

## **STATEMENT ON SALVATION ARMY CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION**

**My name is Ron Trachtenberg and I am the attorney for Cliff Fisher and Rick McKy, two of the commercial residential property owners in the area of the Salvation Army present and proposed homeless shelter.**

**We recognize the national problem of homelessness and the need for a homeless shelter or homeless shelters in the City of Madison. We also recognize the role that the Salvation Army plays in that regard.**

**The present Salvation Army facility has a current family capacity of 22 families, current women capacity of 45 bed and single room capacity of 8 bed. The proposed facility will approximately double those capacities to 41 families and 82 women, and will fivefold the number of single room capacity to 42. In addition there will be 48 pay to stay and 13 medical respite beds.**

**The present and proposed Salvation Army facility is also located in the same immediate area as The Beacon, a homeless day shelter, and Porchlight facilities located along the East Washington corridor.**

**You have heard (via Legistar) and will hear this evening from neighborhood representatives, home owners, residents and business owners regarding the behavioral and criminal burden these facilities, including the Salvation Army facility, and those they attract, place on the immediate neighborhood and surrounding area and its residents and businesses and the concern that the greatly enlarged Salvation Army facility will create additional burdens.**

**The security plans submitted by the Salvation Army basically pertain to internal security. External security plans are deminimis and boil down to five points:**

- 1. Some additional external lighting.**
- 2. Some additional external cameras.**

**will be a greater need for City services in general and that the department welcomes any invitation to work on plans that include CPTED (Crime prevention through environmental design) as it relates to the project. There is nothing in the record that support that the City will be able to provide additional City services (please note that neighborhood policing has been basically reduced if not eliminated) or that the police have had the opportunity to review the Salvation Army security plans.**

**City planning staff also recognizes the issues of neighborhood security. But planning staff's response to the external behavioral and criminal activity concerns appears to be solely based upon their faith in the Salvation Army that the Salvation Army will do the right thing and the now infamous Tree Lane and yet unproven solution: if problems develop after the opening of the new facility those can be addressed after the fact by changes in the conditional use conditions of approval. Please note**

**that the “fix” to Tree Lane has come at great public, not private, expense.**

**If the Salvation Army new facility proposal is to be approved, it should not be approved until the degree and extent of the existing external behavioral and criminal problems are analyzed and resolved and the proper security plans are analyzed by the police and whatever other city departments analyze security and are made part of the new CUP proposal and should come at the expense of the Salvation Army, not the public.**

**As human beings we have a duty to our fellow human beings to provide shelter and other necessities to the homeless, but also, as City officials, we have the primary obligation to provide safe and secure neighborhoods. Before any shelter facilities are expanded, better security has to be in place for the now Salvation Army facility and the proposed Salvation Army facility.**

**Thank you for your time and consideration of these points.**