

Compilation of Public Comments Received
SINCE THE JUNE 9, 2003 ERCPAC MEETING

on the
April 24, 2003 Draft East Rail Corridor Plan and Recommendations

CONTENTS

za. Email from Lauren L. Azar 7/7/03.....	2
zb. Email from Scott Griskavich 7/7/03.....	3
zc. Email from Jodi Vander Molen 7/11/03.....	4
zd. 1st Attachment to Jodi Vander Molen email (Copy of letter to ERPAC dated 7/7/03).....	5
ze. 2nd Attachment to Jodi Vander Molen email (Copy of WSJ article on Rypkema).....	6
zf. Email from Bill Patterson 7/18/03	8
zg. Attachment to Bill Patterson email (Talk by Donovan Rypkema).....	10
zh. Email from John Martens 7/18/03.....	22
zi. Marquette Neighborhood Association Response to ERCPAC 7/21/03.....	23
zj. Email from Gary Tipler-Friends of Historic Third Lake Ridge 7/18/03	56
zk. Email from Sharon Kilfoy 7/18/03.....	57
zl. Email from Jim Czchowicz 7/9/03.....	59
zm. Letter from GWABA 7/11/03.....	60
zn. Email from David Waugh 7/18/03	61
zo. Email from John Edward Peck 7/19/03.....	62
zp. Email from Karolyn Bebee 7/20/03	65

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.

Email July 7, 2003

Michael and Judy --

I'm writing to provide comments on the East Rail Corridor Plan. I own property and live in the 800 block of Spaight Street. My comments are based solely on summaries that I have read about the plan-- I have not read the plan itself.

My Primary Concern:

4 story maximum: the character of the neighborhood suggests that buildings be a maximum of 4 stories. I understand that the current plan allows up to 6 stories. I strongly suggest that the City Council reject any plan allowing more than 4 stories. Many of us purchased property in this eclectic neighborhood because of its wonderful character, which does not include high rises. Let's ensure that character is maintained while allowing developers to build new housing. Four story developments should provide a sufficient profit margin for developers. This is a fundamental issue for me.

Other Concern:

Mixed use in Urban Center: another strong character of the neighborhood is the mixed residential and commercial uses in our urban center. I would ask that this mixed use in the "urban center" continue. I understand that the latest plan proposes exclusively commercial use for 3 blocks between Williamson and Wilson. I would ask that the City Council reject any plan proposing exclusive commercial use.

Thank you for your consideration on these matters.

Lauren L. Azar

From: Scott Griskavich
Date: Monday, July 7, 2003 8:54 AM
To: mwaidelich@ci.madison.wi.us
Subject: Rezoning - Lite Rail & Park Planning Project

Badger Welding Supplies, Inc. is a family-owned and operated business located at 101 S. Dickinson St. Our properties at the corners of South Dickinson and East Main Streets show up on all proposed maps as residential, indicating we are going to be asked to leave.

Commercial zones appear on these proposed land use maps directly across Dickinson St. and directly across Main St. from our present location.

Having been in this location since at least 1955, and possibly as early as 1942, we are more than a little curious as to what the City of Madison land use planners have in mind for our plant location.

We have absolutely no intention of relocating, and would like to expand and improve our present facilities. We have been sitting on our hands for at least two years, wondering what the next step is going to be for us.

Mr. Mike Gay stops by occasionally to bring us updates, but is unable to give us anything concrete.

What is going to happen to our facility?

Are we grandfathered?

Do we have to leave?

Are we going to be regulated out-of-town?

Where do you propose putting us?

What happens if we should proceed with our planned improvements? Do we lose everything when the axe falls?

Thank you,
Scott Griskavich
President
Badger Welding Supplies
608-257-5606
scott@badgerwelding.com

GenevaHello, Michael-- I left the original copy of a letter to ERCPCAC (see below) at the neighborhood meeting Monday night held at Wil-Mar. Here is another copy in case it got lost in transit. Please distribute to ERCPCAC members. I'd also like to add an observation made in a talk last night by Donovan Rypkema, an international expert on the economics of historic preservation (good article in today's WI State Journal on his visit which I will forward). He discussed the importance of density, but said that he considered the density of downtown Madison and surrounding neighborhoods quite adequate. He suggested that one way to increase density is to build up East Washington Avenue to 4-5 stories. Local planners had been talking about 8-12! This dramatizes the need for a decrease in proposed heights on East Wilson. Keeping heights and scale at a level compatible with the existing architecture of the historic Third Lake Ridge district preserves the character that makes it an attractive destination. Could you please drop me a line so I know you received my comments? Thanks in advance for passing them along.

Sincerely, Jodi Vander Molen Geneva
July 7, 2003 ERCPCAC c/o Michael Waidelich Dept. of Planning Madison, WI
Dear ERCPCAC members, I am writing regarding proposed building heights in the current East Rail Corridor draft. I object to the discrepancies between BUILD heights and the heights in the East Rail Corridor draft recommendations. Attached is language from the BUILD plan/a map of the zones. For example, BUILD has three stories max on the 800 block (four under the "bonus" floor concept), which is already higher than existing structures (approx. 2 1/2 stories max). According to a recent East Rail draft, this number has been increased by another two stories, bringing it up to six (with bonuses). Area residents have registered their opinion demanding that heights of new developments in the neighborhood remain at a level compatible with existing structures, maintaining the historic character of the Third Lake Ridge district. For instance, in fall 2002, members of Protect our Williamson! presented the BUILD committee with a neighborhood petition to this effect containing approximately 300 signatures that was filed with the city. And in neighborhood surveys conducted throughout the BUILD process, historic preservation has ranked among the highest concerns of neighborhood residents. The BUILD plan more accurately reflects the input of neighborhood residents than does the East Rail Corridor plan. I believe it is your responsibility to incorporate this input into the final draft of the East Rail plan. Keeping heights at the levels agreed upon in the BUILD plan is how to get there. Thank you for the time you've spent helping to plan for the future of Madison. Sincerely, Jodi Vander Molen Ridge Side Cooperative / POW! (Protect our Williamson) member 843 Williamson St., #6 Madison, WI 53703 Attachment cc: Mayor Dave Cieslewicz, Ald. Judy Olson, MNA, POW! members, BUILD committee

July 7, 2003

ERCPAC
c/o Michael Waidelich
Dept. of Planning
Madison, WI

Dear ERCPAC members,

I am writing regarding proposed building heights in the current East Rail Corridor draft. I object to the discrepancies between BUILD heights and the heights in the East Rail Corridor draft recommendations. Attached is language from the BUILD plan/a map of the zones.

For example, BUILD has three stories max on the 800 block (four under the "bonus" floor concept), which is already higher than existing structures (approx. 2 1/2 stories max). According to a recent East Rail draft, this number has been increased by another two stories, bringing it up to six (with bonuses).

Area residents have registered their opinion demanding that heights of new developments in the neighborhood remain at a level compatible with existing structures, maintaining the historic character of the Third Lake Ridge district.

For instance, in fall 2002, members of Protect our Williamson! presented the BUILD committee with a neighborhood petition to this effect containing approximately 300 signatures that was filed with the city. And in neighborhood surveys conducted throughout the BUILD process, historic preservation has ranked among the highest concerns of neighborhood residents.

The BUILD plan more accurately reflects the input of neighborhood residents than does the East Rail Corridor plan. I believe it is your responsibility to incorporate this input into the final draft of the East Rail plan. Keeping heights at the levels agreed upon in the BUILD plan is how to get there.

Thank you for the time you've spent helping to plan for the future of Madison.

Sincerely,

Jodi Vander Molen
Ridge Side Cooperative / POW! (Protect our Williamson) member
843 Williamson St., #6 Madison, WI 53703

Attachment

cc: Mayor Dave Cieslewicz, Ald. Judy Olson, MNA, POW! members, BUILD committee

From: Jodi <jodi@progressive.org>
To: <mwaidelich@ci.madison.wi.us>
Date: 7/11/03 5:15PM
Subject: Expert: STOP tearing down old housing stock

WISCONSIN STATE JOURNAL FRIDAY JULY 11, 2003

Expert: Nurture Downtown
Dean Mosiman City government reporter

The vast majority of American cities "would kill" to have Madison's Downtown, especially State Street.

The Downtown must be cherished and nurtured amid enormous redevelopment pressures, said Donovan Rypkema, an international expert on the economics of historic preservation.

"You have the authentic of what most people are building fake all across America," he said.

If he were Madison's "czar," Rypkema would:

- * Abandon the mishmash of "stupid" one-way streets Downtown;
- * Stop using State Street as a central crossroads for buses;
- * Stop razing old buildings and preserving only facades - "facadomy;"
- * Save old housing stock for low- and middle-income people; and
- * Never again build a parking garage that doesn't have retail space facing the sidewalk.

An author, consultant, expert in real estate and downtown revitalization and former board member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Rypkema spent a whirlwind two days here as the human centerpiece of a historic preservation summit sponsored by Capitol Neighborhoods Inc. and the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation.

Rypkema met with Mayor Dave Cieslewicz and Dane County Executive Kathleen Falk, the Overture Center's \$100 million donor - W. Jerome Frautschi, and spoke to business groups, UW-Madison students and staff, and residents.

"We are at a critical juncture due to our tremendous prosperity," Joe Lusson, president of the local historic preservation group, said of the summit.

Despite a need for low-cost housing, single-family homes with porches that hug Capitol Square are falling to big projects with underground parking, and the 100 block of State Street next to the rising Overture Center is under siege by speculators paying far above the assessed value for property, Lusson said.

"We kind of feel our backs are against the wall without some kind of strong leadership," Lusson said.

Sheridan Glen, president of Capitol Neighborhoods, said Rypkema was invited to raise the quality of conversation on density, scale, materials and preservation.

"By and large, the development community is sensitive and knowledgeable about what needs to be done," Glen said. "On the other hand, money always drives these things."

Good economics, private and public, lie in understanding what should be saved and not, Rypkema said.

Diversity and local culture - cradled in Downtown - must be saved from an onslaught of cookie-cutter, big-box stores and sterile shopping malls, he said.

Lately, Madison has been doing a lot right, he said.

"The buildings built in this city in the last 10 years are decidedly better than in the 30 years before that," he said.

To preserve the 100 block of State Street, the city could create a historic district and impose height limits, and use public money to help owners improve buildings, he said.

The city should avoid simply preserving building facades, Rypkema said. "Only from a Salvador Dali dictionary written on drugs would that be historic preservation," he said.

A proposal by architect-developer Kenton Peters to save facades and build a glass-domed winter garden on the block would be a "a movie set, not a city," Rypkema said.

The city, however, should build parking garages with retail space that could be used as incubator space and help some businesses that will inevitably be displaced from State Street.

Although he declined an opinion on the mayor's proposal to delay the reconstruction of East Washington Avenue for a more grand boulevard, Rypkema applauded Cieslewicz for recognizing the potential economic benefits and the long-term impact.

"When this sort of decision is made, you're setting a priority for three generations or more," he said. "Those ought not to be made in haste."

July 18, 2003

Michael,

I am writing as a resident (1014 Williamson Street) that is interested in the development of the East Rail Corridor.

I am in favor of appropriate development in the East Rail Corridor. I do have a number of concerns:

* I would encourage mixed-use of much of the land, and not just big tracts of it as office space or manufacturing space that would be dark and vacant during large portions of the day. We need some activity to keep the area interesting.

* I would support larger building heights of 5 or 6 stories along East Washington Avenue with the building heights tapering down to meet the Williamson Street Build recommendations along Wilson Street. As you know, assessments are based upon the highest and best use of land as if it were vacant plus the depreciated value of any buildings. Thus, if you set the maximum building heights fairly high, you are going to cause the assessments to go up, even though an existing building on the site might be much lower than the maximum height. This just causes property taxes to go up and it may be a factor in driving existing tenants out of their buildings. Donovan Rypkema said last week that he thought that 5 and 6 story high buildings are appropriate for East Washington Avenue.

* I strongly urge the Committee to address, in greater detail, the needs to preserve as many of the historic buildings in the area as possible. As Donovan Rypkema (visited Madison last week) said in a Columbus, Ohio forum: "The man-made physical environment gives us a sense of history, a sense of belonging, a sense of identity, a sense of stability, a sense of place, a sense of our values. When we raze buildings that provide that sense we have tacitly decided that those values are not worth saving. Quality of life is fragile. Things that make up any community's quality of life need to be identified, enhanced and protected. Resurrecting the older character and history of places requires vision, blending old with new and an appreciation that place character is a valuable asset in retaining firms and people, and in attracting new investment and businesses." You might want to check out the conclusions of this forum at <http://www.oac.state.oh.us/GrowingInward/policy.html> because many of them will probably apply to the East Rail Corridor. Rypkema's statement comes from the Policy section.

* I feel very strongly that the Committee should make its decisions based upon an overall view of what is happening in this area of east side of Madison. We simply can't afford to make decisions about something like this without taking into consideration other plans and such like the Williamson Street Build process.

* I strongly urge the Committee to carefully examine transportation issues as they relate to the East Rail Corridor. As a member of the Capital Neighborhoods Executive Council, I've been sitting in on the public meetings to discuss the building of Metropolitan Place Phase II. Many of the residents of Metropolitan Place Phase I are upset because Phase II may only provide about one parking space per unit instead of the 1.5 that they

already have. I think that they would really like 2 parking stalls per unit. I feel that many of these people are recent residents of the downtown and they haven't changed their mindset about transportation and they still feel that they need the same number of autos that they needed in a suburban setting. It would be great if people living and/or working in the East Rail Corridor could utilize public transportation as much as possible, but I don't think that it will happen by itself unless you do something to encourage it. Will there be frequent bus routes in the area, including on weekends? Will there be a rail stop if a rail system gets built? Will the city try to get the landlords to get public transportation passes for the tenants?

* Professor Kerry Vandell at the UW School of Business Real Estate Department says that the literature says that when you have high density, this can lead to congestion. I think that you need to keep this in mind as you do your planning. Everyone seems to be saying that high density is a good thing, but it looks like it might also create some problems.

* I have attached the text of Donovan's speech about complete communities that he gave on July 10 in Madison. I think that it should be required reading for your committee.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Bill Patterson

The Competitive Community in the 21st Century

Madison, Wisconsin

July 10, 2003

Donovan D. Rypkema

Thank you and good evening. The widely admired American author Eudora Welty in her collection of essays entitled *The Eye of the Story* wrote, "it is our describable outside that defines us, willy-nilly, to others, that may save us, or destroy us, in the world; it may be our shield against chaos, our mask against exposure; but whatever it is, the move we make in the place we live has to signify our intent and meaning."

Yesterday I received an excellent tour of Madison that included all four of your neighborhoods. The efforts over the last several years by those in this room well represent the "moves you are making in the place you live to signify your intent and meaning." I understand that Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. is a residential neighborhood organization. But, as you probably know better than I, neighborhood based organizations are often accused of being nothing but NIMBY advocates. So while I will have a thing or two to say about residential neighborhoods, I've taken the liberty of taking a slightly more macro view, to talk about what will make the competitive community in the 21st century. We'll have plenty of time for questions and I won't avoid responding to particular neighborhood issues that you might wish to raise, but these more formal remarks are at the level of the city, not primarily at the level of the neighborhood.

I want to begin with a recollection of history and a real estate cliché. Think about how nearly all cities began – they were founded and grew because of their dependence on a fixed location. They were located on a seaport, or near raw materials, at a transportation crossroads, or close to a water source, or at a point that was appropriate as a military defensive outpost. They were location dependent cities. Now think about that old cliché that the three most important things in real estate are location, location, location. And for a long time that has been true. But we are in the midst of changes that will move cities from being driven by location economics to be driven by place economics. What is the distinction between a place and a mere location? I've struggled with that over the past few years. For the moment I have settled on landscape artist Allan Gussow's definition of place as "a piece of the whole environment that has been claimed by feelings." So place is not a synonym for "location." A location is a point on the globe; an intersection of longitude and latitude. Certainly every "place" has to have a location but I do not believe every location meets the test of being a "place."

Without question in my mind, each of your neighborhoods is a place not a mere location. It is a piece of the whole environment that has been claimed by feelings, and your presence here today is evidence of that.

Before we go further I want to make another definitional distinction. The vastly overused word “community” is not, in my judgment, a synonym for “municipality”. I’ve searched for an appropriate definition of “community” and here is the one I think is most useful. “A community is a place in which people know and care for one another--the kind of place in which people do not merely ask 'How are you?' as a formality but care about the answer.”

There are today, throughout America hundreds of groups advocating for “community” and hundreds more advocating for “place.” What virtually none of them has recognized is that the two concepts - community and place - are inseparable.” Place” is the vessel within which the “spirit” of community is stored; “Community” is the catalyst that imbues a location with a “sense” of place. The two are not divisible. You cannot have community without place; and a place without community is only a location.

I also feel the obligation of making a confession to you: I have, by far, the best job in America. Every year I get to visit a hundred or so communities of every size – from villages of 450 people in the middle of Nebraska to Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles and every size in between. In the last 8 weeks I’ve been in the state of Washington, Florida, Ohio, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Colorado, Pennsylvania, Arizona, and the United Arab Emirates. I go in, pretend I know what I’m talking about, and leave – no follow through, no implementation, no responsibility. I don’t actually have to do anything. Which is probably just as well because I really don’t have that many skills. But I do have one. I am a very good note taker. I see what lots of people in lots of places are trying: what is being successful; what is not. And then I take those notes and make lists. That is what I really am – a list maker.

We are now in the 31st month of the 21st century. And since the beginning of this new millennium, but particularly since September 11th, I have spent a lot of time reading, and listening, and thinking about places – thinking about what they are going to have to do to be competitive in this century. And what did I do with this reading and listening and thinking? Make a list, of course, a list I’m calling Qualities of the Competitive Place in the 21st Century.

You should know that this list is a work in progress. I absolutely reserve the right to add, subtract, correct and amend as we all move forward into this new century. Forums such as this have given me the opportunity to put this list on paper and offer it to you as a way to judge for yourselves

if your efforts in Madison in general and your neighborhoods in particular will aid in making this a competitive place in the 21st century. I have twenty or so items on this list, so I'll be brief on most of them. And they are not in any particular order. But, for what it's worth, is my list.

The definition of what "economic development" means needs to be a local one. It needs to be specific and measurable. Many local economic development yardsticks in the 21st Century will be qualitative rather than quantitative. Localization will always necessitate identifying local assets (human, natural, physical, locational, functional, cultural) that can be utilized to respond to globalization. Writing in his book *Post-Capitalist Society*, business guru Peter Drucker writes, "Tomorrow's educated person will have to be prepared for life in a global world. He or she must become a "citizen of the world" – in vision, horizon, information. But he or she will also have to draw nourishment from their local roots and, in turn, enrich and nourish their own local culture."

The competitive place will be an active participant in economic globalization. It is not my intention here to argue the merits of economic globalization aside from the following: 1) economic globalization is inevitable in the 21st century; 2) there are 1.2 billion people in the world living in poverty – most of them people of color – and the industrial world will never tax itself enough to end that hunger; 3) the only escape from poverty is the ability to sell goods and services around the world; and, 4) while there will be some places that choose to opt out of the world economy for reasons of provincial ideology, protectionist isolationism, or political I.O.U.s, the citizens of those places will be the losers. Your economic competitors will not be Boston, Massachusetts but Bilbao, Spain; not Salem, Oregon but Samara, Russia; not Raleigh, North Carolina but Recife, Brazil.

The competitive place will, however, make a conscious effort to avoid cultural globalization. To be lost in a sea of international undifferentiated sameness, to be just a spot in the road that also has a McDonald's, a Toy's R Us, and Super 8 Motel will convert a someplace into an anyplace. And the distance from anyplace to noplacement is short indeed. Perhaps the most articulate advocate for globalization in America is *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman, author of *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. But listen to what he says. "There are two ways to make people homeless: One is to take away their home, and the other is to make their home look like everybody else's home."

The competitive place will forge formal ties to educational institutions at every level – colleges and universities, community colleges, high schools, trade schools, private schools. And the competitive city will provide ample opportunities for ongoing learning opportunities throughout one's life. I don't care what field you are in or how good you are at your profession – if you haven't been in a classroom in the last 24 months you are falling behind.

The competitive place will begin to understand that economic growth and population growth are not inherently one-in-the-same. This will be a tough one, because for at least 200 years in this country we have assumed population growth was essential for economic growth. But I would suggest that is no longer necessarily true. How can there be economic growth without population growth? Well, there are at least six ways: a better educated existing workforce; increased productivity; expanded markets; technological innovation; internet transactions; and telecommuting.

Now don't get me wrong. I am not remotely suggesting that some cities might not want population growth or that population growth can't create economic growth. What I am saying is that we need to step back and ask the question, "Can we have economic growth without population growth?" and I think we can.

Let me digress from the list for a moment. I'm in the business of economic development. When I go into a town the people I typically see are like many of the people at the Rotary Club meeting yesterday – bankers, elected officials, city staff, property owners, business owners, professionals. And I often ask them, "Why are you involved in this economic development stuff?" And, of course, what they immediately say is, "We need to increase the tax base; build loan demand and generate deposits for the bank, increase household income, attract higher paying jobs." But you know what, those are never the real reasons. When you talk long enough, and ask the question enough times the real reason emerges and it is this: "I want my kid to have the chance to stay here and work if she chooses to." That's why we're really involved in economic development – so our child can have the opportunity to live and work where they grew up. And if we can create opportunities for them to do that, that too is economic growth, without population growth. But there's one more issue here – Why would a child want to come back if the place they grew up in is indistinguishable from anywhere else?

The competitive place will be a sustainable place. Sustainability has for sometime been recognized by the resource industries – the necessity to pace extraction or renew resources so that the local economy is sustainable over the long term. A broadened principle of sustainability recognizes the importance of the functional sustainability of public infrastructure, the fiscal sustainability of a local government, the economic sustainability of the local economy the physical sustainability of the built environment, and the cultural sustainability of local traditions, customs, and skills. You might think of the notion of sustainability as an environmental concept, but the English words "ecology" and "economy" come from the same root, the Greek word *oikos*, which means "house". Economic development analysts – based on the models of the ecologists – have

discovered that what is necessary to keep our economic house in order is the same as it takes to keep our ecological house in order and that, in part, is sustainability.

Another word from the ecological world is diversity. Biologists were the first to understand the importance of diversity to a healthy ecological system but it is true of an economic system as well. That's why smart economic development specialists strive to avoid having their community dependent on a single employer, a single industry, or even a single industry focus.

But the competitive place won't just focus on industrial diversity but perhaps even more importantly on human diversity. Now dealing with diversity is never easy. For 40 years we have struggled in this country – often painfully – over our racial and cultural and ethnic and gender diversity. Those struggles have not been easy nor are they over. But as part of that struggle we have learned as an economy how not only to overcome the challenges of diversity but to utilize alternative perspectives to make money in the marketplace. We live in a world where there are far more Brown, Yellow, and Black people than White; where there are more Hindus, more Buddhists, and more Muslims, than non-Hispanic Christians. The percentage of the world's population made up of people who look and in many cases think like most of the people in this room is falling every day. Our having confronted and worked through diversity issues at home will maintain a competitive edge for American business in the global marketplace. Our main economic competitors in the next two decades will be Brazil and South Africa. Why? Because those are two countries that are systematically beginning to recognize their diversity as an economic asset, not a sociological liability. What is a white middle-aged heterosexual Republican-type male doing up here talking about diversity? Because communities are going to have to learn to figure out ways to operate in this context of diversity not for sociological, political, ethical, or moral reasons, but for economic survival. A city that is diverse can be a competitive city if it is smart enough to capitalize on and utilize that diversity.

So these concepts of sustainability and diversity emerged from the environmental sciences but I don't want to leave the subject of the environment quite yet. You know we all diligently recycle our Coke cans. It's a pain in the neck, but we do it because it's good for the environment. Now even though a quarter of everything dumped at the landfill is from construction debris, we don't often think about the environment in relation to the demolition of historic buildings. But let me put it in context for you. Let's say that today we tear down one small building like this in downtown Madison. We have now wiped out the environmental benefit from the last 1,344,000 aluminum cans that were recycled. We've not only wasted an historic building, we've wasted months of diligent recycling by the good people of this community. Now why doesn't every environmentalist have a bumper sticker saying "Recycle your aluminum cans

AND your historic buildings.” Either that or let us off the hook from having to sort those Coke cans every week.

The competitive place will be a differentiated place. Four hundred years ago the Italian philosopher Giordano Bruno recognized that “Where there is no differentiation, there is no distinction of quality.” And today a competitive place must be a quality place.

The competitive place will make sure there is affordable housing for workers. Let me give you a real estate fact of life – you can’t build new and rent cheap, it can’t be done, unless you have deep public subsidies or you build crap. A major economic reason to stabilize and preserve older neighborhoods – even if you think they are of nominal architectural or historic value – is so you preserve an inventory of affordable housing. Every time you see that old house being razed just realize that you’ve lost one more unit of affordable housing, and it will be very expensive to replace it. Why do we care? Over the next ten years around 20 million net new jobs are going to be created in America. And that's great. But nearly seven million of those jobs – 34 percent of the total, are going to pay less than \$20,000 per year. Now I suppose that has all kinds of political, social, and philosophical issues involved. But I have just one question – Where are those people going to live?

Some cities have a hot shot economic director who says, “Well, I understand how other places are going to have to worry about this affordable housing for workers business, but our town is going to be part of the new economy, the high tech economy, the cutting edge economy. And those are all high paid jobs so we don't have to worry about the affordable housing issue.”

Well, Mr. “we're the new economy” economic development director, let me ‘splain you something. In the next ten years for every new job for a computer programmer we'll need 7 clerical workers; for every chemist we'll need 43 cashiers; for every operations research analyst we'll need 73 janitors.

Furthermore the so-called new economy workers are driven by quality of life issues on where they want to live. Well quality of life means good childcare, and childcare workers make less than \$11,000 a year. Quality of life means nice restaurants – and waiters and waitresses, and we'll need 300,000 more of them over the next ten years, make \$12,730. Quality of life means clean and safe buildings, which require janitors and guards and they make less than \$16,000 a year. So high tech, high pay, new economy cities – good for you...but you're going to have to have a whole bunch of workers who don't get paid like you do. Those workers are going to need a place to live. So you better be insisting that older neighborhoods be protected and enhanced if for no other reason than to make sure your kid's nanny has a place she can afford to live.

The competitive place will have arts and cultural activities not as a luxury but as a core component of economic development, of public life, of education. The ballet will be every bit as important as the bandwidth; the interactive art exhibit every bit as important as the internet access.

The competitive place will be a city of partnerships. Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. is a splendid example. Not the public sector, not the private sector, not the non-profit sector has all the answers; but each has value to add to the process. More and more issues will be addressed locally through partnerships.

The competitive place will also have a vision. It will be a vision that stirs the imagination but remains in the category of achievable. It will be a vision that is advanced one step at a time. It will be a vision that evolves over time. It will be a vision that is embraced to the people of the competitive community.

The competitive place will have a long-term perspective. Elected officials will think more about the next generation than the next election. Business leaders will think about the next quarter century instead of the next quarterly dividend. How long term should we be thinking? Here's my rule of thumb – we should think as far into the future as the age of the oldest public building still in use.

Economic development strategies in the competitive place will include both incentives and regulations – carrots and sticks. You know there are at least three groups who are opposed to this approach. First the traditional planner who only thinks in regulations. I once read of a debate in the English Parliament where one member was described as “wielding his stick in a carrot-free environment.” Well that won't work. Neither, however, will only incentives work. The Chinese are trying to build what they call “market socialism”. Well, for a long time I couldn't figure out what “market socialism” could possibly be. But then I looked at a whole bunch of American corporations going from city to city asking who will pay them the most to locate there. No strings attached, mind you, just give me a building and land, and tax abatements, and a low interest loan and a grant and I'll be so beneficent as to come to your town. That sounds pretty much like market socialism to me – take the taxpayers dollars but keep the dividends.

And then we have the Libertarians who say, “let everyone do whatever they damn well please but don't give nobody nothin'”. But the successful community in economic development will reject those three approaches and use the combination of carrots and sticks to enhance the economic opportunity and advance the vision of the city.

The competitive place will be neither dependent nor independent but rather recognize interdependence – interdependence among property owners; interdependence among business owners; interdependence of the private and public sectors; interdependence of business and labor; interdependence between landlord and tenant, interdependence between residential neighborhoods and commercial neighborhoods.

The competitive city will have a strong, healthy, vibrant downtown. Now I work almost exclusively in downtown revitalization so I could talk for hours why this is important. But I'll limit it to this – a city that has a rotten core is ultimately a rotten city. Period.

Related to the importance attached to the downtown is the importance that will be attached by the competitive city to the public realm. Certainly that includes the streets and sidewalks of downtown, but also parks, squares and public gathering places of all types. This was one of the great lessons of September 11th. Here was this horrendous event. One might have speculated that everyone would want to go home, bolt the doors, and curl up in bed in the prenatal position. Instead what did we do, all over America? We gathered together in public spaces. We wanted, we needed to be with other people. And importantly other people not exactly like us. We didn't gather inside the private space of department stores or hotel lobbies. We gathered on the street, we gathered in parks, we gathered in public squares. That's the public realm and the competitive city will pay attention to it.

Likewise the competitive community in the 21st Century will have a strong ethic of historic preservation. More than any other element, our historic built environment tells us who we were, who we are, and who we can be. A less measurable benefit of reusing historic buildings lies in the philosophical examination of the relative significance of space versus the importance of place. Not long ago with the creation of the Internet, the growth of telecommunications, and the ability to work around the globe from one's house, there were predictions that the significance of one's physical place would diminish in importance. In fact the opposite has been true. The ability to work anywhere, the ability to electronically be everywhere, has increased our need to be somewhere – somewhere in particular, somewhere differentiated. The internet exists only in space; humans who use the internet need a real place, a place of both substance and quality.

These last two elements – the importance of the public realm and an historic preservation ethic – are somewhat related. Historic buildings are private assets that include a public value; and public spaces are public assets that include private values. And all of those values need to be recognized.

Of course we all need to be technologically connected. Who knows what will be the evolution after we all have DSL connections or cable modems, but I'm certain it will be amazing.

And importantly as technology advances the number of us who can live anywhere, including Madison, Wisconsin, increases. So is technological connectivity critical for the competitive city in the 21st century? Of course it is. But let me digress again for a moment on this issue. A year ago last November I was in Saudi Arabia at a conference on the Future of the City put on by the Arab Urban Development Institute. One of the other Americans was John Eger. John holds an endowed chair at the University of California in San Diego but is also CEO of the World Foundation for Smart Cities. His presentation was about cities and technology and the importance of being connected. But during the question and answer period John was asked some technical details about the Smart City. And he said, “Well, yes, high speed internet access is important. But you know what? That’s not that hard to get, but that isn’t what is going to make Smart Cities. Smart Cities are those that value their local culture, that preserve their historic buildings, that revitalize their downtowns.” So technology is an important tool, but it isn’t what is at the core of a competitive city.

Competitive places will reduce the adverse impact of automobile. We each have a different definition of what is important for our own family. If I were to ask you to list four or five things most important in a community for you, you might put quality schools, public safety, affordable housing, your church or your friends, access to outdoor recreation, perhaps not having to shovel snow in the winter. But how many of you would put at the top of your quality of life list “How many cars can be moved past a fixed point as quickly as possible.” I don’t think anybody has that on the list. But for the last fifty years all kinds of public decisions have been wrapped around that one. “The highway engineers say we have to move more cars faster”: so we make dozens of decisions to accommodate that one. That’s nuts. I don’t mean traffic flow should not be addressed but it is insanity that every other decision about our cities is subordinate to that one. 21st Century competitive cities will allow that no more.

Open leadership will also be a quality of competitive communities. There will be ready and accessible opportunities for participation and a variety of paths to community leadership. It will not be necessary that everyone participate in civic activities – rather that there is a clear understanding that everyone has the right to participate.

Government in the competitive place will be seen as “us” not as “them.” The population of that community will again see themselves as citizens not merely as consumers of public services. Our devolution from citizen to consumer has, more than anything else, reduced our confidence in and our participation in the public process. That pattern will begin to correct itself in the competitive community.

Finally the criteria for measuring a competitive city in the 21st Century will be more qualitative than quantitative. The single most important element will be that cliché, “Quality of Life”. But ultimately quality of life will be determined by five senses: the sense of place, the sense of evolution, the sense of ownership, the sense of identity and the sense of community itself.

The Greeks had a phrase – *horror vacui* – the intolerability of no-place-at-all. Many places in America have approached that *horror vacui*. On a trip to California I picked up a copy of the Sacramento Bee one morning and read a local columnist – Steve Weigand – and here’s what he wrote. “And from the Brave New World of the Internet comes the following new term. “Generica: fast food joints, strip malls and subdivisions, as in ‘we were so lost in Generica, I didn’t know what city it was.’”

Generica isn’t just a California phenomenon or just a city or suburban phenomena. Generica is happening everywhere and I would suggest it is at the heart of the challenge of economic development, smart growth and place economics. Generica undermines all five senses – the sense of place, of evolution, of ownership, of identity and of community.

A city will need a sense of place for it’s quality of life – something other than Generica – but it will also need a sense of evolution. Let me tell you about the small town of Rushville, Illinois. There is a school there built in 1919 with an addition built in 1925. The addition was the gymnasium on the lower level and an auditorium space on the upper level. The school board decided the structure no longer worked for and so built new schools, added to others, and finally the junior high kids who were the most recent users of the school were moved out. But the school board decided that not only didn’t the building work as a school – it was unusable for anything and intended to demolish it. When I toured the building I went into one of those little dressing rooms that are usually found behind the stage in high school auditoriums. There written in graffiti on the wall – clearly by a 14 or 15 year old was this: “Those who want to tear this building down have never seen this place as Wonderland.” That kid clearly understood what the school superintendent did not – that the evolution of the community was represented in that building and it was a far too precious commodity to be lost. The School Board didn’t understand that and the building was torn down.

But if the Rushville, Illinois School Board didn’t understand that, others do. In his book *The Good Society* sociologist Robert Bellah observes, “Communities, in the sense in which we are using the term, have a history--in an important sense they are constituted by their past--and for this reason we can speak of a real community as a 'community of memory', one that does not forget its past.” Generica diminishes each of the five senses; preservation of the historic built environment

enhances each of the five senses, and constitutes the physical manifestation of a “community of memory”. Historic preservation builds both community and place; generic destroys both community and place.

The third sense necessary for quality of life is the sense of ownership. People within the city need to feel the city is theirs. This sense of ownership has nothing to do with who the deed holders happen to be. People need to truly believe “This is my community.” A sense of ownership stems from a sense of opportunity – economic opportunity, political opportunity, social opportunity, and the opportunity to participate.

The sense of identity is vital to quality of life. A major component of real community identity is community differentiation. In Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities* Marco Polo is describing to Kublai Khan the various cities of the Khan's vast empire. In depicting the city of Trude, here is what he tells the Khan.

If on arriving at Trude I had not read the city's name written in big letters, I would have thought I was landing at the same airport from which I had taken off. The suburbs they drove me through were no different from the others, with the same little greenish and yellowish houses. Following the same signs we swung around the same flower beds in the same squares. The downtown streets displayed goods, packages, signs that had not changed at all. This was the first time I had come to Trude, but I already knew the hotel where I happened to be lodged; I had already heard and spoken my dialogues with the buyers and sellers of hardware; I had ended other days identically, looking through the same goblets at the same swaying navels.

Why come to Trude? I asked myself. And I already wanted to leave. "You can resume your flight whenever you like," they said to me, "but you will arrive at another Trude, absolutely the same, detail by detail. The world is covered by a sole Trude which does not begin and does not end. Only the name of the airport changes."

In economics it is the differentiated product that commands a monetary premium. If in the long run we want to attract capital, to attract investment to our communities, we must differentiate them from anywhere else. It is our built environment that expresses, perhaps better than anything else, our diversity, our identity, our individuality, or differentiation. As the world's economy is globalized – and it needs to be – it is even more important that the local culture and character isn't globalized – and it needn't be.

There is a principal in physics that says if a thing cannot be distinguished from any other thing it does not exist. If your town cannot be distinguished from any other town, sooner or later it will cease to exist. Some of you will remember Robert Pirsig as the author some twenty years ago of *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*. Well Pirsig reemerged a couple of years ago with a book entitled *Lila* in which he hypothesizes a concept called the Metaphysics of Quality. He adds a second principal of physics and states: "if a thing has no value it isn't distinguished from anything

else." My only modification to that premise would be to turn it around and say: if a thing isn't distinguished from anything else it has no value. For our communities to have value they must be distinguished. And their physical distinction – particularly the historic built environment – is a crucial element in that search for value.

The fifth sense necessary for quality of life is the sense of community itself. And lest you misinterpret what I mean, “community” does not imply everybody holding hands and singing *Cumbaya*. In fact as art critic and historian Lucy Lippard writes in her book, *The Lure of the Local*, “Community doesn’t mean understanding everything about everybody and resolving all the differences; it means knowing how to work within differences as they change and evolve...A healthy community in a mixed society can take these risks because it is permeable; it includes all ages, races, preferences, like and unlike, and derives its richness from explicit disagreement as much from implicit agreement.”

Quality of life is the amalgam of those things that make a place out of a location and a community out of a bunch of houses. Maintaining that quality of life in Madison is not easy nor will it get easier. But the five senses of place, of evolution, ownership, of identity and of community will lead us there.

Daniel Kemmis is the former mayor of Missoula, Montana. He wrote: “(W)hat 'we' do depends upon who 'we' are (or who we think we are). It depends, in other words, upon how we choose to relate to each other, to the place we inhabit, and to the issues which that inhabiting raises for us. If in fact there is a connection between the places we inhabit and the political culture which our inhabiting of them produces, then perhaps it makes sense to begin with the place, with a sense of what it is, and then try to imagine a way of being public which would fit the place.”

I think you have begun in your neighborhoods with a sense of this place and I believe Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. is a way of being public which fits this place. Congratulations on what you are doing and thank you for giving me the opportunity to come to Madison. Thank you very much.

© Donovan D. Rypkema, 2002
Place Economics
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-588-6258
Drypkema@PlaceEconomics.com

>>> "John Martens" <jmartens@chorus.net> 07/18/03 10:51AM >>>

I am writing this on behalf of Friends of Historic Third Lake Ridge to express our concerns with some of the current recommendations of The East Rail Corridor Plan Advisory Committee.

I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I believe that the goal of this process should be to attain the highest possible quality of life for not just the future inhabitants or employees in the target area, but also for those current residents of the neighborhood. We should be particularly mindful of the effect upon those residents and business owners who have invested heavily in this area in past decades when it was not the current darling of development that it seems to be today. Those pioneers, many of whom have invested the majority of their lives in this community, were attracted to the area by certain social and historical qualities that others seem to finally recognize and are now eager to exploit.

The point here is that there exists a powerful context; this is not a blank slate, an open book, or just an empty page on a drawing board. People already live here, work here, have raised and are raising families here, and have spent countless hours and untold savings to improve their homes, businesses and community. For all the rhetoric we hear today about the wonderful promises of "New Urbanism", this is the real deal, an honest-to-goodness neighborhood where people really do sit on their porches and talk to each other, where races and classes actually do co-mingle; where, as Donovan Rypkema recently put it, "when people ask each other how they're doing, they really care about what the answer is."

So now in the midst of this improbably delicate balance of people, place, and circumstance the rest of the City turns with a gleam its eye; something good seems to be going on over there, and hey, there's a lot of vacant property, it must be time to "share the love". We here are honored and more than happy to do so; of course, that vacant land should be put to the highest possible use, we all exist in a bigger context, and if our Eastside community can provide a model of urban vitality we should be thrilled.

The problem is that some aspects of the proposed development seem to have almost nothing to do with the community in which it is being implemented. It is almost unfathomable that mixed-use development is not a given! Do we need to be reminded that mixed-use development is one of the primary components of the renaissance of urban centers which has been going on for over a decade across the country? Hasn't that message been sent out loud and clear from Brasilia and Levittown to Cabrini Green?

Let me illustrate with a tale of two buildings, both magnificent turn-of-the-century structures on the 800 block of Williamson Street. One is the "Olds Building", a once-gorgeous ornate brick warehouse. A couple decades ago it was "renovated" and turned into a State office building. Shortly before 8:00 every weekday morning, workers file in the back door, put in their eight hours, and by 5:00 they disappear to parts unknown, and the building becomes a nice pile of bricks. Until a few years ago, people were actually afraid to walk on that side of the street at night.

Then, in 1998, a few doors down, the Madison Candy Company was also renovated. Only this time the developer believed that it was important to use the building to create vitality on the street and had the wherewithal to solicit a restaurant and a coffee shop for the first floor. Suddenly the 800 block came alive, and now the building is not only a destination, but an actual nexus of the community. Although this is not classic mixed-use (residential and commercial), the point here is that if we carefully select the usages of our built environment we can incorporate whole areas into the vital parts of our community, and we would be fools to ignore the potential of the 91 acres in consideration.

There has also been a great stir within the community over the potentially proscribed heights of buildings. It would almost appear that The East Rail Corridor Plan Advisory Committee regards scale simply as something you find on a fish - there seems to be a blind eye for the scale of its

boundary areas. The six-plus stories proposed adjacent to Wilson Street significantly exceeds even the controversial three to four stories proposed by the adjacent Williamson Street B.U.I.L.D. committee. Once again, the context is being ignored, that is the primarily one- and two-story buildings of the surrounding area (with a few exceptions in the 800 block); additionally ignored is the impact that such vast increases in scale would have on the adjacent properties. How would you feel if a six-story building sprang up in your back yard, a very real possibility for many long-time residents?

The Marquette Neighborhood Response to ERC PAC

Prepared by:

Marsha Rummel

Peter Wolff

July 21, 2003

Marquette Neighborhood Response to ERCPAC

July 21, 2003

PREFACE

This report to the East Rail Corridor Plan Advisory Committee (ERCPAC) contains what the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) sees as an emerging consensus vision for East Rail Corridor (ERC) development. The consensus has been elicited during the last 8 months from a variety of sources, although some of the information we have used goes back considerably further. We have discussed the ERCPAC proposals and draft plans at MNA board meetings and studied their supporting documents; we have participated in the ongoing BUILD II planning process that generated a lot of neighborhood input, and at ERCPAC's request included recommendations for heights in the East Wilson Street area; we have gathered information and comments from ERCPAC open meetings, from the Marquette Affordable Housing Study Group, and consultations and meetings with local business owners, Friends of Third Lake Ridge Historic District, Friends of the Yahara River Parkway and neighborhood association leaders from the Tenney-Lapham and Atwood neighborhoods.

These meetings and conversations culminated in a neighborhood forum on July 7, "Our Vision for the East Rail Corridor", sponsored by MNA and Alder Judy Olson. The event, which lasted more than three hours, attracted over 80 Marquette residents, members of adjacent neighborhoods and broader east side members of the East Isthmus Neighborhood Planning Council. At the meeting we first described and discussed the consensus vision we had identified over the past 8 months, and then offered twelve specific recommendations [Appendix 1] for input and straw votes. We recorded comments on flip charts [Appendix 2], and solicited handwritten comments at the meeting [Appendix 3] and emails received after the meeting [Appendix 4]. The fact that the general vision, as well as most of the specific recommendations, were approved by

large majorities, clearly suggests that our assessment of neighborhood sentiment concerning the ERC was accurate.

This document first talks about the consensus vision, recommends some general principles of development that are suggested by this vision, and finally lists specific points that were approved by a clear majority of people who attended the July 7 forum for inclusion in the ERCPAC report, as well as a small number of additional points that the neighborhood has expressed a clear consensus on over the life of the planning process, but which were not specifically discussed at the forum.

[Note: We are not making recommendations for East Washington Avenue in this report for two reasons. First, the vision for the street has been evolving rapidly over the past year or two, and at this point there is no consensus in the neighborhood that we can detect; second, there are plans for a BUILD project to deal with design standards for both sides of East Washington that is supported by ERCPAC. We support that process also and, while we feel our participation in it is important, we don't think it would be helpful to anticipate its findings.]

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

For many years the Marquette neighborhood has recognized the opportunity for additional development in the part of the neighborhood designated as the East Rail Corridor. Our neighborhood plans have recommended that such development should include additional housing, parkland and industrial/commercial/office space, with emphasis on the latter. While the proposal by ERCPAC - a series of single-use areas, with a large amount of the land (91 acres, or 2/3 of the total study area) designated as commercial/industrial, conforms to the neighborhood's usage criteria, two related problems arise from the proposal - one of concept, a second of scale. Briefly, the plan recommends a large employment center, predominantly office space, conceived as an extension of the downtown, with downtown heights and density. Identification of the ERC with the downtown by ERCPAC was so strong that for the entire first phase of the planning process, and a part of the second, there was no recognition that this area is, in fact, a large part of the Marquette neighborhood.

The opposition of the neighborhood to this view of the ERC was strong and immediate. Disappointment with ERCPAC's reduction in the size of the park, combined with this lack of identification of the ERC as part of the neighborhood, caused interest in the planning process on the part of residents to decline radically. However, in the past six months the committee has recognized the importance of tying development of the area into the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods, and this recognition has been increasingly evident in recent drafts of the Phase 2 plan.

In spite of ERCPAC's change in emphasis, the neighborhood process leading to the issue of this report was felt to be necessary because, while a lot of the wording in the ERCPAC plan now reflects neighborhood sentiment, a number of specific recommendations in the plan do not. We felt it was important to resolve these discrepancies. In addition, we feel it is important that we make explicit our vision for the ERC and its development, and attempt, if necessary, to resolve any differences that may still exist between ERCPAC's vision and that of the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods.

SMART GROWTH IN THE EAST RAIL CORRIDOR

A case can be made that the original concept of the ERC as a large single-use addition to the downtown commercial area benefits neither the downtown nor the Marquette neighborhood. During the many years of overrepresentation of commercial use in the downtown, the area was faced with deserted streets at night, especially near the Square, and loss of retail establishments that fled to malls in areas of new housing development. In addition, with the limited relationship between burgeoning downtown employment and housing, commuter traffic increased dramatically, putting increasing pressure not only on the downtown, but also on the isthmus and near west side neighborhoods. But in the last few years there has been a housing renaissance in the downtown that promises to redress the imbalance. This, combined with the development of the Overture Center, and community access to the Monona Terrace Convention Center, as well as older events such as the Concerts on the Square, the farmers market and the art fairs, promises to return vitality to the downtown.

But to add a large "employment center" to the downtown at this point would be to return imbalance to the area. Once again, a part of the downtown where no one is home at night would be created. And in spite of the plans for commuter rail and other mass transit, the increased traffic that would certainly be generated would stress the capacity of East Washington Avenue and put increased pressure on streets in the Marquette and other isthmus neighborhoods that are already near capacity. Moreover, insofar as a large

employment center destabilized land values and housing costs by increasing demand for housing in the Marquette neighborhood, it would accelerate the neighborhood, and perhaps others as well, even further toward gentrification and away from the diversity it has enjoyed in the past.

Instead, we are suggesting a vision that unites the ERC with the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods esthetically, historically and functionally. The ERC, including the commercial/industrial area, would be a dynamic, interesting and exciting area, not only to live, work and play in, but to visit or be a "tourist". It would reflect and communicate many of the attributes of the Marquette and other isthmus neighborhoods, including a love for the history of the area, the oldest in the city; it would recognize the needs of the surrounding area for employment and business opportunities, attracting the kinds of businesses that are consistent with its values and interests; it would respond to people's need for esthetic experience; and it would maintain and transmit a high level of ecological awareness. It would embody the importance of ideas and creation.

While the initial plan has been presented in the context of "smart" development, ironically, smart growth concepts are designed to encourage the very active, dynamic, culturally rich quality of life that already characterizes the Marquette and other isthmus neighborhoods. From this perspective of smart growth, the challenge to the development of the ERC is to enhance this quality of life in the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods, including the downtown, while at the same time contributing to the economic viability of the city as a whole. It is often said that it is easier to build a new building than to retrofit an old one. Perhaps the same adage applies to constructing "smart" communities. It may take a lot of effort and dedication to retrofit an older established city like Madison, whose growth has been somewhat haphazard. But when the historic, esthetic, human, social and economic values are worth preserving and enhancing, it is easy to make the case that this is the course that should be pursued.

PART 2 - GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT

The guidelines for development listed below are intended to contribute to realizing this vision. Most of them come from a number of meetings and discussions, some sponsored by ERCPAC, others by the Marquette neighborhood. Several of the guidelines are also mentioned in the ERCPAC proposal, but sometimes with specific recommendations that are inconsistent with them. In general, they are designed to maximize the interaction and interdependence between the ERC and the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods. While part of the ERC's identification will be with these areas, an important part should be with itself - with its historic roots as a commercial/industrial area with variable massing, and moderate heights and densities, and important links to the downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.

1. Maximize physical continuity with the surrounding neighborhoods. While in general densities and building heights in the ERC will be somewhat greater than those in surrounding isthmus neighborhoods, they should be close enough to be consistent with them. Heights and densities in the ERC should be graded so that they tend to decrease from the western (downtown) end of the ERC to the eastern (Yahara) end. Heights along the Yahara should be consistent with those across the river and on adjoining streets. Heights on Wilson Street should be consistent with those on Williamson and on the rest of the street.

2. Maximize historic continuity with contiguous neighborhoods. The Marquette neighborhood, most of which is located in one of two historic districts, is perhaps the largest intact area representing the early development of Madison. But other adjoining neighborhoods - Old Market Place, Tenney-Lapham and Atwood, as well as the downtown - also have a historic relevance that is becoming increasingly valued. While many of the original buildings in the ERC are no longer there, the ones that still exist and are usable, for example on East Main and East Washington, should be preserved for adaptive reuse, and perhaps used as inspiration for new construction. We want to echo

the sentiments of the Landmarks Commission in their 8/02 report to ERCPCAC that catalogues historic buildings in the ERC:

"The general historic character of the area is one of substantial brick warehouses and industrial buildings. Several of the enterprises were among the leading businesses in Madison in the 20th century. Many of the buildings remaining were constructed with an appearance of solidity and a high quality of design not often seen in modern warehouse or industrial buildings. This type of building often lends itself to adaptive reuse and appeals to a large segment of people who enjoy living and working in spaces that convey an historic industrial character...."

Some of these buildings might be especially attractive as combination studio/gallery/living spaces for artists or artisans, or other artistic enterprises that would attract visitors from both the downtown and adjacent isthmus neighborhoods. Landmarks catalogues 21 of these buildings, 10 on East Washington Avenue, 5 on Main Street, and 6 on side streets. Of these buildings, 4 are eligible for the National Trust for Historic Places Register.

3. Maximize functional continuity with the Marquette and adjoining neighborhoods - the extent to which near east side and downtown residents can interact dynamically with the space. This can be done in a number of ways:

- a. Create opportunities for public use of the commercial/industrial area by judicious multi-function use. Within the constraints of an area largely dedicated to industrial/commercial/office use, the area should nevertheless provide a mixture of uses that are designed to invite people into it, to make it a destination for people during evening and weekend hours as well as during times of employment. While "mixed use" has usually been associated with housing in commercial areas, and there does seem to be a consensus for some additional housing beyond that which has been proposed by ERCPCAC, other ideas for mixed use have been suggested that are closely related to the commercial/industrial role

of the area. As an example, consider the Commonwealth incubator at 100 S. Baldwin. Besides housing a number of businesses, it also has gallery space for use by artists, and space for neighborhood meetings that deal with Commonwealth projects and interests (e.g. design of housing projects, annual meetings, BUILD meetings). Thus it qualifies as a mixed-use enterprise that attracts neighborhood residents and others to it. Other possible examples:

1. retail outlets associated with industrial/commercial enterprises
2. galleries and living spaces associated with artists studios; other opportunities for live/work arrangements
3. arts/crafts, and food-related businesses that offer classes
4. dance or theater-related enterprises that also include performance spaces and classes

b. Attract businesses that supply goods and services needed by neighborhood residents or businesses.

c. Provide employment and business-related opportunities in which area residents have a vital interest.

1. Attract employment opportunities for area residents that match their interests and abilities.
2. Make commercial space available for neighborhood businesses and graduates of neighborhood incubator programs.
3. Make office space available for neighborhood business owners.

d. Encourage the location of public art and other esthetic-related features in the ERC.

Art and related areas have become a major commercial as well as esthetic interest in isthmus neighborhoods as well as the downtown. In the downtown, visual and performance art will be advanced by the new Overture Center. Monona Terrace has strong esthetic ties to the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright. Most of the downtown coffee shops and many other businesses are venues for display of art.

The university art school and gallery are located downtown, close to the Elvehjem Museum.

The isthmus neighborhoods surrounding the ERC have also made art and related pursuits an important part of their commercial life. Marquette, Tenney-Lapham and Atwood neighborhoods have a large and growing number of galleries and other venues for presentation of visual arts, music and theater, and are home to a number of artists and their studios. This high level of interest in art and related disciplines makes the use of public art in the ERC a logical choice as a way of generating and maintaining public interest in the area. It also supports the inclusion of studios, galleries and other art-related businesses as a significant part of the commercial profile of the ERC.

The use and retention of water in exciting ways - e.g., rain gardens, roof gardens, water features, and fountains - would further enhance the esthetic interest of the ERC and at the same time contribute to its environmental health. Consistent with the values of the isthmus neighborhoods, we should establish an expectation that all new development and redevelopment in the ERC should be required to include the best and highest environmental practices. Its role as a demonstration site for these practices would provide another basis for attraction of people to the area. [See the proposal by John Steines for use of water features in the ERC - Appendix 5.]

Another esthetic-environmental practice with a strong application to the ERC and a base in the near east side is public lighting. Environmentally sound and esthetically pleasing lighting should be a major concern in the ERC and, once again, could become a source of attraction as a demonstration site for sound lighting practices. The prominence of MG&E in the ERC offers the unique opportunity to involve them in a rewarding partnership in this pursuit that could have important consequences for the application of cutting-edge lighting technology and principles to the entire city.

IMPLEMENTATION

This vision for ERC development is admittedly ambitious, but we believe its basic assumptions are sound. It is also a vision that can evolve over time and absorb a large number of new ideas. Its success will depend ultimately on the quality of its implementation. The ERCPAC plan contains the recommendation for the formation of a structural entity that will oversee implementation over the life span of the plan. At the "Vision" forum there was a strong consensus on the importance of this structure to the implementation process. It was felt that the majority of its membership should come from the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods and that these delegates should be chosen by the neighborhood associations. While there was no perceived need to specify the affiliations of the rest of the members, we feel that their judicious selection will be important to assure that the relevant interests are represented and that the implementation structure contains the required expertise. But after the considerable interest and concern shown by the Marquette and surrounding neighborhoods in the development of the ERC, we have every reason to believe that, with the cooperation of the City and other resources, the course we are recommending is viable.

PART 3 - RECOMMENDATIONS

MIXED USE

At the final ERCPAC public meeting held in May, there was support for a more mixed-use approach to the employment center. At our July 7th meeting there was also overwhelming support of mixed use in the employment center. People accept that this area will continue to be primarily commercial/industrial, but there was broad support for the goal that the area should be a vital and vibrant space, accessible and interesting both day and night.

1. The majority at the July 7 meeting considered that such uses as public art, performance spaces, galleries, and classes will draw people into the rail corridor and build on our neighborhoods' existing strengths and interests.
2. The majority supported the idea that mixed use should include live/work opportunities such as studio lofts and other live/work situations.
3. There was also a surprisingly strong sentiment for a small to moderate amount of additional conventional housing in the commercial/industrial area. In order to preserve the historical use of the ERC as a commercial/industrial space, we propose that this housing should be located on the periphery. We suggest that the plan designate two parcels as 'transitional' areas with the potential for new residential development: the 800 block of East Wilson St and the corner parcel at Thornton Street and East Washington Avenue. While there was no consensus at the July 7 forum for these parcels to be indicated for residential use, the feeling seemed to be that their selection could be covered under the rubric of mixed use on East Washington and East Wilson. But in addition, both of these parcels are adjacent to residential areas - Thornton Street and the 900 block of East Wilson.

DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS

The July 7th meeting strongly supported the ideas that the Plan should be consistent with its own development standards. “More intensive uses and higher density should occur within the portions of the planning area closest to the downtown and along E Washington, with less intensive development in the eastern and southern portions of the planning area closer to the Yahara River and more traditional residential neighborhoods”.

4. There was strong support for lower heights than proposed in the ERCPCAC plan for the Yahara River Residential District, especially along the river. We approved changing the recommended heights for the Yahara River District to 2-3 stories plus 1 bonus floor for affordable housing.

5. There was overwhelming support for lower heights all along East Wilson in both the employment district and residential areas. The majority of people felt that all of ERCPCAC’s recommendations along East Wilson were out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood and should be lowered considerably. We strongly support the adoption of the BUILD II recommendations and urge the ERCPCAC to lower heights on E Wilson to conform to them.

600 Williamson St north side 2-3 stories

600 E Wilson 5+2 bonus

700 E Wilson 5+2 bonus

800 E Wilson 3+1 bonus

900 E Wilson 3+1 bonus

1000 E Wilson 3+1 bonus

1100 E Wilson 3+1 bonus, except conservation island =2 ½ -3

6. There was strong support for limiting the height of commercial buildings in the area bordered by (but not including) Main Street and East Wilson to 2-3 stories, with a lower percent of lot coverage than those on East Main and East Washington Avenue.

7. There was strong support for keeping the height range recommended in the ERCPCAC plan for buildings on East Main Street (2-5 stories), but roughly grading the heights so that the highest are close to downtown and the lowest at Ingersoll Street.

RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

8. Building heights in the 200 block of South Baldwin Street should be consistent with those in the adjacent conservation district. This block closely resembles the character of the conservation district and should be considered for inclusion.

9. The conservation district island at Ingersoll St. and E Wilson, consisting of approximately 3 houses, elicited strong concerns from residents. Setbacks of 40' were not seen as a sufficient transition from nearby heights that allow up to 5 stories if ERCPCAC recommendations are adopted. We strongly urge the committee, in addition to lowering the heights on East Wilson, to change the heights for any future redevelopment to 3 stories for properties surrounding the conservation island housing.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

We urge ERCPCAC to strengthen the language in the plan concerning historic preservation of commercial buildings described in the Landmarks Commission Report to the East Rail Committee "Historic Buildings in the East Rail Corridor". The plan consistently references the existence of these buildings and supports their retention and adaptive reuse. We suggest that the ERCPCAC plan educate future users of the plan about the specific buildings that may be eligible for designation to the National Trust for Historic Places and eligible for city Landmark status.

10. The following buildings should be noted explicitly in the plan as potentially eligible for local and federal Landmark status and eligible for potential state and federal rehabilitation tax credits:

1. 701 E Washington Buy and Sell shop
2. 901 E Washington Klueter Wholesale Grocery Warehouse
3. 1245-1301 E Washington Gisholt Machine Company complex
4. 100 S Blount MGE Powerhouse
5. 946 E Main St Wisconsin Telephone Garage

11 .We suggest the plan includes the recommendation that the city should facilitate the determination of whether buildings are eligible for National Trust designation and provide the financial resources for the research and application process. This could provide an incentive to property owners who can receive tax credits for 20% of the cost of renovation, a positive opportunity to preserve and enhance the historic character of the east rail corridor.

GREEN STANDARDS

We should establish an expectation that all new development and redevelopment should be required to include the highest and best environmental practices in the corridor.

12. We recommend strengthening the language in the plan that ‘encourages’ green building standards, green roofs and rain gardens by adding a recommendation that green standards be incorporated into the implementation process.

13. We recommend that the use of sound dark-sky lighting practices be required for external illumination throughout the ERC. Through the groundswell of support in the east side isthmus neighborhoods These lighting practices reduce light pollution, improve energy efficiency, and create a more pleasing and intimate environment. The efforts of the east side isthmus neighborhoods to require this lighting on the newly reconstructed

East Washington Avenue have been responsible for an awakening of residents, City staff, and elected officials to the strong benefits of sound lighting.

CENTRAL PARK

At the July 7 meeting, several people advocated for a moderate increase in the size of the park. The ERCPAC plan acknowledges the committee received widespread neighborhood support for a 5 block park during the public meeting process..

14. We recommend expanding the planned footprint of the park to include the parcel now excluded between Ingersoll and Brearly Sts. that includes the Research Products property on Ingersoll St. In the event that Research Products decides to vacate the property during the 50-year period of the plan, we support attempting to add this parcel to the park.

EAST WASHINGTON AVENUE

During Phase II, ERCPAC expanded the planning area to include the north side of East Washington Avenue and recommended design standards. At the July 7 meeting, people expressed disappointment that this expansion was done without the consultation with or support from the Tenney-Lapham and Old Market Place neighborhoods. There was unanimous support for removing all references to recommended uses and design standards for the north side of East Washington Avenue in order to allow for meaningful neighborhood participation for Tenney Lapham and Old Market Place neighborhood associations.

15. We recommend that ERCPAC remove all references to recommended uses and design standards the north side of East Washington Avenue.

16. We recommend that specific design standards for the south side of East Washington Avenue be removed from the ERCPAC plan. This will allow the proposed BUILD process a fresh look at both sides of the street, unencumbered by a process that was not inclusive of all the affected neighborhoods and doesn't predict the outcomes before the

process has begun. The need for a BUILD design study for both sides of the Avenue should be described generally as part of the Phase III process.

IMPLEMENTATION

While many at the July 7th meeting supported the basic language in the draft calling for the oversight committee (which MNA helped draft), there was overwhelming support here, and in other meetings, for adding language that requires ‘meaningful representation’ from MNA and adjacent neighborhoods such as Tenney-Lapham, Old Market Place and Atwood.

17. This group, endorsed the proposal that the majority, or at least 51%, of this implementation structure, should consist of representatives from the neighborhoods, and that they should be chosen, or approved, by their neighborhood associations.

18. Comprehensive Business Retention strategy: Because of insufficient time, this issue was not discussed at the July 7 meeting. We support the idea that neighborhood associations and planning councils should participate in collaborative planning for business retention and attraction described in the Implementation Plan. However, we suggest that this type of function is exactly the kind that the implementation structure should deal with, and, rather than becoming a separate structure, should be included in the charge to that entity.

PART 4 - APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Proposed Changes to the ERCPAC Draft

July 7, 2003

Mixed Use

1. Allow for residential mixed use in the employment center. Change the emphasis of the draft so that employment use there is primary, but not the only use.
2. List appropriate opportunities for location of small amounts of residential use, including cross-isthmus streets, Main Street and East Washington Avenue.
3. List opportunities for uses that are linked to commercial that will also attract the general public into the area, such as retail outlets, performance spaces and public art.

Changes in Heights and density

4. Lower heights for residential use along Yahara River to 2-3 stories with a possible bonus floor for AH, from current call for 4 plus bonus floor for AH. This will be in keeping with plan goal to decrease heights from downtown to river.
5. Lower heights on East Wilson, particularly in the 800-900 blocks. Adopt BUILD II study standards where they conflict with ERCPAC.
6. Grade the building heights along E. Main Street so that they are highest in the blocks closest to the downtown, and lowest as they approach Ingersoll Street.
7. Define the heights and densities in the interior of the rail corridor between Main Street and E. Wilson as lower (2-3 stories) and with a smaller percentage of lot coverage than the buildings on E. Main and E. Washington.

Change Land Use

8. 800 block facing E Wilson is in employment center. Change land use to residential to capture the redevelopment opportunity that exists for infill housing on 800 block of Willy St.
9. Corner parcel of Thornton Ave and E Wash is in the employment center. Change land use to allow for residential and retail uses. The Yahara River Master plan adopted by the city supports retail on E Wash and housing on Thornton to capture the river amenity.
10. The south side of E Wash is in Phase I as part of the corridor planning area. In Phase II, the north side of E Wash has been added to the planning area with detailed and specific development and design standards without the consultation or participation of the Tenney-Lapham neighborhood. All reference to the north side of E Wash should be removed from the ERC PAC plan. These details can wait until the BUILD design study is underway. This BUILD process must include the participation of TNLA and other neighborhood associations at the outset of the planning process. 50% of the board of the BUILD should be composed of representatives of the involved neighborhoods (e.g., Tenney-Lapham and Marquette for the stretch of E. Wash between Blair and the Yahara River).

Implementation

11. The proposed ERC implementation oversight committee must include meaningful neighborhood representation, defined as at least 51% of total committee members, with representatives chosen by the neighborhoods. At least some of the representation of additional members of the committee should be specified.
12. The proposed “cooperative effort” to develop a comprehensive strategy for business retention and attraction should include meaningful neighborhood participation in addition to city and business interests. This effort should be part of the implementation committee defined in 11.

APPENDIX 2

July 7 ERC Neighborhood Forum - Comments from Flip Charts and Straw Poll Results

MIXED USE

- **should be 20-25% residential in employment center**
- **support mixed use in employment center**
- **employment center should be heavily mixed use, with creative use of office buildings and housing**
- **residential and commercial should be in the same building**
- **agree with mixed use, more flexible. Gerrymandering of employment center in 900 and 1000 block of E Wilson, should be park only or residential and park space**
- **park in 900-1000 block E Wilson, not employment**
- **opposed to micro-designing, less detailed proposals better**
- **no residential on cross streets that intersect park, no residential in park areas**
- **great opportunity as employment center**
- **ERCPAC member: committee recognized importance of Willy St business district and concerned about creating competition with employment center**
- **agrees with focus on employment. Might not want to live there if mostly employment, especially with MGE**
- **downtown residential growth has been mixed use, not scary at night**
- **remember when Capitol Square was deserted. Concerned that a little bit of mixed use is not enough to make area vital. Need other night-time uses. Must overcome problem of small pockets of people in mostly dark zone. There is a necessary threshold for mixed use.**
- **housing on EWA would work with appropriate setbacks. Supports Mayor's vision of boulevard with mixed use.**
- **housing okay on EWA. Realize not going to have single family dwellings, heights okay. Don't want office park transplanted downtown.**
- **Expectation for employment. Reason for mixed use not just housing -need a reason to go there. Mixed use not just residential or commercial but draw of art galleries, studios, public art, water elements. Importance of live and vibrant place.**
- **Alder Olson: ERC historically an employment center, existing zoning M1. Plan already cuts back on employment with addition of park and residential land uses. Nearby neighborhood is mixed, contains areas devoted to housing, a business district, areas with lively activity. Diminished opportunities for some types of employment with added residential uses. Housing not always compatible with industrial and commercial uses because of odors, noise.**
- **what about Mautz proposal which calls for mixed use?**
- **ERCPAC member: Basic use = power plant. Must be careful about choosing mixed use but open to it. Relocation of rail might be incompatible with some types of mixed use. Supports judicious addition of mixed use.**

- **is the north side of EWA part of mixed use discussion?**
- **ERCPAC member: north and south side of EWA will be discussed in Phase III**
- **arts make area a destination, local gallery owner welcomes synergy, not worried about competition**

VOTE

#1 allow for mixed use in employment center: MAJORITY Approves, 3 oppose

#2 list appropriate opportunities for residential use, including cross streets and EWA :

NO consensus. Sense vote about deleting reference to streets-still lacks majority

#3 list opportunities for uses linked to commercial that will attract public (art and galleries, performance space, retail) MAJORITY approves

LAND USE

Question #8 change land use of 800 block of E Wilson from employment center to residential

- **wait until plans from developer are clear, don't change land use**
- **neighborhood will have more options with mixed use, good match with existing plans such as BUILD**
- **Alder Olson: developer waiting to see outcome of BUILD. BUILD calls for residential**
- **draft proposal adds strip of commercial/employment in 800 block, should be residential then park**
- **proximity to MGE, is 800 block far enough away?**
- **good block for mixed use**
- **site for Ah on 800 block**
- **neighborhood sentiment to save 802 Willy St**
- **bargaining ability-higher heights on E Wilson protect Willy St?**
- **opposes residential on 800 block = incompatible use**
- **mixed feelings about 800 block: Pretty close to MGE. Bike path offers opportunity for retail. Might be good location for AH**
- **heard about MGE email to area resident that suggested lower heights would block view of coal yard**
- **ERCPAC member: MGE wall around coal yard not just aesthetic, environmentally important to contain hazardous dust. Shouldn't have housing too close to hazard**

VOTE #8 no consensus

-

Question # 10 remove all references to north side of EWA from draft plan

- **OMPNA should be part of BUILD process, include in MNA recommendations**
- **Alder Olson: easy to remove**
- **ERCPAC member: Phase III will begin study**
- **ERCPAC member: would entertain rewording this section of the draft**
- **Tenney Lapham not included in decision to create design study**
- **Design standards and corridor planning should be coordinated with surrounding neighborhoods**
- **Agrees with MNA recommendation if OMPNA added**

VOTE #10 MAJORITY with addition of mention of OMPNA

•

Question #9 change land use of parcel at Thornton and E Wash from employment center to residential/mixed use

- **Alder Olson: It was an error that it was included in employment center. Bridge reconstruction will create challenges**
- **Concern with further loss of employment**
- **Location for special housing opportunities for seniors, assisted living**
- **ERCPAC member: committee concerned that residential on EWA not a good use**
- **How will future rail options affect this parcel?**
- **ERCPAC member: freight will continue, possible site for commuter and high speed rail**
- **With rail use, might not be a good location for residential**
- **Doesn't earlier vote in support of increasing mixed use in employment center cover this area, there is no compelling reason to micromanage this parcel**
- **Creative possibilities for this parcel. Keep options open. Plan should mention the problematic nature of this parcel. Valid opinions for and against. Plan should highlight this and other problematic areas.**
- **ERCPAC member: committee considers so-called problem areas as transition areas.**
- **List as specific location for mixed use**
- **VOTE #9 NO consensus on proposal. Sense vote = support for conception of parcel as transitional and recommendation covered by earlier vote on mixed use in employment center**

IMPLEMENTATION

Question #11 ERC oversight committee

- **Who should be specified as additional members of committee?**
- **Likes wording in draft/vagueness of section referring to committee but would add 51% neighborhood participation, chosen by neighborhood associations**
- **Neighborhoods adjacent to ERC should be included**
- **Supports if last sentence in MNA proposal struck**

- Likes plan wording with addition of “meaningful” participation of neighborhood and adjoining neighborhoods
- Majority of committee members should be from neighborhood
- Plan wording too vague
- Not sufficient to say ‘neighborhood residents’ –could be developers with financial interest. At least neighborhood association selections potentially more democratic

VOTE MAJORITY Approves 27-1. Sense: add to existing plan wording requirement for 51% of committee members should come from neighborhoods

HEIGHTS/DENSITIES

- a neighborhood consensus has evolved following BUILD II planning process and approval process for Commonwealth project on the Yahara River BUILD II calls for lower heights than ERCPAC draft plan. Agrees with ERCPAC conception of heights that descend from downtown to river, and descend from EWA to Willy St. Rail corridor should be more relaxed than EWA.
- ERCPAC recommendations do not gradually diminish. Plan calls for tall buildings on E Wilson St. Less height is desired to maintain neighborhood character. The 1100 block of E Wilson allows 4-5 stories, that’s not compatible with neighborhood character, would undermine character.
- For example, GEF 1 houses 1200 employees. ERC would need 12 GEF 1’s at 4 stories each to get to 14,000 jobs.
- Alder Olson: Plan call for ‘most of Isthmus 2020 jobs’ are weasel words. There are no figures for how many jobs should go in ERC. Should be higher density closer to downtown and along E Wash.

VOTE #4 lower heights for residential uses along Yahara River MAJORITY approve 16-1

Question #5 Lower heights on E Wilson

- can we add language to MNA recommendation about 1000 block E Wilson for heights?
- Heights should be reasonably consistent with existing structures.
- Protect house in discontinuous part of conservation district
- No where on Isthmus exist heights as proposed for 1100 block e Wilson
- Park as amenity
- 3 stories on 1100 block E Wilson –period
- scale and livability, shadow with 3 story buildings
- 2 stories = no shadows
- agree with higher heights on EWA
- density helps control sprawl, willing to live with taller buildings
- contradiction of conservation district island surrounded by proposed heights. Even with step down-heights too high.

- Agrees with taller buildings on EWA and closer to downtown but not 1100 block
- Agrees with higher toward EWA and lower toward E Wilson, but should have appropriate heights at E Wilson and Dickinson.
- Lower all heights along e Wilson, allow redevelopment up to 2 stories
- Baldwin St only partially in the Conservation District
- ERCPAC member: willing to revisit the Baldwin St question
- Conservation district island –the three house on Ingersoll-are surrounded by buildings that could be up 5 stories. 40’setback not sufficient.
- 800-900 block E Wilson has been a battleground in BUILD, because step down will start with these heights. Agrees with preceding comment. Add to MNA recommendations.

VOTE #5 UNANIMOUS APPROVAL. Sense vote: add language about conservation islands.

Question # 6 Grade building heights along E Main St-higher downtown, lowest at Ingersoll

- Concern about canyon effect
- Agree that heights should get lower as gets into neighborhood

VOTE #6 MAJORITY Approves 15-1

Question #7 Lower density/heights between Main St and E Wilson, with smaller percentage of lot coverage

- Agrees with more greenspace, less lot coverage
- Issues of water management, more open space allows for remediation of air, soil and water

VOTE #7 MAJORITY Approves

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- Green building standards and green roofs should be required not merely encouraged
- Add to greenspace, in corridor likes roof gardens which create more places to play.
- Concerns about cross isthmus safety. More liveliness increases safety
- Want more park in central park
- Considering economic pressures on State St businesses, perhaps some could locate in ERC. Want to keep local businesses and keep rents affordable
- Historic preservation in Mautz block. Wisconsin Telephone building could be readapted. Concerned that developer will demolish
- Bump-outs in park to accommodate existing property owners is disappointing. Grandfather in existing users-Research Products, Zimmerman, Warren) then change to park after business ends.
- Finger vs. fist of park. What about empty manufacturing buildings such as Mautz, Rayovac and Gisholt. There is an office boom city wide-lots of space available. Our neighborhood lacks AH and greenspace, we are missing an

opportunity. We are planning for stuff we already have. No promises for employment

- **Support urban design principles that support traditional neighborhoods such as entrances that face on the street**
- **EWA must be walkable and safe**
- **Increase bus service on EWA**

APPENDIX 3

July 7 ERC Neighborhood Forum - Written Comments

Transcribed by Marsha Rummel

Comment #1

I am fine with advocating mixed uses as part of the plan, indeed I prefer mixed uses, as long as it does not preclude the possibility of 1) realizing the potential of the Employment Center of 2) implementing passenger rail (or light rail, or any train that moves people, whatever it's called) in the corridor.

As to the heights of the buildings, I think 8 stories (plus bonuses for affordable housing) on E Wash is perfectly appropriate, as is 4 stories (possibly plus AH bonus) on E Wilson. In short, if we are to achieve the densities that the city's master plan etc calls for, then buildings should be tall on E Wash and taper off to shorter heights towards each lake. Residential is perfectly appropriate along busy roads, btw. People living there make busy streets safer, actually.

Unsigned

Comment #2

In general I support the plan. Living where I do (300 S Few) I have suffered living around mixed use area. Too much noise!! I was expecting the size of the park to cover more area and wish it did. Addendum: It's also disturbing the area has lost 4 industrial/retail companies (Marquip, Rayovac, Kohls, Mautz) That's a big loss for gainful employment.

Nancy Sloan
256-8298

Comment #3

Re #7: I see no reason why we should not have 4 story buildings on S. East Main St. I would prefer taller buildings with bigger setbacks and space for infiltration than short buildings that sprawl all over the place and use space inefficiently.

By the way, price of rent for commercial and residential is based in part on price of land- the more floors, the cheaper the rent can be.

I realize I am probably the only person saying this, but that doesn't mean I'm not right [smiley face]. By the way, I've been campaigning for more stories on the Renaissance development on 800 block, (I live on the other side of the street) because that allows developers to make more affordable housing. P.S. Wary of added one-way roads by bike path.

Kathryn Kingsbury
841 Williamson St #4

Comment #4

I support the subcommittee's comments about heights and density, #s 4-7. I hope they will be included in the Neighborhood Associations suggested changes to the ERCPAC draft.

Mike Soref
1010 Rutledge Ct

APPENDIX 4

July 7 ERC Neighborhood Forum - E-mails

Email #1

Thank you for your work on the ERC plan revisions. I attended the Monday night meeting and thought the proposed revisions were excellent. I thought the meeting was both productive and open to people's comments.

The revisions 1-3 and sentiment expressed at the meeting suggest that the Isthmus neighborhoods want to see development in the Employment Center (also partly the E. Washington corridor) that creates a place people want to go to, and an extension of our traditional neighborhoods. While plans call for a large amount of employment, much in offices, a mix of uses like that found around Capitol Square could ensure the area is active and not a wasteland at night.

To achieve this vision, I think the neighborhood will need to also work on changing the E. Washington Ave. reconstruction plan. As it is currently, the plan creates an environment that is pedestrian-unfriendly (more than the road is now). It will encourage more cars and more development related to cars (like Jiffy Lube). It will also discourage neighborhood-oriented, pedestrian-oriented retail because the walking environment will be so unwelcoming. The reconstruction plan should instead create a much more pedestrian-friendly environment. People should be encouraged to walk along and across E. Washington. This is necessary if traditional neighborhood development and a mix of uses is to be attracted to the E. Washington corridor.

A more ped-friendly environment can be achieved without significant impacts on traffic capacity. So, whether or not the neighborhood supports the Mayor's plan for E. Washington, it is important, I believe, to express the vision of a walkable E. Washington Ave.

Maybe we could talk sometime about this idea if you have a chance. Please feel free to call me at 575-9573. Thanks.

-Will Warlick

1250 Jenifer St.

Email #2

Marsha,

My comments:

There is not enough focus on what I perceive as the focal point of this plan and that is the "Central Park". A Central Park suggests to me a place that is inviting to the community and offers opportunity for community activities and a place that could potentially attract people from out of town, as well. I have visited small towns and cities where an amphitheatre, art galleries, cafes, restaurants, coffee shops, vendors and other unique businesses were a large part of the revitalization of that town or city.

Anne Kate from Wi Assembly for Local Arts is organizing "Summit on the Arts and Creative Economy". This summit will focus on how creativity and "the arts" is necessary for a economically vital community. How a culturally vibrant community attracts new businesses, people who want to relocate to culturally rich areas and tourism. For more information contact Ann @ akatz@wisconsinarts.org.

You and the women who lead the meeting last evening did a great job!

Thanks, Terra Gold/Art Beat Gallery

1148 Williamson St. 251-0635 artbeat@terracom.net

Email #3

Marsha,

Thanks for all the effort in putting together the meeting.

Anyway, I just wanted to know if, in removing reference to the north side of East

Washington, that also removes the TIF language. The TIF idea is something that is now being applied for, but we don't know where it started. Apparently no one was in touch with Brenda. So, now we're leaning about different TIF designations, which include industrial and environmental (you probably know all this).

Just curious --

Best,

James L. Zychowicz
803 East Gorham St.
Madison, WI 53703
USA
608-255-7954
JZychowicz@aol.com

Email #4

Marsha,

Thanks for your response. I understand things better, but wonder why Mayor Cieslewicz is moving things so quickly. I am not one to oppose progress, but understand the need for process -- otherwise, those affected do not have the information needed to support ideas and assist with them.

I still see the north and south side TIF business districts providing unfair competition with the existing Johnson and Williamson St. businesses and/or residential stability on either side. That stated, there are environmental TIFs that might be appropriate for challenging areas, like the Yahara River area or the East Wilson St. portion by the railroad. It's just a suggestion that you are welcome to take or ignore.

Best,

James L. Zychowicz
803 East Gorham St.
Madison, WI 53703
USA
608-255-7954
JZychowicz@aol.com

APPENDIX 5

WATER FEATURES IN THE EAST RAIL CORRIDOR - John Steines

I would envision two parallel (interlocking) systems, #1 - storm water (clean), & #2 - ground water (contaminated). As long as storm water remains separated from the contaminated ground waters it can be considered to remain clean (assuming no new contamination), and can be used for publicly accessible activities and spaces (uncontrolled access). Contaminated ground water could be pumped through a separate green system that would have access only for scientific and educational purposes (controlled access). Significant analysis would be required to study the purposes and effectiveness of any attempt to cleanse the contaminated ground waters within such a system prior to set up.

Common elements include use of water as visual and acoustic element, water storage for reuse, and environmental cleansing via enhanced plant mass viability. Small intimate spaces (patios, courtyards, small squares) require only small trickles to provide an effective acoustic element.

Such acoustic elements are considered very effective in countering the intrusive noises of the urban environment (comforting white noise). Visual seepage, small falls and trickles, rivulets through a patio space all enliven the space for a variety of life functions. There are innumerable ways in which such an effect can be (and has been) realized (e.g., Isamu Noguchi Garden Museum, *California Scenario*, 1980-82, Two Town Center, South Coast Plaza, Costa Mesa, California - <http://www.noguchi.org/cascen.htm>, Lincoln Park Lily Pond designed by Alfred Caldwell).

#1: Storm Water

Storm water system integrated into structural design as series of terraces which may be more than one story apart (waterfall, seepage, drip feature from roof garden terrace or cliff like garden feature), to minimally separated terraces where water flows through soil or plant mass from one pod to another without apparent or significant change of grade. The design scale might be similar to the scale of how a home gardener might construct a small home garden-watering feature (intimate scale, attention to micro climate detail). I would think of the elements of each system as being a series of interconnected containers (pods, pads, pools, planting beds, patios, etc.). The creation of pod like containers (reduced or minimal permeability with ground water as much as possible - ideally an impermeable water membrane in use) allows for separation of the majority of on site storm water from contaminated ground waters. Any storm water not used within the system (including storage cisterns or pools, plant and evaporation loss) would flow either toward the Yahara Parkway or Lake Mendota through uncontaminated soils only (outside the range of the yet to be determined contaminated soil fields), and separated from the contaminated ground waters below.

A system might work like this: Rain falling onto the green surface (roof garden - intensive or extensive system, patio or park feature) is slowed by the planted soil mixture and terrace construction through gravity fed system of elements (planting beds, wall / cliff seepage or falls, patio rivulet or pool) into storm water storage features (rain barrels, pools, cisterns). Where rainwater is not absorbed into the soil and plant life very quickly, it can be stored in a series of:

1. water barrel-like features (these could be inexpensive rain barrels disguised within plantings as simple barrel only, or more visibly displayed as part of a series of sculptural features (sculptural barrels stored at the highest landscape point possible to take advantage of gravity flow for slow feeding of green plant system during dry period without rain),

2. surface pools and rivulets (minimized volume allocated for these items due to evaporation loss and heating effect of exposed water - but necessary element for landscape flow features between top storage system and bottom storage system - including the vital trickle or fall elements where sound of water flow will provide a vital element to the public interaction within any of the intimate patio or square spaces), and

3. cistern structures (not necessarily distinguishable from rain barrel but at or below grade with benefit of decreased evaporation and surface heating of water and control of mosquito breeding and other unwanted intrusions).

Use of solar pumps could provide the continuous movement of waters from cistern or rain barrel (bottom) back up to rain barrel (top) which then provide continual or controlled slow gravity fed flow through plant mass, patio / walkway rivulets, and pools until the water is used up, replenished, or restored within cistern / rain barrel structures. A caretaker would be required to maintain and control the system and would provide additional jobs and some sense of ownership and individual expression for the gardener and caretaker (may or may not be the same individual). Solar pumps to move the water from the bottom to top would need to be kept clean to maximize efficiency. Obstructions to flow would need to be checked. Watering requirements (rate of water flow through landscape) would vary dependent on plant type and micro climate conditions and effect intent.

Roof garden technology (shallow light weight soil mixes) and some of the pod containers require some pumping ability of water through landscape on a regular basis (in the absence of regular rainfall) to maintain health of plant mass (again dependent on species make up and micro climate). Use of rain water storage elements provides a ready source of this water without the necessity to use well (drinking) water as the biomass watering source, except in extreme drought conditions when all stored water might be expected to become used up (not likely in this climate, but unpredictable).

The integration of features can be done on a small or large scale. A business or housing coop might opt to create a self-contained water system to feed only their immediate needs - except when heavy rain and wet conditions result in overflow of local capacity. This would make the most sense economically as each system could evolve and function independently and the design and purity of the system could be a unique element controlled by the owners or occupants. Overflow capacity would need to be designed into the system but ought to only be planned for use when all water storage capacity is filled. It is understood that safe clean water storage capacity should be a priority in such a system.

#2. Contaminated ground waters (significant outside analysis required prior to consideration as an option).

It would be impossible to completely separate all precipitation from a contaminated ground water cycling system, and as I understand the process (which is rather inadequately) the space requirements needed for biomass uptake of contaminants in contaminated ground waters through a green plant system is significantly large. An analysis would be needed to evaluate the benefits of setting up such a system. Even a small system that would not be able to adequately cleanse the waters fully would do some cleansing. More importantly, it would be beneficial for educational purposes to examine and demonstrate what types of plants can survive (even thrive) in such a system and also provide some biomass for examination in school laboratories. The interest and training that could evolve in such an educational process could set any number of youth on a significant career path, and offer general opportunities to explore how systems work.

Such a system might affect the ground water flow in the area in a beneficial manner by preventing the outflow (seepage) of the ground water into non-contaminated spaces outside the corridor. A contaminated system would be accessible for study and open to casual observation but off limits to contact due to the obvious contact issues. A narrow trench into the ground water level

somewhere near the middle of the corridor could provide a source for water to be pumped through another set of terraces which experiment with native or noninvasive species which are known or suspected to be able to uptake pollutants into their biomass. This biomass can then be used within the contaminated water flow system as feed (organic soil matter or mulch) for larger specimen (shrubs, trees) within the same system. While this trench would contain the contaminated ground waters, the terraces would not need to feed their water flow back into the ground water mix, but could be separated and recycled through the biomass to see if cleansing could be accomplished by repeated passage through the system. Alternately, mixture with the ground water of this partially cleansed water could yield increasing cleansed waters as it is mixed and remixed. Soils might need to be replaced and disposed of in a safe manner after water flow with contaminated waters. Whether sufficient change of ground water flow (with use of a contained terrace system) could prevent outflow of ground water beyond the contaminated area (especially during severe drought conditions and significantly lowered Lake Mendota water levels - a possible controlling factor on the ground water depth and flow in these filled sands - or even gradually take up and clean all of the contaminated ground water, assuming it has not already reached and is mixed with Lake Mendota waters), I doubt any one knows. The questions may none the less, be worth asking.

John Steines
3327 Chicago Avenue
Madison, Wi. 53714
jsteines@chorus.net
608-251-1893

To: East Rail Corridor Plan Advisory Committee
From: Gary Tipler, Friends of Historic Third Lake Ridge
Date: July 18, 2003
Re: East Rail Corridor Plan

In our meeting on July 17, 2003, of the Friends of Historic Third Lake Ridge, we decided that there are three areas worth comment on the East Rail plan for their historic preservation implications. All three are in areas in which future development as permitted with the plan as it stands would have a significant negative impact on land values, taxes, home ownership, traffic, and historic amenities of the neighborhood, of which the rail corridor is a part.

1. Mixed Use in the East Rail Corridor

We feel that it is essential for the preservation of buildings and the well-being of the neighborhood that mixed use be the boiler plate for land use, rather than manufacturing/commercial (office) uses only for these large tracts of land. This is particularly important on the 600 through 900 blocks of the Wilson-Williamson blocks. This specific area was proposed to include both housing and office uses by the Williamson Street BUILD study. We'd like to see these areas designated for mixed-use.

2. Building Heights on the Wilson-Williamson Blocks

The East Rail plan calls for as much as two additional stories beyond those permitted by the Williamson Street BUILD plan in the Wilson-Williamson blocks. We feel it important not to exceed the heights of the BUILD plan. The topic of heights was the most contentious topic of the BUILD plan, which was widely discussed and represented in surveys by the 450 or so people who participated in the planning project. The resulting heights in the BUILD plan are still regarded as undesirable by quite a significant portion of the people who participated. The East Rail plan should be brought into conformance with the BUILD heights.

3. Historic Building Preservation in the East Rail Corridor

The existing historic buildings give the area much of its distinct character and offer its greatest intrinsic value. It is important to specifically promote the preservation of buildings listed on the Rankin historic building inventory for the East Rail Corridor. Preservation may be furthered by calling for the City to take responsibility for listing the buildings on the National Register of Historic Places, in order to avail current and future property owners of the potential use of the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit of 20 percent of the value of renovation.

Thank you for your consideration.

July 18, 2003

Dear East Rail Corridor Plan Advisory Committee Member,

I am writing to you because I am concerned about the future of our "side of town." I first came to Williamson Street in 1969 as a student studying art and philosophy. Since 1975, I have raised a family on Williamson Street, and have owned a home there since 1979. When the various committees who are trying to guide development on the east side talk about preserving "the eclectic mix of artists, artisans, free thinkers, and families" I guess they must mean to include me. I seem to have outlasted all the artists who were living on Williamson Street when I got here, and even some of those who have come afterwards. In addition to this, I live on the block that is currently experiencing the most development. So, perhaps I am in a unique position to offer some insights into the situation.

I am glad that you value the contributions of artists and free thinkers to our neighborhood. There is a community of free thinkers at the other end of my block, called La Samaritaine, who are the most wonderful people you can imagine. They pool their resources, own their property in common, and work jobs that contribute to social justice. They run St. Luke House and have managed Port Saint Vincent, Saint Vincent de Paul, and other social welfare agencies. They don't blow their own horn, and quietly live among us, doing good work. I mention them because, to me, this is what it means to live on Willy Street. They are part of why I stay.

Those of us on the 1000 block welcomed the Falconer development that Commonwealth built a few years ago. It was a well-conceived project that, yes, increased density, but includes a mix of accessible housing units that benefit an under served population and contribute stability to our block. Now, however, we have a behemoth going up, and we feel the lack of light and air. We have lost a significant amount of green space that used to afford us a bit of breathability after everybody was done driving down our street. We consider ourselves to be the canaries in the coalmine. The rest of you can learn from the lessons we are living. The one good thing was that we figured that no more development was possible on our block. But, hey, guess what, a new fat cat wants to profit from the fire at 1025 and build a SIX UNIT ON THE 1000 BLOCK????? HELP!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Besides my intermittent work as an artist and a community participant, I have worked full time at the Respite Center, an emergency crisis child care and parent counseling center, for the past eighteen years. I train and manage a staff whose job it is to foster resiliency in children affected by stress. I have studied and witnessed the affects of stress on the human organism, and know first-hand the human capacity for change. While resiliency is a remarkable thing, we human beings have definite limits, and can withstand only so much change before our systems are affected detrimentally, and sometimes irrevocably.

The real message I am trying to convey, is that while you are looking at building heights, land use, and the big question of density, the factor of the human capacity for withstanding change, should also enter the equation. What do I mean? I mean that you need to consider those of us who already live in this area, who have tried to live good lives. We do not want to be surrounded by condos, not because we are unwelcoming people, but because no human beings can withstand an overwhelming amount of change and continue to be healthy productive people.

One thing I have learned from my participation in "neighborhood planning" is that everything needs to be quantified. Can what I am talking about, the human capacity for change, be quantified for our purposes? I believe it can be. Figure it however you want. Come up with some numbers and percentages, and legislate them in. Consider it block by block or home by home. Nobody who lives in a house right now should have to have the light and air blocked by a new building on more than one side. No single block should have to have more than twenty five percent of square footage, or number of additional residents, added. You folks are better at the details than I am.

Besides asking you to consider the human capacity for change, I would like to ask you to step back for a few moments and consider what we are really trying to accomplish here. What is the vision? What is the big picture? Why did we talk about design elements for Willy St., assuming old buildings would be torn down, before discussing land use? I know the pat answer - development pressure - but still, the process has been backwards. I have to go to BUILD meetings to participate in a discussion about what will take place in my front yard, and ERPAC meetings to discuss what will take place in my back yard. Sometimes thinking can get so compartmentalized, it becomes absurd. Details have to serve the greater vision, or they are pointless. East Washington Avenue should be considered in a comprehensive way, before the north side and the south side are considered separately. This is only logical. My final request is that you be willing to change the details as the big picture becomes clearer. Don't be afraid that your efforts will have been wasted. Your time has been well spent. I remember a fellow Willy street artist telling me that he had a thousand bad paintings in him to get out before the good work would come. Maybe it won't take us that long.

Sharon Kilfoy

Sharonkilfoy@cs.com

From: <JZychowicz@aol.com>
To: <mwaidelich@ci.madison.wi.us>
Date: 7/9/03 4:08PM
Subject: ERCPAC

Dear Michael,

It was good to speak with you last week, and I appreciate your contacting Jule Stroick.

As co-president of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, a member of its board, and an active resident/homeowner in the neighborhood, I would like to express my concern about including the TIF district proposal at all in the current ERCPAC document. The TIF proposal has neither been explained to nor discussed by the Alder, Brenda Konkel, the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood or, to my knowledge, the Old Marketplace Neighborhood. A TIF district is a serious matter that should not be imposed without proper consideration. As it stands, the TIF district on the north side of East Washington, as outlined in the plan, or even on the south side of East Washington, could affect adversely the existing business district on East Johnson St., the Williamson St. business district, and compromise the residential nature of the area that has already been destabilized through the excessive number of PUD, CUP and other easements for developers. I admire the initiative behind the ERCPAC document, but cannot support the TIF proposal as it stands.

I must also state that the situation makes me wonder why a committee with a charge as serious as ERCPAC would fail to inform the residents of an area affected by its work. From what I've learned, these ideas were under discussion since the beginning of the year, and that should have been ample time to let us know directly about the TIF proposal. It gives me pause to think that no one realized this was, in essence, one neighborhood dictating the character of another.

I appreciate that you have now included Sal Calomino and me in the e-mail list that exists for ERCPAC. We also realize that you have only been involved with the project for a short time. We appreciate that your work on this initiative is very involved and we simply ask that the committee work with us if ERCPAC proceeds.

Sincerely,

Jim

James L. Zychowicz
803 East Gorham St.
Madison, WI 53703
USA
608-255-7954
JZychowicz@aol.com

Placeholder for GWAGA letter that needs to be scanned in.

From: David Waugh <dwaugh@library.wisc.edu>
To: <mwaidelich@ci.madison.wi.us>
Date: 7/18/03 4:05PM
Subject: ERC lighting issues

July 18,2003

To: Michael Waidelich
Re: ERC lighting issues

Dear Mr. Waidelich, I am a resident in the 2nd district. My home is on east Mifflin street very near the proposed East Rail Corridor development. I have been following the lighting debate for the East Washington reconstruction project and think it is appropriate to also raise my concerns with your committee. I am very concerned that growth on the Isthmus not contribute further to light pollution in our neighborhoods. Public lighting in downtown neighborhoods should incorporate aesthetically pleasing design, provide enough light to safely illuminate sidewalks and streets but should not stray into resident windows or pollute the nighttime sky. This is possible yet often at odds with what city engineers believe. Progressive cities around the country are adopting strategies to preserve our view of the stars. Madison should be on that list. I am not an expert in this area but rather a concerned citizen that would like these issues to be publicly discussed.

Thank you for your considering initiatives to reduce light pollution in Madison.

Sincerely,
David Waugh
1213 E. Mifflin Street
Madison, WI 53703
251-7713

David Waugh | University of Wisconsin | Library Technology Group
728 State St., Madison, WI 53706
dwaugh@library.wisc.edu | 608-262-0240 | 608-262-2833 (fax)

CC: <district6@cityofmadison.com>, <district2@cityofmadison.com>

From John E. Peck

To the East Rail Corridor Advisory Committee
July 19, 2003

I would like to submit comments on the plan as someone who both lives and works in the Willy St. area. To be more specific, I am one of seven people who currently own, manage, and reside at Black Walnut Co-op (1353 Rutledge St.), and am also executive director of Family Farm Defenders, a national nonprofit organization which will be relocating our Madison-based office to 1019 Williamson St. as of Aug. 1st, 2003. I have attended several public hearings related to this plan and have provided feedback at various points in the process. The following comments are my own and do not necessarily reflect those of others in my cooperative or my organization.

1.) Prioritize and Mandate Affordable Housing

This is a top issue for people in the neighborhood (as well as the rest of the city), and it is critical that the plan reflect this priority. I do not believe conventional developers need to be “rewarded” for including a token percentage (15-20%) of affordable housing in their plans, particularly if such includes height bonuses that diminish the quality life for other residents. Affordable housing is a public good and it should be mandated by the community in the public interest for ALL residential development – as is already done in many other progressive communities across the country at much higher percentage rates.

In contrast to conventional developers, not-for-profit co-ops (such as my own) are typically 100% affordable housing. In fact, we arguably provide the least expensive housing option in the neighborhood, and this we do without any particular “incentives” from local government entities. On the other hand, because co-ops do not fit the standard housing model, they continue to face discrimination in zoning and marginalization from other public development/finance programs (such as TIF). It is unfortunate that this plan still accepts the notion that the community must “bribe” developers to be responsible, when the public has the full right to determine just what housing will be available .

2.) Historic Preservation and Proposed Conservation District

Another strength of promoting more cooperative (and co-housing) alternatives in the neighborhood, instead of apartments and condominiums, is that co-ops prefer to purchase and maintain older – often historic – buildings since they better accommodate multi-family and group living situations. Once again, I do not think conventional developers need to be compensated for the “bother” of protecting and restoring historic structures. These have intrinsic value and deserve to have their integrity preserved for posterity, regardless of current fluctuations in real estate markets. While the proposed Conservation District satisfies some concerns about maintaining the character of the neighborhood, I think a more restrictive Historic District would be a better alternative. The plan itself needs to clearly specify and “set aside” for historic designation those properties that still exist in the neighborhood, and offer to assist those who would

maintain and utilize them in accordance with strict preservation standards. Establishing a community land trust for historic properties (with affiliated tax breaks) is a clear option.

3.) Expanding Park Land and Green Space

This neighborhood is woefully “under-parked,” and remedying this situation should be another priority of any good development plan. Access to adequate green space is as important a public service in a community as sewer and water in my opinion. I fully support the popular notion of relocating the Research Products complex, as well as the Zimmerman/Warren Heating operations, elsewhere and expanding the final size of the proposed central park to a full five blocks. As we all know, there are lots of brownfields in the isthmus awaiting subsidized clean up and redevelopment by willing businesses. On the other hand, there are also many existing businesses that could benefit from close proximity to the greenspace of a larger neighborhood park – such as art galleries, cafes, street musicians, theater groups, food carts, as well as the new Eastside Farmers Market.

4.) Mixed Residential and Commercial Zones

One of the worst moments in U.S. land use history which spawned our “geography of nowhere” dilemma was the decision to segregate residential and commercial activities through exclusive zoning practices. Granted there are very horrific examples of toxic industries adjacent to people’s homes – such as Madison Kipp – that need to be addressed. But the majority of entrepreneurial opportunities now emerging in this neighborhood pose much fewer risks to residential development, and this should be explicitly reflected in the plan – such as studio-loft or home office units. Close proximity of housing, green space, and business means less traffic congestion and automobile infrastructure, as residents have the choice of walking or biking to where ever they work , shop, or play – as many people in my co-op now do. It also means greater public safety, as entire blocks are no longer desolate and “abandoned” in the evening hours.

5.) New Development Should be Socially and Ecologically Responsible

This is one of the weakest sections of the plan in my estimation. I share the common sentiment that the height of new buildings should be maintained at the 2-3 story range that currently exists and not be allowed to reach 5-6 stories unless this is close to the capital. No one wants to live in a concrete canyon that blocks out the sun or confront alienating facades that dwarf human beings. In terms of transportation, cars should be de-emphasized in favor of lower impact forms of transit like bus, bike, and foot. There should be adequate street bike racks and bike storage facilities – not just more parking – required for new residences and businesses. Whatever new buildings are approved should be constructed with union labor and conform to state-of-the-art “green design” standards, especially if they are receiving any form of public subsidy (like TIF). Such features would include: recycled materials, vegetation to provide shade and oxygen (street trees, roof gardens), natural interior lighting and minimal external illumination (to reduce light pollution), energy efficient features (high r value windows, low flow fixtures, revolving doors, passive solar, etc.), permeable surface materials (such as

cobblestones) for parking areas and driveways to reduce runoff, to name but a few. Once again, the community has the authority – and I believe the obligation - to make this plan a model for progressive development. We have to live with the results; let's do the best.

6.) Democratic Accountability in the Planning Process

A final point is that I do not feel that this planning process has been sufficiently democratic or participatory. I felt my own serious remarks at one of the hearings were given rather short shrift by the official note taker, and others have told me they felt that the bulk of their input was just being ignored in the form of misplaced post its, unrecorded comments, etc. In particular, I think way too much weight has been accorded to the self-interest of absentee landlords and other real estate speculators in the process. Property is a social construct after all, and the community has no obligation to insure anyone's profit margins. In fact, the government retains the power of eminent domain, as those unfortunate businesses who got in the way of the Overture Project rudely discovered. Any future oversight body for this plan must have a decision-making majority that is genuinely representative of ALL those involved – i.e. neighborhood associations, local residents (both tenants and homeowners), business managers (not just their landlords), and local workers (perhaps through a union group like SCFL).

Thanks for your consideration,

John E. Peck
1353 Rutledge St.
Madison, WI 53703
#257-5949
jepeck@students.wisc.edu

From: "Karolyn Beebe" <keedo@merr.com>
To: "Michael Waidelich" <mwaidelich@ci.madison.wi.us>
Date: 7/20/03 12:16PM
Subject: Comment for the East Rail Corridor

Any outdoor lighting needed in the ERC should be as people & environment friendly as possible. An example is the well shielded favorite for East Washington, Lamp 3A in: <http://www.lic.wisc.edu/users/jsc/lamps/gallery1.htm> The 'eye-opening' qualities of this design are also apparent after dark on West Washington Ave.

Karolyn Beebe
220 Merry St - 53704

