

(00992) #11

July 5, 2005

Mark Olinger and  
Brad Murphy  
Planning and Development and  
Common Council Members

RE: Capitol West Project - Block 51  
Thoughts of a concerned citizen

I have followed the approval process for this project since I first learned of the development. After consultations with City staff, the developer and attending MANY meetings I am concerned about how the Broom Street setback and several of the approval conditions recommended by the Bassett District of Capitol Neighborhoods will affect the project. My MAIN issue is that the developer be treated in a fair manner and that the downtown residents meet the developer at least half way. This project is one of great economic value to the Capitol area.

**BROOM STREET SETBACK:**

I believe that the setback should be maintained at 15 feet to allow for future City traffic and other needs and that the setback should be uniform the entire length of the east side of Broom Street.

**BASSETT NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS:**

"AT GRADE" BUILDING ELEMENTS - the uneven grade along W. Washington makes it necessary to locate part of the ramps and stairs for 1st floor and lower level within the right of way. This is not unreasonable and will not affect the Capitol view.

309 WEST WASHINGTON PROJECTIONS - the bay windows and balconies are NOT at pedestrian level so will not infringe on the public right of way. The 2foot 7inch projection is NOT a safety issue. Several other condominium buildings in the downtown area do have balconies above street level that DO EXTEND outward above the public right of way. This is not an unreasonable design and will not affect the Capitol view.

WEST WASHINGTON CURB CUTS - the proposed delivery and passenger loading/unloading zone within the terrace is for the convenience of the OWNERS/RESIDENTS of 309. I have noticed that the condominium in the 100 block of W. Washington has a similiar zone. The design plan of such a zone within the terrace is a reasonable one.

PEDESTRIAN PASSAGEWAY BROOM STREET TO HENRY STREET - this passageway has been designed to create an enjoyable and safe passage for the public. HOWEVER the developer CANNOT promise that this passageway would ALWAYS be open for other than the OWNERS/RESIDENTS. The status of the access to this passageway is the prerogative of the OWNERS/RESIDENTS and because of this and since this is NOT a City street the approval for this project SHOULD NOT consider any change in or restriction of access to other than the owners and residents as a major alteration. It is a common space belonging to the condominium owners and THEY, not the public, enjoy the right to determine access status. I have noticed that several of the condominiums WEST of the Capitol have gated passageways that without the gates would be accessible to anyone who wanted to walk down them. Because this will be a private walk managed by the Condominium Association it is not fair for the public to assume it should have unrestricted access forever. \*\*

TRASH AND RECYCLING CONTAINERS - the developer's proposal to have all such containers enclosed is adequate. They will be screened from view & there'll be access to them by the trash/recycling collectors.

PARKING GARAGE WIDTH - to demand/suggest that the developer construct a parking garage wide enough to accommodate tractor-trailer units is UNREASONABLE and IMPRACTICAL. To the best of my knowledge NONE OF THE CONDOMINIUM BUILDINGS currently completed have such a wide garage. Why are downtown residents requesting this when their parking garages don't accommodate such large units???????

TEMPORARY COMMON SPACE - an unfair condition for approval. Owners/residents can arrange for their meeting spaces until Phase II completed as they need to meet. Some of the already occupied condominium buildings DO NOT have a common space.

POLE LIGHTING AT TOP OF EXISTING PARKING RAMP - another unfair condition for approval. The current light fixtures were approved when ramp constructed. Developer plans to make improvements to the entire parking ramp in a later construction phase of this project

CONSTRUCTION VEHICLE/EQUIPMENT TRAFFIC - because the developer and City Traffic department will have to agree on the traffic during all phases of construction it should not be the downtown residents prerogative to demand as a condition of approval how traffic should flow. When you reside in the center of an expanding city with so many new construction projects you sometimes have to suffer the inconvenience of construction traffic. It is not permanent and is part of creating new vitality to the Capitol area.

Thank YOU for considering the opinions of a 37 year resident of downtown who loves her community and is excited about all the new development and having so many new and wonderful friends/neighbors.

*Rosemary Lee*  
ROSEMARY LEE  
111 W. WILSON STREET  
MADISON WI 53703  
608-256-1651

*\*\* I find it very curious that some of the neighbors demanding this condition live at Belford Court or 4th Ward Lofts where there are gated passageways with plaques stating "Residents Only - No Trespassers". I ask you how these residents can then expect a developer and other condominium owners to agree to a forever open passageway??*