

Development Proposal: 1954 E. Washington

- The information in this presentation represent shared concerns of neighbors in the Emmerson East neighborhood.

What this is not about...

The issues the neighborhood has with this proposed development have nothing to do with:

- Increased Affordable Housing;
- Economic, Social or Cultural Diversity;
- Or the Madison Development Corporation's Mission

What this is about...

The negative impacts this proposal will have on the Emerson East Neighborhood and its residents.

This presentation will focus on the issues of:

- Size and Scale
- Design
- Density

Examples of the bungalows on E. Mifflin and 2nd St. adjacent to the proposed “Townhouse” building...



The average footprint of these modest homes is approx. 1100 sq. feet... The average height of these homes is approx. 22 feet



The “Townhouse” building proposed for East Mifflin has a footprint of 4,320 square feet, and is 38 feet high. By any measure this building is out of scale with the adjacent neighborhood...



This line represents the approx. height of the proposed “townhouse” building viewed from directly cross East Mifflin St.
The size of this building alone will negatively impact the architectural integrity and charm of E. Mifflin, and 2nd St.



“The word “townhouse” is most often used to describe “*non-uniform units* which share common walls each with unique entrances in suburban areas that are *designed to mimic detached or semi-detached homes.*” (ref. Wikipedia Glossary of Architectural Terms) These are townhomes...



This is more appropriately an apartment building with 6 doors...Or in other words, a “townhouse” on the cheap



The building proposed for East Wash. at a height of 54 ft. is grossly out of scale with the adjacent neighborhood, and with a setback of just 16 feet, it will come dangerously close to the status of “eyesore” on Madison’s main thoroughfare...



The north and east elevations are equally uninspired. And again with just 16 ft back from East Wash, the view of this building driving up to the Square does little to add to the investment the city has made in the East Wash aesthetics initiative....



For almost 50 years houses on East Wash have remained unchanged with neighbors working diligently to sustain the 1920s charm. The homes on this block have an average setback of 24 feet from the neighboring edge of the sidewalk, 8 feet more than the proposed 30 unit.

August 1976



November 2018



Issues of density and budget driving design...

The developer's desire to retain all existing residential buildings, add 36 rental units (~200 total tenants) and do this on a heavily restricted budget has resulted in what appears to be:

- (1) A desperate use of the open/available remaining space on the property, and...
- (2) Seriously compromised aesthetics.

This has resulted in scale and design decisions which are not appropriate for the property, it's current residents, and the neighborhood.

This shows the approx. location of the four story apartment building in relation to the 2 story apartment building already on the site. The current residents are going to be left in the dark, looking at the back of a four story building and it's driveway...



This image shows the approx. location of the rear of the three story “townhouse” building in relation to the small 4 apartment building already on the site. These folks are left with a view of their neighbors back doors and driveways...cutoff from the neighborhood.



Added density, and the direct impact on our neighborhood...

- There are approx. 80 residents currently living in the 40 units on the parcel.
- By MDC's own estimate the 4 story East Washington building alone could add as many as 108 additional tenants. (*MDC's Federal Grant Application*)
- The proposed "townhouse" will add an additional 14 beds (a minimum of 14 residents?)

This would bring *the total number of residents living on the parcel to about **200 folks**, which would then account for 10% of the total estimated population of the East Emerson neighborhood of 2000 residents (ref. 2016 Neighborhood Plan)*

The effects of the increased density will happen “over night” not over time

“we expect to be fully rented within two months of completion” – *MDC’s Federal Grant Application*

- Parking and Traffic issues on E. Mifflin and 2nd St. grow more chaotic every day with overflow traffic from East Washington, East High School, Option’s employees and clients, and commuter traffic as the neighborhood has become a park and ride for bus commuters on East Washington.
- And we are all aware of the ever increasing jumble of traffic on East Washington, and the infamously dangerous East Washington/1st Street intersection...
- In addition we face the impact of added noise and light pollution, and very real concerns of what a doubling of residents will mean to the safety and security of the entire neighborhood.

So what are we asking for...

That the UDC forward a recommendation to Madison Plan and Zoning that the current proposal be rejected, and that the developer continue working with their architects & neighborhood stakeholders to develop a solution which is more in scale, and compatible in design with the Emerson East Neighborhood.



We're asking for a sustainable solution which will continue to enhance the neighborhood long after the architect has moved on the new projects, and the developer has checked this off of their "to do" list at the end of their fiscal year.

December 3, 2018

To: The Members of the Urban Design Commission

The design of the proposed development of The Avenue apartments at 1954 E. Washington Avenue is not compatible with the existing buildings on the property nor the surrounding structures in the neighborhood. The existing apartment building is a three-story brick building. Although it is not residential looking it is set back on the site in a way that makes it less obtrusive to neighboring buildings.

The proposed four-story apartment building (Building A on the plans) looks like nothing on the existing property and is wholly out of character with the neighborhood. This will be the only four-story building between First Street and East High School and well beyond.

The proposed building is sited so that it will shadow the 8 unit townhouse apartments directly behind it and create a canyon like effect with the house(s) to the west. Also it has no set back from the street making its height even more exaggerated.

The application of a false gabled roof to produce a more a more residential feel only makes the building (Bldg A, Option A) look taller. The scarce use of brick as a tie-in to the existing structure is not extensive enough to achieve the intent. The alternate flat-roof version (presented to neighbors at previous meeting) is less objectionable by being slightly lower and uses more brick (although it appears the backside of the proposed building will be composite materials.) But it still suffers from the same siting issues as the Option A.

The proposed new townhouse apartments (Bldg B) on E. Mifflin Street are also not in character with the existing buildings on the site nor the neighboring houses. Although attempts have been made to break-up the mass of the proposed building with pasted on gables and use of color it remains that it is enormous compared to the houses across the street. This is compounded by placing garages under the footprint of the building, effectively raising it another story. The constraints of this site also force the proposed building to be tight to the setbacks making the effect of its height even more visible and pronounced to the smaller bungalow style houses across E. Mifflin Street.

Ultimately the designs of the two proposed buildings do nothing to provide a look of cohesion or unity to the site much less the neighborhood. There would be four different buildings with four different exteriors on the property.

- Brick converted institutional 3 story apartment building - sited with sufficient setback from the street to make it an unobtrusive asset to the neighborhood.
- Cedar style planking 2 story 8 unit townhouse apartment building (1948/50 E. Washington Ave.) - again sited far enough off the street to make its presence almost invisible.
- Composite/brick 4 story apartment building - sited as close to E. Washington Avenue and the property line as allowed making it a towering out of context monstrosity.
- Composite townhouse style which will be essentially a 3 story building - sited on a corner that has been used as a small green space with mature trees by the Avenue and neighborhood residents and is not architecturally compatible and out of scale to any property between First and Fourth Streets.

As a longtime resident of the Emerson East neighborhood I have lived across the street from the Avenue Apartments for 28 years. I have many other opinions (based on historically poor property management) as to why this project is not a good fit for our neighborhood but ask the Urban Design Committee to not recommend the project to the Planning and Zoning Commission based on poor design and siting issues.

Respectfully,

Sheri Rein



Second Street

From: [Eena Co-Chairs](#)
To: [Cleveland, Julie](#)
Subject: Statement about 1954 E. Washington Avenue proposal
Date: Monday, December 03, 2018 7:36:07 PM

Dear members of the Urban Design Commission,
Dear Julie Cleveland and City staff,

The project at 1954 E. Washington Avenue proposed by Madison Development Corporation and Kevin Burow, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC (agenda item 52598) lies within the boundaries of the Emerson East neighborhood. As such this project is of high interest for residents of our neighborhood and members of the neighborhood association.

Please note that at this point Emerson East Neighborhood Association (EENA) has not taken an official position supporting or rejecting the application for this project.

Thank you for your careful consideration of the application and public comments,

Indira Ceylan Christina Heaton
[REDACTED] Upham St [REDACTED] East Mifflin St
EENA Co-Chair EENA Co-Chair

Dear Ms. Cleveland:

As a resident for over ten years at 1944 E. Washington Ave, I urge the design committee to address the inconsistency towards the shape of the neighborhood of the MDC proposal for 1954 E. Wash. To build a 4 story building where there are only much smaller homes/apartments w/out regard for sunlight blockage nor traffic concerns is not w/in the character of our neighborhood. To think it will be oonly 16 feet from my house seems like a small planet blocking the light of the sun. My home is one of the larger buildings but its date is from the late 1800s. Please refocus the design to reflect the character of the neighborhood - not some money-making scheme for MDC!. Thank you.

Rich Zietko

█ E. Wash. █

Madison WI 53704

█

December 4, 2018

City of Madison Urban Design Commission

Dear Commission members:

I am a former resident of the Emerson East Neighborhood and lived directly across the street from Graaskamp Park, which the Madison Development Corporation is currently petitioning the city for redevelopment. I had previously signed a letter that was included for public comment in your discussion of this redevelopment on August 18, 2018. The comments in that letter addressed concerns regarding the proposed townhomes. The concerns expressed in that letter still remain true for me, and I am restating those that relate to the aspects of the project's design below:

- The height of the proposed townhomes is disproportionate to the existing neighboring houses. They will tower over the neighborhood and shade existing homes.
 - The development corporation continues to identify the townhomes as a two-story building, but in fact it is at least a 3-story building due to the 1st story garages, which are only minimally partially underground.
 - The townhomes will replace the current Options for Community Living building but will be 10 feet taller than it. However, the Options building already does not fit well in the neighborhood as it towers at least a story above the neighboring residences. The additional height of the townhomes will just exaggerate this poor fit.
- The proposed setback of the townhomes is not deep enough and noise and activity outside of them (such as smoking) will destroy the peace and privacy of the homes across the street on both Mifflin and Second St.
 - All of the current homes on this side of the block on Mifflin St have much deeper setbacks and sit up on the hill. To fit the neighborhood aesthetically, the new building should have a similar setback.
- The colorful facade depicted in the project drafts also does not fit in with the brick and neutral tones of the neighboring houses.

In addition to my concerns about the townhomes, I feel very concerned that the addition of 36 more rental units in this already compact and dense neighborhood will create of the feeling of being cramped and crowded. The current balance of space in the neighborhood works well allowing for green space, light and buffers for noise. Additional housing units will detract from all of these qualities.

After writing my previous letter of concern regarding the townhomes to Madison Development Corporation, I chose to sell my home on East Mifflin St and leave the neighborhood. I did this because I felt that the quality of my life was going to decline significantly because of this project. In addition, at no time did I feel hopeful that the Madison Development Corporation was willing to collaborate with the neighborhood and modify the project so that it would create quality housing in the neighborhood. (I should note that the developer persists in insisting that they are

working with the neighborhood, but the documentation that they have prepared to support this claim has many misstatements and exaggerations.)

Below I've copied some of the "Comments from the Commission" from the August 8, 2018 UDC meeting. None of these directives were adhered to by MDC.

- "Consider taking the neighbors on a bus tour of existing similar town house projects."
- "Alleviate the neighborhood concerns. Give it a sense of place."
- "Need to make sure that there is that engagement with the community."

While I'm no longer a member of the neighborhood, I still care that the current proposal for this redevelopment will have a profoundly adverse impact on this beautiful, sweet historic neighborhood. Specifically, to borrow from the mission statement of the UDC, I do not see that the project proposal meets any of the following standards:

- Creates the highest quality of design for the project
- Protects economic values
- Maintains and improves the established standards of property values within the city
- Fosters civic pride in the beauty and nobler assets of the city
- Assures a functionally efficient and visually attractive city in the future

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Pamela Moran
■ Woodland Circle
Maple Bluff WI 53704

Urban Design Commission December 4, 2018

City of Madison WI

Tess Camacho

█ N. 2d St

Madison WI. 53704

Dear Commission Members,

The design of the buildings proposed for the development of 1954 East Washington Avenue does not improve the property nor our neighborhood and in fact detracts from the enjoyable campus feel of the property as it stands now. The three main buildings on the property currently all have adequate setback on all sides from E. Washington Ave., N. 2nd St. and E. Mifflin St. that allow for large trees and other landscaping that are beneficial to residents of the property as well as adding a visual buffer to the current buildings which are already large scale in comparison to the typical 1.5-2 story bungalows of the neighborhood. As stated under Visions and Goals in the 2016 neighborhood plan, it is the intent to “preserve the quiet enjoyment of homes, parks and neighborhoods”. Maintaining the mature trees and open space landscaping rather than adding crowded and out of scale structure to replace them is inline with our Neighborhood goals.

The proposed design at 1954 East Washington ignores consideration for the existing structures on the property as well as the neighborhood character. The 4 story building footprint is too large for the property. I feel that there is too little space allowed between the 4 story and the existing 1948/1950 unit to provide continued quality of living for residents in that building. Inevitably there will be loss of sunlight and a constant traffic flow to the underground parking garage of the 4 story building. An example of a structure more in keeping with the neighborhood character is the nearby Victory Arms Apartments. In it’s placement and orientation it appears rather small in stature from the street view and also provides a courtyard area within its’ footprint.

I do not agree with the scale of the Townhouses, proposed building B, on E. Mifflin St. The townhouses are way too tall in comparison to the houses of the neighborhood. The backside of the townhouses will also appear massively tall to the 1953 brick building behind it which sits partially underground. The setback from the sidewalk is not enough to offset the imposing height. The total height of building B is at least double the height of most houses adjacent. The 2 car garages are not underground parking as labeled by the developer, but actually add an entire story under the building. Most houses in the area have a 3’-4’ foundation by comparison. It is not characteristic of our neighborhood to see large additions or new construction.

Presumably, there will not be anything else built as tall as these Townhouses within 2 blocks anytime in the foreseeable future. Therefore, I stress the importance that these townhouses be reduced in scale to correspond with the character of the neighborhood for the long term.

The area between 1st and 4th St. is unique in that it sits between Urban Design Districts along the East Washington corridor. Our part of the Emerson neighborhood is a thriving and viable residential island surrounded by 2 of the largest corridors entering from Madison’s eastside. 1954 E. Washington is not included in the Urban Design District, yet is part of the corridor. As such, I feel that any changes to the property should be held to the same standards and should be aesthetically appealing and in character to the neighborhood. The large scale, outstanding placement and style of the proposed 4 story building does not compliment the 4 block area and will look out of place.

Overall I find the designs of both structures to lack cohesiveness to each other as well as the other existing buildings that already are incohesive. The proposed designs are not high quality and only show lack of effort toward neighborhood character. There should be a greater attempt toward unifying the property with a goal of function and quality of living for the resident while strengthening neighborhood identity and creating a greater sense of place

Sincerely,

The design of the proposed development at The Avenue apartments (1954 E. Washington Ave.) is not compatible with the existing buildings on the site nor the surrounding structures in the neighborhood. The existing apartment building structure is a three-story masonry skin building. Although it is not residential looking it is set back on the site in a manner making it less obtrusive to neighboring buildings.

The existing townhouse apartments are skinned with a cedar style planking; also, not compatible with the existing apartment building, but at two-story height and setback on the site from neighbors it is much less obtrusive than the proposed building's location.

The proposed four-story apartment building looks like nothing on the existing site and is wholly out of context with the neighborhood. It is sited such that it will shadow the existing townhouse apartments and create a canyon like effect with the house(s) to the West. This will be the only four-story building between First Street and East High School and well beyond and is sited so close to the street that its height will be exaggerated. The application of a false gabled roof to produce a more a more residential feel only makes the building look taller. The scarce use of brick is not nearly enough to achieve the intent of portraying it as similar to the existing building. The flat-roof version is less objectionable by being slightly lower and the attempted use of more brick (although it appears the backside of the proposed building will be composite materials). It still suffers from the same siting issues as the other option.

The siting of the proposed apartment building also pushes more traffic onto Second street since anyone needing to travel East will have to use that parking lot access. This can be a difficult intersection and adding traffic will not help make it better.

The proposed new townhouse apartments on Mifflin Street are also not in character with the existing buildings on the site nor the neighboring buildings. Although attempts have been made to break-up the mass of the proposed building with pasted on gables and paint it remains that it is enormous compared to neighboring houses. This is compounded by placing garages under the footprint of the proposed building, effectively raising it another story. The constraints of this site also force the proposed building to be tight to the setbacks making the effect of its height more visible and pronounced.

Charlie Rein

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] N. Second St.

Madison, WI 53704



chris sell [REDACTED]

Development at 1954 E. Washington Ave

chris sell [REDACTED]

Tue, Oct 9, 2018 at 1:41 PM

To: district12@cityofmadison.com, district6@cityofmadison.com, lorrie@mdcorp.org

Cc: Natasha Fahey-Flynn [REDACTED]

Bcc: [REDACTED]

Ald. Palm, Ald. Rummel, and Lorrie Heinemann,

My wife and I recently attended the public meeting held on 9/26/18 regarding the proposed development at 1954 E. Washington. We appreciate you providing an open forum to inform neighbors and collect feedback. We especially appreciate an effort towards collaboration and allowing us an opportunity to engage in the process. We unfortunately were not able to find a sitter for our 1 year old and were forced to leave early. Since this was our first opportunity to learn of the project combined with our limited availability on 9/26, we are submitting a formal letter (attached) regarding our questions and concerns with this proposal.

We appreciate your consideration and please let us know if there are additional forums or steps we can take to seek the reassurance needed to support this project.

Thanks,

Chris Sell & Natasha Fahey-Flynn

[REDACTED] E Washington Ave, Madison, WI 53704



Letter re concerns 1954 east washington 10_8_2018.docx

788K

Date: 10/8/2018

From: Chris Sell & Natasha Fahey-Flynn (██████ E. Washington Ave.)

To: Alderman Larry Palm, Alderman Marsha Rummel, Lorrie Heinemann,

Re: Proposed Development at 1954 E. Washington Ave.

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I recently received a postcard from the City of Madison regarding a public meeting on 9/29/18 for the proposed re-development of 1954 E. Washington Ave. Below are a list of concerns and questions that we were not able to raise or address at the meeting.

1. Proper notification:

At the public meeting on 9/29/18, it seems this project had already taken significant steps to proceeding with the plan. My wife and I, who live 3 homes away from the proposed development, were not aware of these plans and this was the first opportunity we've had to learn about the project and express concerns. I do not feel this is appropriate and proactive engagement with neighborhood stakeholders. Additionally, both of my neighbors were not aware of this and also express concerns regarding the project schedule and lack of neighborhood awareness especially for neighbors residing on East Washington Avenue. This lack of transparency creates trust issues with the proposed development and developer. As this letter will show, we are not shy about engaging in collaborative efforts and community issues when informed of them. With the demands of working full time, taking care of a 1 year old, and only having access to the amount of info that can fit on a postcard, we were lucky to be able to attend this meeting on short notice.

2. Previously "addressed" neighborhood concerns:

A document was provided by MDC at the meeting on 9/29/18 regarding previously raised issues and their response to said issues. I've included a picture of this section of MDC's informational document below, followed by our concerns with those mitigation strategies:

Neighborhood Concerns Addressed

Traffic: Options in Community Living, our commercial tenant on 2nd and Mifflin Streets is growing out of space and may consider move in 2020

Parking: MDC is planning to include 21 underground spaces at the 27-unit and will add three additional surface spaces for the 27 units

Safety and Security: More lighting and security cameras were added on 2nd St. in summer of 2018 – The 27-unit will include more lighting and cameras when it is built

Density: MDC plans to add a 27-unit on E. Washington Ave. by 2020. An early site plan included an apartment complex on 2nd and Mifflin, which the neighbors did not select. Therefore, if Options in Community Living chooses to relocate, we will add 8 townhomes on the corner of 2nd and Mifflin instead. Our goal is to complete entire project (27-unit, townhomes, and Graaskamp Park) by 2021

Graaskamp Park: The park will stay in its current location with UW students to redesign in the Fall 2018/Spring 2019 with neighborhood input

Tenant Base: Our tenant screening includes criminal and credit checks as well as income verification, MDC's priority is to ensure tenant and neighborhood security. We follow the federal fair housing law.

- a. Traffic: What data supports that Options in Community Living is the main “culprit” of traffic issues at 2nd and E. Washington? At minimum I would expect to see how many “rides” to and from Options averages on a daily basis as compared to how many current resident parking spots at 1954 in addition to the additional 27 unit parking spots offset each other. Without data to support this claim, it is widely speculative in nature. I am not sure that the city has analyzed the traffic pattern of this area effectively. Being a resident on the even side of East Washington, if we want to head east bound we must immediately cross three lanes of traffic and take a left at the most dangerous intersection in Madison or we turn right on First St, then right on Mifflin, right on fourth street. Unless, the new development has a safe way to exit on to Second Street to head east bound, the new development will greatly increase traffic on Mifflin St. to East High School. I would request that MDC or the city perform a traffic impact analysis or traffic forecasting pre and post development as East Washington and its intersecting streets are some of the most dangerous in the city. According to Madison.com, in 2016, First Street and East Washington was the most dangerous intersection in Madison. Here is a quote from a June 2017 article:

“With 43 reported crashes, the East Side the intersection of East Washington Avenue and First Street was Madison’s most dangerous intersection in 2016.

What’s more, five of the 10 most dangerous intersections in Madison were at roads intersecting East Washington Avenue, according to the Madison Police Department.”

As a resident of [REDACTED] E. Washington for over 10 years, I’m not naïve to the fact that traffic will continue to be an issue regardless of this proposed development, but adding to the density and the cars entering and exiting East Washington will only add to the problem. Currently, it is very dangerous for pedestrians to cross East Washington. With Schenks Corners being an attractive location for food and beverages, these potential new residents are going to want to cross the street safely to frequent these establishments. With no solution to this problem being considered by the city or MDC, I cannot support a plan that will put more pedestrians at risk. This problem is amplified at dusk and in poor weather conditions (i.e. slippery roads or low visibility). Even in nice weather, drivers use East Washington to “drag-race” as early as dusk which is extremely dangerous for pedestrians when for over half of the calendar year, it gets dark starting at 6pm. The city has failed to do enough to enforce speed limits on this area of East Washington.

- b. Parking: Currently there are ongoing parking issues on east Washington between First and Second Streets. From 1930 E. Washington to First Street there is no street parking. In front of 1938 E. Washington there is a fire hydrant and very small parking spots available before and after the hydrant. Currently people consistently try to fit their cars in these spots and they either overlap with the fire hydrant or spill over into our driveways which violate city ordinance #71 – 10 feet from a fire hydrant and city ordinance #72 – 4 feet from a private driveway. The city parking enforcement does not regularly patrol this area and tickets are only given when they are called and the city ordinance is provided. With 27 units and ~27 parking spots, where will visitors park? If there are families with more than one vehicle, where will they park? The more congested this gets on E. Washington, the greater the impact on my family’s ability to safely exit our driveway on E. Washington especially during morning and afternoon commutes or during inclement weather. The added congestion/density will continue to stress the already

fragile parking availability and creates a hazard if there were a fire and the fire hydrant were blocked by a resident of 1954 E. Washington which is a liability I doubt MDC would entertain. Again, this issue is compounded when there are snow emergencies and east Washington street parking is not available. MDC's response again is inaccurate and does not address these concerns. For these reasons, parking on East Washington Ave (or Mifflin St.) should not be a viable solution for any new residents of the proposed development and the proposed development should include enough parking for each resident's vehicles (more than 1 vehicle for families) as well as visitors. The project is too big if it cannot be self-sufficient with enough parking on the property for tenants, visitors, delivery's, etc. For the amount of land available in this lot/site, it is irresponsible and a rather gluttonous use of public resources to prioritize and maximize the footprint of a four-story 27 unit apartment complex.

As I was writing this letter, I checked out front of my house and sure enough, here is an example of the current overflow / lack of adequate parking causing safety hazards. This happens daily and is not regularly patrolled by parking enforcement. Note to City of Madison: if this area was patrolled a few times a week you could increase annual parking ticket revenue by ~\$1500 (conservatively, a \$30 ticket per week ☺).



- c. Safety & Security: MDC addresses this through "cameras" and surveillance, referencing during the meeting that they will be able to find and catch perpetrators. Dealing with crime after it happens does not provide the re-assurance. There should be proactive plans to mitigate potential crime, not retroactive after the crimes have been committed. If this neighborhood is going to be sustainable, it has to be safe and attractive to young families.
- d. Density: MDC's response is not adequate. I do appreciate them listening to neighborhood concerns about a second apartment complex, but there are still density issues with the proposed 27 unit building. I would like to know if any analysis of current vacancy rates in the neighborhood were considered to ensure there is adequate demand for these additional units. The data below shows that these zip codes currently have the highest amount of rental units and some of the highest percentage vacancy rates with over 1000 vacant units.

City	ZIP Code	Total Rental Units	Total Vacant Units	Percent Vacant Units
Cross Plains	53528	452	12	2.65
Middleton	53562	4,449	104	2.33
Oregon	53575	72	2	2.77
Waunakee	53597	590	13	2.20
Madison	53703	15,045	800	5.31
Madison	53704	8,706	304	3.49
Madison	53705	6,078	455	7.48
Madison/Fitchburg	53711	7,061	296	4.22
Madison	53713	6,915	413	5.97
Madison	53714	2,132	129	6.05
Madison	53715	3,232	189	5.84
Madison/Monona	53716	1,915	78	4.07
Madison	53717	1,090	44	4.03
Madison	53718	2,139	49	2.29
Madison	53719	1,541	59	3.82

Have any of the currently approved development projects been considered? For example, the Marling, Union Corners, and the development near Schenks Corners' have and will continue to increase the number of housing options on the near east side. With the current vacancy rates, is there a need for more housing options or will this create more supply than demand and negatively impact the single family housing market? We, as most, are all for affordable housing options. We live on East Washington because it was more affordable than living in other areas of Madison. That said, for the concept of "affordable housing" to be effective, it needs to be spread out throughout the city, not segregated into certain areas of the city. This neighborhood already has 3 halfway houses, a tiny house community, the current Avenue Apartment at 1954 E. Washington, and one of the higher vacancy rates in the city. I know the city is planning to increase density, but if this is done too quickly and not with strategic intent, it will stress the market. I'm not sure what is driving the urgency of this project. We recommend a more patient, collaborative approach to re-developing this location especially with the impact of the proposed public market being an important and unknown variable.

- e. Grasskamp Park: I do applaud MDC's current considerations for upgrading the park and involving stakeholders in the design process. I do have concerns that some of the larger trees that shade the park will need to be removed to fit in the new 27 unit complex. I also fear that since this is reliant on private fundraising and there is no financial commitment from MDC that it will become an afterthought. We would strongly recommend that there is a park entrance accessible from E. Washington as an opportunity to further integrate the neighborhood.
- f. Tenant Base: MDC references that tenants are screened prior to leasing, but does not provide any evidence as to how this benefits the neighborhood. For example, what types of screening other than income verification are done? What criminal convictions would MDC view as not

acceptable when screening for a potential tenant? In the past, have the property owners not rented to a tenant due to a certain criminal conviction? If so, how typical is this? The answers to this question would provide clarity to the tenant screening process and hopefully provide the neighborhood reassurance that the influx of 30+ new families will have a positive impact on the current neighborhood.

3. Additional Concerns:

- a. Residents Income: I realize this is affordable housing, but the data provided only references a "median income" of the current tenant base? The data does not specify if this is the median income of an individual or a family (more than one earner). How many current tenants are single versus married versus married with children? What is the average income of the current tenant base? How much will rent be for the 27 unit complex? Without this transparency, I have to believe that this data was selectively chosen to "sell" this development to the neighbors. This is data that MDC should have access to and I do not feel it is too much ask to see data. Additionally, how does current income level data throughout the rest of the neighborhood compare? Are there comparable "affordable housing developments" in the adjacent neighborhoods for reference? Are there any economic impact studies that could be done?
- b. Long Term neighborhood stability / family friendly: The current neighborhood has a century long tradition of being family oriented. How does this development attract families to this neighborhood? For the near east side of Madison to continue to thrive, it must be able to attract young families to purchase starter level homes. If the neighborhood cannot attract young families and they will continue to move to the suburbs and surrounding areas, or turn to short term leases and it could de-stabilize the housing market in this area.
- c. Aesthetics: I applaud MDC for trying to maintain the architectural consistency of "rooflines" in an effort to blend the building into the current neighborhood. What people will notice is the roofline of the 27 unit complex towers over the existing 1920 era homes being that it is a 4 story complex and the homes on east Washington are at most 2.5 stories. The long and short of it is the proposed 27 unit apartment complex is going to stick out and likely could make the homes between 1954 E. Washington and First Street look out of place due to the imposing nature of the new structure and how close it is to E. Washington. Additionally, this new building does not look consistent with the current buildings on the property and with no firm plans to update the existing structures, this will continue to look disjointed and out of place. With East Washington being THEE main thoroughfare on the east side, the visual aspect to passerby's is exaggerated. On badger football Saturday's there are thousands of individuals and families from out of town driving down E. Washington to Camp Randall. The aesthetics of this building have to be done well to continue the progress made via the "East Washington revival" that started years ago with the re-development of East Washington Street. The design plans also show that this structure is very close to East Washington Street, further exaggerating the imposing nature of the complex. MDC indicated multiple times that they have a very "tight" budget and I hope they have budgeted to have the financial flexibility to make additional design considerations. This is important as my first thought when I saw the artist renderings was that it looked like a "Courtyard Marriot" which does not fit the character of a 1920's neighborhood.

Lastly, how close is the 27 unit to the nearest E. Washington property owner (1944?)? The design plans seem to be very close to the property line. Have they been notified or engaged regarding these plans? At minimum, I would hope that MDC would make the minimal effort to talk to their new neighbor about their imposing plans. In our neighborhood, even if you plan to build a fence let alone a 4 story building, you talk to your bordering neighbor about it. If this has not been done, that is very telling of the priority that MDC is placing on neighborhood values over profit potential.

- d. Current structures / curb appeal: The renovation of the current structure, "old hospital," is not included in these plans, and when referenced, it would be a phase 3 project contingents on a lot of unknown and co-dependent variables. It concerns me that building new structures is prioritized over rehabbing the current buildings or reinvesting in the current sites. For a comparably small cost, a minimum investment in improving the current landscaping should occur and should occur in one of the first phases. Updating the current structure and improving the curb appeal would go a long way in building good-faith with the neighborhood and should be done or committed to be done before work begins on new structures.
- e. How does this benefit me, my family, and the neighborhood: I didn't hear any talk of how this will benefit the neighboring community or be more attractable to young families. The only benefits are privately funded improvements to the GrassKamp park and depreciation of the current Options building which is a responsibility of MDC regardless of this proposed development. Additionally, a project of this size will create significant noise pollution and construction resources. For over a year, this will severely inconvenience my family and many other neighboring families. This plan seems to primarily benefit MDC without equitable benefit to the neighboring community.

In closing, I have been a property owner at [REDACTED] E. Washington since 2008. My wife and I now have a 16 month child and would like to add to our family. We really enjoying living on the near east side and found many benefits in the neighboring community. If developments like this continue to be "fast-tracked" while intentionally or unintentionally disregarding community involvement and neighborhood buy-in, we will have no choice but to move our family to a more suburban area. My fear is this trend will become more and more typical further destabilizing the near east side neighborhoods and single family homes values which are a hallmark of the Madison community. This project serves as a microcosm for the large scale re-development efforts happening throughout east Madison and the downtown area. While I support many of these redevelopment efforts, if these projects are not well thought through and stakeholders are not adequately engaged and treated as the subject matter experts they are, the city could likely experience profound unintended consequences rendering these massive investment efforts moot.

We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chris Sell & Natasha Fahey-Flynn
Homeowners @ [REDACTED] E. Washington Ave.