



## Bassett Neighborhood Association *A Capitol Neighborhood*

October 17, 2005

To: Urban Design Commission Members

On behalf of the Steering Committee and as chairperson I have sent documentation to you indicating the Steering Committee's work and issues concerning the proposed development for 425 West Washington. I hope this material is helpful in providing you with an accurate perspective as to the issues raised during the process of the neighborhood review of this proposed development.

As you will note by the documents, the Steering Committee attempted to reach consensus on the proposed project. While we all agreed that the developer was attempting to provide a quality project, the scale of the proposed development in relationship to the residential character of the West Washington corridor, as noted in the Bassett Master Plan, was the core of the debate among the Steering Committee members. In the end, this remained the major issue of contention for the Steering Committee in not being able to reach consensus on the project. I am sure that as this proposal moves through the various steps of the review process people will give it a fair hearing. If, in the final determination, the project is approved, the world will not come to an end for those opposing the proposed development. However, from one who has been involved in this process, let me share with you, from a personal perspective, what I think will come to an end.

Steering committees are volunteers. There is no way such a committee can counteract the money, personnel and lobbying the developer can bring to this process. The only thing a steering committee can rely on as a resource and reference is the neighborhood plan and its criteria. Any developer can claim a plan is outdated even when the plan was created to address the very issues that the developer brings to the table. If the city truly wants neighborhoods to take a positive role in reviewing future development proposals, then the neighborhood needs to know that the neighborhood plan is relevant and not subject to being dismissed the first time a developer wants to make an exception. So, I don't think the world will end if this project is approved. However, I do think the credibility of the steering committee process will be brought into question and the commitment on the part of neighborhood members to serve on future steering committees will end if a valid neighborhood plan, presently supported by other city plans past and present, is rendered irrelevant by the city's approval of this project. Thank you for your time and commitment to making Madison a good place to live.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Meehan

**425 Steering Committee**  
**July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2005 Minutes**  
**Meriter Main Gate**  
**7:00 p.m.**

1. In Attendance: Neighborhood residents Jonathon Cooper, Rosemary Lee, Patrick Meehan (Chair/Recorder), Victor Villacrez, and Curtis Weber. Developer Representatives Lee Christensen, Michael Quigley and John Sutton (Architect). City Council Alderman Michael Verveer. Scott Nyland has requested to be taken off the committee. Due to previous commitments residents Chet Droessler and Shane Reddemann were not able to make this meeting but intend to join the committee at future meetings.
2. Committee Ground Rules: The following ground rules were accepted as guidelines by the committee members -
  - a) Decision Making - To use consensus as the basis for agreement.
  - b) Use of Data - To base discussions/decisions on data and hard facts.
  - c) Confidentiality - Members may discuss the committee work and topics with the public at large unless the committee as a whole or individual member sharing such information with the committee wishes it to stay with the committee.
  - d) Assignments - Members delegated assignments will complete assignments on time.
  - e) Participation - All members will be provided the opportunity to give input. At the same time all members will respectfully listen to what others say.
  - f) Predictability in Reporting - The minutes will accurately reflect the discussion and action of the committee. Minutes will be approved at each meeting. Committee minutes will be included in the Bassett Neighborhood binder at Jo's cafe.
3. Project Overview -
  - a) Present Plans - Michael Quigley provided a packet which included minutes from his office hour meetings at the Electric Earth Cafe, letter from the mayor indicating his approval of the development, copies of news articles referring to the development, and a listing of those people attending the June 23<sup>rd</sup> public meeting along with the compilation of the rating given by each person and the comment card they filled out. Jon Cooper said he would remind the Bassett Neighborhood Association of these office hour meetings and Curtis Weber would do likewise with the residents at Metropolitan Place.

Michael again reviewed the development plan indicating that there would be two floors of underground parking. The first floor would have 2000 square feet of retail space that may include a coffee shop/cafe. This he thought would increase foot traffic in the area. The second and third floor would house the health club, including a 25 meter pool with four lanes on the second floor. The fourth floor will be commercial office space with 25% of this area being occupied by Dr. Bonsett-Veal and the rest open for the possibility of a chiropractor and physical therapist type business. The fifth through eighth floors would have forty apartments including 4 efficiencies, 16 one bedrooms and 20 two bedrooms. Inclusionary zoning will involve 15% of the units dispersed both among the allotment of apartment sizes as well as floors (One efficiency, 2 one bedroom and 3 two bedroom).

The roof will be the first intensive green roof constructed in the city. This means large trees and plantings can be established there. A 2000 square foot community room will also be located on the roof which will be available to the tenants with the possibility of it being open to the public under a tenant sponsorship arrangement.

This development will increase the present green space from 1300 to 5000 square feet including the roof. There will be an open balcony design and two different materials used on the front of the building.

The building setback is 17.5 feet from the sidewalk or 16 feet from the property line. It will be almost 2 feet closer to the sidewalk than the present building structure.

- b) Timelines - Michael said a possible timeline for the project would be for the developer to submit a Planned Unit Development (PUD) this fall. It would take approximately four months for the project to move through Urban Design, Planning Commission, Landmarks and the other appropriate city departments as relevant. If all went well then construction would begin next spring (2006) with completion date possibly June of 2007. There is an Inclusionary Zoning meeting with the city on July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005.
4. April 7<sup>th</sup> and June 23<sup>rd</sup> Public Comments Concerning Project – The June 23rd public meeting comments were distributed within the packet during Michael's earlier presentation on the project. Pat Meehan distributed the April 7<sup>th</sup> public meeting comments to include in the record. Members felt that adjustments were made to the project by the developer reflecting the April 7<sup>th</sup> comments.
5. Bassett Neighborhood Plan Relative to 425 Project – Chairperson Pat Meehan pointed out, with Jon Cooper concurring that according to the Bassett Neighborhood Plan the present development with its mass is non-compliant. This statement could also apply when reviewing the 1989 Downtown 2000 and the Central Isthmus 2020 documents as well as the draft of the Madison Comprehensive Plan. Even though the AAA building is next door and Metropolitan Place is a half block away it was noted that with regard to the AAA building mistakes should not be repeated. Metropolitan Place is east of Broom Street and according to the documents mentioned above is in compliance. Some boundary has to serve any plan and Broom Street seems to be the dividing line these plans chose for building mass. A development would have to be outstanding to overcome the existing neighborhood plans. Most of the committee members felt the present plan was at that quality level. Accepting the mass of the building in the neighborhood was a trade off given the quality of the development being proposed. Michael mentioned that the streetscape of this development is much less than the AAA building. It was stated that all of the surrounding property owners are in favor of this development. The developer is looking at a long-term investment (Twenty year return) on this project. John Sutton (architect) thought that the best neighborhoods were ones that had mixed-use and unique buildings.
6. Steering Committee Members' Input As to Project
  - a) Positives – Quality living for renters, Design of building, Retail possibilities, Health club, Green building, Owner commitment to quality, Attracting more professional people downtown, Urban Jump program, Willingness of developer to listen to ideas, More people on street during all hours.

- b) Issues – Members suggested the possibility of a day care facility other than for the health club, a bicycle station (shower) for commuters. Bike stalls may be underestimated in the plan (Only 12 are proposed). The developer would like feedback on landscape, lighting, signage, materials (masonry, siding, pavers/concrete), bicycle parking, community room use and retail space use.
- c) Concerns – Bassett Neighborhood Plan non-compliance (Mass of the building and location). The city is also currently drafting a comprehensive plan.

7. Future Meeting Dates

July 21<sup>st</sup> @ Main Gate, 7:00 p.m. and August 11<sup>th</sup> at Main Gate, 7:15 p.m.

**425 Steering Committee**  
**July 21st, 2005 Minutes**  
**Meriter Main Gate**  
**7:00 p.m.**

1. In Attendance: Neighborhood residents Jonathon Cooper, Chet Droessler, Rosemary Lee, Patrick Meehan (Chair/Recorder), Shane Reddemann, and Curtis Weber. Developer Representatives Lee Christensen, Michael Quigley and John Sutton (Architect). City Council Alderman Michael Verveer.
2. Curtis Weber moved and Jon Cooper seconded approval of the July 7th minutes.
3. Project Review- Michael Quigley
  - a) Compliance with Bassett Neighborhood Plan: Michael Quigley provided a handout comparing the proposed building at 425 with both the Citywide Comprehensive Plan and the Bassett Neighborhood Plan. While many issues raised by these plans in relation to the proposed building are addressed by the developer's comments, the issue of location and mass remains the key to acceptance by all members of the steering committee. The Bassett Plan indicates Broom Street as the dividing line for buildings of this height and mass. The main issue then becomes the 425 building's compatibility with the scale and character of adjoining buildings. The actual height of the building seems to be an issue and the committee members agreed it should be addressed up front. The AAA building's height is 80 feet, which includes its penthouse. This has been compared to the 425 building's height which has been listed at 84 feet if one compares just the front facade. However, if the penthouse is included then its height is 95 feet. Several committee members thought the total height should be used with the explanation that the penthouse is out of sight range from the street level since it is 104 feet from the curb and 8 stories high. It was also suggested that the AAA building, being of such poor design, should not be used as a comparison for the 425 building.
  - b) Inclusionary Zoning: For meeting the inclusionary zoning ordinance there will be one efficiency, one 1 bedroom and one 2 bedroom on the fifth floor; one 1 bedroom and one 2 bedroom on the sixth floor; and one 2 bedroom on the seventh floor. These apartments will be of the same quality as all the other apartments. However, their total square footage may be a little smaller than similar apartments in the building. These six apartments meet the 15% requirement and actually offer more larger apartments ( 2 bedrooms) under the inclusionary zoning ordinance than other developments do.
  - c) Architect John Sutton reviewed the footprint and floor plans for the building. He stated that the details in the floor plans may change over time but the overall footprint would remain the same. The fire department will need to approve a fire lane for the building. The size of the front terrace may take care of this issue but the fire department will determine if this space is sufficient. There was also discussion as to set back with 54 feet being the distance from the curb to the building base, and 16.5 feet from the property line to the building base. There is a total of 11,000 square feet of roof with approximately 3000 square feet for a community room, 3500 square feet for plantings and 4500 square feet of hard surface.

4. Steering Committee Members' Input As to Project

- a) Positives: Members stated that this was a quality of life building, that it would create a positive hub of activity in the neighborhood. The rental, inclusionary housing and the fact that TIF was not being requested were all positives.
- b) Issues/Concerns: For some members the mass and height of the building were still issues.
- c) Action(s)/ Assignments: None

5. Other Agenda Items: a) The chairperson requested that only the steering committee members meet on August 11th from 7:15 – 8:30 p.m. to discuss the main issue of mass and height. Neighbors who may be opposed to this building are encouraged to attend this session to discuss their concerns with the committee and hear the committee members' views concerning the proposed 425 building. We will then have the developer representatives join us from 8:30 – 9:30 for a review of the earlier session. b) The developer would like to submit the General Development Plan (GDP) early next month.

6. Future Meeting Dates

August 11th@ Main Gate, 7:15 – 8:30 ( Steering Committee Members), 8:30 – 9:30 ( Steering Committee Members and Developer Representatives).

August 30 th@ Main Gate, 7:00 – 9:00

**425 Steering Committee  
August 11th, 2005 Minutes  
Meriter Main Gate  
7:15- 9:30 p.m.**

1. Attendance (Items 1-4 from 7:15 – 8:30): Steering Committee members Jonathan Cooper, Rosemary Lee, Patrick Meehan (Chairperson/Recorder), Shane Reddemann, Victor Villacrez, Curtis Weber. Neighborhood members Rob Bergeman, Debby Dines, Chet Droessler, Stefanie Moritz, and Pete Ostlind. Developer Representatives Michael Quigley, Lee Christensen, and John Sutton joined the group at 8:30 as requested on the agenda.
2. Approval of July 21st Minutes: Jon Cooper moved and Rosemary Lee seconded approval of the minutes.
3. Steering Committee Members Open Discussion: The chairperson explained rationale for having the Steering Committee meet without the Developer Representatives for the first half of tonight's meeting. It is a time for Steering Committee members to discuss issues among themselves and to listen to neighbors as to their views concerning the proposed building at 425 W. Washington. One member thought the Developer Representative(s) should be at all meetings. However it was pointed out that the Steering Committee is independent and can hold meetings with or without the Developer. The present session is being held without the Developer Representatives because the members have never been able to talk to one another to better understand one another's views. In addition, neighbors have been invited to speak to the members to better understand and define the issue(s) that remain as a barrier to moving the project forward from the Steering Committee perspective. A member pointed out that there have been two neighborhood open meetings, two prior Steering Committee meetings and five opportunities for the community to meet with Michael at the Electric Earth Cafe to discuss the project. This member felt the community had been offered many opportunities to hear and respond to the project. The chairperson pointed out that this would be one more opportunity for neighborhood input.
4. Open Forum (Invited Neighbors): Four neighbors voiced their opinions as to the pros and cons of the project. Debby Dines was excited about the opportunity available fitness wise. If you can walk to a gym you are more likely to use it. This project adds something that is missing to the neighborhood. Rob Bergeman was very excited about the gym and especially the pool. His eye doctor will also be located in the same building. Height of the building is not a problem for him. Stefanie Moritz mentioned that placing the project on West Washington west of Broom Street was a problem. The Bassett Neighborhood Plan is all we have to guide our land use. She stated she met with Michael Quigley and discussed the aspects of the Bassett Plan that do not fit with this project. This project impacts historic homes. Stefanie mentioned that if a development goes in counter to the Bassett Plan it better be outstanding. Pete Ostlind said the Bassett Plan refers to "residential character". This development goes against the plan. West Washington should preserve the character of the neighborhood. Discussion followed with some comments from the committee members indicating that we should ask ourselves if this project has the ability to develop the neighborhood. It brings jobs and amenities to the neighborhood. At the same time it is hard to predict a master plan. One member said we need to constructively question the Bassett Plan. The issue that Nolen Shores did not follow the Bassett Plan was raised. But it was pointed out that there was a lot of neighborhood support for Nolen Shores and that the Doty School Condo Association held many meetings and supported the project in the end. McGrath changed the project in response to the Doty School Condo Association concerns and even reduced the height by two floors.

5. Project Review (Developer Representatives join the session)

a) Open Forum Feedback: The chairperson summarized for the Developer Representatives the open forum comments from neighbors. The pros were: infill site as opposed to tear down; owner developed; responsive to neighborhood; no TIF requested; good housing mix; and health center/optometrist/physical therapist among other services being made available. The con was the mass and height on that particular site. It doesn't fit the Bassett Plan in that respect. An issue for this Steering Committee and for future committees is if the construction/development does not fit the Bassett Plan is the neighborhood (steering committee) automatically opposed to the new development? Are there any positives that would offset opposition to a development that is not in line with the Bassett Plan? A member suggested that we can respect the Bassett Plan while at the same time factor in the feasibility of a development project with the cost of the property in this day and age. The question is: How does this particular development impact the neighborhood?

b) Compliance with Bassett Neighborhood Plan: The main issue continues to be mass and height with many committee members accepting this as the way it is because of the other benefits of the project, while other members see the mass and height as going against both the spirit and intent of the Bassett Plan. However there was agreement to move on to other issues. At this point there was discussion as to the purpose of the Steering Committee if it was not to approve the project. How do we bring closure to the process? Our Alderman was able to better define the steering committee process for the members indicating that it is our role to work with the developer and then in cooperation with the developer to see what the neighborhood thinks of the project.

c) Shadow Impacts (future agenda)

d) Tree Report (future agenda)

e) Other: Michael Quigley explained that nothing has been formally submitted, although there has been an informational presentation to the Urban Design Commission. John Sutton (architect) also mentioned that he presented the project to the city concerning parking entry, fire department access, etc.

6. Steering Committee Members' Input As to Project

a) Positives (discussed above)

b) Issues/Concerns (discussed above)

c) Action(s)/ Assignments: Michael Quigley will present more details of the project at the next meeting for the Steering Committee to review.

7. Other Agenda Items

8. Future Meeting Dates

August 30th@ Main Gate, 7:00 p.m.



**425 Steering Committee  
August 30th, 2005 Minutes  
Meriter Main Gate  
7:00 p.m.**

1. Attendance: Steering Committee members Jonathan Cooper, Patrick Meehan (Chair/Recorder), Rosemary Lee and Curt Weber. Developer Representatives Lee Christensen, Michael Quigley and John Sutton. CNI President Ledell Zellers and Alderman Mike Verveer. Shane Reddemann was absent due to a business commitment and Victor Villacrez has resigned from the committee due to his moving to Verona.
2. Approval of August 11th Minutes: Jon Cooper moved and Curt Weber seconded the approval of the minutes. Motion passed.
3. Project Review: Michael Quigley mentioned that the project was formally submitted to the city after making some minor changes requested.
  - a) Tree Report: Except for the Honey Locust on the terrace and the arborvitae planted along the back of the lot line the other trees were probably self-seeded. Many of the trees along the east lot line actually have either a wood or iron fence growing through them. There is concern for the Honey Locust during the staging and construction process. In answer to the question as to what happens if either or both trees are destroyed during the construction process the answer assumed the developer would replace them with similar tree(s) at the largest size replacement possible.
  - b) Bike Racks: There will be a minimum of 52 bike stalls; 40 indoor stalls and 12 outdoor stalls. Inside there will be both wall racks for tenants and floor racks for customer traffic. A vendor's catalog (Graber from Verona) was passed around to the committee members to provide an idea as to the possible type and mounting of the bike racks. Outside racks were discussed as to effective and efficient use and placement. Design and functional use were considered important attributes in adding to the aesthetics of the building, especially when placing them in proximity to the proposed "coffee shop". A question was raised as to the parking location for mopeds. Another issue was whether or not the outside bike racks would be moved indoors during the winter.
  - c) Landscaping: The developer wants to create an environmentally sound building. The rooftop will have several garden areas including a vegetable and herb garden, a prairie garden, and a bird garden. A butterfly garden will be at the third floor level. In addition, it is planned that each balcony will have a flower box designated for a particular planting. The roof area is to function as a rain garden. Captured rainwater will be used to irrigate the roof gardens. The intent is to retain all rainwater onsite except in case of a deluge and then the storm sewer will take the excess. In addition, the hard surface roof tiles will be environmentally friendly. The street level plantings around the perimeter of the building was discussed. There will be a 30-inch high wall between the sidewalk and the drop off area. This space will provide for plantings as well as around the perimeter on both sides of the building. Each side will have a combination of Arborvitae as well as flowering shrubs to add color and variety to the foundation. There is no

intention to have grass planted. Underground irrigation will service all plantings on the roof and around the perimeter. A house gardener will be hired to care for all the plantings. It was stated that MG&E might assist in financing some of the environmental aspects of the building.

- d) Lighting: As indicated in the handout the design of all site lighting will be coordinated to complement the site design and architectural character of the building. Site lighting will include wall mount lighting at the parking entrance, wall mount lighting at the main entrance and wall mount lighting at the first floor deck/patio. Each deck will have a wall mount or ceiling light. The decks are recessed and the lights will be no more than 60 watts so there should only be a low light impact. There will also be lighting directed at the building from the 30-inch wall at the sidewalk. It is believed this will have a low light impact. There may be solar lights in the garden area although that has not been decided yet.
  - e) Signage: There will be a sign over the entry in raised metal letters indicating the name of the building. The name hasn't been decided on yet. There would also be some sign for the "coffee shop". There was some discussion as to what signs could be placed in the large windows of the businesses. There are city ordinances guiding these displays.
  - f) Shadowing: A few examples of the shadow impact of the building were provided indicating shadow impacts at noon throughout the year. It was requested that shadow impacts be done for representative months at two-hour intervals so that the shadow impact can be effectively determined.
  - g) Updated Timeline:
    - 1) Monday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, Steering Committee, 7:00 P.M. @ Meriter.
    - 2) Thursday, September 29<sup>th</sup>, Neighborhood meeting @ Meriter.
    - 3) Wednesday, October 5<sup>th</sup>, Urban Design Committee @4:15 P.M.
4. Steering Committee Members' Input As to Project: Around the Table
- a) Positives: One member is impressed with the project and thinks it's a great building. Everyone likes the garden aspect to the building.
  - b) Issues/Concerns: Another member pointed out the possibility of litter from the "coffee shop". Another member had concerns of shadowing and would like to see more detail.
  - c) Action(s)/ Assignments: Developer Representatives will address the following items on our next agenda:
    - 1) Quality of Materials
    - 2) Bike Racks/parking
    - 3) Mopeds
    - 4) Shadowing
    - 5) Signage
5. Other Agenda Items: None
6. Future Meeting Dates: Steering Committee Meeting, Monday, September 19<sup>th</sup> @ Meriter.

**425 Steering Committee**  
**September 19th, 2005 Minutes**  
**Meriter Main Gate**  
**7:00 p.m.**

1. In Attendance: Steering Committee members Jon Cooper, Rosemary Lee, Pat Meehan (Chair and Recorder), Shane Reddemann, and Curtis Weber. Developer Representatives present were Lee Christensen, Michael Quigley, and John Sutton.
2. Approval of August 30th Minutes: Rosemary Lee motioned and Jon Cooper seconded approval of the minutes. Minutes were approved.
3. Project Review (Michael Quigley)
  - a) Quality of Materials: John Sutton (Architect) provided the overview as to the quality of the materials planned for the building at 425 W. Washington now being called **Washington Plaza**. He said that the developer uses above average materials in his buildings. Mechanicals on the rooftop will be enclosed within a structure. The heating/air conditioning system will be a closed water-source pump system in which each individual tenant will have control. The landlord pays for the main plant (temperature range is 75-90 degrees). The tenant pays for the electricity to each individual unit. Plumbing will include stainless steel sinks and garbage disposals. There will be stainless steel appliances including electric ranges and frost-free refrigerators. Laundries will be in every unit including efficiencies. There will be an underground irrigation system for all plant areas. MG&E thought they could put all the electrical wires to the building under ground. There will be an energy efficient lighting package. High Speed Internet will be built in and security cameras will be located throughout the building. The steel column and beam construction will provide a quality of sound separation. There will be an absolute separation from unit to unit. Other features include high quality aluminum framed windows with cultured marble sills. Sinks will also be cultured marble. Finishes will be of maple or birch. Living rooms will have wood floors, with kitchens and bathrooms tiled. A good commercial quality carpet will be used through out the building. A pad will be under the bedroom carpets. An environmental group will work with the architect to select materials.
  - b) Bike Racks/Parking: There are 81 interior bike stalls with 5 ft. walkways. Wall mounts will be available for both tenants and health club members. In addition, every floor will have 10 units for storage. This allowance for bike parking/storage exceeds the zoning requirements. Sixteen spots for bikes will be located outside.
  - c) Mopeds: There will be seven moped spaces available on each of the three floors of parking for total of 21 spaces.
  - d) Signage: All signage has to go through the Urban Design Committee. The name **Washington Plaza** along with the address will be on the canopy of the building. All other signage will be on the glass.
  - e) Shadowing: The committee reviewed the computer generated simulations for the months and hours when shadowing would be most critical to the surrounding areas of the proposed building. Even during January, the month with the severest

shadowing impact, surrounding buildings were impacted very little. Much of the shadowing fell over the street rather than buildings to either side.

- f) Updated Timeline: October 10<sup>th</sup>- Neighborhood Meeting @ 7:00 PM to review 425 W. Washington (thanks to Pete Ostlind for giving up most of the BNA meeting time to make room for our neighborhood meeting); October 19<sup>th</sup>- Urban Design Committee @4:30 PM; October 24<sup>th</sup>- Planning Commission @ 6:00 PM; It was uncertain whether the City Council would review this project on November 1<sup>st</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup>.
4. Steering Committee Members' Input As to Project
- a) Positives: Three of the steering committee members praised the project and feel the developer has done a good job.
  - b) Issues/Concerns: Two of the steering committee members are pleased with the quality of the project but again feel, based on the building's height and mass, it doesn't meet the neighborhood plan and therefore is being proposed for the wrong site.
  - c) Action(s)/ Assignments: The chair will develop a steering committee summary draft of our process and findings for review and editing by the committee members before it is put in final form. This will be the basis of our report at the October 10<sup>th</sup> Neighborhood meeting. If we can't agree on the summary I will ask us to reconvene for a face - to - face meeting to attempt an agreement on the wording of the final document.
5. Other Agenda Items: None
6. Future Meeting Dates: TBD if needed based on agreement as to the steering committee summary document.

BASSETT NEIGHBORHOOD STEERING COMMITTEE  
OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY REPORT  
ON  
425 W. WASHINGTON

#### MEMBERSHIP

Seven neighborhood resident members initially comprised the committee membership including Jonathon Cooper, Chet Droessler, Rosemary Lee, Patrick Meehan (chairperson and recorder), Scott Nyland, Victor Villacrez and Curtis Weber. Shane Reddemann replaced Scott Nyland right from the beginning due to Scott's schedule conflicts. Chet Droessler resigned due to a conflict of interest as a Capital Fitness employee. Victor Villacrez resigned due to moving from the neighborhood. The committee ended up with five members who maintained consistent attendance.

The developer representatives remained constant throughout the five sessions with Lee Christensen, Michael Quigley and John Sutton (architect) attending the meetings.

Alderman Verveer attended the meetings and provided both information and historical perspective as needed.

#### GUIDELINES

The meeting guidelines listed below were accepted by the steering committee members at the July 7<sup>th</sup> meeting:

- a) **Decision Making** - To use consensus as the basis for agreement.
- b) **Use of Data** - To base discussions/decisions on data and hard facts.
- c) **Confidentiality** - Members may discuss the committee work and topics with the public at large unless the committee as a whole or individual member sharing such information with the committee wishes it to stay with the committee.
- d) **Assignments** - Members delegated assignments will complete assignments on time.
- e) **Participation** - All members will be provided the opportunity to give input. At the same time all members will respectfully listen to what others say.
- f) **Predictability in Reporting** - The minutes will accurately reflect the discussion and action of the committee. Minutes will be approved at each meeting. Committee minutes will be included in the Bassett Neighborhood binder at Jo's cafe.

These guidelines were followed throughout the five steering committee sessions.

#### MEETING DATES

The steering committee met five times from July 7<sup>th</sup> to September 19<sup>th</sup>. The minutes of these meetings are attached.

#### OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

The development plan indicated that there would be two floors of underground parking. The first floor would have 2000 square feet of retail space that may include a coffee shop/cafe. This is expected to increase foot traffic in the area. The second and third floor would house the health club, including a 25 meter pool with four lanes on the second floor. The fourth floor will consist of commercial office space with 25% of this area being occupied by Dr.

Bonsett-Veal and the rest open for the possibility of a chiropractor and/or physical therapist type business. The fifth through eighth floors would have forty apartments including four efficiencies, 16 one bedrooms and 20 two bedrooms. Inclusionary zoning will involve 15% of the units dispersed both among the allotment of apartment sizes as well as floors (One efficiency, two one - bedroom and three two - bedroom).

The rooftop area will be the first intensive green roof constructed in the city. This means large trees and plantings can be established there. A 2000 square foot community room will also be located on the roof which will be available to the tenants with the possibility of it being open to the public under a tenant sponsorship arrangement.

This development will increase the present green space from 1300 to 5000 square feet including the roof. There will be an open balcony design and three different materials used on the front of the building: brick; metal shingles at the corners; and stone at the base of the building.

The building setback is 17.5 feet from the sidewalk or 16 feet from the property line. It will be almost two feet closer to the sidewalk than the present building structure.

The following issues were reported on and discussed during the meeting sessions:

**Trees** - Except for the Honey Locust on the terrace and the arborvitae planted along the back of the lot line the other trees were probably self-seeded. Many of the trees along the east lot line actually have either a wood or iron fence growing through them. There is concern for the Honey Locust during the staging and construction process. In answer to the question as to what happens if either or both trees are destroyed during the construction process the answer assumed the developer would replace them with similar tree(s) at the largest size replacement possible.

**Landscaping** - The developer wants to create an environmentally sound building. The rooftop will have several garden areas including a vegetable and herb garden, a prairie garden, and a bird garden. A butterfly garden will be at the third floor level. In addition, it is planned that each balcony will have a flower box designated for a particular planting. The roof area is to function as a rain garden. Captured rainwater will be used to irrigate the roof gardens. The intent is to retain all rainwater onsite except in case of a deluge and then the storm sewer will take the excess. In addition, the hard surface roof tiles will be environmentally friendly. The street level plantings around the perimeter of the building was discussed. There will be a 30-inch high wall between the sidewalk and the drop off area. This space will provide for plantings as well as around the perimeter on both sides of the building. Each side will have a combination of Arborvitae as well as flowering shrubs to add color and variety to the foundation. There is no intention to have grass planted. Underground irrigation will service all plantings on the roof and around the perimeter. A house gardener will be hired to care for all the plantings. It was stated that MG&E might assist in financing some of the environmental aspects of the building.

**Lighting:** As indicated in the handout the design of all site lighting will be coordinated to complement the site design and architectural character of the building. Site lighting will include wall mount lighting at the parking entrance, wall mount lighting at the main entrance and wall mount lighting at the first floor deck/patio. Each deck will have a wall mount or ceiling light. The decks are recessed and the lights will be no more than 60 watts so there should only be a low light impact. There will also be lighting directed at the building from the 30-inch wall at the sidewalk. It is believed this will have a low light

impact. There may be solar lights in the garden area although that has not been decided yet.

**Quality of Materials:** The architect provided an overview as to the quality of the materials planned for the building at 425 W. Washington now being named *Washington Plaza*. He said that the developer uses above average materials in his buildings. Mechanicals on the rooftop will be enclosed within a structure. The heating/air conditioning system will be a closed water-source pump system in which each individual tenant will have control. The landlord pays for the main plant (temperature range is 75-90 degrees). The tenant pays for the electricity to each individual unit. Plumbing will include stainless steel sinks and garbage disposals. There will be stainless steel appliances including electric ranges and frost-free refrigerators. Laundries will be in every unit including efficiencies. There will be an underground irrigation system for all plant areas. MG&E thought they could put all the electrical wires to the building under ground. There will be an energy efficient lighting package. High Speed Internet will be built in and security cameras will be located throughout the building. The steel column and beam construction will provide a quality of sound separation. There will be an absolute sound separation from unit to unit. Other features include high quality aluminum framed windows with cultured marble sills. Sinks will also be cultured marble. Finishes will be of maple or birch. Living rooms will have wood floors, with kitchens and bathrooms tiled. A good commercial quality carpet will be used through out the building. A pad will be under the bedroom carpets. An environmental group will work with the architect to select materials.

**Bike Racks:** There are 81 interior bike stalls with 5 ft. walkways. Wall mounts will be available for both tenants and health club members. In addition, every floor will have 10 units for storage. This allowance for bike parking/storage exceeds the zoning requirements. Sixteen spots for bikes will be located outside.

**Mopeds -** There will be seven moped spaces available on each of the three floors of parking for a total of 21 spaces.

**Signage -** All signage has to go through the Urban Design Committee. The name *Washington Plaza* along with the address will be on the canopy of the building. All other signage will be on the glass.

**Shadowing -** The committee reviewed the computer generated simulations for the months and hours when shadowing would be most critical to the surrounding areas of the proposed building. Even during January, the month with the severest shadowing impact, surrounding buildings were impacted very little. Much of the shadowing fell over the street rather than buildings to either side.

## **PROS AND CONS**

The many positives related to this project are listed below:

- 1) Developer listened to neighborhood concerns
- 2) Owner has stated he has a long term commitment to this project
- 3) All surrounding property owners are in favor of this project
- 4) Provides quality living for tenants
- 5) Several retail possibilities available

- 6) Professional services provided such as optometrist
- 7) Attract more professionals to live downtown
- 8) Provide a positive hub of activity in the area
- 9) Green building with extensive roof garden
- 10) No TIF required
- 11) Inclusionary housing of same quality and distribution as other units
- 12) People in neighborhood can walk to health club
- 13) Brings jobs and amenities to neighborhood
- 14) Infill site as opposed to tear down

There is only one negative but it is a major one and that is the height and mass of the proposed building. As it stands it is in noncompliance with the Bassett Neighborhood Plan. The Bassett Plan is the only guide the neighborhood has concerning land use. Some boundary has to serve any plan and Broom Street is the boundary for buildings taller than four stories. Tall buildings such as the one proposed impact the surrounding historic homes with its scale and impact on the residential character of the neighborhood.

### **SUMMARY**

The committee members could not reach consensus as to approving the project being proposed at 425 W. Washington. It was felt that in order for any building project to override the Bassett Neighborhood Plan it would have to be an outstanding addition to the neighborhood. Three of the steering committee members feel this project meets the “outstanding” criteria. Two of the members, while believing this to be a quality project and a sincere attempt by the developers to bring quality services and living to the neighborhood, still view the building itself as out of scale given its height and mass. So, as three members accept the mass and height as a trade off for the proposed benefits, two members see the mass and height issue as going against both the spirit and intent of the Bassett Neighborhood Plan. While it is a quality project, the dissenting members feel the project is a block too far west.

### **CHAIRPERSON’S EDITORIAL**

As this project moves on to the various city committees seeking approval, it is this chairperson’s hope that future projects will continue to be judged on their individual merits and not on the basis of any precedence being set. Otherwise, it is my belief that neighborhood plans will be disregarded and have no impact on neighborhood development decisions in the future.

I want to thank the committee members, both the neighborhood residents and the developers’ representatives, for their valued time and input into the steering committee process. While we didn’t always agree I always felt that people listened to one another and respected each other’s views. One can’t ask for more.



## BASSETT NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

### SUMMARY

OCTOBER 10, 2005

Meriter Terrace

The Bassett Neighborhood meeting was called to order by Alderman Verveer at 7:15 p.m. He thanked the Steering Committee members for giving their time to the review of the current project. He also stated that the Bassett Plan will need to be amended if the project presented tonight is approved by the city council. Mike Verveer then introduced the Bassett Neighborhood District chairperson Pete Ostlind.

Pete Ostlind welcomed everyone and had people introduce themselves around the room. He encouraged membership in the Bassett Neighborhood and the Capital Neighborhood Incorporated associations. He also mentioned that people should wait till the end of the presentation tonight before filling out the survey. He noted that several surveys had already been completed. Pete Ostlind then introduced Michael Quigley.

Michael Quigley mentioned that he appreciated working with the neighborhood and felt that it improved the project overall. Michael then presented the project and the qualities of the building. He emphasized the attempt by the developer to create a high quality design with amenities for both tenants and those using the facilities. The green aspects of the building were also presented including steps that will be taken to recycle materials during the demolition process.

Michael then introduced Patrick Meehan, chairperson of the Bassett Neighborhood Steering Committee.

Patrick Meehan reviewed the Overview and Summary of the Steering Committee process which was made available to everyone at the meeting. Each of the committee members were provided an opportunity to speak with all five expressing their appreciation for the quality of the project and three supporting the project as a whole. Two of the members expressed concern as to the height and mass of the building with respect to its location and adherence to the Bassett Neighborhood Plan. Patrick Meehan turned the meeting back over to Pete Ostlind.

Pete Ostlind moderated the question and answer period. An often spirited discussion and debate followed with give and take among all parties involved. The issues raised are reflected in the survey results. Holding to the 90 minute agenda agreed to the meeting ended at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Patrick Meehan

NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY  
FOR  
425 W. WASHINGTON  
OCTOBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2005

Questions v	BASSETT	CAPITAL	OTHER	ALL
Responders>	22	40	15	77
Quality of surrounding architectural design	7.61	8.71	8.53	8.36
Design compatibility with surrounding neighborhood	6.42	7.79	7.67	7.37
Quality of proposed building materials	8.50	9.28	9.29	9.04
Height and mass of building at proposed location	5.64	8.51	8.00	7.58
Shadowing impact on surrounding neighborhood	5.63	9.14	8.46	8.01
Appropriateness of proposed building use	8.36	9.47	8.60	9.22
Sufficient green space	7.73	9.27	9.67	8.91
Quality of landscaping	7.77	9.54	9.67	9.05
Pedestrian-friendly environment	7.45	9.32	9.60	8.83
Minimizes noise and light impact on surrounding neighborhood	6.59	8.97	9.43	8.32
Quality of life for future Washington Plaza residents	8.95	9.18	9.61	9.21
Overall quality of this development	7.90	9.08	9.31	8.78
TOTAL	7.38	9.01	9.08	8.56
YES > Responders-percent	15-68%	38-95%	14-93%	67-87%
NO > Responders-percent	7-32%	2-5%	1-7%	10-13%