

**Public Comments — BUILD meeting 11/17 — Recorded on the Flip Charts**

Storm water management

Build out = number of residential units?

Encourage transit?

Pedestrian friendly? Serious problem. Destinations?

Main St. as pedestrian main street. Is this even achievable on E. Wash.?

Is there any way to ensure that buildings would not be built out to maximum envelope?

Overly restrictive height restrictions. Too regimented — range of heights. Ex.: flexibility of Downtown Design Guidelines

Like “shrinking garage” graphic; living in place

Use Density Bonuses to achieve goals and vary skyline.

View this as preliminary plan

Depend on private sector to provide ideas. Need to not discourage, but encourage developers to come forward with ideas in spirit of plan.

Not too restrictive guidelines

Height decisions? Public hearings, process?

Soil contamination — costs, responsibility

— there are issues

— who pays: owners, previous owners, maybe TIF

spills of fuel in the street, where does it go?

Height concerns — for Mifflin residential areas, may block light

Process : ranges make me nervous — propose a 4-story, get a 10-story

Pictures buildings on E. Wash like those on John Nolen

15-18 story building hurts neighbors: cars, parking an even more difficult issue

Concerned about traffic — want neighborhood streets for neighborhood use. E. Wash is at capacity. Density will add to traffic, push this into neighborhoods.

Goal: mitigate sprawl. If you allow these tall buildings. What’s the limit that you can put in there?

10 maximum stories.  
Encourage family-oriented  
Trees lining East Washington

Preserve neighborhood quality — tall buildings, condos will ruin that

Infill believe [?], but there is a limit. Ex: Gorham at bend near University Ave — suffocating; height, poor design

Respect neighborhoods. But benefit to neighborhood from new residences. Better than commuters driving through. A few buildings taller, OK

Respect and Strengthen the South side of East Washington. This is part of our (Marquette) neighborhood. Want this plan to fit into our neighborhood.

Problem with heights. Need to be consistent with blocks in neighborhood

Tall building next to a shorter building is a visual disconnect.

Need a gradient of height West to East. East Washington is not going to become an environment to itself

Sprawl-busting argument = DON'T buy it. Tall buildings and urban sprawl can coexist

East Rail Corridor plan is an already adopted plan. 8 stories. Tenney-Lapham neighborhood is working on 6 stories.

East Washington is not a good place to live. Too much traffic, dust, vehicle exhaust.

Support E. Rail building heights! What does this document mean, if E. Rail Plan can be overwritten and overruled so quickly?

Would like to see existing buildings shown i.e., some houses at First St.

Surface parking: Create green space by moving surface parking underground. From dead area to net gain that increases parking capacity.

How to get an understanding of and REAL FEEL for impact of building heights?  
— Mark O. step backs are to maintain solar access; 3-D models possible  
— Physical and web-based modeling?

Al Martin: future projects will undergo the whole approval process. Evaluation of proposals will be site-specific.

Core principle #2: Destination on E. Wash: Will this conflict with Willy and E. Johnson business districts?

Traffic concerns (Mifflin, Emerson East) pedestrian experiences a wind tunnel, is exposed to elements, traffic

Few cross-E. Wash connections / linkages  
Streetscape, street life facing into neighborhoods

Don't believe that Density is either a Panacea, or a Bogeyman  
Site-sensitive design is the key

Building Heights — support E Rail Corridor Heights  
They relate better to neighborhoods  
2-years of investment (time, labor) to get the E. Rail recommendations

Supports E. Wash BUILD revision to building heights. Will create a vibrant city corridor, and enhanced pedestrian experience. It's worth it.

Was E. Rail Corridor Plan just advisory, pending this story? Bob- There was no priority among these plans.

Have lived in the area for 15 years. Can bike in area and bike to work. Support higher density.

Lou Host-J. idea — attention on heights, setbacks.... But developers may put parking on backside, creating a dead zone – and a dead street. Main and Mifflin will be dead streets.

Deal with this issue. North Side works, South side doesn't. Feels we won't get much ped activity even with the density. More likely focus on E. Main.  
Focus attention on this as well as on E. Wash

Setbacks. Could be too much dead space, With big block and buildings. Maybe varied, deep at entrance.

Who reconciles difference? City Council

E. Main — hopes for increased infill, retail (coffeehouses, grocery) — increased access, walkability

Was another city the inspiration? None specifically.

T-L/Gorham area — Height on back side of blocks  
Need 3-D model for neighbors  
High water table – effect on underground parking?

Density will come. Plan for it.

Traffic — create feeders into both neighborhoods.

Curt: Parking drives vertical density  
Parking can be put underground.

No surface parking on East Washington  
Proposals will go through an approval process  
Storm water is strictly regulated

Different building heights on North vs. South sides  
Will create an IMBALANCE  
Distort view of Capitol and frame it poorly  
Constitute an UNEQUAL distribution of redevelopment activity

Marquette contains E. Rail Corridor and E. Washington Avenue

Parking underground: further east, it's more expensive to go underground

E. Rail Corridor Plan considered the aesthetics of boulevard in setting heights. Sought to balance with North side of E. Washington, and maintain symmetry.

North side—better developed than South side.

If sense of ownership of Main St., we would have developed better plan there.

Response: We actually considered both sides intensively. Different context.

Hope process does not create a wall of tall buildings

Only reason to go with tall buildings is to make a buck. If you destroy neighborhoods then you will GET sprawl.

Disagree with that. Need to encourage development downtown

Want another public meeting like this one.