



T. Wall Enterprises

January 24, 2024

Dear UDC:

We would appreciate if you reject the proposed building plans for 139 W. Wilson Street.

Being an immediately adjacent neighbor, we are not opposed to a new development at 139, but this proposal is so far off the rocker, we ask you to reject. The developer should be held to the same high standard that UDC imposed on our development and on the adjacent Apex development on the other side, the Adria. Likewise, the proposed building is NOT a lawful building at this time.

It appears 139 is taking the slow grind approach and just keeps coming back in an effort to inch forward. My opinion.

139 Problems:

- No secure vestibule
- Multiple at grade entry points with a single door for security
- No visible control at the entry doors
- Multiple Code issues
- No operable windows
- No balconies
- Apartment sizes that make a loud statement of packing in as many as possible with stated goal of providing space while ignoring quality of life issues on multiple levels.
- No on-site handicap parking.
- Statement that parking is provided by the City (in a public parking ramp that is blocks away), not owned by the developer.
- Set-up for a hostile living environment – cramming too many people into small, prison-like sized cells.

Code Concerns:

- Size of stairs and required clearances does not need codes on door clearances or indications for high rise pressurization.
- Multiple locations indicate showers that structural columns interrupt. May not meet codes for clearances. No bathtubs in any unit.
- Bike parking does not meet City standards.
- Undersized electrical room. Door egress and clearances do not meet code per National Electric Code.



T. Wall Enterprises

- Missing a location for MG&E services vaults, clearances, access and required emergency egress.
- Handicap parking will need to be remotely located and a clear dedicated route to the building is required per Federal regulations.
- Clearances to adjacent properties, required fire separations combined with the City 22% of minimal openings is not clearly defined.
- No indication of a location for providing heating, cooling, or air movement equipment for all common spaces on all levels.
- Access to the four parking spots indicated does not meet handicap codes. Applicant indicates use of a City parking ramp that is not under the ownership control. City ownership allows for the possibility of demolition of the existing parking structure, or the city can schedule the use of the facility in a manner they desire. How handicap parking and access is considered is not indicated.
- Drive access required site lines does not consider the approved adjacent property.
- Egress from 16th floor amenity space needs a door that swings out. May not work with exit corridor configuration.
- Exit from John Nolen egress stair does not align with the door.
- No venting path for all washers and dryers. Do they vent to a side wall?
- Code clearances for generator room and venting adjacent properties is not defined.
- Solar PV array may intrude into the Capitol view preservation height limit. Building elevation indicated parapet is at the allowed limit.
- Access to the stair that is a part of the elevator override may require security fencing if it is closer than 10' to the building edge.
- No railing indicated at steep drop to railroad tracks.

Design Issues:

- Blocky single form building with no relief.
- Repetitive window forms. No design relief.
- Comment of 9'-4" ceiling height indicates bare concrete ceilings with exposed conduits, lights, and sprinkler lines attached directly to the open structure.
- No operable windows defined on the plans or elevations.
- Applique images of green spaces on the building does not enhance the blocky design. Appears pasted on the square building form. These items are applied signage and not architectural design elements.
- Trash/recycling room is viewed as grossly inadequate for approximately 335 residents - if there was one occupant per unit.
- No on-site storage for tenant belongings.



T. Wall Enterprises

- Access to the approximately 10 SF per unit of outdoor space is through a bicycle storage room.
- Most of the minimal open 'green' space is directly adjacent to train tracks with no visible separation offered.
- No balconies to allow larger openings to fresh air and light from any unit.
- One washer/dryer combination for approximately every 5/6 households seems inadequate.
- Without a vestibule security can only be controlled from the two doors facing West Wilson.
- No management office indicated for service personnel, leasing staff or support of visual control of the security doors.
- Sheet A2.1 indicates the possibility for a sub grade level. Please clarify.

Commentary Items:

- No indication of vertical services for required items such as stair pressurization and elevator pressurization. Inclusion of these will further reduce usable living space.
- Largely one sleeping 'area' for most units with all showers. Not welcoming to families or changing needs of family life.
- Parking is not provided for and is an affront to individuals of lower economic levels that you need to acquire parking remotely and walk to where sleep.
- Would be remembered as an inhumane vertical eye sore with minimal access to services and outdoor spaces for hundreds of people in a building proposed in every manner to support only maximum financial return.

Sincerely,

T. Wall Enterprises Mgt, LLC

By: Terrence R. Wall, President

CAPITOL

NEIGHBORHOODS, INC.

MADISON, WISCONSIN

January 19, 2024

Urban Design Commission
City of Madison

Re: 139 West Wilson Street

The developers for this proposal first brought their plans to the Bassett neighborhood nearly two years ago. Over the course of the last two years, the neighborhood has had many conversations with members of the development team and we are appreciative of the time they have spent with us. However, the neighborhood has had serious concerns regarding this proposal from the beginning and most of those concerns remain. The neighborhood's memo to the Urban Design Commission dated September 18, 2023, outlines several of those concerns and while the latest iteration of the plans for this proposal do attempt to address some of these concerns both the neighborhood and UDC raised at the September 2023 UDC meeting, many of those concerns remain.

Maybe first and foremost, the driveway is simply too narrow to handle the amount of traffic from delivery vehicles, trash and recycling trucks, taxis, and move-in, move-out vehicles that a 320 unit building will generate on a daily basis, much of it unscheduled and unschedulable.. Such traffic will likely overwhelm that space at times and lead to blockage of the passageway providing access to the lake. With no parking provided for residents, there will be a steady stream of Uber, Lyft, and cabs picking up and dropping off in this space. Move ins, move outs, delivery vehicles, trash and recycling will all need to use this same space and the development team expects one lane to remain free at all times to provide access for the shared cars housed on-site. The lake access also will need to remain free at all times as well. The building faces onto a very busy street with a heavily used sidewalk and a cycle track, and none of the delivery, drop off, and pick up activity can be allowed to occur in or block the public right-of-way. Without adequate space to turn around, vehicles backing out of the driveway will need to cross both the sidewalk and cycle track to back into a heavily used traffic lane. Snow removal from this drive space will be problematic without blocking the public right-of-way. The neighborhood feels that the driveway space provided is simply inadequate to handle the amount of traffic that would be generated by the residents of this building.

The materials and design of the building exterior, while improved over the version that city staff found failed to meet city zoning requirements, is still uninspiring. A building with an exposure to John Nolen Drive needs to present a more interesting if not iconic facade as part of the downtown skyline. The neighborhood would hope that the Urban Design commissioners give the use of wall packs on all sides of the building, including the street-facing facade, serious scrutiny before approving such a design. We would also ask the Urban Design commissioners to again closely scrutinize all incursions into the Capitol View Preservation Limit space.

The neighborhood is concerned that elevators are not adequate to serve a sixteen story building with 320 units, neither during normal traffic days nor during days that involve tenant move ins and move outs.

The lack of bicycle stalls that conform to city requirements is troubling, especially in a building where many tenants will be without a car due to the lack of on-site parking. The four shared cars to be housed on site seems to be an inadequate number to serve 320 units and the potential need to sacrifice one of these shared cars to provide a handicapped parking space would only exacerbate that situation.

The interior design, with one long hall on each floor with micro-units on both sides, none of which will have operable windows, seems to be a design for dismal living conditions, especially considering that some of these units will face the neighboring building which will be a mere ten feet away.

The neighborhood has had a large number of frank and open discussions with Mr. Seamon of the development team and we very much appreciate the time he has taken to listen to our concerns. That said, given the number and extent of the concerns this proposal raises and their potential impact on both the surrounding area and the potential residents of this building, we feel that the current proposal is not an acceptable design for this space at this location and we cannot support this proposal in its current form.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jonathan Cooper

Neighborhood Steering Committee Chair
Bassett District of Capitol Neighborhoods