

From: Hayley Tymeson <hdtymeson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 12:54 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: On Agenda Item 8 (#60480, 133 E. Lakeside St)

Hi there,

First of all, I'd like to thank the Plan Commission for all the time, energy, and diligence they bring to the Madison planning process. I appreciate that public comments are solicited and accepted, even though it lengthens meetings and adds prep time to an already-busy schedule.

I'd like to offer my mixed support for the 133 East Lakeside Street redevelopment, with a few long-term worries. I know the area very well - I have often biked past the property in question over the last year on my way to Olin Park or the John Nolen Drive bike lane. This is a *prime* location for the city's Comprehensive Plan goals of adding the missing-middle model of housing density, and will offer some much-needed housing as Madison grows. In general, I think this is a great development.

Yet I was concerned to read that the developers plan to incorporate 70 enclosed parking spaces for 66 housing units (with a further 19 parking spaces for the commercial property). I have multiple reasons for thinking this is excessive for the property, and will incentive vehicle ownership in Madison.

1. Transportation options: This location is perfect for a reduced reliance on cars for transportation. It is directly across the street from the John Nolen separated bike path, which offers bicyclists a safe, two-lane, separated bike lane away from cars. Biking from 133 Lakeside to the capitol is a mere 13 minute bike ride, or a 30-minute walk. There is a grocery store, local shops, and multiple parks within one mile of the property, so many of the basic necessities are easily within reach without a car. There are (admittedly slower, but available) bus routes that are a six minute walk away as well.

2. Apartment offerings: Of the 66 planned units, 58 of them are intended as efficiency, studio, or 1-bedroom apartments. That seems like a clear signal that the apartment building is targeting young, single professionals...like myself. My generation does not all expect to have the opportunity to own a car. We don't even *want* to own a car much of the time. But if we offer free parking spaces for everyone, and the city neglects walk, bike, and bus infrastructure as a result...residents may end up feeling forced into buying a car.

This property doesn't need that much parking. It has many other transportation options, and is marketed towards a group of renters that might gladly forgo a car (or take the extra income of renting their parking space out if parking and apartment rent were unbundled).

This matters to me a lot, because every additional car driving through Madison chips away at the city I hope for. As a public health professional, I dream of a world where walking and biking are the norm. Walkable communities would probably be my #1 intervention to counter our rise in non-communicable diseases such as diabetes and high blood pressure, and our nation's obesity crisis. Walkable and bikeable cities would also be a major step forward in responding to our climate crisis. When people ditch cars, they also leave behind the huge amount of CO2 emissions

from vehicle use. And as sprawl decreases, nature gets a little less far away for everyone. Instead of driving 45 minutes to get out of the city suburbs, imagine a world where people can take public transportation to the end of the city boundaries and find themselves on a hiking trail. Without sprawl, nature is more accessible, more equitable, and closer than ever for city-dwellers. Last, on a personal level, I know this world works for busy human beings - because I lived without a car in a walkable and bikeable city for three years and *loved* it. From age 23-26, I lived, worked, and studied in Seattle while owning only a bike and renting a microflat. I appreciated dodging the expense of a car while working full time and studying for my Master's in Public Health in Seattle - because Seattle made buying a car *expensive*. Parking was typically \$100 a month, and never a given when renting an apartment (my microflat building didn't even have parking). Further, the city made biking *faster* than driving through its network of bike lanes. Seriously, I could bike almost anywhere in the city and beat my friends who drove or took the bus instead.

Raising costs for car ownership will likely reduce car ownership among the rising generations in Madison, and hopefully even convince some families that their second car isn't quite so necessary anymore. Reducing parking options will up space, money, and resources towards developing walkable and bikeable neighborhoods. Offering every renter a free parking spot as a right will, on the other hand, incentivize car ownership, and lead to more traffic, more sprawl, and less and less space for pedestrians, bikers, and buses.

I understand it is immensely difficult for the Plan Commission to arbitrarily enforce Transportation Demand Plans or different parking standards for certain properties. I know it's likely not possible to tell this one developer that it should have less parking than it is legally allowed to. But continuing to allow one parking space per apartment, even in neighborhoods that are already highly navigable via other transportation methods, will have long-term costs for Madison. I urge members of the Plan Commission to think through incentives to encourage developers to include unbundled parking (ie separating the cost of renting a parking space from renting an apartment), less parking, and more bicycle and walking infrastructure, in this case and many others.

Thanks for bearing with me through that loong comment.
Best,

Hayley Tymeson
1209 Chandler St.
Madison, WI

From: Susan Millar <sbmillar@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 09, 2020 4:17 PM

To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Susan Millar <sbmillar@gmail.com>

Subject: Regarding Item 8 (#60480, 133 E. Lakeside St.) on the 08/10/20 Plan Commission Agenda

Dear Members of the Plan Commission:

I begin, as before, by thanking you for the time, expertise and commitment you bring to the Plan Commission.

First, I support the City's, and especially the Plan Commission's, commitment to increasing housing density both in order to provide affordable housing, and to reduce urban sprawl and the harm (particularly in CO2 emissions) it causes the Earth that supports us. Thank you for attending to the research that demonstrates that CO2 emissions are reduced if people live in well-planned, dense urban centers, rather than in car-focused single-family urban sprawl, and for making pro-density rezoning decisions at your recent Special Meeting.

Second, I write to support the location and housing density features of the project proposed for 133 E. Lakeside Street.

Third, I write to express grave concern about the *unsustainable design* of this as well as the many other apartment building proposals you have approved in the last few months. As used here, the term "unsustainable design" refers to:

- the efficiency standards of the buildings,
- the strategies (or lack thereof) for making the use of cars undesirable while making walking, biking and public transport easy and attractive, and
- the sustainability of the landscaping (including stormwater management).

My understanding is that you too share many of these concerns. Watching your meetings, I have seen you struggle with the limits placed by outdated state-mandated building codes, and with the absence of sustainability-focused city ordinances that might be passed. As a member of 350 Madison's City of Madison Plan Commission Climate Corps (PC3), I seek to push these limits by asking the following questions about Proposal #60480:

- Can the number of proposed parking spaces (89 spaces for 66 units, many of which may be occupied by people who do not own cars and plan to travel by foot, bike or bus) be reduced? At a minimum, can renters be required to pay for a parking space, thereby reducing the attractiveness of car use? Such changes would reduce building cost and CO2 emissions.
- Can you require that the building at least be solar ready? This would reduce expense once the building owners realize how cheap solar is, compared with fossil fuels.
- Can you require that the building be all electric and provide renters with appliances that use the minimum amount of energy? This would protect tenants from fossil gas fumes, and reduce their utility bills.

I close with a quote that partially captures the concerns that inform this letter:

Ecological economists argue for reforms that would ground economics in ecological principles and the constraints of thermodynamics. They urge the embrace of the radical

notion that we must sustain natural capital and ecosystem services if we are to maintain quality of life. But governments still cling to the neoclassical fallacy that human consumption has no consequences. We continue to embrace economic systems that prescribe infinite growth on a finite planet, as if somehow the universe had repealed the laws of thermodynamics on our behalf....

from Robin Wall Kimmerer's *Braiding Sweetgrass* (2015)

With my respect,
Susan Millar
2233 Rowley Ave., Madison, WI 53726
sbmillar@gmail.com

From: Peggy ROSIN <peggy.rosin@wisc.edu>
Sent: Saturday, August 08, 2020 3:32 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: August Item: 60480. 133 E. Lakeside Street

August 8, 2020

To: Plan Commission Item: 60480. 133 E. Lakeside Street
Dear Plan Commission:

I applaud your commitment to the City of Madison and its future. Your time, efforts and expertise are appreciated. I'm writing to ask a few questions about Item: 60480. 133 E. Lakeside Street. My partner has had a business on E Lakeside Street for over 40 years, so I know the neighborhood well. I do believe that the City needs to increase density to combat urban sprawl and the accompanying use of energy and resources and its contribution to increased CO2. Since the argument for increasing density is to decrease the CO2, this brings me my questions:

1. Has the proposed mixed-use building proposal made any attempt to address sustainability? Are there any carbon reduction strategies proposed e.g., solar panels, or solar ready roof, high energy appliances? There is a third-floor deck and a large community space. The landscaping includes many native shrubs and plants but are these surfaces may be less impermeable than lawn.
2. Does the number of parking spaces for 66 units (70 underground and 19 surface) promote multimodal transportation? Decreasing traffic on Lakeside street with Franklin Elementary being close by is beneficial to the children's safety. Are there ways the developer can encourage biking with the bike path so close. The buildings apartments are mostly studio and single bedroom so may have many younger tenants who work around the Square or University.

I understand that the Plan Commission needs to approve projects meeting the conditional use standards/ordinances. However, it seems we need to ask questions about how Madison's built environment can better be inline with our aspirations for a greener Madison. Thank you for your time.

Peggy Rosin
1515 Vilas Avenue
Peggy.rosin@wisc.edu