

Options in Community Living, Inc.

22 N. 2nd Street • Madison, WI 53704 • Voice/TTY (608) 249-1585; Fax (608) 249-3372 • www.optionsmadison.com

Date: January 7, 2019

To: City of Madison CDD and Planning Team

From: Kim Turner, Executive Director, Options in Community Living (Tenant of Madison Development Corporation)

Re: Madison Development Corporation's Avenue Development

Options in Community Living, Inc. has been a commercial tenant on MDC's Avenue site for the past 29 years, and in the same location for many years prior to MDC's responsibility for the property. We provide services to individuals with developmental and intellectual disabilities who live in their own homes and apartments. We have approximately 50 staff who work in the office building on the Avenue site; this is the building at the corner of N. Second Street & E. Mifflin streets, just behind the Avenue Apartments, which are located in the former UW Hospital building at 1954 E Washington Ave. We also support many individuals who have or do currently live in affordable and accessible housing owned by MDC.

I am writing to express our support for MDC's current proposal to add a 44-Unit new apartment building on East Washington Avenue. The addition of more quality, affordable housing is needed in Madison, and MDC does a great job housing many of our current clients at the 1954 E. Washington building. MDC also keeps their privately-owned James A. Graaskamp park in good condition, and we support their plan to further upgrade the park as part of their overall plans to improve the property. Many neighbors use this park, and also use the green space on the side of our building that faces Second Street. This additional green space would continue to be a neighborhood asset under MDC's 44 unit plan.

MDC's 44 unit plan would eliminate any immediate need to raze the building with our offices. Keeping our office building intact until we find a suitable place to move our business in the future is greatly appreciated. This allows Options to give MDC the one year notice they would need from us, as well as for us to be flexible in when we choose to move.

Thank you for your consideration of our support. We have been in this neighborhood since 1981, and appreciate all that MDC does for us. Please feel free to contact me if additional information is needed.

11-12

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

From: Adam Grassnickle [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 7:36 PM
To: Cashton Laufenberg <cashton@mdcorp.org>
Subject: Re: Avenue Project

Hi cashton,

Thank you for meeting with me today, I hope your dentist appointment went well. This Apartment looks very nice, if it does become available I would like to see it.

The avenue project looks like it's going to produce a very nice building and I'm very excited. I especially enjoy the fact that all the units will have balconies.

Again thanks for your time and I hope to hear back soon.
Adam

11-12

To whom it may concern,

Hi my name is barrisha Richards I live in 1950 East Washington Avenue apartment number 4. I am writing on behalf of Madison Development Corporation to show my support in their new project. As much as I love my apartment I do support them upgrading and rebuilding a newer apartment complex. I think it will be exciting and great for the community and tenants to have an updated building to fit the new construction on East Washington. I think this will bring in more tenants and provide a lot of positive outlook on the property. I'm excited for the new amenities they're trying to build and put into the buildings.

Barrisha Richards

11-12

Friday, February 22, 2019

RE: 1954 E. Washington
Public Comment in Support of Project

Phone Call at 3:30 pm:
Thomas J. Widmyer
1954 E. Washington, Avenue Apartments, Unit #8
Madison, WI

I am in full support of the proposed project at 1954 E. Washington for the following reasons:

- Provides affordable moderate rent
- Provides clean units
- The area is relatively safe
- There is a high level of maintenance and grounds keeping on site – well maintained
- Site has full access to bus lines
- Good maintenance response – quick to fix anything in apartments
- Accept Section 8 housing

11-12

Dear Ms. Glaeser and Ms. Cleveland,

I am a near east side resident and past board member and chair of Madison Development Corporation. I am writing to support their project to build an affordable housing facility as part of their complex at The Avenue, which now includes affordable housing and some of Madison's earliest accessible facilities. Both the new and old facilities have, to my knowledge, been created and managed in a responsible and community-sensitive manner and are terrific resources for our area, including the immediate neighborhood. I urge your support of this current project.

I am copying my sister, a very close neighbor to the project, on Dayton and Second Streets, inviting her to express her position. We and other members of our family, including our great grandparents who lived on Jenifer Street 90 years ago, love, and have been involved in the neighborhood in many ways since those days. I understand that the next formal considerations of the project will be starting next Monday.

Tom Solheim

11-12

I am in support of MDC's 44 unit The Avenue project - The Graaskamp

I live at 1143 Emerald Street. MADISON, WI 53715.

Sharon McCabe

11-12

Hi Janine and Judy,

I've been a board member of Madison Development Corporation since 2012. We take our mission of providing quality, affordable housing very seriously, and our organization has a great track record of delivering on this mission.

I'm registering in support of MDC's Avenue project.

Thank you,
Matt

--
Matt Younkle

11-12

Tom,

Thank you for sharing your note with me and providing an opportunity for me to express my position on a new affordable housing facility as part of The Avenue.

I can readily support this project. As a nurse with public health background I am aware that housing is an important health determinant. When citizens have adequate, affordable housing I believe we all benefit. According to a 2016 Robert Wood Johnson report, affordable housing in higher resource communities helps families who are poorer to benefit from opportunities for education, employment, health and so forth within the community.

Recently I have learned that three of my nursing colleagues (one running for the District 12 alder) live in the Emerson-East neighborhood. I cannot imagine one of them objecting to a new affordable housing project in our neighborhood. Personally, I like living in communities that welcome people from diverse socio-economic strata, various ethnic groups and all age groups.

Thank you again for the chance to weigh in on this issue.

Best,
Karen Solheim

11-12

I am a member of the board of directors of the Madison Development Corporation registering in support of MDC's Avenue project to build a 44-unit new construction affordable housing complex on the 1954 Block of East Washington. This is project helps the City of Madison fulfill its goal of providing quality affordable housing.

Thank you,

Rob Bergenthal

Dear UDC:

"Buildings have a substantial impact on the health and wellbeing of people and the planet. They use resources, generate waste and are costly to maintain and operate. Green building is the practice of designing, constructing and operating buildings to maximize occupant health and productivity, use fewer resources, reduce waste and negative environmental impacts, and decrease life cycle costs." This quote is from the US Green Building Council and I believe it captures my thoughts on the proposed development for 1954 E. Washington Ave.

The fact that MDC proposes to demolish an existing housing complex that only dates from the 1980s seems contrary to this as well as is reflective of a poor commitment to maintain their current buildings - how will this new "monstrosity" be cared for.

And yes, the 4 story proposal is just that: a giant monster invading a small neighborhood!

A smaller development, say two stories, will allow for a gradual integration of new residents thus fostering a greater sense of entering into an already existing neighborhood and allowing one to get to know one another and create a healthy city.

I can't help think of Cabrini Green in Chicago or the Greenbush development of Madison that did not create an inclusive neighborhood but rather the focus on density created areas of extreme poverty. Rather than enhancing a neighborhood, it just created isolation.

Neighborhood design is not limited to a building but is of the many interacting parts. Traffic flows - both vehicular and pedestrian - need to be considered. Environmental impacts of soil compaction upon water and plant management, shade concerns for plants and passive heating from the sun, and noise pollution need to be considered.

As I live at 1944 and this proposal will be a mere 16.5 feet from my residence of 12 years, I am greatly troubled by the prospect of the potential for fire to spread to my building that was built in the 1890s.

(How is that for durability?)

So if any building were to be built, please keep it in tune w/ the character and size of the neighborhood and insist upon LEED Standards.

11-12

As this is now a design issue, I have not included other concerns that this project will have on increasing property taxes and rents as well as more social factors. I look forward to seeing you on the 27th to present my humble opinion to the UDC.

Sincerely,

Rich Zietko

11-12

02/25/19

To: Members of the Urban Design Commission

As a concerned neighbor I am writing to express my objection to the project at 1954 E. Washington Ave proposed by Madison Development Corp. I have written a statement before that detailed concerns with the initial design. Nothing with the new design has changed my opinion that the plan is ill conceived and will be detrimental to the current residents at The Avenue and to the neighborhood at large.

- The apartment building is too tall in height at four stories to fit in a neighborhood of modest two story homes. Other developments have taken into account their proximity to residential neighborhoods and scaled back their designs to three stories. The development in Middleton on University Avenue being the most recent. And also at Union Corners, the multi-generational apartments under construction closest to the neighboring residences are just three story.
- The building has grown in density from an initial 27 unit building on 09/19/18 to a 30 unit building on 10/09/18 to a 44 unit building on 01/09/19. Every iteration of the project has driven home the utter disregard that Madison Development Corp. has to the feedback from the neighbors. Encasing this out of proportion building partially in brick and thinking a fourth story set back is an enhancement is like putting lipstick on a pig.
- The size of the building is immense and will cast a literal shadow over the adjacent homes to the west. To the north it will be imposing presence to the neighborhood and undoubtedly shade much of Graaskamp Park for the majority of the day. A shade study would allow the neighborhood to better understand the impact the building's height would have.
- The building takes up every inch of what had been a buffer to E. Washington Ave for current residents of The Avenue and provides no additional green space for the future tenants of the buildings. It's hard to imagine a resident enjoying their "green space" balcony overlooking E. Washington Ave. at rush hour and being pleased with the outdoor ambience of exhaust fumes and traffic noise.
- The 40 unit building also does not provide adequate parking. And the overflow parking that will result will negatively impact the neighborhood. There are 10 – 12 on-street parking spaces that abut the MDC property. Due the fact that the three streets surrounding the parcel are limited to one sided parking, these spaces are shared with the neighborhood residents living across the street from The Avenue. This is the only parking available for visitors, utility vans, service trucks, etc. We currently compete for parking spaces on a daily basis with the Options in Community Living staff and East High School students taking up the majority of on street parking. A parking study would be appropriate to gauge impact especially now that Options will continue to occupy the office building on N. Second Street while as many as 100 new residents move in on the same property.
- The resulting traffic congestion of an additional 40 – 80 car driving residents from the proposed building is a burden to our narrow streets and small neighborhood. Due to the layout of the parking lot and underground parking entrance, most of the traffic associated with the new building will use N. Second Street as part of their routine driving route. On a street that is one block long this is an excessive amount of traffic.

11-12

My objections are based on the desire to prevent high rise development from encroaching on all residential neighborhoods east of First Street. This could be the first of many small infill projects that corrupt the integrity and cohesion of the pocket neighborhoods lining major traffic corridors throughout Madison but especially on the East side.

I would like to think that Members of the Commission would see that a common sense solution is possible. Limiting this building to three stories would lessen the impact of the development to the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sheri Rein

21 N. Second St.

11-12

I am in support of the plan for a 44 unit building at the Avenue apartments on East Washington Blvd. There seems to be an emphasis on providing affordable living units in Madison. An additional 44 units would be a good addition to meeting this goal. This plan would make good use of the land and give the neighborhood a larger green space when the Options building is removed. Renovation of the Grasscamp Park will make that green space even more usable for the neighborhood. Having underground parking for the new units will be a nice practical and aesthetic solution of how to provide parking for the new units.

I live at 1954 East Washington Blvd., Apt 7, Madison WI 53704.

Janet Calkins DVM

11-12

As a Management Development Corporation Board member, I wanted to reach out to you and let you know that I'm registering in support of MDC's Avenue project to build a 44-unit new construction affordable housing complex on the 1954 Block of East Washington. I'm excited to see this project become a reality. Have a great weekend!

Thomas J. Golden
Executive Vice President
M3 Insurance
828 John Nolen Drive
Madison, WI 53713

11-12

Dear Ms. Glaeser and Ms. Cleveland,

As a resident of Madison, business owner and current board member of Madison Development Corp., I am writing to indicate my strong support of the 44 unit redevelopment project referred to as the Avenue on E. Washington.

We are all aware of the acute need for more affordable housing in Madison and I am proud to be part of an organization with such a solid reputation of completing projects that meet the needs of all stakeholder groups including tenants and neighbors.

I hope you will support approval of this project moving forward.

Best regards,

Tony Koblinski
President/CEO
Madison-Kipp Corporation

11-12

Urban Design Commission
City of Madison WI

February 26, 2019

Tess Camacho
102 N. 2d St
Madison WI. 53704

Dear Commission Members,

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed development at 1954 East Washington Avenue by Madison Development Corporation. I have lived across the street from Graaskamp Park and the proposed development site for 13 years and previously lived on the 2100 block of East Dayton. I am not opposed to affordable housing in my neighborhood but I am opposed to the massive scale of the proposed 4 story building. MDC has repeatedly rushed the process and not provided information in a timely manner that would allow for feedback from the neighbors. As a resident across the street from the property, I feel that my input should be taken seriously. The developers construction schedule should not be at the expense of the neighborhood. I would like to see a design that benefits the neighborhood and MDC residents and not just the ambitions of a development corporation who does not live in the neighborhood.

- 1) As with previous proposed designs, I still feel that the developer is trying to squeeze in a building that is too large for the space. The building is massively larger in scale to all other structures between 1st and 4th streets. While the East Washington Corridor has gained large scale developments, these have been in areas that were once commercial lots. Our neighborhood between 1st and 4th is comprised of smaller homes and only 1 or 2 small scale 2 story buildings. As a comparison, the largest building in the area is East High. The first story of East High on the front side is actually sunk into the ground so that it is not even a full 4 stories. Also, the significant setback diminishes the appearance. I feel a more appropriate scale for 1954 would be a 3 story building with a 3rd story setback. The proposed design on the backside is a full 4 stories on the Mifflin St side with no setback. A 4 story on the top of a hill with a 10' elevation drop to the street will make the building look even more imposing and out of character on Mifflin St. This 4 story height will surely cast shade onto the park and possibly reach the other side of the street to my house as well as the other buildings on the property. In the winter especially, I highly value my sunshine for passive solar warmth not to mention my happiness and I think most people would agree. I would like to know the results of any shade studies, who conducted the study, how it was done.
- 2) The driveway to the underground parking is ill placed and cumbersome. The over all design seems to attempt to unify the 2 buildings with matching brick but ultimately it fails. The driveway placement in the middle is a huge divider and acts like a moat between the 2 buildings. The division is further enhanced by the downward grade with retaining wall and a guard rail which is placed in the middle of the property. It seems that the 2

11-12

buildings could be better integrated if the proposed building was a smaller scale allowing for more landscaping and pedestrian areas in between.

- 3) The landscape plan seems incomplete. There should be more screening between the MDC property and neighbors on the southwest side in the form of either a fence or shrubbery that would provide a buffer to noise and add privacy from patios. Also, there is no clear path to the park directly behind the building especially due to the driveway that wraps along the northeast side of the building.
- 4) With this proposed design and scale we are going to lose very large trees that provide shade and animal habitat in the neighborhood. When all of the ash trees were removed on Mifflin Street it became noticeably warmer in the summer. There were 3-4 trees removed from MDC's terrace along Mifflin Street that were not replaced. I don't know why MDC didn't prompt the city for the replacement trees on the terrace and I question their commitment to the landscaping of the property. I believe that with a smaller scale building less trees will be in jeopardy.
- 5) Another concern is the indefinite occupation of the Options building and the future plans for the demolition or rather lack of plan. I am not comfortable with this open ended situation. I would like to see a concrete plan with renderings for the landscaping of this area in the future.

I would like the developer to realize the limitations of this property and the scope of what will actually fit into this space. This should be an opportunity for improvement to the neighborhood. I feel that this overscale design would be a decline to the overall quality of the immediate neighborhood as well as MDC's own property.

Thank you considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Tess Camacho

Urban Design Commission
City of Madison
126 S. Hamilton St
Madison, WI 53703

RE: The Avenue 1954 E. Washington Development Proposal - 52598

February 24, 2019

Dear Urban Design Commission:

In advance of the Urban Design Commission Meeting scheduled for February 27th, 2019, we, a collective of 21 nearby residents, would like to provide formal written comment for your consideration on The Avenue 1954 E. Washington Development Proposal.

Enclosed/attached with this letter is a document outlining a number of shared concerns with the most recent proposal which was presented to neighbors on January 9th, 2019. Throughout multiple iterations of this development, the neighbors and residents listed below have engaged in the process and expressed concerns, ideas, and recommendations during available forums with the developer, Madison Development Corp.

We appreciate the opportunity to collaborate and provide feedback in this process. We appreciate the efforts of the architects, Knothe and Bruce, to try to address design concerns. Unfortunately, we still have significant concerns. Some concerns are new, a result of the significant redesign of the latest iteration, yet some concerns have remained consistent throughout our engagement. Since this new proposal was moved forward by the developer despite our concerns, we present the attached for the independent consideration of the UDC.

We acknowledge that not every issue or recommendation listed may be in scope or actionable by the UDC; regardless, we prefer to provide this feedback at this time for formal public record. As subject matter experts of the neighborhood and site, it is our duty to provide our qualitative perspective to ensure the committee has the information required to ensure decisions are evidence based and support the long term success of the city and its hallmark neighborhoods.

Lastly, as neighbors, we seek transparency, communication, collaboration, and empathetic consideration. Going forward, if these principles are valued, we are optimistic we can come to a solution that is a win-win for the neighborhood and the developer.

Sincerely,

Chris Sell on behalf of a collective of 21 concerned neighbors (listed on Page 2)

11-12

Neighbor	Address	Email
<i>Christopher Sell</i>	1934 E. Washington Ave.	sellfactor@gmail.com
<i>Natasha Fahey-Flynn</i>	1934 E. Washington Ave.	natashacff@gmail.com
<i>Sheri Rein</i>	21 N. Second St.	szrein@gmail.com
<i>Charlie Rein</i>	21 N. Second St.	Crein42@gmail.com
<i>Tess Camacho</i>	102 N. Second St.	tesscamacho@rocketmail.com
<i>Dawn Sabin</i>	1930 E. Washington Ave	dawnwalkersemail@yahoo.com
<i>Ben Sabin</i>	1930 E. Washington Ave.	Benjamin3137@hotmail.com
<i>Abby Bailey</i>	29 N. Second St.	Mabbyb32@yahoo.com
<i>Rich Zietko</i>	1944 E. Washington Ave.	rzierko@yahoo.com
<i>Andrea Zietko</i>	1944 E. Washington Ave.	avzierko@yahoo.com
<i>Katie Kane</i>	1938 E. Washington Ave.	katiekanep@gmail.com
<i>Bart Klaas</i>	1940 E. Washington Ave.	Bjklaas@gmail.com
<i>Jessica Wheeler</i>	29 N. Second St.	Jesswheeler35@yahoo.com
<i>Ed Feeny</i>	2030 Carey Ct.	efeeny@tds.net
<i>Suzy Grindrod</i>	2030 Carey Ct.	sjgrindrod@icloud.com
<i>Willy & Jane Schomaker</i>	13 N. Second St.	Willyschomaker@sbcglobal.net
<i>Dario Tesmer</i>	1934 E. Mifflin St.	dtesmer@hotmail.com
<i>Jenny and Joe Sweeney</i>	2024 E. Mifflin St.	jennylmsweeney@gmail.com
<i>Sara Hinkel</i>	2026 E. Mifflin St.	sarahinkel@sbcglobal.net

11-12

The Avenue Project - Stakeholder Concerns and Recommendations

ISSUE #1: Size and Height of the Proposed Building

The neighbors feel strongly that a 4 story building in the Emerson East neighborhood does not fit with the character of the neighborhood or this section of the East Washington Corridor. This feedback has been consistently shared with the developer through various iterations of this project, yet the latest design calls for an even larger 4 story building than the previous designs.

The only building in Emerson East, the adjacent neighborhoods, and this portion of the East Washington Corridor that is comparable in size/height is East High School, and that building has at least double the setback from the street. The majority of the homes within Emerson East and adjacent to the proposed development have a very small footprint with an average square footage of 1100 sq ft and an average height of 22 feet.

The fourth story along with the new design and the significantly larger footprint towards the back of the lot eliminates the privacy of the east Washington neighbors and their backyards, which offer the only true privacy of living on East Washington. There are proposed walk-out patios that with no planned buffer or barrier to the East Washington residents' backyards. The second, third, and fourth stories all have outdoor patios with site lines that will directly overlook these once private backyards. The larger buildings nearer to downtown that exceed 4 stories are also at a much lower elevation than 1954 E. Washington further exaggerating the size and scale of the 44 unit 4 story building.

Recommendation 1.1: We recommend that the building be reduced by one story equating to a 3 story building with the 3rd story setback.

Recommendation 1.2 We have recently learned that the developer may have completed a shade study, and we would request additional time to review the results of that study and anticipate impacts to our properties and the neighborhood.

Recommendation 1.3 We recommend the developer address the significant, newly created privacy concerns resulting from the new proposal.

ISSUE #2: Parking

In MDC's Home Funds grant application and confirmed by MDC representatives, the developer indicates they will charge anywhere from \$20 to \$120 for their parking spots. Street parking is already very competitive because many of the smaller homes in Emerson East do not have garages and only enough driveway for one vehicle. We feel that many future Avenue tenants who would qualify to live in the affordable housing development would choose save money and not purchase a parking spot which could potentially add up 50-100 cars parking on the adjacent streets. These concerns are exacerbated by the Options for Independence site whose employees park on the street Monday through Friday

11-12

7:30am to 5:00pm. If MDC's claim that very few of their tenants will have cars is true, then will the un-rented parking spots be "sold" to non-tenants? This would be of concern to the neighbors. Lastly, we believe there should be designated onsite visitor parking when tenants inevitably have visitors. We'd prefer an independent entity verify or determine the adequate amount of visitor parking for a building of this size.

Recommendation 2.1: *Parking be offered to tenants as part of their rent*

Recommendation 2.2: *Provide the neighbors the time to review a parking study*

The neighbors are also very supportive of ensuring Madison is accessible by all individuals including persons with disabilities. This includes having a designated pickup/drop-off area that is protected by inclement weather. We want to ensure that the developer has completed an accessibility study and that the plan is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Recommendation 2.3: *An accessibility analysis be completed and allow the neighbors and opportunity to review*

ISSUE #3: Traffic

We recognize that East Washington Street is heavily studied by the city and the isthmus presents significant and unique challenges regarding traffic flow. Qualitatively, the neighborhood is aware that there is a traffic congestion problem on the parallel streets especially on Mifflin St, from First to Fourth. Because it is difficult and unsafe for cars entering East Washington at Second St to head eastbound, many current Avenue residents drive down Second St. and head down Mifflin St. to Fourth Street where there is a light to more easily turn left and head east. The same situation occurs for traffic entering east Washington between Second and First Street, where traffic will turn right on First St and the Mifflin to Fourth. The congestion is further compounded by East High School and the need for student pickup/drop-off on Fourth St and the daily parking of East High School students. It will be very difficult and unsafe for any Avenue residents exiting on East Washington to cross 3 lanes of traffic in less than 1 block in an effort to take a left at First Street (no U-turn allowed). Mifflin Street is narrow and allows parking on both sides of the street on evenings and weekends, and when cars are parked on both sides, only one car can fit through the street. We believe it is fair to consider if the additional density will continue to stress the adjacent streets and create a level of congestion that could result in significant safety issues especially around East High School.

Recommendation 3.1: *A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and traffic counts on Mifflin St. from First to Fourth Street be shared with the neighbors and allowed time to review and comment. We ask the city to supplement this study with qualitative data such as focus groups or surveys with residents in this area. Engaging the stakeholders would create good faith with the neighborhood and may result in creative solutions.*

ISSUE #4: Pedestrian Safety

Overall, the neighbors are open to some additional density if it is done thoughtfully and "smart." We acknowledge that a reason this site is attractive for increased density is due to it being on/near bus lines. Unfortunately, only west bound bus lines are easily and safely accessible. All residents heading east need to cross one of the most dangerous sections of East Washington to access the east bound bus lines. With the developer adding potentially 120 new neighbors, it should be their duty to ensure that access to public transportation is safe especially if this is quoted as a reason for approving a zoning change allowing additional density. The pedestrian traffic is has also increased with the revitalization of Schenks' Corners which will inevitably be accessed by Avenue's tenants. Safety is a driver of property values and economic stability. We want to ensure that Madison is a safe place to live and access. As regular and experienced pedestrians, we feel it would be irresponsible of the developer to ignore potential risk mitigation strategies or at minimum consider the known and unknown safety risks that could be exaggerated by this proposed development and added density.

Recommendation 4.1: We recommend a safety analysis be completed and shared with neighbors to review options to allow pedestrians to safely cross at Second St. and E. Washington Ave.

Recommendation 4.2: MDC and the neighbors partner to identify long term risk mitigation strategies. For example, the addition of a traffic light or pedestrian bridge would be large scale strategies that we realize would not be responsibility of the developer, so we, as neighbors, would welcome the opportunity to partner with MDC in lobbying the city to implement large scale safety measures.

ISSUE #5 – Market Instability & Property Values

We openly admit that we do not know what the economic impact of this development would have on the surrounding neighborhood. We do know that this is a significant development for our neighborhood highlighted by the 10% increase Emerson East residents. Although Madison's housing market has been strong, the neighbors do have some anxiety about the unknown impact of this development on the local market and property values. The near east side is already one of the more affordable housing markets in Madison and the variability of home prices within different areas of the city are a concern.

It is no secret that a housing market driver for the young family demographic is the quality of schools. Unfortunately, east side school districts do not score as well as West Madison, Middleton, Sun Prairie, and Monona. To counteract that tendency, it is important that the near east side and Emerson East neighborhood remain attractive to young families. Otherwise, these quaint homes may become the affordable short term residential solutions for young professionals. This could create market instability with additional turnover and quicker degradation of the historic bungalows. Because of these factors and underlying anxieties, we seek a better understanding of what impact, if any, this development will have on our property values and the housing/rental market.

11-12

Recommendation 5.1: *A Housing and Rental Market impact study completed to provide the neighbors with information on the economic impact this development will have on the neighborhood and property/rental values. Other developers have engaged research firms like Pitney Bowes to provide market impact analyses. We feel it would ease anxieties of neighbors concerned about the impact to property values.*

ISSUE #6 – Stormwater management

Although this property is not considered within a floodplain, a number of neighbors experience flooding issues within 1-3 blocks of the proposed development. MDC has indicated that they have a stormwater management plan, but we would like the city, or an independent entity, complete a study or verify the proposed stormwater management plan.

Recommendation 6.1: *A stormwater management study be completed and validated by an independent party to re-assure neighbors that this development won't exaggerate current flooding issues.*

ISSUE #7 – Neighborhood Plan & Planning Process

This site is not included as a focus area in the neighborhood plan, because it was not seen as a plot that needed development. Focus areas are plots that are seen to have potential for development and more importantly need attention. While city project future density increases, this site is at a density level that meets the criteria of our most recent neighborhood plan.

Neighbors, specifically ones that contributed, are concerned that the neighborhood planning process is being circumvented. Even if that perception exists it could devalue the neighborhood planning process which allows for democratic representation in city planning. The residents that make up the neighborhood are the subject matter experts and provide critical qualitative data to assist decision makers. Not valuing this process and input could have profound impacts on the city's ability to make evidence based decisions. In addition, many of the neighbors who have learned of this project have been very active, but have found it to be difficult and stressful to keep up with MDC's aggressive schedule and significant design changes.

The neighbors along with the city agree that the environment is a priority. Most new buildings across the county meet basic Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) building requirements. We want to make sure that Madison remains progressive in the areas of energy efficiency and green building.

Recommendation 7.1: *Provide an environmental analysis of the building and/or seek to obtain a LEED green building certification*

ISSUE #8 - Displacement and Relocation of Current Tenants

The new proposed design requires the demolition of a building currently occupied by MDC tenants. This will require tenants to be relocated. The residents of the Avenue and the building being demolished are our neighbors and we want to make sure that they are treated respectfully, humanely, and do not suffer an undue financial burden as they are forced to relocate. We feel it is only right for the developer to provide a detailed transition plan in advance of approving this design.

Recommendation 8.1: We request that MDC provide a relocation and transition plan for the impacted tenants with details including but not limited to: the amount of notification, where they would be moved, and who will incur the moving expenses.

Additional recommendations:

A landscaping plan which encompasses the entire property edge to edge with special focus on landscaping which contributes to the privacy of both property residents and the adjacent neighborhood. With the site being a historical site, there are many "heritage trees" that are invaluable to the neighborhood. We ask that the developer maintain these trees.

A privacy fence between the walkout patio units adjacent to the backyards of East Washington residents

The community room and adjoining outdoor space be moved to an area of the building not directly adjacent to the east Washington residents' private backyards. The current location of the community space will create noise and privacy concerns being adjacent to the east Washington neighbors' backyards.

Alternative Idea for Consideration by MDC and the city

If the city and common council believe the proposed project is in the best interest of the neighborhood, we offer a creative alternative solution. Since the residential units would be at the maximum allowed per zoning code, once the Options for Independence Site is demolished, we would ask the developer to consider expanding the current Grasskamp park to Second Street and sell/donate that greenspace to the city and made an official public city park. This would allow a compromise with the neighborhood while allowing the 120+ new tenants adequate green space to better support the added density. This would help the city meet its goal of increasing greenspace and parkland while allowing MDC to reduce maintenance resources needed for upkeep of the current private park.

From: Jax Broom [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 8:18 AM
To: Glaeser, Janine
Subject: Proposed 44-unit


Hello! Good! Morning my name is jeff b. 1954 East Washington ave #15 I've lived in my apartment a little over a year now it has been really great! However when i heard of the new 44 unit it just made my day! something like this would be a welcome in my eyes it's a facelift for the neighborhood being that a lot of new business and buildings are being built it brings something fresh to Madison!

These photos help depict how a 4 story structure will tower over the neighbor's homes and backyards. They also show how much green space will be lost by adding a building with such a large footprint.

These are the five homes directly to the west of the proposed development. Clearly a 4 story building is out of place.



Green space and the tree that will be lost.




These photos help show the proportion of the proposed building and the green space that would be lost at the development site.



This photo was taken from the backyard of a home mid-block on East Washington looking towards the proposed development site.



With the proposed development the neighbors will no longer have privacy in their backyards. And instead of seeing sky and a beautiful old growth tree they will see nothing but a wall of building.



Urban Design Commission
City of Madison
126 S. Hamilton St
Madison, WI 53703

RE: The Avenue 1954 E. Washington Development Proposal - 52598

February 24, 2019

Dear Urban Design Commission:

In advance of the Urban Design Commission Meeting scheduled for February 27th, 2019, we, a collective of 21 nearby residents, would like to provide formal written comment for your consideration on The Avenue 1954 E. Washington Development Proposal.

Enclosed/attached with this letter is a document outlining a number of shared concerns with the most recent proposal which was presented to neighbors on January 9th, 2019. Throughout multiple iterations of this development, the neighbors and residents listed below have engaged in the process and expressed concerns, ideas, and recommendations during available forums with the developer, Madison Development Corp.

We appreciate the opportunity to collaborate and provide feedback in this process. We appreciate the efforts of the architects, Knothe and Bruce, to try to address design concerns. Unfortunately, we still have significant concerns. Some concerns are new, a result of the significant redesign of the latest iteration, yet some concerns have remained consistent throughout our engagement. Since this new proposal was moved forward by the developer despite our concerns, we present the attached for the independent consideration of the UDC.

We acknowledge that not every issue or recommendation listed may be in scope or actionable by the UDC; regardless, we prefer to provide this feedback at this time for formal public record. As subject matter experts of the neighborhood and site, it is our duty to provide our qualitative perspective to ensure the committee has the information required to ensure decisions are evidence based and support the long term success of the city and its hallmark neighborhoods.

Lastly, as neighbors, we seek transparency, communication, collaboration, and empathetic consideration. Going forward, if these principles are valued, we are optimistic we can come to a solution that is a win-win for the neighborhood and the developer.

Sincerely,

Chris Sell on behalf of a collective of 21 concerned neighbors (listed on Page 2)

11-12

Neighbor	Address	Email
Christopher Sell	1934 E. Washington Ave.	sellfactor@gmail.com
Natasha Fahey-Flynn	1934 E. Washington Ave.	natashacff@gmail.com
Sheri Rein	21 N. Second St.	szrein@gmail.com
Charlie Rein	21 N. Second St.	Crein42@gmail.com
Tess Camacho	102 N. Second St.	tesscamacho@rocketmail.com
Dawn Sabin	1930 E. Washington Ave	dawnwalkersemail@yahoo.com
Ben Sabin	1930 E. Washington Ave.	Benjamin3137@hotmail.com
Abby Bailey	29 N. Second St.	Mabby32@yahoo.com
Rich Zietko	1944 E. Washington Ave.	rziejko@yahoo.com
Andrea Zietko	1944 E. Washington Ave.	avziejko@yahoo.com
Katie Kane	1938 E. Washington Ave.	katiekanep@gmail.com
Bart Klaas	1940 E. Washington Ave.	Bjklas@gmail.com
Jessica Wheeler	29 N. Second St.	Jesswheeler35@yahoo.com
Ed Feeny	2030 Carey Ct.	efeeny@tds.net
Suzy Grindrod	2030 Carey Ct.	sjgrindrod@icloud.com
Willy & Jane Schomaker	13 N. Second St.	Willyschomaker@sbcglobal.net
Dario Tesmer	1934 E. Mifflin St.	dtesmer@hotmail.com
Jenny and Joe Sweeney	2024 E. Mifflin St.	jennylmsweeney@gmail.com
Sara Hinkel	2026 E. Mifflin St.	sarahinkel@sbcglobal.net

The Avenue Project - Stakeholder Concerns and Recommendations

ISSUE #1: Size and Height of the Proposed Building

Recommendation 1.1: We recommend that the building be reduced by one story equating to a 3 story building with the 3rd story stepback.

Recommendation 1.2 We have recently learned that the developer may have completed a shade study, and we would request additional time to review the results of that study and anticipate impacts to our properties and the neighborhood.

Recommendation 1.3 We recommend the developer address the significant, newly created privacy concerns resulting from the new proposal.

ISSUE #2: Parking

Recommendation 2.1: Parking be offered to tenants as part of their rent

Recommendation 2.2: Provide the neighbors the time to review a parking study

Recommendation 2.3: An accessibility analysis be completed and allow the neighbors and opportunity to review

ISSUE #3: Traffic

Recommendation 3.1: A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and traffic counts on Mifflin St. from First to Fourth Street be shared with the neighbors and allowed time to review and comment. We ask the city to supplement this study with qualitative data such as focus groups or surveys with residents in this area. Engaging the stakeholders would create good faith with the neighborhood and may result in creative solutions.

ISSUE #4: Pedestrian Safety

Recommendation 4.1: We recommend a safety analysis be completed and shared with neighbors to review options to allow pedestrians to safely cross at Second St. and E. Washington Ave.

Recommendation 4.2: MDC and the neighbors partner to identify long term risk mitigation strategies. For example, the addition of a traffic light or pedestrian bridge would be large scale strategies that we realize would not be responsibility of the developer, so we, as neighbors, would welcome the opportunity to partner with MDC in lobbying the city to implement large scale safety measures.

ISSUE #5 – Market Instability & Property Values

Recommendation 5.1: A Housing and Rental Market impact study completed to provide the neighbors with information on the economic impact this development will have on the neighborhood and property/rental values. Other developers have engaged research firms like Pitney Bowes to provide market impact analyses. We feel it would ease anxieties of neighbors concerned about the impact to property values.

ISSUE #6 – Stormwater management

Recommendation 6.1: A stormwater management study be completed and validated by an independent party to re-assure neighbors that this development won't exaggerate current flooding issues.

ISSUE #7 – Neighborhood Plan & Planning Process

Recommendation 7.1: Provide an environmental analysis of the building and/or seek to obtain a LEED green building certification

ISSUE #8 - Displacement and Relocation of Current Tenants

Recommendation 8.1: We request that MDC provide a relocation and transition plan for the impacted tenants with details including but not limited to: the amount of notification, where they would be moved, and who will incur the moving expenses.

Additional recommendations:

A landscaping plan which encompasses the entire property edge to edge with special focus on landscaping which contributes to the privacy of both property residents and the adjacent neighborhood. With the site being a historical site, there are many "heritage trees" that are invaluable to the neighborhood. We ask that the developer maintain these trees.

A privacy fence between the walkout patio units adjacent to the backyards of East Washington residents

The community room and adjoining outdoor space be moved to an area of the building not directly adjacent to the east Washington residents' private backyards. The current location of the community space will create noise and privacy concerns being adjacent to the east Washington neighbors' backyards.

Alternative Idea for Consideration by MDC and the city

If the city and common council believe the proposed project is in the best interest of the neighborhood, we offer a creative alternative solution. Since the residential units would be at the maximum allowed per zoning code, once the Options for Independence Site is demolished, we would ask the developer to consider expanding the current Grasskamp park to Second Street and sell/donate that greenspace to the city and made an official public city park. This would allow a compromise with the neighborhood while allowing the 120+ new tenants adequate green space to better support the added density. This would help the city meet its goal of increasing greenspace and parkland while allowing MDC to reduce maintenance resources needed for upkeep of the current private park.

Natasha Fahey-Flynn
1934 E Washington Ave
Madison WI 53703

February 27, 2019

Madison Urban Design Committee
Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd Ste 017
Madison WI 53703

RE: Public Comment - Strongly Oppose MDC Development of The Avenues

Dear Urban Design Committee Members:

My husband bought our house in 2008. We have owned and occupied the house since it was purchased. We are about to expand our family, we are having another baby in September. We will then have two small children, two years old and younger. Adding 44 units and a 4-story building three houses down from ours, does not encourage us to stay in our neighborhood. In fact, I'm feeling as if we are getting pushed out of one of the last affordable neighborhoods on the Isthmus.

- My number one objection is the size of the building. 4 stories in a neighborhood of bungalows is absurd – those units will overlook my backyard, taking away any sense of privacy we once had. Offering each unit a balcony to overlook my backyard is not a selling point to me. This development will dwarf our neighborhood and our homes.
- The huge influx of people/units and the concerns this creates for neighbors has not been adequately addressed.
- How does MDC plan to unify The Avenues campus???
- I believe it is a conflict of interest and inappropriate for MDC to solicit support for their project from their own tenants.
- It is irrelevant that MDC board members support the project, their letters of support are in poor taste since they don't reside in the neighborhood and one would gather, they are already in support as they serve on the MDC board – I too could have asked my friends and family to write letters saying they do not support the development. My parents would have happily obliged.
- In multiple letters of support for the project the neighborhood is villainized, and it's made to seem that we object to more residence, diversity and or affordable housing, which could not be further from the truth. I'm a proud resident of Emerson East, we have one of the most diverse schools in the district, East High School, in OUR neighborhood. I know personally we have LGBTQ families, families of different ethnicities and socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as multiple generations represented in the neighborhood.


Please feel free to contact me with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Natasha C. Fahey-Flynn

11-12



21-12

From: Rich Zietko <rzietko@yahoo.com>

Date: March 8, 2019 at 8:27:15 AM EST

Subject: Proposed Development of 1954 E. Washington Ave.

Dear Committee Members:

Having previously worked for 14 years w/ Porchlight Inc, I know affordable housing. Having lived at 1944 E. Washington for 12 years and at 1906 for the preceding 4 years, I know my neighborhood. The proposal for 1954 E. Washington really does little to improve both these areas.

As section 42 is based upon median incomes, its "affordability" is derived from earnings of which are prone to reflect outliers of higher incomes and the fair housing rates also reflect the influx of more affluent citizens. Based upon 2016 Dane County Median Incomes, this translates into someone making between \$14.13 - \$16.96/hr. In contrast, a person receiving \$1,500 in SSDI, comes to about \$8.62/hr. This disparity reflects that the population most vulnerable and most needing of housing, are faced w/ unobtainable housing.

Since there is a shortage of subsidized housing (section 8) as evidenced by long waitlists, the focus should be on providing housing for the already struggling long term residents of Madison - not importing new residents coming to Madison to often work in the food/beverage service industry (of which I myself did in the years of high school and college).

Smaller developments that are section 8 will help our most vulnerable assimilate into neighborhoods rather than creating divisions in already existing neighborhoods. As such, the EENA neighborhood is already being overrun w/ new tenants from Marling to Union Corners (which bookend our neighborhood). As of now, EENA is an oasis of small homes for owners and renters alike.

I mention these concerns to the planning/zoning committee because I have heard the reps from MDC crow about their affordable housing at times when it appears out of context (UDC mtg). When I inquired about such things as support services to help tenants succeed as renters or bus passes to address traffic concerns, I was told rather bluntly "NO!" Additionally requests for a more environmentally friendly LEED design was dismissed as "too expensive". I guess my questions must have angered MDC as being the adjacent property, we did not receive any of the postcards announcing mtg dates to discuss this proposal.

Is this an organization that is really concerned w/ the neighborhood?

If it were, a two story design of section 8 housing w/ services and eco-friendly design would be the plan.

So please do not change the land use of LMR (low medium residential) by re-zoning to accommodate a building that simply does not fit (in so many ways) into our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Rich Zietko

1944 E. Washington Ave

PS: I also have concerns over air quality (I have asthma) if an already existing building built in the 80's and appearing well is torn down and am concerned about the effects of construction a mere 15 feet from the foundation of my home which dates to the 1890s.