To: Members of the Plan Commission  
From: Sara Eskrich, District 13 Alder  
RE: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street  
Date: July 8, 2017  

Thank you for your thorough review of the revised Peloton proposal before you on Monday, July 10. As you know, this project has garnered much attention over the past two years from this Commission, neighbors, and city staff. The process for neighborhood input began prior to my tenure as alder, through original approvals, and continued through the revised plans submission and changes. However, I will note the comments emailed from “Bay Creek Neighbors” to you were not shared with me, nor did I see any mention of public meetings where they were crafted or discussed on the Bay Creek listserv. I am therefore not sure of how representative they are, but they are generally reflective of the past public engagement on the design approved in 2015.

We held a neighborhood meeting on this revised project in February. Updates have also been provided via email and in-person at BCNA meetings as the submission has proceeded over the past 9 months. The general comments I have received on the new proposal include concern about height and density, but also include support for height and density. There has not been as much focus on the details, likely because this project continues to be such a moving target. Nevertheless, I will attempt to summarize comments as I have heard them below.

Most of the concerns I have heard from neighbors regarding this project are within the purview of the Plan Commission. They relate to added density, traffic risks, inadequate parking, bike and pedestrian safety, possible negative environmental impact, and general community impact. The following are particular elements to help address these concerns that I hope you will consider, as you did during original approvals:

- **Greenspace** – This is a priority and should be emphasized with greening landscaping elements that will be accessible (even just visibly) to the neighborhood, as well as the private greenspace for residents (perhaps enhancing the rooftop patio with green elements).
  - Setbacks – These should be required, per Planning Staff and UDC comments.
  - Green Roof – A green roof was required as a past condition of approval, and should remain part of this project, as proposed.

- **Encouraging Transit** – The building is on a major transit corridor and should encourage the use of Metro by rebuilding a visually appealing and beneficial bus stop with transit amenities, with the minimum of trash receptacles and seating amenities. Greening of this transit space could encourage use. I appreciate Metro adding the bus amenities as a condition of approval.
Bike and Car-Share – the applicant should be required to include a ride-share vehicle as a condition of approval, as was required previously. Additionally, the applicant should consider a bike-share station and the staff-recommended bike improvements to the property to encourage this mode of transit.

Commercial Space and Use – I agree with Planning Staff’s recommended condition to strengthen and expand the required condition from previous approvals regarding mandating a conditional use for any restaurant, nightclub, brewpub, restaurant-tavern, or restaurant-nightclub commercial tenant.

Additional Conditions to Carry-Over to this Approval include: Encourage construction laborers to not park on streets when working on the site and to explore the possibility of providing a shuttle service or shared parking with the adjacent clinic during construction; and limited exterior façade illumination on street-facing facades to balcony or patio illumination.

Size – The previous approval focused on a five story project. The fifth story elements of this current proposal are minimal, and the sixth story element is even smaller. I appreciate the aesthetic of the point being higher, without creating many extra units, as the concern on height I often hear is a reflection of density and more people/parking-related impacts. Resident comments as part of the Imagine Madison process have focused on the east side of Park Street being smaller in height, as it abuts single family homes. I believe it is more appropriate to have height on this side of Park Street, and am therefore comfortable with the minimal fifth and sixth floors of this proposal.

I will support this project provided that the conditions noted above as well as those in the staff report are met. Thank you again for your thorough review of this project. Please do not hesitate to contact me directly with any questions. I will also be at the Plan Commission meeting on Monday evening.