

COMMENT SUMMARY

November 8, 2010

Alder- and RNA-Sponsored Neighborhood Meeting

Mullins Group's Proposed Redevelopment of the 2500 Block of University Avenue

HEIGHT AND MASS

General Comments

- I like the varied levels. (113 Elm Street)
- Not too bad, although the six-story block will really loom over Kendall during winter! (13 Farley Avenue)
- Not great, but ok. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Reasonable for surrounding commercial area. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- This is an appropriately-sized building for this site. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Too massive – not the same architecture as other building – height and mass does not fit the neighborhood. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Better. I think it's appropriate for the location. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Too tall. Five years ago it was agreed no building over four stories on this area south of University Avenue. Respect this and lower the building. Way out of scale to residential neighborhood. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- It feels too big and too tall for the neighborhood. There's no doubt it will change the neighborhood from a small "Midwestern town" of single-family homes to an urban scene. That's a huge change! (2501 Kendall Avenue)
- Still appears a bit blocky but is an improvement over earlier. Vandewalle representative said the public space will be "tight," and it appears it should be expanded by 2-3 feet to make it more useable. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- I like the bulk of the development being immediately adjacent to Campus Drive and set back from University. This provides an excellent buffer between Campus and University. (234 Lathrop Street)
- Think the height and mass will work well given the surrounding buildings, such as VA and InnTowner. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Clearly an improvement over the original 14 stories – or later 11-story – projects. Height especially much better now. Whole project still seems ridiculously large. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Like the gradual step up in height. Difficult to tell (for me) if it will be sufficient for those in close proximity on Kendall, etc. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Like breakup of building into units. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Six stories OK because setback from University Avenue needs step down at Highland Avenue. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I am supportive of the project as proposed. The height and mass fit into this block as it is located against Campus Drive and the lower portion on the sidewalk side is sensitive to pedestrians. I like how the building is broken up into several sections and is not just a rectangular building. It provides a lot of interest and is exactly what urban infill should look like. (18 N. Roby Road)
- Reasonable height and mass. One story lower would be better. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- There is too much mass near University Avenue. It will feel like a tunnel and block out much light. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)

General Comments (cont.)

- The occupancy level is too high for this location, owing to the traffic congestion of the surrounding streets. University Avenue between Highland and Grand is already crowded and complicated, and there is no parking to speak of on this street. The bulk of traffic for this site will use one entry/exit – on Highland Avenue – forcing more traffic onto this street and into an intersection (Regent-Highland) poorly equipped to accommodate it. Reduce the height by one story on the north and thereby reduce occupancy to a level that can be supported by the existing street infrastructure. (2522 Chamberlain Avenue)
 - Bigger than I would like, but better than a 14-story tower and reasonable for the site. One or two stories shorter would be better (closer to InnTowner height). (110 N. Spooner Street)
 - Overall, a good improvement from earlier attempt, however overall mass and height still too big. One story needs to be removed and west end needs stepback and should be no taller than three stories. This is ultra-high density at 120/acre and vastly exceeds density of comprehensive plan. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
 - The development on the whole is too massive and too tall for this residential neighborhood. The dwelling units per acre far exceed what is considered high density – again, this a residential neighborhood. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
 - The overall height and mass are too large and not compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood. The 75-foot high, six-story section is the same height above the sidewalk as a seven-story building with 10' floor-to-floor heights. (10' residential floor heights were as specified as the standard for comparison in the RNA's 2007 PDI draft Design Guidelines for Old University Avenue).¹

The five- and six-story heights should each be reduced by at least a story to four and five stories respectively. Reducing these heights by one story will reduce the number of dwelling units from 130 to 106 units. This would leave the project with 98 units per acre (plus 8600 ft² of commercial), a density which is still far above the maximum recommended density of 60 units per acre specified in the City's Comprehensive Plan for the Community Mixed Use (CMU) district² that the Mullins site is in. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- ¹ "It is assumed that residential uses require 10' floor heights and commercial and institutional uses require 15' floor heights." Page 7 - http://www.regentneighborhood.org/docs/corridor/PDI_FinalDraft_101807.pdf
- ² "Net residential densities within a Community Mixed-Use district generally should not exceed 60 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." http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/comp/dplan/v2/chapter2/v2c2_1.pdf
<http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/comp/dplan/v2/chapter2/v2c2.pdf> page 2-88
- In my opinion, a four-story building would much better fit this site, but it is really the mass of the project that is overwhelming. To cram such a large development on this little, awkward wedge of dirt seems a little, well, abusive. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

Height & Mass on University Ave (South facing façade)

- Much improved since two meetings ago; was a slab façade, patios/entrances/setbacks are a big improvement. (13 Farley Avenue)
- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- OK, appropriate step-down and appropriate massing. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Three stories is fine. We already have a three-story building across the street. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Too tall. Blocks light and air! Neighbors don't like it, I don't like it. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Need to have more open space for light and blue sky views. Break up the outline to allow views of the sky without getting a sore neck. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Well architected and designed to be approachable. (234 Lathrop Street)
- Think the height and mass will work well given the surrounding buildings, such as VA and InnTowner. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Townhouses, three stories high, seem reasonable. However, I don't like the way they come right up to the sidewalk. The few little 20-ft. setbacks are some alleviation but hardly enough. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Improved. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Fine. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I like the lower height here and the ins and outs of the face along University Avenue, especially the potential outdoor seating areas. (18 N. Roby Road)
- Smaller scale on University Avenue, transitioning to higher buildings in back, is good. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Needs stepback and setback. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Needs stepback in general and better setback for residential units. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The five-story west end is too massive. Squeezed between Campus Drive and the sidewalk, this large block should be softened with more setback and by reducing the height to either three stories or four stories with a 10' stepback above the second floor. A 10' stepback would be consistent with the 2007 PDI draft Design Guidelines for Old University Avenue.³ The 170' long townhome/flat section is too large to be so close to the sidewalk. (There's only 1' setback from sidewalk for 2nd and 3rd floors. It's hard to tell from the drawings but something (balconies?) seems to hang over the sidewalk). Because of the large floor-to-floor spacing, the 38' foot high roof edge on University Avenue is nearly as high as the four-story roof edges of the InnTowner (which are significantly set back from the sidewalk). This long residential section, combined with the five-story west section, looms over the sidewalk and creates a wall that cuts off too much sky. The 2007 PDI draft Design Guidelines discourage buildings with more than 120 lineal feet of building edge along the street frontage.⁴ The townhome face, including the 2nd and 3rd floors, should be set back 10' from the sidewalk to open up the space and allow more sky to be part of the corridor.⁵ Moving the building back a bit from the sidewalk would provide sufficient space for mature terrace trees and obviate the need for severe, lopsided pruning. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)

³ "Minimum University Avenue and Highland Street upper-level stepback: 10' at the top of second or third story"
See page 13 - http://www.regentneighborhood.org/docs/corridor/PDI_FinalDraft_101807.pdf

⁴ "In order to manage and control building massing, buildings with more than continuous 120 feet of linear building edge along the street frontage are discouraged." See page 7 - http://www.regentneighborhood.org/docs/corridor/PDI_FinalDraft_101807.pdf

⁵ Recent mixed-use residential developments in other neighborhoods were built with significant setbacks from the sidewalk.

- Depot Apartments at 2 S. Bedford has 9 feet of setback (and stoops!) for residential buildings #2 and #3.

- Sequoya Commons has 9' to 12' setbacks

- The three-story townhouses facing University Avenue are about the right height for this little plot. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

Height & Mass on Highland Ave (East facing façade)

- Pretty high and rather monolithic, but it just leads to underpass and on to hospital complex; “no harm, no foul.” (13 Farley Avenue)
- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- OK. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Fine. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Too tall. “Enjoyable” area to sit on busy Highland Avenue? Dream on. Not enough setbacks, skimpy “outdoor” seating areas will not be comfortable for people to use. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- The façade facing Lombardino’s still looks disproportionately massive. (2318 Rowley Avenue)
- I appreciate the outdoor dining and spacing from Lombardino’s. (234 Lathrop Street)
- Think the height and mass will work well given the surrounding buildings, such as VA and InnTowner. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- I like the idea of retail here, would be nice to have a café again. Unfortunately, there are no guarantees – witness the empty offices at Old University Place! (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Improved. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Prefer four to five stories. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Too much, too close to sidewalk. “Towers” over the walk. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I think this height and mass is fine as it is on a commercial street and adjacent to Campus Drive. It really has no negative impact on the residential area that I can see... good place for height. I like how the west and east façades have the matching architectural features at the rooftop. (18 N. Roby Road)
- The west façade includes a fifth floor patio, which is functional and does not appear to project above the building, since the six-story section is behind it. On the east façade, an architectural feature was included on the NE corner to match/balance the westside fifth floor patio. This eastside feature serves no useful purpose and projects visibly above the rest of the building, accentuating the height of the building. The eastside feature should be removed from the plan. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Upper trellis needs to be removed (on roof; adds unnecessary height). (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- The 75’ high, six-story section is too high (equivalent in height to a seven-story building) and way too massive. It looms over Lombardino’s like a giant. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- This side of the property is going to be a looming presence for car and foot and bicycle traffic. It is too high and way too massive. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

Height & Mass on West facing façade

- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- OK. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Fine, and this is the side facing me. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Too tall. Way too tall in contrast to restaurant. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- West end (corner) on University Avenue too high and blocky. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- I particularly like the urban, cosmopolitan retail space on this corner. (234 Lathrop Street)
- Think the height and mass will work well given the surrounding buildings, such as VA and InnTowner. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- The taller building on west end along University Avenue seems excessive. Why not make the west end also three stories? (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Improved. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Prefer four stories. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I also think this height and mass is appropriate and like how the architecture reads as you enter our neighborhood coming from the west to the east. I like the top green roof and architectural treatment. (18 N. Roby Road)
- See comments about east façade. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Needs to be reduced to three stories along Old University (and needs stepback all along Old University). (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Too tall and too monolithic – some height and stepback variation would help. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The five-story west end is too massive. Squeezed between Campus Drive and the sidewalk, this large block should be softened with more setback and by reducing the height to either three stories or four stories with a 10' stepback above the second floor. A 10' stepback would be consistent with the 2007 PDI draft Design Guidelines for Old University Avenue. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- See above. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

Height & Mass on North end (backing into Campus Drive)

- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Very appropriate. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Fine. Campus Drive is already elevated, and there are only tall buildings pretty far away facing this building. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Seventy feet is way, way, way too tall. Creates corridor feeling. Too commercial, not residential feel. Forty-five feet maximum. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- One floor lower would be better for the neighborhood and look less massive. (2318 Rowley Avenue)
- Very blocky from Campus Drive, but will the VA patients mind? I don't know. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Effective buffer; interesting views to traffic. (234 Lathrop Street)
- Think the height and mass will work well given the surrounding buildings, such as VA and InnTowner. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- As an inhabitant of an apartment building which borders Campus Drive (with setback from a parking lot), I question whether people will want to live that close to Campus Drive traffic. If they also have access to the inner courtyard, it will help. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Where it clearly ought to be. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Prefer five to six stories. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (14 N. Allen Street)
- This height and mass is appropriate as well... this whole section of building along Campus Drive will be a nice barrier to Campus Drive... I like the idea it will block sound. (18 N. Roby Road)
- See general comments. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- One story needs to be removed. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Should be at least one story shorter. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The height should be reduced to five stories in order to reduce the mass on the southern, neighborhood side of the building. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- Here is what I don't understand. Will medical residents, etc. really live in a "high end" apartment overlooking Campus Drive? It will be like living on a highway. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

SETBACKS AND STEPBACKS

- Seems fine for rental property. (113 Elm Street)
- Good! Big improvement! (13 Farley Avenue)
- Much better than original proposal(s). (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- I would like even bigger setbacks. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Beautifully crafted. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Reasonable and appropriate for neighborhood's commercial district. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- No strong opinion, but it seems there will be a good pedestrian environment and a variety of setbacks, which is good. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Not enough – but if you are so greedy, so be it. At least hold back on the cement as much as possible. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Good. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Mullins 11' compromise is a joke! Stronger – deeper setbacks needed to offset corridor feel. Entire building is too blocky. Architecturally uninteresting. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Eleven feet is a bit too tight. The 13' at Regent Co-op is the minimum required to have a functional pedestrian space and still have adequate access to bike parking. Bike parking must not be squashed right up against the building. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- In keeping with existing setbacks. (234 Lathrop Street)
- They look great. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Need more setback along University Avenue. Look at the ones in front of Hilldale condos along Midvale! Rather pathetic. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Like the variety. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Better. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Imaginative and creative. Good job, E-U! (14 N. Allen Street)
- I think the architect has done a good job of varying the building so that it looks interesting with setbacks and stepbacks. (18 N. Roby Road)
- The tree-story/six-story arrangement gives a nice stepback effect. The setbacks were presented in a rather confusing way. There is actually little or no setback from the city sidewalk, but that is common in urban commercial areas. I like the fact that the entrances to the flats along University Avenue are recessed. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Very good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- Not enough on University Avenue. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Need setback for residential lofts along Old University; need stepback all along Old University – this is an extremely long building (N 300 feet) along Old University and needs stepback. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- See earlier comment – both needed along Old University Avenue. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- A minimum setback of 2' from the property line/sidewalk is OK in front of dedicated storefront commercial space. Dining and lingering areas need significantly more space, however. The residential section of the development (flats/townhomes along University Avenue) should be setback from the sidewalk 10' for all floors. No part of the structure (i.e., balconies) should be allowed to overhang the sidewalk. Recent mixed-use residential developments in other neighborhoods were built with significant setbacks from the sidewalk. Depot Apartments at 2 S. Bedford has 9 feet of setback (and stoops!) for residential buildings #2 and #3. Sequoia Commons has 9' to 12' setbacks. A minimum stepback of 10' should be required above the 2nd or 3rd floor for

any parts of the building along University Avenue that aren't already setback 10' from the sidewalk. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)

- What setback? If only there were some! I don't mind retail being against the sidewalk, but this "retail" will not be retail at all, but instead will be someone's living room we'll be walking by. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

ARCHITECTURE AND BUILDING MATERIALS

- Looks good. No objections. (113 Elm Street)
- Less metal, more brick on façade. (1908 Arlington Place)
- Like the brick and aesthetics thereof. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- The white portions of the six-story building look ugly to me, but it's hard to tell on the photos. I am glad to have a modern building in our neighborhood. I am in favor of using metals and modern materials. I think this is in keeping with a neighborhood that embraced Frank Lloyd Wright when his buildings were "radical." (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Beautiful – modern but not quickly outdated. The town seems to appreciate the Frank Lloyd Wright, pseudo-Prairie look – not too shiny, not too dull. Either way, a revitalization to the neighborhood is mandatory. Any attempt to blend (more brick and pre-cast panels, more windows), the better. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Contemporary and will mix in well with some of the larger buildings on the north side of University Avenue. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Not sure yet. Hard to know without seeing materials. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Hope it isn't as unbelievably awful as the new Josie's – that is so out of place. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Good. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Have been non-specific. "Durable, high quality materials" is another term for ugly, blocky brown brick. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- I support modern-looking, quality materials and think that a 1930s look would be stodgy and out of character with a dynamic neighborhood area. However, I think that the colors of the materials – red and white – will help link the modern look with the older neighborhood. I am concerned with the description of the red material being a "look alike," and hope that it doesn't look cheesy or won't hold up. (2318 Rowley Avenue)
- A bit too much white. Is the large mass of white strategic to reflect summer heat? It should be limited in placement to places where it serves that function. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- The varied external materials add visual interest. (234 Lathrop Street)
- I am impressed with the high-end materials. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- I haven't studied this enough to give an educated opinion. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- The architecture looks good. Materials selection (palette) should be made available with sufficient time for review. Materials should be durable as well as short-term aesthetic. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Need to see these. Prefer traditional brick. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- White brick sounds too slick. Reddish brick should be sand-pressed to provide texture. Oversized brick OK. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I like the architecture being more modern. This block has no significant architectural characteristics and this is not the historic portion of our neighborhood. I like the more contemporary feel and from what I can tell, the building materials are good quality. I expect UDC will do a good job weighing in on materials. (18 N. Roby Road)
- The buildings look fairly attractive in the renderings. Let's hope they really turn out that way. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- A single exterior siding (such as brick) on public facing exterior walls would greatly improve the look and aesthetics. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)

- Precast concrete and architectural panels are not a good idea and will look shabby. This is a 1920s neighborhood and should reflect that character. The brick is much better. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Although the brick is nice, the precast concrete and architectural panels seem cheap – need to see what they look like. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The main building architecture conveys a sense of just another massive post-industrial, high density housing development (think Cabrini) with some doo-dads added for interest. The use of precast concrete panels and metal panels suggest that the developer doesn't want to spend any more on the exterior than is absolutely necessary. I'm afraid the building will look cheap on the day it opens, much less over time. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The architecture is nice! I don't remember a discussion about materials. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

COMPATIBILITY WITH SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

- Will look much better than many surrounding properties. (113 Elm Street)
- Not great, but ok. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- Good. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Any opportunity for future collaboration with City to get market – fresh or farmer’s – to use as a draw for pedestrian traffic, or continuation or tie to bike path through that lane (Kendall)? (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Reasonable addition to the commercial and rental properties in the area. Will be improvement to current blighted buildings on site. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Fine. University Avenue is a commercial area. This is not a historical corner, unless you count Lombardino’s. There are already modern buildings across the street(s). (2613 Stevens Street)
- Doesn’t fit. No walking and strolling – speeding cars trying to get somewhere. Sirens, ambulances going on Highland, trains and lots of traffic and buses every 20 minutes. (Hardly a place to hang out and chat.) (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- It shouldn’t look the same as a historic building, and it doesn’t. It should look contemporary and blend with the neighborhood. I think Vandewalle is a great firm. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- What about this design fits in? NOTHING, not one thing. Even the ugly brick color is not present. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Better than was months ago, I appreciate the attempt to improve this by lowering south façade, but the mass on the west and north is still not adequately in scale with nearby homes. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- I mostly appreciate the buffer from Campus Drive and the retail space on the University Avenue side. (234 Lathrop Street)
- I think this site will transform the neighborhood. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- It’s obvious that this will not be particularly compatible with the nice, quirky little businesses and buildings now along University Avenue. I agree with one attendee’s comment: “A building that big is going to change our neighborhood.” (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Making the architecture fit with the community style will be important to this project’s long-term sustainability and success. (115 Chestnut Street)
- OK. (14 N. Allen Street)
- This block is a good bookend to the Energy Institute Building on the east end, and I also think compatible with a commercial street and block that is adjacent to Campus Drive. Height on this side of University Avenue can work given distance from residences and it not being adjacent to homes. (18 N. Roby Road)
- The project is compatible with its surroundings, which include Campus Drive, two busy streets, a commercial area and the InnTowner. Nearby single-family homes are buffered somewhat by the commercial strip along University Avenue. The project doesn’t have to match the neighborhood exactly in style; a mix of architectural styles can be interesting and enlivening. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- Need to remove one story for residents of 2500 block of Kendall Avenue. These people deserve better. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Too massive for the neighborhood (especially 2500 block of Kendall). (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)

- The architecture is incompatible with the look of the adjacent neighborhood, which dates from the late teens and twenties. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- There isn't much. Old University is already overrun with ugly, old apartment buildings, but most of them are much smaller in scale, and many are set back off the street. The neighborhood also hopes that redevelopment will be better, not more of the same! (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

COMMERCIAL/RETAIL SPACE

- Hopefully will include food & beverage places to encourage neighborhood gathering rather than office spaces. (113 Elm Street)
- I have concerns about these spaces being too expensive for the kinds of businesses that used to be there; may lead to “commercial gentrification” (ala Hilldale Mall). (13 Farley Avenue)
- Good. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- Well developed, and I like the use of open space. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Commercial/Retail Space/Residential. Other developments have suffered vacancy due to such an effort to restrict students; this is accomplished by owner-only properties. What instead will be done to keep it professional residence site while increasing odds of occupancy? (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Retaining four commercial spaces is a reasonable amount for the mixed use. I would hope that the ground floor flats could be zoned for professional office space. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- I would like to see more commercial space. This is a very busy corner, especially for walking, biking and transit. Perfect for commercial space. Because of the 24-hour nature of the hospitals, as well as many students, work-at-home and flex-schedule neighbors, we need a breakfast space! All current restaurants in the area are jammed at lunch. People getting off work in early AM also need a place to eat. Also, InnTowner guests would appreciate a breakfast spot. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Great. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Is insignificant/has no parking, not enough to be worthwhile. I would not sit next to Lombardino’s parking lot to have an outdoor experience. This poor planning and layout clearly shows a lack of design skill and use awareness. Sitting in parking lot fumes and headlights will not make this a successful outdoor seating experience for our neighborhood. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- This could be a great feature – IF the area were served by fast, light rail. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Nice complement to businesses across the street; not overpowering like a strip mall. (234 Lathrop Street)
- I think the patios will add a huge, vibrant atmosphere in the warm weather. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- This is very welcome! If it actually gets filled, however, and if tenants are such that they promote walk-in business and social interaction. In other words, who wants an insurance company? But will a café or other small restaurant be able to afford the rent? (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Looks like it’s well distributed. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Efforts should continue to identify businesses that encourage neighborhood use. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- The more, the merrier. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I like how they found a way to add commercial and the locations they placed them in... the outdoor spaces adjacent will be very inviting. (18 N. Roby Road)
- It was a good idea to replace the “flex space” with flats. The four dedicated commercial spaces are enhanced by adjacent areas for outdoor seating. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- I hope the rent will be more than reasonable, especially for a small or start-up business. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Nice to see more commercial space (versus “flex” space, which was simple residential units without setback). (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Good that they got rid of “flex space.” (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)

- Because of the inadequacy of parking, I'm concerned that there will be a problem attracting retail business to the commercial spaces. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The idea of convertible space is odd, and I don't think it will work. Retail won't go in there because there will literally be nowhere to park. It will be living space, but the Mullins Group hopes to get support from offering "retail." (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

SIGNAGE AND LIGHTING

- Seems ok. (113 Elm Street)
- Good. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Any neighborhood lighting study done to measure amount of light visible from the 400+ setbacks from commercial. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Tough to get a true sense. Hope lighting is energy efficient and does not visually pollute into residential neighborhood. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Not much info provided. West end shouldn't be too bright, as that area does face some neighborhood buildings. Keep lighting "pedestrian scale." (2613 Stevens Street)
- Please keep any lighting to a minimum – that would be the large building signs, lighting entrance. My home will have it shine in our windows and sleeping areas – thanks. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Looks good – a lot of thought has gone into the lights. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Why do we need signage and lighting in our quiet neighborhood that's lit all the time? We don't want or need this project, period. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Keep these dim, turn them very low from 10:30 p.m. to sunrise. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Considered and pleasant, especially with courtyard space. (234 Lathrop Street)
- Looks great. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Since our bedroom looks out on Campus Drive with its excessive streetlighting, I think such a huge project will probably add to light pollution. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Low impact lighting. Compatible signage with neighborhood character. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Specifics of lighting not addressed at meeting. Subdued lighting (vs. glare) preferred. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- Nice, New Urbanism. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I expect UDC will handle future signage and lighting will be important for safety and to attract people to block in evenings... they do need to be sensitive to too much light, though, so not so bright it affects residences on blocks to south. (18 N. Roby Road)
- Lighting should be designed to minimize light being directed upward and to prevent unwanted light from shining into residential areas. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Lights should be positioned so that they don't shine into backyards on Kendall Avenue. Should not be too bright. Special concern for the "2500 Apartments" lights. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- Minimal. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Again, subtle lighting is required for residents of 2500 block. The building itself should not be lit at night. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Building should not be brightly lit – unclear what signage they will have/use. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The large 2550 banner sign hanging out over the public sidewalk on the west end of University Avenue face is obnoxious and unnecessary. Private banner signs over public sidewalks should not be allowed anywhere on the project. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- Don't know. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

LANDSCAPE PLAN

- Looks good; room for public as well as residential gathering. (113 Elm Street)
- Good. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- Good. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Any impact of snow, snow removal on site? Seems as though landscape plan will drastically improve that side of the street – seems a lot like the areas in and around Hilldale shops. Timeless, nice! (But I might add, even Hilldale needs a ramp – hope collaboration with DOT is a reality.) Building sheltered nicely by ash – hope effort to save the trees doesn't jeopardize their shape, fullness – if yes, different species (conifers) preferred. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Hope trees are kept and will look forward to street level plantings. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- OK. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Actually, “planters” don't really scream landscape – could be a way to fit in neighborhood by planting various “prairie plots” with the indigenous plants – coneflowers, flax, ornamental grasses and various daisies and irises. (Maybe no grass in some of these plots, but natural plants.) (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Looks good. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Planters for trees is not landscaping. I do not believe the trees will survive, they are large trees. By the way, a 50 – 70 year old maple tree is not a weed tree. Tall destroyed trees can't be replaced. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Install as much grass and as many trees as absolutely possible. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- I think the patio will be great for residents. Outside areas look good. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Save the trees – please! One can only hope the massive construction will make a minimum of difference, but it's hard to imagine that it won't have some effect. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Appears OK – encourage maintenance of University Avenue front flats gardens. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- Nice, New Urbanism. (14 N. Allen Street)
- Landscape plan seems okay. I understand the streetscape will be coordinated with the University Avenue plan? (18 N. Roby Road)
- The proposal includes a central green area, a green roof, gardens in front of University Avenue flats, and outdoor seating areas near the commercial spaces. All of these are welcome features. However, it will be important that these areas be properly maintained. Prior maintenance of the site by this developer has been poor. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Very good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- What landscaping? Those trees in the sidewalk? (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

PARKING & TRAFFIC ISSUES – ON AND OFF-SITE

- Some concern about 8:00 a.m. patterns; people leaving apartments to get to work – lots of people coming in on Highland who work at VA and UW Hospitals. (113 Elm Street)
- Strongly support locating one or more Community Cars on site. Ensure no parking overflow into adjacent neighborhood. (1908 Arlington Place)
- Adequate at best. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Don't expect too much increase, as some residents might be moving to live within walking distance to work to remove commute. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- I approve of residents being required to pay for parking separately. This keeps housing more affordable. Included parking = less affordable. Make parking a separate cost. Don't penalize people who don't own a car! I am also fine with little on-site parking for commercial. On-street parking in area can be used. I live one block away, and you can often park in front of my house. This is an urban area, and people have to expect to walk a little to access the commercial. There is already so much traffic. (2613 Stevens Street)
- Could Traffic find out the cars that park on Kendall – 2400-2600? Like for example, during the day vs. after 5:00 p.m.? Reason being, many students/renters are already parking there and live in Goldleaf and above Korean restaurant. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Two-thirds of parking traffic enters on/exits to Highland – this will have major issues with an already very heavily used street. It will, contrary to the study on the green sheet given out tonight, impact traffic. It will have safety impacts on foot/bicycle traffic going to and from the hospitals and Forest Products. (2326 Chamberlain Avenue)
- Acceptable. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Should be OK. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- I absolutely think your "There is no impact" study is skewed and slanted. There will be more traffic and noise, and it is obvious. Guest traffic – delivery traffic. I tire of your double-talking and vague answers. Way too many "it may be," no firm answers. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Why is there no traffic count for 2700 block Kendall? This is the busiest residential block in the area! All development in the University Avenue corridor needs to be suspended until the RTC/County/City initiate a viable commuter rail transit system in this corridor. Bus service is too slow, being often blocked by traffic jams on Campus Drive and University Avenue. Rail will not be held hostage to creeping masses of cars, so that people can use it to access this site and UW campus. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- It seems that the coming-and-going of cars into/out of this development will serve to slow traffic exiting eastbound from Campus/University Avenue fork in the road. MAXIMIZE PARKING ON 2400 AND 2500 BLOCKS! SLOW DOWN TRAFFIC! (234 Lathrop Street)
- Given that there are residences, I don't think traffic will be an issue. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- This seems to me the biggest problem. At rush hours and when hospital shifts end, traffic in this area is horrendous. Pedestrians and bicyclists have a very hard time, especially at the University/Highland intersection. (I know, because I am both.) This project will add to an already unfortunate parking/traffic situation. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Suggest allowing tenants to sublet their parking. Make the garages secure to allow this option to offset the problem of tenants not paying. (115 Chestnut Street)

- Concern about number of parking spaces – not enough on-site. Concern over how parking will be allotted – tenants should get a space with rent – not extra money. Concern over bike safety on Highland and turning cars. Neighborhood does not need more pressure on off-street parking in surrounding neighborhood. Goldleaf is great example of not repeating a parking mistake. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Still issues – I don't have an answer and live far enough away to defer to closer neighbors. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- I think the model underestimates the impact of traffic from this building. Visitors will end up parking on Kendall and Chamberlain. (2421 Chamberlain Avenue)
- Needs street parking to be enlarged so other businesses can benefit as well. 2400 block should be 1-hour except in "rush hour." (14 N. Allen Street)
- Our neighborhood wants to have commercial, but we also don't want to increase traffic, so it is really a balance for a development. I think that the Community Car is a great idea and the number of parking stalls seems reasonable. We really need to maintain the DOT lot and make those stalls for customers, not monthly parking, and maintain some parking along the street if we want commercial. (18 N. Roby Road)
- I'm glad to know that residential parking permits will not be issued for this site. However, I'm doubtful about the assumptions made by traffic engineers about the traffic impact of the development. Their reductions of estimates based on assumptions about bike, pedestrian and public transportation seem extremely optimistic. Also, there was no real evaluation of the impact on other problematic intersections in the surrounding area – particularly at Highland and Regent during school and business peak hours. I hope that the plan for the University/Highland intersection will take into account the difficulties for people trying to exit Chamberlain and Kendall Avenues onto Highland during peak hours. The parking situation on Highland, with cars able to park fairly close to these intersections, thereby making it difficult or impossible to see traffic from the north without inching into the intersection, makes for dangerous crossings – particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists. It is complicated by the fact that Chamberlain "jogs" at Highland and doesn't go straight through, confusing some motorists. I hope the challenges faced by pedestrians and cyclists at these intersections will be addressed by moving back the yellow No Parking areas on the west side of Highland farther from these intersections – and by creating far more prominent crosswalks on Highland (e.g., the kind with the stripes). A side note: As a daily bike commuter, I've failed to see any benefit to cyclists from the Kendall "bike boulevard," other than increased traffic on Chamberlain Avenue in the morning "drop kids off at West" time, and increased hostility from vehicles, who I've observed "play chicken" with cyclists on several occasions when cyclists occupy a full lane. Last night, heading east on Bluff on my bicycle toward the Kendall "bike boulevard," I observed a moving shouting match between a westbound cyclist and driver, full of dangerous maneuvers on both people's parts and lots of extremely hostile profanity. I wish I could say I thought this change would make it more likely for people in the Mullins project to bike to work, and more likely that drivers will accommodate them, but I remain skeptical. (2522 Chamberlain Avenue)

- The traffic study estimates a maximum of 25 vehicles entering or exiting during peak hours, which seems rather low given that the plan calls for 152 parking stalls and 130 residential units with up to 220 occupants total. The parking garage entrances are on busy streets and additional traffic from the parking garage will undoubtedly add to congestion at peak times. The traffic study mentions that approximately 50 parking spaces currently used by people who work in the area will be lost, and states that this will partially offset traffic caused by residents of the project. However, there is no discussion of where those 50 cars will park instead. It seems likely that they will try to park in the adjacent neighborhood. The developer plans to charge extra for the parking spaces under the building. Although this is presumably intended to encourage walking, biking and bus riding, the effect may be to increase parking pressure in the neighborhood. It would be better to assign a parking stall to each unit and include the cost in the rent. The Highland Avenue-University Avenue intersection presents a number of difficulties for pedestrians, bikers and vehicles. In light of the Mullins project and the additional traffic it will generate, it will be especially important that this intersection be redesigned in a thoughtful way before the reconstruction planned for 2011. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- I think they should have a Community Car. I also think it would be best if they did not allow resident parking area egress heading west, because then I believe residents will head to Grand, take Kendall west to Farley, to get out to University Avenue heading west. Too much traffic on Kendall. (110 Farley Avenue)
- This is my other area of concern: More parking is needed for the retail area. One hundred more parking spaces would be good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- Include parking in rental costs. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Not enough parking for commercial unit. This neighborhood needs more parking enforcement all around this area. Meters should be installed on Old University to promote turnover of spot (and prevent hospital workers from using all day.) (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Concerned about additional traffic volumes on neighboring streets. Concerned about sufficient parking (on- or off-street) on that block to support commercial/retail space. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- Parking is insufficient to support both the apartments and commercial spaces. Most of the 50 spaces that are currently on the project site and occupied during both the day and many evenings will disappear with the project. Parking is already an issue in the neighborhood. Additional pressure from the loss of the 50 spaces and any new commercial use can only flow south into the neighborhood because of Campus Drive. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- Traffic is going to be a nightmare in this area one day if the City doesn't take steps to head it off. Anyone can see that – regardless of that traffic “study.” I hope the City will be proactive here. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

TREE PRESERVATION PLAN

- Certainly looked at carefully. (113 Elm Street)
- Good. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- OK. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Hope trees will be maintained as much as possible and cutting to a minimum. Appreciate the involvement of City Forester. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Good. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Massive construction over old tree roots won't help the tree – neither will trimming. Old trees can't be replaced successfully. I'd rather see the trees as it is now and have the light and air. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Developer should plant a sufficient number of trees in Madison to offset CO₂ from energy use. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- No problem. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Good, hope it works... Also, make good on the promise to replant trees that die. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Pleased with co-operation with City Forester – pleased that over course of development, Mullins responded to concerns about trees. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- Good. (14 N. Allen Street)
- Seems reasonable. Given the fact that many trees are ash, I don't have a problem if some get removed and replaced with trees that will not be affected by the ash borer in the future. This will allow those new trees more time to grow and match other trees in area rather than waiting until existing trees die. (18 N. Roby Road)
- Some trees may be lost, either to construction or to emerald ash borer. It is important that these be replaced with high quality trees which will grow up to partially screen the building from the street, instead of the small fruit trees which have been used recently in some areas. (110 N. Spooner Street)
- Good. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- Trees need to be preserved along Campus Drive. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- The relatively small distance between the front of the building and the terrace along University Avenue (inadequate setback) may not provide sufficient room for mature trees with severe, lopsided pruning. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- ☺ (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Not clear (at least to me) whether site will have net effect of ↑ or ↓ existing Highland/University water problem. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- Very good. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Appropriate. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- It appears that approximately one-third of the roof space is designated as a green roof. Why not increase the percentage of roof designated as a green roof? (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Can't do much about this. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Has not been successfully addressed. It's an area that floods easily – a park would be better – less flooding. Right now, Lulu's has water/ice problems at their front door. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- The green roof is a good start but seems far too limited and sounds like commitment to install it is a bit tenuous. It should be expanded to cover most of the roof area. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Don't know enough about it to comment, but the area is certainly prone to flooding, so it needs to be an effective plan. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Make sure that conditions of use include ensuring that whatever happens, things are not worse after development. If they are measurably worse, the developer must correct. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Big concerns. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Assume that "better than required" will be sufficient. I don't know requirements. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- Good. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I am not an expert in this and assume City staff will make sure it is appropriate. (18 N. Roby Road)
- Good, but consider permeable materials for walkways and driveways. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- Is there one? University Avenue already floods easily. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

GENERAL COMMENTS

- This is an excellent proposal. Balanced and interesting architecture that adds appropriate density and function to an important site for our neighborhood. (No address provided)
- We live b/w Kendall & Chamberlain, often walk area, eat at Lombardino's. Would walk in those blocks more once it looks nicer and functions for those businesses. (113 Elm Street)
- The sustainability program sounds a little thin, even approaching "greenwashing": Energy Star appliances are good, but the real issue is HVAC design, insulation valves, etc. I would like to get a meeting with architects about this! (13 Farley Avenue)
- Noise – encourage taking of noise measurements prior to and after construction. Goal should be no noise increase from mechanicals. Use WEI process as example. (From Laura – the "noise police"!) (1908 Arlington Place)
- PRO: I've lived in the neighborhood since 1978. This neighborhood will need to adjust to higher density housing whether we like it or not, given our geographical location. In my opinion, this is a B+ quality project, all things considered.
CON: My big concern is whether this project will quickly default to student housing (given economic conditions), regardless of the intent of Mullins. Stranger things have happened. (2750 Kendall Avenue)
- I like that you are bringing a modern building into the neighborhood. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- I think three ground floor flats should be zoned to allow for professional office/home space. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- HVAC NOISE HUMMING WILL BE A MAJOR PROBLEM FOR ME. LOSING MY LIGHT SKY IS ONE THING, BUT I REALLY DON'T WANT BRIGHT LIGHTS SHINING IN MY BACKYARD 24-7. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- The developer has made appropriate adjustments to earlier design criticisms. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- Coming from downtown, I think this development is appropriate for this neighborhood. I know change is painful for those who live closest to the development. However, infill in blighted lots is very important. (2702 Kendall Avenue)
- Project is not a good fit. Concerns not addressed to date. Shame, shame, shame on Mullins for this ugly building. So similar to the ugly building at Park and Regent. You cannot even get snow plowed per your contractual obligations with Lulu's – they had to get the City to make you plow – Mullins Group. What makes you think we should trust anything you say? (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Energy use – solar hot water – don't just try to install it, commit to doing it. This will make this project a model for the entire University Avenue corridor and the city as a whole. Provide light tubes into each residential and commercial unit. This will greatly reduce electrical use for lighting and thereby reduce pollutants from electricity generation. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Mullins as the developers is an important advantage. They are Madisonians and have a well-earned reputation for high quality, completed, thoughtful projects in Madison. This is a well-regarded but under-analyzed fact, especially in light of recent project debacles like the "Hotel Red" and my property at 234 Lathrop, also a stalled development before I bought it in August 2008. (234 Lathrop Street)

- This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to redevelop an otherwise underutilized site. It will add high-end apartments in close proximity to many jobs. (2320 Rowley Avenue)
- Architectural team, RNA representatives, City and resident input has resulted in a refined, attractive and beneficial project. (1903 Rowley Avenue)
- We need to do something with this block. There is sufficient shared interest to come to agreement. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Are you doing any demo recycling? If so, what are the standards? (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- HVAC noise should be controlled and specifications written into forma document. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- You should disallow pets. We don't need another 200 dogs walking in the neighborhood. (2421 Chamberlain Avenue)
- Very creative re-use of a difficult site. (14 N. Allen Street)
- I think it is time to move this project forward. The existing site needs to be redeveloped. This is a transit-oriented development area and deserves some density. If we want commuter rail in the future, this is a perfect location for some added population. The project has changed substantially since the first one proposed years ago. This proposed project seems to be a good one and constructing it at the same time as University Avenue is being redone makes sense to minimize disruption over a longer period of time. (18 N. Roby Road)
- Due to being out of town or having medical issues, I have been to too few meetings to fully understand final plans, so cannot comment on general issues. (110 Farley Avenue)
- Rooftop deck must have limited hours of use. This could be very noisy. Management plan should also require landscape management, including the residential along Old University. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- See all comments above. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- I hate to be so critical, but my overall impression is that the building will be a detriment to the neighborhood. Other neighborhoods have been the beneficiaries of high quality, mixed-use developments that fit in and were compatible with the neighborhood. Why not here? (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- The argument by the Mullins Group that they need do this now or the project will need to be larger rings as a not-so-subtle threat to the neighborhood. What I most dislike is that after all these years of these properties sitting empty and being an eyesore, this plan has to be done the year before the community will finish a plan for the corridor. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

OVERALL DO YOU SUPPORT THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED TODAY?

Yes

- No address provided
- 14 N. Allen Street
- 1908 Arlington Place
- 115 Chestnut Street
- 2201 Commonwealth Avenue
- 2215 Commonwealth Avenue
- 113 Elm Street
- 13 Farley Avenue
- 1715 Hoyt Street
- 2542 Kendall Avenue
- 2702 Kendall Avenue
- 2750 Kendall Avenue
- 234 Lathrop Street
- 24 N. Prospect Avenue
- 18 N. Roby Road
- 1903 Rowley Avenue
- 2318 Rowley Avenue
- 2320 Rowley Avenue
- 110 N. Spooner Street
- 126 N. Spooner Street (person 1)
- 126 N. Spooner Street (person 2)
- 2613 Stevens Street

No

- 2326 Chamberlain Avenue
- 2530 Chamberlain Avenue
- 2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1
- 2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2
- 2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1
- 2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2
- 2714 Kendall Avenue
- 2721 Kendall Avenue
- 2020 University Avenue, #317

Not yet

- 2510 Kendall Avenue

Please elaborate either way:

- I think it will enhance the neighborhood. What's there now detracts from neighborhood. (113 Elm Street)
- Somewhat reluctant support: "It could be much worse," and it was improved greatly. (13 Farley Avenue)
- A very good use of the space. I look forward to having the new commercial in the neighborhood. Plus having rental housing would be great. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 1)
- Aesthetic improvement to that lane is badly needed. The opportunity to attract new occupancy and business will improve the current darkness. See my comments on architecture in particular. (126 N. Spooner Street, person 2)
- Look forward to improvements to a blighted area. (1715 Hoyt Street)
- Entering and exiting onto Highland so close to the overpass is dangerous. To have two-thirds enter/exit on Highland is a deal breaker. (2326 Chamberlain Avenue)
- It looks like the project will be an asset to the neighborhood. (2201 Commonwealth Avenue)
- It's student housing, regardless of what you say – 97% will be rented to students. It's obvious what you are trying to get away with. (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- One floor less at the north end would be better. (2318 Rowley Avenue)
- There are no assurances that generated traffic will avoid using Kendall and other residential streets to access Hilldale and Whole Foods. Rail service is not developed yet and must be before generating more traffic in the Campus Drive/University Avenue corridor. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- We are fortunate for a well-planned development on a difficult site. The professionals this project will attract as resident tenants will add to our neighborhood. (234 Lathrop Street)
- I wish it were smaller. I wish we could have the quirky little shops like we used to have. I am glad the project has been reduced from its original plan at least. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Much improved over course of development. All development will be a compromise and everyone's desires cannot be met. I think a reasonable attempt has been made. (24 N. Prospect Avenue)
- Increase thermal envelope to R-56 roof and R-23 sidewalks. (14 N. Allen Street)
- This project has been sufficiently vetted. **The Near Westside's critical need to rehabilitate this blighted part of our neighborhood must be the primary consideration.** I believe that the property owner has made reasonable accommodation to the concerns of the adjacent property owners, and the time is now overdue to proceed. I believe the current proposal is reasonable, and that this projected needs to be approved. (2215 Commonwealth Avenue)
- The developers have made substantial modifications to their original plan in response to the demands of a difficult site, City requirements and neighborhood concerns. They have incorporated a number of nice features to mitigate the mass of the building and retain a pedestrian-friendly area around the perimeter of the site. Although I have expressed a few concerns above, on balance I support the project and think it has the potential to have a positive impact on the neighborhood. (110 N. Spooner Street)

- Contingent upon finding at least 50 more parking spaces for retail stores. (2542 Kendall Avenue)
- I'd like to see less mass and a single siding material (no metal or rough painted siding.) (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Although a good start, definitely needs some reduction in mass and size. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- It's just too tall and large for this residential area. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- I hope the City will have a vision for this area that is more to scale, more approachable, and less overwhelming. I hope there will be real leadership in the face of an influential developer or a highly visible property. (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

If no, what change(s) would be necessary in order to gain your support?

- A serious aggressive energy efficiency design! (13 Farley Avenue)
- Really concerned about how the parking, crime and noise will affect us in the next few years. (2510 Kendall Avenue)
- Traffic management – this should be changed to avoid impact on Highland Avenue. Where do tenants’ visitors park? (2326 Chamberlain Avenue)
- Scrap this design and start over. IF you must wreck this area, at least try to make the design historically attractive and to fit in. Four stories maximum, no students. No commercial use. No on-street parking problems. A park would be nice. We don’t need the housing in the first place. Too contemporary, 1930s-style a better choice. IF you must build – what do steel or contemporary materials have to do with a turn of the century to 1930s neighborhood? It’s high time the City and Mullins Group begin to LISTEN to the request of the neighborhood and not trying to strong-arm us. This is a building being expensively thrown up that we are going to be stuck with for a long time. I don’t think any of you have the foresight and skills that Jerry did have. Time to drop your egos, arrogance and expand your ideas toward a much better design. The more close-minded you show that you are, the more I will go door to door to find people who appreciate our neighborhood as it is. We were all here first and live here. You do not. My comments are absolutely in context and current to the project. The materials are very similar and the flat architectural features as well – as the project on Park and Regent. The facts remain that the Inn on the Park could have been refurbished far sooner than it was. Affordable accommodations do not have to include threadbare furniture. Say what you like, it’s a fact that Mullins Group didn’t care for a long time. There is nothing exciting about losing our light and airy views to a too tall project when financially four stories would be just fine. Too much is being crammed into a small space. This project could be built in 1930s style – far more classic style with contemporary/transitional exteriors. Tonight I am especially motivated having heard Sue Springman say in passing that “it’s a done deal”! (2714 Kendall Avenue)
- Implementation of rail service for commuters and access to commerce. Traffic congestion is outrageous, and we need to provide a means to focus on moving people, not creeping cars. Rail access will help alleviate concerns over parking on University Avenue. (2721 Kendall Avenue)
- Cut the space used in half, put in more landscaping between buildings and sidewalk. (2020 University Avenue, #317)
- Make sure fit and finish are adequate to ensure quality tenants short- and long-term. (115 Chestnut Street)
- Lose one story on west, north and east. (2533 Kendall Avenue)
- Ultimately, the neighborhood does not benefit in any way from this project. (2421 Chamberlain Avenue)
- Reduce massing next to Highland Avenue. White roofing. Dispersed bike parking for local visitors. (14 N. Allen Street)

- Reduce occupancy by 15-20% and make more off-street parking available for visits to the retail in the development, or it's likely the retail will die a slow, painful death. Doctors don't like to walk, mostly because they don't perceive themselves to have the time to do so. (2522 Chamberlain Avenue)
- See above. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 1)
- Fewer dwelling units; smaller mass/floor area; one or more stories removed everywhere, especially from E/W ends. (2711 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- Less height and slightly less density; better architecture that is compatible with the neighborhood; better quality materials (not precast and metal panels); increase setback and stepbacks on University Avenue/more sky; parking to support storefront commercial without adding to neighborhood parking pressures. (2630 Kendall Avenue, person 2)
- Four floors; setbacks from Old University; benches and landscape; smaller project. And wait until the neighborhood has a plan in place for the corridor before ramming this through! (2520 Chamberlain Avenue)

COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL NOT USING COMMENT FORM

2514 Chamberlain Avenue

I wasn't able to stay around for the public commentary portion...I hope the conversation went well. Good going getting the correct kind of process. How this has played out compared to four years ago is clearly much better, and I agree with those that say the process this time has helped hone a fantastic potential project.

When I heard that Steve from EUA and Sue Springman were on the Mullins team... and Brian Munson as well... I was much more comfortable that the right kind of project proposal would result. It is clear, too, that the Mullins group has listened, adapted and are bringing a quality project to potential, and hoped for, fruition.

I was completely impressed by the current status of the plan and what it brings to our neighborhood. It's a nice balance of mixed-use, articulated setbacks, interesting architecture, materials, land use and quality construction with good green strategic components.

In the nothing's perfect category... I thought the potential live/work loft townhome component originally proposed was a good thing for our neighborhood and the function that that block could bring in diversifying our neighborhood's commercial/consulting/services options. I have seen same in many projects in the Chicago market, and they are almost always successful spaces... I would see that potential here as well. But time and projects move on and get redefined.

In a time hopefully not so distant, I could also easily see the potential to convert the apartments into condos... but as we've seen in many central and near west, near east neighborhoods... high quality professional rental apartments can bring vitality to a block... and a neighborhood. This project would clearly be important progress for our area.

Again, please feel free to share this as my opinion (which is a fairly educated one in projects this size) if you'd like to with anyone.

131 Kendall Avenue

I attended the meeting recently related to the Mullins' 2500 block of University Avenue. After further reflection, I strongly agree with those who commented that the project needs more parking stalls. The presenters stated that they plan to target professional people rather than students. If that means professional couples, they will probably have two cars, not just one per unit, and they do not even

have one parking stall per unit. That just means that on-street parking and traffic by people looking for parking will become increasing difficult on Kendall (the bicycle boulevard), and the parallel streets going up the University Heights hill.

2549 Kendall Avenue

Before the 1968 construction of the Campus Drive bypass, the street now known as Old University Avenue had a string of single-story businesses extending from Walnut Street to Farley Avenue. The proposed changes to the 2500 block will bring back a measure of the old business activity, while adding new residences. Following the most recent public meeting (August 16), I offer here some suggestions and concerns.

1. An apartment complex, set alongside Campus Drive. Four stories instead of six. The new apartment will thus resemble the one located at 2355-2379 Old University Avenue. Many additional automobiles will come into the neighborhood – roughly two cars for each new residential unit. The traffic at Old University Avenue/Highland Avenue will be heavy but manageable. Traffic resulting from a six-story complex would resemble that of a football Saturday, the year around.
2. The north side of Old University Avenue, from Lombardino’s Restaurant to Grand Avenue. No residences here. The four-story apartment building (see above, no. 1) will bring a sufficiency of newcomers into the neighborhood. Instead, a mall-like single-story complex, capable of being subdivided for small businesses. One of these subdivisions will be set aside as a neighborhood house, modeled on the Neighborhood House located on Mills Street. The City will rent this structure, and in turn rent out segments for meetings and programs of interest in the neighborhood.
3. Other changes to the area, especially among the small businesses located at or near the Highland/Old University intersection. Here again, the City becomes involved: City-sponsored low-cost loans.

109 Elm Street

I live on Elm Street and have a continual problem with apartment residents parking up our street so we have no street parking on nights or weekends (in addition, we also have to contend with West High Schoolers parking on regular days). I feel any new building of any kind should provide ample parking, so there is no additional burden on the residents who are already struggling to park in their neighborhood. Additional permits generated to our areas would also mean when we have company over for dinner and parties, there is no place to park.

I want to know how many people you are going to accommodate in apartments, and volume of traffic for commercial ventures. What will your projected parking needs be, and how much parking do you plan to provide for all of your projects each individually? How did you derive these numbers, and what

will you do if the parking needs exceed what you provide? I think this is a very important part of development.

Our neighborhood is already very congested and doesn't need more competition for parking spots. We also recently have a half day of no parking for street cleaning, which means this is an additional burden on Friday mornings.

I anxiously await your thoughtful reply.

16 S. Allen Street

I'm writing this note to express my support for the Mullins University Avenue Project as I am traveling and cannot attend the meeting tonight in person. I have attended several of the previous project neighborhood meetings during the review and discernment process and have followed the development process fairly closely (I am a member of the RNA). I support this project because it is an excellent expression of sound infill development in an urban setting. Green development requires higher densities utilizing existing infrastructure in close proximity to employment centers. The height and mass of the Mullins project on both University Avenue and Highland Avenue are consistent with this ideal and, as such, the project is compatible with the existing neighborhood structures. I also support the proposed building setbacks and applaud the developer's willingness to layer the structure so that the building mass steps back from University Avenue. As a minor point, I am in favor of using more exterior masonry and suggest, if possible, the developer take a look at whether it would be possible to add more masonry to the street façades.

We cannot allow our neighborhood to continue to deteriorate with vacant store fronts and insufficient economic investment. I support this project without reservation.

211 Lathrop Street

As a resident of the Regent Neighborhood, I want you to know that I am very supportive of the development you are proposing for the 2500 block of University Avenue. The preliminary design concepts I have viewed are attractive. I particularly like how you have treated the Old University Avenue street level of the building with the live/work and potential retail. I know that this area of the street is very difficult to get to via automobile and parking is even more so. I also know these businesses need more than walkers to keep them viable, so you have a real balancing act. I note throughout the city the vacant commercial space, particularly in mixed-use projects, and I would rather see it occupied by something than nothing. Your attempt to accommodate what the market will bear is a good one.

As to height, I know there are some who don't want any height or density in this location, and I think that is totally contrary to good sustainability and energy conservation practices. This is an ideal walking location for residents, close to where commuter rail will be and by a high employment area as well. If anything, I think you could have more height and density.

I hope that the City will support this concept and good luck.

234 Lathrop Street

(Note: Also submitted comments at the neighborhood meeting using the comment form.)

My wife Karen and I support your planned project on University Avenue, for three principal reasons:

- (1) Building Design: The multi-use (apartment, office, retail, parking) nature of the development is filling a need in our neighborhood. The design is aesthetic, as the substantial number of parking stalls are gracefully incorporated into the design. In fact, the neighborhood will not only benefit from this safe parking, but the building itself will serve as a valuable buffer from Campus Drive.
- (2) Mullins as Developer: As a multi-generational landlord and developer right here in Madison, we are appreciative that the Mullins Group has chosen the Regent Neighborhood as a place to make a substantial investment. Your projects are first-class, thoughtful, and you carry through on your promises. We took over a project that had been abandoned for over two years at the corner of Lathrop and Kendall Streets, and the "Hotel Red" is stalled with little promise of completion any time soon. A Mullins-backed project is not in this category.
- (3) Coordination with Lombardino's: As friends with Michael Banas and Patrick O'Halloran, current owners of Lombardino's Restaurant, we understand that Brad Mullins has been in communication and coordination with Lombardino's since the project's inception. Not only good business and the neighborly thing to do, this level of communication and cooperation bodes well for the future harmony of coordinated activity on the 2500 block of University Avenue.

Good luck in obtaining your approvals with RNA and the City of Madison. We look forward to seeing your development plan approved and construction beginning.

227 Princeton Avenue

My family and I are 22-year residents of the Regent Neighborhood, residing at 227 Princeton Avenue.

We strongly support the proposed 2550 University Avenue Redevelopment PUD dated October 20, 2010, but we are out of state this coming Monday, November 8, 2010, hence this letter.

The effective utilization of this site should be one of the highest priorities for the Regent Neighborhood and its concerned land stewards. As a long time resident, our family accepts and embraces the need to develop this site at the moderate density described in the PUD and as vetted to date by a valuable neighborhood process. This project is an important land use development that will increase housing and retail options that maximize walk routes, bike utilization, and the use of mass transit in the Regent Neighborhood.

The project makes use of a site that is both distant from but at the same time supportive of the traditional small scale housing that is typical for the inner core of the Regent Neighborhood.

The site is appropriately positioned on the north side of University Avenue and immediately adjacent to Campus Drive. No sunlight or views are impacted for the more southerly traditional single-family areas of the neighborhood. Noise attenuation from Campus Drive is achieved. Lighting is carefully designed to minimize spill and to respect the night sky. The project's scale and massing follow well established neighborhood-building scale.

The three-story façade along Campus Drive effectively utilizes precious urban land area to maximize walkable, bikeable and transit-supported housing and retail options at one of the most dense employment centers in Madison. Any reduction to the plan scope would not be making effective use of this scarce option. Literally hundreds of people could walk to work from this site. Alternatively, all commercial and residential units in the proposed project are also supported by a carefully sized structured parking option. With flex time management of the parking structure, it can have high rates of utilization and the strategic effect of supporting both the housing and retail uses, which typically alternate peak load demands.

The 2550 University Avenue PUD as proposed and vetted by a series of thorough Regent Neighborhood and RNA board meetings will effectively reduce Madison's overall traffic congestion and its dependence on fossil fueled transport while adding a well designed building to the fabric of the neighborhood. We urge the approval of this PUD as presented.

2520 Chamberlain Avenue

(Note: Also submitted comments via email using the comment form.)

I appreciate the opportunity to make one last comment on the proposed project, as I will be unable to attend this final neighborhood meeting with the Mullins Group. While I believe that the Mullins Group has partially responded to neighborhood input and understand that the Mullins family have every right to make as much profit from their investments as possible, I am frustrated by the timing of the project, the manner in which the traffic issues that this development could exacerbate have been pushed aside, and the overall direction in which this sort of project could push the neighborhood. I believe that some of the concerns of the neighborhood have been essentially ignored, and that many residents have given up on the idea of having input on the project in the face of an influential development group and its marketers.

I would first like to draw the City's attention to the fact that the Mullins Group decided, after years of owning these properties and leaving them empty, to rush this project through just in advance of the work currently being done by the Regent Neighborhood Association to define a new vision for the University Avenue corridor. The community is in the early stages of developing a creative and inventive plan for this prominent street in our neighborhood, and it is very disrespectful for the Mullins Group to preempt the community's work, especially when they were fully aware of the effort, by rushing through the approval process for this project. In fact, I find it very suspicious. The "low cost" argument is not enough to justify this, especially when we have tolerated for years the abandoned properties under their ownership.

Additionally, the Mullins Group certainly knows that traffic is an issue in this immediate area and has attempted to deflect criticism of this impact with the arguments that the resident will use primarily public transportation and that the two entrances to the property's parking will negate any issues with the Highland Avenue/Old University Avenue intersection. These arguments are simplistic at best. It is, to be honest, ridiculous to assume that two entrances will prevent occupants from using this intersection, since, in fact, any occupant wishing to drive east will be forced to use it (and the already crowded University Avenue), and many driving south will likely use it as well (or an alternate pass through the neighborhood). Arguing that residents will primarily use public transportation rings hollow, as well, since parking IS being provided. Even assuming many of the residents will be students does not mean that they will not have automobiles. This area is already very difficult to manage on foot, by bicycle, or car – I have nearly been struck on several occasions walking at and near this intersection, and cyclists often use sidewalks to feel safe. This situation is bound to worsen over time, and I see no good reason for hurrying those problems along by erecting another high-density structure in this location.

Finally, as mentioned above, the Regent Neighborhood has begun a process to develop a Long Range Plan for the University Avenue corridor. There are several existing issues for the association to deal with: Campus Drive was constructed without having full access to Walnut Street or Highland Avenue (the roads going into campus); the UW is encroaching on the east end of this corridor; and, we are already high-density, with a good number of rental units. But our neighborhood is beginning a period of transition, with properties ready to be redeveloped on Old University Avenue and still others that are good candidates for redevelopment, and so it is the perfect time to construct a viable plan for the future of this corridor and an opportunity to guide a gradual redevelopment of this area that will be creative and inventive while still appropriate for a neighborhood – perhaps along the lines of the Dudgeon-Monroe area. We hope that you will help us, at this critical time in the long history of the Regent Street Neighborhood, by thoughtfully and carefully considering the effect that this structure will have on future development in this area. We invite you to share our vision for our community and to help us to continue to develop our neighborhood into a pleasant place to live and work.

2613 Stevens Street

(Note: Also submitted comments at the neighborhood meeting using the comment form.)

I know I may be in the minority among the people you hear from, but I will reiterate what I said at the meeting Monday night: Requiring all tenants to pay for a parking spot, whether they own a car or not, is both unfair and bad for the neighborhood. If Mullins includes a parking spot with every apartment, you are forcing people to pay for something they don't need, don't want and won't use. And it's not a community asset, like a green roof, patio or workout room, that tenants may or may not use. A parking spot adds significantly to the cost of an apartment, so it makes the apartment less affordable.

It also makes the apartment only attractive to those who own cars, and is that what RNA wants? Is that good for the neighborhood? Do we want to only have drivers and car owners moving into an already crowded area? I don't think so.

To make sure I had my facts straight, I checked with Sue Springman of the Mullins Group. They do not want to allow tenants to reassign the spot - the one they are required to pay for - to a friend, work colleague, or other party. Tenants would not be able to resell or rent the spot to someone else. Mullins considers that too much of a security risk.

So the expensive parking spot included with the apartment will not only be unused by the tenant but will not be able to be used to get one more car off the neighborhood streets during the day. Again, is this in the interest of the neighborhood?

So, my request to you is: Do not ask that a parking spot be included with each apartment. It is bad public policy and bad for the neighborhood. If you are determined to require a parking spot be paid for by each tenant, then ask that Mullins allow the spots to be reassigned to outside parties. This will be more fair to tenants that do not own cars, and it will also get cars off our neighborhood streets.

As to commercial and visitor parking - i.e., short term parking - as a neighbor that lives one block from the site, I can tell you that there IS parking available on our neighborhood streets, although one might have to walk a block or two. Despite what some think, we live in an urban area, and one cannot expect to park directly in front of one's destination. The streets are a public area, and anyone can use them, including for parking. We have two-hour limits during the day, and that's appropriate. I have no problem with commercial customers parking on my block, nor do I think that a lack of commercial or visitor parking will doom the project.

When we visit the Monroe, Atwood, or Williamson Street areas, whether to visit friends, shop, or enjoy dinner or a drink, we often have to park on the street, and possibly several blocks away. (OK, Monroe has a parking garage at Trader Joes, but the east side areas do not.) That does not keep us from visiting these areas, nor does it seem to impede the success of businesses. Just as with our neighborhood, these areas were built for and continue to be accessible by foot, bike, and transit. People who live in and visit these areas expect that parking may be less convenient, but they also enjoy a wonderful neighborhood experience, highlighted by easy, pleasant walking.

Please don't let a few loud voices push you to make suggestions to the City committees that are in opposition to the interests of the neighborhood and the best practices of urban design. Several people have contacted me since the meeting to tell me they agree with me, so I am not alone. We all know that those opposed are often the loudest and most strident, but maybe not the majority.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.