

Compilation of Public Comments Received
on the
April 24, 2003 Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations

CONTENTS

a. Comment notes as written on flip chart during the May 3, 2003 public open house.....	2
b. Expanded comment statements based on the flip chart notes.....	3
c. Comment Sheet comments turned in during the May 3 public open house.	5
d. Comment Sheet comments received at the Planning Unit after the public open house.....	8
e. Comment Letter from Friends of the Yahara Parkway 5/7/03	9
f. Letter from Marquette Neighborhood Association 5/8/03.....	11
g. Letter from John DeLamater 5/9/03	12
h. Letter from John Coleman 5/9/03.....	15
i. Letter from Nick Schroeder 5/9/03.....	16

Note: These comments were originally composed in several different formats, including emails, Word, and WordPerfect documents, and incorporated a wide variety of format settings. Content was not edited and most changes in appearance are due to format shifts as everything was forced into a single Word document. The name of the sender and the date were added to the top of some communications. Some spelling typos may have been corrected by the spell checker.

**May 3, 2003 Public Open House
Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations**

**Flipchart Comments and Questions
(as written on chart)**

- Connections beyond planning area
 - Willy/Wilson - ped/bike friendly
 - Main/Blair - ped/bike friendly
- TDM area
- Alleys - Wilson Street frontage
- Conservation District - Baldwin Street (house/garage)
- More mixed use everywhere
- Lighting standards
- Open space uses
- No openings caused by....uninterrupted massing should be design
- Shadow projections for new higher rises
- Process on plan differences/variances from plan
- Density discussion clarified
- Next steps to implement quickly/priority
- Wilson Street corridor - mixed use 600-800 blocks; heights 900-1100 blocks.
- Livingston closing needs functional alley in place
- Employee density definition/concepts
- More beautiful buildings. No (more) ugly buildings.
- Huge scale
- Business orientation to bike path, signage
- Post-incubator space

**May 3, 2003 Public Open House
Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations**

**DRAFT
Expanded Flipchart Comments and Questions
(based on Staff recollection)**

- Connections beyond planning area. The East Rail Corridor Plan should also include recommendations to create and/or enhance pedestrian/bicycle connections extending beyond the planning area. In particular,
 - Willy/Wilson - ped/bike friendly [These are parallel streets. The comment may have referred to cross-connections between the two streets, and/or more generally to ped/bicycle improvements along both streets.]
 - Main/Blair - ped/bike friendly [I think this referred specifically to addressing the current difficulty of crossing Blair Street at Main Street.]
- TDM area. [This may have been a question regarding the coverage of the proposed District Transportation Demand Management plan.]
- Alleys - Wilson Street frontage. Question regarding the alignment of the proposed mid-block alleys on some blocks of East Wilson Street. Response referenced the mid-block alignment recommended by the BUILD Committee.
- Conservation District - Baldwin Street (house/garage) There are buildings located on the east side of Baldwin Street that are not included in the proposed Conservation District, although they are adjacent to it. Why were these buildings (which include a house and garage) left out?
- More mixed use everywhere. Why seek to limit residential development within the designated employment districts?
- Lighting standards should require that lights (including street lighting) be directed downward and adhere to “dark sky” standards.
- Open space uses. The draft plan doesn’t include a description of any of the specific features and functions included in the concept plan for the Central Park. Some of these (skateboarding/blading, for example) are of particular interest and importance to me and others, and it would be good to see that they are included.
- No openings caused by....uninterrupted massing should be design. [I think this was about breaks along street frontages created by parking lots, but the comment may have been more broad than that.]
- Shadow projections for new higher rises should be required. Presumably also an implied recommendation that design standards be established that would consider the shadowing effect on surrounding developments in development reviews.

- Process on plan differences/variances from plan. What happens if proposed developments are different from the plan recommendations?
- Density discussion clarified. [I can't remember what this was about. May have just been a question.]
- Next steps to implement quickly/priority. It is critical that the planning process continue and not end (or slow to a crawl) with adoption of the plan---this cannot afford to be a "50-year plan." What are the next steps to implement the plan?
- Wilson Street corridor - mixed use 600-800 blocks; heights 900-1100 blocks. [I think these were two comments noting that the ERCPCAC recommendations were different (and presumably not as good as) the BUILD recommendations, which would allow residential-commercial mixed uses in the 600-800 blocks, and had lower maximum building height recommendations for the 900-1100 blocks.]
- Livingston closing needs functional alley in place to provide access to existing and proposed uses now served from Livingston Street before the street closed.
- Employee density definition/concepts General question regarding how employee density is defined and measured. Implied question about the amount of projected employment.
- More beautiful buildings. No (more) ugly buildings
- Huge scale. The proposed scale and density of future development in the East Rail Corridor is too large and out-of-scale to fit into the neighborhood. The neighborhood will be overwhelmed by new employment, traffic, parking congestion, etc., as a result of all this development.
- Business orientation to bike path, signage. Neighborhood businesses should take advantage of the bicycle path by orienting the business toward the path (if located adjacent to it) or including informational signage beside the path directing path users to their establishment located nearby (on Williamson Street, for example.)
- Post-incubator space. There is a need for facilities that enterprises graduating from business incubators could move into that would allow them to remain in the East Rail Corridor as they become established and expand.

Note: Underlined text is what was actually written on the flip chart at the Open House. Non-underlined text is an expanded, more complete statement of the question or comment, as remembered by staff. Text in [brackets] is staff guessing or hedging.

5-13-03

**May 3, 2003 Public Open House
Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations**

**Comment Sheet Comments
(as written)**

- I was hoping to see specific use plans for the “open space” areas. I support a skate-park for use by the local kids (and adults) that skate and blade.

- In general, all streets within the planning area should remain (or be made) open and accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists. In particular, I understand the rationale for recommending the closing of Livingston Street, but the degradation of the traditional grid of streets that that causes could be mitigated somewhat--for example, by the reopening of E. Main Street between the 1000 and 1300 blocks.

- The general plan, while overall it has good scope, commercially it seems to over-exceed the broad commercial availability in central Madison.

- Livingston St. closing is good, except this will push north/south traffic onto S. Blount and S. Paterson. Railroad crossings on both streets are poorly maintained and dangerous to cross (except, perhaps, for cars). The railroad must be held responsible for keeping the crossings perpetually safe for all vehicles and pedestrian-assist devices, for use by all above purposes during all seasons.
- Existing Isthmus Bike Path should remain straight. I heard there was some discussion of making a “winding path.” Bad idea! And, walking/ped paths should be separate, like the paths in Minneapolis. Pedestrian paths should not just be a width-wise extension of bike paths. Look, for example, at Monona Terrace. Pedestrians regularly use the bike “lanes,” ignoring the lane created for them. A physical separation (green strip) between bike and ped paths is preferable.
- Rail crossings on S. Baldwin are in such condition that the railroad commits criminal damage to property every time a bicycle or similar vehicle passes over them. Rails themselves are several inches below grade. This must be corrected, now, and in such a way that it never gets to its current state again.

- “Transitions” on bike path at street intersections are “spoke busters.” When the sewer line necessitated reconstruction of part of the path, there was a promise to correct this problem, at least in part. This promise was broken. Any development that involves the bike path and/or the intersecting streets must include improvement of the transitions.
- With regard to housing, “affordable” should be based on median income of the neighborhood, not the rest of the County, which skews the numbers.

- Keep Livingston and Brearly fully open to bike and pedestrian transportation. At the same time, question closing to motor vehicles (neighborhood grid pattern spreads out traffic [?]).
- Bike/ped crossings under both banks of Yahara on railroad structure (between Willy and E. Main).
- Connect E. Main thru bus garage area.
- Question second lane on Willy St. for rush hour (No Parking inbound AM and outbound PM). Takes away from ambience of street--need to concentrate on making Willy St. a more people street.
- Four-way stop at Dickinson and E. Wilson, or Dickinson “stop” and bike path/E. Wilson “no stop.”
- Better mixed-use---too exclusive.
- Extreme concern about Central Park plan---i.e., new crossing at Few St., hills on bike path (existing path). The park plan needs a comprehensive review for transportation impacts.
- No diagonal parking on El Wilson Street. East Wilson two-way.
- No sidepath along E. Wilson.
- The park plan should not drive the transportation plan.

- Please pass this on to the folks at Research Products: the bike parking rack is placed backwards.

- Any TIF District should exclude any pre-‘50’s residential housing.
- Another Public Meeting with advanced notice (two-three weeks) to the community.

- Developers should submit their plans and projections of where shadows will fall.
- Business and industry for the industrial area should be accepted in part on the basis of how many jobs they will bring to the area (the goal is 14,000 new jobs over the next 20 years in downtown Madison?)
- Please keep in mind night time security of park and industry/business areas.
- Thank you for your work.

Note: Not sorted by subject. ***** separates individual comment sheets.

5-7-03

**May 3, 2003 Public Open House
Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations**

**Comment Sheet Comments Received after the Open House
(as written)**

I am concerned with the height limits for residential housing. These limits may be too high, and they are inconsistent with the height limits specified in the BUILD plan for Williamson St. Building heights of five stories are at the limit of what I think are livable heights for buildings outside of downtown, and a six-story building is too high.

I understand that these maximum heights might only apply to parts of buildings, and only when the developer provides affordable housing, but I worry that in practice the recommendations would only be the starting point for negotiation.

In general, I support the report's land use recommendations for the East Rail Corridor.

I am grateful to the committee members for their hard work.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

5-10-03

We do not need more parks for the people in the neighborhood to take their dogs to for unloading. More parks cost taxpayers more money. Added business would bring in more tax money which the City needs badly. The City can't take care of the parks they have now. When we spend all this money for this beautiful big park and invite all the people all over the world to come see it, are we going to take them all on an excursion down thru the 1300 block of E. Wilson Street and Schley Pass too? Thirteen blocks from the Capitol and we want to preserve it. We should get a big write-up nationwide on this. [Excluded statement to the effect that the big park is an UOSF pipe dream.]

Received 5-15-03

Friends of the Yahara River Parkway
Comments on the Final East Rail Corridor Plan

May 7, 2003

Dear Mr. Waidelich,

The Friends of the Yahara River Parkway, a nonprofit group formed to foster the implementation of the Yahara River Parkway (YRP) master plan, offer the following comments on the East Rail Corridor Final Report. Our comments are specific to those portions of the plan that abut or are within one block of the Yahara River Parkway.

First, we appreciate the awareness the planners and committee members have shown to the approved YRP master plan recommendations. We believe the implementation of the recommendations within these plans, particularly mixed use developments, will help to foster a dynamic isthmus that will provide high quality job, housing, transportation and recreational opportunities.

We are in agreement with the density recommendations included in the plan for the Yahara River District. The four story recommendation with a fifth story allowance when 15% of the units are considered affordable housing is reasonable.

We believe the following considerations should be included in the East Rail Plan and/or required of redevelopment projects within the district of interest as described above.

A. Building heights should be stepped back so a solid mass 4-5 stories in height does not loom immediately above the parkway. A general recommendation within your plan to create buildings with diverse heights and setbacks rather than creating a monotonous façade would be particularly appropriate along the parkway.

B. Minimum building setback of 50 feet should be required to prevent encroachment of buildings on the historic parkway, particularly on larger lots and for large buildings. Buildings too close to the parkway and tenants too close to the parkway may come to view the YRP as “their” front yard. This is already an issue on other portions of the YRP and appropriate management of this historic space could become seriously compromised.

C. All landscaping should be considered in relation to the historic and nationally landmarked status of the adjacent parkway. Landscaping aesthetics and plant selection in harmony with those of the approved parkway landscape plan should be required.

D. Buildings should face the parkway to enhance the park and river frontage. Features such as terraces, verandas, patios, porches or other outdoor amenity that allows residents or patrons to enjoy the parkway while protecting the character of the parkway are welcome. Roof gardens should be encouraged.

E. Parking and paved areas for vehicles should be prohibited from those areas immediately along the parkway for any new or substantial redevelopments. Long term parking area and trash receptacles (i.e.,

dumpsters) should be away from the parkway. Drives leading to front entrances and not intended for vehicle parking should be screened by appropriate vegetation to minimize their visual encroachment on the parkway yet provide safe ingress and egress for vehicles.

F. Rain gardens or other measures to encourage infiltration of storm runoff to improve the quality of water entering the Yahara River should be required.

G. The plan should require pedestrian and bike path connections and routes associated with redevelopment projects along the parkway be compatible with the YRP master plan paths. For example, how the sidewalks/bike paths from the cross streets will merge with the YRP paths should be specific design elements in any redevelopment projects.

H. Acquisition of critical parcels or portions of parcels to enhance the YRP or other greenspaces in this area should be an element of TIF district formation for this area.

I. Sunlight, shadow and wind effects of taller buildings will become more pronounced on pedestrians and neighboring properties as density increases and building height and mass expand. The plan should recommend that studies of these effects be included in future regulation and studies within this area.

J. Appropriate lighting to minimize glare and light pollution off property will be critical to protect the character of the YRP.

The current Commonwealth housing development along E. Main Street incorporates many of the desirable design features we would like to see in other developments along the parkway.

For those commercial areas one block on either side of E. Washington similar considerations as listed above should be required. In particular we would encourage ground level retail that would benefit from the amenity value of the adjacent parkway and river. For example, restaurants or the hospitality businesses with overlooks of the river or stores catering to users of the parkway might be very appropriate.

In general, we would like to see adjacent developments and associated landscaping complement and add to the character of the parkway. Though not easy to define in advance attention to the details noted above will help to create economically sound and YRP compatible developments.

We are willing to assist in any efforts needed to implement the recommendations listed above. Thank you for consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

President of the Friends of the Yahara River Parkway.

Cc,
Mayor Cieslewicz
East Rail Corridor Committee
Alders 2nd, 6th and 12th districts
Madison Parks Commission

Marquette Neighborhood Association

May 8, 2003

Dear ERCPAC Members

At the May 6, 2003 Marquette Neighborhood Association meeting, the Board discussed the ERCPAC public meeting held May 3.

The Board unanimously voted to request that the East Rail Corridor Plan Advisory Committee extend the public comment period an additional 45 days from the May 9th deadline.

The residents and businesses in the Marquette neighborhood were not notified of the meeting by postcard or letter. The draft recommendations were available online or as hard copies only 5 days before the meeting, and only a small number of people in the neighborhood were notified of their availability. None of the maps to be included in the draft were available at the public meeting.

As you have know, the study area is a sizeable and important part of the Marquette neighborhood, and the relationship between the East Rail Corridor and Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods will be critical for its success. The treatment of the ERC will be extremely important for the future development of these Isthmus neighborhoods. We therefore feel it is in everyone's interest to give us ample opportunity to respond thoughtfully and thoroughly to the draft proposal, and we urge the committee to extend the comment period to allow this process to occur. We also urge the committee to make a reasonable effort to contact the media and area residents about the extension and ask for their participation.

Please contact me and let me know your decision so that MNA Board members can help notify people that they still have an opportunity to give input. I can be reached at work at 257-6050 or at home at 241-0188.

Thank you,
Marsha Rummel
Marquette Neighborhood Association

May 9, 2003

Dear Michael,

I am writing to you as the staff person for the East rail corridor development effort. I want to inform you of a proposal that bears on the design and planning of that project. If you are already aware of this, I apologize for the duplication.

I followed rather closely the Transport 2020 and Oversight Advisory Committee Process. As they moved toward a commuter rail proposal using existing right-of-way, it was obvious to me that this will not serve the needs of the downtown and near east and west side for improved transit. Accordingly, I developed a proposal for a streetcar line to serve this area, connecting with commuter rail at Ingersoll Street on the east side and Union South on the west side. I have attached descriptions of the proposed line in both Word (.doc) and WordPerfect (.wpd) format. As you will see, I proposed that the line utilize East Main Street from the Square to Ingersoll. Among other benefits, this line would open up the surrounding area for development.

The Oversight Advisory Committee responded favorably to this proposal, and it is included in the Phase II recommendations that they made. It is represented on the Phase II map as a yellow line.

As you also may know, Portland, OR has built a streetcar line that runs on a north-south alignment through the downtown area. On the north end, it runs through an area that at one time was a rail yard/industrial area, and had been largely abandoned. One goal was to encourage development in this area. The woman responsible for managing the Portland Streetcar visited Madison last year and gave a presentation on the streetcar line. She said that 15 million dollars worth of development was announced within the first year of the line's operation. You can get more information about the Portland line at <http://www.portlandstreetcar.org/>

I would be happy to discuss this further. You can contact me as indicated below.

John DeLamater

John DeLamater
Downtown Trolley, Inc.
2015 Chadbourne Avenue
Madison, WI 53705
(608) 233-1999
delamate@ssc.wisc.edu
<http://www.downtownrolley.com/>

Transport 2020

LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (LPA)

-Draft-

PHASE 1B REGIONAL TRANSIT SYSTEM CONNECTOR

Connector service in-street to downtown activity centers:

In-street starter rail service, utilizing a light passenger rail vehicle, would connect downtown activity centers to the commuter rail trunk line service.

Proposed Alignment (See Figure 1)

- ∃ The line would begin at a station adjacent and connected to the *Camp Randall* commuter rail station (near Randall and West Johnson Streets).
- ∃ The line would proceed southeast, parallel to the rail right-of-way, to Dayton Street.
- ∃ The tracks would run east in the center of Dayton Street, in mixed traffic, to Frances Street, where they would turn north on Frances Street to University Avenue.
- ∃ The tracks would cross University Avenue and continue northeast on Gilman Street to State Street.
- ∃ The tracks would then continue east on the State Street Transit Mall.
- ∃ At Capitol Square, the eastbound track would continue southeast on Carroll Street and turn northeast on Main Street; the alignment on Capitol Square would be in mixed traffic, with cars operating in the prevailing direction.
- ∃ The tracks would continue northeast in the center of East Main Street to Ingersoll Street.
- ∃ The tracks would turn southeast on Ingersoll Street, and continue to the rail right-of-way.
- ∃ The line would terminate at a station adjacent to and connected to the *Ingersoll* commuter rail station (near Ingersoll street and the ROW).
- ∃ The westbound route would be the reverse of the route outlined above, except that it would travel around Capitol Square via Pinckney and Mifflin Streets, in mixed traffic, with cars operating in the prevailing direction.

This alignment is 3.2 miles in length.

In order to provide flexibility of service, on Capitol Square, the eastbound and westbound tracks should be connected via segments of curved track and switches (at Main and Pinckney/King and at State and Mifflin/Carroll). This would allow cars from *Camp Randall* and *Ingersoll* to end their trips or Ashort turn≡ at the Square; this may be desirable during rush hour, parades and other downtown events.

Also for flexibility, cross-overs should be provided at two or three locations to allow cars to reverse direction. One obvious location for a cross-over would be on Dayton Street, west of the Kohl Center (between Lake and Park Streets).

Proposed Station/Stop Locations and Spacing

The preliminary station/stop locations for this alignment are shown in Figure 1. There are 8 stations/stops. The stops are as follows:

1. Camp Randall (commuter rail station).
2. Dayton/Mills (Streets)
3. Kohl Center (Dayton at Lake/Frances Streets)
4. Gilman/State (Streets)
5. Capitol Square West (State near Carroll Street)
6. Capitol Square East (E. Main near Pinckney Street)
7. Main/Blair (Streets)
8. Ingersoll (commuter rail station)

An optional stop could be located on East Main at Paterson.

The spacing between the proposed stops ranges from .3 miles to .6 miles. The average stop spacing is .4 miles.

There are at least two advantages of locating the eastern terminal at *Ingersoll*. First, the system will need a storage and maintenance facility for the cars. An ideal location is the vacant land between the existing Madison Metro facility and the rail ROW east of Ingersoll Street. Placing this facility at the end of the line minimizes non-revenue (A deadhead \cong) trips for cars to and from the facility. Second, locating the line in the center of East Main Street will encourage development in this area, and would make the line accessible to residents of the near east side.

Hours of Operation, Headway, Scheduling

The following are recommended:

- ⊘ Hours of service: 5:00 AM to 12:00 PM on weekdays; 7:00 AM to 12:00 PM on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.
- ⊘ Headway: 5-minutes peak, 10-minutes off-peak, 15 minutes after 9:00 PM Sunday through Thursday; 15 minutes on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, with more frequent service during special events.
- ⊘ Scheduling: inbound streetcars should be scheduled to leave the terminals 1 minute after the arrival of inbound commuter trains (trains from Greenway Center, East Towne). Streetcars should be scheduled to arrive at the terminals shortly before the arrival of outbound commuter trains (trains to Greenway Center, East Towne).
Additional cars should be scheduled in coordination with the starting and ending times of major events at Camp Randall, the Kohl Center, the Overture Hall and Oscar Meyer Theatre, and Monona Terrace.

Number of Cars

To provide the proposed service, a fleet of 8 cars would be sufficient.

John Coleman
Comments on East Rail Corridor Plan

May 9, 2003

I could use more time to comment but here are my comments so far.
Comments are on the draft dated April 24, 2003.

Page numbers refer to pages in the draft distributed at the public meeting:

-- Page 5. If the East Rail Corridor is to be "an extension of the downtown commercial core" the MG&E "campus" must not act as a impediment to linkage between the downtown and the rest of the East Rail Corridor. The need for maintaining links through the MG&E "campus" between the East Rail Corridor and downtown should be emphasized. In particular East Main needs to be maintained as a primary entrance from the west into the East Rail Corridor.

-- Page 15. I strongly disagree with the notion that the 700 and 800 block of Wilson Street is unsuitable with residential development. Certain residential developments could be very suitable in these two blocks, particularly those that benefit from the location's proximity to workplaces downtown, and those that benefit from the Capital and Lake views that are possible from these blocks. Residential or commercial developments that take advantage of the positive aspects of the site should be the recommended uses for these blocks.

-- Page 16. Two bonus stories to allow up to 7 stories in the 800 block is excessive. There should be a maximum of one bonus story for underground or structured parking.

-- Page 19. The statement about desired residential density is useful in putting the goals in a commonly discussed context. Inclusion of a little more specificity would also be helpful.

-- Page 20. The Yahara River district should extend to E. Washington Ave. or at least to within 1/2 block of E. Wash. The open space resources at the river and in the rail corridor at Dickinson make this an ideal location for residential development that focuses on these resources.

-- Page 21. A recommended height of 4 - 5 stories is too high for the Yahara River district, particularly near the river. Even East Main St. (Page 13), which is much closer to the existing larger buildings of downtown has a recommendation of 4 - 5 stories. Recommending the same number of stories at the far east and far west ends of the planning area is in conflict with the concept of greater building mass toward the downtown. The recommended heights in the Yahara District should be 3 - 4 stories.

-- Page 29. Links between the bike/pedestrian path and retail establishments should be encouraged. Signage, sidewalks and the placement of bike racks should encourage access to retail businesses from the bike/pedestrian path.

-- Development should recognize and complement open space parks. This should be done for esthetic reasons as well as for the purpose of creating "linkages". Open space, such as the bike/pedestrian path, should not be used as the "back side" or "back alley" of developments. There should be a statement to the effect that development should be designed to benefit from and to esthetically compliment adjacent open space.

-- Lighting standard should be recommended. They should specify energy efficient, pedestrian friendly, low glare lighting. Lighting should be designed to focus light where it is needed and minimize light escape to the sky.

Nick Schroeder
Comments on the Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations

May 9, 2003

To Mike Waidelich and the East Rail Committee:

I would like to thank you for the great deal of time and effort that you have put in to this project. Such a well-developed, comprehensive plan in this neighborhood is certainly a challenge when dealing with the many contentious issues entailed here. As a whole, I am very impressed with the draft report, and I am excited for the prospects of the future.

However, there is one part of the proposal that I would like to address here. The East Wilson/Schley Pass/Dewey Ct Conservation District is a concept that is long overdue. But strangely, the Baldwin St. frontage of Block 213 (201-221 S. Baldwin) is excluded from this district. This omission is a rubber stamp for large-scale development of these parcels, which would ultimately ruin the quality of the surrounding district. I am glad that I attended the open house, for the maps of these zones, which you displayed there, are referred to in the draft proposal, but are mysteriously not included in the handout, or the online copy.

As outlined in the report, the qualities of this district are exemplary of many of the characteristics that make the greater neighborhood a desirable place to live. These blocks are a close knit community of small owner-occupied and rental homes, representing one of the most unique, diverse, eclectic and affordable areas in the entire near East Side. Ironically, the structures omitted from the district fit these criteria even more than most any other of dwellings in the indicated zone. Each of them has more historic value and social character than the rest of the entire block. (And there is probably no isthmus housing that is more affordable than Port St. Vincent) This is a very bizarre situation, where we see the only buildings which are omitted from a conservation/preservation district being some of the very few in the area that weren't built as cheap spec houses. Indeed, the 200 block buildings predate the replat of Block 213, as the parcels were carved from John George Ott's brickyard while it was still in that use. The pieces of the same red bricks that made his house at 754 Jennifer St. are still littering the soil of the properties, giving the area a very unique connection to the neighborhood.

The Baldwin St. frontage is the gateway to the district. The houses and other buildings in this stretch are an essential part of it and have been for 100 years, for better or worse. I'm afraid that many of the memories of the "worse" parts, combined with some of the recent neglect of the appearance of these properties, has disguised their value to the community. It is unacceptable that this plan goes out of its way to include a couple of homes several blocks away from the center of the

district, yet excludes these similar homes right in the heart of the area in question. The only visible difference between these dwellings is that the included ones have been recently renovated and cared after, while the ones that have been excluded eventually will be renovated and cared after, assuming that they are spared demolition. I find this very shortsighted.

According to the draft report, the 200 block buildings could be razed, and structures erected in their place structures that, while having a 2/1/2 story limit on the back lot line, ("closet to the conservation district") would have no limit on the Baldwin St. frontage as it is more than 40 ft. from the district boundary. From your map it appears that the distance between the district line and Baldwin St. would be enough to make these extra floors feasible. This recommendation is greatly out of step with its title of "transition zone," as the possibility has been created for the transition between the proposed park and the Schely Pass homes to include six-story high rises.

Therefore, I request that the committee review this omission, as I can see no other reason for the exclusion of these properties other than to give a handout to development interests and a pittance more tax revenue for the city. The disruption it would cause to the surrounding neighborhood has not been sufficiently examined. As I pointed out in the open house, my garage is in the district, yet my house is not. This highlights that either the boundaries of this zone were hastily thrown together, or that the development process there is intended to radically alter the parcels of this "conservation" district. I am not opposed to development. I am eager to see growth in the East Rail Corridor, even in the form of condominiums. This is not a "Not in my Backyard" issue either. My lot would sell for a lot more as a prospective development site than as the oldest and more bizarre house in the old and bizarre house conservation district. I am convinced that this omission is wrong, and not in the best interest of the community. History shows that once these plans are put into effect, certain interests have a way of eroding the influence of the recommendations contained in them. There is already a land grab going on down here and many rumblings of future developments on these affordable housing sites. Thus, I think it is better to lean on the side of caution and include the entire block in the district, and hopefully prevent future wrangling and negotiations about where the wavy line through the middle of it begins and ends. I again thank you for your efforts on this otherwise excellent report. I hope you take my comments into account and I invite any further discussion on the matter.

Thank You,
Nick Schroeder
213 S. Baldwin St.
nschroeder@mge.com