

From: Gillian Shaw [
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 12:40 PM
To: Martin, Alan; jwendt@cityofmadison.com
Subject: I oppose the development at 1109 South Park Street

Greetings,

I am opposed to this development in its current proposed form/structure. To block solar panels (which are helping to make our city "greener") in favor of commercial development is not okay!

Gillian Shaw

--

Gillian Shaw, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Thomas J. Mertz [
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 11:50 AM
To: tdmادتown@charter.net; Carter, Sheri;; Eskrich, Sara; Martin, Alan
Subject: Jade Garden Development

I understand the "Jade Garden" development at 1109 South Park Street is before the Urban Design Commission for approval this week.

I would like to echo the concerns raised by neighbors and reflected in the statement on Park St. Development by the Bay Creek Neighborhood Association in opposition to a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the three story limit.

In general, developments of this sort adjacent to single family residences must be carefully planned to avoid abrupt transitions and adverse impacts. Size and massing are part of this as are planned uses, traffic, parking, and much more. This development in the current incarnation presents many reasons for concern that advise against granting a conditional use. Our neighborhood has seen significant development recently, often with Planned Use or Conditional Use exceptions being made to plans and zoning. I support improvements on Park St., but also believe that the bar should be high for granting exceptions.

Additionally, the direct impacts of increased shading from this project on an existing residential solar power installation appear to be significantly adverse, and for me tip the scale against approval. I ask that you vote against the permit.

Thank you.

TJM

█ Gilson St
Madison, WI
53715

Thomas J. Mertz
Department of History
Edgewood College

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

From: Jim Winkle []

Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 11:10 AM

To: Eskrich, Sara; Martin, Alan

Subject: 1109 South Park St redevelopment, comments attached and text below

Dear Alder Eskrich and UDC members,

I am writing about the proposed redevelopment of the Jade Garden site at 1109 South Park St. Please correct me if I am misunderstanding or misquoting something in my comments below and I will try to resubmit.

I am opposed to the current four-story proposal before you. It's my understanding that three stories are what is called for here and that a fourth story requires a conditional use permit.

Here are two relevant statements from Madison code.

1. According to the conditional use approval standards (28.183, 6a3) "The uses, values and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood for purposes already established will not be substantially impaired or diminished in any foreseeable manner."

2. Urban Design District #7 (33.24, 14a) states "These requirements and guidelines are intended to preserve and enhance the property values in the District, and avoid substantial depreciation of the property values and help to ensure long-term economic vitality."

Regarding (1), we use and value the sun in two ways. The shade studies clearly demonstrate that there will be significantly more shading.

* We generate 100% of our electricity from solar electric panels. This use of our property will be diminished because of the shading, perhaps 2-7 percent. At first blush that may not seem like much, but even a small percentage loss is significant when it comes to our \$10,000 long-term solar investment. Please consider how it would feel if you invested that much money and were about to lose 2-7%. This was a huge investment for us, and we chose to invest it in this manner so that we could do some good for the planet with our money.

* We grow a fair amount of food in our yard. While some plants (like kale) can grow without full sun, others (like onions) need 100% full sun; they are dependent on the length of the day. Tomatoes *love* the heat of the sun beating down on them. While this would not be as much of a financial loss, we like gardening!

We've been gardening since we bought the house in 2002 and went solar in 2007, so these uses are well-established. I'm delighted that this Madison code exists and will hopefully protect our investment.

Regarding (2), when we added solar onto our house we knew that eventually it would sell for more. If this project were to be approved, this will *lower* the value of our property, not raise or even preserve it.

And not just our property... the value of ALL properties east of the site will be lowered because of the hours-long shading. I estimate that these houses -- at

least the first block, and perhaps more -- will lose 1.5 - 3 hours of sunlight at the end of every day the entire year. That means when sunset is 8:30 pm, we may lose direct sunlight as early as 5:30 pm. This will make the properties less desirable and they will sell for less. Note that many descriptions of houses for sale or apartments for rent talk about sunny interiors as a major selling point.

Since the loss of sunlight is at the end of my (and most people's) workday, this means that by the time I get home from work, there will be very little to no sun in my yard for the majority of the year. That's a depressing thought.

Here, too, I am grateful that this second statement talks about property values and acknowledges that nobody wants their property value to go down because their daylight is significantly shorter.

In closing, I will say that if the project were three stories, my sense is that I would support it even though we will probably still get some additional shading of our yard and solar panels. I am *for* appropriate redevelopment of that site... the current owners have maintained the properties poorly for years, it's unsightly, and gives the appearance of a run-down, blighted neighborhood, which Bay Creek is not.

The Isthmus newspaper wrote a good article about this issue; if you haven't seen it, I encourage you to read it at https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_isthmus.com_news_news_new-2Ddevelopment-2Dshades-2Dsolar-2Dpower-2Dinstall&d=CwIBAg&c=byefhD2ZumMFFQYPZBagUCDuBiM9Q9twmxaBM0hCgII&r=acIXPp6P1CPhE3lEoA_L42NVlyAegjGsIGciLw_Ux9o&m=k48P-4kIN8iFCa5U9ayMMC6_1kVYsGKXjeEgLAY9ynM&s=XrP8NWdn8CqMMb9H4eHILvn6XGmvqE3ZPYblrwLzFFw&e=ments/. Note that shading is worse than we knew when the article went to press and there will be shading year-round.

I wrote an article explaining the process of going solar; this is at https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_www.eventsgalore.net_solar_pv.html&d=CwIBAg&c=byefhD2ZumMFFQYPZBagUCDuBiM9Q9twmxaBM0hCgII&r=acIXPp6P1CPhE3lEoA_L42NVlyAegjGsIGciLw_Ux9o&m=k48P-4kIN8iFCa5U9ayMMC6_1kVYsGKXjeEgLAY9ynM&s=r2iF2EPFaWzGBLR6sr-3SpCbMJ5uo246LB-aGl-0CDs&e=

I hope you will join me in rejecting this plan as it stands at four stories.

Thanks!

Jim Winkle
Emerson St
Madison, WI

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

From: Alan Ng []

Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 8:54 AM

To: Martin, Alan; Plan Commission members

Subject: 1109 S Park proposal

Urban Development and Plan Commission members,

As a resident of the Bay Creek neighborhood, I'm writing about the proposed redevelopment of the Jade Garden site at 1109 South Park St.

While I welcome higher-density development in general, and enjoyed living in Berlin, Germany for a while, where 4-story residential blocks were the norm, a 4-story building at 1109 S Park would be too tall and too abruptly close to existing 1-2 story homes whose value is directly related to their surrounding environment. I therefore oppose granting a special conditional-use permit for the 4th story.

While this particular proposal would not affect my own home, I would certainly oppose it being that close to my 1-story house in Bay Creek, particularly if it were to affect my garden during the growing season or my solar heating during the winter.

Thank you for your service to the city,

Alan Ng

█ Colby St, Madison WI

From: Arntsen, Allen A.

Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 8:25 AM

To: district13@cityofmadison.com; amartin@cityofmadison.com; 'jwendt@cityofmadison.com'

Subject: Jade Garden

Good morning. I live at [REDACTED] South Shore Drive. While I applaud Ms. Jiang's efforts to redevelop and improve her Jade Garden property, the proposed 4 story building is too tall. It does not comply with the conditional use standards set forth in MGO 28.183(6)(a)3, 4, 5 and 6. In addition to not complying with the 3 story limit for TSS zoned buildings, this 4-5 story building is dramatically out of scale with the adjoining neighborhood and development pattern along the east side of Park Street. The mass of the building—which will present at 5 stories to the east because Park Street is on a ridge-- will significantly diminish existing neighbor homeowners' use, value and enjoyment of their properties because of the shading caused by the building and its disproportionate size. It's negative impact on the normal and orderly improvement of neighborhood properties is shown by its effect on existing solar power systems installed by neighbors. There will be a negative traffic impact on Emerson and Lowell streets, which are short (approx. 3 blocks long) narrow neighborhood streets, which contain an elementary school bus stop less than 1 block from this property.

The west side of Park Street can handle tall buildings, so long as transportation is properly managed, and I strongly support additional density on these properties. However, the east side of Park street has narrow lots that abut a longstanding neighborhood of one and two story homes on small urban lots. For this reason, there are currently no buildings taller than two stories on the east side of Park Street from West Washington Avenue to south of Olin Avenue. This includes some newer commercial buildings, such as those housing Dunkin Donuts and Klinkes, which respected the adjoining neighborhoods by limiting their height to two stories. Frankly a 3 story building (which presents as 4 stories from the east), is pushing the envelope here.

Please condition any approvals to limit the height of this building to 3 stories. Thank you for considering this submittal.

Allen A. Arntsen

From: Nick Glass (TeachingBooks) [
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2016 11:32 PM
To: Martin, Alan; jwendt@cityofmadison.com
Subject: redevelopment at the Jade Garden site on Park and Emerson Streets

Hi Alder Eskrich and UDC members,

Thank you for all your work on this project. The drafts have been very thoughtfully considered, and the effort of all is appreciated.

As a 24-year-long Emerson Street and Bay Creek resident, who loves this neighborhood and that particular part of Park Street, I'd like to express my support for the current design IF it can meet the zoning requirement of 3 stories. I feel 3 stories is just right. 4 stories feels out of character and most large for this corner (particularly when you consider that the neighborhood side of Emerson drops another 10+ feet below Park Street). This extra story has a direct, adverse impact by blocking existing neighbors' investments in solar panels. The TSS district plan (completed and sponsored for a valid reason) nor the UDC support this height. And as a matter of fact, I don't think I've met anyone who says yes to this height other than the developer.

I really do hope that this project goes through -- with the height of 3 stories.

Thank you again for all your effort.

Nick

From: MARTIN D SAUNDERS [
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 10:15 AM
To: Vaughn, Jessica
Subject: Park St Development

I would like to chime in on the issue of the development project at 1109 S. Park St.

I strongly oppose this development as it stands.

I am a Bay Creek resident of 30 years, living a couple of blocks away from this proposed development . A four story building in this location is completely out of proportion for that particular block and for the continuity of the area.

Additionally, the quality of life of nearby neighbors would be greatly affected by this development. Locals who are doing their best to address environmental issues by erecting solar panels will have the benefit of this energy source diminished, and up to 3 hours of sunlight will be extinguished from their homes. Development is important, and homes for all economic strata should be provided. Nevertheless, it is only profit that drives the development of larger, and more exclusive apartments in this neighborhood. If we are providing homes for people it should not be at the expense of residents who have offered stability and the true progress of community to this neighborhood for decades.

Martin Saunders
Lakeside St.

From: Clarence Cameron [
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 1:32 PM
To: Vaughn, Jessica; Martin, Alan
Cc: Eskrich, Sara
Subject: RE: PROPOSED JADE GARDEN SITE

Hello,

Having lived only two houses off South Park Street for over forty years, we are all for commercial redevelopment of this corridor into the city. However, said development should in no way produce a negative impact on the adjacent neighborhoods, as has been expressed by the Urban Design Commission.

If these neighborhoods were in decline, we might see redevelopment in a different light. However, the Bay Creek area is not only vital, but the houses are well-kept and affordable, and the majority of residents are resolute in keeping it this way.

The Jade Garden site could be workable if its height did not have such a powerful impact on nearby residential dwellings. Having an extra floor not only reduces the use of existing, or future, solar and the ability to sustain vegetable gardens, it will mean more traffic in the area, as well. If the developer's current building height is allowed, it will also destroy the character of the east side of Park Street, itself. The developer's own words seem to indicate this might be considered a hotel rather than a typical apartment complex with yearlong leases.

One or two generations from now, unless current population growth is reduced, the entire area may be filled with skyscrapers. By that time, the Jade Garden site may well be ready for destruction to make use of its land for those taller buildings. Leave that to future generations.

We are both against the current proposal, as presented. Thank for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Robert W. Lockhart
Clarence P. Cameron
■ Cedar Street

From: James Campbell [
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 1:58 PM
To: Martin, Alan
Subject: Jade Garden Development

Hi - I am writing to you as a resident of Emerson st (█).

Having attended two meetings with the neighbourhood and architects/developers I am very, very disappointed that the developer has chosen not to take into account the major concern of those of us who live near to the proposed building, namely the inappropriate height of the building.

As proposed I will be looking at (and losing sun light to) a 5 storey building where today there is a 1.5 storey one.

How can this possibly 'fit' with the existing 1 and 2 storey houses that make up our neighborhood?.

Additionally there is already a problem with traffic generated by the restaurant on the corner (the street is not wide enough to accomodate two cars when there is parking on both sides). Surely adding 38 apartments and their occupants to the traffic generated by a busy restaurant can only lead to more disruption, and potentially cause accidents with cars turning off Park St.

I welcomed the redevelopment of the site (that the current owner has allowed to fall into a terrible state of disrepair) but as proposed it will have a huge negative impact to the neighbourhood.

Regards

James Campbell

█ Emerson St

October 25, 2016

To: Urban Design Commission and Madison Plan Commission

Re: 1109 South Park Street Redevelopment

The revised plans submitted October 12, 2016 to the Urban Design Commission for the proposed "Asian Center" at 1009 South Park Street still do not blend appropriately with the mostly two story homes adjoining this subject property on Emerson Street. The developer has removed the rooftop community room and patio, however, this only reduces the height of the building about 4 feet from previous plans as there is still a rather large 4 foot tall mechanical area on the 4th floor roof. I question the need for such a large mechanical area on the roof of this building, but four stories at this location is still too tall in relation to the two story homes nearby.

Any building on this small lot needs to be no taller than 3 stories tall to best mesh with the adjoining two story homes and the commercial Park Street corridor. This is necessary to protect the rights and quality of life of the nearby residential neighbors.

The properties on the west side of this area of Park Street are more suited to taller buildings. I can envision appropriately designed buildings on the west side of Park Street from the 1100 block of Park Street all the way to Wingra Creek being 4 to 6 stories tall; some even could reach 8 stories or more if designed as a larger planned redevelopment project. If the city would only stop the piece meal development that is happening along the Park Street corridor and get down to master planning this important transportation corridor to protect the interests of the existing residential property owners while looking to the future growth potential of the busy Park Street corridor.

The developer should be required to provide full 12 hour animation of the shade studies at different times of the year. The time stamped snapshots don't show the full effect of the shading this 4 story building will impose on Emerson Street residences. Furthermore, the developer should also be required to provide similar shade studies for a three story building with the same footprint on the property. This will provide evidence that building shadow effects of a three story building will have much less impact on the nearby properties.

Another problem with this proposed redevelopment is the increased traffic on Emerson Street and Lowell Street as well as issues with overflow parking clogging the streets of this residential neighborhood of mostly single family homes.

By eliminating the fourth floor there will be nine fewer units. Six of these units are about the size of a sardine can at \$400 to 500 square feet. This will free up as much as nine parking stalls that can be used by the commercial suites on the first floor or by other residents of the building that have more than one car.

The proposed building currently has 38 residential units, thirteen of these are very tiny at less than 500 square feet. Units of this size are more suited to be rooms in an extended stay hotel not an apartment building. This makes me wonder how this proposed building will really be used. The developer has stated in previous public meetings that it is the owners intent to rent many of the apartments to Chinese Nationals who are visiting Madison while their children attend the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Here is a link to a CNN news story about Chinese parents wanting to go live near their only child while the child attends college in China.

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/12/asia/china-college-parents-tents-of-love/index.html>

The Jade Garden redevelopment seems geared towards attracting the more prosperous Chinese helicopter parents to come stay near their child, who is fortunate enough to be able to afford attend the UW Madison instead of some Chinese mainland college.

I question how this can be called an apartment building when it appears that the redevelopment will be run more like an extended stay hotel. How will it get past discrimination laws designed to give everyone an equal chance to apply for and obtain an apartment in Madison without being discriminated against. It does seem like you might need to be Chinese and visiting the US on a visa to have a better chance to rent a residential unit in this building.

Are extended stay hotels allowed in TSS zoned areas? If so, why not call the building what it seems intended to be, an extended stay hotel for a selected group of people. The plans give a title of "1109 S Park Street Asian Center Development" for the project. The developer has said that all apartment leases will be for a thirty day minimum. But there is nothing to stop someone from renting a unit for a month but only stay there for a couple weeks. It would probably still be cheaper than staying in a real extended stay hotel for two weeks. Plus the person renting a unit in the building would not have to pay room taxes that would be required of any real hotel stay.

But the not so lucky USA citizens living on Emerson Street who scrimped and saved to be able to afford a real house in the beautiful Bay Creek Neighborhood will get to literally live in the shadow of a proposed four story hotel for Chinese Nationals. One of these neighbors has already installed solar collectors on their roof. Others living nearby have been planning to do the same with their south facing house roofs. But the proposed four story building will project shadows into the neighborhood and not only impinge on the potential for solar collectors but decrease the amount of sunlight these property owners will be able to enjoy from their yards and through the windows of their homes.

I wonder why is Alan Fish helping the developer with getting this project approved? I suspect it could be because he is well connected with UW and Madison politics. A building like this near the UW campus could be perk to help draw more Chinese students to the UW Madison campus and pay the ridiculously expensive foreign student tuition. Why not have a building like this

built on UW Madison property as a dormitory for Chinese helicopter parents instead of shoving it up against an area of single family homes.

We need appropriately designed and affordable apartments and homes for Madison residents to be able to live in and enjoy in our neighborhood, not four story hotels designed for use by foreign tourists built right next to two story residential homes.

Beyond the height and unit density of the building along with the traffic and parking issues, the building seems to fit nicely on the lot, however, the parking lot seems to impinging on the alley a bit. The proposed trellises along the alley seem like a nice visual screen but I question how long they will last as they are located only about one foot from the alley roadway and snow plowing in the winter very probably will destroy a wooden trellis in a short time. A trellis system this close to the alley ROW would have to be constructed of steel and anchored in concrete to attempt to resist the force of hardened snow and ice being pushed at them by plows each winter. But the vines planted there will have a rough time trying to survive the sideways push of hardened snow and ice. But even if they do manage to survive, their healthy growth would likely extend out into the alley ROW and block the view down the roadway. It would be nice to have a wider greenspace area along the alley and move the trellis further from the roadway. Otherwise the alley will seem awfully narrow with residential fences right up against the roadway on one side and a line of trellis on the other side.

Please reject the proposed building plans and require the owner to design a building on the property that respects the rights and interests of the existing nearby neighbors.

Ron Shutvet
Madison, WI

From: Ron Wiecki []
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 5:31 PM
To: Martin, Alan; Vaughn, Jessica
Cc: Eskrich, Sara; Sara Lubbers
Subject: Jade Garden Site

We want to write to you **in support** of the proposed development at the Jade Garden Site on South Park Street. It is long past time for Park Street to participate in the redevelopment of areas of the city and this, along with the proposed development at the corner of Park and Fish Hatchery, is a step in the right direction.

We are increasingly annoyed when the NIMBYists in this neighborhood have such a knee-jerk, negative reaction to anything that can help to improve the South Park Street area.

We strongly urge you to **approve this development.**

PS: We were also disturbed by the recent Barriques decision. That was a real blow to any potential entrepreneurs investigating this area for entertainment businesses, as well as for us area residents eagerly waiting for such opportunities within walking distance.

thanks
Ron & Sara

Ron Wiecki & Sara Lubbers
■ Cedar St.
Madison, WI 53715

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

From: Jane Elmer []
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 5:49 PM
To: Vaughn, Jessica
Subject: Jade Garden

The project at the Jade Garden site is too large for the site. It's too tall and will shade the neighborhood houses. The traffic from this project will be unbearable for the residents that bought into this small neighborhood street. I can't believe that the city would allow a project like this to be so race specific. Please send this back to the drawing board.

Jane Elmer
Steve Vanko
[REDACTED]. South Shore Dr
Madison,Wi

Sent from my iPad

From: Kailee Winkle [
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Eskrich, Sara; Martin, Alan
Cc: Jim Winkle
Subject: Re: 1109 South Park St redevelopment, comments attached and text below

Dear Alder Eskrich and UDC members,

I am writing to you today because I am opposed to the proposed building at the 1109 S Park Street site. I am a recent college graduate and currently live a few houses down from the proposed building site, at ■■■ Emerson Street. My family has solar and the current proposal, in which the building stands at four floors, would decrease the amount of solar energy we are able to generate each day. Our solar production would decrease, and so would my ability to enjoy my backyard. As a nurse, I work long days three times per week and have the rest of the days off. On these days, I enjoy sitting in the sun in the backyard, or drying the laundry outside. The proposed development would decrease my ability to do these things. Thank you for considering how the current proposal would change the environment I live in.

Sincerely,

Kailee Winkle

From: Andrey Nevinskiy [

Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 5:04 PM

To: Martin, Alan; Eskrich, Sara

Subject: Proposed redevelopment of Jade Garden Site on Park st.

Dear Al and Sara,

My name is Andrey and I've been living in the neighborhood for about 5 years now. I love this neighborhood so much I've bought a home at [REDACTED] Spruce st. and my wife and kids are enjoying living there.

I've learned about the proposed redevelopment of that Jade Garden site and want to share some ideas regarding that.

I've come from Moscow, Russia- very congested, crowded and polluted city- and that happened due to the terrible lack of planning and only caring about money, not people, who lives there.

The neighborhood has it's very special style to it with unique architectural features and a calm environment. It's great to see the Park Street becoming more and more beautiful, but at the same time it may kill the unique flavor of Madison- the combination of the City Life and calm country like neighborhoods- that what we love it for a lot.

I understand that the development is important, but I think there must be a balance between this and surrounding buildings. Otherwise it may become like on the photo attached.

May I suggest to lower the building- make it two story, may be with 3rd as attic. Similar to what was built next to the former Access Clinic (literacy network now) further down the park street.

Let's save our beautiful City and the unique features of it for the future generations to enjoy.

Thank you so much for listening and have a great rest of your day.

With best regards,

Andrey.