

To: City of Madison, Urban Design Commission
From: Carrie Rothburd, Vest Lakeside Street, Madison
Re: Proposed development at 1004 and 1032 South Park
Date: March 11, 2015

I'm Carrie Rothburd, BCNA co-chair of Planning & Economic Development and a home-owner in BC. The points I make reflect ideas neighbors have shared with me or spoken at the meetings we've had with T. Wall and as a NA.

The first point is that these plans do not respect the Park Street Corridor Urban Design Guidelines (<http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/pdf/ParkStreetChapter2.pdf>), which say on p. 13: "These guidelines generally recommend that new buildings on Park Street should not be less than two or taller than four stories."

The 2006 BUILD Report, product of an extensive collective process that reflects the input of businesses, neighbors, planners, and representatives, adds: "The former dairy site would be [a] good location for higher density, mid-rise housing...Target densities should be approximately 30 to 50 dwelling units per acre."

<http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/wingra/pdfs/SummaryReport062005.pdf>

T. Wall's proposal is 2 1/3 to 4 times BUILD's recommended density for the perhaps 1.5 acres that remain of the dairy site. There should be 45-75 units—not 174 or more. The BUILD Plan Appendix lists residential and commercial projects in Madison of recommended scale and type, including projects in the Bassett, Atwood, and Downtown neighborhoods.

These two respected, thoughtfully conceived development plans call for buildings of a scale that fits into the surrounding community. Such buildings would not pose to the same degree the problems that concern neighbors and come from increasing the neighborhood's population suddenly by 10%. T. Wall himself admits that his plan introduces a variety of challenges arising from its height and mass, but offers no researched solutions to the potential for noise and light pollution, traffic dangers, or water run-off, to name a few. That's not planning. That's jumping, eyes closed, fingers crossed.

My point two concerns the mixed-use aspect of the building—something called for in the community development plans I refer to. These docs envision a corridor that stands out and draws people to it to visit. The open lobby and street-side stores that T. Wall would fill with low-traffic businesses, such as insurance or real estate, won't invigorate Park Street, South Madison, or the city.

Neighborhoods that draw people don't need to be tall. In fact they may be just the opposite. Think of the Portland, Oregon's, Hawthorne District or NW 23rd Avenue with urban shopping, restaurants, and people hanging out. Think of Andersonville in Chicago. Think of our own

Atwood Avenue, Monroe Street, or Willy Street. All draw people in by offering something valuable to them. All are on the edge of residential neighborhoods and are human scale.

To redevelop Park Street into a welcoming corridor where people want to visit and live will take more thought by more people than the proposal before you. The planning docs I've quoted begin this process and their conclusions should be heeded not undone by whatever is built on the site in question.

BC and its neighbors are pro-development. We want to see a revitalized Park Street and to reap the benefits of enhanced community. We deserve more than this project and we want more of a role in its making than to be invited in at the 11th hour to critique something inherently flawed. We want to go back to the drawing board with the developer to work together to build upon past plans and create something outstanding.