

**From:** [Dave Waters](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Comment for June 9 Plan Commission Meeting  
**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 5:57:46 PM

---

You don't often get email from daveh2os@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

For the June 9, 2025 meeting, In regards to Agenda item 15, the proposal for 3535-3553 University Avenue and 733-737 N Meadow Lane.

I live on Meadow Lane, only a few houses away from the proposed development.

I note that On page 13 of the staff report it states: "50. Per Section MGO 12.138 (14), this project is not eligible for residential parking permits. It is recommended that this prohibition be noted in the leases for the residential units."

I fully support that this property should NOT be eligible for residential parking permits. I request that the city do not waive the rule for this property.

thank you,  
Dave Waters

**From:** [Alicia Lyu](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Support for file 87881  
**Date:** Friday, June 6, 2025 9:06:00 PM

---

You don't often get email from alicia.w.lyu@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Plan Commission,

I think it's great that the revised design of 3535 University Ave extends to Meadow Lane. Local resistance to dense housing due to noise, traffic, etc has led to distinct "neighborhood characters" in different communities. **Such distinction effectively led to economic/class segregation, which sometimes manifests itself as racial segregation.** I think this project made a baby step to resist this trend, allowing a little proximity between renters and homeowners. I also acknowledge that they designed a smooth transition—generous setbacks along Meadow Lane, allowing the part adjacent to single-family homes to be only 2 floors.

As the population in Madison grows, it only makes sense if streets, as public property, become busier. In fact, **Meadow Lane, given its prime location, has shared an unfairly small portion of that growth.** South Yellowstone Drive, where I live, is a 2-lane road almost as far as the Beltline Highway, but it sees addition of 300 units in recent years. Many of these units house children as well. Moreover, being steps away from the BRT stop at University & Midvale, this project **decreases the traffic of the city overall and improves environmental sustainability.**

I urge the Plan Commission to approve this project.

Alicia Lyu  
District 19

**From:** [Nicholas Davies](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Yes to Meadow & University, with a modal filter (88325 & 87881)  
**Date:** Sunday, June 8, 2025 5:24:23 PM

---

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

Dear Plan Commission,

I hope you will support approval for the rezoning and conditional use necessary for a mixed use building at Meadow Lane and University Ave.

A mixed use building at this location--along University, along the BRT corridor, and within walking/biking range of a lot of amenities, jobs, and potential customers--makes a ton of sense. I appreciate how much housing will be provided in this project, as well as commercial amenities, continuing to make University Ave a vibrant and activated corridor. Now we just need more buildings like this, please! The UWCU parking lot across the street looks about the right size for this building's twin.

Regardless of where the vehicular access is, including a Meadow Lane frontage is a big improvement over earlier plans that did not have this. University Ave is not the best/safest approach for cyclists and pedestrians, whether that's the building's own residents, or customers to the commercial tenant.

Because of that, I previously urged the project team to include a pedestrian connection to Bruce Ct. While that would still be a nice-to-have (and supported by the Comp Plan), having bike/ped access via Meadow Lane generally fills that need.

Because of the access to transit, walkable amenities, I do not see this development having a significant impact on traffic on adjacent streets. However, in addition to ideally a lower parking ratio, I would be supportive of traffic calming measures for Meadow Lane, and the staff report indicates that the applicant will be required to provide \$10k towards the cost of those.

The most effective traffic calming measure would be to turn Meadow Lane into a dead-end for vehicular traffic, much like Bruce Ct and Eugenia Ave already are. If this still allows bike/ped traffic through to University Ave, then this could act as a modal filter.

In combination with the existing dead-ends--and Lucia Crest not going through to Midvale--this would effectively protect this neighborhood from the high-volume traffic on adjacent arterials, and be a step towards something akin to London's successful Low Traffic Neighborhoods.

Then even if this building's garage opened onto Meadow Lane, the overall traffic on Meadow Lane would likely still be reduced from current counts, with little chance of any future increase. This would also address concerns about queuing on University Ave, because any building residents traveling by car would have to approach via Meadow Lane.

Estimating this at ~2 trips per day per parking spot, Meadow Lane traffic counts would end up being ~500 total (counting other Meadow Lane residents as well). This is still far lower than

950 on Heather Crest or 1,450 on Blackhawk Ave, the only streets in this neighborhood with available counts.

Still, while traffic calming would be greatly appreciated--particularly a modal filter--I don't see this as a prerequisite to approval or construction of this building.

Thank you,

Nick Davies  
3717 Richard St

**From:** [Mike S O](#)  
**To:** [Vidaver, Regina](#); [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Regarding: ID TBD & 87881 scheduled for 6/9/25  
**Date:** Monday, June 9, 2025 8:01:15 AM

---

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

Following up on my earlier comments after the Staff Notes for the 6/9 meeting —

Condition #44 that says the developer will submit a \$10,000 deposit which will go to city engineering to potentially create traffic improvements on Meadow is underwhelming and misses the scope of the impact of this development.

Traffic will not cease to exist once it leaves N Meadow Lane — vehicles that are traveling on Meadow will have to travel across other ‘Local’ streets (Heather Crest, Lucia Crest) before reaching a collector or arterial. There are ten pedestrian/vehicle conflict points I counted quickly on a map — is \$10,000 enough to properly evaluate and address the safety of ten different conflict points? My rough guess is that there are at least 300 current residents living where cars may travel past to get to a collector — is \$30 per impacted person enough to evaluate & implement a solution that will allow them to continue to safely walk to the park, their errands, their friends homes, and their bus stops? Remember that the decision to allow traffic directly on Meadow should not be taken lightly as this development will remain for decades and very likely could outlive us all.

I understand this concern is placed on the city and not the developer but as someone who has been following the progression of safety improvements in the area (ex: N Midvale, University crossing at Blackhawk, closure of gaps in the sidewalk network) I’d be concerned that the city would not prioritize these safety measures such that they will be implemented by the time the construction on the development is done.

In summary I don’t believe this condition goes far enough to address the concern and safety of the residents of this neighborhood. Even with this condition I am in opposition of this proposal and remain in favor of the original proposal which did not have direct vehicular access to Meadow Lane. If the Meadow Lane access is needed for service vehicles then limit the access to service vehicles only.

Mike Sobek Ozburn

On Tue, May 13, 2025 at 2:09 PM Mike S O <[mwozburn@gmail.com](mailto:mwozburn@gmail.com)> wrote:

Regarding:

- ID TBD & 87881 - 3535-3553 University Avenue and 733-737 N Meadow Lane - Rezone from TR-C1 to CC-T and Conditional Use - Construct a six-story mixed-use building with 4,268 square feet of commercial space and 146 apartments

I am writing to voice my concerns over two aspects of this project:

1. The access into/out of this building on Meadow Lane is concerning as this building would be a 470% increase in housing units on Meadow Lane. Drivers coming to/from this building will drive through the neighborhood on Meadow Lane, Lucia Crest, &

Heather Crest (all "Locals") instead of on University where the traffic belongs (a "principal arterial"). These streets (primarily Meadow & Heather Crest) are already overtaxed for their classification. It would be irresponsible to allow this building without including requirements for physical traffic control measures on the nearby streets in order to protect the children in the area who utilize these streets and crosswalks for access to Lucia Crest Park & their bus stops.

2. Over half the units in this building are studio apartments and only 7.5% of the units (11 units) will be 2 bedrooms. To add context, the EO Apartments recently built at Madison Yards are only 15% studio apartments and 30% 2 bedroom units and the Tradition which is a couple blocks east on University is only 24% studio apartments. The Tradition has one third of the amount of units in the building overall but has an almost equal amount of two bedroom units (10 vs. 11). There is no reason that a majority of the units in this apartment should be studio apartments; it is a blatant attempt to cram as many human lives in the smallest amount of space possible in order to maximize profits.

I believe this project is only considering short term profits and is not currently designed to have a positive impact on the surrounding community long term. I am in support of building dense, mixed use properties but I am not in support of the proposal as it stands now.

Mike Sobek Ozburn