

**From:** david snook <[tontoadam@yahoo.com](mailto:tontoadam@yahoo.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 18, 2020 7:23:06 PM

**To:** Stouder, Heather

**Cc:** Tao, Yang; Evers, Tag

**Subject:** 1224 South Park St-

Please consider first floor retail, especially a good quality hamburger restaurant - possibly with an outdoor dining space. Taking some of the parking would enable this.

Harry D Snook  
1014 Lowell St  
53715

On the 1224 S. Park St. development proposed by Joe Krupp.

**The Good:**

- \* Madison housing stock increased
- \* Urban density increased
- \* Access to major bus line and future Bus Rapid Transit increased
- \* Ugly single-story strip mall replaced

**The Could Be Improved:**

- \* Decreased commercial space: Neighborhood and Madison needs current commercial properties replaced.
- \* Overreliance on cars in Transit Oriented Development area: Development should provide *some* tenants ability to rely on current transit and future BRT without requiring *all* tenants to pay for a parking space. The parking place to apartment ratio favors car ownership, preventing additional apartments and storage from replacing some designated parking, raising the cost of living there.
- \* Weak integration with rear of 1224 S. Park: the new SSM created High St. pocket park and future High St. pedestrian/bike way, back street parking.

**The Easy Fix:**

Replace 8 tenant-only, Park St. level, parking spaces by extending the Park St facing commercial space into the building's south west/High St. corner.

**Explanation:**

Current commercial space is almost 14,000 SF: Krupp's proposal is only just over 4,000 SF. The previous, city approved, 2019 Sara Investments plan *increased* commercial space with two stories for offices: the first-floor plan alone was more than double the commercial space Krupp is proposing.

Many tenants and neighbors want urban, pedestrian accessible, amenities on the first floor -- such as new restaurants to replace the ones closed. (Post covid will increase demand for restaurants.)

The developer currently proposes a greater than one to one ratio of parking spaces to apartments. (There are 7 tenant-only parking spaces beyond the number of apartments.) The commercial space can be expanded and still permit every apartment a parking space. The commercial space rental value will actually be greater than the tenant-only parking spaces rental value.

**The Slightly Harder Fix:**

Reduce tenant-only, Park St. entrance level, parking spaces further with more commercial space and/or additional High St. facing apartments.

Leave just the 47, High St. accessed, tenant-only parking spaces for proposed 69 apartments. Still plenty of parking: the apartment will attract tenants choosing to live close to downtown, on a major bus line (and future BRT), next to future High St. bicycle/pedestrian trails and pocket park, one block from a grocery store, who do not need, or necessarily want to pay extra rent for a

dedicated parking space. The apartments without a designated parking place will rent for slightly less and be slightly more affordable. As noted, the additional apartments or commercial space rental income will more than offset the loss of parking place rental income.

**Additional benefits of reduced parking:**

Reducing parking entering from Park St. will increase pedestrian safety (e.g. when walking to the grocery store) by cutting down the number of cars crossing the Park St. sidewalk.

**Compromise:** turn at least 8 of the Park St. entrance parking spaces into tenant storage space: these could be “caged” storage spaces.

**Rear access change regardless:**

Whether or not 1224 S. Park has expanded commercial property or reduced designated parking places, providing a High St. rear external entrance (i.e. not an access through the tenant-only garage) for pedestrians, bicyclists, and street parked cars will increase connectivity and access to commercial property and Park St. Tenant guests will more easily park behind the building rather further away across busy Park St.

**Conclusion:**

I am thankful that Joe Krupp will increase the housing stock by replacing the current 1960s style strip mall, but the development can look further ahead to a more urban, greener, pedestrian and Transit Oriented Development designed for more people and fewer cars, for more commercial property and apartments, and less parking. Good urban density prioritizes development over parking and that is what the neighborhood and Madison need on Park St.

Thank you for reading my thoughts on the development,

I live on Emerson St. a block and a half from 1224 S Park St.

Stanley Rubio Jackson

**From:** Allen Arntsen <[allenarntsen@gmail.com](mailto:allenarntsen@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:16 AM

**To:** Stouder, Heather <[HStouder@cityofmadison.com](mailto:HStouder@cityofmadison.com)>

**Cc:** Evers, Tag <[district13@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district13@cityofmadison.com)>; Tao, Yang <[YTao@cityofmadison.com](mailto:YTao@cityofmadison.com)>

**Subject:** 1224 South Park

Greetings. I support the application for approval of a proposed five story mixed use building at 1224 South Park Street, which is around four blocks from my home. The proposed building replaces an obsolete strip mall in the Wingra Triangle, and neither impinges on a residential neighborhood nor displaces any existing housing. This is a good location for residential density, as it has excellent bus service (and is on a proposed BRT route), and is near the health care employers along Park Street. It also has reasonable nearby green space (Wingra Creek and arboretum) and excellent school access (Franklin and Wright). It is a short walk to the proposed new southside grocery store at Truman Olson.

Five stories is an appropriate height in the Wingra Triangle. The proposed setback is a reasonable way to address the building mass. The commercial space appears to be consistent with market demand and existing vacancies. The parking appears to be reasonable given available alternate transportation options, and the unlikelihood that overflow parkers will choose to park on the other side of (and then walk across) Park Street.

This project should be a net positive for housing affordability. The target is workforce housing, which seems reasonable given nearby health care employers and good transit access. No existing housing is being displaced. And basic market principles indicate that adding to the housing stock will promote affordability, access to housing, and contribute to the range of housing options in south Madison.

I urge the Plan Commission to approve this project and appreciate your forwarding this email to the Commission.

Allen Arntsen  
821 South Shore Drive

On the 1224 S. Park St. development proposed by Joe Krupp.

**The Good:**

- \* Madison housing stock increased
- \* Urban density increased
- \* Access to major bus line and future Bus Rapid Transit increased
- \* Ugly single-story strip mall replaced

**The Could Be Improved:**

- \* Decreased commercial space: Neighborhood and Madison needs current commercial properties replaced.
- \* Overreliance on cars in Transit Oriented Development area: Development should provide *some* tenants ability to rely on current transit and future BRT without requiring *all* tenants to pay for a parking space. The parking place to apartment ratio favors car ownership, preventing additional apartments and storage from replacing some designated parking, raising the cost of living there.
- \* Weak integration with rear of 1224 S. Park: the new SSM created High St. pocket park and future High St. pedestrian/bike way, back street parking.

**The Easy Fix:**

Replace 8 tenant-only, Park St. level, parking spaces by extending the Park St facing commercial space into the building's south west/High St. corner.

**Explanation:**

Current commercial space is almost 14,000 SF: Krupp's proposal is only just over 4,000 SF. The previous, city approved, 2019 Sara Investments plan *increased* commercial space with two stories for offices: the first-floor plan alone was more than double the commercial space Krupp is proposing.

Many tenants and neighbors want urban, pedestrian accessible, amenities on the first floor -- such as new restaurants to replace the ones closed. (Post covid will increase demand for restaurants.)

The developer currently proposes a greater than one to one ratio of parking spaces to apartments. (There are 7 tenant-only parking spaces beyond the number of apartments.) The commercial space can be expanded and still permit every apartment a parking space. The commercial space rental value will actually be greater than the tenant-only parking spaces rental value.

**The Slightly Harder Fix:**

Reduce tenant-only, Park St. entrance level, parking spaces further with more commercial space and/or additional High St. facing apartments.

Leave just the 47, High St. accessed, tenant-only parking spaces for proposed 69 apartments. Still plenty of parking: the apartment will attract tenants choosing to live close to downtown, on a major bus line (and future BRT), next to future High St. bicycle/pedestrian trails and pocket park, one block from a grocery store, who do not need, or necessarily want to pay extra rent for a

dedicated parking space. The apartments without a designated parking place will rent for slightly less and be slightly more affordable. As noted, the additional apartments or commercial space rental income will more than offset the loss of parking place rental income.

**Additional benefits of reduced parking:**

Reducing parking entering from Park St. will increase pedestrian safety (e.g. when walking to the grocery store) by cutting down the number of cars crossing the Park St. sidewalk.

**Compromise:** turn at least 8 of the Park St. entrance parking spaces into tenant storage space: these could be “caged” storage spaces.

**Rear access change regardless:**

Whether or not 1224 S. Park has expanded commercial property or reduced designated parking places, providing a High St. rear external entrance (i.e. not an access through the tenant-only garage) for pedestrians, bicyclists, and street parked cars will increase connectivity and access to commercial property and Park St. Tenant guests will more easily park behind the building rather further away across busy Park St.

**Conclusion:**

I am thankful that Joe Krupp will increase the housing stock by replacing the current 1960s style strip mall, but the development can look further ahead to a more urban, greener, pedestrian and Transit Oriented Development designed for more people and fewer cars, for more commercial property and apartments, and less parking. Good urban density prioritizes development over parking and that is what the neighborhood and Madison need on Park St.

Thank you for reading my thoughts on the development,

I live on Emerson St. a block and a half from 1224 S Park St.

Stanley Rubio Jackson

To: Plan Commission, Alder Tag Evers

From: Lisie Kitchel, Carrie Rothburd, Janelle Munns, Jody Clowes, Charlene Munns, Maia Pearson, Ms. Pia, Dave Davis, Cindy McCollum, Steve Davis

Re: 1224 S. Park Street proposed development

Date: November 18, 2020

---

- 1) In keeping with the specifications of the UDD guidelines the proposed building for 1224 S. Park should be no more than 4 stories in height, original designs indicated a 4-5 story building.. As per the UDD guidelines it also should enhance the appearance of and promote a pedestrian-friendly South Park Street. More pedestrian friendly amenities should be added.
- 2) The slightly greater than 1:1 housing unit to parking stall ratio of the developer's original design for 1224 should be retained. The developer has indicated he could do so, and we support that decision. Parking stalls should not be converted to storage units for tenants or to additional retail space, until and unless surplus stalls prove available over time. The 1:1 ratio will ensure enough parking for both retail customers and tenants and prevent spill-over parking into a community already burdened by spillover parking from other developments along South Park. Preventing spillover parking along residential streets is in keeping with neighbors' concerns, as expressed at multiple community meetings over the past 5 years.
- 3) A unit mix that focuses on 2- and 3-bedroom apartments should be encouraged rather than studios and one bedrooms currently proposed. The latter does not reflect the housing needs of the current South Madison community, which is being pushed out of South Madison for lack of affordable and appropriate housing stock.
- 4) Building entrance and egress for automobiles should ensure safety along Park Street. The Spruce Street median should be maintained at all costs.
- 5) Affordable rents should be pursued for as many housing units as possible by the developer to make the building affordable to current South Madison residents. The developer has indicated a certain percentage of units could be affordable and we support this decision. Likewise, rents for retail space should be designed to retain existing South Madison businesses. Affordable rents are desperately needed and will help thwart the gentrification of S. Park and of South Madison, encourage community wealth-building, and avoid more vacant retail space. We also encourage the businesses that were previously at the site be invited to return. These businesses were considered an integral part of the community.

**From:** [Peggy ROSIN](#)  
**To:** [Plan Commission Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Plan Commission November 23, 2020 Item: #62316 1224 South Park Street  
**Date:** Monday, November 23, 2020 7:56:50 AM

---

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

November 22, 2020

To: Plan Commission Item: #62316 1224 South Park Street

Dear Plan Commission:

Thank you for your efforts in working toward Madison's sustainability goals. The proposed project to construct a five-story mixed-use building with 4000 square feet of commercial space and 62 apartment units has some positive aspects: 1) major corridor with public transportation at its door; 2) excellent location to add population density, 3) replaces an outdated strip mall, 4) adds outdoor space for tenants with a second floor plaza, 5) adds landscaping and trees around building, 6) includes commercial space (although a tenant is not identified), and 7) offers studio, and 1 and 2-bedroom options to renters. The built environment is responsible for 39% of carbon dioxide emissions according to the *US Green Building Council*. However, my review of the project finds that little is proposed to mitigate carbon emissions. I am not an expert but a concerned citizen wondering how to encourage proposals that specifically state how they are building greener?

I understand that the Plan Commission needs to approve projects that meet the conditional use standards/ordinances. However, it seems we need to question how Madison's built environment can better be inline with our aspirations for a greener Madison. The *American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy* published their City Clean Energy Scorecard last month and Madison was 64th falling well behind other midwest cities. We need to do better. Can we ask:

Has the proposed mixed-use building proposal made any attempt to address sustainability?

Are there any carbon reduction strategies proposed e.g., solar panels, or solar-ready roof, high energy appliances? I do not see this in the proposal.

Do the number of parking spaces requested promote multimodal transportation? Park Street is a major thoroughfare serviced by Madison Metro.

How does the project promote connections to bike paths and linking to neighborhood green spaces?



Can EV charging stations to promote EV be included?

I respect the work you do for Madison. Thank you.

Peggy Rosin

1515 Vilas Avenue

Member, 350 Madison

[peggy.rosin@wisc.edu](mailto:peggy.rosin@wisc.edu)