

Wells, Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2016 10:25 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: (Fwd) maintenance of public right of way/division st developement
Attachments: Mail message body.PM\$

fyi--see below an email I sent to the 2 chairs of p & d (preservation and dev) and Alder Rummel

Thanks for asking for input

Anne Walker

----- Forwarded message follows -----

To: district6@cityofmadison.com, jesse Pycha-Holst
<[REDACTED]>,
brad Hinkfuss [REDACTED]
Subject: maintenance of public right of way
Date sent: Fri, 05 Aug 2016 06:43:01 -0500

All

its great to have partners with labor and cost sharing of projects in our neighborhood, particularly in relation to public right of way. I was thinking about the Pollinator Report, which was passed fairly recently at Common Council. In addition to discussing the importance of pollinators, the document discusses land management principles that maximize the chance for success. Land management has so very much to do with why pollinators do or do not survive in an environment.

Those priciples should be incorporated into projects such as Joe's on Division Street. For example, this could be an excellent place to incorporate a dragonfly garden in conjunction with the rain garden. Dragonflies are excellent at reducing mosquito populations and are beautiful to boot.

From my perspective, it would be a shame to miss out on such an amazing opportunity. As mentioned at the meeting, the location is at the "hub" of the neighborhood from a multimodal perspective. Its a perfect location to create an excellent example of sustainability that will go mobile.

Additionally, I would personally emphasize the importance of retaining seating. We create a lot of ways to get around.....we need places to be. And we need them for all sorts of reasons. This a great location for a pocket park and is aligned with the goals in the Madison Sustainability Plan.

Anne

----- End of forwarded message -----

Wells, Chris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 9:58 AM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: 418 division st.

Hi Chris,

I just read the staff report for this project and again I am struck by the deviations from the requirements and what is proposed. I will not be able to make it to the meeting for this project tonight but I want to LOUDLY express my displeasure with this project. Again me and other neighbors are objecting to specifically;

1. The height of this proposed structure is above the 40' requirement. Grade is the level that the existing building is at, Krupp is trying to use the railroad/bike path as grade, that will add 6' to the height then when the planned towers are added to the height you have well in excess of the 15% more in height that is required.

2. The requirement is for a one to one ratio for parking. This proposal does NOT follow this requirement. 29 space for 31 units will only capture about half of the needed spaces as is. He meets the requirement for bikes but more importantly cars are the bigger concern. Look if you were paying any attention to the neighbors in the two meetings we had on this project clearly parking and traffic are of major concerns in this neighborhood.

Please if you will add my concerns listed here with others for the meeting tonight, which I won't be able to attend, because if I were able to attend I would speak of these at the meeting and I would like all our concerns to be taken into account BEFORE approval is given.

Thanks
Keith Kobs
[REDACTED]

Wells, Chris

From: Rummel, Marsha
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Wells, Chris; [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Capital Water Softener

Please share with PC

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Rankin <[REDACTED]>
Date: August 8, 2016 at 12:14:39 PM CDT
To: "Rummel, Marsha" <district6@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Re: Capital Water Softener

Here it is again. I plan to be at the hearing tonight to say something similar in person. Do they get the oral comments from the community meetings?

Steve

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Rankin <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Capital Water Softener
Date: 24 June, 2016 at 6:01:07 PM CDT
To: district6@cityofmadison.com

Hi Marsha:

I received your postcard re: the meeting about Joe Krupp's proposal for the Capital Water Softener property. I have another commitment that evening. If I can find a way to come to the meeting I will. That being said, I do have an initial reaction.

I cannot imagine a version of that proposal that I could find acceptable. I liked having Capital Water Softener as a neighbor. I like living in a neighborhood with a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. I also liked being able to walk down the street to buy my water softener. However, a three story building on that property, with 31 apartments, is totally out of scale for the block. On that side of Helena (west of the single-story Schoep's offices) are tiny one story slab-constructed houses and then bungalows. Most of Schoep's on the other side of the street is one story - the freezer is about three stories tall but is a small part of the overall footprint. The rest of the block is one to 1.5 story houses with a couple of two story two flats in the mix. Division Street has a couple of two story small apartment buildings but nothing approaching 31 units. I find it interesting that he is using Division Street as the address. Unless I am mistaken, Capital Water Softener's address was on Helena Street. Is this to make it appear more palatable in some way (since there are a couple of small apartment buildings there and none on Helena)? Helena is a very narrow street. To put a three story building anywhere near the street will make it tower over the street. Unless the parking entrance is on Division, the extra traffic, coupled with the Schoep's trucks unloading on the block, will make Helena virtually impassable even in summer. In short, this sounds like a terrible idea.

Steve Rankin
[REDACTED] Helena Street

Wells, Chris

From: Monica H [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 1:46 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Subject: Re: 418 Division steering committee

thank you, Chris. I have a couple comments to pass along, if you could please include them for the Plan Commission.

As I said at the neighborhood meeting last week, I appreciate the juxtaposition of industrial materials with a residential project, and that the material choices in a way reflect the recent history of the site. And I appreciate that the developer and architect are happy with the design. However, the design is not like art they are picking out for their own office--it's something the neighborhood has to live with. As much as I like modern design, I strongly believe that a more traditional residential design is appropriate for this site, for the following reasons:

- 1) it may have a traffic calming effect. A design that says "office park" is not an engaging visual cue that there is pedestrian and cycle traffic to watch for, and we already have speeding issues on Eastwood Ave. (The proposed rain garden along the bike path side of the development would help, but it would only be an effective traffic calming measure in the warmer months.)
- 2) it would set the stage that this is a residential area. Given reasonable concern among my neighbors that this development may set a precedent for future redevelopment along Division and Helena streets, it is important to signal that this is a residential area with the design and materials.

Thank you,

Monica Harkey
[REDACTED] Helena St
Madison WI

Wells, Chris

From: Lisa Pfaff [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 2:47 PM
To: Wells, Chris
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Comments on File #: 43648 -- Rezoning 418 Division St. from TE to TSS

Hello Chris,

As a neighborhood resident who lives across the street and down the block from the former Capitol Water Softener building I would like to thank you very much for attending the second neighborhood meeting regarding the 31-unit apartment building proposed for 418 Division St. I found your comments regarding zoning rules and planning decisions very interesting and informative. Unfortunately, two of your comments continue to bother me.

The first is your suggestion that even though TSS stands for "Traditional Shopping Street" we should overlook the history of Division St. (it has never been a traditional shopping street) and the geography (the parcel in question is separated from an actual traditional shopping street by a former rail corridor, now limited access parkway) because those are just the words used to describe the package of zoning rules that happen to fit the building that this developer wants to build.

Apart from the rather disturbing cart-before-the-horse nature of this explanation, please allow me to point out that the rules that make up the TSS zoning designation are based on the typical streetscapes of traditional shopping streets and are meant to produce more of the same. In this case they would allow a traditional shopping street façade on the Division St. side of the proposed apartment building, with the exterior stairways and lobby wall pushed up against the sidewalk and only a few pockets of landscaped open space (the length of one staircase in depth) visually reading as setback. That proposed traditional shopping street-style crowding on west side of Division Street makes an odd contrast with the traditional residential setback of the single and multifamily houses on the east side of Division and, I think, sends the wrong message about the future of residential development in the neighborhood (which, let's note, has always been well accommodated by TR-V1 in the past).

If I am reading the landscape plans correctly it looks like more of a setback is planned on the (presumably thought to be more residential) Helena St. side of the proposed building (that, or the landscaper is planning on planting trees in the middle of the sidewalk...). Despite the factory and grocery store traffic Division Street is also a residential street, and that side should have a similarly clear, useable setback. As would be required by residential or neighborhood mixed use zoning rules.

A second odd thing that you said was that the increased unit density per acre is justified because the intersection of Atwood and Division is a "transit hub." Let me just point out here that there are two bus stops at Atwood and Division, one for each direction, and neither of them actually merits a bus shelter. A number of commuter-hour bus routes go through on weekdays but only one route uses these stops on weekends. As far as I know light rail has never been discussed for Atwood Ave. This is no East Washington corridor, not much of a destination and certainly no kind of a transfer stop. And if there were you would need an umbrella when it's raining. Not a transit hub by any stretch of the imagination.

I find it disturbing that in your report you cite two projects by the same developer on Atwood Ave, whose buildings generally look out of place there due to their excessive height and size, to support the high density planned for the 418 Division St. proposal. That size and density may be the standard for his buildings but it's certainly not the standard for the neighborhood or even for Atwood Ave., including some other newer construction. Just to say.

Also to say: For all the height mid-block of the Schoeps factory buildings, the Division St. facades are all 1-2 stories high, unlike the 3+ story height of the proposed apartment building. More incongruity with the existing very-much-not-TSS streetscape.

And to add: there are numerous multi-unit buildings on Division St., Center Ave, and throughout the neighborhood that have somehow managed to increase unit per acre density while still abiding by TR-V1 or TR-V2 rules with reasonable variances. I just don't believe that 418 Division St. is such an exception that the rules we in the neighborhood live by simply must be tossed out in favor of rules meant for higher traffic streets and intense mixed use. Changing the zoning of this parcel to TSS would set a very unfortunate precedent. I am against the zoning change.

Thank you for your attention, and for all your thoughtful work in studying and explaining this project. I'm sorry that I simply do not agree with your analysis of what is good or acceptable for my section of Division St.

Lisa Pfaff

Center Ave
Madison 53704

[Redacted]