DRAFT

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION		**PRESENTED:** January 4, 2012	
TITLE:	2048-2100 Winnebago Street – PUD-GDP for a Four-Story, Mixed-Use Building. 6th Ald. Dist. (24851)	**REFERRED:**	
		REREFERRED:	
		REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		**ADOPTED:**	**POF:**
DATED: January 4, 2012		**ID NUMBER:**	

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Henry Lufler, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Dawn O'Kroley, Todd Barnett and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 4, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-GDP located at 2048-2100 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jim Glueck, representing Movin' Out; Lou Host-Jablonski, representing the Schenk-Atwood Neighborhood Association; Kristin Silva, Dee Hoff, Jane Capito, Helen Aarli and Greg Markle. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Adam Cuern and John Young. Registered in opposition was Bruce Luecke. Changes to the plans include creating a potential front yard open space as requested, the building has been pushed back which results in a loss of approximately 12 parking stalls. Parking ratios will be one to one for residential with shared parking for the retail aspect. Lou Host-Jablonski spoke on behalf of the neighborhood association, expressing strong support for the project and their business model. They provided suggestions including keeping the project at four stories, the modified "T" is an improvement but they are concerned about greenspace in front of the retail as not usable; they'd prefer a 5-10 foot setback. They are concerned with the large amount of parking and would like to see this project more pervious pavement. Bruce Luecke spoke in disapproval to the landscaping and expanded greenspace as being inconsistent with the setbacks of neighboring homes. He also presented photographs of building types, photos of the power lines and poles in relation to the trees. He feels that if the building is placed close to the sidewalk it will dominate the neighborhood. He noted that there isn't a single house on this stretch that will see anything over the top of this building. Greg Markle spoke as a neighborhood representative for Head Start in support of the project; the philosophy of the business and mixed-use complement the neighborhood. He felt that the live-work units are a positive, as well as the handicapped accessibility. Helen Aarli spoke in support of this building for the neighborhood. She remarked that it's an infill with different abilities and will serve all generations, this is a site that is well-served by bus service and will provide a sense of community. Jane Capito spoke in praise of the inter-generational uses of this project and sees it as a great addition to the neighborhood. Kristin Silva spoke as a neighborhood resident and praised the affordability and handicapped accessibility and noted that this area needs help and could use the additional housing and residents. Dee Hoff spoke as a neighborhood resident and has a daughter with disabilities, understanding the importance of her daughter being able to integrate with the neighborhood and the residents and emphasized the importance of retaining affordable housing.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- In terms of the extra setback space on the "T," does it line up with the houses on the north side of Winnebago?
  - Essentially yes. Across the street it's not too different either. I assume at the SIP level we will be showing you those details.

If you're going to have multiple tenants in there, instead of thinking of that as greenspace think of it as landscaped plaza space. You could have a coffee shop and have a more urban feel while still giving the neighbors the space that they want.

- Look closely at how the setback relates to the neighbors. There should be some undulation in that setback to create interest within that plaza area.
- Think about transportation with the front entries.
- Make your parking counts clear as part of the GDP approval, including allowances for shared parking with Ford's Gym.
- It seems to be that for this urban project the parking has a suburban approach, not recognizing that there is street parking. All of that parking is taking away for any provision for on-site stormwater management.
- Look at your landscaping/hardscape treatment to help bring the building to the scale rather than designating something to show where it's green.
- Your major entry could be treated as more of an entry it will help circulation in the parking lot.
- Changing the layout of parking might help the handicapped accessible stalls not having to cross the road to get to the entry.
- It seems like we're banking a lot of parking for speculative tenants. You have some room to play with the parking spots as well as some stormwater management.
    - We intend to pursue the stormwater options. In regards to the parking count.
    - I'm hoping you will give us a range and at the SIP level we can work that out in more detail. We don't know what we can offer except that range at this point.
- The layout of 93 stalls is simple but where they aren't double loaded they aren't as efficient. What about investigating 45° parking?
    - It reduces the efficiency. You set up a directional movement that some people are going to ignore. I don't know that it reduces the square footage of pavement. 90° is the more efficient.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL.** The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

The motion provided for the following:

- A range of 10-15 feet setback at Winnebago Street for room to play, including undulations in the building façade with landscaping/hardscape amenities that relate to the streetscape.
- Four-stories with the request that at the SIP level the parking counts are investigated and return with what is needed for the range of uses proposed and shared parking arrangements.
- Include underground storage, blue roofs, green roof, rain gardens or bioretention swales as stormwater management.
- Consideration for banking some parking stalls.
- Pursue the discussion with Traffic Engineering related to the long-term goals for the courts and addressing the transportation drop-off access opportunities that may occur on Winnebago Street.
- Address massing in relation to the site with the building shape to respond.
- Parking counts are subject to further review of on-site need and availability of on-street parking.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 5, 5.5, 6 and 7.

DRAFT

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2048-2100 Winnebago Street – PUD-GDP

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	-	-	-	-	5	6	5
	6	-	-	-	-	6	8	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	-	-	-	-	5	7	6
	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5

General Comments:

- Great project!
- Too much parking, worthy concept.
- Limited documentation for substantial project.

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION		**PRESENTED:** December 21, 2011	
TITLE:	2048-2100 Winnebago Street – PUD-GDP for a Four-Story, Mixed-Use Building. 6th Ald. Dist. (24851)	**REFERRED:**	
		REREFERRED:	
		REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		**ADOPTED:**	**POF:**
DATED: December 21, 2011		**ID NUMBER:**	

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O'Kroley, Melissa Huggins and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 21, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-GDP located at 2048-2100 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dave Porterfield, Jim Glueck and Adam Chern, representing Accipiter Properties/Movin' Out, Inc. Appearing in opposition to the project was Bruce Luecke.

Glueck began by presenting photographic context for the development site. He noted that they were looking for GDP approval. The idea is we have a site plan that is fairly solidified in terms of general concept; create a streetscape along Winnebago St. and fairly hard edge along Sutherland Court. which creates a potential for greenspace. We did stagger back portion of the building, moved whole building back. Don't know who tenants are for commercial part with the three upper stories residential units. We may have some live/work units. There is a large parking demand with a surface lot providing for 85 stalls with approximately 60 spots under the building. There is a potential for a daycare tenant which might take away some surface parking for greenspace; potential for shifting and redesigning. Still need to know who tenants are and deal with open space for the daycare, but there is little to loose right now.

Glueck provided a review of a high tech vapor massing model which has been revised to better make it look more like a building. He noted that the fourth story would step in and out, in contrast to the building on the adjacent corner down which is fairly tall, just 2 stories.

Luecke noted his support for disabled housing and lives across the street. He stated that going to be looking at the Great Wall of China. Looks like a 3-story building. Building's going to be tall, is set so closely to street, about 7 feet off the curb, unacceptable in this neighborhood. This is the only 4-story building on the entire street all the way over to Milwaukee Street. Compared it to other buildings that are 14-feet back. He felt that his prairie garden is going to be shaded in the afternoon by the structure. Adjacent to his home, each of the lots has a greenspace between the structures, something like that needs to be implemented here to fit neighborhood. There is nothing like the proposal on the street here, not appropriate. He stated that his property value is going to suffer. There were two meetings with the neighborhood, there was a meeting in between that the neighbors were not invited to, e.g. that is dishonest.

Porterfield noted the goal to provide housing for workforce/disability. We're really excited about having this on a mixed-use setting. He further noted their offices would move there too (Movin Out, Inc.) on site with social service and daycare center with meeting rooms, business equipment also proposed including technical assistance, grow business in Capital neighborhood. He felt that there is general support for the whole thing, definitely a lot of questions. Right now we're asking for the GDP.

- It was questioned that it looks like you're proposing 60-65 units? Do you have a sense of distribution of studios, one bedrooms, two bedrooms, etc.
    - Yeah, it will probably be 60-61 units, we'd probably have about 17 ones, 27 twos and 17 threes. Emphasis: live in home and have home offices. Business center with meeting rooms, business equipment. Technical assistance, grow business in Capital neighborhood. Going to make partnerships with groups such as Commonwealth and community based organizations who provides assistance for that sort of thing.

The Chair noted that there's a registration from Adam Chern with the Scheck-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association (SASY) able to answer some questions. Questions for Mr. Chern?

- Can you give us a clarification on the neighborhood?
    - So there was a neighborhood meeting, the first one was a different plan presented as Bruce mentioned and then the SASY Neighborhood has a preservation and development committee and they asked to meet with the team and I thought when this was presented, it wasn't as if SASY came and said, "don't do this, do this instead," it was this was the latest iteration, they had revisited a two building solution for a one building and the SASY team which included Lou Host-Jablonski, who's the neighborhood chair, association chair and others, it's kind of one of those normal things you'd see in my neighborhood where the neighborhood association activists have pretty strong ideas about parking counts and neighbors who live across the street have different ideas about parking. Pretty much the neighbors wanted to make sure there was enough off-street parking to accommodate retail and the proposed new residential and the neighborhood association types are like, "no, no, no, push that back", so they're kind of caught between different legitimate concerns about how you do these things. At the meeting, there was overall support for the concept, but there were concerns and I think Bruce (Luecke) points out, he didn't really point out the grade change on his side of the street is such that all those houses are elevated, so you're pretty much looking into the top of this building, but if there was a way to break the mass or rearrange the mass so that the whole row of single family or small lots wouldn't look into this really long wall. We sort of asked if they'd look into a T-shape, U-shape – I think what's happening is there's a push because of the trying to get WHEDA tax credits, deadlines to try and get, something to them that the City has done. I do feel there, general support, but definitely concerns about too close to street. That the corner was too close to the street for sure, kind of did a little cut-out, I personally thought maybe we do something where we have a mid-section to sneak through property. Or how do you take Sutherland Court and make that more of a, instead of a driveway entrance, more of a kind of space that's a neighborhood space? But I think timing is running into refinements.

- Struggling to see where various entrances are.
    - We intend to have multiple entries, but one large commercial tenant, certain way, more tenants' different ways. Entrance points off parking… Anticipating a lot of entry points. Daycare going to have entry and walkway into playground. Grading. Upper levels to have entry level. We have

discussed an open slot where you can walk or see through for the common entry point. Building to be stretched to accommodate the condo from office. Commercial tenants to be long term.

A residential from Winnebago Street would be important. Definitely. Surface parking and underground parking. Space for canopy trees to come from street. Bike racks. Bike parking. Outdoor seating for a café. When Winnebago Street is redone they are going to narrow the street so have bigger terrace.

- Architecturally, you have many diverse elements, day care, residential, desire for more commercial. I would look at those 2-3 program elements and architecturally bring the building up based on, there's a lot of energy here. Because there's a court, corner entry not appropriate; not at an intersection of tow or three streets. Think about Winnebago as your commercial side and the court less so. For parking purposes, is it possible to use the court as your drive aisle and is it possible to get angle parking off the court?
    - There's two courts, Sutherland Court and Linden Court
- Sutherland, particularly.
    - No. Can't slide the whole building down. Need L shape to make program work for square footage. Need whole coverage. No possible parking there. Narrow street. If you have diagonal parking, square footage lost.
    - We always see projects where things have to be massaged. That was a reasonable question.
- May be more efficient for your site to use back end parking stall off of Williamson Street on Livingston Street.
    - We can look at everything.
- Look at site's relationship to Railroad; architecture elsewhere furthers angle of rail corridor.
- Agree with all those comments. Commercial edge here. The L-shape makes sense. Natural footprint with sprinkling of commercial buildings. The offsets of 3 or 4 feet are more harmful than keeping it flush because they ultimately don't do anything. Not deep enough to put landscape – another 4 feet of concrete; make room for tables, street trees on your side, terrace.
    - Insets are meant to be entries. One bigger than several little ones.
- Argument for zero lot line or 8 or 9 feet. What does this little strip of green do?
    - Seating for café, bike parking, and couple of benches? Roman Candle does it.
- I think comments about the sunlight are reasonable, zoning? What's the building height? Staff noted that the properties existing zoning supports a FAR of 2.0
- So you could go 4 stories. Not a manufacturing site. 4 story and drop down to 3 stories. Volume defines the edge. Grade wise is even but does slope down 2 or 3 feet. Parallel parking loop back around edge and circulate back.
    - Circles, I don't think its turnable. Total rebuild of Sutherland Court.
- You could park here and come back through, if this is designated as parking for the site. Bring building edge closer to the building. Question about green space placement.
    - Not hanging hat on greenspace as shown, more or less quantity. Focused on GDP. Very tempting to do something with Linden Court.
- Can move parking and greenspace, but massing is locked. That's a concern.
- Density is all locked in.
- Come down a story. Green space is needed.
- Parking is a challenge but there is a better way to avoid middle island and improve circulation.
- Building massive. Look breaking up into three pieces, step back corner, commercial node, provide residential scale with less blocking and address neighborhood edge.
    - That's possible. Suggestion of 4-story set-back. This is only generally. Did not define yet at SIP level. Not the final perimeter of the 4 floors.

- On a GDP, we just need to know the set-backs? Staff noted that a GDP is basic site-plan approval.
    - Setback can be revised, but need to see design.
- Need to see modified design.
- Don't have total building program. Only square footage. Final number of units, size. Needs to be in the GDP language.
- Sounds like normally we would refer this.
    - Does anyone have a problem saying that the entire Winnebago 4-story is setback a minimum of X? from other 3 stories?
- Staff noted that approval of rezoning related general plan shall establish the right of use with the area when in conformity of plan. Need to know what we are approving addresses suggested modifications to the proposal.
    - Doesn't feel like we have the approval to build the square footage they need. Can't commit to cutting half the 4-story off. Tight schedule for Section 42. Product people will enjoy. We need Zoning at GDP level – will redo and come back. City has entire SIP approval of the level. Redo GDP.
- Rearrange the L?
- We shouldn't be designing this. Turn this piece. Come up with 3, 4, 5 stories. Lots of possibilities. Massing is an issue and we need to approve massing. WHEDA approval for something that isn't viable.
- Come down to 3-stories on part of Winnebago? Can you extend that back to railroad? Push back green space. Might lose parking. Shifting mass to make building work?
- The surface parking lot as designed provides for very inefficient turning. Lose a lot.
- Go into parking area to get more building and less height?
- Not going to get 4 levels approved tonight as designed, referral or need adjustment to get approval? Consider a 5th story with reallocation on building mass along Winnebago Street.
- Suggest an initial approval with no less than 1/3 of Winnebago is 3 stories tall. Go to 5 stories to make up square footage elsewhere, including that corner.
- Maybe too big of a building for neighborhood.
- Support the general concept.
- Tight timeline. Graphic information, grades. Look into parking suggestions.
- Bring back several different Variations on the setback issue along Winnebago Street.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion required address of the above-stated concerns.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2048-2100 Winnebago Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	4	-	-	-	-	6	5
	5	5	-	-	-	4	6	5

General Comments:

- Massing not there yet.
- Not soup yet.
- Lowering building height of east wing will help compositionally and with goodwill.

-----Original Message-----
From: Bruce Luecke [mailto:blformsa@tds.net]
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 9:03 PM
To: Martin, Al; lufler@education.wisc.edu; Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Proposed Movin' Out Inc. project at 22046 and 2100 Winnebago Street

Dear Members of the Urban Design Commission :

My name is Bruce Luecke. My wife Susan Freiss and I live across Winnebago Street from the proposed monstrous building at 2046 through 2100 Winnebago Street. Our paid for home is a well cared for 1928 home with many of the features of the later arts and crafts design. Its landscaping incorporates many native and prairie planting in the sunny front yard and more shaded back yard.

There are currently no commercial structures in the area from Schenk's Corners to the end of New Winnebago Street which consist of more than a small business format in width or length and two stories in height. The longer former Anderson Thomas building, while only two stories high is set back nearly a hundred feet off Winnebago Street.

At the first Movin' Out Inc. meeting with the neighborhood, the developer spoke of the concept of the construction project as two buildings, one an office building located at
2046 Winnebago Street then a space between the office building and a second building further east which would be housing designed for the disabled. The developer indicated that there would be underground parking for these structures accessible through Sutherland Court, immediately west of the 2046 office building. There was discussion from several individuals concerning the massing of the residential building of uncertain size on Winnebago Street proper. The developer indicated that the relative location of the residential structure was flexible and could be set farther off the street with landscaping in the area of the street and sidewalk. The neighborhood was receptive to the building functions proposed, but concerned about how this construction would fit in the neighborhood. The developer indicated that efforts would be made to incorporate the design of the buildings into the existing neighborhood.

At a second neighborhood meeting with the developer were presented with a photograph of Winnebago Street taken from in front of the TPS printing service building looking across the street and eastward to show the block massing of their proposed structure, now a single structure located right at the edge of the sidewalk . This depiction shows the proposed building to be lower in height than power poles on the north side of Winnebago Street though that is not possible with a 4 story building. In fact, the power poles and trees at that stretch of street would be right up against the building face as they overhang portions of the current Winnebago Studio building. The new layout of the building, no longer a two structure project more typical of the neighborhood small businesses, was far out of scale with anything in the neighborhood and a big change from the set back residential building we understood to be amenable for the project plan.

As it came to light during questions of the developer, the neighborhood was not invited to a third interim meeting with some members of the SASNYA neighborhood group.

In this meeting the group, none of whom live on these several blocks of the neighborhood, recommended siting the building, which now was conceived to have lower level business locations, closer to the street and apparently to also mass the building as one structure much like the oversize United Way and/or Kennedy Place buildings on Atwood Avenue. This stretch of Winnebago has neither the more highly urban feel of Atwood Ave. where there only one rental home in the Division Street to Schenk's Corners segment, nor the very high traffic volume also found there. Four stories of building massed at the sidewalk on Winnebago is inconsistent with the neighborhood as it largely residential with buildings separated by small green spaces and set back from the street by green space as well. The developer does not seem to be familiar with working with a neighborhood to formulate planning that works with several parties to reach a consensus positive in ways that accommodate both the business and the neighborhood.

In order to address the lower level business rental locations apparently proposed in, what used to be a second building, it must be understood that on-street parking on Winnebago disappears after 8:00 A.M. occupied by local business workers. There might be one or two
parking spaces available for lower level business customers at best.
Thus, it makes some sense to set this segment of the structure back somewhat and align it North/South so that parking is still located at the business face of the building. Appropriate signage would work as it does for Ford's Gym, Sector 67, and Nessalla Combucha.

My approach toward this proposed structure would be more along the lines of the Nelson building in its street-side two story unit backed by some greater massing of the
structure away from the more residential neighborhood street side.
One further regrettable aspect of the project is that the developer has not shown the neighborhood any possible outward plans or designs for his structure. A very tasteful piece of condo architecture also can be found in the neighborhood at the north face of Atwood and Division Streets.

I will be in attendance at the Urban Design meeting on Wednesday the 21st. Bruce Luecke

From: iambrad chorus.net [mailto:iambrad@chorus.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 10:38 AM
To: Martin, Al
Cc: Lou Host-Jablonski; Lance Green; Doug Johnson; Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 2048-2100 Winnebago development

Al Martin and Urban Design Commission Members,

I send this message to express the consensus opinion of the Preservation & Development Committee, a subgroup of the Schenk Atwood Starkweather Yahara Neighborhood Association (SASYNA). On January 4th you will again consider a development proposal for 2048-2100 Winnebago St, proposed as a joint project between Accipiter Properties and Movin' Out. The SASYNA organization has had some good interaction with the developers over the past 4 months in an effort to build neighborhood awareness about the project, as well as to solicit feedback. However, we have been frustrated more than once by a lack of clear and detailed information about the project. This is due - in part - to the tactic of splitting the GDP from the SIP approval process. While there is some apparent value to this approach from the developers' perspective, it has proved more challenging to the neighborhood because it provides far less on which to base feedback. I feel that some of the earlier confusion - as well as some of the discussion taking place at UDC right now - could have been avoided by more fully fleshing this project out in the early stages. There is some legitimate concern that the proposal potentially approved by UDC and the Plan Commission may morph into something quite unlike the general plan idea that the neighborhood saw in late 2011.

Even so, it is the consensus of the Preservation & Development Committee that we express enthusiastic support for the proposed project. We strongly feel that urban infill projects such as this are precisely what the neighborhood needs in commercial/transitional areas such as Schenks Corners, particularly on largely unused commercial space. However, in the spirit of the earlier meetings and discussions that took place about this same project, we temper our support with the following suggestions/conditions:

1. Size: We are OK with the 4 story height, but that support is lukewarm. We offer stronger support for 3 stories on much of the Winnebago elevation (past the corner). Five stories on the Sutherland Court wing dramatically outsizes everything else in the neighborhood and has no support. The issue is not the number of units. The issue is the size and presentation of those units in the current design.
2. Modified Setback: The 'modified T' setback that you see tonight was discussed earlier. We view this as a positive design feature but feel that the 15' setback gives the project an inappropriate suburban feel. Such a big setback will also compromise the storefront feel & function of all the first floor commercial space scheduled for that wing. We proposed a setback between 5 and 10 feet from the sidewalk.
3. Street Front Elevations: We strongly support design features on the Winnebago and Sutherland elevations that incorporate undulations in the wall, set-backs for taller areas (if there are to be 4-story areas) and balconies that promote visual interest and interaction with the street.
4. Impervious Surface: The current parking proposal expresses a range but the plans consistently show the maximum end of that range. In turn, this greatly increases the

amount of impervious surface while reducing greenspace. Combined with the building footprint, too much of the site is impervious. While sympathetic to concerns over 'enough' parking, we feel that this plays into a design that ultimately will not serve the neighborhood well at a number of levels. Rather than promote a specific parking quota, we support a higher standard of storm water runoff control than NR151. For example, we propose that the developers design the site to handle 10-year rain events entirely on-site through increased pervious surfaces and other measures.

We offer our strong support of the project with the caveat that it pass UDC with a commitment to accommodate the conditions listed above.

Brad Hinkfuss
Chair, Preservation & Development Committee
Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association

From: Kim Turner [mailto:KTurner@optionsmadison.com]
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2012 2:10 PM
To: Martin, Al
Subject: 2048-2100 Winnebago Street

Mr. Martin:

I am writing to express the support of my organization, Options in Community Living, Inc. for the proposed development of the mixed use residential and commercial space proposed for the Anderson-Thomas space on Winnebago Street. Options is very excited about the possibility of being a long term tenant at this location, and we believe the project design is a great fit for the neighborhood. We have been tenants at our current location on Second Street for 30 years, and while we are technically in a different neighborhood on the other side of E. Washington, we are excited to have viable office space close by.

I attended the neighborhood meeting at the end of November, and heard the general support for the project, and the concerns of close neighbors to the fact that their neighborhood WILL change, with any development. The developers for this project are very intent on taking neighborhood feedback and creating spaces that will help the neighborhood thrive.

I hope you will support the project, and work with the developers on getting approval for the project in a manner which is affordable.

Thank you,

Kim Turner
Executive Director
Options in Community Living, Inc.
22. N. Second Street
Madison, WI

53704
608-249-1585

-----Original Message-----
From: Lance Green <greenlance@aol.com>
To: district6 <district6@cityofmadison.com>; amartin <amartin@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: greenlance <greenlance@aol.com>; John <John@AccipiterProperties.com>; Lou <Lou@designcoalition.org>; iambrad <iambrad@chorus.net>
Sent: Mon, Jan 2, 2012 3:44 pm
Subject: 2048-2100 Winnebago

Dear Marsha Rummel and Al Martin,
I am writing to express support for the development project proposed in the 2048-2100 block of Winnebago St. I have attended several meetings in the project and have realized that it will bing much-needed low-cost housing options for a special group of people, affordable commercial spaces and is a good fit for this location.

I appreciate the side-walk set-back now included in the plan and I have no problems with a 4-story building.
I serve on the SASYNA Council, but I am offering these comments only from myself as a long-time resident of this neighborhood.

Thanks you for considering my comments on this worthy project.
Lance Green
186 Dixon St
Madison, Wi 53704
greenlance@aol.com