

**From:** zweibel@astro.wisc.edu <zweibel@astro.wisc.edu>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 3, 2021 1:08 PM  
**To:** All Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** [All Alders] Housing on East Washington Ave

**Recipient:** All Alders

**Name:** Ellen Zweibel  
**Address:** 1511 Rutledge St, Madison, WI 53703  
**Phone:** 608-294-5614  
**Email:** [zweibel@astro.wisc.edu](mailto:zweibel@astro.wisc.edu)

**Would you like us to contact you?** Yes, by email

**Message:**

Dear Alders,

I'm appalled by the statements reported in the October 3 Wisconsin State Journal that Bill Connors made about building new housing along E. Washington Ave. in an area that will be exposed to high volume noise from F35s at Truax Field.

It is acknowledged that basing the F 35s at Truax will subject nearby residents to a dangerous level of noise. Why, then, expose even more people to this environmental bane? Why let the personal greed of Mr. Connor and his associates what else could it be? present Madisonians with a housing choice that's demonstrably bad for their health? One of the reasons we have laws and government is to protect people from their own desperation. Be a good government and continue to deny applications for housing development in dangerously noisy areas.

From: James Wold <[jaydub45@att.net](mailto:jaydub45@att.net)>  
Sent: Sunday, October 3, 2021 1:16 PM  
To: Abbas, Syed  
Subject: Comment Re Development news story.

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

James S. Wold  
2845 Hoard St.  
Madison WI, 53704

Sunday, October 3, 2021

Syed Abbas,  
Alder, District 12  
City of Madison

Re: Contemplated residential redevelopment of E. Washington Ave. corridor, 2900 through 3500 blocks.

Hi Syed,  
I read the news story in the Sunday State Journal about this. I believe you are aimed in the right direction on the subject, go slow, be cautious, and be very mindful of noise pollution.

I saw comments by Bill Conners, Executive Director, of Smart Growth Greater Madison addressing the noise concerns.

ITEM

Conners says the market will solve the problem as builders who do not adequately sound proof will struggle to keep tenants.

Nonsense. Poor quality buildings will do one of two things, and one is to rent to whoever can supply cash, and thereby forgo meaningful tenant screening. Ask Mr Conners how many active drug dealers in a building does it take to run all the good tenants out of a 40 unit apartment building?

Otherwise, poor quality buildings will change ownership frequently with an occasional foreclosure along the way. Can Mr. Conners present data, from Madison, showing how apartment buildings which change ownership frequently improve in quality, with information about increases in rent, decreases in tenant turnover, and number of calls for police service per building?

ITEM

Conners suggests just letting the developers and renters just figure it out. Renters would be free to move on. But..... the buildings will stay. The developers or owners will still have to pay the mortgage on the building. So they will either rent to lesser quality tenants to get money, be foreclosed, or sell the building to an unsuspecting new owner at a loss just to get rid of it. See the previous item.

ITEM

Conners says that developers were scared off of sites with potential future noise pollution issues by the demise of the Raemisch Farm development. Why exactly isn't that a good thing for the people who live here and may find themselves in a terrible living situation due to noise pollution? Ask Mr. Conners to answer that specific question.

Conners says if you take an area prime for redevelopment out of play for residential development, you make it harder to reach the stated goals for increases in housing stock. Why exactly? Make him answer that question. Are there no other locations in the Madison area suitable for residential development?

Can city staff draw a simple map showing areas in Madison that are “prime for redevelopment” but are not near the airport? Can that map be presented to Mr Conners and then ask him to explain his comment above in light of it?

#### ITEM

My memory of areas in Madison come up with stretches along Park St. south of Fish Hatchery Rd. that appear similar to E. Washington Ave. in the 2900 - 3500 blocks. You could also find blocks of downtown Regent St. and even Monroe St. that fit that description vaguely. Yes, the BRT route could be moved to go “University Ave., south on Park St., west on Regent St., North on Highland Ave., back to University Ave.” Park St. is already noted as a supplemental route for BRT.

Is Mr. Conners focused upon that portion of E. Washington Ave. because of the potential to buy up a half or even a whole block at one time and thus do a larger and more profitable residential development in the manner of the Galaxy or Constellation buildings on E. Washington Ave. near Livingston St.?

#### CONCLUSION:

City redevelopment incorporating many and important considerations is complex. The consequences of choices made about this will affect Madison for decades. So patience and care are entirely warranted. I submit that the short term desires of one well funded interest group are only one item for consideration and not at all the most important of the varied items at play in this complicated issue.

Feel free to pass this along to your “Council Workgroup” on this issue.

Thank you,  
/s/ Jim Wold