

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Brad Hinkfuss <bradhinkfuss@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 14, 2019 10:30 PM  
**To:** Rummel, Marsha; Joe Krupp ([REDACTED]); Wells, Chris; sasy-council; Thomas Garver; Olivia Mote; Timothy Anderson; Host-Jablonski, Lou  
**Subject:** Re: 1938 Atwood Avenue

Hello Joe,

I send this on behalf of the SASY Neighborhood Association in regards to your proposed development at 1936-38 Atwood Ave. As you know, the P&D Committee has been following this with more than a little interest for several months. Over that past two months it's also been a significant topic of discussion for the full SASY Board.

This latest proposal has been cause for a lot of local discussion and reactions have been very mixed. As I think you already know, people have been generally supportive of the size and density. This is true for the SASY Board and for the neighborhood in general; if there is a place in this neighborhood for this scale of density, a site like 1936-38 Atwood is it. There's no resistance to the proposed density or height.

The reaction to the architecture has also been fairly supportive. This is all the more true with the changes that you and your team have made over the past few weeks. The move to less varied design with fewer materials is more in keeping with the fabric of the neighborhood and Schenks Corners.

One point that I will raise again - having first spoken of it at the public meeting - is the treatment of the terrace and sidewalk area on the south side of the development. Unlike the rest of the block, the proposal here is to pave everything from the curb to the building except for the tree spots. I recall that you said this treatment was based on feedback from the city but I still fail to see the value in it. It is out of keeping with the rest of the block. What the current elevations and discussion also fail to capture is that this is the south side of the building. The entire area sees a tremendous amount of solar heat gain in the summer. Paving all that much more surface area only exacerbates the problem, to say nothing of compounding the issue of stormwater runoff. Furthermore, as mentioned at the public meeting, this entire street can be viewed through the lens of street reconstruction. This is entirely plausible given the condition of the street and the needed utility work underneath. Since the street is one-way and will doubtless remain that way, the street could be narrowed and the terraces extended somewhat. This would take nothing from the building but would foster a cooler, healthier and superior pedestrian experience for everyone.

The one issue that has garnered huge consternation has been that of parking. While this is generally true for almost every new development in the neighborhood, the 1936/38 lot has the unintentional distinction of serving as the last bastion of free after-hours parking for the entire business district. To be clear, no one feels that they have a right to free parking. However, the presence of this parking (and other opens lots that have since disappeared) has supported the development of a burgeoning neighborhood business district. So much so that some business owners are very legitimately concerned about the viability of their businesses when the parking lot at 1936/38 disappears. Frankly, the issue was only exacerbated when you originally advertised a public paid-parking lot of 61 stalls at the public meeting - and then pulled it off the table completely with the first plan submission. I (and the SASY Board and the neighborhood) fully

understand that you are under no obligation to provide any public parking to any one. The disappointment - as with so many things in life - is with dashed hopes and expectations.

With very little public input you have shifted yet again and reintroduced the public paid-parking in a more limited scope of 36 stalls. The SASY Board extends its support and thanks for that move since we view it as entirely good for the surrounding neighborhood. Not coincidentally, we also believe that this move is good for you as a long-term revenue stream and as a support for the local businesses that rent commercial space from Prime Urban Properties. Not to take the reintroduction of 36 public stalls for granted, but we further urge you to revisit the original plan of offering 61 stalls. We understand that this means accepting a lower rate of return for the initial years of the project. We also understand that this involves you assuming more risk in the development. However, you are in the rare position of having the resources to make this sort of investment and broker this risk. The same cannot be said of any of the business owners who are nervously watching as this project unfolds. The same also cannot be said of the City of Madison, in truth, since it is bound by rules, policy and public accountability that regulate its moves.

In closing, I must reiterate that the SASY Board is supportive of this project. We also recognize and applaud the value of reintroducing 36 public parking stalls as part of the project. We do not feel that there needs to be another public meeting since the dominant topic would unquestionably be parking. We feel that the larger issue of parking is one that must be addressed with the city as part of policy and other initiatives. As I stated above, though, we do encourage you to consider yet again the possibility of offering 61 public stalls as part of the design for 1936/38 Atwood Ave. We sincerely believe that the fortunes of many rise and fall together in this case, and that ultimately the success of the smaller businesses will mutually reinforce the success of your own.

Thank you for your time, attention and consideration.

Brad Hinkfuss  
President - SASY, Inc.

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Thomas Garver <thgarver@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 14, 2019 6:46 PM  
**To:** Wells, Chris  
**Cc:** Brad Hinkfuss; Rummel, Marsha; Brad Kuse; Host-Jablonski, Lou; Jason Tish; Olivia Mote; Ryan; Michael Vickerman; [REDACTED]; Dan Lenz; Alchemy Cafe; Tucker, Matthew; Stouder, Heather; Firchow, Kevin  
**Subject:** Re: updates to submittal at 1936-38 Atwood Avenue

Chris Wells, et. al.:

Tom Garver here, a member of the SASY Planning and Development Committee and coincidentally the next door neighbor to Joe Krupp's proposed new building at 1938 Atwood. I speak only for myself when I say that I think that a few adjustments have made this a vastly better building. I am a great believer in simplicity (not to be mistaken for vapidness or flaccidity), and the fact that this building has been made more simple, but of reasonably interesting modularity and without a corner that would overwhelm the Frank Reiley Monona Bank Building, the "doyenne" of Schenk's Corners is a vast improvement. I also appreciate Joe's willingness to reduce his ROI a bit by providing some more space to parking, a tough problem in this area.

I am eager, however, to see the final choices of brick and mortar color, and horizontal and flat cladding.

Tom

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Jason Tish <jason.tish@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2018 2:08 PM  
**To:** Wells, Chris  
**Cc:** Thomas Garver; Brad Hinkfuss; Rummel, Marsha; Brad Kuse; Firchow, Kevin; Host-Jablonski, Lou; Olivia Mote; Ryan; Michael Vickerman; Doug Johnson; Dan Lenz; Tucker, Matthew; Stouder, Heather; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Submittal for 1938 Atwood Avenue

I fully endorse the comments of Mr. Hinkfuss. I am a member of the SASY Neighborhood Association Board of Directors, and sit on the Preservation and Development Committee which studies and comments on the effects of development proposals on our neighborhood. I am commenting here as an individual resident (and yes, please include my comments in the public record as well), because the submitted proposal is dramatically different from what we reviewed with Mr. Krupp, and we have not had an opportunity, as a committee, to review the amended proposal and submit unified comment.

The parking provided the existing surface lot is critical to the vitality of the Schenk's Corners business district. We, and neighboring businesses, made that abundantly clear to Mr. Krupp during public meetings about this proposal. He made us aware that his application for TIF in support of a public parking component was denied, and that he was working to find an alternative financing option. With that understanding, and with an expectation that he would be successful in devising a way to include public parking, we did not offer resistance to the proposal. The lack of publicly available parking in the submitted proposal is a dramatic change from what the Neighborhood Association reviewed. The absence of that public amenity would likely have gotten strong resistance.

-Jason Tish

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Thomas Garver <thgarver@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:14 AM  
**To:** Brad Hinkfuss  
**Cc:** Wells, Chris; Rummel, Marsha; [REDACTED]; Firchow, Kevin; Host-Jablonski, Lou; Jason Tish; Olivia Mote; Ryan; Michael Vickerman; [REDACTED]; Dan Lenz  
**Subject:** Re: Submittal for 1938 Atwood Avenue

Brad, et. al.:

Garver here. I think that Joe's dropping the parking is an absolute disaster! He's increasing his density by five units and cutting his parking by, what, 55-60 stalls? I think that SASY should file a formal complaint with the city. This seems to be typical, as per the Marling. Submit one plan to the public, build something quite different.

Brad notes that he writes as a single individual. We, as a neighborhood association, have expressed our dismay and disagreement with the Planning Commission about density and had some effect. Are we now unable to see what pressure could be brought by the neighborhood on the project, even to the point of gaining TIF approval? This project may fatten Joe's wallet, and I can understand this, but maybe we have to do some direct criticism with the city to see some parking preserved. I think that a campaign amongst the local businesses, restaurants, hairdressers, etc. would be most beneficial! At the very least perhaps the approval process could be slowed to allow for the input of more comment, considering that this isn't "just another apartment house."

Tom

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Brad Hinkfuss <bradhinkfuss@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2018 10:03 AM  
**To:** Wells, Chris  
**Cc:** Rummel, Marsha; Brad Kuse; Firchow, Kevin; Host-Jablonski, Lou; Thomas Garver; Jason Tish; Olivia Mote; Ryan; Michael Vickerman; Doug Johnson; Dan Lenz  
**Subject:** Re: Submittal for 1938 Atwood Avenue  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello Chris,

Thanks for sending this along. My first reaction is to express some concern over how dramatically the plan has changed since the public meeting - which you may recall was a concern that I expressed at the public meeting itself. The plan that the developer shared in the public meeting made it seem very likely that there would be a significant public amenity - public parking - available as part of this project. This was one of the major discussion topics in the public meeting; the surrounding business owners and private citizens declared repeatedly how valuable public parking would be as part of that project. It's not an overstatement to say that much of acceptance (or lack of resistance) to the project hinged on the provision of public parking. There were several other issues discussed as well, but the parking component was one of the biggest. People left the meeting feeling that there were some problems with the details but that parking would probably be part of the mix.

Fast forward to today, and we have a plan that will make its way through the approval process absent any public parking. But no one knows this outside of a few of us who just learned it, and the single public meeting is over. I understand some of the backstory and concerns that city staff have in funding the Joe's TIF request for parking associated with this project. Personally, I tend to agree with city staff reservations. However, I think that the importance of the parking component has been largely lost on city staff. The value lies in the context of that particular area, which isn't immediately apparent when considering things at a policy level. My concern is that an opportunity to leverage this project for the greater neighborhood good will be lost if this project proceeds in its current form. Let me be clear that I am not necessarily advocating to give Joe the full TIF funding and/or other concessions he's requested. Even so, I'd like to think that there is a middle ground available here wherein Joe can be convinced to submit a plan that includes parking while not having the public bankroll too much of it, and that preserves that public accessibility through an easement, MOU or some other provision for years to come. Given that this project has rezoning and conditional use dimensions to it I think that the city and the general public have the ability to hold it to a higher standard - or at least to strive for it.

At an absolute minimum, there should be a second public meeting if the plan is set to proceed through the city approval process absent any public parking provision. Beyond the parking issue, there are the additional design considerations that you mentioned above that have received no public airing. As an additional aside, the social media public reaction to the proposed design has been largely negative.

Although I'm the President of the SASY Neighborhood Association, I write this as a lone citizen today since we haven't had time to bring this evolving issue before the SASY Preservation & Development Committee or the full SASY Board. The SASY Board does meet this Thursday, though, and may well take a position by that time.

I ask that you give voice to these concerns in the staff charrette that you said would take place later today.

Thank you,

Brad Hinkfuss  
President - SASY, Inc.

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Thomas Garver <thgarver@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 21, 2018 5:41 PM  
**To:** Wells, Chris; Brad Hinkfuss; Marsha Rummel; Joe Krupp  
**Subject:** Appearance of proposed structure at 1936-38 Atwood Ave.

Chris Wells:

Tom Garver here. My wife and I are the owners of the building directly east of Joe Krupp's proposed 79 unit building at 1936-1938 Atwood Avenue. I am also a member of the Planning and Development Committee of the Schenk Atwood Starkweather Yahara (SASY) Neighborhood Association. I am responding to your e-mail of a few minutes ago regarding (in part) the proposed appearance of this new and very large addition to the Schenk's Corners area.

I am writing you to very strongly support the planning department's concern with the strongly contrasting/conflicting architectural elements of this building, e. g. the metal and cement board corners contrasted with the more traditional brickwork of the center part of the facade. I have written a private letter to Joe Krupp and Randy Bruce expressing this very concern, and am glad to see that the city's Planning Division is also concerned about it.

It seems reasonable to seek a building design that would complement and extend the "texture" of the neighborhood, which is historical in character, particularly the area immediately surrounding the crossing of Winnebago Street and Atwood Avenue. In fact, I would urge the Planning Division to examine photos of this exact area, taken approximately 75 years apart, ca. 1925 and ca. 2000, as documented in Zane Williams' book, Doubletake: The Rephotography of Madison, which shows this architectural preservation, something which we have come to truly appreciate, and which makes this street crossing unique in the city.

The addition of a clump of sheet metal and cementboard on a very prominent corner of this area, one with a long vista down

Atwood Avenue should be reconsidered. What I believe is needed here is a more substantial, and what might be regarded as a more "collegial" building, one that would compliment what is already here and what has been here for decades. Now that Schenk's Corners has been recognized for its intrinsic historic flavor and not seen just as a center for "stand up drinking," what is constructed here warrants more consideration of the existing character of the surrounding buildings.

Joe Krupp has been the most significant developer in this immediate area, and I would say that what his company has built has been better than what previously existed on these sites. While the site under discussion is currently a parking lot, it is immediately adjacent to the Monona Bank building, the most significant building architecturally in the area, and one of the more significant buildings constructed in the historic period of development of Schenk's Corners. Further, it is a fine example of a distinguished type of period construction, what might be called "The Small Town Bank," and it deserves a complimentary not a clashing ambience.

I am therefore pleased to see that the city's Planning Division is taking a stance on the current design of this building. I do believe that much of the facade as currently planned by Knothe Bruce to be quite handsome, with its inset balconies dividing the long facade into nice modules. A simplification of the materials, the absurdly mixed use of which is one of the great cliches and "vices" of current architecture, would both be warmly welcomed and also very much better stand the test of time. With some relatively minor adjustments to the facade design and selection of materials, this building could be a real addition to Schenk's Corners rather than something that in future will come to be recognized as one of those "Post Modern mistakes."

I strongly encourage the city's Planning Division to press for changes here, changes that you have expressed in your memo to a number of us.

Best, Tom Garver

## Wells, Chris

---

**From:** Stouder, Heather  
**Sent:** Monday, November 19, 2018 7:48 AM  
**To:** Wells, Chris  
**Cc:** Firchow, Kevin  
**Subject:** FW: [MarqNA] D6 Items of Interest Week of November 19, 2018

Chris-  
Please save this for the file for this proposal.  
Thank you!

Heather

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

From: Michael D. Barrett [mailto: ]  
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 1:16 AM  
To: MarqNA@yahoogroups.com; Einpc <einpc@yahoogroups.com>; SASYNA-Discussions@yahoogroups.com; Tao, Yang <YTao@cityofmadison.com>  
Cc: Monks, Anne <AMonks@cityofmadison.com>; Pat Schneider <pschneider@madison.com>; Knepp, Eric <EKnepp@cityofmadison.com>; Erdman, Natalie <NERdman@cityofmadison.com>; Stouder, Heather <HStouder@cityofmadison.com>; Phillips, Robert <RPhillips@cityofmadison.com>; Pat Schneider <pschneider@madison.com>; Dean Mosiman <dmosiman@madison.com>; Bill Novak <bnovak@madison.com>; jnichols@madison.com; Isthmus Davidoff <jdavidoff@isthmus.com>; ; lwroge@madison.com; dzweifel@madison.com; N: <pfanlund@madison.com>; Marc Eisen < >; Susan De Vos < >; "Chawla, Yogesh", <chawla.yogesh@countyofdane.com>; madisonareabusadvocates@googlegroups.com; ageyer@isthmus.com; Cap Times <cmurphy@madison.com>; kdean@madison.com; jjoyce@madison.com; lchristians@madison.com; selbow@madison.com; abecker@madison.com; ldanielson@madison.com; elorenzsonn@madison.com; Lisa Speckhard Pasque <lspeckhard@madison.com>; Joe Tarr <jtarr@isthmus.com>; dbrogan@isthmus.com; ccapellaro@isthmus.com; Mayor <Mayor@cityofmadison.com>; Lynch, Thomas <TLynch@cityofmadison.com>;  
Subject: Re: [MarqNA] D6 Items of Interest Week of November 19, 2018

Dear Marsha,

Unfortunately, I won't be able to attend the Monday meeting about the 1936-1938 Atwood development due to a commitment that pre-dates the announcement of this meeting. Please accept this as citizen comment to the official project record.

I do have major concerns. But first, as a general principle I \*do\* like seeing parking lots filled in with fairly dense housing & commercial. I don't like seeing old houses torn down though. I'm sad that one after another approved the tear down of "just" one house, then another, then another...until it became "obvious" that the last house had to go. Will you at least reflect on that sort of tear-down thinking?

-Will this be another Joe Krupp Special out of an Atlanta real estate developer's catalogue? We have so many creative architects in this town.

Why do we always submit to these pro-forma products? Every new development is looking more like Fitchburg or Verona or Eau Claire or--ick!--Atlanta. Very little of his recent examples set our neighborhood apart. Given that this is the neighborhood that jump-started the whole neighborhood/urban re-vitalization of this city, why do we have to settle for Suburban Atlanta?

-Will this building engage the streetscape in a convivial way? Or will it militantly seal itself off from the street as so many of his projects do? It was a battle royal to get him to create a pedestrian-friendly entry for Kennedy Point (even with the

concessions, it wasn't completely successful). We need building entries to be grand and enhancing of the streetscape. We need them to be welcoming--in a BIG way--to people arriving on foot. That scrunchy entry at the new building where Gail Ambrosius Chocolatier is an architectural travesty; not welcoming at all as an entry. (Don't get me wrong, I love Gail's Chocolates! Always a friendly environment once inside! I'm strictly talking architecture here!). Mr. Krupp's architecture follows the Frank Lloyd Wright Battlement Theory of the Hidden (or grossly underdeveloped) Entry. Instead, we need to look to the building entries of yore to re-create the window-shoppable, people-welcoming experience that was de-rigueur pre-WW II. Entries that provide shelter from the elements (while still being outside). Entries that allow for casual, serendipitous socializing in front of the building without being out in pedestrian street traffic.

State Street still has a lot of examples of this; Little Luxuries/Fanny Garver Gallery is a prime example. And finally, the entry has to be scaled to the size of the building (the example cited above is +/-25% of the frontage!). Classic architecture embraces the entry visually, makes it prominent as an architectural statement. The old Yost's on State was another example of a building that makes its entry a grand one. If the 1936-1938 Atwood project is just residential (I don't know one way or the other), you can look to examples like the Kennedy Manor on Langdon--its entry is an architectural heralding of arrival.

-Awnings. Bring back good sized, sidewalk enveloping awnings. It is an essential element to urban street life. Look at pix of Madison of 75 years ago. Any lively street had them. It is the most essential of pedestrian-first elements.

-Will there be outdoor verandas for each apartment or will they be his typical dog-crate-sized decks? Milwaukee's Third Ward has a lot of examples of elegantly-sized balconies that really engage the indoor-outdoor aesthetic that is the hallmark of our older neighborhoods. Porches predominate here, Marsha. Why shouldn't these new buildings follow our stated desire to have a socially engaging built environment? The very thing that makes our neighborhood special, his projects give short shrift to. Why should new arrivals to our 'hood be deprived of an engaging domestic outdoor experience that is so cherished in the rest of our 'hood? At a minimum, apartment balconies should be able to accommodate four 18" planters planted in abundance, and four 6-foot tall humans (say, a couple and two visiting friends) lounging comfortably facing one another with legs outstretched & not overlapped.

Virtually all of the decks recently installed on virtually all of Madison's recent apartment buildings couldn't even accommodate one person lounging without one's knees up in one's chin, much less one couple. This is about aesthetics (people can have good-sized planters with sizable green plantings if there is decent space allowances). And I hate to bring up the dreaded security/safety issue, but, yes, by having spaces where people randomly but regularly enjoy the outdoors from their own home perch, it does provide a sense of eyes-on-the-street safety.

Responsible eyes on the street--informal surveillance for the security-minded--is the best crime prevention strategy ever invented by human-kind.

-Why invite more cars here by building yet more parking? We should be building for more progressive, ecologically-minded people--the productive, creative driving forces in an economically thriving green community--rather than for those who chain themselves to the motorized menace. Are you aware that in the last 10 years Seattle added some 45,000 high-quality, high-paying jobs while not adding one extra driven mile on their roads? THAT is what enlightened urban living is about.

Furthermore, structured parking undermines affordability: it typically sends rents at least 13% higher (that's on the low-end). How does that help alleviate the affordable housing crisis we are experiencing here?

How does adding more car-minded people motoring down our streets fit in with the city's CO2 reduction goals? Or a creative, healthy, productive work force? And \*if\* expensive structured parking is permitted here, why must the garage entry be so hideously wide? Why not do as civilized cities do the world over and have one narrow shared entry/exit lane that is signalized to allow that one lane to do double duty? It makes for a much friendlier pedestrian environment when cars are constrained in this way. It cuts costs. The gigantic double-laned entry/exits--mandated by Madison's un-creative engineers--are essentially urban scars. Why do we inflict this on ourselves?

-All of the building's stormwater should be managed for infiltration on-site (green roofs, raingardens, etc.). That means, there should be a significant green area. Mr. Krupp's buildings never provide the greenspace that they should. We--and his future residents--deserve a higher quality of landscaping than what we get from his projects. And no, the

surrounding public property that he industrially landscapes and dumps chemicals on does not count (see: the barren brown curb terraces surrounding his properties, all contravening city landscaping standards, e.g., the Barriques building or the Velo 404 building). His imperiousness notwithstanding, it is \*public\*, not his private domain. He needs to provide quality and extensive landscaping, adapted to this climate (i.e., not needing pesticides) on his own property.  
Lot-line-to-lot line bloatitecture does not cut it.

-This would be a wonderful opportunity to throttle this block of Atwood Avenue (extending to 1st St.) down to just one narrow, very traffic-calmed lane. It should function as a Woonerf--a shared street, primarily for people, not obscenely wide, raging thruway it currently is. The main course of westbound traffic should stay on Winnebago until First St., while the right-most lane of Winnebago should be a forced right onto First St. itself (to keep traffic shunting over to E. Wash, alleviating traffic from Willy St.). There is no sense in having two, essentially parallel arterials within a block of one another. Let's start reclaiming such paved redundancy for green (see next item....)

-As this block of Atwood is narrowed, aggressively, significantly expand curb terraces as green oases that accommodate virtually all of the street's stormwater. If Chicago can do it on arterial streets, why can't we?

We need to start getting creative for the good life--a less energy intense life, a more convivial life--instead of mimicking Interstate architecture fit only for habitation by atomized automatons. There is plenty of that out at the Beltline & beyond.

Happy Thanksgiving!

-Mike Barrett