

August 22, 2023 Brayton Lot-Block 113 in-person Meeting

Participant Questionnaire Responses

1. What do you see as the biggest opportunity for redevelopment of Block 113?
 - Premium location, great opportunity for market rate & affordable housing bonus; less parking, better transit options w/ BRT & buses; Good retail locations close to capitol
 - Possibility for maximum density housing that is able to take full advantage of the City's power to influence affordability given they own the property; Biggest opportunity is really the unique situation & if it can be used to do a lot more than non-city owned projects
 - Bring a mix of retail & housing; we need more condos or single family housing (affordable); parking underground
 - Density-more housing, some affordable/go for the stories bonus, let's remove the height limits; some community services, fine but let's return some revenue too; bus service/departure times at nearby stops; condos that face the lake-let's recoup some money
 - I think it is imperative that a significant affordable housing initiative be part of this development. Rental rather than owner-oriented to best serve the downtown market (and recognize the lack of downtown schools will serve to inhibit the market for owner occupied). If the City can't make affordable happen on property they control it's probably not doable downtown
 - Not-for-profit services, mental health services, senior center, welcome services for new residents, community center, continuing education, churches outreach, and recreation facilities
 - Infill connecting Capitol square with future GEF redevelopment with Cap East
 - Recreation center. The University has two, which contribute to building an active & cohesive campus community. The City of Madison has nothing similar for its residents. We're adding lots of residents, but we aren't giving them space to congregate/recreate especially in the winter
 - Affordable housing
 - Housing at variety of price points. Because the City owns the land, it can require a substantial portion of the housing units to be "affordable" provided the City or other levels of government provide sufficient incentives to make the "affordable" housing is financially feasible. But not predominantly "affordable" housing
 - Affordable; owner occupied and/or rental, retain city ownership, land bank the property for city; include community space, community center, possible community exercise (like other city community centers & the private market rate high rises), incorporate "green" in iteration of project
 - Affordable & market rate housing compatible with the scale of the First Settlement neighborhood
 - Housing! I hope to see at least 500-600 units of housing on this parcel. They are so desperately needed in Madison. I would love as many as possible to be affordable. With

this parcel being right on BRT, I'd like to see a bit of commercial space to make it mixed-use area. As much sustainability as possible in the buildings

- Would love to see this redeveloped into the types of housing hard to get done w/ privately owned parcels. Should be high density 250+ units, limited parking of/to proximity to bus/downtown. Would love to see affordable units (30% & 60% AMI), family size units (2 & 3 BR), and owner-occupied condos included in the design, as there are limited choices downtown for these types
2. What are your biggest concerns about redevelopment of Block 113?
- It remains vacant until we build; I'm concerned w/ this premium lot not being developed; do anything we can to move this process along
 - Missing out on the opportunity the City has to create much needed affordable housing downtown & on the bus line; it is important to have a variety of housing types/costs & have enough services
 - Bringing in Sect. 8 housing; we need owner occupied housing; traffic flow-where will cars enter/exit parking; will residential street be able to handle the new flow of traffic
 - Parking-please minimize parking; cost-let's build as little parking as possible, and try to return some revenue from commercial/lab
 - The redevelopment needs to respect the existing built environment of First Settlement. Taller towards E. Wash., yes, but tower needs to step down as it moves south. Parking is expensive but consider putting a 2nd level of the parking underground to allow the tower to step down to six or five stories before covering to the four-story component
 - Need to favor housing of interest to seniors; balance is need ____ demographic distributions
 - Not maximizing density
 - It will default to more housing
 - Prime real estate being gobbled up by the wealthiest people in Mad City; giving voice to those most in need
 - Make sure the process to select a developer is transparent and all interested developers are treated equally. Allow teams of developers to make combined proposals; gives local developers a fair shot; consider allowing RFP responses to be either for the whole block or just for the 10 story part or just for the 4 story part
 - Goes to market rate, city loses agency/ownership; pricing out even more local residents; lost opportunity for affordable owner-occupation
 - Keep the development ____ it low-rise residential development compatible with the residential properties & church ____ street
 - I worry that we'll get far fewer units out of this area than we should. I worry that parking will be over-provided. I worry that the concerns of affluent, older homeowners who bought their houses in a much more affordable era will be prioritized over the needs of the environment and of renter struggling with price hikes
 - I am concerned we will prioritize the needs of commuters by building too much parking, rather than the dense/transit oriented housing that could prevent people from needing to commute. I would hate to see the City miss an opportunity to build affordable housing , provide 250+ new units, and create opportunities for family-size apartments and condos that are lacking in many of the other downtown developments

3. Is there anything else that you wish to tell staff and policymakers about Block 113?
- Love less parking & take that FTA requirement seriously; make it transit rider friendly; more units the better, even at sacrifice of parking, \$15 million is insane for parking
 - While there is a stated need for highest end unity, people w/ the highest budget will always have options & clearly have incentive to move to this lovely place; people & families in the middle & lowest ends are most at risk of being pushed out of a city they have called home; also people wanting luxury apartments, also want services & amenities that will be near impossible to staff is the City doesn't make big housing moves. I know it is also complicated & there are lots of constraints as well
 - There should be a historical marker highlighting the history & the former school building at that site; we need some green space as part of the development
 - Let's return more than \$9 million to Metro Transit
 - This is a tremendous opportunity for the City, downtown and First Settlement. Heed the past planning efforts for this block and the input of all stakeholders as this proposal moves forward
 - Affordable housing means what?
 - Consider gathering space
 - Nonprofit/community serving use-childcare facility with small part of plot sacrificed for outdoor play area; otherwise maximum scale possible
 - Priority for block-would love to see lab and/or child care
 - This is an awesome opportunity to reinforce Madison as active/healthy city. Memberships for a rec center would help many interactions of city residents, support wellness, and overall health. Most downtown residents currently have to drive out of the city for rec centers (Princeton Club, YMCA, KEUA, etc.)
 - Please consider community use spaces & include non-profits as part of occupancy
 - Respect compatibility w/ FSD LHP, existing neighborhood plan, please incorporate that neighbor work; incorporate "green" concerned about climate & "heatsink" urban hot spot; opportunity for owner/affordable options; what are other transit supportive options, not parking & not just BRT infrastructure
 - Please give services _____ to the development & design proposal. The First Settlement residents _____ at cost of \$15,000 over 25 years up until ____ Keep _____, it is still the _____ proposal & _____ your RFP
 - The Continental across the street is a good starting point. This lot can fit two buildings like that and leave ample space for "mossing middle" townhomes, smaller 2-5 story buildings, and green space. We need to reduce from the proposed 350 parking spots. The above ground parking space should instead go to additional homes. \$15 million for parking is insane
 - Please think of future residents and the needs of young professionals & families, even though they are usually not vocal during the feedback process

August 22, 2023 Brayton Lot-Block 113 Redevelopment Questions Asked During the Meeting

1. What is City doing to ensure that voices of renters are captured?
2. Is there a minimum amount of parking set?
3. Do we envision an RFP that sets a list of requirements on the development respondents?
4. Is the entire site under the FTA constraints? YES
5. Can there be any public parking? NO
 - a. St. Patrick's Church could benefit from public parking, and without it that is an ongoing issue for events
6. What are the thoughts for green space and / or common use public space?
 - a. Plans did not stress public space
 - b. These come with costs
7. How much will parking stalls cost for 350?
 - a. Estimate of \$14,000,000
8. Are all of these things (uses) serviceable / marketable?
 - a. City is still looking to figure out
 - b. Trying to get to right mix of right things
9. Additional context on parking, including parking in the area, and what might be required in the development?
 - a. Context of parking in the area (slide)
10. Do we have a sense of what the FTA means when they say "no excess public parking"?
 - a. No excess parking for the public means no additional public parking. Period.
11. The loaded nature of asking whether the property should develop "affordable" housing versus market rate housing. Any new housing relieves demand on other, older housing.
12. Are there creative ways that the City is looking at to address the potential creation of affordable housing?
13. What Federal resources is the City looking towards for the site?
 - a. City Staff do not know yet. This will be informed by the potential uses that are in the mix.
14. Where is the closest BRT stop?
 - a. Blair St & East Wash; 2 blocks away, and on the Capitol @ Wisconsin Ave and MLK Blvd
15. How long does each step in this process take?
 - a. Estimate that it will take 4-6 years overall to get into the project and have construction occurring / occupancy happening.

Block 113 Survey Monkey: Open Ended Responses 8/23/23-9/23/23

What do you see as the biggest opportunity for redevelopment of Block 113?

- Madison Indoor Market
- More housing to service the downtown in a location that provides density, accessibility, and wonderful downtown amenities.
- Take a look at what is missing from the neighborhood, not just what we think we need more of. Do we need medical facilities to make it easier on residents who do not have cars? Yes, bus can help, but not all facilities are easily reachable.
- Food market, winter time farmer's market, sustainable development.
- A beautiful mini village with green space, contemporary design, sustainable build with housing and retail and parking underground.
- A shift in city management style away from downtown Madison being a car centric city ruled by parking lots
- I would love to see a diversity of unit types for example, affordable, owner occupied, and market rate. We really lack multi-generational housing and units that are 4+ bedrooms.
- A large, iconic building with a high concentration of affordable housing.
- I see this as the potential to keep a significant state employer (WDNR) downtown to support local businesses by building a new green office building and to work with the state to redevelop the GEF parcels for housing and commercial. BRT is being designed to get workers downtown, so let's keep state workers downtown.
- With the potential availability of GEF2 and GEF3 for future redevelopment, the Brayton lot could serve as the tip of the spear in revitalizing the entire area.
- Housing
- Provide housing ownership options downtown,
- An opportunity to fund a developer who will pursue mixed-income housing downtown that will be owner-occupied. With the potential sale of GEF II and GEF III, there's a real opportunity to transform that area into a nice little community within downtown.
- Beautiful, walkable, connected to services and events, some green space!
- the chance to make the area welcoming - more green space
- Transforming what has long been a single-level parking lot to a thriving residential and commercial location with prime access to the city's improving public transport system and continuing to promote development along the E Wash corridor in a location where people want to live.
- Creation of affordable, sustainable and livable community housing for long-term residency with ample open, green, recreational space. Mix of owner-occupied and rental, 1-3 bedrooms, family and senior-friendly.
- Critical mass for a successful BRT stop on this side of the Square.
- Finally, a good opportunity to build affordable housing, and on a reasonable scale. Please include parking, otherwise the street parking problem only intensifies.
- Critically needed eco-friendly, sustainable low-income housing. Small apartments are beautiful and efficient.

- As a full city block, we should take advantage of opportunities to include housing in a tower for a portion of the site, commercial office/retail/services on the lower floors of the tower/podium and owner-occupied townhouse or stacked townhouse-style housing on the Mifflin St/back side of the block.
- The city could make a genuine step toward alleviating the city's affordable housing crisis.
- Significant number of affordable units downtown
- It's not often that a huge block owned by the city comes available and we can get around state bans on affordability.
- Affordable housing
- I would like the city to be firm on PERPETUALLY affordable housing, and for 100% of units to be affordable. I am tired of seeing only 10% of units affordable, and knowing that the contracts with developers only require affordability for 15 or so years. I want there to be affordable housing forever, not just until the city forgets.
- affordable and accessible housing
- Please just build a giant building with lots of apartments in it that are of good quality and size. The bigger the better. MORE HOUSING!
- Affordable housing to address the critical and urgent housing crisis
- I think this is an opportunity to have rent controlled apartments that are affordable for both young professionals and students
- Create affordable housing that can be used for students and locals! I hate to see the high prices that wealthier students can afford drive out underprivileged students and community members
- Making downtown Madison livable and beautiful for the average person, which, some don't like to hear, we all are.
- Adding housing downtown. Housing is needed, period. More specifically for this block I would like to see owner occupied cohousing-- affordable condo units that could be clustered on a floor or section of the project, that would include a common dining/multi-purpose room, guest rooms, and outdoor spaces for all members. Also, rental housing co-op units - these could be as small as a room or room+bathroom, with common kitchen/dining facilities owned and managed by the cooperative membership. These types of developments can add housing very affordably, reduce the cost of construction, while creating highly desirable spaces that promote community connection.
- Significant park and open space as part of the development plan. A place for human safety and interaction in the urban environment
- Add higher end residential condos
- HOUSING! Especially in an amenity-rich area. There should be minimal parking because this is an extremely transit-rich, pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly area. The affordable housing story bonus should absolutely be utilized to the greatest extent possible.
- Establishing a walkable commercial district between the square and "cap east"
- A beautiful affordable apartment or condo building surrounded by canopy trees and some interior green play areas for children.
- Significantly increasing housing supply in downtown
- Real affordability since the city owns the land

- Development should include many units but also include plans for retail services that make the car less of an overshoot without a car. Grocery sit on the ground level.
- The opportunity to add a lot of affordable housing in the middle of downtown *without displacing anyone*.
- Large scale mixed use (affordable and market-rate condo's and apartments) with services and retail. I think the block should be chopped up into smaller components. Think Cayalá in Guatemala City, but with even greater density.
- Madison should continue to invest in affordable housing and other public services and reduce car-centric infrastructure downtown. If not affordable housing or public services, the site could be well used as green space, perhaps consisting of native species restoration, water cooling/play areas, or a space otherwise for public events in a shady and natural area.
- I see this as an opportunity to potentially build public housing as Madison already owns the lot. This way the city can ensure it remains affordable in the long term. If this is not a possibility, the city may at least be able to use it's ownership of the lot as leverage to ensure the long term affordability of privately owned rental units.
- The possibility of creating safe and healthy housing: non smoking (no cigarettes or marijuana), access to green space on site, designed with multiple accessibility needs in mind, well constructed to prevent flooding/mold/noise issues/broken HVAC/people falling through their balconies/all the other issues that the "luxury" buildings up and down E Wash are inflicting on residents.
- Affordable senior housing!
- The biggest opportunity here would be to create an affordable housing and commercial mixed use development. The parking limitations combined with the site's proximity to a BRT station mean residents who do not own automobiles are still well-connected.
- Offering large quantities of lower-cost housing that can be managed and moderated by a public entity rather than corporate developers whose only goal is profit.
- Affordable housing
- The city of Madison ****desperately**** needs MORE 30% AMI apartments specifically for disabled people. The city of Madison also needs MORE services specifically designed for disabled people--shopping, exercise/entertainment, and general 'life enrichment' services. The city does not have a public indoor swimming pool/gym for year-round use, nor one that is specifically designed to be primarily for use by disabled people. It appears that the Block 113 area is large enough to include an apartment building specifically for 30% AMI disabled renters, retail stores, a public use swimming pool and gym specifically designed for disabled users. My proposal could also be a source for jobs for disabled renters, which give the City of Madison a 'return' on its investment in our needs. The city of Madison could use my proposal for the Block 113 redevelopment project as a national model and become a 'leader' in disability services. The lot also appears to be large enough to build apartments that a disabled person can live in. A 400 square foot 1-bedroom "public housing" apartment is not suitable for a wheelchair-bound disabled person. We should be able to have a large 2-bedroom apartment. The city of Madison should be making sure that we can live here comfortably too, not just 'rich folks' who can afford the newly built apartments charging \$2400+/month for rent. The city of Madison is building apartments that only rich people can afford, while repetitively and intentionally ignoring the needs of lower income disabled people. Increasing bus ridership is a focus of this

redevelopment. Disabled people use the bus, the bus routes are already in place surrounding Block 113. My proposal would increase bus ridership.

- Because the affordable housing crisis in Madison is so clear and present, this lot provides a critical opportunity to somewhat lessen it and allow lower-income students and families a place to stay that isn't miles away from downtown Madison, where many work and go to school.
- Building equity in an affordable fashion through a limited-equity co-operative.
- Its city owned, which allows us to mandate affordable housing. Its a rare opportunity downtown, and we must use it.
- Redeveloping this block to maximize the number of new residents living in a transit rich, walkable, jobs rich area will not only help solve the housing crisis, but will add millions of dollars of annual tax revenue to support other City of Madison services and priorities.
- Accessible Housing
- This is a great opportunity for Madison to serve as a model and leader in developing a true community living space that provides affordable housing and builds sustainable support between neighbors/residents.
- Increased housing and community space near the Capitol Square; iconic architecture.
- Righting the wrongs that housing and urban development in Madison have previously done, meaning affordable housing and opportunities for those historically impacted by the current and historical engagement techniques and collaboration.
- To add hundreds of affordable units downtown
- Affordable housing and capital square access for nonprofit/service organizations.
- East Washington Avenue currently only has a few options for dining and retail. If the market permits, retail/restaurant space would be great for local residents and visitors.

What are your biggest concerns about redevelopment of Block 113?

- City requirements overburdening development; failure to locate indoor market at site
- Sticking low income/Section 8 housing blocks from our state capitol could provide a multitude of issues generally associated with this type of housing product. Hopefully, if affordable is approved, it will be a ratio of affordable and market rate.
- That we'll let it be something easy to get approved, instead of what would really be valuable.
- it will be big and ugly. it will create a lot of traffic. should limit on site parking.
- It will be ugly and have surface parking.
- That it'll probably still end up being a luxury apartment complex even with this survey
- I want to avoid another luxury high rise. If it will be a luxury high rise, it should be built with high quality materials and with true sustainability in mind including the materials in each unit. Like bamboo flooring, low volume toilets etc.
- The City considers and acts on replacing the prior parking and building some commercial office space, losing focus on affordable housing as the first priority.
- I have no concerns. It is an underutilized parcel. It would be nice to include some parking with the redevelopment.
- Under-building on the site would be a missed opportunity.
- Parking on site
- There needs to be adequate parking, not on the street. Also, the design of the building should recognize the historic nature of the area.

- Another large and generic apartment complex that only serves high-income individuals.
-
- I strongly oppose the massive up to the sidewalk, giant buildings. Also, I would hate to see this be a solid block of big buildings. Aesthetics matter as does human scale. Livability
- that there will be just another huge building that only wealthy people will be able to afford; that the city will prioritize getting more property taxes instead of thinking about what a downtown neighborhood should look like
- Excess parking in a very central location. The podium component of the 2023 Conceptual Space Study. Will this reduction in vertical space lead to fewer units being built? What is the justification for this component?
- Another gigantic full-block single building of overpriced "luxury" studios and 1 BRs aimed at ripping off rich students and transient professionals.
- It will be more nondescript rental homes offering little to the broader community.
- Too massive, not affordable, no parking.
- Excludes low-income people. Will not utilize high standards of green, energy-efficient construction.
- Overparking - we should not build any above-ground parking. Any parking should be underground.
- Without proper incentives provided by the city, a reasonable developer would build expensive luxury apartments that provide the greatest guarantee of ROI but are least helpful for lower and middle income Madison residents.
- Two concerns: 1. People insisting on abundant parking. This is in downtown Madison along the BRT, and blocks from a grocery store. We should not overbuilding parking or insisting on 1 parking space per bedroom. 2. I'm concerned people are going to insist on cutting down the number of units. Again, this is in our downtown. Anything less than a tower in this site would be a travesty. This is not the place for "Missing middle"
- I am sort of visually tired by the typical 5 over 1 all over East Wash.
- Unaffordable housing
- The definition of affordability is not a true reflection of affordability. 1200 for a one bedroom is not affordable. Middle class folks are stuck between too expensive apartments and being ineligible for more affordable housing.
- for profit businesses
- none, get that fuckin parking lot blight outta here.
- I am concerned that rental units will be unaffordable and therefore will not help in the affordable housing crisis.
- I don't want another huge high rise apartment building with unaffordable rates and is ugly to look at
- Being such a great location in madison I would love to see a development that prioritizes sustainability and enrichment of the madison ecosystem
- Over-development of ugly, expensive, too-huge buildings, w/ miserly or virtually no landscaping. The world is on fire folks. We do not have much time left if we are to reverse climate change.

- Too much market rate 'luxury' housing that many people can't afford (unless they work for Epic or similar). There needs to be more truly affordable housing available so that people with a range of jobs and income levels can afford to live downtown.
- that it won't have sufficient density
- Heat Island effect and no urban forest
- crappy design , with no parking
- -That too much space will be dedicated to parking -That the buildings won't be tall/dense enough
- Lack of street level activation
- That we end up with a behemoth box of a building that abuts the sidewalk on all 4 sides with no place for trees.
- I am concerned that the development potential will be held back by calls to preserve character.
- The idea of using preservation in order to push for low to medium housing density.
- That density will be stifled by alders looking to safeguard the “character” of the neighborhood, or that density will not be high enough because they want to add “missing middle” housing, which is not appropriate here. Needs to be talk and dense.
- Ensuring quality, affordable housing
- My biggest concern is that too much parking will be provided and that the scale of the building will be too modest.
- I hope that it's not developed for luxury apartments or luxury commercial spaces.
- I am concerned that this could potentially become a missed opportunity to reduce the shortage of affordable rental units in Madison.
- That it will not be a truly healthy or sustainable place to live.
- That it will turn into a hangout spot like the old Transfer Points for the buses.
- That we'll let perfect get in the way of good enough. We need to build housing.
- My biggest concerns are accessibility, pedestrian safety from E. Washington vehicle traffic, maintaining First Settlement architectural character, price and size of the potential apartment units.
- First-floor retail that gets built and sits empty for years.
- Activation of the area will be required in order to deal with issues that come with affordable housing at the rates that people are clamoring for. I believe that this will happen organically over time with the redevelopment of the GEFs and the infill from the 700 block to the 200 block. However we've seen deleterious situations in more “remote” sites like Tree Ln, Meadowlands, and the Madisonian. I suspect that even without advanced preparation. the Brayton Lot location would be different. However, St John's, Salvation Army and the Valor across the avenue are integrating social services with their mixed market-rate/affordable housing projects. Maybe The Breeze is a better reference point, since that population is more mixed and the location has many retail services in the immediate area, but hasn't any integrated social services. Regardless, we need to look at all-inclusive affordable housing the provides the needs of families, seniors, and downtown workers.
- I suspect that as usual, the city will allow/assist a developer to build more UNaffordable apartments, and will intentionally ignore the needs of disabled people, again.

- My sole concern is addressing the urgent affordable housing crisis. I, along with many of my peers, will be absolutely outraged to see this lot become anything other than affordable housing.
- Another building that looks slapped together by architects who didn't talk to each other, with the currently-trendy materials (a little corrugated metal, a little brick, a little vinyl, with unrelated colors tossed in because we think color is good). Another building in which a tiny studio will cost more than my mortgage.
- I'm worried that the development might lack density and might lead to non-housing development. That would be a waste of an opportunity
- My biggest concern is that we listen to a handful of older, affluent homeowners lucky enough to have been the original gentrifiers of First Settlement neighborhood (think of the massive capital gains on their houses!) and reduce the height and massing and thus number of units provided and tax base created. The City cannot let a handful of loud voices continue to make the housing crisis worse, when those most impacted by the housing crisis don't have the ability to attend daytime meetings.
- Needs to fit into the neighborhood.
- I fear the "decision by committee" process will result in a "the-whole-is-less-than-the-sum-of-its-parts" hodge-podge development. I would prefer a more controversial but unified project over an underwhelming compromise project with no clear vision.
- That individuals with the most availability to share their opinions will be the ones listened to. Who is invited to the table is one thing, but who has built that table is the deeper thing to be looked at here. When and how is engagement and input being sought by all Madison residents?
- underbuilding the site (too little density)
- Another commercial/mixed use building with condos — which we do not need.
-

Is there anything else that you wish to tell staff and policymakers about Block 113?

- With rising costs at the E. Johnson location, Madison has an opportunity to course correct. Please do not make a generational mistake - locate the public market here and bring desperately needed foot traffic to the downtown during winter months.
- Be mindful of what this property will be 30 years from now. We do not want our tax payer money constructing a problem.
- It would be nice to think about where the downtown area is going (vision for its use), not just today's perspective.
- limit height so as to not block capitol view from east as visitors and tourists enter the city.
- Just going to reiterate the fact that there are thousands of young people that work within a few blocks of this location and you could fill an apartment complex of people who dont need to keep another SUV downtown
- On the BRT, it should really be focused on affordability.
- Block 113 may be a parking lot, but that parking does not need reinstating. Madison is a city: a large community of people, not vehicles.

- See my comments about redeveloping this parcel for state use and redeveloping the GEF parcels for housing and commercial uses.
- Think big, build big, and be wary of bad-faith arguments from an aging cohort who want Madison to be exactly as it was when they moved here in 1982.
- please try to think creatively - what does our city need the most? how can we get there with this Block 113 opportunity; then please share and tell all city residents and be transparent about how decisions are made
- Given the public transportation focus of the site, please consider reducing or making exceptions to the minimum parking requirements in favor of more residential units.
- It would be nice if the new complex included a nod to Turner Hall, a great public meeting space made available to the wider community by a great community organization. I am very sorry to see it go and even sadder to see it spend so much time as the corner of a parking lot. How about a park or a playground? Or a dedicated community meeting space?
- Central Madison needs more owner-occupied housing for people to age in place, as well as inspiring architecture. I hope this project can include both.
- Don't mess this opportunity up!
- Providing a large supply of parking for residents will incentivize car use, worsening traffic congestion along an already troublesome corridor.
- If the city does not take a stand and mandate affordable housing to STAY affordable, people of color will suffer, children will suffer, and it will be the city's fault for cowardice against standing up to developers
- please help out the residents that you are in charge of helping through policy
- If you don't develop this land at all you have failed as a policymaker, prioritizing wasting valuable space for cars.
- Please prioritize urgent affordable housing needs over expensive units to own
- Please take the housing crisis in Madison seriously- people are getting priced out of a city they have lived their entire lives.
- Prioritize projects that don't drive out the deeply rooted madison community & projects that protect Madison's nature!
- The block needs solar paneling, lots of trees and green, affordable housing.
- This is a whole city block. We need to do something special, let's not waste the opportunity.
- don't include parking minimums, people who live here will be able to live car free
- Make it a signature project of a livable downtown space with open park/ and shade opportunity
- This is a great opportunity to continue to densify and pedestrianize East Washington
- Make it beautiful, make it affordable, make it green.
- The plans are outdated
- Push for density and affordable condo units.
 - I desperately would like to see actually useful services like grocery stores, general goods, affordable clothing, etc, rather than more restaurants and bars. Making sure people don't need cars to live downtown has to be a top priority. - I'd love to see the height limit increased on the shorter side of the block. There's precious little space on the isthmus, we have to use as much of it as possible. - Please don't let this be yet another "luxury" apartment building with a soulless interior that feels more sterile than a hospital. - An opportunity like this one won't exist again—I hope the city doesn't compromise on our needs.

- Please emphasize the pedestrian. Think Cayalá in Guatemala City as a great example of what this could be.
- Thank you for your continued efforts to make Madison an affordable, green, and pedestrian-friendly home. Please continue this work to support the lives of everyday people, green and sustainable practices and spaces, and non-car-centric transportation infrastructure.
- Do not allow smoking of any kind! Smoke does not stay in an apartment, and it isn't fair to inflict air quality issues and nasty chemicals on neighbors.
- If we are receiving a 9 million dollar grant to develop the site to promote public transit, how can we justify a project that spends 15 million dollars on parking?
- Following the decision to approve Market-rate housing on Broom St, it is of utmost importance that the City of Madison prioritize housing for students and low-income residents.
- This is a great location to kick the height up to 12 or even 14 stories. There's no reason we can't amend UDD4.
- Generally speaking, the city of Madison should NOT be approving any future apartment construction projects unless the building plan includes a minimum of 30% of the units for the lowest income people, the 30% AMI group. The Block 113 proposal I am submitting, would be a good start to correct a long-standing problem.
- I appreciate your efforts to hear from many voices in the community, and please keep in mind that most students (whom the housing crisis will directly affect in the coming years) aren't back from summer break yet and thus input regarding the necessity of affordable housing will likely be less representative of the largest population in Madison until the school semester begins.
- We are not going to transform E Washington Avenue into a pedestrian paradise. The isthmus needs a major thoroughfare. We can face a residential building toward the residential neighborhood to encourage interaction. We can encourage interaction within the project. With a mix of sizes of affordable units, we can encourage a diverse community of working families, downsizing seniors, students.
- Please maximize residential density and future tax base to support city services! Moreover, don't let perfect be the enemy of the good. Each additional day until construction completes and residents can occupy the units makes the housing crisis worse.
- I appreciate the opportunity to give input.
- I hope that "perfect" does not become the enemy of "good." Market-rate housing is not a bad outcome; currently, Block 113 does not have any housing at any price point.
- I urge engagement with Madison residents on their terms, spaces, and structures rather than only on staff and policymaker's terms.
- Keep parking ratios low
- A lot of my friends have had difficulty finding housing downtown. Many of them have had to live in suburban areas that are less walkable and have poor transit coverage. This is a great opportunity to allow more people to live in a dense urban environment.