

**From:** [T Christopher Hacker](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Foster, Grant](#)  
**Subject:** Amended CGR Proposal Feedback - 10/5/20 PC Meeting  
**Date:** Sunday, October 4, 2020 9:40:20 AM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To whom this concerns,

In consideration of the cottage grove rd redevelopment proposal.

My Lake Edge Neighborhood family is concerned with the lack of walkable and affordable commercial space and neighborhood amenity as designed in the proposal.

#### LIVE WORK SPACE

Our fear is that the builder/developer has created “live/work” space to trick the community and committee into believing that people and families will be enjoying some vibrant array of shops.

In truth, those square footages & their awkward accessibility will not provide the space nor functionality for most businesses, and especially not for walk up, walk-in type business that could handle 2 neighborhood’s worth of activity.

#### ACTIVITY/FITNESS CENTER

The “activities center” is not a draw to the community unless run by a local business. If it is in reality an “open to the public” fitness center for the building, it is likely some weights and a few treadmills ultimately designed as a draw to families from within the building. The expectation this will serve our community is far fetched, especially considering there’s an affordable Ymca a block down the road which exists as a real activities center, w/ community outreach, family care, one which maintains a daily schedule of programming for all ages and abilities.

#### IN GENERAL

We need the infill of affordable housing in our city and this is a perfect place. But we also need the foresight to consider how we LIVE in the areas of housing we create. This plan seems to go against every “vision” I’ve seen from any planning committee.

If we had our wish, we’d see a Trader Joe’s or some other walkable grocery. This would provide a daily use destination, it would serve neighborhoods and the building and provide then considerable foot traffic for other businesses to thrive. These plans don’t provide space for any real anchoring business now or in the future.

The Anchor business CANNOT be but 1 food fight restaurant with nothing else around. And as is clear, a library amidst and pandemic and soaring rent might also not make a good enough anchor.

It is inequitable and against our plans for universal accessibility, (and frankly a disaster and mockery of your consideration), to believe a developer when they tell you people don’t want to walk to accomplish their errands anymore. You are the gate keepers of your children’s futures in this city.

The argument I heard was that there is not want nor density to support commercial spaces. But we’ve had both here for decades. And if it were “density first”,... what then? You’ve designed in the density with nowhere for commercial life support. Another big block desert .

A builder is only ever going to build the building, one they can sell easily. We ask you to build the city, and keep the vision intact doing it.

It's our hope that we do not approve this scope as is revised, without additional revision to create considerably more affordable commercial space.

Thank you and be well!

Chris Hacker  
100 Davies Street  
Lake Edge, Madison, WI 53716

**From:** [Suzanne Harp](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Foster, Grant](#)  
**Subject:** Amended CGR Proposal Feedback - 10/5/20 PC Meeting  
**Date:** Saturday, October 3, 2020 10:18:32 AM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello!

I am apposed to this new proposal. We already have a fitness center within a three block walking distance to the proposed new site. We don't need another one! What we NEED is a hardware store.

Thanks for considering my opinion...

*Suzanne Harp  
Artist-Maker  
Pronouns: She/Her  
303 E Dean Ave  
Madison*

**From:** [Kathy Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Cottage Grove redesign of development proposal  
**Date:** Saturday, October 3, 2020 11:25:00 AM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I started a nonprofit in 2015, the goal of which was to provide a gallery and studio space for individuals who are disadvantaged, like those with disabilities, foster kids and people without the income to support themselves. I paid for supplies and then sold the artist's creations, returning 70% to the artist. Sadly, I could not afford the rent in a building with bus service to continue the gallery/studio. Neighborhoods need space for these types of activities. After school classes, a place to bring the family, the materials to be creative, a place to earn extra money. I agree with Alder Foster that the neighborhoods in this area do not need more high end rentals that exclude the very people who built these neighborhoods. I have lived in Lake Edge for 38years and do not understand why I should have to move to live and work in the same area. Nor why others who already live here must "deal" with the invasion of greed into our neighborhoods. Think INCLUSION instead of exclusion. Diversity makes us stronger but it must be meaningful diversity.

Thank you,  
Kathleen Johnson

**From:** [Pat Malcolm](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Foster, Grant](#)  
**Subject:** Amended CGR Proposal Feedback - 10/5/20 PC Meeting  
**Date:** Sunday, October 4, 2020 11:10:09 PM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Members of the Planning Commission

Re: 209 Cottage Grove Rd Redevelopment Proposal  
Agenda Items 7-10

Please accept my comments in opposition to reconsideration of this project, and if reconsidered, in objection to rezoning, demolition and construction of the project.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->Zoning—Maintain Neighborhood Mixed Use to keep this a neighborhood with supportive services. This use make the most sense given the traffic congestion already experienced at the existing traffic light. It would also best help foster the smaller businesses and housing mix the neighborhood needs. It also recognizes that development needs to rely upon the retail-housing mix appropriate for this area of small lot sizes for development.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->Transportation and Parking—The proposed development is intended as an all-commuter building whose residents will rely on their vehicles. It includes a single two-level underground parking garage offering a single space per unit and fewer than 40 outside parking spaces. There is a single point of egress from the underground parking garage, which can be anticipated to send a high volume of traffic directly into what is already a rush hour nightmare within the first block from the light. The only thing that makes current daytime traffic in the area bearable is the use of dedicated right and left turn signals at each of the three corners, but with wait times increasing considerably it is only to be expected that local streets will bear more of the burden than they are designed for. These streets will certainly also be required to absorb overflow parking for 2-car apartments and visitors, and they are hardly suited to do so. This is a quiet neighborhood of narrow streets and tiny lots

too small even for the addition of sidewalks. Since no alternate modes of transportation are considered useful by this proposal, I will offer no comment, but in general without transit development this neighborhood cannot bear much density.

3. **Building Size**—This development fills up the available lot size, which is small, and rather than making the most of the space it pushes the limits by going up. Given the close proximity to the small apartment buildings to the south, four stories are far too tall, especially for the garden apartments at ground level. Ideally setbacks would be comprised of a four-story fronting the road with a three-story behind, but the lot is too narrow. There is proposed a single four-story height with just a 13'8" setback to the south away from the road. Those small buildings will live in shade.

4. **Lack of Retail**—This was a major sticking point in the original proposal, and while this revision provides what are being called work live spaces, pardon my skepticism. Even if every one of the designated spaces resulted in a business use, as long as the use would depend on the developer's good will as opposed to strictly financial considerations—say, the first available renter—I believe space labeled flexible would soon become residential. I also question what provisions would be made up front, during development, to ensure ADA access to these spaces should they be used for business purposes, since the building lot rests above the sidewalk and each unit would be accessed by a flight of stairs. Are there enough handicapped parking spaces? I believe I saw just 2 in surface parking for each of the two buildings in the development.

Madison has always been known first for its quality of life, and the City Plan and neighborhood plans seem to reflect that this is still a priority. Certainly there is a place for development of buildings of this size, and larger, but the Plans make abundantly clear that incremental building sizes are what make for good neighborhoods. A transportation mix is a big part of the equation as well, and vital if we recognize the limitations of a city constrained by a central isthmus and all those lakes, wetlands and streams. Good planning is one part of

managing growth, but if Madison is expected to grow as quickly as I hear is projected the key will be to follow the Plan. Keep smaller lots in neighborhoods like mine small to encourage mixed housing and more small housing entrepreneurs. Please don't go from tiny houses to apartments that tower over them, plowing under neighborhood businesses along the way.

Thank you.

A. Pat Malcolm

206 Davidson St., Apt. 2  
Madison

Pmalcpoet@gmail.com

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Melanie Sard](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#); [Foster, Grant](#)  
**Subject:** CGR redevelopment proposal  
**Date:** Sunday, October 4, 2020 1:51:37 PM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi, I'd like to share my opinions about the developmental proposal at Cottage Grove & Monona drive. As a resident of this neighborhood, I support new development of this space to meet Madison's growing housing needs. However, I agree with Alder Foster that the proposal as it stands does not promote a truly mixed use neighborhood with a mix of housing types. I am glad about the additional commercial space and coworking/fitness area, but again I agree that these are not necessarily going to be sufficient to integrate this space into the neighborhood. I would like to see the affordability of both the commercial space, and the housing units, be prioritized as this plan moves forward.

Sincerely,  
Melanie Sard  
4029 Rockwell Dr  
Madison WI 53714



**From:** [Yvonne Subak](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Cottage Grove Project  
**Date:** Saturday, October 3, 2020 10:18:34 AM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi, the project should have very little commercial space, with the empty space across the street, and down the street, need to be filled . We also should support businesses that are already open, we do not need more retail space, it makes zero sense, since this is not how people shop now are going forward, thank you, Doug

Doug Subak

608-359-1053

Doug.Subak@kellogg.com

Kellogg Sales Representative

" Game Changer"