

From: Kevin Luecke [<mailto:kluecke1@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 12:58 PM

To: Murphy, Brad

Cc: King, Steve; Rummel, Marsha; Schmidt, Chris; erics@cow.s.org; michael.heifetz@deancare.com; hiwayman@chorus.net; bacantrell@charter.net; avandrzejews@wisc.edu; tonyalhn@aol.com; jfinnmore@madison.k12.wi.us

Subject: Comments for 4/23/12 Meeting re: 800 block of East Washington

Dear Members of the Plan Commission:

I am writing to urge you to reject Item 25885 on your agenda today regarding Urban Land Interests, LLC's proposal for the 800 Block of East Washington Avenue.

As a resident of the area, I am strongly in favor of densely redeveloping the East Washington corridor to provide employment, retail and housing opportunities. I support the general concept of ULI's proposal, but am opposed to the design and phasing of the project. ULI's proposal, with medium density development and a phasing schedule potentially stretching to ten years, would be appropriate for Research Park or some other suburban office park, but it is not an appropriate catalyst to spur further development in the East Washington corridor.

The city should work to ensure that the development on the 800 North and South blocks of East Washington is dense and will set a high standard for future development in the corridor. The ULI proposal does not do this.

Please reject item 25885 on today's meeting agenda and support item 25966 which would reopen the selection process for development on the 800 North and South blocks of East Washington.

Thank you,
Kevin Luecke
121 N. Ingersoll St.

Firchow, Kevin

From: Murphy, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2012 10:43 AM
To: Firchow, Kevin
Subject: FW:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Kevin, You probably have this but if not it should get into the leg. File. Thanks.

Brad Murphy
Planning Division Director
Dept. of Planning & Community & Economic Development
P.O. Box 2985
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
Madison, WI 53701
608 266 4635

From: Joseph Hoey [mailto:joeypoey@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 1:20 PM
To: Murphy, Brad
Subject:

Dear Chair Fey,

I appreciate you taking the time to consider my comments regarding this evenings Plan Commission meeting. On tonight's agenda are two items dealing with the redevelopment of the 800 Block of East Washington. As a resident of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood who walks by the site on my way to and from work every day, I want to offer support for the ULI proposal and express discomfort with any attempt to start the process over.

Especially troubling is the language in Alder Maniaci's resolution that tries to justify reopening the process on the grounds that "no representation of area neighborhood associations were part of the Selection Committee decision making process . . . and no public meetings were held as part of the Selection Committee's work to expressly solicit and consider public reactions to the submitted proposals." As you can see from the e-mail below, neighborhood residents tried to involve themselves in the process but were actively opposed by their own Alder.

It is true that it would have been better to have neighborhood input earlier, but the process worked as designed and developers were chosen. ULI played by the rules and should not be penalized. Their proposal may not be everyone's first choice, but they have proven time and time again that they can do a good job and be good neighbors.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Joe Hoey
1318 East Mifflin Street
Madison, WI

On Fri, Oct 28, 2011 at 7:14 PM, Maniaci, Bridget wrote:

Dear Neighbors,

The redevelopment of the Don Miller parcels are an important step forward for our neighborhood and the city as a whole. With the City as a partner in this process, we must be quite public and the city and its development process must be forefront in our handling of this project. I must write a response to David Waugh's previous email to the neighborhood and outline the public process under which this project will be handled.

Interested citizens are always free to gather in each others' homes to discuss policy, however, development proposals demand that everyone is included in an equitable fashion, and a steering committee made up of a handful of individuals does not make for the thoughtful and thorough conversation we would like to see on this project, no matter how well-intentioned.

Therefore, after considerable conversation with the Mayor's Office, Common Council Leadership and the head of Planning & Community & Economic Development, we have advised the developers of the 700 N Block development not to meet with small groups in private discussion. There are several reasons for this. First, comments and feedback on this (and any other) development proposal need to be made in a public setting. Secondly, it sets a dangerous precedent that developers are expected to meet with any individuals or group that seeks an audience. Not only does that create a conflicted communication path, but it sets development proposals on a sideward trajectory through the city's well-defined development process. Additionally, no one group should unduly influence the development process and the proposals being made. The purpose of committees like Urban Design and Plan Commission is to balance the public interests and opinions of various groups.

The Gebhardt development team has had two public meetings on their proposal with the neighborhood to date, in addition to a lengthy discussion with the entire Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association Council. These conversations shall continue regularly as there are new developments and designs to consider. They are now working to further refine their plans, based upon these public meetings, and when there is additional information, we will be working to organize a follow-up neighborhood meeting. It is imperative that this project is shaped by us all, not a small group of individuals, because there are many important stakeholders on this project not just in the neighborhood, but city-wide, and opportunities to share opinions need to be open to all those groups equitably.

Additionally, discussions on height to the proposal are of question at this point. The city's RFP committee recommended the project while there is an ordinance related to the urban design district that would preclude parts of the proposal. The question of height has been being debated both off-line and in public by many for weeks now. In the interest of an open public dialogue on this matter, Tuesday night I will be introducing legislation so that the commissions and Common Council may hear your opinions on the ordinance and make a decision as it relates to this project site. I have attached it to this email. It would allow for a building height of 10 stories, with 2 additional floors as allowed under the existing conditions set forth in the ordinance for the portion of the 700 N block that Gebhardt would be purchasing from the city. The site in question currently is written into the ordinance at 8 stories, plus 2 additional floors as allowed. The proper place for this debate lies before the city and its committees. I look forward to your participation in this process. It will be referred to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission. The tentative schedule would have it at Urban Design on November 23 and Plan Commission on December 5. You may visit the city's weekly meeting schedule to check on committee meetings and agendas. <http://www.cityofmadison.com/cityHall/WeeklySchedule/>

I want to thank David in his capacity of Development Chair for TLNA for setting up a website to disseminate information on the project as it develops. I'm sure it will be an invaluable resource. There are many folks who must be a part of "hashing this through" and I encourage you all to be a part of this public process for the city.

Sincerely,
Alder Bridget Maniaci

The Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association had the opportunity to have an active dialogue and presentation with Tom Neujahr and Kevin O'Driscoll on April 5 and the council has developed a position on the proposal thus far.

We oppose the sale of the 800 block of E Washington Avenue to Urban Land Interest unless they can demonstrate the ability to develop the whole block in its entirety and within a 3 year window, and so we register in opposition to the Letter of Intent before you. We are underwhelmed by the level of details that have been made available to us and among other terms and conditions, we are uncomfortable with the phasing concept of this proposal.

While we believe that ULI has shown that they are capable of smart, efficient development with the City of Madison, and applaud them for their previous projects, we are discouraged by a number of the specific negotiated terms to their proposal and the impacts they will have in the neighborhood.

1) The enclosed terms separating the parcel into different sale phases is contrary to our wishes. We believe that the block should be sold and developed in its entirety with the responsibilities and implications of all parties clear, especially regarding the parking ramp structure.

2) The proposed timeline for pre-construction and construction activity is a significant concern. A protracted construction window is detrimental to the quality of life in the neighborhood. Our expectation is to have a developer that can undertake a shovel-ready project for the full block and to break ground no later than summer of 2013.

We believe that a 2 year construction window is an acceptable intrusion to the residential nature of the neighborhood. The pre-construction 12-18 month period where there may be uncertainty as to whether the project will move forward is troubling to us. We have little assurances that this project is even viable given the lack of hard tenant prospects demonstrated to us at this point.

3) The use of surface parking lots with no guarantee of a parking ramp being built gives us no comfort that the site plan conforms with the adopted BUILD Plan or successfully addresses the neighborhood's parking concerns of Breese Stevens Field.

4) We embrace technology-based employment, but do not believe it should be the dominating employment consideration as outlined in the Letter of Intent. We look for a diversity of employment opportunities that support the mixed-income nature of the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods. Additionally, we ask that the employment opportunities cater to the needs of the neighborhood while still providing a diversity of services to the neighborhood.

We are excited to be at the forefront of the City of Madison's next great development vision. As engaged taxpayers, we, more than anyone, do not want to see the City's

money and resources tied up on this block for a protracted period and we will continue to be highly enthusiastic partners with the City in making the 800 block of East Washington a success. We urge you to press for a stronger commitment of terms from the developer than is currently proposed within the Letter of Intent.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with you through the decision and development process.

Sincerely,

Richard Linster, President TLNA