CAMPUS AREA NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Johnson & Broom Steering Committee Report

November 10th, 2023

The Johnson & Broom Street Steering Committee convened after the first initial steering committee on July 26th and formal neighborhood postcard meeting on September 7th for the development co-hosted by city staff, the Campus Area Neighborhood Association, District 4 Alder and Development Team. The proposed location of the Johnson & Broom Project by CORE Spaces falls within the 4th Alder District.

The Campus Area Neighborhood Association (CANA) led the steering committee for the Johnson & Broom project and hosted public meetings dedicated to topics regarding the proposal; Eli Tsarovsky (past CANA President), Cleo Le (past CANA Vice President) and Tanner Mechura (current CANA President) of CANA co-led these meetings via Zoom and in person. Through this process, the steering committee and developer discussed: affordability, resident experience, management and operations, sustainability, and design. The steering committee process included:

- The initial neighborhood meeting,
- Three steering committee meetings with the developer, and
- One steering committee meeting without the developer.

In addition, the project was discussed during several Johnson and Bassett Steering Committee meetings that took place from March until June.

CANA publicized the meetings through the CANA email list, the Capitol Neighborhoods Inc. Miffland District email list, CANA and partner social media, and other neighborhood communications.

The steering committee has appreciated the development team's continued engagement with the neighborhood. The developers started early with the neighborhood input process and provided information to the community through an extensive steering committee process. The development team offered continued updates and welcomed the steering committee as an essential input body. The steering committee and development team exercised a high level of transparency throughout the steering committee process.

After extensive discussion, the steering committee found more pros than cons in the project and thinks the project will benefit the Madison Community. The steering

committee would like to highlight parts of the project they appreciated and provide specific feedback for improving the project.

The feedback on the project is organized into four categories: ***Affordability Component***, ***Resident Experience***, ***Sustainability***, ***Urban Design***, *and* ***Additional Community Considerations*** for the Plan Commission to consider. These considerations and highlights from the steering committee can largely be considered among the Approval Standards 1, 2, 6, and 9 for Conditional Uses. The affordability component should be considered under the current ordinance Chapter 28 under subsection 28E. - Section 28.071.

Affordablility Component

Overall, the Steering Committee is excited to see the development team use the new downtown ordinance to create voluntary low-cost student housing in the Campus Area. To reflect the sentiment of the Downtown Neighborhood Coalition's Affordable Housing Resolution signed on by the Capitol Neighborhood Inc. and the Campus Area Neighborhood, the steering committee strongly encourages the developer and Plan Commission to seriously consider the content in the resolution (resolution is linked below)

Does the added density supply need housing stock in the neighborhood while matching the downtown plan recommendations and surrounding/emerging context?

While the proposed development at Johnson and Broom would significantly expand the supply of housing in the neighborhood, there are many important factors to consider beyond the total number of units or beds being produced. To be sure, much more student housing is needed downtown and in near-campus neighborhoods. However, as housing experts and policymakers have noted, all "three P's" of housing must be considered when evaluating housing policies and development proposals:

1) ***"Production*** of new housing at all income levels, **especially affordable housing**;
2) ***Protection*** for current residents to avoid displacement;
3) ***Preservation*** of existing housing affordable for lower- and middle-income residents" (Shaw, 2020, p. xvii; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2023)

There is clearly an urgent need for the production of more affordable and market-rate student housing downtown, and this will require the construction of new high-density buildings. However, when there is a shortage of developable space downtown and students are struggling to find the decent, affordable housing that they need to gain access to education, affordable units or beds should be a significant component of all new, high-density student housing developments. This need was expressed in the

Downtown Neighborhoods Coalition Affordable Housing Resolution, which was approved by CANA, CNI, the Marquette Neighborhood Association, and the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association in 2021 and 2022. This Resolution notes that, at the current average Madison hourly wage of $17.24, a student would have to work 46 hours per week to afford the average one-bedroom apartment in downtown Madison (Downtown Neighborhoods Coalition, 2021). Students also typically work lower-paying service-sector jobs, and at the Wisconsin minimum wage of $7.25 per hour, a student would have to work 94 hours to afford the average studio apartment in downtown Madison, and 110 hours to afford the average one-bedroom apartment (DNC, 2021). In the Resolution, the Downtown Neighborhood Coalition "requests that **at least 15% of available units [in new downtown developments] be qualified as affordable"** for a household earning 30% of Dane County's Area Median Income (DNC, 2021). The Downtown Neighborhood Coalition also **"expects developers to seek out financial assistance from the City of Madison**, Dane County, federal, and/or other local funding partners … **prior to indicating to neighborhoods or development approval bodies** like the Plan Commission **that affordability was not an option** for the given project…" (DNC, 2021).

Below are some comments from neighbors that were submitted in our neighborhood survey for the project:

- "20% should be discounted. Currently all of the housing being torn down to develop this plan is affordable housing so this is only adequate for the displacement of multiple affordable housing projects already available."
- "Only 10% are considered affordable by the developer? Consider removing the pool/green space/other unnecessary amenities that drive up prices."
- "Much more than 10% of units should be discounted. Aim for 50% or even more"
- "A larger portion of the project should be affordable housing, as there the greatest housing deficit for the lowest 30% of income in Madison, to actually combat that problem, at least 30% of this project should be affordable housing, if not the deficit will shrink for upper and middle income renters at a greater rate than for the lowest 30%."
- "Reasonable accommodations"
- "I'd like to be more informed about this."
- there needs to be a higher percentage of affordable units. 10% is hardly anything. At least 30%-50%. So many students can't afford housing as it is downtown and these units will be expensive. You are only creating more luxury housing right now and the demand for affordable housing is massive.
- "While 10% being less than dorms is great, it's important to note that dorms are extremely unaffordable over long term. Freshmen live in them in order to make friends and because they're not aware of other options, not because they can sustainably pay that price. For almost everyone I was friends with, budgets going into apartment shopping was $400-900. All is less than a dorm

price and $700-900 is still an expensive option. 90% of the building being more than dorm prices is mind boggling."

- "Affordability is subjective and I would appreciate some actual numbers regarding price range. I come from a low income family and I'm an out of state student so expenses are something I have to very very strongly consider before making any decisions"
- "Every resident should have their own bedroom or else lower income students will be forced to share bedrooms which negatively impacts academic performance and mental health. 10% of beds at a discounted rate is not appropriate this number needs to be much higher, at least 20%"
- "Having things like a laundry room on each floor or a fitness center is nice, but affordability is more important. If both can be done, great, but otherwise prioritize giving students a place to live."
- "My greatest concern is that only 10% of the units will be offered at below market rate. There are many more students who would need affordable housing, so it would be good if Developer could offer more such units within this building."
- "Please consider affordable rates for graduate students, even those that may not be eligible for financial aid, as this is a financially difficult time for many students"
- "Most housing is out of the budgets of students. Affordable for students should realistically be under $800 per room"
- "Firstly, to have any impact on Madison affordable housing, this development project must provide at LEAST 30% affordable housing units. This is compared to the dismal 10% that is currently being offered. Secondly, by only letting low income students receive a discount on housing in double occupancy rooms, you are still not giving low income students the same living opportunities because not all low income students want to have 3 roommates and to share a room with another person. For the housing to truly be affordable to low income students, I believe we should be able to rent any unit at a discounted price without being forced into a double occupancy unit because that is what other students have the opportunity to do. If low income students wish to share a room with someone to save more money, they should be able to do that too. However, with the current guidelines for low income student housing in the apartment complexes, you will only continue to push low income students further and further off campus. When my parents went to UW-Madison in the 90s, they struggled to find affordable housing just like I am. At one point they had 5 people (illegally) living in a 2 bedroom duplex because that's all they could afford. When I began my housing search freshman year, they were extremely saddened to hear the state of affordable student housing has only gotten worse, especially due to all of the expensive high rise apartments being built on campus. I understand that no matter what low income guidelines come out of this project, people will still stand in line all morning to sign a lease at complexes like this. I just wish that, even for a

moment, housing developers considered doing good in the community and attempting to alleviate the pertinent issue of affordable on campus housing, rather than just thinking about how much money they can make off of people who have no other choice."

- "30% affordable housing is the minimum. Nothing else will do."
- "There should be section 42 or section 8 housing in this building."
- "If a 4 bedroom apartment is more than $3600, it is not affordable. If a person is sharing a room and paying more than $600, that's not affordable. The rest of the 90% of units need to not be priced at Hub and James prices. This kind of luxury apartment building is what is gentrifying Madison and pushing everyone who is not living off of Daddy's money, out."
- "I was excited to see that there would be ~1500 beds provided in this development, but when I saw that only ~160 would be affordable, I was very disappointed. I like all the amenities and residential experiences, and I love mixed-use zoning, but we can't be depriving low-income students of good locations and over a thousand living spaces just so that we can provide a parking garage and rooftop pool. When I attended a neighborhood meeting on this development project, I was told it would help alleviate the shortage of housing in the campus area, but how can we hope to alleviate a crisis by only helping the people who are already the most financially insulated from the crisis? We absolutely must be evaluating the costs that the residents will incur from these added amenities and reducing rental costs where we can. Please do something about this."
- "I'm concerned there won't be enough accommodations made for students in the middle those who don't qualify for financial aid but are also barely getting by. I feel as if that's the situation for most students."
- "Affordability, affordability, affordability. We do not need more luxury housing. Also, I feel in the dark about how much of this project is actually subject to change from the community."
- "My main concern is that there will be at least 30% affordable housing units in this complex."
- "I'm concerned about the lack of affordability and sustainability [sic]"

Resident Experience

The steering committee considered many aspects of resident experience when evaluating the Johnson & Broom development.

When considering resident experience, the committee welcomes the increase of density the development brings to the site. They hope the increase in people living in the area will activate the space and the bike path. The committee enjoys how the developer uses public art to activate the side of the building facing the bike path. The committee was encouraged to see a lot of bike parking and a dedicated space for

bikes in the project. The steering committee hopes the developer can work with the city to offer a free bike fix-it station near the bike parking (See Bike Madison Website). Additionally, they suggest widening the ramp meant for bikes and adding a railing for safety. Finally, the committee appreciates the natural green space next to the bike path and recommends adding a rounded curb to distinguish between the bike path and green space and adding a rise in the middle for picnicking. Overall, the committee appreciates the development team's intention to make the building a bike-friendly environment by activating the area next to the bike path and incorporating a large amount of bike storage into their project. The committee recommends identifying moped/scooter parking for residents.

The steering committee suggests that the developer provide a detailed management plan for the property to be approved by the Planning Division and reviewed by MPD. In this plan, the steering committee suggests that the development team provide a thorough recycling and garbage plan for residents, address pets and pet amenities, a move-in and move-out plan, and a rooftop management plan (Pool guests and patrons, hours restrictions, etc.). The steering committee suggests that the detailed management plan contains a security plan. Additionally, the committee suggests that the team contact UW-Madison Safewalk (https://transportation.wisc.edu/safewalk/) to advertise services to their residents.

CANA shared a survey with the community to get input and one resident experience comment is:

> “All of these features sound like good things for a living situation and social experience, but if they increase the costs that the residents incur then it’s not worth it. I’m expecting that outdoor tables and the Art Moments program would be less costly, and I’d love to promote outdoor space, [but] I could be incorrect about the costs. I’m assuming that a parking garage, outdoor pool, fitness center, conference rooms, etc. would drive up costs for residents, and they seem more like luxuries that could potentially reduce the number of residential spaces that we could construct to alleviate the housing crisis. All of them seem like good things, but some seem better and less costly than others. I’d also like to hear more about the ground-floor retail location, and whether that would also drive up costs. I’m all for mixed-use development, but I’d like to know how it may affect affordability.”

Sustainability

The steering committee considered many design aspects when evaluating the Broom & Johnson project. The steering committee appreciates the developer’s “green roof” plan on the ninth floor rooftop along Broom Street. Also, the committee is thankful for the developer’s addition of seven trees to the street frontage. The

committee encourages the development team to contact the U.S. Forest Products Lab to source materials and use recycled plastic wood for amenity decks.

Does the proposed sustainability approach meet expectations?

> *"Key 9: Become a Model of Sustainability. Downtowns are inherently the most sustainable part of a community. They usually have higher residential densities, more jobs in close proximity to workers, a wider variety of transportation options, and more goods, services, and activities that are integrated into the urban fabric. This plan recognizes the interrelationships among these and other "urban systems" and the objectives and recommendations in each theme area advance the goal of haying Downtown become a leader in sustainability." (Downtown Plan, page 6)*

CANA believes that new buildings should enliven the public streetscape, complement the character of adjacent buildings, and provide inviting entrances to pedestrians/residents. Building designs should be sustainable as well. "Green" architecture–which uses water, energy, and other natural resources more efficiently–is encouraged. Our views are consistent with best practices for urban design and the Downtown Plan:

> *"Vision: Downtown Madison will be a flourishing and visually exciting center for the arts, commerce, government and education. It will be a magnet for a diverse population working, living, visiting and enjoying an urban environment characterized by a sensitive blending of carefully preserved older structures, high-quality new construction, architectural gems, and engaging public spaces—all working together and integrated with surrounding neighborhoods, parks and the transportation system to create a unique and sustainable environment for the community, the region, and beyond." (Downtown Plan, page 5)*
> https://cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/Downtown_Plan.pdf

CANA is focused on creating positive relationships and a dynamic urban environment coupled with fostering more sustainable lifestyles.

> *The Downtown plan "should be used as a primary policy document when evaluating development proposals. Its goal is to provide a guide for new development potential in a proactive and deliberate way by outlining basic parameters for new development to provide additional predictability for property owners, developers, businesses, and residents. It is important that each proposed development be evaluated not as a stand-alone project, but on how well the project fits the context of both its immediate surroundings and that of the greater Downtown and the vision embodied in this plan." (Downtown Plan, page 23)*

A key recommendation of the Downtown Plan was to “develop a new park near the intersections of Bassett and West Johnson streets to meet the needs of the undeserved high-density housing at this location.” A previous planning process recommended a new park on Bedford Street, but this location would be a good multi-purpose adjacent outdoor amenity for the neighborhood.

Park Space

1. Preserve and enhance historic tree terrace width to provide for a healthy tree canopy.
2. Support a new downtown park in a location that creates a welcoming space for diverse gathering and social events, reflects the history of the neighborhood, provides an opportunity to demonstrate urban greenspace water management and sustainability, and is reflective of the growing diversity of Madison.

Revisiting our community input survey, some sustainability comments are:

- “Green roof is fire [this is colloquial for “good”]. Will there be a community garden or are the plants purely for biodiversity/aesthetic?”
- “The construction of the rooms themselves would also be important for sustainability purposes, such as insulation or having double or triple pane windows. Using permeable materials such as porous paving could also help prevent some rainwater runoff. For whatever runoff that happens regardless, rain gardens could be a useful filtering and infiltration system to mitigate the runoff. Finally, I’m not sure what the approach to composting is like in the city, but I’d like if that were an option.”
- “I like the green roof idea and the walkability of the rooftop, but I’m curious if it would drive up costs more than it would save them. I’m aware that green roofs would regulate building heat and reduce costs for air conditioning, but I’m sure the depth of soil needed and the structural integrity needs to support the vegetation would be expensive too. Would this ultimately be more expensive than otherwise for residents? If so, then we should opt for rain gardens on the green space on the ground, as that would not only mitigate storm water runoff like the green roof would, but it would also provide flood control.”
- “Solar panels must be included. And they should be required to have compost facilities”
- “Why is this developer only aiming for LEED Silver? Surely they could incorporate heat pumps and solar panels to increase the LEED score of this building. Does the city gain from more LEED Silver buildings that are going to need to be retrofitted in 20 years because they were built on the [cheap]?”
- “The developers should aim for gold instead of silver. Sustainability is a top priority for me”
- “It would be great if the rooftop turf area was real plants, especially similar to those on the 9th floor.”
- “Reduced car parking space”

Sustainability information shared with CORE Spaces:

- The Purple-Roof concept improves on the green roof design to maximize storm water retention.
    - https://www.purple-roof.com
    - The concept fosters more water detention than a traditional green roof design. The concept uses friction between layers of needled materials to retain runoff. The Purple-Roof concept is a non-proprietary specification to delay runoff. Water is captured by a base layer of natural needled material which reduces peak runoff intensity and minimizes the need for fertilizer and plant replacement.
- Green, blue, brown and white roofs – what are they and why do we need them?
    - https://gca.org/green-blue-brown-and-white-roofs-what-are-they-and-why-do-we-need-them/

Urban Design

The committee is interested in the public art panel installations along Johnson Street. Similarly, we look forward to seeing art activation of the pedestrian walkway with lighting and a bright ground, whether with lighting or paint, to guide people.

Returning to our community input survey, some urban design comments are:

- "Will people in the apartments facing walls get an adequate amount of sunlight?"
- "Metal panels do not match the character of downtown Madison, and serve to promote a 'luxury' feel while actually saving money. Ultimately would like to see mostly brick exterior to match similar buildings downtown."
- "Anything that can mitigate runoff, eliminates waste, and reduce the carbon footprint of the building would be welcome."

Additional Community Considerations

The steering committee considered ways the project adds benefit to the community. The committee appreciated the project's plaza and its open access to people not living in the building. The committee liked the introduction of more outdoor lighting to the area to increase safety in the area. The steering committee requests continued collaboration with the community on public space to consider how to enhance the exciting opportunity to create a unique outdoor experience for the neighborhood. Some things to consider would be active uses of lighting that could be used to highlight special events - pride month. The street corner on Broom and Gorham provides the development team with a very exciting space to share with the

community and add a new amenity in our neighborhood that does not currently exist. It will be important for them to consider space programming and active programming on the ground floor plan and connecting them to the neighborhood. This could be a great space for music or outdoor activities like community gardening along with other activities. The committee was happy to see the development team expand the public plaza for the residents and neighborhood. It is important to consider how the Broom Street corridor provides a unique entrance to our neighborhood acting like the front door to campus from the east. The steering committee encourages the city to remove the slip lane on to Gorham to expand the public amenity area and improve pedestrian safety for future residents, current neighbors and visitors to our neighborhood.

The committee encourages future surveying of people's thoughts on this project's open spaces with questions like:

- Should the open space be a "green" space or a "hard," paved space?
- What are the community's goals for the open spaces?
- Which local cultural elements should be incorporated?
- How can the arts fit into the open spaces?
- How can lighting work with the open spaces?

The steering committee is excited about the development's incorporation of public art in the development through the panels on the building and the potential for sculptures in the promenade area. The steering committee recommends the development team works with the neighborhood association and the city to find local artists and collaborate on the art installations on the project.

Another consideration is ensuring bicycle parking has not been and will not be reduced throughout this project.

One final comment from our community input survey:

> "I am concerned about the loss of use of the current housing on the build site for the duration of the project. Students living in these buildings currently will be displaced for multiple years. I am also concerned about the construction noise and sidewalk closures in the area as these are already pertinent issues in the neighborhood."

Acknowledgments

The Steering Committee would like to thank the developer for their continued engagement and receptiveness to feedback from the neighborhood. They would like to recognize Eli Tsarovsky, Cleo Le, and Tanner Mechura for organizing the steering committees. They would like to acknowledge Eli Tsarovsky, Cleo Le, and Tanner Mechura for drafting notes, sending out information to residents to keep them informed of the process, and drafting the steering committee Report. Finally, they would like to thank everyone who participated in the Steering Committees. It was great to see people from all surrounding neighborhoods participate and we look forward to your continued participation. Your voice matters.

Additional Information

Meeting Notes

6/15/23 Johnson & Broom Introduction Meeting
7.26.23 Broom & Johnson Project Introduction
9.7.23 Broom Project Neighborhood Meeting
Broom & Johnson 10.16.2023 SC Meeting

Affordable Housing Resolution

Fully Adopted DNC Affordable Housing Resolution.pdf

Affordable Housing Petition

https://chng.it/h9TpKnMqrj

Citations

Dane County Housing Initiative. (2019). *Dane County housing needs assessment: 2019 update*. County of Dane. https://danehousing.countyofdane.com/housingreport

Downtown Neighborhoods Coalition. (2021). *Promoting affordable housing: Neighborhood guidelines for affordability of new rental construction*. Campus Area Neighborhood Association. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1z7QvyawUoLCUOxS7EzjW6tJT4wBwryOm/view

Metropolitan Transportation Commission. (2023). *Housing protection, preservation & production*. State of California. https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/investment-strategies-commitments/housing-solutions/housing-protection-preservation-production#:~:text=Solving%20the%20Bay%20Area's%20housing,enough%20housing%20for%20all%20residents.

Shaw, R. (2020). *Generation priced out: Who gets to live in the new urban America* (1st paperback ed.). University of California Press.

Wethal, W. (2022, December 3). Just how tight is Madison's student rental market? Researchers hope to find out. *Wisconsin State Journal*. https://madison.com/news/local/education/university/just-how-tight-is-madisons-student-rental-market-researchers-hope-to-find-out/article_da986ffa-8e68-5eef-bc67-5115cc4fd24f.html