

From: Robbie Webber

Date: February 22, 2015 at 3:11:30 PM CST

To: "Cornwell, Katherine" <kcornwell@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, Maurice Sheppard, Michael Heifetz, Tonya Hamilton-Nisbet, Bradley Cantrell, Eric Sundquist, Ken Opin, Ledell Zellers, Melissa Berger, Michael Rewey, Scott Resnick, Steve King

Subject: 2505-2525 University Ave item

Plan Commission members -

Although I am generally the last person to raise an alarm about parking issues in the neighborhood, I did note this text in the Traffic Engineering staff recommendations:

"Twenty three underground and 9 surface off-street auto parking spaces are provided for the development, which has 20 residential units. It is not clear whether any of the off street parking spaces are reserved at all times for residents. A condition of approval shall be that no residential parking permits shall be issued for 2505 & 2525 University Avenue unless a minimum of 20 off street parking spaces are reserved at all times for residents. If a minimum of 20 off street parking spaces are not reserved at all time for residents, the applicant shall inform all tenants of this restriction in their apartment leases. In addition, if a minimum of 20 off street parking spaces are not reserved at all time for residents the applicant shall submit for 2505 & 2525 University Avenue a copy of the lease noting the above condition."

Does this mean that if 20 parking stalls are reserved for residents at all times, then tenants would be able to get residential parking permits for street parking?

I believe this might be a problem for many people in the neighborhood. At virtually ever discussion of development or planning in our neighborhood, even in the most general discussions, there has been resistance to increased parking pressure on our streets. This has translated into resistance to redevelopments. Even when assured that residents of new buildings will not be issued RP3 permits, this resistance persists.

In general, residents of new buildings in our neighborhood have not been allowed to get residential parking permits, and all neighborhood meetings on developments have included assurances that new building residents will not be eligible for RP3s.

I am worried that if this building is allowed to get RP3 permits, then there will be resistance to future developments if they do not feature what our neighbors consider "sufficient" parking. (There seems to be a persistent idea that every adult will own a car, and therefore there must be an off-street spot for every adult in the building. I personally do not share this concern, but many of my neighbors do.)

This concern that new buildings will put more pressure on local streets might throw a wet blanket on some good development in the future or make developers build either large surface lots or expensive underground spots. Neither of these options is healthy for smart redevelopment or the city in general.

I think the safer route would be a condition that no RP3 permits would be allowed, regardless of the number of spots permanently reserved for tenants.

Former Alder Robbie Webber

Stevens St

(one block away from the building under consideration)