a persuasive and reassuring manner.

John Beeman
Romnes Apartments

On Wed, Dec 2, 2020, 11:08 AM Ron Shutvet via [groups.io](#) <rpyramid=aol.com@groups.io> wrote:

Truman Olson Redevelopment Project Comments for the UDC and Plan Commission

Why can't this city give fair notice of design changes and a reasonable amount of time to provide public comments? The Bay Creek neighborhood only got a one day notice that the Truman Olson redevelopment project is going to be before the UDC this week for final approval. This is wrong and it has to stop. You need to postpone this agenda item until January to give the neighborhood a chance to comment on the "final" plans. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The ZOOM online meeting process excludes so many people from participating and the public participation process is falling apart. The UDC should require that all approvals for final approval should be publicly noticed and the "final plans" must be available for review by the public AT LEAST one week before any scheduled meeting for final approval before the UDC or Common Council. The city has rigged the process to effectively limit public participation and this has to stop. Sure, I can look at the city meeting agenda on a Friday afternoon and find out what the UDC is and then look through the whole thing to see if anything pertains to your neighborhood and then dig in more to find the plans. But why can't the city or our alder just let us know as soon as they know when a project is up for approval instead of making us always dig for the information all the time?

I look at these "final plans" and I see a redevelopment project that must have run out of money because a major part of the third, fourth and fifth floors and even part of the sixth floor look unfinished with all the cheap looking white washed lap siding on these upper floors. Even the back part of the sixth floor is ugly white. I thought that buildings in this UDC district are supposed to look equally attractive on all four

sides not just on the front face of the building. I am tired of the way architects and developers are now using white as the color of the upper floors of buildings to make them look smaller. These white upper levels are not attractive and look really cheap compared to the rest of the building.

With hundreds of thousands of people trying to flee big city ghettos in this country and moving to smaller cities like Madison, you are just building more ghetto style redevelopment projects for them to live in when they get here. Where are all the children who you expect to be living here going to play? The 4000 square foot roof top open space is inadequate for the number of people expected to be living here. There is no suitable ground level greenspace for a play area anywhere on this property. If you are not going to provide adequate outdoor space for children to play then perhaps you should switch to mostly one bedroom apartments and gear the apartment units to single and older people. With 30 three bedroom units and 56 two bedroom apartments proposed in addition to the 64 one bedroom apartments, I expect at least 120 children and perhaps many more will be living in this redevelopment project. I see nowhere for these children to play outside. The only elevators for the apartment units are near the grocery entrance area, funneling nearly all the ingress/egress movement to that area making it more crowded.

The parking structure has only one vehicle entrance/exit and the same is also the only pedestrian/bicycle entrance/exit. Does this meet fire code? All vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic is funneled to one area adjacent to the grocery store entrance. I see no area designated for grocery pickup or drop off and pickup of people who use other modes of transportation like ride sharing, Uber, or para transit services provided by the city or third parties. If there would be a vehicle fire near the parking structure entrance, how will people and vehicles get out of the parking structure? It would be advantageous to have a secondary entrance/exit to the parking structure that uses the south service road. The way it is designed now, EVERY VEHICLE that enters the parking structure will have to either park in a stall and then back out to leave or perform a dangerous Y-Turn to turn around and exit the parking structure when they find that all the parking stalls are taken.

The city, in its efforts to build denser redevelopment projects is building more future ghettos with nowhere decent for children to safely play outside or even inside. Look at the tiny proposed "Kids Nook" play area on the second floor. The nearby elevator and stairwell area is larger than the Kids Nook and the adjacent fitness room is three times larger. Pathetic. This project has morphed into a government subsidized low income housing project with an attached grocery store that just does not meet expectations.

The grocery store is going to be too small to serve this area of Madison. The parking structure is boxed in with an inadequate entrance/exit area that is going to be a bottleneck. Vehicle pickup and drop off for grocery customers and apartment residents will probably have to be performed out on Cedar Street with no canopy for protection from the elements. The developer and the city keep trying to fit more and more on this property but there just isn't enough space for all that is being proposed. Over half of the property is taken up by city street ROW and the parking

structure. This parcel of land is too small for what is being attempted here. I suggest that the city or the developer purchase the vacant land parcels to the south and start over to create a better redevelopment project that includes that additional land. The grocery store needs an additional surface parking lot for those who are intimidated by a large, crowded, parking structure with only one entrance/exit and nowhere to turn around safely.

I don't like the way shadows are included in both the color and black and white elevation plans. It detracts from being able to visualize what the building will look like. You need to have a separate set of plans to show shadow effects on the property and adjoining properties. Also, some of the architectural elements of the building seem to be improperly labeled on the plans. For instance, the white lap fiber cement siding has the same description as the wood grained siding which is "Fiber cement wood siding Nichiha Vintagewood Color - Spruce" but I don't know of any spruce trees that are white. And what is the real size of the apartment windows? It looks like the window openings are larger than the actual windows making the smaller windows look larger than they really are. Please include closeup detail of the windows so you can see the size of the actual window sashes compared to the window frame opening. It looks like there are large black or gray fill panels at the tops and some sides of all the windows that make the windows look larger than they really are. Tiny windows in addition to lack of greenspace and no balconies anywhere will make this apartment complex look like a large multi-level sardine can. Finally, the plans don't state the type of windows that will be used but if the windows are going to be black or dark colored, the window frames and sash should have an aluminum exterior as vinyl and composite windows will not hold up as well. I am not berating the black window frames and in fact like them and even the windows of my own home have black frames and sash. But I will warn you that black window frames will collect visible dust and dirt and look shabby quickly unless they are cleaned regularly.

If I have made any errors in my review of these "final plans" that I received on very short notice, I apologize. If I would have had more time to review the plans, I could have drafted a better list of concerns. If I seem angry or upset, it is because everyone in city government keeps dropping the ball when it comes to public participation in the design of redevelopment projects.

Ron Shutvet
Madison, WI

Groups.io Links:

You receive all messages sent to this group.

[View/Reply Online \(#66\)](#) | [Reply To Group](#) | [Reply To Sender](#) | [Mute This Topic](#) | [New Topic](#)

If you reply to a message it will go to the whole list rather than to the individual, despite what the "From:" line might say.

Please read our "Guidelines for Civil Discourse" at <http://baycreekmadison.org/bc-discourse.pdf> before posting.

Bay Creek website: <http://baycreekmadison.org>

[Your Subscription](#) | [Contact Group Owner](#) | [Unsubscribe \[jbeeman53715@gmail.com\]](#)

From: [S J](#)
To: baycreek@groups.io
Cc: [Urban Design Comments](#)
Subject: Re: [Bay Creek] Truman Olson Redevelopment Project
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 12:34:33 AM

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

Dear Neighbors and UDC,

I want to support John's comments.

Green space is key.

History:

The idea of building up was originally meant (i.e. in the early twentieth century modern architect's mind) to permit more green space. All those single story buildings would in essence be stacked on top of each other freeing vast amounts of land, permitting "a tower in a park."

However, then the automobile took over and what we ended up with is basically "a tower in a parking lot."

The Automobile Present:

To see this dynamic, all you have to do is google "South Park St. Madison WI" and look at the satellite image of the Wingra Triangle: you will see the beautiful green Truman Olson rectangle surrounded by surface parking; SSM St. Mary's parking to the west; SSM Dean Clinic parking and the Grocery lot to the north; mostly privately owned parking lot (rented to SSM) to the south between the post office and the Labor Temple. In fact, the google image is dated -- the green space around the former Garden St. is the site for the new Dean Clinic -- the old Dean Clinic will be torn down and turned into mostly surface parking.

The Green Space Proposal:

Short of the city taking these parking lots by eminent domain and turning them into parks, one way to add green space around the site would be to NOT spend millions of dollars building the new Cedar St.

Instead of a new Cedar St., design a private, narrow, one way, loop around driveway for the new grocery store and tenants.

Don't extend it across the Wingra Triangle; make that space dedicated to roadway along and through SSM's parking lot green space instead.

Don't spend millions more moving Appleton Street twenty yards north just to line up with the new Cedar.

More Benefits:

Neighbors were concerned that some cars from a new Cedar St. would cut through the current Cedar St. -- but all of that traffic will be "cutting through" the new Cedar St. past, as noted by John and Ron, the many children expected to live there.

Counterpoint:

Though neither Tom Bunbury nor Kurt Welton -- who own the contiguous Shenandoah Apartments and the Pick and Save -- want this road, the rationale for building it is to help

develop the Triangle, to give SSM parking lots another exit, and most importantly to help the grocery store succeed.

Nevertheless:

The new Grocery, like the old one, will not need the new Cedar St. to succeed: Park St. is enough; the Triangle's strategic location near public transit, close to downtown means that it can be developed without dedicating additional space for cars; as the city embraces new models of low car development, SSM will shift away from wasteful parking lots to useful buildings.

Sincerely,

Stanley Jackson

On Wed, Dec 2, 2020 at 10:47 PM John Beeman <jbeeman53715@gmail.com> wrote:

I mistakenly sent this post to our previous listserv address earlier today. Apologies to those who are receiving it a second time.

Many wise and insightful things have been posted regarding Ron Shutvet's extremely ill advised and highly provocative use of the word "ghetto." At the very least he should have explained what he meant by that term. However, I believe there is merit to his fears that the TORP runs the risk of becoming yet another "dumping ground" for people of limited means. The City's track record on low-income people is, at best, decidedly uneven. (See Heartland Housing.) And I share his concerns about the negative impact the site's lack of greenspace and other amenities could have on its children. The current development team has not, in my admittedly imperfect judgment, addressed these concerns in a persuasive and reassuring manner.

John Beeman
Romnes Apartments

On Wed, Dec 2, 2020, 11:08 AM Ron Shutvet via groups.io
<rpyramid@aol.com@groups.io> wrote:

Truman Olson Redevelopment Project Comments for the UDC and Plan Commission

Why can't this city give fair notice of design changes and a reasonable amount of time to provide public comments? The Bay Creek neighborhood only got a one day notice that the Truman Olson redevelopment project is going to be before the UDC this week for final approval. This is wrong and it has to stop. You need to postpone this agenda item until January to give the neighborhood a chance to comment on the "final" plans. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The ZOOM online meeting process excludes so many people from participating and the public participation process is falling apart. The UDC should require that all approvals for

final approval should be publicly noticed and the “final plans” must be available for review by the public AT LEAST one week before any scheduled meeting for final approval before the UDC or Common Council. The city has rigged the process to effectively limit public participation and this has to stop. Sure, I can look at the city meeting agenda on a Friday afternoon and find out what the UDC is and then look through the whole thing to see if anything pertains to your neighborhood and then dig in more to find the plans. But why can't the city or our alder just let us know as soon as they know when a project is up for approval instead of making us always dig for the information all the time?

I look at these “final plans” and I see a redevelopment project that must have run out of money because a major part of the third, fourth and fifth floors and even part of the sixth floor look unfinished with all the cheap looking white washed lap siding on these upper floors. Even the back part of the sixth floor is ugly white. I thought that buildings in this UDC district are supposed to look equally attractive on all four sides not just on the front face of the building. I am tired of the way architects and developers are now using white as the color of the upper floors of buildings to make them look smaller. These white upper levels are not attractive and look really cheap compared to the rest of the building.

With hundreds of thousands of people trying to flee big city ghettos in this country and moving to smaller cities like Madison, you are just building more ghetto style redevelopment projects for them to live in when they get here. Where are all the children who you expect to be living here going to play? The 4000 square foot roof top open space is inadequate for the number of people expected to be living here. There is no suitable ground level greenspace for a play area anywhere on this property. If you are not going to provide adequate outdoor space for children to play then perhaps you should switch to mostly one bedroom apartments and gear the apartment units to single and older people. With 30 three bedroom units and 56 two bedroom apartments proposed in addition to the 64 one bedroom apartments, I expect at least 120 children and perhaps many more will be living in this redevelopment project. I see nowhere for these children to play outside. The only elevators for the apartment units are near the grocery entrance area, funneling nearly all the ingress/egress movement to that area making it more crowded.

The parking structure has only one vehicle entrance/exit and the same is also the only pedestrian/bicycle entrance/exit. Does this meet fire code? All vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic is funneled to one area adjacent to the grocery store entrance. I see no area designated for grocery pickup or drop off and pickup of people who use other modes of transportation like ride sharing, Uber, or para transit services provided by the city or third parties. If there would be a vehicle fire near the parking structure entrance, how will people and vehicles get out of the parking structure? It would be advantageous to have a secondary entrance/exit to the parking structure that uses the south service road. The way it is designed now, EVERY VEHICLE that enters the parking structure will have to either park in a stall and then back out to leave or perform a dangerous Y-Turn to turn around and exit the parking structure when they find that all the parking stalls are taken.

The city, in its efforts to build denser redevelopment projects is building more future ghettos with nowhere decent for children to safely play outside or even inside. Look at the tiny proposed "Kids Nook" play area on the second floor. The nearby elevator and stairwell area is larger than the Kids Nook and the adjacent fitness room is three times larger. Pathetic. This project has morphed into a government subsidized low income housing project with an attached grocery store that just does not meet expectations.

The grocery store is going to be too small to serve this area of Madison. The parking structure is boxed in with an inadequate entrance/exit area that is going to be a bottleneck. Vehicle pickup and drop off for grocery customers and apartment residents will probably have to be performed out on Cedar Street with no canopy for protection from the elements. The developer and the city keep trying to fit more and more on this property but there just isn't enough space for all that is being proposed. Over half of the property is taken up by city street ROW and the parking structure. This parcel of land is too small for what is being attempted here. I suggest that the city or the developer purchase the vacant land parcels to the south and start over to create a better redevelopment project that includes that additional land. The grocery store needs an additional surface parking lot for those who are intimidated by a large, crowded, parking structure with only one entrance/exit and nowhere to turn around safely.

I don't like the way shadows are included in both the color and black and white elevation plans. It detracts from being able to visualize what the building will look like. You need to have a separate set of plans to show shadow effects on the property and adjoining properties. Also, some of the architectural elements of the building seem to be improperly labeled on the plans. For instance, the white lap fiber cement siding has the same description as the wood grained siding which is "Fiber cement wood siding Nichiha Vintagewood Color - Spruce" but I don't know of any spruce trees that are white. And what is the real size of the apartment windows? It looks like the window openings are larger than the actual windows making the smaller windows look larger than they really are. Please include closeup detail of the windows so you can see the size of the actual window sashes compared to the window frame opening. It looks like there are large black or gray fill panels at the tops and some sides of all the windows that make the windows look larger than they really are. Tiny windows in addition to lack of greenspace and no balconies anywhere will make this apartment complex look like a large multi-level sardine can. Finally, the plans don't state the type of windows that will be used but if the windows are going to be black or dark colored, the window frames and sash should have an aluminum exterior as vinyl and composite windows will not hold up as well. I am not berating the black window frames and in fact like them and even the windows of my own home have black frames and sash. But I will warn you that black window frames will collect visible dust and dirt and look shabby quickly unless they are cleaned regularly.

If I have made any errors in my review of these "final plans" that I received on very short notice, I apologize. If I would have had more time to review the plans, I could

have drafted a better list of concerns. If I seem angry or upset, it is because everyone in city government keeps dropping the ball when it comes to public participation in the design of redevelopment projects.

Ron Shutvet
Madison, WI

Groups.io Links:

You receive all messages sent to this group.

[View/Reply Online \(#88\)](#) | [Reply To Group](#) | [Reply To Sender](#) | [Mute This Topic](#) | [New Topic](#)

If you reply to a message it will go to the whole list rather than to the individual, despite what the "From:" line might say.

Please read our "Guidelines for Civil Discourse" at <http://baycreekmadison.org/bc-discourse.pdf> before posting.

Bay Creek website: <http://baycreekmadison.org>

[Your Subscription](#) | [Contact Group Owner](#) | [Unsubscribe](#) [srj29@cornell.edu]