

TO: City Plan Commission: Stephanie Bloomingdale, Allyson Nemec, Brianna Sas-Perez, Catrina Crane, Ranell Washington, Tarik Moody, Willie Smith

cc: Sam Leichtling, Mayor Cavalier Johnson

RE: Proposed 55-Unit Apartment on 2600 Block of Hackett, File 220401

FROM: Neighbors on 2600 block of Hackett and 2600 block of Summit (see list below)

As condominium owners and homeowners on the 2600 blocks of Hackett Ave and Summit Ave, and other interested east side parties, we are writing to express vehement opposition to St Mark's proposed 55-unit apartment building on Hackett. We have many concerns, but the issues of size, density and appearance are of utmost importance to us. The proposed modern-looking apartment design has, regrettably, been approved without question by the Historic Preservation Commission, but issues of size and density remain. We intend to persuade you that these issues warrant the City Plan Commission's rejection of the proposed zoning change.

Frankly, we were shocked and angry to learn that this zoning change doesn't require justification by the requesting party; in other words, they aren't required to explain WHY the zoning should be changed. We have taken initiative to provide sound data that quantifies the degree to which the zoning change would alter population density on the 2600 block of Hackett. Following the data, we have identified many reasons why the zoning change should not be granted. Other objections may arise as individuals think more about the analysis.

We respectfully ask that you read this document in its entirety before you decide the outcome of the zoning request.

Please see page 3 for the beginning of the "report."

Written by: Kay Wosewick, 2633 N Hackett Ave, Unit E (see last page for my credentials)

Endorsed by:

St Regis Residents

Kathy Papineau

Deb Bylan

Barbara Finch

Phil Blenski

Jane Strykowski

Joan Strykowski

Lorraine McNamara McGraw

Ken Barbeau

Georgetown Residents

Janet Fitch

Colleen Berge

Karen Hagen

Chris Herder

Jonathab Heimish

Samantha Juedemann

Kathy Miller

Stonehenge Residents

Kelly Knoke

Janet Thompson

John Neil Thompson

Neil Thompson

Summit Avenue Residents

Mark Plotkin

Shirley Bankier

Grace Sorbjan

Sam and Jean White

Ellen Blank

Brian Hanson

Melissa Johnson

Jeff and Linda May

Other Interest Neighborhood Residents

Hannah Becker

Esther Shin

James Verbsky

Rob McCoy

Ben Baumes

Maria and Cole Bultman

Krista Dunn

Corey Espinoza

Nader Pakroo

Amanda Reavey

Lucas Kmezich

Christina Todorovski

Jim Bruso

Martha Beckman

Harold Johnson

Maria Becker

Lisa Boyd

ST MARK'S PROPOSED 55-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING: HOW THE APARTMENT WILL AFFECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Current residents' objections to the proposed apartment can be summarized around three core issues: population density, traffic, and parking. Each will be addressed separately. Relevant data will be presented, followed by implications drawn from the data.

POPULATION DENSITY

The data below comes from residents living in St. Regis, Georgetown and Stonehenge Condominiums. The Proposed Apartment data comes from HGA presentation materials.

Population Density On the 2600 Block of Hackett

LOCATION	UNITS	RESIDENTS	POP DENSITY
EXISTING CONDOMINIUMS			
St Regis	7	9	1.3
Georgetown	14	16	1.1
Stonehenge	8	13	1.6
EXISTING TOTAL	29	38	1.3
PROPOSED APARTMENTS			
		low-mid-high est*	low-mid-high est*
Studio	8	8-12-16	1.0-1.5
1-bedroom	17	17-25-34	1.0-1.5
2-bedroom	30	60-90-120	2.0-4.0
PROPOSED TOTAL	55	85-127-170	1.5-2.3-3.1
EXISTING+PROPOSED TOTALS			
	84	123-165-208	1.5-2.0-2.5
% INCREASE	+190%	223%-334%-447%	15%-55%-92%

*Estimates were arrived at as follows:

Studio apartments: 1st estimate = 1 resident per unit; 2nd estimate assumes ½ of units have 2 residents; 3rd estimate assumes 2 residents per unit

1-bedroom apartments: 1st estimate assumes 1 resident per unit; 2nd assumes just under ½ of units have 2 residents; 3rd estimate assumes 2 residents per unit

2-bedroom apartments: 1st estimate assumes 2 residents per unit; 2nd estimate assumes 3 residents per unit; 3rd estimate assumes 4 residents per unit

Three Density Scenarios

Conservative Estimate

The most conservative estimate of the effect of the proposed apartment on population density of the 2600 block of Hackett is astonishing:

- The number of residential units will increase from 29 to 84 units. **This is means two new residential units for every existing unit on this block.** Keep in mind that the number of residential units on this block has not changed for over 100 years.
- Currently, 38 people reside in owner-occupied condominiums on the 2600 block of Hackett. At minimum, the new apartment will add a minimum of 85 new residents to this block, bringing the total to 123 individuals. Thus, **there will be more than 2 new residents for every current resident** on this small block. This is the absolute minimum when every unit is rented.

Realistic Estimate

A more “realistic scenario” leads to genuinely depressing changes on the 2600 block of Hackett. This scenario assumes a married couple or partners will rent ½ of the studios; a married couple or partners will rent just under ½ of the 1-bedroom units; and a married couple or partners plus one other individual will rent ½ of the 2-bedroom units.

- This scenario adds 127 new residents, bringing the total number of residents on this block to 165. **This single, small block of Hackett will likely see a 334% increase in residents virtually overnight.**

▪

High Estimate

A high-estimate scenario is also supplied. Given shaky economic trends, millennials and upcoming Gen Zs may encounter serious financial binds and be pressed to extreme living conditions. We can only hope this will not happen.

- **Should the worst happen, there could be nearly 450% more renters than owners on the 2600 block of Hackett** (170 renters to 38 owners). The street would be unrecognizable.

Implications of the Density Data

The massive increase in population will negatively affect many aspects of this neighborhood.

- **Current owner-occupied residents will lose ALL sense of living in a small, lovely, friendly, reasonably quiet neighborhood. This is a genuine neighborhood where people know each other, care about each other, and have spontaneous conversations of the street.** We often know when someone is moving out so we can say farewell. We welcome new residents personally and talk about what a unique, wonderful neighborhood they have moved to. This applies to both Hackett residents and effected Summit Ave residents.
 - Almost all of us treasure Café Hollander’s occasional noisy, themed parties, and the way the neighborhood comes alive during the annual bike race. But these events are limited, by choice

of the entire Downer neighborhood. Goodbye to guaranteed good seats for these events if the apartment is built.

- However, with far more cars coming and going from the apartment, we can't be certain the neighborhood will remain eligible to host the Downer Neighborhood Classic. Furthermore, Café Hollander now gets approval from neighbors to have their special events. It is difficult to imagine how Café Hollander will obtain approval from 55 new residences.
- The disappearance of these events would be a great loss for the neighborhood, from both cultural/festive and financial points-of-view.

TRAFFIC

Under the most likely estimate, residents make about 78 trips on this street daily. A more conservative estimate has residents making 59 trips per day, and a very low estimate of average daily residential traffic is a mere 39 trips.

The arrival of a filled new 55-unit apartment complex will likely increase residential traffic by nearly 370%

Expected Daily Traffic on 2600 Hackett Block Among New and Existing Residents ONLY

LOCATION	POPULATION	TOTAL CARS OWNED BY RESIDENTS*	SCENARIO 1 1 outing/car/day (= 2 trips)	SCENARIO 2 75% of cars make 1 outing/day	SCENARIO 3 50% of cars make an outing/day
EXISTING					
St Regis	9	8	16	12	8
Georgetown	16	15	30	23	15
Stonehenge	13	16	32	24	16
EXISTING TOTAL	38	39	78	59	39
ST MARK'S APTS (3 scenarios)	low-med-high	low-med-high	low-med-high	low-med-high	L ow-med-high
Studio	8-12-16	7-10-13	14-20-26	11-15-20	7-10-13
1-bedroom	17-25-34	16-22-29	32-44-58	24-33-44	16-22-27
2-bedroom	60-90-120	52-74-97	104-148-194	78-111-146	53-74-97
APTS TOTAL	85-127-170	75-106-139	150-212-388	113-159-291	76-106-137
EXISTING + APTS	125-165-170	98-129-162	228-290-466	172-218-350	115-145-176
% INCREASE			292%-370%-605%		

Details of data calculations available upon request.

IMPORTANTLY, this the data above does not include a very wide range of other vehicles driving on the 2600 block of Hackett

Implications of Traffic Data

- **Residential traffic will at least triple under the realistic density estimate. But total traffic will probably be much worse.**
 - An estimated 200+ additional residential cars will come and go daily on Hackett. What kind of safety issues might this pose? How might it affect the Downer/Belleview/Hackett intersection and timing of lights? Will the Park/Hackett intersection need a 4-way stop sign? How will this affect the “life” of the street itself? Why haven’t city traffic experts been consulted for a change of this magnitude? These questions take on far more importance when other traffic is taken into account.
- **Total traffic will be much worse.**
 - Several different trash, recycling, and compost trucks service this block, and their large size usually makes them unpassable. The apartment building could add to that traffic with different trash and recycling services. Café Hollander delivery trucks are haphazardly parked here frequently, and often can’t be passed. These vehicles cause occasional pockets of stopped traffic. Neighborhood drivers are patient when this happens; it’s a little idiosyncrasy we tolerate because we love our neighborhood. These stops will occur far more often as apartment traffic increases, and until it happens, we won’t know how new renters will react to these annoyances.
 - St Mark’s apartment dwellers will be significantly younger than current residents. Age in itself is not an issue at all.* It is a fact that younger generations are heavier users of fast-delivery services such as DoorDash and Amazon, services not often seen on this street. This additional traffic could be significant. And by the way, deliveries will take longer than most because the main entrance is set unusually far from street.

*This is Kay speaking personally. I am the oldest employee where I work. The majority of people I work with daily are in the 20’s. I genuinely like—very much—all of these ‘kids.’ They seem to like me too, as we have frequent conversations when the store has a lull. I am, in no way, against the presence of younger people in this neighborhood; in fact, I think it will be wonderful. It is the QUANTITY of them—or people of any age, that I object to. And I believe other neighborhood residents feel the same.
 - More cars will be circling blocks, searching for parking spots that were once more readily available. This will get worse as renters’ street parking inevitably rises.
 - Will snowplows be able to easily access this block when traffic triples or quadruples? Where will snow plowed from the apartment’s 25’ wide driveway be put? Will apartment plows create new problems we can’t yet imagine?
 - The conditions mentioned above can make any driver inattentive, old or young. The massive increase in new traffic in this heavily walked neighborhood could lead to more pedestrian/car as well as car/car accidents. There are also many dog walkers on this block, and additional traffic may make them susceptible to accidents too.
 - All this on a narrow street with two odd corners (one 5-way, the other with a sharp turn, and limited visibility for those who drive small cars. Traffic. Will. Be. A. Serious. Problem. It will certainly reduce any sense of neighborhood we might have had left.
 - (While this is a side issue today, Hackett will likely suffer significant damage from large, heavy trucks that will be coming and going during demolition of St Mark’s current addition, construction of St Mark’s new addition, deep digging for an underground parking structure, prep and construction a 25’ wide driveway, and finally construction of the 55-unit apartment. Is the city going to budget for repairs of the street?)

PARKING WITH ST MARK'S APARTMENT BUILDING

The table below shows the number of parking of parking spaces required to meet average daily/nightly parking demand among current residents: 27. It also shows low, medium, and high estimates of average daily/nightly demand among apartment dwellers. The most reasonable estimate is that 37 cars won't be accommodated by the apartment's planned 69 space. Parking demand will almost double when renters fill the new apartment building.

Expected Parking Demand With Addition of St Mark's Apartments

RESIDENT LOCATION	CAR OWNERSHIP	# OFFSTREET PARKING SPACES AVAILABLE	# OF CARS HAVING TO PARK ON STREET
EXISTING CONDOS	39	12	27
	low-med-high est.		low-med-high est.
ST MARK'S APARTMENTS	75- 106 -139	69	7- 37 -70
TOTAL CARS	114- 145 -178	81	32- 62 -95

- **The 2600 block of Hackett as well as neighboring streets are already parking-stressed. Neither the city nor any proponents of the proposals have addressed how these projects will affect parking. Why hasn't a parking study been conducted by the city, especially since St Mark's is eliminating their own parking lot?**
 - Many of the apartments will have more than two cars, as discussed earlier. Using the same assumptions as before, ** 37 more vehicles will need to park on the street (assuming all 14 addition parking spots in the apartment are for renters only, and not for others such as St Mark's employees). With two to three parking spots lost to St Mark's loading/unloading zone and four spots metered, some current parkers will be pushed to other streets. Resident on other streets will start experiencing daily parking issues like we've had on the 2600 block of Hackett, especially after St Mark's kicked paying residents out of their lot.
 - Our mail carrier currently parks in St Mark's lot. Where will he reliably park when that lot is gone? Will his job be made more difficult, and will our mail service suffer?
 - In addition to existing residential parkers, many Downer Avenue employees park here regularly, as do shoppers and restaurant patrons, church attendees, etc. Many of these people will be forced to park further away. Might that affect businesses' ability to hire employees? Worse, will some shoppers/restaurant patrons be unwilling to walk further than they are used to, especially if they have kids in tow? Depending on the business, new apartment dwellers may or may not make up for potential lost sales.
 - There are already regular service people like housecleaners and yard maintenance people who need parking. Visiting friends and relatives need parking. Movers, electricians, plumbers, lock openers, handymen, small construction projects workers, pet sitters, plant sitters, furniture

delivery, window washers, etc., are occasionally used by current residents, and parking is needed. Apartment dwellers will want parking for visiting friends and relatives (in fact, this demand might explode). Some apartment dwellers may also want housekeepers, pet sitters and others, all who need parking. Where will these extra people park?

- When people do return to their parked cars, some of them who get on devices and sit there while the next parker waits in the middle of the street to take their spot. The increase in parkers doing this is undeniable. Data shows that younger generations are heavy device users, so it is reasonable to expect that this will occur more often.
 - Typically, to lure renters, parking is offered free or at a reduced rate for the first year. What happens in Year 2 when that special deal usually disappears? Renters will have to pay extra for parking. A quick look at local rentals shows monthly parking rates of \$125 to \$175 a month. Given budget issues facing many people, how many more cars will that put on the street?
 - As just noted earlier, the design for St Mark's proposed addition has already designated two over-sized drop-off spots in front of their new entrance. How many additional spots might they decide they want? If they eventually ask for more designated parking on Hackett, will those requests be granted with o input from the neighborhood?
 - Snow emergencies require parking on only one side of the street. There are already people (not residents, who understand this issue and deal appropriately with parking during snow emergencies) who ruin 2-3 parking spots every winter because they don't move for the plows. Until the snow melts, those parking spots are gone. The cars that cause these problems usually don't get ticketed.
 - In fact, the city rarely monitors parking on Hackett, making parking more challenging for everyone who lives here.
- **The 2600 block of Hackett is simply too small for such a large apartment building.**
 - Apartment buildings of the proposed scale are almost always built on major (often 4 lane) streets such as Prospect, Farwell, Downer, Lake, North, Locust, Oakland; they rarely, if ever, are built on tiny neighborhood streets like Hackett, for many good reasons discussed above. In fact, in Jim Shield's presentation, the buildings he selected to compare his design for St Mark's 55-unit apartment are all on much larger streets, such as Downer and Lake, that already, and appropriately, have RM6 or higher zoning. Why is an apartment of this size being even proposed for this site?

We urge you to keep the zoning as RM3 and let appropriate building happen.

August 16, 2022

Kay Wosewick

You may wonder if, or how, I am qualified to write this analysis. After graduate school, I worked in marketing research for 18 years. I estimate that I designed, managed suppliers who executed the research, wrote topline analyses, then dug deep into the data to write detailed final reports with recommendations, for somewhere between 225 and 275 studies. I worked at three companies in increasingly responsible positions: R.J.R. Tobacco, Monsanto, and Ralston Purina (then a Fortune 50 company) where I rose to Director of Information Resources (marketing research plus sales analysis) in its Branded Foods Division. I had a staff of 8 professionals and a budget of \$2.2 million dollars in the late 1980s. After several years in management, I yearned to be a hands-on researcher again. The timing was perfect because companies were eagerly hiring 'consultants' who effectively filled staff positions. I did this at Ocean Spray, a large advertising agency in Boston, and then at S.C. Johnson. I quit the field after completing the most exciting, complex project I ever conducted. It was time to do something new. Today, I walk to my job at a Downer Avenue business.