

email feedback to the neighborhood development chairperson as of 19 Dec. 2012. *Note that some of the submissions wished to remain anonymous, or did not explicitly give permission for their email to be a public record when asked. Their contact info has been removed.*

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

Subject:Crane Lot Feedback

Date:Thu, 20 Dec 2012 21:58:09 -0600

From:Alyssa Kesler Ryanjoy <axxxr@gmail.com>

To:waugh@morningwoodfarm.com

Dear David,

Thanks for soliciting feedback about this project. I have a few thoughts.

By far, my overriding opinion is that I would rather see a new apartment building in the neighborhood than the crane lot. Reynolds may be a great community employer, but having housing in that area would do a lot for both the aesthetic and the safety of the neighborhood where I walk almost everyday.

For me personally, the views of the capitol are a second thought. Through the leafless trees, I have a bit of a view from my front porch in the winter and it's neat that you can see it from Reynold's Park, but that is something that I point out to people when I'm trying to make living near a crane lot sound nicer. I would gladly accept an apartment building in the viewshed.

I do hope this project happens because I'm excited about the property being developed. I have noted with interest the comments that the neighborhood should wait for a better proposal for the site. I am curious to know if Reynolds has already committed to a new location - meaning that they will be looking to sell the property even if the Westwood proposal falls through - or if it might be a while before another proposal comes along that would motivate Reynolds to relocate. I would rather not wait 10 years to see this area start looking sharp and feeling safer.

Feel free to include my name when posting my comments to the feedback site.

Thanks,
Alyssa Ryanjoy

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

Subject:RE: [tlna] reynolds crane lot -- notes from steering committee

Date:Wed, 19 Dec 2012 17:02:59 +0000

From:Keith Wessel <keith@xxx.com>

To:waugh@morningwoodfarm.com <waugh@morningwoodfarm.com>

David,

Being new the council I think it is important for me to get feedback from our neighbors. My first impression is to support less density and more green space.

I moved to this neighborhood in 1977 because I wanted to live in a city that could support culture but not be too big. Unfortunately, I have seen rush hour traffic increase dramatically during my years here.

If people in our neighborhood want a substantial increase in density, I would like to know why.

Keith

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

Subject:Re: [tlna] Reynolds Crane lot update

Date:Mon, 17 Dec 2012 00:42:51 -0600

From:Jxxx<jxx@gmail.com>

To:waugh@morningwoodfarm.com <waugh@morningwoodfarm.com>

David,

I don't have major objections to the massing...though I really like your suggestions re: orienting the massing around Livingston.

I would be concerned if the units will be 700 sq. ft. or so unless these are 1 bedrooms. Seems smaller than market...but I'm going on gut, not numbers.

Just some random thoughts for you...

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

Subject:Re: [tlna] RE: Reynolds Crane lot

Date:Sat, 15 Dec 2012 11:08:39 -0600

From:Gay <wipoet@xxx.com>

To:<klebba@morningwoodfarm.com> <klebba@morningwoodfarm.com>

CC:, <tlna@yahoogroups.com> <tlna@yahoogroups.com>, <jamesmadisonparkneighborhood@yahoogroups.com> <jamesmadisonparkneighborhood@yahoogroups.com>

I was among those working on the neighborhood plan and am alarmed at how easily we violate it and make exceptions. I, for one, dread the "canyonization" of E Wash and believe proper scale (usually lower) is better. Finally, I resent as mom in a mom and pop rental business the constant building of more and more perhaps unnecessary monolithic apartment enclaves (often with public TIF funding) while allowing our older rental housing stock to go completely unsupported. Just my penny's worth. Gay D/Z

Sent from my iPhone

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

Subject:Re: Reynolds Crane Lot

Date:Sat, 15 Dec 2012 07:58:32 -0600

From:Kevin Luecke <kluecke1@xxx.com>

To:waugh@morningwoodfarm.com

As for the project, I have the following comments:

- I like the idea of very dense housing at that site and in the neighborhood in general.
- I am fine with heights up to six or seven stories as long as they step back above four.
- The proposed buildings need some facade articulation: they are just too big and flat now. City Row or Old Market Row on Blair are good examples, even if the developer doesn't like the specific style of each.
- Everything possible should be done to keep traffic off Mifflin and Dayton. This means the garage entrance should be on Livingston.
- First floor apartments should be elevated from street level - it is better for the people living in the from a privacy perspective and looks better from the street.

I am sure I will have other comments as things move along.

Thank you,
Kevin
121 N Ingersoll St

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

Subject:Re: [tlna] re: Reynolds Crane Lot

Date:Fri, 14 Dec 2012 19:57:32 -0600

From:Lxxx <lxxxxx@gmail.com>

To:David Waugh <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Very puzzled by the comments regarding "high density" and "vacancy rate is too low".

We work hard to renovate and maintain our properties. It was difficult to hear someone speak about saturating the market with cookie cutter rentals. It was difficult to hear someone describe what would happen to the old duplexes in the neighborhood, as if Their worth was past their time and they would only be used as student housing.

As for our rentals,

We've increased our rate over the past few years, however we've also invested thousands of dollars in renovation in the past few years.

I'd like to see less focus on getting the rental market back to 5percent vacancy. More focus on Open spaces for those in the high density areas.

Focus on affordable housing.

I have to admit it's been scary to see the very run down duplexes that have been vacant for years, all of the sudden they have people living in them.

There is definitely a need for housing , however I don't think we need massive complexes. And why do we have to provide housing for epic?

Sent from my iPhone

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

Subject:wrong link on the reynolds crane project site, and a few comments

Date:Fri, 14 Dec 2012 18:22:29 -0600

From:Erik Paulson <epaulson@xxx.com>

To:David Waugh <waugh@morningwoodfarm.com>, Paul Marotte <pmarotte@gmail.com>

CC:Cover, Steven <SCover@cityofmadison.com>, Randy Bruce <rbruce@knothebruce.com>, Stouder, Heather

<HStouder@cityofmadison.com>

I haven't been following the plans very closely - for what it's worth, I do think the architecture matters on that block; Das Kronenberg and City Market set an interesting tone for the block and I'd hope to see respected. I wouldn't try to mimic it or try to step too far out of time (though, Randy did a great job over on W Main behind the CVS) but I'd think about trying to capture that spirit of a place where people came to do commerce or create things. I know when you said the "architecture specifically was not as important" you were just looking for easy examples of different styles when you were putting your massing together and not making a general statement, but a City Row-esque portion on E Mifflin is really out of place. (I am very much a fan of different styles on different portions, though)

I'm still thinking about sightlines overall. One thing I'd like to better understand is how the view corridor from the park interacts with the 600 block between Blair/Mifflin/Blount/Wash, which is also very underutilized, and has the potential according to plans to incorporate 8-story buildings. The Capitol viewshed from Reynolds park (or, really, anywhere) didn't show up in the quick search I did through the TL neighborhood plan, so I'm curious what happens if an 8 story building goes up near E Wash on that block.

You don't need to remove my name if you log these.

-Erik

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

Subject:Re: new reynolds plans

Date:Thu, 13 Dec 2012 14:49:00 -0800 (PST)

From:Jxxx <jxxx@yahoo.com>

To:Patrick Heck <pwheck@gmail.com>, richard linster <rlinster@tds.net>, Patty Prime <pprime@gmail.com>, Richard Freihoefer <rafreihoefer@hotmail.com>, Seth Nowak <thinktoolbox@gmail.com>, "benhalfenwm@gmail.com" <benhalfenwm@gmail.com>, Lupe Montes <lupemontes@earthlink.net>, Joe Lusson <joelusson@gmail.com>, Brenda Konkel <brendakonkel@gmail.com>, Bill McGrath <mcgrathwi@gmail.com>, Josh Lavik <joshlavik@kw.com>, Steven Maerz <sjmaerz@gmail.com>, patricia Kelly <pjkmifflin@sbcglobal.net>, postbryan@gmail.com, Ledell.Zellers@gmail.com, BridgetManiaci <district2@cityofmadison.com>, David Waugh <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Short introduction for those of you I don't know. I own a home on the 1300 block of East Mifflin and had offered to serve on the steering group. David kindly included me in on his e-mail.

An idea that may or may not be feasible. I've been told that Reynolds acquired the parcel in a land swap with the city. Given that the size and density of the project they are proposing would be more appropriate on the block bordering East Washington; would it be possible to trade part of the old Don Miller site for their parcel? That would theoretically leave open the possibility of realizing the neighborhood plan of expanding Reynolds Park.

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

Subject:Re: Graphic from Paul

Date:Thu, 13 Dec 2012 08:12:22 -0800 (PST)

From:pxxx <pxx@sbcglobal.net>

To:David Waugh <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Pretty darn ugly, looks like a minimum security prison. No charm, no character.

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

Subject: Re: Reynolds property development
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2012 11:51:54 -0600
From: Patrick McDonnell <pmcdonnell@tds.net>
To: David Waugh <dpwaugh@gmail.com>, Joe Lusson <joelusson@gmail.com>

Hi David and Joe,

I haven't had time to participate in the Reynolds meetings, but I want to give you this observation in case it is helpful. The Reynold's block is designated for high density residential in the Neighborhood Plan which is defined as 41-60 units per acre. This was the range for high density residential given to us by city staff. We didn't invent it. Given that the City has rejected the option for Reynolds Field expansion, it is fair to consider the whole block appropriate for high density residential development.

The total block is 3.6 acres.

Das Kronenberg and Old Market Place Apartments combined sit on 1 acre and have a total of 61 units by my count. This is already high density.

The rest of the block is 2.6 acres which would allow for a maximum of 156 more units. This would be maximum high density for the whole city block.

Patrick

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

Subject: RE: [tlna] Neighborhood Plan, Reynolds Property and Future
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2012 13:01:49 -0600
From: xxx>
To: 'David Waugh' <waugh@morningwoodfarm.com>

Hello David,

My brief input on the Reynolds lot proposal:

Six stories with no step back on East Mifflin or East Dayton should be a non-starter for any development. The kindest description I would have for this project, having only seen the online site plan, would be "uninspired". Buildings right up to lot lines, no step backs, too much height for a simple block design, little or no green space, and too many units for this block. Six stories seems excessive, but not unreasonable if done with some imagination and step backs. Parking needs to be a priority for any of these projects going forward. Residential developments should have at least one parking space INCLUDED with each unit, for either apartments or condos. Residential parking is going to be very hard to come by in this area in the near future.

I am not concerned about the TLNA plan calling for expanding the park here, only because I never thought that was a realistic goal. This is privately owned property, not a city owned parcel. Reynolds Transfer has been a good neighbor and an asset to the community for decades. Their family has made significant contributions to the City of Madison and they have always cared about being good neighbors. Actually, Reynolds acquired this lot in a land swap with the City that allowed the development of Coachyard Square on 600 block. While I am disappointed that they chose to deal with an out of state developer, that is their prerogative. I don't see any way this lot becomes a park unless the City of Madison can match offers for the parcel, and that is not going to happen. That being said, I would agree that the development should be an asset to the neighborhood and in character with existing and future housing, and this one certainly doesn't meet that standard yet.

Thanks for your consideration.

xxxx
xxxx E. Mifflin Street
Madison, WI 53703

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

Subject:Re: [tlna] Neighborhood Plan, Reynolds Property and Future

Date:Thu, 06 Dec 2012 11:46:18 -0500 (EST)

From:Bob Sommerfeldt <BSegypt@xxxcom>

To:klebba@morningwoodfarm.com, tlna@yahoogroups.com

Thank you for the excellent way you worded it. I agree.

Bob Sommerfeldt

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

From: Bob Klebba <klebba@morningwoodfarm.com>

To: tlna <tlna@yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Thu, Dec 6, 2012 9:16 am

Subject: RE: [tlna] Neighborhood Plan, Reynolds Property and Future

First, ad hominem attacks are the hallmark of a desperate politician, not a community leader.

Second, everyone please go and read the neighborhood plan. Thanks to Mr. Panofsky for taking the time to do so. The proposal for the Reynolds lot deviates significantly from the neighborhood plan. Park or not, it imposes density that is not conducive to single-family homes in our neighborhood. In-fill is a good thing for many reasons. We've defined in our neighborhood plan and the East Wash BUILD over 10 acres for high density development along E. Wash, not between Mifflin and Dayton.

If we want to deviate from the plans we already have, that's fine. But let's make sure we're knowingly deviating from plans that wise people worked on for several years before we embrace development similar to what is happening just east of campus.

Bob

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

From: Bob Klebba <klebba@xxx.com>

To: tlna <tlna@yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Thu, Dec 6, 2012 9:16 am

Subject: RE: [tlna] Neighborhood Plan, Reynolds Property and Future

First, ad hominem attacks are the hallmark of a desperate politician, not a community leader.

Second, everyone please go and read the neighborhood plan. Thanks to Mr. Panofsky for taking the time to do so. The proposal for the Reynolds lot deviates significantly from the neighborhood plan. Park or not, it imposes density that is not conducive to single-family homes in our neighborhood. In-fill is a good thing for many reasons. We've defined in our neighborhood plan and the East Wash BUILD over 10 acres for high density development along E. Wash, not between

Mifflin and Dayton.

If we want to deviate from the plans we already have, that's fine. But let's make sure we're knowingly deviating from plans that wise people worked on for several years before we embrace development similar to what is happening just east of campus.

Bob

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

Subject:[tlna] Neighborhood Plan, Reynolds Property and Future

Date:Wed, 05 Dec 2012 17:11:27 -0600

From:panofsmith tds.net <panofsmith@xxx.net>

To:tlna@yahoogroups.com

Dear TLNA folks,

I recently re-familiarized myself with the 2008 Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan

<http://www.cityofmadison.com/planning/ndp/tenney.pdf>, which I believe presents a thoughtful vision for our neighborhood. It became apparent to me at the fall Spaghetti Dinner and meeting that as a new TLNA board person, I needed to get up to speed on the issues at hand. One specific issue which motivated me to consult the plan was the presentation for a proposed six-story apartment complex on the Reynolds Crane property.

The neighborhood plan mentions this property no fewer than five specific times and states that all or a portion of this property (and the one block of Livingston from Dayton to Mifflin) be turned into an extension of Reynolds Park. Development in our neighborhood can be a good thing and that includes the development of public open space, such as the extension of Reynolds Park, as the plan envisions.

As an association we should require developers with proposals for our neighborhood to understand our neighborhood plan and discuss with us how their project is consistent with it. I intend to bring this issue to the table at a future TLNA meeting: that proposals (even informal ones) specifically address our plan and the list of community benefits outlined in the community benefits agreement document shared during the last TLNA meeting.

I look forward to further discussion.

David Panofsky

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

Date:Thu, 15 Nov 2012 20:43:37 -0600

From:xxxxxxx

To:dpwaugh@gmail.com

CC:xxxxxxx

Hi David,

We would like to share our thoughts about the development:

XXX purchased our unit in 2005 and I have lived here since 2007. Overall, we support development of the Reynolds properties, but we want it to be responsible, fit into the neighborhood and minimally impact the quality of life for our residents, who cumulatively pay real estate taxes on our more than \$8 mil. assessed value. In addition, many homeowners (including us) have invested large amounts of money into remodeling and maintaining our condos.

Our concerns:

- The proposed 250 apartments, combined with the 250 apartments of The Constellation's 12 stories, **will flood the neighborhood with cars**. This is of particular interest to us personally since our corner unit overlooks the parking lot and Reynolds lot right out our living room. The developers are proposing an entrance point at the end our parking lot, which means all 12 units with windows facing the lot will be hearing and seeing 250+ cars go in and out every day. This could significantly impact noise and be quite disturbing.
- The unique and diverse character of the Eastside of Madison should not be sacrificed. We do not want to see our building's character overshadowed by these monster-sized buildings. The **views and sun of some DK residents are going to impacted**, so we prefer that the developers lower the height of the buildings.
- We are concerned that the city is enabling a flooding of the apartment market, just as they did with the condo market in the mid-2000s. What will be the result for our neighborhood if these apartments should eventually end up empty? If they are supposedly "high end" apartments, what happens if the market cannot support high end? There needs to be a reasonable and sustainable plan for housing for a variety of income levels.

Thanks,
xxx

XXXXX
xxx N. Blount St. xxx
Madison, WI 53703

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

Date:Thu, 15 Nov 2012 11:58:31 -0600

From:XXXXX

To:Patrick Heck <303@xxx.org>

CC:dpwaugh@gmail.com

Hi Pat,

I think the number of apartments that will be built is simply **overkill**. A creative park would be my first wish, but since that's not in the cards, I would rather see a mixed use for this land other than only **apartments, apartments and more apartments**. At some point the apartment market will be saturated as well.

What's in the best interest for the neighborhood should be the deciding factor and not only how much revenue will be generated.

The general design looks fairly nice, but I would like for the developers to have one of their buildings to be converted for retail space or, even better, create extra green space (mini park) for the neighborhood and not just for the people who live

in the new buildings.

I hope for a more creative and innovative solution so that everyone can benefit!!! Bottom line, we need to have a more long term vision of the neighborhood. Also it would be really cool if the new design would reflect our building and the old market place apartments as well. Likewise they should have functional rooftops like ours for their residents, which would also be an incentive for people to move in.

XXXXXX

#XXXXXX
(xxx N. Blount St.)

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

Subject:Reynolds Development

Date:Wed, 14 Nov 2012 23:24:09 -0500

From:xxxx

To:David Waugh <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Dear David,

I am writing to register my opinion concerning the proposed development of the Reynolds property adjacent to Das Kronenberg. While I strongly support the redevelopment in our immediate neighborhood, especially the Reynolds property, I do not believe that the current proposal meets the goals laid out by the TLNA plan for the area.

The height and density of the project, as currently proposal by Westwood Development, will adversely impact the quality of life of its neighbors, including single family homes, rental properties and the owners of Das Kronenberg, which itself has more than \$8 million of city assessed value. I also fear the loss of street parking at night and on weekends, as well as an decrease in the unique character of the near Eastside of Madison. Flooding the high-end apartment market also could eventually result in many unoccupied apartments, analogous to the empty downtown condos that were a product of overbuilding in the mid-2000s, hence increasing the possibility of neighborhood degradation when rents are lowered and landlords start cutting corners.

I urge the TLNA to work with the developer to lower the height of the proposed buildings and to avoid flooding the neighborhood with too many apartments.

Sincerely,

xxx
xxx N Blount St xxx
Madison, WI 53703

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

Subject:Reynolds Project

Date:Mon, 12 Nov 2012 07:48:22 -0800 (PST)

From:joe malkasian <malfunk17@xxxxcom>

Reply-To:joe malkasian <malfunk17@yxxx.com>

To:dpwaugh@gmail.com <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Good Morning David,

My name is Joe Malkasian and I live at 123 North Blount Street and emailing you about the Reynold project and what this Atlanta company would like to do. First let me say that it is pretty sad that we have a Atlanta company coming in to develop in are great city. I already have a bad feeling about this because I was told that the company was going to be at the last neighborhood meeting and then cancelled. Well I know they sent someone there to see the election results because I over heard him at dinner when I was at the Avenue. I hope he introduced himself at the meeting because I was not there to point him out. With that said here are some concerns I have with the project. With all this development going on where are people in the neighborhood going to be able to park. I buy a city sticker for myself because I park on the street. It is going to get really hard to park soon, its already a pain some weekend and what about snow emergencies in the winter and parking on one side of the street during Thursday and Fridays. I would say think of downtown Chicago and that is what its going to look like. With that said to what about the bike boulevard, that should be renamed by the time this is done to a car boulevard because there will be lots more cars to bikes in the area. Also the height of the buildings, do we want to set the bar that anyone can come into the neighborhood and try to change the policies we put in place. I'm not against them coming and developing the area but they seem to be rushing this through which gets me nervous. Thank you for your service to the neighborhood and for ready my concerns.

Joe Malkasian
123 North Blount Street

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

Subject:Letter in opposition to Westwood Development proposal for the Reynolds Property

Date:Sat, 10 Nov 2012 15:20:06 -0600

From:xxxxx

To:dpwaugh@gmail.com <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Hello David,

As a Tenny-Lapham resident I would like to communicate my opposition to Westwood Development proposal for the Reynolds Property.

I oppose the current plan for the following reasons:

1. I don't believe than an additional 250 apartments are a good idea for the neighborhood, there is already an abundance of apartments being developed downtown madison and right next door and even without these proposed apartments there is insufficient street parking in my neighborhood already.
2. I live on the top floor of the DK building facing the proposed development project and the views and sun from my property are going to be negatively impacted. I would prefer that the developers lower the height of the building.
3. I think we as a neighborhood community should look to support a development more consistent with the current TLNA plan – not another generic apartment building. I chose this building and neighborhood because it did not resemble a new cheaply constructed subdivision. With this and the current development under construction next door I feel the character of the neighborhood will be lost and will come very close to feeling like a new cheaply constructed subdivision.

Thank you.

xxx
xxx N. Blount St. xxx
Madison WI 53703

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

Subject:Re: Thoughts on Reynolds

Date:Mon, 22 Oct 2012 18:33:37 -0500
From:xxxx
To:Patrick Heck <pwheck@gmail.com>
CC:David Waugh <dpwaugh@gmail.com>

Patrick and David,

The neighborhood should feel empowered to ask for and receive the best possible development. The Reynolds location is extremely desirable and it will only become more so with the passage of time. We needn't fear that this will be our only offer. Just because they say they need 6 stories, doesn't mean they actually do, or that no other developer can do something that fits better in the neighborhood.

Current Reynolds usage is not terrible and shouldn't be considered blight. They are providing jobs and have been a good neighbor. I don't think they will up and leave until a deal is struck, so we're not talking about a vacant parking lot. It's a job producer. And, it affords many neighbors a great view of the Capitol, which has tremendous value -- to the homes on Paterson and adjacent streets and park users.

Das Kronenberg should not feel guilty about its height. It's a high quality old building with a ton of character. Nothing newly built will have the old growth timber and general history of DK. Existing residents have every right to stand up for their rights.

Not long ago, when Apex proposed building atop the capital north (mifflin/butler) ramp, the new owners in the new Capital (McGrath) Point tower were not shy in defending their recently gotten views. And they didn't have history backing them up.

Residential street parking. It's good when tenants of high density developments are denied resident street parking permits. However, that doesn't prevent them from parking overnight and weekends on the street. RPG tenants in the 5 houses on 600-623 Gorham are denied permits but routinely park on the street. Rather than pay the \$90/month for an underground stall at City Row they take their chances on the street. They are simply at work during the 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. M-F parking restriction. Then of course there are their friends' and visitors' cars too.

Permanent residents' views and concerns should get the strongest hearing. Users of Reynolds Park are also important and their opinions can be valuable in as much as they help contain the general size of the building. But they shouldn't dictate that the mass get pushed toward Dayton Street where we have a residential neighborhood.

Six stories is not appropriate between Mifflin and Dayton.

Affordable housing. The best chance we have at affordable housing are the existing houses in the area. This new construction will not be affordable given the cost of land and construction. But rentals on Dayton, for instance, could be affordably rehabbed for new owner occupants, or for ongoing rental. There are tons of new apartment buildings going up downtown, so we alone do not have to solve the low vacancy rate issue. That will soon be resolved elsewhere.

Thanks,
xxx

Last updated 17 Dec, 2012