

Mike Wittenwyler, property owner 99 block E. Mifflin (via email, 10 November 2017)

As a member of TLNA and property owner in the 900 block of East Mifflin, I strongly support the proposed redevelopment of the 700 block of East Johnson as proposed by Palisade Properties. Unfortunately, I had another meeting to attend last night and could not stay for the portion of the TLNA meeting when this agenda item was discussed.

Development and investment in the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood needs to be embraced and channeled into maintaining the area's existing character. The proposed mixed-use development by Palisade Properties does exactly that. The new buildings are limited to three-stories and several existing homes will be rehabbed and preserved. It will further add to the density of a downtown neighborhood in an extremely positive manner, limiting urban sprawl and development. That density leads to more amenities and less problems with the chronic inebriants. This is also a locally-owned and developed project that will be done without utilizing any TIF. It is the perfect complement to the Stone House project in the 600 block. And, most importantly, it will continue the growth of Madison's urban core along East Johnson – exactly where growth should be occurring in an urban plan.

There is a good book that came out a couple of years ago on real estate development that was written by a professor at U. of Minnesota. One take-away from it is that neighborhoods need to learn to stop saying “no” and get to “Yes, but...” With the Palisade Properties proposed re-development, the developer has taken the neighborhood concerns into account and arrived at a project that meets the “yes, but...” category. For those reasons, would urge the TLNA and City to support this timely and worthwhile investment in our community.

Kirstin Pires, 400 block N. Brearly St. (via email, 11 April 2017)

I will be at work when this meeting happens, but I want to express my dismay at the prospect of demolishing the houses in the 700 block of E Johnson. While I don't necessarily object to mixed-use buildings, once those vernacular houses are gone, there is no getting them back. The materials they are built from simply don't exist anymore, and no one is willing to pay for the correct craftsmanship. City Row is a good example--while it may sort of blend in if you don't look too close, the cheap materials and sloppy skills make me wince when I walk by. Why not demolish an eyesore like 640 E Johnson, which already doesn't belong in the neighborhood instead of destroying vernacular features that make the neighborhood the appealing place it is. 911 would also be a good candidate for demolition because it too is out of place and an eyesore.

Jonny Hunter, Forequarter and 1100 block E. Johnson St. (via email, 14 March 2017)

I want to send an email about the 700 block of Johnson. I want to say that I think it would have a really big effect on forequarter. the construction on Johnson almost put us out of business and there is still residual effects from it. The effect on parking and traffic for the business corridor would never be offset from the increased housing.

I see increased density as a positive. But more than anything, there seems to be a disconnect between the housing stock available and the conversion of houses to apartments. Its almost

impossible to buy a house in tenney lapham right now, we have an amazing school and great neighborhood and people want to be a part of that, why would we tear down houses that could be converted to single family houses and create more housing stock, we have a bunch of houses that have been abandoned by their landlords and we have people trying to buy houses and can't. I have no problem with developments for apartment but I think it's problematic when we are tearing houses that would be wanted by people trying to move into the neighborhood.

Tony Sturm, 400 block N. Few St. (via email, 13 March 2017)

As a long time Tenney neighbor and a newer homeowner I am strongly pro-project. Sure I would feel something was lost if every block of Johnson were a newer development but nothing would be lost if half the blocks were redeveloped. Vibrant neighborhoods include a variety of built projects spanning decades. Our neighborhood can be more architecturally diverse with new projects and better off.

Brian Roessler, 1000 block E. Gorham St. (via email, 13 March 2017)

Thanks for letting me know about the neighborhood involvement on 700 Block of E Johnson development. Personally I'm never in favor of any demolition of older buildings. Nor am I in favor of all the housing being built on the isthmus. I'm not against population density, but the infrastructure & the nature of the isthmus can only handle so much traffic. I appreciate the time neighbors spend working with the city & developers on this. I personally don't have time to attend meetings. I would sign a petition if available.

Corin and Matt Frost, 700 block E. Johnson Ave. (via email, 13 March 2017)

We support the development. The only character those old houses have is "neglected rental." We appreciate the work the TLNA council does to vet projects. More affordable and low income housing is important and we see the council making it a priority with all of the developments. Thank you.

Casey Garhart, 1000 block Sherman Ave., (via email to Alder Zellers, 11 March 2017)

I would like to register my opposition to the redevelopment of the 700 block of Johnson. I think it is critical to the character of our neighborhood to leave the houses that are there now, and find ways to encourage their upkeep. Tearing them down to fill the block with a large project is only in the interest of the developer.

We have a lot of development going on in this neighborhood, and replacing car lots and old dairies with more dense housing and a grocery store is good for the area. But we need a mix of housing, and we need to keep the development along Johnson St. less dense.

Tim Blindauer, 200 block N. Paterson (via email, 8 March 2017)

I have to say no to this proposal. When I walk by them, those houses look to be in good condition.

Remember what makes a neighborhood viable are the owner occupied houses and rental properties. I think this housing proposal will make the neighborhood into more of a transient population and that will bring about its own problems.

I also don't think the city has enough of an infrastructure for the neighborhood as it has increased in population. By infrastructure I do mean policing and traffic control, maintenance of the roads.

The bike boulevard not being really a bike boulevard or a street to drive on it, in my opinion.

So, I cannot support it.

Mike Barrett, former resident now property owner 900 E. Johnson block (via email to Alder Zellers, 7 March 2017)

Meanwhile, Lori's email is **exactly** the email I've been wanting to write to you about my experience as a nano-landlord. People flee the towers at the first chance they find a decently maintained old house. And so, not to brag, but I never have to show our place more than once, and that's after asking a pretty good rent. And that's **on E. Johnson no less**!

I'm not against what is happening on E. Wash (well, except all the parking and intersection widening....next email!). I like the idea of tall, density there filling in empty lots (or replacing sheds). Indeed, I helped put in the call for that sort of density along E. Wash in the old T-L plan, the Isthmus Plan (and probably others) back in the early 90s & forward. But those same plans called for preserving our old residential & commercial hoods. So please, please maintain the cool character that we do have. Even the people who live in the towers really enjoy the human scale of the old hoods. It **adds** to the value of the towers!

It is an EPIC mistake to mow down our cool hoods. I'm serious. The Epicurians **love** our old hoods. I rent to them regularly and I know what they are looking for. It ain't Houden's suburbs shoe-horned into our urban hoods.

Lori Wessel, 300 block N. Ingersoll (via email, 7 March 2017)

The near East side would benefit from saving the remaining Victorian and Queen Anne housing which some have become to call "affordable housing".

Someone commented at the first steering committee meeting, regarding the 700 block of E Gorham. He said to developer Houden "please don't insult us by building studio units, and calling them affordable because the rent would be \$1200".

Our rentals are in 100-year old duplexes that we've renovated with modern kitchens and baths in the style of the original home. We try to keep the historic features of our rentals, and rather than

removing the house, we renovate. Actually, we don't do that much "renovating", we maintain the 100-year old floors and walls by repairing them.

I just showed some of our 1-bedroom units in the 1000 block of East Gorham. Three of the people looking at our units are living in "high end" new high rise complexes on the near east side.

I asked them why they are looking to rent our units in the Fall.

Comments I received:

"I'd rather live in a unit with character"

"I'd rather save my money"

"I don't like the smoker next door, in a non smoking complex"

"I don't need granite counter tops, in-unit laundry. . . .I'd rather spend less on rent."

I'm not sending this email to advertise our rentals. We support and encourage the upkeep and maintenance on the older housing stock in our neighborhood. A house that has stood for 100 years will out live a new micro unit.

Please support the remaining historic character of Madison, and attend the next steering committee meeting.

Paul Schechter, 1200 block E. Dayton (via email 7 March 2017)

I hate to see 100 year old buildings being demolished. House *moving* is often an affordable compromise. It's more expensive than demolition, but cheaper than building new. I've heard estimates of around \$20/ft to move. So a 1,500sf house would cost \$30,000. I have a friend who bought a full city block of land and moved a dozen houses on to it over a decade.

Rev. Glen Hall Reichelderfer, Assoc. Pastor, Christ Presbyterian Church, 944 E. Gorham (via email, 15 Feb. 2017):

Just to say from this one minister's standpoint... We do not want to become either Portland or San Francisco. Low-income housing is a necessity for any development in this wonderful diverse neighborhood of ours. Peace.

David Zoppo, 900 block E. Mifflin (via email, 14 Feb. 2017):

Thank you for notifying the neighborhood about the development proposal along the 700 block of E. Johnson. I am unable to make the meeting tomorrow, but wanted to pass along my thoughts. I am a new homeowner and am not as familiar with historical planning and development in the neighborhood, so my understanding of and opinion on these issues may be somewhat limited. All the same, I wanted to share my opinion with you all, so you can relay it to the relevant decisionmakers.

In brief, I understand that a lot of the housing stock in our neighborhood is old and in need of

repair or replacement. From that perspective, the proposal could be advantageous. However, I am concerned that the flurry of recent development could adversely change the character of the neighborhood and create a glut of expensive housing that goes unused due to lack of demand.

One of the charming aspects of our neighborhood is the variety and character of the single family homes along Johnson, Dayton, and Mifflin. However, these new apartment buildings all look the same--in my opinion, they are dull, sterile, and lack the redeeming aesthetic qualities of the older housing stock. I would hate to see another post-modern apartment complex change the quaint aesthetic of a main thoroughway in our neighborhood, especially if the contemplated retail/commercial space is only affordable for large, "chain" companies (as opposed to local mom-and-pop shops).

More importantly, I am at a loss to understand why the neighborhood needs additional residential units, especially if there is little to no assurance that these units will be affordable. To my knowledge, [the Constellation](#) has 220 units, [the Galaxie](#) has 244 units, [Veritas Village](#) will have 189 units, and [the Stone House Development project](#) (currently underway on the 1000 block of E. Washington) will add another 205 units. That's over 850 additional residential units in or around the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood in the last few years. And it appears that many of these units aren't even being rented. Madison Property Management's website indicates that [almost 40% \(93 units\)](#) of the Galaxie's units are or will be available in the next few months, and that [almost 35% \(76 units\)](#) of the Constellation's units are or will be available in the next few months. I'm not sure what the prospects are for Veritas Village and the Stone House Development, but (given the vacancy rate at the Constellation and the Galaxie) I can't imagine that all of those units will be spoken for when construction is complete.

In light of that, there appears to be little market demand for additional residential units in the neighborhood, especially if rents are comparable to the rents at the Constellation or the Galaxie. I worry that developers are pursuing projects and creating housing that nobody can afford, and therefore, that nobody will use. In five years, could we end up in a situation where the majority of these buildings are vacant, particularly if the US economy tumbles again? I don't know. But I think it's a question that we should be asking as we consider these proposals.

I would be more open to this proposal if the developer could guarantee that some of the units (at least half, I think) would be designated as affordable housing or would have rents below what the Constellation and the Galaxie are currently charging. I understand that, from a business standpoint, this may not be feasible for the developer. However, without that assurance, I don't think the proposal should be approved. And at the very least, the neighborhood and the city need to carefully consider how the market will react to this development and whether it is actually needed.

Mary Ellen Spoerke, 300 block Marston Ave. (via email, 14 Feb. 2017):

I am unable to attend Wednesday's meeting but I'd like to voice my concern and opposition to further large-scale development in our neighborhood. The level of traffic and congestion from the high rises on East Washington is taxing enough without adding more with this proposal. I also have strong reservations about our neighborhood becoming a "big box" development with more ugly high rise cement looming in the sky. The beauty of our neighborhood is the houses

and the sense of community which is lacking in high-rise development. I realize in cities we have to build up but enough is enough. As a homeowner, I feel we need to preserve the look and feel of our residential community by stopping further encroachment of high rises into the neighborhood.

It's one thing to hear about plans and another to actually see the grey masses as they are going up. We have done our fair share as a community by allowing the development of high rises on East Washington. We do not need to let this form of development creep further into our residential blocks. I've been impressed with cities that have maintained the community look and feel of their neighborhoods. It's what makes them desirable places to live. We have a beautiful neighborhood and must now work to preserve it by halting further

Christine Knorr, 1100 block E. Mifflin (via email, 14 Feb. 2017):

Hi, I am writing because I am unable to attend the meeting on the Houden development proposal. While I am generally appreciating some of the exciting changes happening in our neighborhood, I feel that the Houden proposal will set the precedent for high-density, high-income housing throughout our neighborhood. I am concerned that the commercial space that is included in these developments will have lease rates more conducive to large, chain retail businesses and not local or homegrown retail. This newer proposal will remove 35 affordable apartments continuing east, replacing them with 85-90 apartments that will most likely rent for double to triple what current rates are. What we need is density that falls within the range that the neighborhood plan calls for and more affordable housing, not more towers of high priced apartments. The proposed density will be 3 to 4 times what is recommended in our neighborhood plan and 2 to 4 times what the city comprehensive plan recommends. Lastly, parking is another huge concern of mine.

What the neighborhood needs is something that fits the scale and feel of the nearby neighborhood and something that emphasizes and encourages local small businesses. Keep the high density, high rent on East Washington.

Gwen Johnson, co-owner of Johnson Public House and Kin-Kin Coffee (via email, 13 Feb. 2017):

As a business owner on E. Johnson I would say our concerns are:

1. Look of the building and what that will do to the street (Willy and Atwood have become overridden with apartment / retail new-builds that feel like glorified strip malls. We really don't want Johnson to also go that route).
2. Keeping E. Johnson businesses interesting. One of the appeals of our street is that we have no chains. All businesses are independently owned, local businesses. They are interesting. You can't find these businesses elsewhere in the city. I am worried about the influx of retail on E. Washington and now creating these new retail spaces on E. Johnson and changing the vibe on our eclectic street. I would appreciate the building owner being selective in tenants and getting other business owner feedback on tenant selection.

Resident of Proposed Development Site (via email, 9 Feb., 2017):

I pay \$1200 a month for a 2 bedroom that I enjoy very much. \$600 a month (I have a roommate) is AFFORDABLE to working people.

I am being booted out of my affordable apartment that I like very much. I am a successful working professional and I feel like I'm being pushed out so they can build more ugly, neighborhood-destroying apartment buildings.

The Galaxy/Festival/ whatever you want to call the apartment buildings at Livingston/East Wash are hideous. I hate to think that the nice, charming, affordable, STRUCTURALLY SOUND place I have is getting torn down to build those, and then price me out of living there.

I sincerely hope this development doesn't happen. Please don't price us out of our neighborhood and knock down our beloved building.

Patty Prime, TLNA President, 400 block Sidney Street (via email, 3 Feb. 2017, after the Feb 2. Steering Committee meeting):

I'm not sure I was clear enough when making my point last night. The rear setback is too small. However, that really doesn't convey the impact of the entire building. It's too big, too massive. Like the Butler St. proposal, it fills the entire property to the extent that zoning allows. I just don't find that acceptable.

I'd rather see any number of alternatives, but those alternatives ought to include real green space, like back yards that can be enjoyed not only by the tenants, but also as open space as viewed from the Dayton St. neighbors (whether they are tenants or owners).

Daniel Parker, 100 block N. Blount (via email, 21 Jan. 2017):

We love the idea of more retail on that block to blend into the following blocks on East Washington. I walk that block several times a week and it always feels like such a dead spot and a bit run down. We definitely support and would advocate for low income housing as part of the project. Let us know if you would need help with that messaging to developers or the city.

Having nicer apartments and housing that would attract families or workers in the retail spaces of the neighborhood would be a plus. When I heard about redevelopment of that whole block, my first thought was this may feel like a new Monroe street type area. I've noticed with all the development in our immediate area (apartments, grocery, restaurants) this seems to also affected what I have seen further east in our neighborhood of folks renovating smaller homes (also a good sign for the neighborhood). Thus, the more retail and nicer looking commerce spaces, seems to be leading to younger families buying some of those smaller homes further east on Mifflin, Dayton, side streets, and fixing them up. I've lived in college towns before and have seen how "college rentals" of what used to be family homes can really change a neighborhood (not in a good way unless you are in college). But having well thought out apartment structures which cater to older residents (mixed incomes) can really improve a neighborhood's diversity.

In addition, for this 700 block development, with the proximity of Johnson to East Washington and then Willy, it is really interesting to see how people might walk more often between those streets. Just in the last five years, we have seen many more people walking between Johnson and Willy as we do the majority of our outings in this area (don't even need a car except for work that takes us out of the neighborhood). Wondering when I'll start seeing a bike cart in the summer transporting folks to these areas.

In summary, thanks for the great notes and update and we hope this development moves along as we plan to live in this neighborhood for into the future.

James Legard, 724 E. Johnson (via email to Alder Zellers, 18 Jan. 2017):

I didn't make it to the Meeting at Christ Presbyterian Church last Tuesday but I really wanted to voice my opinion and I hope there were others there who are opposed to the development plan. To keep this short I'll just say that Johnson St. for the most part is really a residential area. The only businesses that have had any longevity here are the ones that have been well entrenched here 30 years and more. Norris Grocery, Bernie's Rock, Cork and Bottle, Caribou, and the Laundry basket are fixtures here. The new businesses like Forequarter came with a built in clientele from day one, and our residential parking problem started that day also. I live at 724 E. Johnson but have had to park on Dayton St. because of Forquarter. Their customers take all the street parking from 6 - 10 pm. That's when everyone who lives here comes back from work or school. What would happen to our residential parking if more businesses came with the new proposed development. We pay the city for our street parking permits. Most of the other businesses are teetering financially. The hair salon (800 blk.), the Tea shop, Tattoo shop and what was the Juneberry at the corner of Blount and Johnson never seemed to ever have any customers and went under as well as a few others. Keeping in mind that a retail infrastructure is already built and more planned over by the Galaxy on E. Washington. Why do we need what could end up to be a fried chicken wings franchise or a sports bar with multiple big screen tv's or another liquor store or any number of useless stores that can't make a go of it and leave behind empty retail space.

The rents are staggering in this new construction today. Presently in this area 2 bdrm apts. are in the \$950.00 range (give or take). The new construction is at least 25% more in the 1250.00 + price range, even twice that at the Galaxy. The developers are ratcheting up the the cost of housing and dispossessing the local residents and transient students who can't afford the "new improved" housing" and cater to under educated, over paid employees from Epic and a few other tech firms. The developers are forcing people who live here out of the area. The promise of some affordable housing is a ploy. The Galaxy has one or two studio apts. I think for \$750.00, a very small concession to enable them to build. And more landlords of local rental properties are finding it harder to rent their existing units. There are more unrented apts. in the Johnson - Dayton St. area.

Anyway those are my feelings. not every part of Madison needs a facelift. I hope this plan was not viewed favorably by those who attended the meeting. Sometimes "progress" and promises for the greater good are really about "number one" the developer. Thank you for the time you spent reading this.