

From: Linda <lehnertz.l@att.net>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 1:35 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Council 8.3 meeting, item #12, Legistar 66221, rezoning E Olin

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

The Plan Commission placed this rezoning on file without prejudice. I hope the Council respects the Commission's considered decision.

Except for a one-block stretch of residential on the west side of John Nolen (just south of the causeway), John Nolen from the causeway to the Beltline is either parks or "Suburban Employment." John Nolen has 36.3 acres, 18 parcels, zoned SE. Yet only this one parcel is proposed for rezoning.

For developers, Traditional Employment zoning has advantages over SE zoning. For example, in TE the maximum lot coverage is 85% while in SE the maximum is 75%. Part of the purpose of SE zoning is to encourage "improved landscaping and site design, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities." In an area with so much park land, those considerations are important.

Rezoning this one parcel is spot zoning. As summarized in the annotation to sec. 62.23, 2019-20 Wisconsin Statutes & Annotations:

"Spot zoning grants privileges to a single lot or area that are not granted or extended to other land in the same use district. Spot zoning is not per se illegal but, absent any showing that a refusal to rezone will in effect confiscate the property by depriving all beneficial use thereof should only be indulged in when it is in the public interest and not solely for the benefit of the property owner who requests the rezoning. *Step Now Citizens Group v. Town of Utica*, 2003 WI App 109, 264 Wis. 2d 662, 663 N.W.2d 833, 02-2760."

Rezoning this one parcel is solely for the benefit of the property owner who is requesting the rezoning. It might make sense at some point in the future to rezone all of the John Nolen SE properties to TE – once the Alliant Energy Center plans are finalized – since a purpose of TE zoning is to take "advantage of the varied transportation options and proximity to urban activities and cultural amenities found in many Traditional Employment locations." However, that is not what is being requested, and proximity to urban activities and cultural amenities is, at this time, just a future hope.

Linda Lehnertz

From: Barbara Fahrenkrug <barfahrenkrug@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 3:49 PM

To: council <council@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: Building heights

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

To Council members,

Thank you for all that you do. Why are we letting a developer build such a monster building? If you drive into our neighborhood on rusk street off of badger road you can see the capitol. The name of the neighborhood is capitol view. We need restaurants in this neighborhood and for alliant center more than a monster building. I cant imagine having to build a parking ramp for 290 cars. Thats only 1 car per apartment. We should not have to lose our view of the capitol, and all the pollution with the added 350 cars plus each day. Thank you.

Barb Fahrenkrug

2005 Sundstrom Street

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

From: Charlene Sweeney <sweeneyc2814@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 4:01 PM

To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>

Subject: McGrath Olin Ave high rise project

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

Dear City Council Members,

I am a close neighbor of this site, but this is important to all persons in Madison.

I am writing to encourage you to vote “no” to a code change for this proposed project—an 18 story apartment building. It will be the tallest building in Madison, and completely out of place at this very special site. It is a historic area of small homes and businesses (100+ yrs). It is across from a calming and beautiful, very old park, that has been maintained as a treasured wildlife, boating, hiking, birding, and quiet enjoyment spot for all in Madison. Traffic and speeding are increasing to a problematic degree on John Nolen, Olin, and Lakeside St. There is a creek next to the property that runs into Lake Monona.

The building is a very, very poor fit for that location. It does not fit with existing housing or businesses (the developer said no houses within 1/4 mi—Not true!). Two blocks away is more correct. It is marshy land where they cannot build parking beneath. 4 floors of above ground parking for 350+ cars? It has potential for flooding, and all of that concrete will change the close area and street flooding. Pollution will come with runoff of sidewalk salt in the winter months—Into the creek and lake.

Wildlife exists all over this area. Coyotes, raccoons, fox, turkeys, ducks and geese, and many migrating species of birds. Many will die crashing into these super-high windows.

This building, as proposed, should not be built. Zoning should not be changed. There are other areas that might be better suited. This is a very old, special, natural, beautiful, and peaceful entrance to the city. Don't let it be ruined by an ordinary high rise, out of place, building that can be seen from all parts of Madison.

People who live here deserve better than a “Trophy” building at this special spot. Mr. McGrath should significantly downsize, or withdraw his plan. The City Council should vote no for a Proposed Code Change. I go on record as opposing this misplaced change.

Charlene Sweeney
114 East Lakeside St.
Madison, WI 53715

From: Carrie Rothburd <crothburd@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 4:08 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Marsha Rummel <marsha.rummel@gmail.com>; Linda <lehnertz.l@att.net>; Dave Davis <davis_da@charter.net>; Kitchel, Lisie E - DNR <Lisie.Kitchel@wisconsin.gov>
Subject: Comments from the community re Item 12, Rezoning 222-232 E Olin

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

Hello,

I am forwarding you three letters submitted to Plan for their review regarding the proposal for development for 222-232 E. Olin Avenue that are especially relevant with respect to rezoning and land use as they pertain to Council Item 12 on the agenda for August 3, 2021.

Neighbors are not certain you have seen their comments re Item 12 because all of the files relevant to Items 4 (rezoning) and 5 (demolition) for 222-232 E Olin were filed under Item 5 (demolition) for the Plan Commission meeting for 7/26/21. You may find more than these three letters at <https://madison.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=>

Neighbors were not informed that Council would continue to take up the rezoning Mr. McGrath requested for 222-232 E. Olin Avenue after his development was placed on file without prejudice and so did not submit letters to you.

We hope that you will read these before your discussion tomorrow night. It would be an egregious error to assume that neighbors are indifferent to the proposed rezoning. I have also added a new letter of my own new letter to Council, written with other neighbors.

Thank you,

Carrie Rothburd

To: Plan Commission

From: Janelle Munns, Daina Zemliauskas-Juozevicius, Colleen O’Dea Potter, Carrie Rothburd, Daniel Thurs, Lisie Kitchel, Stefan Westman, Dave Davis

Re: Proposal for Redevelopment at 222 – 232 East Olin Avenue, Legistar ID # 65653 & 66221

Date: July 23, 2021

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Community character: The building does not suit the character of its natural and residential surroundings.
2. Neighborhood Plan: The building is out of keeping with the recommendations of the neighborhood plans for the area. There is not yet an Area Plan for the lands bounded by Olin Ave, John Nolen Dr and Wingra Creek, but one should be developed for the SE district in which this proposed project is located. The South Madison Plan (2020-21) should not be part of this discussion as that Plan has not been adopted and any references to the area north of the AEC have not yet been made available for public review, comment, or approval.
3. Land use designation: The building does not conform to the priorities of the Employment District in which it is located, not being primarily employment in character. Less than 10% of the buildings uses will be devoted to employment purposes.
4. Zoning: The building does not conform to the purposes of either SE or TE. Its primarily residential use does not “provide significant numbers of living-wage jobs,” or “facilitate preservation, development or redevelopment consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.”
5. Conditional Use: CU requires compliance with existing land use plans, but the Comp Plan’s GFLU map does not envision the building proposed for this location. CU is meant to extend and not subvert the purpose of a zoning designation. The height of this building does not conform to the Standards required for granting CU in a TE zone.
6. Comp Plan, map note 8 on page 17: Rezoning of this area is supposed to wait until the approval of the Master Plan for the AEC is adopted by the City. That cannot occur until November 2022 at the earliest.

Request

- We ask that Plan honor its commitment to its Standards of Approval, its Comp Plan, and relevant neighborhood plans and not approve this noncompliant proposal.
We believe that Plan should ask the developer to rethink its design on a more modest scale for a better fit with the surrounding area, both natural and developed, and allow time for preservation of the area’s historical building, the Wonder Bar, whether onsite or nearby. During the process of reconceptualizing and planning for redevelopment of 222-232 E. Olin, the City/developer should seek out and include input from the neighborhoods adjacent these site and from nature conservationists, as well as from the neighboring AEC, as laid forth in the city’s best practice guide, *Participating in the Development Process*, which can be found at: <https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/best-practices-guide.pdf>.
- We ask Plan to defer consideration of the demolition permit for the Wonder Bar until after the Landmarks Commission considers the landmark nomination.

FEEDBACK FROM NEIGHBORS IN DISTRICT 13

At the request of the chair of BCNA’s Planning & Economic Development Committee, an informational session took place at Bay Creek Neighborhood Association’s June meeting where Mr. McGrath informed neighbors of his submitted plans for an 18-story luxury apartment building located between Bay Creek (District 13) and Capital View (District 14) neighborhoods. Because this building is not in either neighborhood association’s domain, the developer was not required to follow the city’s best practice for engaging with community. Residents of Bay Creek, the development’s closest neighbors did not receive 30-day notice of McGrath’s intent to submit this proposal. They did not, in fact, learn about the proposal until it was fully planned and submitted and then only from an article in the local newspaper. The District 14 alder, in whose district this project is located, did not provide any advanced notice of this project to her constituents. McGrath Group did not incorporate any of neighbors’ feedback into the plans reviewed by the UDC on July 14, 2021. Here is an overview of neighbors’ feedback at the BCNA meeting:

- 1) The building does not relate in appearance to the other buildings along Olin Avenue. Its height and massing are too large, and it stands out in an unpleasing manner from its nearest neighbors.
- 2) The building does not respond to the affordable and family housing needs of residents of South Madison.
- 3) The building could harm the area’s resident wildlife and interfere with their habitat needs. The light from the building’s many apartments, exacerbated by the glass exterior, overall absence of bird-friendly glass, and the beacon at the

building's apex, will pollute the night sky and increase avian deaths , especially during migration due to its proximity to Olin-Turville Park and the UW-Arboretum.

4) The building could cause the loss of the Wonder Bar, a one-of-a-kind Madison asset that cannot be replaced, according to the Landmarks Commission.

APPLICATION TO REZONE 222 - 232 E. OLIN TO TE (Traditional Employment)

The intended future use of both these sites, according to the Generalized Future Land Use (GFLU) map, is Employment. Much of the triangle of land between John Nolen, Olin, and Colby Street as well as the narrow strip of land east of John Nolen and the AEC is Employment. The entire area is adjacent to Low-use Residential. Both areas are zoned Suburban Employment (SE).

According to the most recent Comp Plan (p. 25), "commercial and employment areas are recommended locations for businesses, corporate and government offices, medical facilities, retail, services, and other commercial land uses. Compared to mixed-use districts, commercial and employment areas are not generally expected to include a residential component, although limited residential uses may be present in some areas...[S]uch uses may be considered as part of a conditional use under relevant zoning districts... Depending on specific uses, the districts may require significant buffering from adjacent land uses. Employment (E) areas generally do not include retail and consumer service uses for the wider community but may include limited retail and service establishments that primarily serve employees and users of the area... [Residential uses] may be considered as part of a conditional use under relevant zoning districts. While there are no fixed limits on size of an establishment or development intensity within E areas, all uses should be compatible with the density and scale of surrounding development.

According to the current municipal Zoning Code, SE's intent is not explicitly residential but only allows for limited residential uses. SE allows for buildings of up to 5 stories—4 stories if a residential use is included—with additional stories added only with Conditional Use.

It is clear that City of Madison planners did not intend a building of the scope or use proposed by the McGrath Property Group to occupy the eastern end of Olin Avenue. The question is whether it is appropriate at this time to re-envision the assigned land use and rezone the property. Rezoning, according to the City's Standards of Approval, must be based on "public health, safety and welfare, shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and shall comply with Wisconsin and federal law." A discussion of rezoning 222-232 E. Olin must also include discussion of the land between McGrath's property and Wingra Creek.

In fact, the Imagine Madison Comp Plan map note (8) on page 17 speaks specifically to rezoning the properties currently zoned SE north of the AEC:

The Alliant Energy Center is shown as SI, but may include restaurant, entertainment, and hotel uses if a Master Plan for the area that includes those uses is adopted by the City. Such a Plan may include land use changes to surrounding properties, such as the Employment-designated properties to the north. (p 17)

However, the Master Plan for the AEC has not been approved by the City and will not be approved until after the Town of Madison attachment occurs in October 2022. Presumably at that time the City would undertake a thorough consideration of all the properties north of the AEC, both those that are part of District 14 and those that are part of District 13 through a public process that gives community members a chance to voice their opinions.

EXISTING PLANS FOR 222 - 232 E. OLIN AND THE AREA NORTH OF THE AEC –BAY CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD & SOUTH MADISON NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

The Bay Creek Neighborhood Plan (1991) (pp. 13-14) mentions the neighborhood's proximity to the Dane County Coliseum/Alliant Energy Center and John Nolen commercial corridor and their adjacent uses. Recommendations include: "increase neighborhood awareness of future development potential and proposals along John Nolen Drive corridor." (p. 50). However, as mentioned above, the proposal before the City to develop 222-232 East Olin was undertaken without the neighborhood's or its alder's awareness, does not reflect either's participation, or the needs of the community. Several members of the UDC spoke to it seeming out of place for the area.

The South Madison Neighborhood Plan (2005) mentions John Nolen as a gateway to downtown Madison/transportation corridor with a view of the lakes and the capitol and identifies the importance of safe pedestrian access to amenities at

Olin-Turville Park. However, it makes no recommendations for the East Olin portion of the planning area. Both plans call for buildings of no more than 4 stories or up to 5 stories with amenities.

The Law Park/Olin Park Waterfront plan is charged with addressing this area, but those plans have only recently been initiated and will not be completed until 2023 at the earliest.

The new South Madison Plan should not be used as a basis for evaluating this project. Its vision for the area in question has not been made available to the public for review or comment, and any information relevant to this proposal has never been seen, discussed, or approved by the community. The SMP was intended to be a very public process.

In 2016, the Dane County Board rejected a proposal for a mixed-use development containing one 14-story building and three 10-story buildings directly across E. Olin Ave. from this proposed development.

The proposal to build a high-rise at 222-232 E. Olin is not envisioned by any of the existing plans addressing the area north of the AEC. This parcel calls out for a plan and in fact, Bay Creek neighbors lobbied the City for a plan in 2020, during discussions about redevelopment of the VFW site on Sayle Street. Their intention was then—and Plan’s intention now should be—to avoid piecemeal redevelopment of the existing Employment District, to look at its possible uses, ensure it fits with the adjacent residential community of Bay Creek, nearby parkland, and the AEC.

Mr. McGrath’s building, if approved now, would set the stage for any plan to follow for the area. While the approval of the 4-story, mid-sized, approximately 60-unit building at 133 E Lakeside last year sets some precedent for switching to a residential use for the land currently zoned SE, that development proposal when finalized was the result of multiple conversations between neighbors and the developer during which they carefully considered the impacts of the development on the community. It should go without saying that the plan for the important area north of the AEC should be carefully considered as a whole with input from City staff, commissioners, and citizens. It should include both the county land, not currently part of the City of Madison, and immediately adjacent neighborhoods in District 13 and 14.

CONCEPT FOR THE AEC DESTINATION DISTRICT

Mr. McGrath justifies his building concept by referring to the *AEC’s Destination District Vision & Strategy* for the area surrounding the AEC, prepared by Vandewalle & Associates and sometimes referred to by its endorers as a “plan.” This concept paper makes the presumption that the development it proposes fit and benefit to the surrounding neighborhoods and greater Madison community. (It could just as easily be reasoned that an iconic supper club, located in a historic building with ties to Prohibition and within walking distance of the AEC, would fit the vision of a Destination District.)

In 2018, Dane County hired a consultant to prepare a *Comprehensive Master Plan for the Alliant Energy Center Campus*, but there is no accepted AEC Destination District Plan. According to Vandewalle’s website:

Understanding that some areas surrounding the Alliant Energy Center are currently in the Town of Madison but slated for annexation to the cities of Madison and Fitchburg in 2022 and that the City of Madison would be undertaking a detailed effort for those areas in 2019, a group of public and private leaders came together to fund the preparation of the *Destination District Vision and Strategy*. The interim study advanced the vision of creating cohesive and connected Destination District anchored by the Alliant Energy Center” and including the non-residential areas surrounding the Alliant Energy Center.

This concept paper is immaterial to consideration of this application as it is not code or City policy. It has not gone through the City’s process for approval and acceptance. In fact the AEC Master Plan is itself still in flux, more a sketch than a final design. The selection of the developer for the site continues behind schedule as this Commission debates this proposal. (Please see section below about the possible demolition or relocation of a historic building.)

STANDARDS OF APPROVAL, APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF ZONING TO TE WITH CONDITIONAL USE

Mr. McGrath asks to change the zoning of 222-232 E. Olin to Traditional Employment (TE), which allows a maximum of five stories and encourages “a broad range of employment activities, taking advantage of the varied transportation options and proximity to urban activities and cultural amenities. Residential uses are of secondary importance.” A TE district is also intended to: “(a)Encourage businesses with the potential to provide significant numbers of living-wage jobs that contribute to a sustainable economy and a strong tax base.(b)Support the continued use or adaptive re-use of

traditional industrial buildings for a variety of purposes.(c)Facilitate preservation, development or redevelopment consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.”

To add 13 stories on top of the five allowed with TE (to build 260% above permitted height), McGrath Property Group must apply for CU. The request for “[T]he City Plan Commission shall not approve a conditional use without due consideration of the recommendations in the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan and any applicable, neighborhood, neighborhood development, or special area plan, including design guidelines adopted as supplements to these plans,” according to the Standards of Approval. Neither SE nor TE has a primary focus on residential use for this area, certainly not at high-density. Plan Commission approval of a conditional use of this extraordinary magnitude sets a precedent that literally invalidates current zoning codes and city policy embodied in the comprehensive plan and other overlay districts.

With respect to CU, the City’s Approval Standards inform that “there are conditions that must be met. We believe that the following conditions are not met:

3. The uses, values and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood for purposes already established will not be substantially impaired or diminished in any foreseeable manner.	The 2018 Comp Plan assigned an Employment use to this area which is adjacent to a Low-density residential area. Both are altered irrevocably by an unintended High-density use.
4. The establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.	The addition of High-density residential use in an area intended for Employment uses is incompatible and interferes with the normal (i.e., intended) development of the area.
5. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, parking supply, internal circulation improvements, including but not limited to vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, public transit and other necessary site improvements have been or are being provided.	The area is poorly connected to public transit, served by two bus routes only, one of which connects to the South transfer point on Park half-hourly and the other which connects to the UW hours on weekdays during the day only. Access to downtown on foot or bike is made challenging by poor pedestrian and bike crossings on John Nolen.
7. The conditional use conforms to all applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.	Residential uses in Employment Districts are intended for workers affiliated with the employment uses.
9. When applying the above standards to any new construction of a building or an addition to an existing building the Plan Commission shall find that the project creates an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose for the zoning district.	Immediately surrounding the site is low-density residential housing, parkland, a nature refuge, and the AEC. The 18-story glass tower is out of place with the area’s aesthetic and character. It does not conform to the statement of purpose for TE, which does not include primarily residential use.
12. When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in the district, the Plan Commission shall consider recommendations in adopted plans; the impact on surrounding properties, including height, mass, orientation, shadows and view; architectural quality and amenities; the relationship of the proposed building(s) with adjoining streets, alleys, and public rights of ways; and the public interest in exceeding the district height limits.	Both the SMNP and Bay Creek NP recommend heights of 4 and 5 stories in this area. The new South Madison Plan adopts the 2005 recommendations for Bay Creek. The addition of the 18-story building alters the viewshed from all vantage points of the surrounding area, detracting from the natural aesthetic that characterized it and contributing no amenities to the area in return.

STANDARDS OF APPROVAL AND DEMOLITION OF A HISTORIC BUILDING

McGrath’s proposal also requires a demolition permit to remove the existing structures at 222 and 232 East Olin. The property at 222 E. Olin, the Wonder Bar, is a small brick building that Landmarks Commission has found to be of historical significance.

The Madison Trust for Historic Preservation resubmitted its application for the Wonder Bar’s Landmark status on July 22, 2021, in recognition of the importance of preserving the Wonder Bar, if not onsite, as is most fitting, then nearby. If landmarked, it will be the owner/developers responsibility to preserve the building by integrating it into the redevelopment or by moving it.

Zoning Code Sec. 28.185 discusses the Demolition and Removal of buildings and focuses on “[aiding] the implementation of adopted City plans, [protecting] neighborhood character, [preserving] historic buildings, [encouraging] the reuse and/or relocation of existing buildings...and before [taking] the irrevocable step of demolishing or moving...existing building or buildings.” This irrevocable step is especially critical where a building worthy of Landmark status is concerned. There is only one Prohibition-era roadhouse in Madison, and it is irreplaceable.

Approval Standards for demolition or removal permits require that the Plan Commission finds that both the requested demolition/removal and the proposed use... “are compatible with adopted neighborhood plans, the Comprehensive Plan or with any applicable neighborhood conservation district requirements. “ In doing so, “it may give decisive weight to any relevant facts,” which in this case includes the report of the City’s historic preservation planner regarding the historic value of the property as well as any report submitted by the Landmarks Commission. The Standards instruct Plan to consider each of the following:

<p>a. The effects the proposed demolition or removal and proposed use of the subject property would have on the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties.</p>	<p>Without a plan for the area, the demolition of the Wonder Bar is premature. It is to the detriment and not improvement of the surrounding area and the City stands to lose an important, one-of-a-kind, historically significant building and potential attraction of the conceptual Destination District.</p>
<p>b. The reasonableness of efforts to relocate the building, including but not limited to the costs of relocation, the structural soundness of the building;</p>	<p>There has been insufficient time to explore relocating the Wonder Bar. Quotes have varied widely and prognoses for moving the heavy building across the nearby bridges have been contradictory. Mr. McGrath has relied largely on a group of nearby neighbors and the Madison Trust to generate the options that he has by and large immediately rejected. As mentioned above, the compressed timing of the proposal has rendered it impossible to consider the most likely and logical options of moving the Wonder Bar to either adjacent City or County land, where it would be enjoyed by generations of the public to come.</p>
<p>c. The limits that the location of the building would place on efforts to relocate it, and the availability of affordable housing</p>	<p>Initial exploration indicated that the Wonder Bar could not cross any of the bridges that surround it. However, that now appear not to be true.</p>

Of note, Madison citizens have launched a petition to seek support for saving the Wonder Bar on July 15, 2021. The petition had 2,300 signatures as of July 22, 2021, and was still growing steadily. We will be providing a list of the names and some comments made by those who signed the petition. Madison’s citizens do not want the Wonder Bar destroyed to make room for this development.

CONCLUSION

McGrath Property Group desires to rezone the property at 222-232 E. Olin and once rezoned to be granted conditional use. The need for housing in Madison is real and McGrath Property Group seeks to take advantage of the scenic location of 222-232 E. Olin to build luxury housing at a premium return on investment. This is what developers do. However, we encourage the Plan Commission to see through the jargon of beginning to build the as-yet conceptual Destination District vision. The time for this opportunity is not yet ripe. The new AEC does not exist, and its plans are still in flux. The Destination District Strategy & Vision has not been brought before the City for evaluation or approval. No City plans exist for the area north of the AEC. As such we cannot discuss or evaluate the fit of this building to AEC goals, area/neighborhood needs/appropriateness, conformance to Standards of Approval.

From: Marsha Rummel <marsha.rummel@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 12:25 AM
To: Ledell Zellers <ledell.zellers@gmail.com>; Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>; Punt, Colin <CPunt@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Please share my comments RE Agenda item #4/5 Legistar 64920 222-232 E. Olin Avenue

July 25, 2021

Legistar 64920 222-232 E. Olin Avenue - Approval of a zoning map amendment to change the zoning at 222-232 East Olin Avenue from SE (Suburban Employment) District to TE (Traditional Employment) District, approval of demolition permits for two restaurant buildings, and approval of the following conditional uses: Dwelling units in mixed-use buildings (§28.082(1) MGO) Food and beverage uses (§28.082(1) MGO) An outdoor eating area associated with a food and beverage establishment (§28.082(1) MGO) A building exceeding five stories and 68 feet in height (§28.084(3)(c) MGO)

Greetings Plan Commission members-

I will not be able to attend your meeting tonight but I wanted to share my thoughts on this proposal. I do not support the proposal for 222-232 E Olin to rezone from SE to TE and to demolish two restaurants. I do not support demolition of the Wonder Bar, it is a historic resource worth preserving in place as part of a redevelopment proposal or finding a viable place to relocate the building. As currently presented, I do not think the proposal meets conditional use standards #5, #9, and #12, nor does demolition of a historic resource meet the statement of purpose of the Demolition and Removal standard or the TE zoning district statement of purpose. (I do not have concerns about the demolition of the Coliseum Bar).

I understand city electeds, policy makers, city staff and developers are trying to get as many housing units built as fast as they can to fulfill demand, but I don't think the large-scale primarily residential mixed use building as proposed is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan

and Generalized Future Land Use Plan. The Comprehensive Plan identifies this area for Employment and it is currently zoned Suburban Employment/SE.

Per the comp plan: “Commercial and employment areas are recommended locations for businesses, corporate and government offices, medical facilities, retail, services, and other commercial land uses. Compared to mixed-use districts, commercial and employment areas are not generally expected to include a residential component, although limited residential uses may be present in some areas..... Employment (E) areas include predominantly corporate and business offices, research facilities, laboratories, hospitals, medical clinics, and other similar uses. They generally do not include retail and consumer service uses for the wider community, but may include limited retail and service establishments that primarily serve employees and users of the area. E areas are not generally recommended for residential uses, though such uses may be considered as part of a conditional use under relevant zoning districts.” (p24-25)

While rezoning from SE to Traditional Employment would allow more flexibility, the proposed 18 story building pushes well beyond “limited residential uses” in my opinion and raises several questions. What is the future of this Suburban Employment corridor that starts at Lakeside St and continues to E Olin Ave? (see map clip at the end of this message) How does it relate to the future plans for the intensification of uses for the Alliant Energy Center?

The E Olin Ave SE zoning portion from John Nolen to Wingra Creek currently contains office and restaurant uses. Across the street is the Alliant Energy Center (AEC) which is zoned Special Institutional. Planning for the AEC is not completed, nor is the parcel in the City of Madison until 2022. The 2018 AEC Destination District study provides a concept for a new Lake View area which incorporates the E Olin Ave SE zoning district.

According to the plan, the area could provide “active adult living and offices. In particular, it offers an unequaled opportunity for those

seeking - lakefront and park oriented living, multimodal, and mixed income - near, but not in, the city's central business district." (pp 20-21) The plan provides an illustrated map showing several multi-story residential buildings (p 21). Offices, per the illustration, would be incorporated across the street in the AEC parcel.

If the city thinks this SE zoned corridor should allow high density housing with some ground level mixed uses, I would argue the E Olin Ave corridor should undergo a planning process to review the zoning and the Comp Plan GFLU map. Currently, I don't believe it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or adopted neighborhood plans.

The Comp Plan Map Note 8 indicates the AEC master planning process that is underway and ends with the following: Such a Plan may include land use changes to surrounding properties, such as the Employment-designated properties to the north. (p 17) At this point, changing the land use to mixed use zoning appears to be preceding the plan's adoption. The existing adopted plans include the Bay Creek plan (1991): which mentions W Olin, John Nolen, and the AEC/Dane County Coliseum but is silent on E Olin Ave (pp 13-14). The South Madison Neighborhood Plan (2005) mentions John Nolen as gateway/transportation corridor and identifies importance of safe pedestrian access to amenities at Olin-Turville Park but makes no recommendations for the E Olin portion of the planning area.

The location of this parcel on a major collector street and adjacent to a major arterial makes pedestrian access to transit, the park, the lake and the AEC problematic, raising the question of whether the proposed plan meets Conditional Use standard #5. The AEC Destination District plan acknowledges the difficulty of pedestrian access to the AEC and proposes a pedestrian bridge or underpass to cross John Nolen. "Short-term solutions include enhanced crosswalks at major intersections on John Nolen Drive at Rimrock Road, Olin Avenue, and Lakeside Street, and on Rimrock Road at East Rusk Avenue. This should include raised planters and other decorative barriers to improve pedestrian safety and comfort and, possibly, the reconfiguration of turn lanes to shorten the crossing distance. Longer

term, a new, substantial pedestrian crossing over or under John Nolen Drive will be required. The crossing should be located just south of Olin Avenue and cross both John Nolen Drive and the railroad tracks to the east with a wide and inviting design to facilitate easy movement from one side to the other.”

Understandably the developer doesn't have the ability to fix the road geometry, and the fixes, as proposed in AEC Destination District plan, are at least 10 years out. The parcel is adjacent to a major arterial street, and a railroad crossing is adjacent to the property and also crosses John Nolen Dr. Pedestrian connections to public transit exist (although Routes 11, 13 are primarily commuter routes) but require crossing John Nolen, a 6-lane highway at an unimproved intersection, to catch EB buses. The parcel is served by bike paths but it is generally in a car-dependent location (walk score 32). There is no street parking on E Olin Ave near the parcel, which makes me question whether the parking allocated is sufficient. There is 1:1 parking per unit for residents and the developer is proposing parking stalls for office users but the restaurant use is TBD based on capacity per the staff report. Given the isolation of this parcel from the surrounding residential neighborhoods, sufficient parking could become a critical issue. Until improvements are made to the John Nolen intersection, a case could be made that Conditional Use standard #1 is also not met especially for unaccompanied young people seeking to walk to Olin-Turville Park and Lake Monona.

Conditional Use standard #9 expects that the proposed development will create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area. The statement of purpose for the TE district states the district is established to encourage a broad range of employment activities, taking advantage of the varied transportation options and proximity to urban activities and cultural amenities found in many Traditional Employment locations. Residential uses are of secondary importance. The district is also intended to: (a) Encourage businesses with the potential to provide significant numbers of living-wage jobs that contribute to a sustainable economy and a strong tax base. (b)

Support the continued use or adaptive re-use of traditional industrial buildings for a variety of purposes. (c) Facilitate preservation, development or redevelopment consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans. I don't think the proposal meets the statement of purpose of the TE zoning district since residential use for the property is significant, not secondary.

Conditional Use standard #12 addresses height that exceeds what is allowed in the zoning district = 5 stories/68 ft. The staff report addresses shadow impacts and mentions nearby properties but fails to note whether shadows would affect the safety of the John Nolen intersection during winter which requires pedestrians and bikers crossing potentially icy railroad tracks.

If policymakers want to revisit and possibly amend the Comp Plan and GFLU map recommendations and rezone the SE area to mixed use instead of employment; and if through a planning process there was a review of pedestrian access/safety in the adjoining streets; and if there was a decision to move toward a 'destination district' as envisioned by the AEC planning effort with primary focus on high density housing on E Olin Ave, then I would say a public interest in exceeding the district heights limits could be confirmed.

At this point, I don't believe the public interest benefit has been proven without more discussion and a policy change. I think the height is excessive for the zoning district which calls for limited residential uses and surrounding area as presently recommended in adopted plans. I am not one who regularly argues that a development will create a precedent, but in this case, I believe that this intensive mostly residential use will send a message to owners of adjacent SE parcels.

My final question is about condition #32. "The City's Quit Claim Deed per Document No. 3259688 does not resolve any claim the State of Wisconsin may have to the lands underlying the City's Quit Claim Deed. The Quit Claim area comprises a substantial portion of the planned site. This matter needs to be resolved before the City will

approve any building improvement within the Quit Claim area. The resolution can be a disposal of surplus lands, a lease or other documentation clearing title from the Wisconsin DOT, allowing for the construction of the building over any portion of those lands within the Quit Claim Deed and as proposed by these plans." I hope an explanation is provided to Plan Commissioners. Does this relate to railroad rights of way? Which reminds me, will the railroad require fencing?

The proposal for high density housing on this parcel needs to wait until more planning for the SE zoning area is done. I don't think the developer would follow the lead of 133 E Lakeside St, another parcel in the SE zoning district that was approved last year, and reduce the height to fit the allowable zoning maximums. Placing the rezoning, demolition, and conditional use requests on file would provide more time to figure out the future of the Wonder Bar and for the PC and planning staff to study and make recommendations to the Council about this corridor before exceeding the height limits so dramatically.

Thank you-
Marsha Rummel
1029 Spaight St 6C
Madison

Plan Commission
July 26, 2021
Agenda #4 and #5, Legistar 66221 and 65653

Rezoning

The zoning change is being sought, presumably, because SE is more restrictive than TE (e.g., TE only has a rear yard setback of the lesser of 20% lot depth or 20' while SE has 30', and TE has a maximum lot coverage of 85% instead of the SE 75%.

This rezoning is in a long stretch of SE. Except for a one-block stretch of residential on the west side of John Nolan just south of the causeway, John Nolan from the causeway to the Beltline is either parks or "Suburban Employment." Is there something unique about this parcel that merits a change? If not, will all this SE stretch be available for TE?

Conditional Use

The City Plan Commission shall not approve a conditional use without due consideration of the recommendations in the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan and any applicable, neighborhood, neighborhood development, or special area plan, including design guidelines adopted as supplements to these plans.

Recommendations in the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan

Although changing from one employment zoning category to another employment category does not create a Comprehensive Plan inconsistency, the conditional use does create an inconsistency.

- "Commercial and employment areas are recommended locations for businesses, corporate and government offices, medical facilities, retail, services, and other commercial land uses. Compared to mixed-use districts, commercial and employment areas *are not generally expected to include a residential component, although limited residential uses may be present in some areas.*" (Comprehensive Plan, page 24, emphasis added)
- "Employment (E) areas include predominantly corporate and business offices, research facilities, laboratories, hospitals, medical clinics, and other similar uses. *They generally do not include retail and consumer service uses for the wider community, but may include limited retail and service establishments that primarily serve employees and users of the area. E areas are not generally recommended for residential uses, though such uses may be considered as part of a conditional use under relevant zoning districts. ... While there are no fixed limits on size of an establishment or development intensity within E areas, all uses should be compatible with the density and scale of surrounding development. The intensity of development may vary significantly depending on the location and surrounding context.*" (Comprehensive Plan, pages 24-25)

The proposed building has 257,320 SF of residential leasable space and 15,985 SF of commercial leasable space. Or, 94.15% of the leasable space is residential and 5.85% of the

leasable space is commercial. This is 216 dwelling units/acre. Does this count as a "limited residential use" as described under the Comprehensive Plan?

This use is not "compatible with the density and scale of surrounding development." The scale and density of surrounding development is for the most part 0' and 0 residential density – the proposed project would sit in the middle of green space, other than three 2-story office buildings to the west which are about 20-25' in height. The proposed project has a height of **201'**.

Recommendations in any applicable, neighborhood, neighborhood development, or special area plan

The South Madison Plan does not propose any changes to this parcel and the site is not a site recommended for new residential construction.

- Map 7 (page 42) does not have the site as a "major plan recommendation."
- Map 8 (page 44) shows this site as "CC" (community commercial).
- "The South Madison neighborhoods want to preserve the residential areas, increase homeownership, and promote additional residential units throughout the neighborhood in appropriate locations. (See Map 14.)"
- "Objective 2.4 – Ensure that new infill multi-family, mixed-use, and commercial developments along and/or adjacent to the major transportation corridors incorporate traditional neighborhood design principles, especially regarding pedestrian-oriented features." (page 30)
- Pages 72-73 list areas for new residential construction. The site of this proposed project is not one of the recommended sites.
- "...retain commercial and manufacturing areas with the exception of one manufacturing area adjacent to a predominantly residential area on Gilson Street." (page 43)
- The VFW site, 133 E Lakeside, a mere quarter mile from the proposed project, has as recommendation: "The height of the building should take advantage of the lake views, however, should not exceed four stories unless other site amenities are agreed upon by the neighborhood." (page 65)

The South Madison plan is currently being updated. It is worth noting that the focus areas do not include the site of this proposed project.

The Alliant Energy Center Master Plan* is addressed in the staff memo ("it is very likely that the future of the AEC will include a mix of higher-intensity uses. While the proposed building is taller than any other in this vicinity, staff believes that the proposal could be found compatible with the AEC Campus and the surrounding area for both the short-term and long-term"). The proposed project would not be compatible with the density and scale of the future surrounding development in the AEC Campus.

- The Alliant Energy Center Master Plan calls for two residential buildings at 8 stories (page 48) closer to Rimrock Road, with a total of 180.
- The Master Plan says the redevelopment site north of Willow Island "offers a unique redevelopment opportunity located at the north end of campus with potential views of Lake Monona and Downtown Madison. The proposed redevelopment of this site is as a mixed-use office building."
- The Master Plan also speaks to a "human-scale public realm."

*The AEC Master Plan is irrelevant since it is not a plan adopted by the City. However, it does illustrate that this 201' high building would be more than double the height of what is called for in the Master Plan.

In 2018 there was a Destination District Vision and Strategy process for the Alliant Energy Center. A report was issued in December of 2018, though it does not appear to have been accepted by the Council and it not listed on the City's webpage that list the various plans. The applicant's letter of intent claims that "the project fits the vision of the *District Destination* planning process." Like the AEC Master Plan, the District Destination is irrelevant as it is not adopted. However, it is worth noting that one District Destination objective is: "Develop variety of housing types north of Olin Avenue with lake oriented views that serve a mix of incomes." What level of income will this project be serving? The UDC report from April states that the applicant is talking with WHEDA, so 3 months later the applicant should have a sense of whether anything in this proposed building will be affordable.

Standard #3. The uses, values and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood for purposes already established will not be substantially impaired or diminished in any foreseeable manner.

The lights from 100 or so apartments, the light from the penthouse (which does not seem to be required under the ordinances), and the lights from the 4 stories of garage parking with translucent screening, all combine to create a nighttime beacon. UDC received comments regarding the effect on park users, wildlife and birds. At 201', this amount of lighting also effects views from much of Lake Monona – both public and private.

Standard #5. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage, parking supply, internal circulation improvements, including but not limited to vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, public transit and other necessary site improvements have been or are being provided.

Approval of this project implicitly approves a 15 stall parking reduction. The only other parking is street parking on E Olin.

Residential: 290 units (367 bedrooms) requires 290 parking stalls

Restaurant: proposed capacity of 220 requires 33 stalls

Office: Two 5517 SF areas require 28 stalls

290+33+28=351. 336 stalls are provided, or 15 stalls short.

A recommended condition of approval is that the "applicant shall work with Traffic Engineering and Engineering to provide an easement along the Northern edge of their site to allow for a future path connection to Wingra Creek Bike Path to provide bicyclists and pedestrians better access to the Capital City Trail." With the northern edge only being 20' wide, this would likely make the easement about 5' wide (otherwise removal of the rain garden would be needed). It would seem that the City would be responsible for the cost of this future path to a private development. Would it perhaps be better to have a street side easement, where the public could have access? Plus, the City's arcgis tax parcel map shows a wider right-of-way at the two properties between the project and the Wingra bike path – thus, if the easement was provided at the street side, it seems improved access could be implemented in connection with the project rather than some unspecified future date.

Another recommended condition of approval is a \$40,000 deposit for the installation of pedestrian improvements at the John Nolen/Olin intersection. If these improvements are being made for the benefit of this project, will that deposit cover the entire cost?

What about the railroad tracks? Will fencing be required?

Almost half of the bicycle parking is on the 4th level (147 stalls out of 315).

Standard #9. When applying the above standards to any new construction of a building or an addition to an existing building the Plan Commission shall find that the project creates an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose for the zoning district.

The TE purpose, MGO 28.084 states: "Residential uses are of secondary importance." Yet this proposed project, as noted above, has 94.15% of the leasable space as residential and only 5.85% as commercial.

The TE District is established to encourage a broad range of employment activities. With the Alliant Energy Center undergoing revisions (a RFP was issued in May), this could be a prime site for associated employment activities. (The area is much better served by a commuter bus schedule than it is by the once-per-hour daytime service.) Or, for residential workforce housing for those working at the AEC.

Standard #12. When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in the district, the Plan Commission shall consider recommendations in adopted plans; the impact on surrounding properties, including height, mass, orientation, shadows and view; architectural quality and amenities; the relationship of the proposed building(s) with adjoining streets, alleys, and public rights of ways; and the public interest in exceeding the district height limits.

What are the shadow impacts? Staff notes that the playing fields are over 350' away. However, the bike path (the Olin Turville Court connector for the bike path) is only 300 feet away. During winter afternoons, the shadows may well cover the path for a good portion of the day, just when available sunlight is needed to help prevent ice.

What is the public interest in allowing a 201' high building? Increasing the tax base might be the only public benefit, unless luxury housing is a public benefit.

The vision for this area is in the process of being redefined, but under the current South Madison plan, this building does not fit. Even in the future, based on the AEC Master Plan, an 18-story building is likely to remain an oddity in the landscape and not be compatible with the surroundings. Before permitting an 18-story building, which has been said to perhaps be the tallest building in Madison, the vision/neighborhood plans for this area should be finalized.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

To: All Alders

From: Carrie Rothburd

Re: Item 12, Creating Section 28.022 -- 00508 of the Madison General Ordinances to change the zoning of property located at 222-232 E. Olin Avenue, 14th Aldermanic District, from SE (Suburban Employment) District to TE (Traditional Employment) District.

Date: August 3, 2021

Suburban Employment District vs. Traditional Employment District

Except for a one-block stretch of residential on the west side of John Nolen (just south of the causeway), John Nolen from the causeway to the Beltline is either parks or "Suburban Employment." John Nolen has 36.3 acres, 18 parcels, zoned SE. Yet only 222-232 E Olin is proposed for rezoning.

For developers, Traditional Employment zoning has advantages over SE zoning. For example, in TE the maximum lot coverage is 85% while in SE the maximum is 75%. Part of the purpose of SE zoning is to encourage "improved landscaping and site design, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities." In an area with so much park land, those considerations are important.

Spot Zoning

Rezoning this one parcel is spot zoning. It is solely for the benefit of the property owner who is requesting the rezoning. As summarized in the annotation to sec. 62.23, 2019-20 Wisconsin Statutes & Annotations:

"Spot zoning grants privileges to a single lot or area that are not granted or extended to other land in the same use district. Spot zoning is not per se illegal but, absent any showing that a refusal to rezone will in effect confiscate the property by depriving all beneficial use thereof should only be indulged in when it is in the public interest and not solely for the benefit of the property owner who requests the rezoning. *Step Now Citizens Group v. Town of Utica*, 2003 WI App 109, 264 Wis. 2d 662, 663 N.W.2d 833, 02-2760."

Relevant Plans

It might make sense at some point in the future to look at rezoning John Nolen – once the Alliant Energy Center Master plan has been adopted by the City (which won't occur until 2022) and once the South Madison Plan is complete. It might make sense then to look at TE zoning since one of TE's purposes is to take "advantage of the varied transportation options and proximity to urban activities and cultural amenities found in many Traditional Employment locations." However, that is not what is being requested, and proximity to urban activities and cultural amenities is, at this time, just a future hope. The Destination District to which McGrath Property Group refers is just a concept and not an approved.

Request by Neighbors

What would be preferable in the meantime rather than rezoning is a careful and thorough consideration by planners and neighbors of the possible uses of this site. There is nothing in the existing South Madison Neighborhood Plan that points to a TE use or even a residential use for this site and the vision and new South Madison plans for this area are still in process. It might, for example, make sense to retain Suburban Employment uses on this site and build workforce housing for workers at the AEC. Or it might now. What is certain is that it is premature to rezone 222-232 E. Olin to benefit a single developer, especially for the purposes of plans that have been put on file by the Plan Commission.

From: Howard, Mark - DWD <Mark.Howard@dwd.wisconsin.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 5:25 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Olin Ave proposal for 'Luxury' apartments

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

- 1.) We have no "Height Map" for the proposed project and surrounding areas on Olin Ave.
- 2.) There are no buildings now or planned to be built soon that matches HALF of that size.

There needs to be coordination between AEC's & the County's plans for the improvements to AEC and surrounding environments.

I am diametrically opposed to this irresponsible development plan for 'luxury' apartments on Olin Ave.

Mark Howard, Deputy
Unemployment Insurance
Bureau of Tax & Accounting
(608) 266-8262
Mark.Howard@dwd.wisconsin.gov

From: Cynthia K McCallum <dotckk@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 8:15 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: opposed to TE zoning for 222-232 E. Olin Ave

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

To whom it concerns,

Please do not rezone the parcels on E. Olin Avenue from SE to TE.

I think the massiveness of the proposed development needs to be balanced with the 25% of space provided under the SE zoning.

The City shouldn't create pockets of zoning designations before adopting a comprehensive plan for the AEC and adjoining properties.

Thank you,

Cynthia K. McCallum

From: anewalker@homelandgarden.com <anewalker@homelandgarden.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 9:40 AM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Common Council-Zoning Change-McGrath project-opposed

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

Dear Alders

Several CC meetings back, you were considering, and then passed, a change to our zoning ordinance. At that meeting, I spoke, urging alders and our City to carefully consider infill development that abuts our public-right-of-ways, our parks, and our greenspaces. Isthmus neighborhoods are greenspace and park deficient. Infill development has the potential to change the use, and feel, of our public spaces.

While I can understand why this location is a highly desirable one, and, can appreciate the amazing views an 18-story building could provide to some..... overlooking the lake, Olin Turville Park and the Capital. The building, particularly in this location, could also dominate the space.

Olin Turville is a very special bit of park land in the isthmus. It is one of the very few places that residents can walk and ride to that provides an opportunity to 'get-away' and breathe deeply... and relax in nature. An 18-story building in this location stands a very good chance of looming over the park, changing the experience for both park users and people using the bike and ped path.

The park is important to not only people, but also for our wild neighbors, including birds, and most especially migratory birds. Madison is a part of a major migratory 'highway'. Tall, glassy buildings, especially at night when the building lights up the night sky, stand a very good chance of killing birds, migrating through our area. Since the 1970's, our bird population has plummeted. Buildings such as the one that is being proposed are one of the reasons for this loss. Olin Turville Park is an especially important location for a hungry bird on a long journey. It provides food, water and a place to rest.

Olin Turville provides a much needed respite for our wild kin, as well as our residents. I do not support an 18-story development project in this location.

Respectfully

Anne Walker

From: linkvi2014 <linkvi2014@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 11:12 AM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: No on Olin/Nolen 18-story condo development

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

Hello! I know Madison is a hot spot for people escaping from the nightmare environmental conditions happening around our nation's flood and fire zones, but this kind of development opens the door for projects that will destroy the reasons we do live here and why we *want* to continue living here.

I completely agree with my neighbors' well-thought-out reasons (below) to reject this development!

"Proposal for Redevelopment at 222 – 232 East Olin Avenue, Legistar ID # 65653 & 66221

Date: July 23, 2021

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Community character: The building does not suit the character of its natural and residential surroundings.
2. Neighborhood Plan: The building is out of keeping with the recommendations of the neighborhood plans for the area. There is not yet an Area Plan for the lands bounded by Olin Ave, John Nolen Dr and Wingra Creek, but one should be developed for the SE district in which this proposed project is located. The South Madison Plan (2020-21) should not be part of this discussion as that Plan has not been adopted and any references to the area north of the AEC have not yet been made available for public review, comment, or approval.
3. Land use designation: The building does not conform to the priorities of the Employment District in which it is located, not being primarily employment in character. Less than 10% of the buildings uses will be devoted to employment purposes.
4. Zoning: The building does not conform to the purposes of either SE or TE. Its primarily residential use does not “provide significant numbers of living-wage jobs,” or “facilitate preservation, development or redevelopment consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.”
5. Conditional Use: CU requires compliance with existing land use plans, but the Comp Plan’s GFLU map does not envision the building proposed for this location. CU is meant to extend and not subvert the purpose of a zoning designation. The height of this building does not conform to the Standards required for granting CU in a TE zone.
6. Comp Plan, map note 8 on page 17: Rezoning of this area is supposed to wait until the approval of the Master Plan for the AEC is adopted by the City. That cannot occur until November 2022 at the earliest.

- We ask that Plan honor its commitment to its Standards of Approval, its Comp Plan, and relevant neighborhood plans and not approve this noncompliant proposal.

We believe that Plan should ask the developer to rethink its design on a more modest scale for a better fit with the surrounding area, both natural and developed, and allow time for preservation of the area’s historical building, the Wonder Bar, whether onsite or nearby. During the process of reconceptualizing and planning for redevelopment of 222-232 E. Olin, the City/developer should seek out and include

input from the neighborhoods adjacent these site and from nature conservationists, as well as from the neighboring AEC, as laid forth in the city's best practice guide, Participating in the Development Process, which can be found at:

<https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/best-practices-guide.pdf>.

- We ask Plan to defer consideration of the demolition permit for the Wonder Bar until after the Landmarks Commission considers the landmark nomination."

Sincerely,

Virginia J Link

2102 Cliff Court

Madison Wisconsin 53713

From: Christine Schwartz <lemonlimebutter@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 12:06 PM
To: All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Development on John Nolan and Olin

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

Hello,

I wanted to let you know that I support development on the corner of John Nolan and Olin. I live very close to this planned development (117 Van Deusen) and I know that my view is not shared by some of my neighbors. In my opinion, increasing housing availability is a way to keep housing affordable and that is very important. I'm willing to live with the consequences of this even in my own neighborhood.

Although I do support developing this area, it is important to me that pedestrian and bike access along with landscaping be a top priority. For instance, the lack of pedestrian and bike ability around the Alliant Center and the new Starbucks and Liberty Station restaurant is a real shame. (Can this be improved?) It would be wonderful if these amenities were easily walk- and bike-able for those staying at nearby hotels as well as people in nearby neighborhoods, instead of them being extremely car-oriented and hard to get to otherwise as they are. Imagine the possibilities of a cluster of hotels and restaurants that are actually attractive and easy to get to by bike and foot! This would draw even more people to the area.

Let's keep the quality of life in Madison high rather than building unattractive impersonal spaces that cater to car culture.

Sincerely,

Christine Schwartz
117 Van Deusen St