To: Urban Design Commission, Alder Tag Evers

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

Re: Clarification regarding memo sent Oct 30, 2020 about 1224 S. Park Street

Date: November 16, 2020

We have learned that the memo sent October 30, 2020 regarding 1224 South Park Street was interpreted by Urban Design commissioners as an official correspondence from Bay Creek Neighborhood Association (BCNA).

We are writing to clarify that this was not the case. The memo was sent, as stated in its first paragraph, from a group consisting of "members of BCNA's Planning and Economic Development Committee and members of South Madison Unite! " The reason we did not put names to the memo is that we did not have the time to circulate it among all of us for signing, as is our practice.

The perspectives we included in the memo and also communicated to the developer during two conversations we had with him about 1224 South Park prior to October 30th were not intended as inclusive of all viewpoints. We were aiming to convey the primary concerns we have heard expressed repeatedly by individuals we have canvassed and during meetings that have taken place in South Madison about multiple South Park Street developments. We understand that some Bay Creek neighbors have stood up to disagree with these concerns.

We regret the confusion our memo may have caused. Thank-you for your time and consideration.

To: Urban Design Commission From: P&ED/BCNA and South Madison Unite! Re: 1224 S. Park Street proposed development Date: October 30, 2020

A group of neighbors representing South Madison neighborhoods, including members of BCNA's Planning and Economic Development Committee from Bay Creek and members of South Madison Unite! from Burr Oaks, Bram's Addition, and Capital View Heights, met on two occasions with Joe Krupp and Kevin Burow. Here is a summary of the points they made about the proposed 1224 South Park Street.

Points 1, 2, and 3 fall particularly within the purview of UDC design concerns; the remaining two points, although not as directly related, have an impact on the overall design concept of the building and so are included here.

1) The proposed building for 1224 S. Park should be no more than 4 stories in height, in keeping with the specifications of UDD guidelines. The building does not reflect the sensibility of or integrate with the aesthetic of South Madison architecture at its finest. It does not enhance the appearance of or promote a pedestrian-friendly South Park Street, both aspirations of UDD 8 guidelines.

2) The slightly greater than 1:1 housing unit to parking stall ratio of the developer's original design for 1224 should be retained. Parking stalls should not be converted to storage units for tenants. The 1:1 ratio will ensure enough parking for both retail customers and tenants and prevent spillover parking into a community already burdened by spillover parking from other developments along South Park. An emphasis in preventing spillover parking along residential streets is in keeping with neighbors' perspectives as expressed at multiple community meetings over the past 5 years.

3) A unit mix that focuses primarily on 2- and 3-bedroom apartments should be included instead of on studios and one bedrooms. 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 increased safety along Park Street. The Spruce Street median must at all costs be maintained.

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. Likewise, rents for retail space should be designed to retain existing South Madison businesses. Affordable rents will thwart the gentrification of S. Park and of South Madison, encourage community wealth-building, and avoid more vacant retail space. In particular, arrangements should be made to invite the businesses that were, in effect, evicted from 1224 S. Park by the proposed redevelopment to return. These businesses were considered a part of the community.