

**From:** Kaufman, Bruce [mailto:BKaufman@mcw.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 22, 2008 12:31 PM  
**To:** Witkowiak, James  
**Subject:** RE: condo project

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

I was present for the demolition of the nursing home – ‘not unattractive’ is a kind interpretation of the building that was there.

But I want to make sure you understand my comments.

It is NOT my contention that the reason to oppose the proposed construction is due to ‘preserving views’ (although that may be true for some of the residents) – it does not affect my ‘view’.

I am concerned by the design that projects the building way to the EAST – overshadowing the bluffs and trail, and way out of line with the other buildings there. I talked with the developers of our condo building during design and construction, and I know that they worked very hard to accommodate that aspect during their design – including burying the garage, limiting the garage capacity, and terracing the top of it – to address these same concerns. They would have liked to have built our building closer to the bluff – but they could and did not – and the proposed building should not be allowed to do that either.

I am concerned that the ‘added value’ of the development is being overstated relative to the hidden ‘costs’ (depreciation – whether due to change in views or over capacity; quality of area) that are much harder to measure.

In this case, the city/the people seem to have to make a determination –

- do we want to preserve the mansion – but at the cost of the overall architecture on the street (and below on the trail)?
- do we want to increase the tax base – but at the cost of the mansion?

The plans and discussion I have seen seem to have sacrificed true aesthetics and planning at the alter of money – and I remain unconvinced that the ‘rewards’ to the city are as great as the ‘costs’.

Thank you  
Bruce K.

---

**From:** Witkowiak, James [mailto:jwitko@milwaukee.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 22, 2008 11:24 AM  
**To:** Kaufman, Bruce  
**Subject:** RE: condo project

**Dr. Kaufman...Alderman Witkowiak will consider all views in making any decision(s) on this matter, to include your view of course.**

**He is aware that historic and cultural concerns are important, as are other concerns..**

**Under the proposed most recent plan, the Goll Mansion will be preserved in it's basic entirety, and will even be enhanced with the addition of what appears to be a period *faux* garage or carriage house.**

Sitting at 1522 N. Prospect was once a beautiful mansion that was later converted into the Surf Hotel. That structure was demolished in the early 60's and a not unattractive nursing home was then built there (Marina View). The residents there enjoyed a beautiful lake-view. They lost that when the building was torn down to make room for a condo.

It appears that the condo owners at 1522 are now understandably trying to preserve their lake-view, and other advantages.

Their views will be heard and considered.

**Mike McGuire**  
**Asst. to Ald. Witkowiak**  
**286-2861**

---

**From:** Kaufman, Bruce [mailto:BKaufman@mcw.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 22, 2008 10:41 AM  
**To:** Witkowiak, James  
**Cc:** Mayor Tom Barrett  
**Subject:**

Dear Alderman Witkowiak,

I am writing to you in **opposition to the proposed condominium at the Goll Mansion site.**

In deference to full disclosure, I am a resident of the condo next door – 1522 Prospect. However, I am on the other side of the building (south side) and would not be directly affected by the proposed new building.

I have been listening and assessing the comments of those in favor and opposed to the building at that site as proposed. I am struck by a couple observations that I feel are most relevant.

1. **The proposed construction would significantly alter (in a negative way) the appearance of the green space/park area/neighborhood.** Its proposed location far to the east on the property is inappropriate for the line of other buildings. A building situated that far east would seriously detract from the neighborhood. This has nothing to do with views – it has to do with overall value and aesthetics. In addition, the proposed above grade parking garage would be a major 'eye-sore' for the region.

I moved to that neighborhood because of the green space and the appearance of the buildings – a situation that has allowed for large structures but maintains the park like appearance.

2. **The emphasis on 'value to the city' is misguided.** At this time I look around and see empty condo buildings in the neighborhood – I have watched the lights go out as the building three doors down converted from apartments to condo's, and have not seen any lights come back on. There is another large building going up. One other recently built luxury condo down the street is still not full. I am fearful that approving another major building at this time would only add capacity that is not currently needed.

During this week of financial turmoil, it sort of reminds me of the debacle on Wall Street – where for the goal of ‘we can make a lot of money’ the companies were allowed to over-extend to the point where we all are going to suffer – immensely. Pick any of the discussions about securities or mortgages and replace those words with ‘condo units’ and we are looking at the same thing – one person or group makes the money up front, but we all end up paying for the oversupply.

Alderman Bauman’s comments in this Sunday’s paper struck me as blind capitalism at the expense of aesthetics (look of the neighborhood/environs) and culture (historic value of the Mansion). I am not convinced that those added condo units/building will actually save me money.

Thank you for your time and attention.

I wish the best in trying to balance the needs of our neighborhood and city.

Sincerely,

Bruce A. Kaufman, MD

Chief, Pediatric Neurosurgery – Children’s Hospital of Wisconsin

Professor, Neurosurgery – Medical College of Wisconsin