

On Mon, Jun 4, 2018 at 1:18 AM, Michael D. Barrett [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Plan Commissioners,

We oppose the mowing down of our classic vernacular neighborhoods. The proposed destruction of the 700 block of East Johnson (June 4, 2018 Plan Commission Agenda Items 8-10) is an abomination and we oppose it in the strongest terms. This city has a very bad record of destroying the very neighborhoods that we cherish, starting with what it did to the Greenbush Neighborhood lo those many decades ago. It doesn't matter that you weren't responsible for it. It doesn't matter that it was long ago. The same process is in play here. Indeed, the destruction has continued unabated with the current destruction of Miffland and other cherished places. You've long tried to rip up Marquette, including in the latest Comp Plan update. Fortunately they pushed back hard. It remains to be seen if you will be successful against Atwood and Tenney-Lapham. To approve this travesty--in the heart of the isthmus--will set in motion a wave of destruction against the very places that have added so much value to our city. And not just monetary. Mostly, it is about our collective (re-)gained wisdom in how to live convivially in an urban neighborhood. It was an art lost in those decades after WW II. Our re-discovered capacity to live together is just now coming to fruition. What you have before you is the complete opposite of our newfound conviviality. Indeed, it's just Fitchburg shoe-horned into our beloved isthmus. And yes, if this is approved, the rest of East Johnson will be bulldozed as well. Adjoining streets will become increasingly isolated and vestigial until it becomes "obvious" that they, too, must succumb to the same fate. Having once been on the Urban Design Commission, I know that once one developer is allowed to do something, the rest come rushing in to demand the same. So anyone reading this in the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood should expect that this will be just the beginning of a trend that eventually will reach your backyard, and then, yes, your very house (yes, I'm talking to you if you live on Gorham, Dayton, or Jean, or Sydney or other nearby streets; i.e., this is NOT just an issue for E. Johnson).

To give an idea of where we are coming from, consider this: We have owned rental property just two blocks down, on the 900 block of East Johnson, since 1991. We stand to gain monetarily--and significantly--if this proposal goes through. But we aren't in this primarily for the money.

When we bought, the isthmus was considered to be a throw-away neighborhood. City policy was in on the destruction. At the time the city was pushing to knock down half of the 800 block for parking. The city was so excited to get the bulldozers rolling that they were even going to pay for it. The old timers were good with it, too. How better to compete with the malls than to provide lots of free parking, right? But we fought it and won. With the specter of tear-downs lifted, we went about building a cool neighborhood--parking be damned because "plenty of parking" damns a place--along with others with the same ideas.

The 80s & early-90s market signaled rust belt wreck as well; houses like ours sold for *less* than they went for a decade before. Real estate agents wouldn't even show us houses in Tenney-Lapham. But those of us who resisted the conventional wisdom had an idea of creating a more sustainable community, starting with embracing the human-scale of classic old neighborhoods like Tenney-Lapham. There is nothing more sustainable than preserving old houses. (Did you know that the #1 source of landfill waste is construction waste, much of that from tear downs?) In our case, through a lot of sweat equity and investment of life savings, we turned the slumlord

special into a very comfy/cozy and beloved home that we lived in for several years, then successfully managed it for the enjoyment of excellent & responsible tenants for the decades to come. Sustainability is when the same abode serves as shelter for many generations; ours has served five generations. Because we keep a good roof and siding on it, it surely will serve another ten generations. Or more. On the topic of sustainability, when proposals like this come before you, we usually hear about how much more efficient the new apartments will be compared with old houses. That is just straight up BS. It is only the case when neglectful slumlords make no energy efficiency upgrades at all. Even then it takes 65 years to recoup the energy expended tearing down the embodied energy of the old structure and building the new. Yes, SIXTY FIVE YEARS! Contrary to the Madison slumlord conventional wisdom, we upgraded the insulation and mechanicals to our old house to the point that it now *exceeds* the energy performance of the shiny new cardboard apartments that you keep approving. Their minimal insulation and contractor-grade mechanicals (read: bottom-feeder efficiency) result in drafty, moldy 35-year tear-downs. Thus, new is *not* greener. They just get torn down quicker. Old houses and their strong bones can easily be retrofitted for generations of healthy, comfortable living. If you approve this, you cast a pall over every property in the area: Why bother upgrading/maintaining an old house it is just going to get torn down in a few years?

In the early 90s, we also helped lead the rejuvenation of the neighborhood association and other local organizations. We helped turn a neighborhood sliding toward rustbelt tragedy into something that is now cherished by tenants, homeowners and visitors alike (have you ever read the Airbnb reviews of old places in the area?).

Why do you want to tear it down?

There has always been this bias against old houses and old neighborhoods among The Very Important of Madison. We suspect that a lot of it has to do with the very fact that our isthmus neighborhoods keep proving to be strong enough--pesky enough--to push back against you and your developer friends. Mow down the classic, human-scaled, and you drive those politically pesky (but caring & considerate) eastsiders away into diaspora, much as your predecessors did to the Italians and others they viewed as undesirable in the 'Bush. With the eastsiders gone, Fitchburgers newly resident, the bulldozers can roam free across the isthmus unimpeded by any neighborhood political pushback.

We've always had to fight you from a defensive crouch. At some point, don't you think you should stop attacking us? Instead, why don't you embrace the very neighborhoods that have made Madison Madison and not Des Moines. Have you ever seen the wrecked neighborhoods of similar era in Des Moines? Or Peoria? Or Milwaukee? Or Kansas City? Or Rockford? Or any other formerly-dignified & livable Midwestern tragedy? Most of the cool neighborhoods are gone. The vestiges that remain are wrecks. "Obvious" tear downs. Why do you continue to inflict this Midwestern narrow-minded prejudice against the old upon Madison? Why are you so against cohesive, community-oriented neighborhoods? And yes, the neighborhood scale and architectural vernacular--*sizeable* porches! *sizeable* balconies, *real* yards!--of our older neighborhoods are what allow community to thrive. You obviously prefer anonymous pod-living: from anonymous apartment to anonymous elevator to anonymous subterranean parking to anonymous ramp to anonymous highway, to anonymous office park, never once having occasion

to interact with neighbors. Fine. That's why we have Fitchburg. Go there. But the life of an atomic particle zipping from pod to pod is not what we want. We want community.

There is plenty of already-wrecked and underutilized space along East Washington, Packers Ave, Cottage Grove Road, University Ave, & beyond that is ripe for putting up this sort of development. Hundreds of sites across Madison with acres of parking surrounding a cinder block hut, just *begging* to be re-developed. Indeed, we participated in the early-90s Tenney-Lapham plan that envisioned the revitalization of East Washington (and ridding ourselves of it's hideous car lots) that we are now seeing & enjoying. With that opportunity still abundant--and with neighborhood support--why rip at the fabric of a successful, human-scaled neighborhood? Do you even realize that the residents of those E. Wash towers really, REALLY like to stroll nearby old-school streets like East Johnson? You didn't, did you? East Johnson, as it is, right now, is an asset that accrues to the new development on East Wash. Believe me, we know, we're in the biz.

Keep Fitchburg in Fitchburg! SAVE THE HEART OF MADISON!

Sincerely,
Michael D. Barrett and Pamela S. Barrett
[REDACTED] Sommers Ave.
Madison, WI 53704

-----Original Message-----

From: Kirstin Pires [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 12:46 PM

To: Michael D. Barrett [REDACTED]

Cc: Mayor [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: [tlna] Plan Comm. Agenda Items 8-10: Oppose the Mowdown of 700 block East Johnson!

What Mr. Barrett said!

From: Bootsy Christine Harden [REDACTED]

Date: 6/4/18 11:18 AM (GMT-06:00)

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: "Michael D. Barrett" [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Plan Comm. Agenda Items 8-10: Oppose the Mowdown of 700 block East Johnson!

Dear All to Whom Mike & Pam's Letter Was Addressed (or cc'ed):

As a resident of this neighborhood, I could not agree more with this letter. I count on my fellow citizens to promote cultivation, rather than obliteration, of the delightfully funky elements of neighborhoods like the 700 block of East Johnson in my lovely adopted hometown.

Sincerely,

Bootsy

Christine "Bootsy" Harden

[REDACTED] Castle Place, [REDACTED]

Madison, WI 53703

From: Martin Lopez [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 1:11 PM

To: Mayor [REDACTED]

Cc: Monks, Anne [REDACTED]

Subject: 700 Block of East Johnson St.

Dear Plan Commissioners,

I'm forwarding a letter that I strongly agree with -- that the development project of the 700 block of E. Johnson should be denied.

Thanks for taking my message.

Sincerely,

Martin Lopez

Martin Lopez
[REDACTED] Castle Place, [REDACTED]
Madison, WI 53703

June 3rd, 2018

Dear Plan Commissioners and Alders,

I'd like to send a further letter discussing the housing proposal being proposed by the Houden team for the 700 block of East Johnson Street that update my thoughts on the matter since my original letter on November 28, 2017.

My understanding is that through the project's refinement and adjustments in the last 6 months or so, the project has gained the support of a number of immediately adjacent homeowners and residents and has the support of city staff after a lengthy neighborhood-driven redesign. I am especially pleased at the retention of 4 houses to be located within the immediate and surrounding neighborhood. The vacant parcel on Gorham Street in particular has been an eyesore and has proven resistant to natural market redevelopment. Positioning two vintage, appropriate properties on the site is the most optimal outcome I could imagine for that site, having sat without residents and eventually becoming vacant for a number of years now.

I have reached out directly to the development team and was able to tour the properties that are proposed for demolition, in addition to reviewing the full and complete project submittal in detail. Having also toured the properties that were demolished for the City Row project in 2009 on the preceding block of E Johnson Street, I would like to register that I found these parcels on the 700 block in worse condition and with fewer redevelopment options than the City Row properties had. After seeing the properties and their decades of neglect and having been long ago subdivided, I have no objection to their demolition. In the balance of saving nine properties (keeping five in situ, moving four properties), and by assisting other vacant sites within the neighborhood that have failed to see housing built under other conditions, and to have viable and comparable rent levels to what currently is occupied by the structures within these parcels, I cannot imagine a likely subsequent option that would solve as many issues on these other vacant sites, and addresses the need to build vibrant, mixed income neighborhoods.

(I love that within this neighborhood and equidistant to this site within about two blocks you have each the home of the heir to the Kimberly Clark fortune and the women and children's shelter of Salvation Army. This is truly a neighborhood where residents of every income and background have a home.)

The massing for the main project as it's currently proposed, and reduced from the initial iteration, fits with the spirit and intent of the neighborhood's past plans and conversations around the zoning code rewrite in my experience, regardless of what some resident may now be currently trying to lead you to believe. There are some elements to the design that I'm less than enthusiastic about (the rooflines, the mid-block commercial spaces), but considering that that was the direction the development team was led down by the alder and neighborhood stakeholders, as well as it having received approvals from the urban design commission, at this point it is a non-essential quibble, and I need to respect the design decisions they made and directed the development team to pursue. Would I have pushed for a different aesthetic design, certainly, but that's me.

I had lengthy conversations with the development team about landscaping and resident amenities I'd like to see incorporated to create a well-functioning, cohesive experience for both their tenants, and abutting residents, having previously been a resident across the street from their site proposal and having been a resident on a very similar parcel located on the 600 block of E Johnson Street.

Additionally, it is important to recognize that the Michael Matty project currently under construction is shifting how the 700 block relates to the streetscape. I appreciate the way that the Houdens' proposal integrates and transitions the new face of the 700 block that Matty's project has created, with the established face the block ends with at Livingston Street.

In four years of serving as alder of this neighborhood facing a variety of unique urban redevelopment situations, I believe that this project as it is currently proposed merits your approval.

I would of course wish that there were an unlimited supply of low income housing tax credits that WHEDA would provide to Madison so that every project has affordable housing set asides. The LIHTC units were a major factor of my support of City Row in 2009. For this project, the retention of the number of units and corresponding rents in existing and relocated homes, especially onto vacant lots, is a valuable consideration for me to support the proposal. The redesign and reduction of height, massing and density is also sufficient to gain my support from the original concept.

At the end of the day, the questions to be answered are does the project meet the city's standards for approval (city staff believes it does)¹ and does the plan improve the condition of the property and the neighborhood; I believe it does, and I hope you'll support this project for approval.

Sincerely,

Bridget Maniaci
District 2 Alderperson, 2009-2013

¹ "As discussed in this report, staff believes that this proposal is largely consistent with the underlying longer-term recommendation, acknowledging however, that the development is much larger in size compared to surrounding structures. Other than height, the neighborhood plan does not have prescriptive bulk recommendations and there is no fixed maximum number of dwelling units, provided the building's scale could be determined to be appropriate. However, the plan's definition of neighborhood mixed use states that the scale of mixed-use buildings should generally be small when adjacent to low or medium density areas. Staff notes that the reduction of the fourth-story mass, proposed in the current plans, improves plan consistency regarding height. However, the applicant's corresponding alteration to connect the previously separate above-grade buildings adds to the mass and size of the building when compared to earlier versions. In reviewing the specific approval standards, staff believes the standards may be met, subject to the recommended conditions." Planning Division Staff Report, June 4, 2018 <https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6280769&GUID=0259EA4D-34C6-4DC2-B613-CB641016E368>

From: Barb Irvin [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 2:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Zellers, Ledell [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Rewey, mike [REDACTED]; Carter, Sheri [REDACTED]; King, J Steven [REDACTED]
Cc: Stouder, Heather [REDACTED]; Mayor [REDACTED]; Erdman, Natalie [REDACTED] Eskrich, Sara [REDACTED]
Subject: Opposition to demolitions in 700 block of East Johnson

Dear Plan Commission members -

I am writing to oppose the proposed demolition permit for the buildings in the 700 block of East Johnson St. Such wide-scale destruction is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. The block has already lost several houses recently. Our inner city neighborhoods are looking less and less like Madison and more like anywhere USA. I currently live in the Greenbush neighborhood, which is undergoing a similar transition from traditional housing and scale to faceless large apartments. And, as a former resident of E. Johnson, I would like to say that this large an increase in the density is not wise until we have a transit system that is good enough that more residents give up cars. The streets on the Isthmus are terribly clogged and are becoming less safe for cyclists and pedestrians as a result.

Please oppose the proposed demolition and development in the 700 block of East Johnson.

Thank you,

Barbara Irvin
[REDACTED] Drake St

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 3:45 PM
To: Firchow, Kevin <KFirchow@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: 'marcus@urbanassetsconsulting.com' <marcus@urbanassetsconsulting.com>
Subject: 700-block East Johnson Street Feedback

Dear Mr. Firchow:

I am writing in regard to the proposed development plan for 717-753 East Johnson Street. As a homeowner on Washburn Place, I have written before on this matter, and I am planning to attend the meeting on June 19. However, I cannot attend tonight's meeting, and it was unclear after the several scheduling changes what agenda items will still be discussed tonight. (Hence my email now.)

The bottom line is that I am strongly opposed to the relocation of any houses onto 827 E. Gorham Street (this appears to be agenda item number 10 for tonight's meeting, file #50431).

Although I generally support the Johnson Street project, I do not support it at the expense of polluting other parts of the neighborhood with unwanted houses that are scheduled to be removed to make the project possible. I am much more opposed to the relocation of houses onto Gorham than I am in favor of the development. The lots on Gorham street would be put to much better use being developed with new homes in the historical style of the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration. Please let me know if I can assist you with any questions.

Regards,
Joe

Joseph S. Harper
Associate
Foley & Lardner LLP
Suite 5000 | 150 East Gilman Street
Madison, WI 53703-1482
P 608.258.4310

Dear Members of the Plan Commission:

The 700 East Johnson project is at long last in front of you, following a journey that began in January of 2017, eighteen months ago. The development team has worked hard to design a project that meets the relevant city plans, desires of the neighborhood, and needs of the community. As the staff report concludes, the project does indeed meet the 2006 City of Madison Comprehensive Plan and the TLNA Neighborhood Plan's long-term recommendations for the 700 block. The project also meets the compelling needs of our growing community, providing much needed additional housing units with a range of housing options; increasing density in a major transit corridor; and activating street life in our dynamic city.

The TLNA Neighborhood Plan was adopted in 2008, and as stated in the staff memo this project should be evaluated based on the long-term recommendations included in the plan. The plan states "the long-range vision anticipates the expansion of the NMU district to the 700 block as well." (See, Note One, Future Land Use Map, TLNA Neighborhood Plan). Importantly, our community faces different challenges than it did in 2008, which was the depth of the great recession. Right now, we face an historically low vacancy rate combined with a robust economy and growing population. That means we have a choice: Sprawl or Smart Growth. Good planning and principles of healthy, sustainable development dictate that density is the most appropriate and effective solution to these challenges in transportation corridors, just like East Johnson.

UDC provided a largely supportive advisory opinion for the height, contemporary architecture, and the pedestrian experience this project offers. They did, however, have some concerns regarding Conditional Use Standards 4 and 9, some due to the lack of knowledge of the surrounding context and a focus on the near-term recommendations of the TLNA Neighborhood Plan. The staff memo also raises questions about whether these two standards can be met. Finally, in addition to Conditional Use Standard 4, Alder Zellers' email states that the demolition standards have not been met, although we disagree for reasons stated below.

To that end, I would like to address these concerns directly.

The area around the project site is actually more architecturally diverse than simply converted single-family homes. City Row is one block to the northwest and Norris Court is one block to the northeast. The Matty project (under construction), which will be tucked between this project and the commercial buildings that are home to the Caribou and the laundromat, is an urban, multi-family building form. Looking across Dayton Street from the rear yard of the project site, you can see Veritas Village as well as Das Kronenberg.

The density of this development, at 50 dwelling units per acre, is less than the density of all the projects listed above. City Row is 75 dwelling units per acre and Norris Court, which was built in the 1920s, is 60 dwelling units per acre. The Matty project, currently under construction and adjacent to this project, is considerably denser, at 94 dwelling units per acre, almost double this project. Across Dayton Street, Veritas Village is 84 dwelling units per acre and Das Kronenberg is 65 dwelling units per acre.

The length of this development is not, in fact, more than 300 feet. Each building is less than 130 feet, separated by a pedestrian plaza, which is 30 feet wide, a total of 290 feet. In addition, it will be experienced as two buildings. In contrast, City Row is approximately 330 feet. As for the depth of the buildings, the rear façade moves in and out, broken up by the pedestrian plaza and the patios and also steps down to two stories. The closest rear neighbor, an older multi-family building, is 61 feet from the project while the older single and multi-family homes are between 72 and 102 feet.

The architecture of the building is contemporary, but the form and the rhythm of the building address and echo the historic pattern language of the TLNA neighborhood in an exciting way. The building mass is broken down so that the façade, divided into regular segments, is reminiscent of the surrounding neighborhood. In addition, the project preserves five of the existing houses on site and fills an existing gap in the block, blending the new with the old. A pedestrian walking by the finished project would experience the new buildings similarly to the older houses.

Reviewed in the context of the **long-term** recommendations of the TLNA Neighborhood plan, a more accurate understanding of the surrounding area, and the architecture and form of the development, this project clearly relates to the "Normal and Orderly" development of the surrounding properties (Conditional Use Standard 4) and "creates an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or **intended** character of the site" (Conditional Use Standard 9, my emphasis).

As to whether this project complies with the demolition ordinance, we note that the ordinance specifically states that it "is to aid in the implementation of adopted City plans, protect neighborhood character, preserve historic buildings, encourage the reuse and/or relocation of existing buildings...." I respectfully disagree with Alder Zellers' conclusions. The project does, in fact, implement Note One of the Land Use Map of the TLNA Neighborhood Plan as described in detail above. It also reuses existing buildings by relocating them not just on East Johnson but also on East Gorham, thereby protecting the character of both streets.

Despite seven steering committee meetings, two meetings with the TLNA Council, and the extensive changes made in response to the feedback we heard during that process, the TLNA Council ignored long term goals, seizing on near term goals only. In addition, as you can see from the numerous and thoughtful letters of support, there are many who are not in agreement with the Council. These supporters have a more holistic view of the neighborhood's growth and development **and** the needs of the Madison community for the long term. The supporters understand the value of increasing the number of new units (which will be ADA accessible and energy efficient) to accommodate the on-going need for more housing, while at the same time preserving five of the original houses on site and two others on a long vacant site on East Gorham. Supporters would like to see the extension of East Johnson's commercial district, as recommended in the TLNA Neighborhood Plan, increasing the number of neighborhood amenities and creating an active streetscape with dynamic place-making.

I strongly urge you to support this project.

Respectfully,

Melissa Huggins, AICP

Melissa Huggins, AICP
Principal
Urban Assets
807 East Johnson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
P: 608.819.6566
C: 608.345.0996
www.urbanassetsconsulting.com

Project description: New, three-story mixed-use housing development and renovation of existing Queen Anne houses on the 700 block of East Johnson Street in the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood.

The undersigned include neighborhood members who support the approval of this development by the City of Madison Plan Commission and/or Common Council

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Date
Josh Biolo	<i>Josh Biolo</i>	920 E Johnson	805 310 <i>biolo@urbanassets.com</i>	
Melissa Mesner	<i>Melissa Mesner</i>	857 E. Johnson	120 <i>lframeit.madison@gmail.com</i>	5/30
ERIN SHEA	<i>Erin Shea</i>	845 E. Johnson LYNNEN PARK STATION	<i>erinshea@urbanassets.com</i>	

Firchow, Kevin

From: Evelyn Atkinson <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2018 4:31 PM
To: Zellers, Ledell
Cc: Joe Harper; URBAN ASSETS LLC; Firchow, Kevin
Subject: comments on Johnson St. development

Hi Ledell,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing because unfortunately my husband and I won't be able to be at the Plan Commission meeting tonight when they hear the 700 Johnson St. proposal (with all the rescheduling we got confused and thought the meeting had been moved to June 19th, but then we realized that was the Common Council meeting). We wanted to emphasize to you, however, that we are in support of the proposal generally with two major caveats.

First, we don't support the design of the building, as it's too modern and out of character with the neighborhood. This is a concern we share with the Neighborhood Association. However, I believe this aspect of the development plan is easily fixed.

Second, unlike TLNA, we also strongly oppose the relocation of the two houses to Gorham St. The two houses are dilapidated and ugly, and since the developer has let them fall into even further disrepair since he purchased them we don't believe he will adequately restore them after he moves them. We live on Washburn Place facing the empty lot where the houses are proposed to be moved, and we are concerned that cramming two falling-down houses into that small lot will decrease the property values of the neighborhood. I know that TLNA was concerned about the destruction of the houses on 700 Johnson, but frankly I don't believe these two houses are worth saving.

Finally, as I'm sure you are aware from attending the Steering Committee meetings, we wanted to stress that there is a significant demographic divide on the question of developing Johnson St. Young working professionals who have recently bought homes in the neighborhood, like ourselves, are largely in favor of the development. Unfortunately, most young homeowners in the neighborhood have jobs that prevent them from attending neighborhood association meetings, and so our voice is underrepresented. I was fortunate enough to be able to serve on the Steering Committee, but found that my voice was usually drowned out by a vociferous "old guard." We moved to Tenney Lapham because of the great mix of lively commercial and quiet residential spaces here, and would love to see the neighborhood continue to flourish and grow through targeted development that keeps with the neighborhood plan but also injects new life into the community.

I hope that you will represent our concerns to the Plan Commission. Thank you so much for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Evelyn Atkinson & Joe Harper
[REDACTED] Washburn Pl.

From: Liz Tiefenthaler [

Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 9:54 AM

To: All Alders

Cc: Firchow, Kevin <KFirchow@cityofmadison.com>; Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>;

Subject: Christopher Houden Development for Johnson Street

To City of Madison Officials:

My wife and I are long-time Tenney/Lapham residents, having lived on Sherman Ave for 37 years. We support local businesses on Johnson Street and count ourselves blessed to be able to access so many wonderful things in downtown Madison and State St. This is why we are so particularly pleased to see the plans for Chris Houden's development of the 800 block of Johnson St.

More and more we have watched landlords not caring for their properties and homes and yards falling into complete disrepair. It is our opinion that people need access to good housing and should not have to live in dilapidated apartments. Recent successful developments such as Galaxy and Lyric apartments point to the demand for nice housing. Also, improving the beauty of our neighborhood will make the entire Tenney/Lapham area more vibrant. We feel that the Houden properties will enhance our neighborhood and will fit in beautifully with the neighborhood's current revival.

We hope that you will welcome Chris Houden to our neighborhood and support his project.

Thank you,

Todd and Liz Tiefenthaler

Sherman Ave

From: Cedric Johnson
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2018 11:47 AM
To: All Alders
Cc: Firchow, Kevin <KFirchow@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: From a Tenney-Lapham Resident

Good Morning,

I am writing to voice my support for the proposed 700 East Johnson project. After reviewing the proposal (and monitoring the ongoing conversation) I became excited by the idea of a fresh development that will bring more neighbors who are diverse and engaged.

Many of my peers (thirty-something professionals) are moving north where they can find affordable housing, a variety of residents, and access to new businesses. We joke about me being the last one downtown where the only thing changing is the price of rent; driving most of us out.

As a renter at Norris Court I do not have the same concerns as homeowners in the neighborhood, however with the rapid development along the E. Washington corridor I feel that more options is a good thing. I want to stay in this neighborhood for the foreseeable future; it is where I live, work, and play. Perhaps I'll look to buy here as well. What makes this area desirable is the opportunities for smart growth (inclusive and equitable) that takes into consideration ALL residents, from owners to renters, young professionals to families, and even the businesses we patronize.

I hope that the Council will approve this project for the sake of building a neighborhood rich in diversity, desirable quality of life, and access for everyone who wants to reside here.

Regards,
Cedric Johnson