

SASY

Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association

Wednesday, August 17, 2016

TO: Madison Plan Commission
Attn., Heather Stouder
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Ms. Stouder and Plan Commission Members,

I send this letter on behalf of the SASY Neighborhood Association concerning the proposed development at 418 Division St. The SASY Preservation & Development (P&D) Committee has been following this since May of this year, when the developer first requested its feedback. That committee made some specific recommendations for improvement but overall approved of the proposed project. On August 11, the full SASY Council voted to recommend approval of the project. With this letter SASY communicates that approval, and also highlights its related recommendations.

When elevations were first made available to the SASY P&D Committee it offered two specific points of feedback. The first related to the position of the proposed development on a prominent corner. The committee members felt that the Division St./Eastwood Dr. corner should be strengthened architecturally so as to create a stronger presence at that corner.

The second point involved the public right-of-way land between the proposed building and the Capital City Bike Path. The committee members felt that this land should not simply be left as open, grassy land. They felt that the developer should strive to make improvements to the space that would better activate it both for residents of the building and for all those who passed by. The idea was that such improvements would benefit both the building and the surrounding neighborhood.

In later iterations of the plan, the SASY P&D members were impressed to see that the development did incorporate changes in both these areas. The leading corner has been strengthened architecturally. More significantly, the development now proposes a rain garden that meanders along the north side of the building. Both of these changes improve the proposal overall.

There is further room for significant improvement on the northeast corner of the site, where the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) currently has a stone bench/sign and the surrounding area landscaped with trees and shrubs. On a recent landscape plan this area shows up colored and marked, "Undisturbed Area." This area has fallen somewhat into disrepair lately since there has not been an ongoing effort to maintain the vegetation. Preliminary feedback from some Marquette Neighborhood Association Council members suggest that they would be willing to work with the developer to rework some aspects of this corner. The developer has also indicated an interest in working with MNA on this issue. Reworking and further activating this space as an area of common use could be a great improvement for the neighborhood.

The SASY Council makes a further recommendation that additional units be designed as two-bedroom units (more than the 4 currently proposed) as a means of further diversifying the housing stock and likely residents.

SASY

Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association

Lastly, I will repeat what has been said in other spaces; there is a great deal of concern among some neighbors that a development of this density and scale is a first for the south side of Eastwood Dr. They are concerned that it marks a precedent of things to come, and that buildings of similar size and density will march further down Helena and Division Streets in the future. These fears should not be taken lightly. In recommending the plans for 418 Division St, the SASY Council reminds the Plan Commission members that the recommendation is made only for the corner development in this specific context. It is not a recommendation for more of the same at a future date.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Brad Hinkfuss
Chair - SASY Neighborhood Association

Cc: SASY Council, Alder Marsha Rummel, Joe Krupp, Thomas Garver, Lou Host-Jablonski, MNA Council, Chris Wells

Wells, Chris

From: Helene C ANDROSKI [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 12:04 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Development of 418 Division St.

Dear Development Review Planner Chris Wells,

Although we do want to see some sort of development for the now vacant Capitol Water Softener site at 418 Division St. we are writing to express opposition to Prime Urban Properties' proposal for the following reasons.

- The zoning change to TSS is not appropriate for the primarily single-family residential neighborhood and not necessary. There is already a commercial area along Atwood with plenty of room for growth there. The area across from Eastwood should stay residential or, at the very least, mixed use (NMX) which requires open space and balance of residential and light commercial.
- The density of the proposed Krupp building at 78 units/acre is 5X the current residential density and nearly 2X what the 2006 Comprehensive Plan recommends for the area. While we support urban infill (certainly as an alternative to suburban sprawl), a five-fold leap in density is too much for the neighborhood to absorb. And it would set a disturbing precedent for future high density housing schemes.
- The traffic situation at the Division-Eastwood-Helena and bike-pedestrian path intersections is already complex. Adding an additional 30–50 vehicles in the apartment can only make matters worse.
- Finally we have grave concerns about the process here. This proposal was voted down by the Plan Commission for very good reasons on August 8 and neighborhood residents went home thinking the issue was settled. While it is technically within the rules to reconsider that vote because of the “excused absence” of a member, the appearance is that the Commission is showing favoritism to a big time developer over neighborhood residents, especially since Krupp has stated he has no plans to modify the scale or density of his project.

So if the Plan Commission must reconsider its vote, it should reject any proposals not in keeping with the 2006 Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,
Helene Androski and Larry Gray
[REDACTED] Riverside Drive
Madison, WI 53704

7-8

From: Sheppard, Maurice C
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:00 AM
To: Parks, Timothy
Cc: kenopin [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: August 29th Plan Commission

Hi Tim,
Please file the correspondence below from [Joe Krupp].

Thanks!

Maurice Sheppard
Instructor, Political Science
School of Arts and Sciences
Madison College (MATC) [Truax Campus]

From: Joe Krupp
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2016 8:24 PM
To: Sheppard, Maurice C
Cc: rbruce [REDACTED]
Subject: August 29th Plan Commission

Hello Maurice,

I am the applicant for the project located at 418 Division St that was voted down at the meeting on August 8th. I want you to know that I very much appreciate your willingness to request a reconsideration of my application at the August 29th Plan Commission meeting. Our development team has looked at concerns expressed by a couple of the commission members and have resubmitted plans that reflect some changes addressing those concerns. You should be receiving the revised packet on Friday. I look forward to presenting on Monday and making the case for the commission members to reach the conclusion recommended in the initial staff report that the zoning change be approved and that the standards have been met to approve both the demolition and conditional use request. Thanks again for the reconsideration request.

Sincerely

Joe

Joseph D. Krupp
Prime Urban Properties
[REDACTED] Eastwood Dr.
Madison, WI 53704
[REDACTED]

Wells, Chris

From: Marlisa [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 5:30 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Tim Condon; Isabelle Girard
Subject: Citizen Comments for Plan Commission Review Meeting on August 29

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Chris Wells-

Unfortunately I can not attend the Plan Commission Review Meeting on August 29, but I have concerns about the proposed approach for the development of the property at 418 Division Street. I understand there will be a revote at this meeting and I would like my comments included in the member packet. Please see below. Thank you.

Dear Plan Commission-

My husband and I have lived on Clemons Avenue, four blocks away from 418 Division Street, for nearly 12 years. We have two young daughters who attend Marquette Elementary School. While we are relative newcomers to the neighborhood, we have seen many changes—some well executed, and some poorly executed—since making the Yahara Park Neighborhood our home. In our experience, developments that follow the Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan, without exception, are those that make the most positive, and have the least negative, long-term impact.

We have serious concerns about Prime Urban Properties proposed plan to develop the Capital Water Softener site insofar as it challenges the guidelines of the 2006 Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, I am opposed to changing the zoning of the site and accommodating the proposed density of the development. The proposal also fails to adhere to the goals for positive contributions to the neighborhood outlined by the neighborhood associations. I do not believe the proposal enhances the neighborhood's goal of increased affordable housing, access to public transportation or flexible use.

It is my concern that bending the rules to accommodate Prime Urban Properties' proposal will not only result in a poorly executed development at 418 Division Street, but will also set a precedent for future developments with potentially equally negative impact that my family, my neighbors and I will have to live with for years to come.

Our east side neighborhood is a wonderful place to live and a destination for all residents of Madison. Please help us maintain the integrity of the area by insisting that Prime Urban Properties follows the guidelines for development that are in place.

Sincerely,
Marlisa Kopenski Condon
[REDACTED] Clemons Avenue
[REDACTED]

Plan Commission
August 8, 2016 Meeting
Agenda item #19 and #20, Legistar #43648 and 43416 (418 Division Street)

If 418 Division Street is not approved by the Council for rezoning to TSS, then the conditional uses requested by the applicant become irrelevant as those uses are based on TSS zoning.

418 Division should not be rezoned to TSS for the following reasons.

1. The Comprehensive Plan addresses this parcel with specificity in a footnote, requiring buildings to be "generally compatible in scale" with existing buildings: the Comprehensive Plan is not merely making generalized recommendations for land uses on this property.
2. The building density is too high. The net residential density of this "mixed-use district," which would be this one parcel, is almost twice the maximum net density. Even if 418 Division could look to an unforeseeable future and include the whole TE area, increased pockets of density are only permitted when the neighborhood plan identifies such pockets. Neighborhood plans do not identify 418 Division for increased density.
3. The potential impact on Schoep's should be considered. If Schoep's were to be developed, the density would decrease by 15% (down from 40 to 34 du/acre) to compensate for the excessive density at 418 Division. This, of course, would decrease the value of the property to a potential buyer.
4. To date, TSS zoning has been reserved for mixed-use corridors. The Council has not approved TSS zoning for any parcel not located on a mixed-use corridor. Division Street is not a mixed-use corridor.

Comprehensive Plan footnotes are not mere generalized recommended land uses

The Staff report states:

"It is also important to keep in mind that the Comprehensive Plan does note that its maps are "a representation of the recommended pattern of future land uses at a large scale, and is not intended for application on a parcel-by-parcel basis; nor should it be interpreted as similar to a zoning district map. Recommended land uses are generalized in that the exact boundaries between one land use category and another are often only approximate, the range of different land uses and development densities encompassed within the use district definitions is relatively large, and all of the districts may include a variety of land uses in addition to the primary use."

But 418 Division is part of a Comprehensive Plan footnote. The Comprehensive Plan explains the footnotes:

"The recommended land use district designations used on the Generalized Future Land Use Plan Maps are supplemented by the Land Use Plan Map Notes keyed to specific locations on the Maps. These notes provide additional explanation regarding the intent of the land use designation as applied to that location, and may indicate some of the additional land use and design issues and choices that should be addressed in more-detailed neighborhood plans or special area plans."

And the applicable footnote states:

"Note 1: This is currently the site of a long-established ice cream production facility located within a predominantly residential neighborhood. If this site is redeveloped at some future time, a mix of residential development and neighborhood-serving commercial or employment uses is recommended rather than redevelopment with a new industrial use. The existing grocery adjacent to the ice cream plant is a significant amenity to the surrounding residential area, and a neighborhood grocery should be retained as part of any future redevelopment. **Buildings should be generally compatible in scale with existing residential and commercial buildings in the area.**" (emphasis added)

This very specific footnote makes clear that the Comprehensive Plan took great care to address potential development in this specific area (Schoep's/Capital). Thus, although the Comprehensive Plan maps make generalized recommended land uses, that generalization is overruled by the footnote.

Building Scale, Density and Neighborhood Character

The Comprehensive Plan provides that “[n]et residential densities within a neighborhood mixed-use district generally should not exceed 40 dwelling units per acre ...” The Staff report urges the Commission to look not at this particular parcel, and its excessive density, but to look at the “future net density” of the entire area (Schoep's/ Capital/Jenifer Street Market) – that the area could have an overall density of 40 du/acre “*if* and when the entire area is redeveloped.” (emphasis added)

If the entire area was in the process of development, this argument could have merit – for example, mixing 77.5 du/acre with single family homes that have a density of 15 du/acre. But the entire area is not being developed, nor have plans even been presented to develop the entire area. The mixed-use district, if TSS is approved by the Council, is this one parcel – it is not the whole Schoep's/Capital/Jenifer Market area.

Even if one were to look at the net density of this whole TE area and say that it would be 40 du/acre at some indeterminate future time, the Comprehensive Plan only allows pockets of increased density if (1) the neighborhood or special area plan recommends small areas within the district for a higher maximum density and (2) the development is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood.

“Net residential densities within a neighborhood mixed-use district generally should not exceed 40 dwelling units per acre, but a neighborhood or special area plan may recommend small areas within the district for a higher maximum density if the development is compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood.”

This interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan is exactly the interpretation taken by Staff not even a year ago on another project developed by Mr. Krupp (2087 Atwood, Legistar #40170):

“Notably, if the mix of dwelling units included two- and three-bedroom units, the residential density would technically decrease, and the proposal would likely be more in keeping with the density recommendation for CMU areas, which is under 60 units per acre **except when recommended in a more detailed neighborhood plan.**” (emphasis added)

(As a side note, the report was prepared by Heather Stouder, the new Planning Division Director.)

Neither condition is met with this proposed development. The neighborhood plan does not propose this level of density. This building would not be compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood. The scale and the character of the neighborhood (other than Schoep's) is low density residential (per the Comprehensive Plan). Or, per the Zoning Code, TR-C3 (single family detached to the west) and TR-V2 (various building forms, including large multi-family buildings to the east – but MGO 28.172(7) provides that the “massing, proportions and articulation of Large Multi-Family Buildings shall respond to existing residential buildings in their vicinity”).

The Comprehensive Plan states that housing types in neighborhood mixed-use areas should have an appropriate building scale and that generally “this will be a relatively small building when the adjacent neighborhood is low density.”

Potential impact on Schoep's property

The Staff report states:

"This means that while the density on the subject parcel is twice that recommended by the Comprehensive Plan, one needs to focus on the future net density of the entire area in the contiguous Generalized Future Land Use district (i.e. the Capital Water Softening, Schoeps Ice Cream, and Jenifer Street Market parcels). While it would not be consistent with the plan to develop the entire area at 78 du/ac, smaller portions being developed (where appropriate) at a density higher-than-average doesn't preclude an overall density of ~40 dwelling units per acre if and when the entire area is redeveloped."

Schoep's has 2.4 acres (2066 Helena and 514 Division). At a net density of 40 du/acre, the Schoep's property could support 96 dwelling units. The Schoep's plus Capital properties total 2.4 acres, which provides 112 dwelling units over these three properties. (I did not include the Jenifer market parcel since it is already zoned neighborhood mixed-use and since the Comprehensive Plan states a grocery should remain.) If 418 Division is permitted a density of 77.5 du/acre, this drops the density allowed for the two Schoep's properties down to 34 du/acre.

Is it fair to make the Scoep's properties take a 15% reduction in net density in order to balance out the excessive density in the current application?

Zoning Code: TSS Purpose

MGO 28.065: The TSS District is established to **encourage and sustain the viability of Madison's mixed-use corridors**, which sustain many of the City's traditional neighborhoods. The district is also intended to:

- (a) Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit use as a means of accessing and moving through **these corridors**.
- (b) Encourage diversification of uses, including residential, commercial, and civic uses, in order to enhance the vitality and appeal of **these areas**.
- (c) Maintain the viability of existing residential buildings located within or adjacent to **these corridors**.
- (d) Encourage **appropriate transitions** between higher-intensity uses within TSS districts and adjacent lower-density residential districts.
- (e) Facilitate preservation, development or redevelopment consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans. (emphasis added)

These corridors, as identified on the Zoning Map (streets with TSS zoning) are Monroe, Regent, Park, Old University, Williamson, Atwood, Winnebago, and a section of East Washington. Division Street is not a mixed-use corridor, nor is Helena Street

Allowing 418 Division to be zoned TSS does not further any other purpose of TSS zoning. And it would clearly contravene the purpose of having "appropriate transitions" – a building in excess of the high-density residential standard (an average of 41-60 units per net acre) would be plopped into a low-density residential area (an average of less than 16 units per acre)

TSS is being sought, or so it appears, to obtain the highest possible intensity on this parcel. It is worthwhile to review how the Council has approved rezoning to TSS in the past. Legistar reflects the following properties rezoned to TSS.

- 2014: 1014 Williamson (mapping error)
- 2013: 1146, 1148 Williamson (mapping error)

2013: 1119 Williamson (provide conforming zoning similar to previous zoning)
2013: 1403 University (correction to provide conforming zoning)
2013: 1419 Monroe (rezoned from CC-T)

The Staff report for 1419 Monroe (now 1423 Monroe) provided the following rationale for the change to TSS:

“It is noted that during the recent changes to the City’s zoning map, this property was included in the CC-T District, rather than the TSS District, primarily so that the long-established Stadium Bar beer garden associated with home UW football games could have continued as a conforming use. Were it not for this use, the property would likely have been included in the TSS District, (which does not allow for beer gardens open to the public - termed “Non-accessory temporary outdoor events” in the use list).”

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=2405149&GUID=DD710558-4C0A-4D32-8FE7-B42948AE0FD4>

Thus, up until this time, TSS zoning has not been used in order for a developer to have a higher building/lesser setbacks/higher density. Nor has TSS zoning been applied to any property that is not located on a street that has traditionally been a mixed-use corridor.

Allowing TSS zoning for this property, which is isolated from other TSS properties (the nearby TSS all fronts Atwood Avenue) and not on a mixed-use corridor, would set the precedent that the TSS zoning classification is appropriate in any part of the City when a developer wants a more intense use than what is permitted under the NMX zoning classification.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz

Wells, Chris

From: Lisa Pfaff [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 2:47 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Comments on File #: 43648 -- Rezoning 418 Division St. from TE to TSS

Hello Chris,

As a neighborhood resident who lives across the street and down the block from the former Capitol Water Softener building I would like to thank you very much for attending the second neighborhood meeting regarding the 31-unit apartment building proposed for 418 Division St. I found your comments regarding zoning rules and planning decisions very interesting and informative. Unfortunately, two of your comments continue to bother me.

The first is your suggestion that even though TSS stands for "Traditional Shopping Street" we should overlook the history of Division St. (it has never been a traditional shopping street) and the geography (the parcel in question is separated from an actual traditional shopping street by a former rail corridor, now limited access parkway) because those are just the words used to describe the package of zoning rules that happen to fit the building that this developer wants to build.

Apart from the rather disturbing cart-before-the-horse nature of this explanation, please allow me to point out that the rules that make up the TSS zoning designation are based on the typical streetscapes of traditional shopping streets and are meant to produce more of the same. In this case they would allow a traditional shopping street façade on the Division St. side of the proposed apartment building, with the exterior stairways and lobby wall pushed up against the sidewalk and only a few pockets of landscaped open space (the length of one staircase in depth) visually reading as setback. That proposed traditional shopping street-style crowding on west side of Division Street makes an odd contrast with the traditional residential setback of the single and multifamily houses on the east side of Division and, I think, sends the wrong message about the future of residential development in the neighborhood (which, let's note, has always been well accommodated by TR-V1 in the past).

If I am reading the landscape plans correctly it looks like more of a setback is planned on the (presumably thought to be more residential) Helena St. side of the proposed building (that, or the landscaper is planning on planting trees in the middle of the sidewalk...). Despite the factory and grocery store traffic Division Street is also a residential street, and that side should have a similarly clear, useable setback. As would be required by residential or neighborhood mixed use zoning rules.

A second odd thing that you said was that the increased unit density per acre is justified because the intersection of Atwood and Division is a "transit hub." Let me just point out here that there are two bus stops at Atwood and Division, one for each direction, and neither of them actually merits a bus shelter. A number of commuter-hour bus routes go through on weekdays but only one route uses these stops on weekends. As far as I know light rail has never been discussed for Atwood Ave. This is no East Washington corridor, not much of a destination and certainly no kind of a transfer stop. And if there were you would need an umbrella when it's raining. Not a transit hub by any stretch of the imagination.

I find it disturbing that in your report you cite two projects by the same developer on Atwood Ave, whose buildings generally look out of place there due to their excessive height and size, to support the high density planned for the 418 Division St. proposal. That size and density may be the standard for his buildings but it's certainly not the standard for the neighborhood or even for Atwood Ave., including some other newer construction. Just to say.

Also to say: For all the height mid-block of the Schoeps factory buildings, the Division St. facades are all 1-2 stories high, unlike the 3+ story height of the proposed apartment building. More incongruity with the existing very-much-not-TSS streetscape.

And to add: there are numerous multi-unit buildings on Division St., Center Ave, and throughout the neighborhood that have somehow managed to increase unit per acre density while still abiding by TR-V1 or TR-V2 rules with reasonable variances. I just don't believe that 418 Division St. is such an exception that the rules we in the neighborhood live by simply must be tossed out in favor of rules meant for higher traffic streets and intense mixed use. Changing the zoning of this parcel to TSS would set a very unfortunate precedent. I am against the zoning change.

Thank you for your attention, and for all your thoughtful work in studying and explaining this project. I'm sorry that I simply do not agree with your analysis of what is good or acceptable for my section of Division St.

Lisa Pfaff

Center Ave
Madison 53704

[Redacted]

Wells, Chris

From: Monica H [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 1:46 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Re: 418 Division steering committee

thank you, Chris. I have a couple comments to pass along, if you could please include them for the Plan Commission.

As I said at the neighborhood meeting last week, I appreciate the juxtaposition of industrial materials with a residential project, and that the material choices in a way reflect the recent history of the site. And I appreciate that the developer and architect are happy with the design. However, the design is not like art they are picking out for their own office--it's something the neighborhood has to live with. As much as I like modern design, I strongly believe that a more traditional residential design is appropriate for this site, for the following reasons:

- 1) it may have a traffic calming effect. A design that says "office park" is not an engaging visual cue that there is pedestrian and cycle traffic to watch for, and we already have speeding issues on Eastwood Ave. (The proposed rain garden along the bike path side of the development would help, but it would only be an effective traffic calming measure in the warmer months.)
- 2) it would set the stage that this is a residential area. Given reasonable concern among my neighbors that this development may set a precedent for future redevelopment along Division and Helena streets, it is important to signal that this is a residential area with the design and materials.

Thank you,

Monica Harkey
[REDACTED] Helena St
Madison WI

Wells, Chris

From: Rummel, Marsha
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Wells, Chris; [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Capital Water Softener

Please share with PC

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Rankin <[REDACTED]>
Date: August 8, 2016 at 12:14:39 PM CDT
To: "Rummel, Marsha" <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Re: Capital Water Softener

Here it is again. I plan to be at the hearing tonight to say something similar in person. Do they get the oral comments from the community meetings?

Steve

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Rankin <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Capital Water Softener
Date: 24 June, 2016 at 6:01:07 PM CDT
To: district6@cityofmadison.com

Hi Marsha:

I received your postcard re: the meeting about Joe Krupp's proposal for the Capital Water Softener property. I have another commitment that evening. If I can find a way to come to the meeting I will. That being said, I do have an initial reaction.

I cannot imagine a version of that proposal that I could find acceptable. I liked having Capital Water Softener as a neighbor. I like living in a neighborhood with a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. I also liked being able to walk down the street to buy my water softener. However, a three story building on that property, with 31 apartments, is totally out of scale for the block. On that side of Helena (west of the single-story Schoep's offices) are tiny one story slab-constructed houses and then bungalows. Most of Schoep's on the other side of the street is one story - the freezer is about three stories tall but is a small part of the overall footprint. The rest of the block is one to 1.5 story houses with a couple of two story two flats in the mix. Division Street has a couple of two story small apartment buildings but nothing approaching 31 units. I find it interesting that he is using Division Street as the address. Unless I am mistaken, Capital Water Softener's address was on Helena Street. Is this to make it appear more palatable in some way (since there are a couple of small apartment buildings there and none on Helena)? Helena is a very narrow street. To put a three story building anywhere near the street will make it tower over the street. Unless the parking entrance is on Division, the extra traffic, coupled with the Schoep's trucks unloading on the block, will make Helena virtually impassable even in summer. In short, this sounds like a terrible idea.

Steve Rankin
[REDACTED] Helena Street

Wells, Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 9:58 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: 418 division st.

Hi Chris,

I just read the staff report for this project and again I am struck by the deviations from the requirements and what is proposed. I will not be able to make it to the meeting for this project tonight but I want to LOUDLY express my displeasure with this project. Again me and other neighbors are objecting to specifically;

1. The height of this proposed structure is above the 40' requirement. Grade is the level that the existing building is at, Krupp is trying to use the railroad/bike path as grade, that will add 6' to the height then when the planned towers are added to the height you have well in excess of the 15% more in height that is required.

2. The requirement is for a one to one ratio for parking. This proposal does NOT follow this requirement. 29 space for 31 units will only capture about half of the needed spaces as is. He meets the requirement for bikes but more importantly cars are the bigger concern. Look if you were paying any attention to the neighbors in the two meetings we had on this project clearly parking and traffic are of major concerns in this neighborhood.

Please if you will add my concerns listed here with others for the meeting tonight, which I won't be able to attend, because if I were able to attend I would speak of these at the meeting and I would like all our concerns to be taken into account BEFORE approval is given.

Thanks
Keith Kobs
[REDACTED]

Wells, Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2016 10:25 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: (Fwd) maintenance of public right of way/division st developement
Attachments: Mail message body.PM\$

fyi--see below an email I sent to the 2 chairs of p &d (preservation and dev) and Alder Rummel

Thanks for asking for input

Anne Walker

----- Forwarded message follows -----

To: district6@cityofmadison.com, jesse Pycha-Holst
<[REDACTED]>,
brad Hinkfuss [REDACTED]
Subject: maintenance of public right of way
Date sent: Fri, 05 Aug 2016 06:43:01 -0500

All

its great to have partners with labor and cost sharing of projects in our neighborhood, particularly in relation to public right of way. I was thinking about the Pollinator Report, which was passed fairly recently at Common Council. In addition to discussing the importance of pollinators, the document discusses land management principles that maximize the chance for success. Land management has so very much to do with why pollinators do or do not survive in an environment.

Those priciples should be incorporated into projects such as Joe's on Division Street. For example, this could be an excellent place to incorporate a dragonfly garden in conjunction with the rain garden. Dragonflies are excellent at reducing mosquito populations and are beautiful to boot.

From my perspective, it would be a shame to miss out on such an amazing opportunity. As mentioned at the meeting, the location is at the "hub" of the neighborhood from a multimodal perspective. Its a perfect location to create an excellent example of sustainability that will go mobile.

Additionally, I would personally emphasize the importance of retaining seating. We create a lot of ways to get around.....we need places to be. And we need them for all sorts of reasons. This a great location for a pocket park and is aligned with the goals in the Madison Sustainability Plan.

Anne

----- End of forwarded message -----

From: Suzanne Leimontas [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 5:51 PM
To: Stouder, Heather
Subject: new apartments on Division St and Truck Traffic

I have lived at [REDACTED] Oakridge Ave since 1982. My husband and I have raised 3 daughters in this wonderful neighborhood and I am so grateful for all this area offers.

I do have a concern that I think might impact my area and wanted to bring it to your attention. I understand an apartment complex is going to be built on Division St. I am wondering if the city has studied how the increase in traffic will affect the traffic flow on Division St and other side streets. Right now traffic is compromised due the large trucks that come to the area. I have always been concerned about the size of these trucks and how they interfere with traffic, bikers, and pedestrians. I would appreciate it if you could let me know if this concern has been taken into account when evaluating this proposed apartment complex.

Thank you for your assistance.

Suzanne Leimontas

Wells, Chris

From: Kent & Ruth Hill [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 5:39 PM
To: Wells, Chris; Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 418 Division Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Chris & Marsha

Brad Hinkfuss wrote this in his 8/2 e-mail (below): "Renewed push for Schoeps truck traffic to behave as per city ordinance as a corollary to the development." When we (Marquette & Schenk/Atwood) met with Joe Krupp and Matt Tucker on 6/30, I was the one who spoke to the importance of ordinances on this project. Others spoke more to building design and setback issues. I then volunteered to be on the steering committee, and went a bit further the next week with them.

I read Monica's and Chris's e-mails from earlier today, and don't believe "ordinances" is an issue that fits well with what you're asking from us (me). Knowing that, I understand this may or may not seem important to you, but it is to me. Marsha has done much to help us, but it's not realistic to expect her to resolve these issues.

Here are some of the reasons why I wanted the issue considered: (1) traffic and parking problems on the 400 & 500 blocks of Division have been "accumulating" for years, (2) conversations with George Hank, Mark Winter, Marsha (our alder), and briefly with Katy Crawley suggest there may never have been a plan for today's Division Street, (3) with the new 45,000 square foot freezer near the inter-state and all production at the Division plant, truck traffic was destined to increase as product is moved from plant to freezer, (4) compliance with the stated ordinances would solve much of the problem (particularly the loading zone), but it's not simple (where would the semis park as they come off the inter-state unto Division), and (5) I think (but then I live at 523) you would find an assessment of the "activity on the street itself" useful.

I admire the many young people I met and who took time out of their busy lives to come out for the 6/30 meeting. They had good questions, but more important, they care about their neighborhood. I grew up on this street and neighborhood, went to schools like Marquette and East, had my first job at what is today Jenifer Market, and have continued to be part of the neighborhood now for over 70 years. One of my regrets is I didn't get involved in issues like 418 earlier in life.

Hope what I've shared can be useful, Kent

From: [Monica H](#)
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 11:02 AM
To: [Brad Hinkfuss](#) ; [Joanne Schilling](#)
Cc: [john coleman](#) ; [REDACTED] ; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 418 Division steering committee

Wells, Chris

From: Rummel, Marsha
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 6:29 PM
To: Firchow, Kevin; Wells, Chris
Subject: Fw: 418 Division St meeting July7

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

From: Monica H [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 7, 2016 1:17 PM
To: Rummel, Marsha; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Brad Hinkfuss
Cc: John
Subject: Re: 418 Division St meeting July7

hi Marsha et al.,
for your/our records, here are the comments people on the "helenahood" listserv wanted to share about the project.
-Monica

I like the proposal - 3 stories seems a reasonable compromise between density and the surrounding neighborhood, as long as parking is addressed appropriately.
[D.]

I'm not in town this week to attend, but i'll share with you my knee-jerk (and yet sincere) comments, upon first hearing about the site plans, etc.:
'great. More difficult, confusing, congested, dangerous traffic issues for that little area. Maybe the Schoeps factory will move, tho, and JSM could actually expand. or something. will property values go up? property taxes increase, too? (guess I'll be moving)
i wish that goofy old building could house something else.
Urgh.
[L.]

This looks great. I like it a lot and think it fits in well with the neighborhood. I greatly appreciate infill, as it prevents subdivisions gobbling up our gorgeous countryside and farmland, it accommodates good and efficient mass transit and it is very sustainable development. Cities that are spread out cost immensely more money to maintain for all the increased road repair and snow maintenance, emergency service costs, etc. that are needed.

This is efficient, sustainable development with lots of bike parking. Definitely no more car parking needed! The developer is correct. Driving rates have been decreasing. Each underground parking stall adds \$35,000 to the cost of development, making the apartments much more expensive and encouraging residents to own cars

since they are already paying the cost of those parking stalls in their increased rent. We want to encourage and support the ability to live without cars -- creating less noise and less traffic in our neighborhood and city streets, enabling us to walk and bike throughout our neighborhood much easier and safer. We want to encourage cheaper development costs so apartments lean more toward the affordable side of the equation than to the luxury, high end side. I like the design and the industrial sense the metal will add, although I am only looking at b/w illustrations. Joe Krupp has good design sense and knows how to fit buildings nicely into our neighborhood.

Please pass on my comments to Marsha.

Thank you so much.

[Donna Magdalena]

My comments for the meeting and Marsha:

Without seeing all the details, I'm generally in favor of this plan. I think the height sounds reasonable, I am so happy to hear there will be a setback! I approve of that heartily!

I am grateful that our neighborhood is vital and that it is desirable. Any chance this will have mixed-income/subsidized housing? I care about that quite a lot. That would be very, very worth an increase in my taxes. [We can talk later about how willy-nilly the \$ is actually used in our town...] We are a city, and I am in favor of thoughtful in-fill.

I'm with you on the design features, Monica. I would like to see an alternate facade. Something that blended better into the historic nature of the 'hood.

I think it may be worth looking at some sort of a speed - limiter for the Division side...like a small divider in the middle (like at Few St. and Willy St. by the Weary traveler). Otherwise, I don't find any troubles at that corner, currently, being a dog-walking pedestrian, cyclist and driver.

I hope Schoep's doesn't leave. They are a really good neighbor, and who else can say they have an (historic!) ice cream factory right in their neighborhood?

PS - I am just glad it isn't another hair salon.

PPS - There should be a rider on any unit's contract that they must attend the Helenahood Block Party.

[Susan]

The "failed" effort he is talking about, some may recall, if the Inclusionary Zoning ordinance that was on the Madison books for awhile. To his credit, Mayor Cieslewicz got it passed; but among the reasons it failed so badly is that to get it passed he capitulated to developers so much in developing the law that it became impossibly complicated and doomed itself to failure.

The Stonehouse development team seems strongly committed to and very good and projects that include affordable housing. Sadly, it seems like everyone else, including Krupp (whom I generally count as among the better developers out there) have flat out taken themselves out of considering projects with elements of affordability. Why wouldn't they given today's market, there's too much money to make.

Anyhoo, I agree it is important in our 'hood and important to keep pressing.

[MJ]

I am sorry I missed the meeting(s); I was working. I am not a big fan of "infill", though like others, I appreciate that the plan is for only 3 stories.

Though I didn't look up the design, I would really prefer something that matches historical neighborhood architecture. (No corrugated metal..)

It's not that I dislike modern construction under all circumstances, but I feel we've gotten enough of it with

other buildings that have already come into the neighborhood in the last 5-10 years, starting with the United Way Bldg and the condos on the corner between Eastwood & Winnebago at First.

It's at times like this that I miss Kitty Rankin, who was the voice of historic preservation in the Madison Planning Department.

It's great to see the dialogue here.

[J.]

Thanks, MJ - we are clearly surfing on the same waves! That is helpful information. I agree about Krupp! He really does seem to have community in mind for his projects, and has overall been open to engaging in this way.

Monica -I would like to emphasize that we need mixed income housing, too. I am sure I'll follow up with Marsha on the side, but please convey this to her, again. The city needs to make it easier for the developer to do this. Our vital neighborhood depends upon diversity of all kinds. What would it take to make it happen? I am willing to be pointed in the right direction.

[S.]

From: Rummel, Marsha <district6@cityofmadison.com>

Sent: Sunday, July 3, 2016 9:34 AM

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Brad Hinkfuss

Cc: John

Subject: 418 Division St meeting July7

Hey everyone-

Thanks for agreeing to be part of the neighborhood steering committee. We agreed to meet at Mike Schill's apt [REDACTED] Atwood on July 7 at 7p.

On the list is Kent Hill, Monica Harkey, Brad Hinkfuss, and Mike Schill. I copied John Coleman, the MNA rep, who indicated he would be out of town.

Here is the link to the submission <http://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/418-division-street/2044/>

[418 Division Street - Planning - DPCED - City of Madison ...](#)

www.cityofmadison.com

[City of Madison DPCED Planning. Katherine Cornwell, Director. DPCED Menu](#)

See you Thursday-

Marsha

Urban Design Commission
Meeting of July 27, 2016
Agenda item #11, Legistar #43725

MGO 33.24(2) provides, in part, that a purpose of the ordinance is to "encourage the ... proper use of properties."

Is TSS zoning a proper use of 418 Division Street/2096 Helena Street?

As the map on the next page reflects (part of the City's Zoning Map), surrounding properties are primarily comprised of TR-C3 (single family detached) and TR-V2. The nearby TSS all fronts on Atwood with entrances on Atwood, or through the parking lot further west.

Further, the Comprehensive Plan, Note 1 states with respect to this TE area:

"This is currently the site of a long-established ice cream production facility located within a predominantly residential neighborhood. If this site is redeveloped at some future time, a mix of residential development and neighborhood-serving commercial or employment uses is recommended rather than redevelopment with a new industrial use. The existing grocery adjacent to the ice cream plant is a significant amenity to the surrounding residential area, and a neighborhood grocery should be retained as part of any future redevelopment. Buildings should be generally compatible in scale with existing residential and commercial buildings in the area."

The proposed building is not compatible in scale. Other than the surrounding Schoep's buildings at one to two stories, the surrounding properties are primarily one and two story single family homes.

In a relatively recent (2014) infill at Tennyson Lane, that project had appropriate open space. In contrast, the use of TSS zoning for this proposed project allows for the most intensive use possible.

- 77.5 dwelling units per acre;
- Usable open space of 40 square feet per unit (in contrast NMX would require 160 square feet for a one-bedroom unit);
- Lot area of 500 square feet per unit (NMX would use TR-V2 standards); and,
- Maximum lot coverage of 85% (NMX maximum is 75%).

There is not any interaction with the public bike path -- other than re-grading the area to make it more flat. The sidewalk to entrances along the bike path is on the property line.

At the recent Marquette Neighborhood Association Board meeting, the Board voted unanimously against TSS zoning.

I hope the UDC, when it reviews this proposed project, will consider whether TSS zoning is appropriate and whether the building should have more interaction with the public right-of-way and more open space for residential uses.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Lehnertz



TE: Traditional Employment

NMX: Neighborhood Mixed Use (grocery store)

TSS: Traditional Shopping Street

TR-C3: Traditional Residential - Consistent District 3 (only single family detached dwellings)

TR-V2: Traditional Residential - Varied District 2

Wells, Chris

From: Hyndla Kensdottir [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2016 10:11 PM
To: Wells, Chris; Parks, Timothy
Subject: 418 Division redevelopment

To: Chris Wells, Tim Parks, Madison Plan Commission

From: Pam Skaar, [REDACTED] Helena Street, Madison

Subject: 418 Division Street Redevelopment

Date: July 24, 2016

During the seven years I worked as an environmental consultant for The Evergreen Group and Eagle Environmental, I designed stormwater control systems for several industrial clients in KY, OH, and IN.

It's my understanding that the building plans for the proposed apartment building will raise the grade of the current lot about five feet from the north side apartments to the bike trail. That elevation in grade is likely to cause flooding in the lower yards on the same side of Helena. My house is probably the lowest.

To alleviate this problem, I suggest that a rain garden be installed between the building and the bike path in a manner similar to the development on First Street. This approach would also interface well with the bike trail and beautify the neighborhood entry on Division Street.

Wells, Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2016 9:07 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Fwd: Krupp Towers on Division st.

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

From: keithkobs <[REDACTED]>
To: district6 <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Thu, Jun 30, 2016 7:38 am
Subject: Krupp Towers on Division st.

Hi Marsha,

I want to thank you for setting up the meeting for Krupp's newest project, it is vital that we have people like you who keep us informed of the changes in our neighborhood. You are doing a Great job. I do have some real concerns about this project at Division st. I feel like a lot of people have concerns about this project and many people I talked to this week who couldn't make the meeting last night have major concerns. I wonder if those concerns were really heard by the developer and or if he plans to make changes to his proposal based on those concerns. What I am hearing from neighbors and what I took away from last nite are these;

1. Too many apartments for the amount of parking spaces provided
2. Concerns about the way the development interacts with the neighborhood.
3. How the project will utilize public right of way

After the meeting last night, I walked the property and really have a major concern with the way they want to in-fill from the bike path towards the building, this area is public property, I don't think this area was thought through very well on the plans shown and I really think those plans need to be revisited to make the neighborhood happy with this proposal. With that in mind I want to get much more involved and would like to work with who ever I can to make sure this gets done in a decent way. Can you inform me of who I can meet with or how we can further discussions on this development? Please let me know, and again thank you for your good work.

Keith K, Kobs

Wells, Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 1:46 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Cc: Wells, Chris
Subject: 418 division st.

Chris, Tim,

The plans that krupp has put forward for this property require many changes to make it satisfactory for the neighborhood here are some of the issues I have and have talked to other neighbors about.

1.) 29 parking spaces for 31 apartments is too few. 4 of the apartments are 2bd units which may have potentially 4 cars per unit=16 plus 27 one bd and eff. equals more like 43 spaces required. Needs either more spaces or fewer apt.s. And Madison SHOULD have and ordinance that forces a 1 to1 ratio of cars to apartments, that only makes sense in a city who has a history of parking issues.

2.) The plan for raising the back side of the property or the bike path side to level with the path has all kinds of problems with it. First by raising the back of the building by 5 to 6ft this essentially becomes a four story building, which we do not want and is not appropriate for this location. Secondly by raising the back and filling in an area 100ft. by 25ft wide (approx) of the city owned property he will be changeing the way water is distributed down the narrow bike path corridor leading I fear to flooding in my and my neighbors yards.Third every other property along the full length of the path including Schoep's sits below the bike path level at street level, It would look odd or out of place sitting up above all other properties.

3.) Many of the neighbors had issues with the look of the building, I'm not so much, but I would like to see a rain garden built between the bike path and this building. This is the main corner representing our neighborhood we have a nice stone seat put down at this corner and whatever is done with this property must above all represent our community, right now the plans I have seen do not accomplish that.