

Meeting Notes
Tenney Lapham Neighborhood (TLN) Meeting
Christ Presbyterian Church (944 East Gorham Street)
County Redevelopment of the Messner Site for Affordable Housing
March 13, 2017 at 5:30 p.m.

NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENT COMMENTS ORGANIZED BY PRIMARY THEMES

1. Design, Density, and Accessibility
 - a. Explicitly state the preferred or planned residential development density in the RFP.
 - b. Analyze the impact on surrounding properties of the shadow cast from any new development.
 - c. Incorporate usable, 'meaningful' green space, as well as possible garden plots for residents.
 - d. Explore a 'living building' design concept, promoting energy efficiency, water conservation, health, equity, etc.
 - e. Look into a 'universal building' design concept that would enable accessibility by everyone in the community, either upon construction or easily adaptable post-construction, going beyond minimum ADA requirements.
 - f. Support housing for families with sufficient numbers of bedrooms to accommodate them, e.g. 3-bedroom units.
2. Residential Unit Affordability
 - a. Integrate creative means of promoting affordable living, like live-work units, co-housing, and cooperative housing concepts.
 - b. If the site is redeveloped and existing buildings are demolished to make way for the new building(s), existing residents may be displaced: Dane County should commit resources to ensure these residents retain housing at a comparable rent.
3. Parking
 - a. Include affordable, possibly free, parking for low- and moderate-income residents.
 - b. Don't *require* parking for residents; make residential units available to those choosing to live without an automobile, making these units more affordable by not including the cost of parking in the rent.
 - c. Explore collaboration with Mullins on creative parking solutions on this block. (Mullins owns a great deal of land both on this block and in the neighborhood.)
 - d. Thoroughly investigate ways in which parking can be placed underground.
 - e. Consider how sufficient parking will be provided for non-residential uses of the development, e.g. commercial retail, office, employment, etc.
 - f. Any development proposal to be considered should not include subsidizing parking with TIF, which should instead be applied to other site amenities, like enhanced bus stops.
 - g. Consider a B-Cycle dock on the site; B-Cycle may be interested in this location.
4. Commercial Space
 - a. There were comments expressed both supporting and opposing commercial space in the development.
 - i. Supporting comments favored commercial uses that could benefit and complement the neighborhood. There generally appeared to be more support for commercial space than opposition.

- ii. Opposing comments expressed concern over a possible oversaturation of commercial retail establishments in this corridor due to the many newer large-scale developments in this part of the neighborhood.
- 5. Tenney Nursery
 - a. Avoid adverse impacts on the nursery with such actions as not allowing smoking along the property line near the nursery playground and considering how building shadow will impact the playground's exposure to sunlight.
 - b. Promote positive impacts, like considering green space in the development along the nursery property line and promoting residential units in the development compatible with families, which are compatible with the nursery.
 - c. Evaluate commercial retail, office and employment uses in the development for their compatibility with the nursery.

DIRECT COMMENTS FROM NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS

1. Even the least expensive units in many of the newer residential developments in the neighborhood are still not affordable for lower-income residents.
2. There should be consideration of the Tenney Nursery school and playground; no smoking should be allowed near the nursery on the rear/northwest side of the lot closest to the playground.
3. Affordable parking should be accommodated for low- and moderate-income residents; explore the possibility of including parking in rent for these residents.
4. Look into collaborating on parking with the Mullins and their surface parking lot to the northeast associated with Pasqual's restaurant.
5. Consider less commercial space in the development: There may be an over-saturation of commercial retail space in the neighborhood along East Washington Avenue with the many newer mixed-use developments providing such space, and the neighborhood does not want to see vacant storefronts along East Washington. Could ground floor housing be considered, instead of retail?
6. Be aware of how the shadow cast from the building will impact the neighborhood and surrounding properties. Is this considered in the City's development review process?
7. Include some form of 'meaningful' green space in the new development, possibly on the rear of the lot nearest the Tenney Nursery playground area.
8. If there is a preferred or planned development density for the property, it should be stated clearly in the RFP. (City staff speculated that the planned density for this site is 60 dwelling units/acre.)
9. Don't *require* parking for residents. There seems to be an emerging trend of people interested in living without a car, and if parking costs add to the monthly rent, this may be one way to increase affordability.
10. Explore creative and technologically feasible ways in which parking can be placed underground.
11. Support housing for families by providing units with sufficient numbers of bedrooms to accommodate them, e.g. 3-bedroom apartments. The neighborhood council supported Resolution 497 because this is a family-oriented neighborhood, and such housing is compatible with the Tenney Nursery, Lapham Elementary School, etc.
12. Support commercial space on East Washington, particularly uses compatible with and complementary to the neighborhood.

13. Provide gardening plots for residents, possibly including them with the 'meaningful' green space recommended earlier in the meeting.
14. Provide units accessible to those who are differently abled, beyond the minimum ADA requirements, e.g. the Yahara River View Apartments. Perhaps require that all units be easily adaptable to certain accessibility standards.
15. Ensure sufficient parking for commercial spaces.
16. The city of Madison should not be subsidizing parking with TIF. Instead, it should apply it to things like enhanced multi-modal amenities, e.g. nice bus stops.
17. Consider a B-Cycle dock on the site. (This one was proposed for consideration by county and city staff.)
18. Promote live-work units where someone could rent a retail or office space in conjunction with a residential unit where they would live.
19. Consider the possibility of co-housing or cooperative housing on-site as alternative forms of affordable housing.
20. Ensure any displaced residents will get replacement housing at a comparable rent. Dane County owns a multi-family residential property immediately west of the Messner building. If the site is redeveloped and existing buildings are demolished to make way for the new building(s), existing residents may be displaced. Dane County should commit resources to ensure these residents retain similarly priced housing.
21. Favor a developer with a 'universal design' concept to accommodate varying forms of ability and accessibility.
22. Explore the possibility of requiring a 'living building,' promoting energy efficiency, water conservation, health, equity, etc., with fewer adverse environmental impacts and lower operating costs contributing to affordability.

INITIAL RESIDENT QUESTIONS (MOSTLY ANSWERED AT THE MEETING)

1. Is redevelopment of the site anticipated in the adopted city plan(s)?
2. Please clarify the city's development approval process.
3. How many stories can the development be under adopted plans and regulations?
4. Would a Planned Unit Development (PUD) project be possible or appropriate at this site?
5. Has the Request for Proposals (RFP) been written? When will it be issued?
6. Ensure that current residents in the county-owned multi-family residential building to the west of the Messner building retain similarly priced housing.
7. What will be the county's commitment to the project?
8. Who will manage the property?
9. Will the county sell or lease the land to the prospective developer?
10. What are the tax implications of Dane County owning the land and leasing it to a private developer on a very long-term basis?
11. Is there a similar example of Dane County owning a property elsewhere and leasing it to a developer or property manager?
12. Please explain the language in Resolution 497 about the county being receptive to discussing an 'exchange' of land in the neighborhood?
13. What is the current projected timeline?
14. Is this site in a TIF district? How would or could TIF factor into this development?
15. Will anything be included in the RFP specifically regarding the Tenney Nursery?
16. Is the Messner building of any historical significance, and if so, are there any tax credit benefits?