

From: Gregory F. Bird, manager – Chases'Crossings LLC, residence 2230 S. Woodward St 53207
2023Sep12

Urban Milwaukee's Aug 18 coverage of development plans for the Filer and Stowell/147 E. Becher site quoted some of my comments.

Because of the enormous potential positive impact for Milwaukee of careful developments in this district a block away from the KK estuary branch leading to the Port, Lake, and world, please consider this more coherent set of observations:

1. Aug 19, my newsfeed included from ArchDaily, a Call for Entries for a large urban design planning effort in the Core Region of Pingshan, Shenzhen, China, which includes, a "high-tech Zone".
2. In Milwaukee's harbor lands, Rockwell Automation, Michels, Komatsu (Mitsui Keiretsu), School of Freshwater Sciences, several remaining smaller tech shops, and three nearby engineering schools, are, using the term in the Pingshan Call for Entries, a high tech "cluster".
3. The substantial 10 acre site on Becher Street has, among other assets, over 1200 straight feet under roof now
4. The site has, if used for residential housing, the day-long sleep-interrupting noise of mainline rail traffic and nearby I-94, stresses long recognized as costly to disturbed and destructive behaviors and degraded lifestyles.
5. In considering a larger planning effort for a KK Tech District, the site likely would not be best used for low-end housing of the type proposed by developer, with a WIDNR approved "cap" to control/end off-gassing toxics, which type of construction recently led to evacuation of new construction, magnifying degrading, with residents not knowing what micro-dosing of off-gassing is doing, or when a major event will cause evacuation and abandonment of space and belongings
6. Housing for "workforce", or other lower income labels, must be built into any tech district planning, including, as I saw Aug 21 on Milwaukee Broadcast (source is one-way, edited, widely available) Public Television, busing in (training in ?) employees from the dense urban residential, to food factories in a Catalan nature reserve – and in Milwaukee's case the natural asset is access to the world via water that could produce out-sized income for all of Milwaukee City, County, and Region, from a neighborhood/district planning for that outcome
7. The developer says that at a public meeting in May which I did not attend, people (less than a handful ?) said a project at the site about the same height as other existing Bay View mid-rise residencials would be acceptable, which in effect, 'bluffed' the whole development complex – developer, funding groups, city regulators – into a low-value hi-risk project at a key location
8. There are no City or financial planning schemes I know of that group Kinnickinnic Avenue up on the high ground with some cozy in-the-backyard Lake views surrounded by lovely neighborhoods and supporting retail offerings, with a much less elevated industrial legacy site next to Lake level floodplain (the differences between the Harbor District and KK Ave Business Improvement Districts), where in Milwaukee's industrial prime, people could walk down to the KK River industrial complex – meaning, the City (and developer systems) need pay minimal non-determinative attention to a handful of people who at a meeting on their neighborhood home turf of the Bay View Library, whether they mean to or not, sell Milwaukee short – short even unto succeeding in limiting height at the site to about the height of the surface of Kinnickinnic Avenue, and no consideration of matching height of tallest building on KK Avenue or Howell south of Lincoln

9. Another public meeting of north F&S gate neighborly parties should be considered before proceeding to a final Council vote, as the appeal of these neighborly parties to their customers is at risk of damage
10. The property has been privately owned historically and operated outside toxics regulations not subject to an environmental assessment with a formal environmental impact statement through an industrial revolution, two world wars, and other build-ups, meaning, in spite of investments sunk by the current owners for toxics environment characterizations, surprises may remain
11. The current owner has already shown questionable diligence by changing from salvaging existing buildings (which salvage problems should have shown up before sale), to complete demo and new construction
12. Legacy toxic TCE (and other) problems elsewhere in the City demonstrate big problems with proceeding with hasty development with incomplete information regarding legacy toxics – big problems for developer, City, neighbors, visitors, environment, etc.
13. Has the developer or associated funding group agents paid privately for professionally engineered evaluations of sub-surface monitoring wells/other examinations, and reports therefrom, in addition for Department of Natural Resources or USEPA, that a funding party, the taxpayers of the City of Milwaukee, can examine before final approval of taxpayer backing?
14. Urban Milwaukee reported that at a meeting in May, the developer said it would be too expensive to build sub-surface foundations for taller buildings as the site is in a floodplain, meaning, it is cheaper to build a surface mount (no basement) light-weight building that attempts to seal off-gassing ground (using a cap or slab on grade), like at southwest corner of East Bay Street and Kinnickinnic, and at Lakeshore Power Plant slag piles, which don't have the leverage of poorly-secured being pushed by the wind.
15. If the development goes sour because of legacy toxics and bankruptcy occurs, will taxpayers be ultimately responsible for salvaging this site from subsurface toxics so that it might be useful, meaning, is insurance adequate ?
16. With true information about sub-surface conditions, a decision about removing toxics (as site is in floodplain now subject to dredging elsewhere, toxics removal to Dredged Materials Management Facility ?) for a deep foundation (a "bathtub" seen all over the world and as was done downtown for tall buildings – don't again sell short the south end of the harbor) might become appropriate, supporting a new building bringing maximum value at Federal Aviation Administration Obstruction Height of, according to city official, 499 feet.
17. Should housing of the proposed type be the ultimate choice, the future mental well-being and self-regulation of tenants depends on finding some happiness in their home surroundings, as has been described in behavioral design for decades, so as to reduce neighborhood stress, that may, if left unchecked, instead, result in requiring City and management services the sirens and flashing lights of which disturb the larger neighborhood peace and quiet (and how about an EMT station next to the freeway ?)
18. The developer discloses renderings of eight units easily/cheaply arrayed simply and squarely – maybe think of barracks - tenants might well feel stuck in "boxes"
19. Have other City housing layouts resulted in favorable behaviors and more or less calls for services ?
20. The developer's renderings show a curving paved path through the middle of the array, and paved parking on the east and west adjacent to the housing

21. The developer suggests public bicycle and pedestrian traffic will use the central curved path for through passage (with the occasional motorized/poorly-muffled scooter seen on bike paths, including in the middle of the night so as to avoid detection), disturbing opportunities for a modicum of privacy such as vegetable gardening that would ease the stress of density and noise
22. Will the central path be used for EMT vehicles and all their visual and noise disturbances along all of the long barrack central way, or will there be some sort of control system (gates with passcards ?) to segregate external parking from central curved path
23. A scheme that keeps the 1200 ft shed and builds residential east of shed and on abandoned rail causeway west of shed (stacked tiny/container houses dormitory style, like the old neighborhood "rooms for rent" ?) together could be tall enough to provide Lake views in a multi-income/industrial-mixed zoning compliance arrangement and should be considered by reviewing at least 10 other workforce developments world-wide to review options to build future value for Milwaukee
24. The imperatives of climate heating are weakly addressed by the photovoltaic array suggested by the developer to only power the common areas of the development
25. Tom Daykin's reports that the developer CEO, S.R. Mills, said "he was cautioned by the [council member] . . . from going too high"
26. Brokers representing developers interested in my nearby site have said words to the effect that the city won't let a building over ~ 5 stories on my site, so, I asked city officials about heights of buildings, and, beyond the current basic zoning limits (exceeded by a weak zoning height limit variance at nearby Michels, but no variance filed by Bear Real Estate Group – did Bear even make the ask for *bigger* to their funding group ?)
27. Response email from Council Member's office indicated full Council will only consider development when a proposal reaches them, meaning little height guidance, yet, my Aug 22 meeting with Department of City Development management indicated their office has no plan from Bear Real Estate Group.
28. Other general developer deflections are versions of, "We can't get it to pencil out", "Could never get my funding group . . .", "That's proprietary", etc, yet, the public knows little about what is said to funder groups unless there is disclosure to courts from lawsuits
29. It doesn't happen often, but I've read of self-financing, where parties shave funds from their cash positions to avoid some of constraints of bankrates and insurance/re-insurance
30. With the neighboring big-tech firms well-cashed, perhaps they could form a sort of mini-Keiretsu to fund build-out of Technical District to higher company-specific standards than freeway ramp-type apartment and hotel clusters, and do so using systems more responsive to carbon reduction imperatives
31. Consider opening quote in John L. Nesheim's 2000 *High Tech Start-Up*, citing founder of Sequoia Capital (Apple, Cisco, Yahoo, MP3, and more), that their firm is: " . . . focused on the concept of *bigness*: big thinkers, big markets, big companies. Employing thousands of people paying millions in taxes and hundreds of millions in salaries. That's bigger than people who just want to become millionaires." – Technology District fills the bill of *bigness*
32. (perhaps the freeway could be covered like Boston Big Dig and some version rigged for trains that would have this feeling more like a neighborhood)
33. As I review the effort already invested in environmental testing, in detailing of re-use option, consultants, planning, and so forth, will it be more difficult to find a profit with a capped minimal

investment for a set rent, rather than more income from cleaned-up forever mixed-rate lake view signature project producing some skyscraper rents for scores of years?

34. If one wants to get bigger players to come in to the Milwaukee Game, on Lake Michigan, players in addition to Rockwell Automation, Michels, Komatsu (Mitsui), and say as well, from the US Coasts, where start-ups have got bigger through a certain stickiness among them squeezed in by the coast (threatened as always by extremes of nature), or from across the seas, who might want close-to-the-water in the least risky region on earth and low commute times currently, if not living in walkable work neighborhood

35. Bigger

DRAFT