

**Capitol Gateway Corridor Land Use and Urban Design Plan
Public Meeting # 2**

Tuesday, Nov. 17th, 2005, 5:00-8:00 pm (snacks and beverages provided)

945 E. Washington Ave

Public Comment Forms Received

Question 1. a. Core Development Principles, LIKE

- R3. Worthy goals
Attempt to harmonize with existing historic neighborhoods.
- R5. I appreciate the effort to encourage a mix of land uses and the language supporting transit.
- R7. Increased density
Focus on employment
Scaling back towards the neighborhood
- R9. The idea of respecting existing neighborhoods

Q1b. Core Development Principles, CHANGE

- R1. Widen East Washington Ave. to accommodate the increased traffic through the major linkage route to allow competing uses by bicycles and buses, cars and pedestrians. East Washington is too narrow. This will be a very contested area and may become a bottleneck. There are few alternate routes.
- R4. On E. Wash: No mandatory set/step backs — we need diversity!
: No max height limits
Design guidelines: We don't want "harmony" with existing — existing conditions are ugly!
We want fun, interesting, and exciting!
- R5. Would have liked to see a mention of encouraging affordable housing in future development.
- R7. Strengthen green development principles

Question 2a. Proposed Land Uses, LIKE

- R1. Like: Renewal of the area.
- R3. They seem to fit in well with existing uses. I like the idea of integrating more housing and more services for local residents in surrounding neighborhoods. I live on 1800 block of E., Main and I'd like it if residential was strengthened around there.

R5. I like the emphasis on mixed use. I also like the inclusion of language that would prevent completely filling up both sides of E Wash with buildings that are shoulder to shoulder — or are all of one use (e.g., all office buildings for several blocks).

R7. Encouragement of mix

R9. I like most of them, including the focus on employment.

Q2b. Proposed Land Uses, CHANGE

R1. This is a major flood risk area. When the nearby river rises, no water will drain. Where will it go?

R4. Title of Section III should be: “Firmly establish corridor ... employment. ... supported by living nearby.”

I also echo Lou Host-Jablonski’s comment that there should be no rear side to the development [i.e., no dead side, w/ only parking]. E. Main should be lively.

R5. Would like to see a greater emphasis on providing a mix of housing with the encouragement of housing that could support lower-income earners.

R7. Don’t preclude some larger retail uses — a multi-story, well-designed retail building could be a good complement to a primarily employment-oriented area.

R8. I’m afraid our focus on our homes will lead to forgetting the corridor is where bike routes and bus routes converge and is ideal for development of an employment center. Encourage employment and allow height to maximize the employment opportunities.

R9. The Fiore shopping area should be a multi-modal transit park and ride area, as well as having commercial space for commuters to shop.

Question 3a. Proposed Design Guidelines & Bulk Standards, LIKE

R3. That it is attempt at least to formulate aesthetic guidelines for developers — instead of having to fight battles over and over one at a time! YES, make it an ordinance — to avoid conflict between what city says is ok vs. neighborhood.

R5. I like the idea of allowing developers an envelope that provides them some latitude when coming up wit building ideas.

R7. Flexibility of standards.

R9. The limit of 3 stories on E. Mifflin is good.

Q3b. Proposed Design Guidelines & Bulk Standards, CHANGE

R1. Reduce the congestion.

R2. Allow higher heights. Trust and let the public bodies decide individual projects in context. The Urban Design Commission, Plan Commission and City Council will do things right with Citizen Involvement. Use the Capitol Preservation height limit as your guide.

R3. I understand the purpose of the step backs and facades that re shorter, but in practice they often end up looking really goofy — visually chaotic! Like, designer forgets the building can be viewed from many different directions! Maybe the step backs need to be deeper or something so they look like separate buildings instead of false fronts — please — address this in your guidelines.

R4. Strike 7. We need diversity and interest and surprise and excitement, not boring over-planned sealed-up façade.

Number 13 is very good — GO GREEN!

Strike 11. Too much of one sealed-up building should at least be broken up by very dramatic building entrances.

Strike 16. Too much mobility kills cities. This is not a suburb and should not attempt to compete in terms of parking, highway speeds, etc.

R5. I would encourage setbacks around 10 feet max. Larger requirements seem to be wasted space.

I'd like to see more discussion of impacts of potential surface parking fronting Mifflin or Main Street.

R7. Deal more with impact of parking — prevent parking decks from deadening streetscape — promote internal decks. With [street]liners of commercial / residential buildings.

The step backs should be greater. More provisions should be in place to ensure that current envelopes are not built to the maximum. It's not enough to assert that such maximization is unlikely — because developers do have an incentive to build out the envelope — and if standards are created that allow it, it will be difficult at that point to prevent it.

R8. I've lived in District 2 for more than 14 years. You should increase height limits from Baldwin to the River. Allow flexibility, consider the future of Madison. Limiting height to levels below the Capitol View Preservation level will ultimately mean more sprawl, less farmland on outskirts, less tax revenue for city and lost opportunities. An eight level limit, for example, is unrealistic when parking needs to be provided and excavation (due to water table) is not available. We can still enjoy and have the Capitol View without the artificial limit on height east of Baldwin. Ultimately the result of restricted heights would be to take substantial revenue out of the hands of the City to foster and fund public

assistance programs without a compelling reason. I'd rather the City's programs, and the School District funding be promoted than to limit the height of the buildings on East Washington Avenue. Lower heights mean higher taxes and fewer public programs. Please do not decide that limiting heights that aren't necessary to preserve the view of the Capitol are more important than funding public programs and our schools.

- R9. The height limits on the north side of E. Wash are too high, particularly the internal (circled numbers) are too high. The internal height limit should be 6 stories.

The step backs on E. Mifflin are too small.

The height limit on E. Wash (north side) should be 6 stories — the same as the internal height limits that I suggested in point 1 above.

Question 4. Other Comments

- R3. Add to guidelines — lighting MUST be shielded and meet dark sky criteria. This more than anything will enhance night view of Capitol as well as create livable urban environment.

Add architectural features and scale of buildings needing to be in harmony with existing buildings — it's more than just materials and colors needing to be harmonized.

p.s. — Buildings can be tall without being heavy and massive. Tall buildings OK — massive and out-of-scale not OK. Maybe that distinction needs to be made in these discussion.

- R6. I like the height and setback requirements in the plan. I support the goal to increase density. I want to see good bike and bus access to high-density buildings.

I want pedestrian underpasses under E. Washington— they will be needed if density increases.

- R7. Strengthen provisions that encourage alternatives to car travel. As density increases, it becomes more important to provide alternatives.

- R8. Don't be so restrictive on uses, heights, etc. Remember the UDC < the Plan Commission and the City Council still have control of any proposal.

Incorporate flexibility. What seems brilliant and crystal clear today, may not at all be what is in the neighborhood's best interest in 10 years, etc.

Forcing a lower height limit compels the landowner to fill up the block and will work against open space. I'd rather have open space with a higher tower than a large, shorter building with less open space. Ala Gorman story.