

**From:** [Ethington, Ruth](#) on behalf of [Planning](#)  
**To:** [Vaughn, Jessica L](#); [Cleveland, Julie](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Form submission from: Contact  
**Date:** Friday, April 1, 2022 6:32:42 AM

---

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

From: [noreply@cityofmadison.com](mailto:noreply@cityofmadison.com) <[noreply@cityofmadison.com](mailto:noreply@cityofmadison.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022 6:51 PM  
To: [Planning](mailto:planning@cityofmadison.com) <[planning@cityofmadison.com](mailto:planning@cityofmadison.com)>  
Subject: Form submission from: Contact

Submitted on Thursday, March 31, 2022 - 6:51pm Submitted by user: Anonymous Submitted values are:

==Contact DSC==

First Name: Harry  
Last Name: Snook  
Organization / Company: retired  
Address: 1014 LOWELL ST, WI Madison, WI, 53715  
Primary Phone Number: (303) 910-4000  
Email: [tontoadam@yahoo.com](mailto:tontoadam@yahoo.com)  
Request Type: Urban Design Approvals  
How should we contact you? Email

Message:

The proposed residential project at S. Park and Regent is probably intended to address the need for housing units in the city. I see two problems with this project as described and pictured: 1) There is no mention of any below-market units available. This is where the most acute need exists. 2) The design as shown is anonymous. It has no connection to Madison other than location. There is no architecture in the area with any resemblance to the proposal. Will South Park be developed as East Washington has been and is being developed: Metal and glass with a bit of brick that could be in Portland, Chicago, Charlotte, etc.? None of the charm for which Madison is famous. Does it make a difference? Ask the students who come from outside Wisconsin and they will tell you that they love the charm of Gorham and Langdon, and even Johnson St, because the architecture is eclectic and appropriate to the city, not anonymous.

Surely the developer can do better to connect with Madison's architectural heritage, especially the heritage of the Italian neighborhood this building, if built as shown, will bury.

Harry David Snook  
Bay Creek Neighborhood

**From:** [Orrie Walsvik](#)  
**To:** [Urban Design Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Meeting 3/30/2022 on Agenda Item 70450  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 30, 2022 8:51:35 AM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Good day,

I am addressing these comments to the Urban Design Commission in support of Agenda Item 70450 for the meeting tonight.

I am a longtime Madison Resident and past (and hopefully future) resident of the Greenbush community, who wants to increase density, public transit, lower housing costs, and greenhouse gasses. I want this because it is best for the underserved population of Madison.

We know that Madison has a housing problem--not just affordability, but *occupancy*. The Occupancy Rate in this city is sky-high--which drives developments like these. Not all development is created equal, however. Some developments are off transit corridors, replace affordable housing with luxury, or require giant parking lots due to the city's outdated parking requirements.

This is NOT one such development. This development is in a prime position, and I am concerned by comments from the community that such an aptly-placed proposal will face too much scrutiny.

1. The development is on a high use transit corridor. The south transfer point is just down park street, AND it is on a proposed future BRT route--but what's more consequential is that the housing is walkable to both hospitals, and university buildings in that area which employ so many individuals.
2. The development will increase density downtown, which should be a major goal of the city.
3. The development will remove eyesores and insufficiently maintained last-century buildings with modern, energy efficient housing.

While these three items should be enough to put the proposal through as it is, there are a few considerations that the committee should suggest to address community concerns, if possible.

- A. Making some units affordable housing.
- B. Reducing the parking requirements for the space to reduce traffic.

Finally, a Madison.com article details two concerns that residents and UW-Madison have about the building--affordable housing, and traffic.

I would like to address those comments by UW-Madison. UW-Madison has consistently increased its enrollment by thousands every year, yet relies on the local madison community to meet housing demands. UW-Madison should not have an input to deny dense housing near the university when it requires the city and its residents to bear the increased housing costs of its students.

Because of the University's actions to increase their enrollment, many individuals in more affordable housing have been priced out. The residents of Greenbush should see this as an opportunity to funnel less students further outward into their neighborhood and instead an opportunity to funnel them into the dense housing they need, close to UW.

Finally, the idea that giving individuals walkable housing near major employers will somehow increase traffic on one of the busiest roads in the city is outlandishly foolish. This building should *decrease* traffic by allowing commuters from suburbs a choice to move into the city and walk to work in modern apartments which they do not have to purchase for nearly half a million dollars, the current going rate in greenbush. If traffic is a concern of the individuals in greenbush, they should push for restrictions on commuters, not restrictions which would prevent a dense, transit-oriented building from being built.

Thank you,

Orrie Walsvik