

Comparison of Building Setbacks for 1202 S Park Street with other Redevelopment Projects

Updated September 26, 2018

The following data compares the proposed building setbacks for selected redevelopment projects on Park Street, Fish Hatchery Road, and East Washington Avenue.

1202 S Park

Current 2018 plans for 10-3-2018 UDC meeting

Terrace	none
Sidewalk	8.7 ft
Building setback from property line (varies)	1.1 to 2.3 ft
Total setback (curb to building)	9.8 to 11.0 ft

1202 S Park (previously proposed plans)

Feb. 2017 plans for 2-8-2017 UDC meeting

Terrace	none
Sidewalk	7.0 ft
Building setback from property line (planters and additional sidewalk area)	8.0 ft
Total setback (curb to building)	15.0 ft

1109 S Park (Jade Garden) plans for 10-26-2016 UDC meeting

Terrace (Brick or stamped concrete proposed)	5.0 ft
Sidewalk	11 ft approx.
Building setback beyond clear sidewalk (this area is mainly used for planters)	2.0 ft approx.
Building setback from property line	9 feet 5-1/2 inches
Total setback (curb to building)	18 ft
Total setback (curb to building front columns)	16.5 ft approx.

Wingra Clinic - Park Street

Terrace (grass)	5 ft
Sidewalk	5.0 ft
Building setback from sidewalk	10 ft (including planter area)
Total setback (curb to building)	20 ft

Wingra Clinic Parking Ramp - Fish Hatchery

Terrace (grass)	12 ft
Sidewalk	5 ft
Building setback from sidewalk	11 ft
Total setback (curb to building)	28 ft

Peloton Flatiron Building - Park Street Side

Terrace (brick or stamped concrete)	5.5 ft
Sidewalk	6 ft
Building setback from sidewalk	2.0 ft

Building setback from property line 5 ft
Total setback (curb to building) 13.5 ft

Peloton Flatiron Building - Fish Hatchery Side

Terrace (will be reduced to 8 ft with future proposed bike lane on road) 13 ft approx.

Sidewalk 5.0 ft
Building setback from sidewalk 3.0 ft
Total setback (curb to building) 21.0 ft approx.

801 S Park (Dunkin Donuts)

Terrace (concrete) 2.0 ft
Sidewalk 5.0 ft
Building setback from sidewalk 8.0 ft (along most of frontage)
Building setback from property line 7.0 ft approx. (along most of frontage)
Total setback (curb to building) 15.0 ft

1402 S Park (Truman - Olsen Site) RFP Proposal

Terrace (grass) 5.0 ft approx.
Sidewalk 5.0 ft approx.
Building setback from sidewalk 20.0 ft approx.
Total setback curb to building) 30.0 ft approx.

Note: 1402 S Park distances are approximate as the plans were preliminary and did not have dimensions.

Comparison of Building Setbacks in Urban Design Districts 7 and 8

Building Setback requirements on Park Street in Urban Design District 7

"New buildings shall have a setback between one (1) to ten (10) feet from the front property line. Where new buildings are designed for existing blockfaces, the building setback shall be consistent with adjoining buildings but shall not exceed ten (10) feet. However, the Urban Design Commission may allow buildings to be set back greater than ten (10) feet to allow for the development of usable public open spaces, such as pedestrian plazas."

Note: The existing blockfaces should be ignored as these buildings are old and obsolete. The entire area will be redeveloped in the near future, hopefully with a greater building setback along this busy major transportation corridor.

Building Setback requirements on East Washington Avenue in Urban Design District 8

Most new construction on East Washington Avenue in Urban Design District 8 requires at least a 15 foot setback from the property line. Just a few lots have a minimum setback of 5 feet from the property line for new buildings.

The following links provide the complete plans for the listed projects as well as links to the parts of the plans that provide the building setback information so that you can more quickly realize that the proposed setbacks for 1202 S Park Street are totally inadequate:

[1202 S Park Complete Plans for UDC meeting 10-3-2018 - Legistar 52912](#)

[1202 S Park Plans for UDC meeting 10-3-2018 - page 7](#)

[1202 S Park Complete Plans for UDC meeting 2-8-2017 - Legistar 45917](#)

[1202 S Park Plans for UDC meeting 2-8-2017 - page 6](#)

Note: The two above links show plans dated 1-16-2016, however, this is a typo on the plans. The plans were actually created on 1-16-2017.

[1109-1123 S Park Complete Revised Plans 10-12-2016 - Legistar 42707](#)

[1109-1123 S Park Revised Plans 10-12-2016 - pages 16,30,33,35](#)

Note: This project was not approved by the city because of the proposed height of the building. The building setback was well received by city planning staff, UDC and public input during the review process.

[1102 S Park \(Wingra Clinic\) Complete Plans 9-7-2011 - Legistar 22565](#)

[1102 S Park \(Wingra Clinic\) Plans 9-7-2011 - page 15](#)

[1004 & 1032 S Park \(Peloton\) Complete Approved Plans - Legistar 46483](#)

[1004 & 1032 S Park \(Peloton\) approved plans - page 25, 26, 27](#)

[801 S Park \(Dunkin Donuts\) Complete Plans 6-6-2012 - Legistar 16320](#)

[801 S Park \(Dunkin Donuts\) Plans 6-6-2012 - page 22](#)

[1402 S Park \(Hovde and SSM RFP proposal\) - page 10](#)

This document was created by Ron Shutvet to show that the current proposed plans for 1202 S Park Street do not provide enough building setback from the property line to provide a sufficient width for pedestrians and bicycles, or enough open space for trees along this section of Park Street.

1202 S Park Street Comments and Questions for the UDC and Plan Commission

Updated September 26, 2018

The proposed building will severely limit what can be built on the adjoining properties. This area would be better suited to all nearby properties being grouped together and developed as one master planned redevelopment project. I believe that the short dead end portion of High Street should be abandoned by the city and all adjoining parcels should be combined to become one larger parcel that could be redeveloped to better utilize the Park Street frontage with more first floor commercial/retail and wider sidewalks. The combining of all these properties could make it possible to have two floors of parking under parts of the larger building footprint with access from South Street. The first floor of this much larger building could be commercial/retail and the upper floors could be mixed income housing. I can envision portions of this larger building could be 6 to 8 stories tall with rooftop open space at the roof levels of lower portions of the building.

If it is deemed by the city that housing for the homeless cannot be incorporated into a larger building like I propose for this location, this type of housing could easily be incorporated into the redevelopment of the Fish Hatchery Road portion of the Wingra BUILD triangle as the SSM/Dean Clinic is looking to rebuild their clinic along Park Street. If SSM/Dean succeeds in moving their clinic to Park Street, all the properties in the Wingra BUILD triangle along Fish Hatchery Road could be redeveloped as residential housing.

But, I worry our city planners will fail to see the real potential of this portion of Park Street and eventually approve these poorly thought out plans, so, I must provide the following questions and comments for all of you to consider before you make your decision:

- The proposed sidewalk and building setback on Park Street is severely inadequate. There should be at least a 15 foot setback from curb to all future buildings along this entire section of Park Street. A 20 foot setback in places could be even better to allow for the potential of sidewalk cafe seating areas. Don't dwell on the existing building setbacks in this area. These old buildings will all be gone soon and the properties will be redeveloped to higher density. We need a 15 foot or more setback all along this section of Park Street on the west side of the street and where ever possible on the east side of the street to allow for free flow of pedestrians, bicycles and enough street side open space to plant trees along the Park Street corridor. Here is a link to another document I have created comparing the pitifully small building setbacks proposed for 1202 S. Park Street to other building setbacks proposed or approved along Park Street, Fish Hatchery Road and East Washington Avenue:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1y-l4I1bL0BWr20kRRvMD-bfuT4wRb5uq3tPFwkpTE7s>

- Where are the future bus stops on Park Street going to be located? With the proposed rapid transit bus system along Park Street, the most appropriate bus stop locations must be identified and space allotted for their location on the Park Street ROW as a turn out lane so the busses do not impede traffic when they are at the bus stops. This project, with its narrow pedestrian corridor and its limiting affect on higher density infill of surrounding properties, runs counter to a transit based transportation system.
- What is the width of the existing High Street ROW? What will be the final design for High Street? Street width? Wide enough for street parking? Sidewalk? Terrace? The plans should show a

proposed future street cross section for this portion of High Street. How will the street dead end? There is currently no space for a turnaround at the end of the street.

- Why is there a 6 foot wide building setback on north side of property? Previous plans showed no setback. Why is there a 4 foot wide sidewalk on the north side of property? Is this sidewalk for public use or just there so the retail space has a way to get trash to the back of the building trash enclosure? No storage of bikes, trash receptacles or other objects should be allowed in this area. Will the gate on this sidewalk be operable at all times or locked part of day? Could this space become ideal for out of sight drug dealing? Due to lack of sun, landscaping plants will have difficulty thriving along north property line.
- Why is there a 6 foot building setback from south property line? Will the proposed access gate be locked except for maintenance access or unlocked? Will the gate be transparent or block any view through gate. Could this space become ideal for out of sight drug dealing? The proposed ostrich ferns are tall and invasive plants with spreading rhizomes and will completely overtake this area so no one will be able to walk through this area eventually. Once the property to the south is redeveloped with a 4 to 6 story building this setback will look odd. Plants will not thrive in this narrow space between buildings.
- What is purpose of the 1200 sq ft commercial space? Is it only there to be able to call this a mixed use building and be able to get by with less required open space? There seems to be no provision for an emergency exit or bathrooms for the commercial space. I am having a hard time imagining what type of commercial or retail business would be able to utilize such a small space.
- The proposed 800 sq ft multi-purpose/community room is probably too small for use as meeting space for the Bay Creek Neighborhood Association general meetings. It could only be utilized for smaller group meetings.
- Will tenant unit windows be openable with screens to allow fresh air into room? There really needs to be more than one small openable window for each dwelling unit. Better ventilation is achieved with double hung or tall openable casement windows.
- Are tenants allowed to have pets? If so, where will their dogs go to pee and poop? There is a lack of real grass in this area to absorb the pee and hide the poop when it does not get picked up. Most dogs tend to like to pee or poop on real grass. They should not be forced to do their thing on pavement because there is no grass nearby.
- What is the guest policy? Though there are only 58 units, could this building really be housing many more than 58 people on a regular basis?
- There appears to be a need for 24/7 building supervision/security? Will that happen and who will pay for it? Heartland housing is having a lot of issues with tenants at their two other housing projects in Madison. This proposed housing project should not even move forward until Heartland Housing can fully resolve supervision/ security issues at their other properties.
- There is no place allowed for surface parking of bicycles belonging to building visitors, commercial space customers or tenant guests. A space must be required for surface parking of

bicycles on this property. All other recently approved mixed use redevelopment projects have required spaces to be provided for surface bicycle parking.

These comments and questions were thoughtfully provided by Ron Shutvet in hopes that our leaders can try to think longer term in shaping the future of our city.