

Dear Plan Commission and City Staff,

Sept 30. 2013

RE: Agenda item #10, 1220-1236 Mound St

We support the proposed request to rezone the above properties from TR-C4 to PD (Planned Development) with the condition that the zoning for the **entire lot** be consistent with TR-C4 zoning. TR-C4 zoning has a more restrictive family definition, allowing only a maximum of two unrelated per unit.

Zoning in the Greenbush neighborhood was changed in 1976 from R4 to R3 to encourage more owner occupied homes and lower occupancy. With the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy the city essentially allowed the less restrictive family definition to continue and continues to this day. As Greenbush residents for over 35 years we have struggled with over-occupancy in our neighborhood. It has been often difficult to determine legal occupancy from city records and even more difficult to enforce. Over-occupancy results in parking, traffic and noise issues that are not easily resolved. We see zoning this entire PD as TR-C4 as an opportunity to start addressing over occupancy issues.

The Greenbush Bush neighborhood plan wishes to encourage family housing and increased occupancy does not encourage family housing. The property owner wishes to potentially attract families to his new single family homes but this is doubtful considering the number of residents allowed in his current units. With the council approval of the TIF#43(Park/Drake-Sept 17) we feel a critical component in the implementation of this TIF district, to encourage possible homeowners to buy in our neighborhood, is to decrease the number of units that are over-occupied throughout the neighborhood.

In conclusion, we believe this rezoning to Planned Development should **only** go forward with the development-specific zoning of TR-C4 for **all** properties, both old (Lots 4, 5, 6, 7) and newly constructed.

Thank you for your consideration,

Cynthia Koschmann
Edward Mason
1157 Emerald St

September 27, 2013

Re: 1220-1236 Mound Street Planned Development Proposal (St. James Cottage Homes)

Dear Members of the Plan Commission and Planning Staff,

I am a resident of the Greenbush Neighborhood and am writing to provide comments on the 1220 – 1236 Mound Street Planned Development (St. James Cottage Homes). After reviewing the developer's plans and reading the Planning Division's Staff Report, I am neither opposed nor in favor of the development. However I would like to comment on two aspects of the project including, 1) The requested zoning change, and 2) On-street residential parking permits.

1) Requested Zoning Change:

The current Greenbush Neighborhood Plan and its related Revitalization Strategy both specifically recommends changing the zoning of Mound Street back to the "family definition", reducing the number of non-related occupants per unit down to 2 (to encourage work force and family housing). Four of the seven structures in the proposed St. James Cottage Home Planned Development currently exist at 1220 – 1236 Mound Street and the developer is requesting a zone change from TR-C4 to PD-GDP-SIP. Because the developer is the one requesting a zone change, I feel that any zoning change requests should now reflect the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan & Revitalization Strategy and only allow a maximum of 2 un-related occupants per dwelling unit. This proposed project is a wonderful opportunity to see both the Neighborhood Plan & Revitalization Strategy visions come to fruition for four separate structures located on Mound St. If it does not happen now, it will likely be a very long time before this opportunity exists again. City staff already recommends that the proposed 3 new structures in this Planned Development adhere to the "family definition" from TR-C4 zoning, and therefore the Neighborhood Plan (which I completely agree with). I respectfully ask the Plan Commission to consider making all 7 structures (the 4 existing on Mound Street and the 3 to be built) adhere to the Neighborhood Plan & Revitalization Strategy and have the TR-C4 "family definition" be applied to the entire Planned Development. With proposing this project right now, the developer is the one who is opening up the zoning "can of worms" (so to speak) and it's also a wonderful opportunity for the City to help our Neighborhood return four Mound Street structures back to family and workforce housing as outlined in our current Greenbush Neighborhood Plan and Revitalization Strategy.

2) On-street residential parking permits (RP3):

This proposed Planned Development has only 9 off-street parking stalls. If the project is approved as proposed by the developer, a total of 29 individuals can live in this development (which is equivalent to a 15 unit building with TR-C4 "family definition" limits). The ratio of 9

parking stalls to the equivalent 15 unit building is 0.6, a ratio that typically triggers City Traffic Engineering to restrict/eliminate on-street residential parking permits (RP3). Other very recent proposed/approved Greenbush Planned Developments (e.g. "Ideal" PD, "Longfellow" PD, "Vicinato" PD) all had a ratio < 1.0 and Traffic Engineering reduced or eliminated RP3's in these developments. I do not feel the St. James Cottage Home developer has provided enough off-street parking in this proposed Planned Development, thus residents will park their vehicles on the already congested Greenbush Neighborhood streets. I request the Plan Commission consider restricting the number of RP3's allowed for this proposed Planned Development to a maximum of 7 on-street residential parking permits (1 per residential lot).

As mentioned above, I have read the Planning Division's Staff Report and in particular I agree with the following recommendations they made, and I hope the Plan Commission will also incorporate these recommendations if the project is approved:

- The 3 new structures will adhere to the "family definition" of occupancy and allow no more than 2 un-related individuals per unit. (Though I hope the Commission will consider that all 7 structures adhere to this "family definition", as mentioned above.)
- A minimum of 4 additional bicycle parking stalls be provided.
- Existing trees shall be protected.

Thank you for considering my comments on this project.

Sincerely,

Dawn Perkins
1153 Emerald Street
Madison, WI 53715

From: Laurie S [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 5:24 AM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Plan Commission 9/30; comments on 2 agenda items

Hi Tim,

Unfortunately, we are unable to attend the plan commission meeting on 9/30. However, we want to let you know our thoughts on two agenda items, the Vincinato Apartments Proposal and the St James Cottage Homes proposal.

Vincinato Apartments

We have several issues with this proposal

1. The developer is proposing to tear down the O'Connell House at 1022 Mound St. This house, which has been sadly neglected by its current owner (Meriter Hospital), was built in 1897, is an excellent example of Queen Anne architecture, and was featured in a 1991 walking tour brochure of the Greenbush-Vilas neighborhood. It also complements a house directly across from it on Mills St which was incorporated into the Village Co-housing development a number of years ago. Tearing down the O'Connell House will destroy part of the historic character of the Greenbush neighborhood. Tearing down this house will also destroy
2. The proposed apartment buildings are too large and it does nothing to add to the older character of the Greenbush Neighborhood. It also detracts from, rather than compliments the facade created by the co-housing development directly across the street. Yes, the Meriter GDP allows for such density. But the Meriter GDP considered primarily profit margin for Meriter and did not look at the overall character or traffic and parking issues of the neighborhood.
3. We agree with City Transportation officials who have recommended no RP3 parking permits be issued for this project. It is already next to impossible to find parking within a block any direction of where this apartment is going to be built. If it's tenants are allowed to buy street permits, it will push the parking congestion further away from the actual apartment building.
4. City traffic needs to foresee traffic congestion issues, particularly for the corner of Regent and Mills. Traffic calming devices have been successful over the past 5-7 years at reducing and slowing traffic in the Meriter "corner" of the neighborhood. But the increased density of this project, along with the Longfellow project, have the potential to make Mills St between Regent and south to Vilas, a congestion nightmare.

St James Cottage Homes proposal

This landowner and architect have already designed and built 2 very nice duplexes across the alley from us. It looks like his proposal for this block of St James Court will also be an attractive addition to the neighborhood. However, we would encourage him to add dedicated bicycle parking. We also would like him to be required to provide parking ON the property for any units he adds to the current configuration of units. This is already a congested parking area, and a significant increase in parking permits will move the parking pressure further south, making it extremely difficult to find parking in the winter during single side parking (and we don't have any parking ramps within walking distance like downtown residents do).

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Laurie & Lee Swimm
■ Chandler St.