# PLANNING DIVISION REPORT DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT of May 16, 2007

## RE: LD. # 06130: Zoning Map Amendment LD. 3270, rezoning 302 Cross Oak Drive from PUD-GDP to PUD-SIP

- 1. Requested Actions: Approval of a request to rezone 302 Cross Oak Drive from Planned Unit Development, General Development Plan (PUD-GDP) to Planned Unit Development, Specific Implementation Plan (PUD-SIP) allow construction of 24 multi-family dwelling units in four buildings.
- 2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments; Section 28.07 (6) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Developments.
- 3. Report Prepared By: Timothy M. Parks, Planner.

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

- 1. Applicant & Property Owner: Great Neighborhoods West, LLC (Veridian), 6801 South Towne Drive, Madison; Don Esposito, representative.
  - Agent: Brian Munson, Vandewalle & Associates; 120 East Lakeside Street; Madison.
- 2. Development Schedule: The applicant wishes to begin construction once all regulatory approvals have been granted, with completion anticipated in January 2008.
- 3. Location: Approximately 1.6 acres of land located on the south side of Silicon Prairie Parkway between South Point Road and Cross Oak Drive; Aldermanic District 9; Madison Metropolitan School District.
- 4. Existing Conditions: The subject site is undeveloped.
- 5. Proposed Land Use: The applicant proposes to construct 24 multi-family dwelling units in four buildings.
- 6. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:
  North: Undeveloped land, zoned A (Agriculture District);
  - South: Single-family residences in the Cardinal Glenn subdivision, zoned R2T, R2Y & R2Z (Single-Family Residence Districts);

West: Silicon Prairie business park, zoned SM (Specific Manufacturing District), including

City of Madison public works facility;

East: Future Cardinal Glenn townhouses, zoned PUD-GDP.

7. Adopted Land Use Plan: The <u>Pioneer Neighborhood Development Plan</u> recommends that the subject site and adjoining parcels to the south and east be developed with "medium density residential uses."

- 8. Environmental Corridor Status: The property is not located within a mapped environmental corridor.
- 9. Public Utilities & Services: The property is served by a full range of urban services.

#### STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

This application is subject to the standards for Planned Unit Development Districts.

#### PREVIOUS APPROVAL

On January 18, 2005, the Common Council approved a request to rezone 74.9 acres located at 9201 Mineral Point Road and 501 South Point Road from Temporary A to A, C, R2T, R2Y, R2Z and PUD-GDP and approval of a preliminary plat and final plat creating 154 single-family lots, four lots for future two-family and multi-family residential uses, and outlots for public parkland and stormwater detention and future commercial development north of Silicon Prairie Parkway.

#### **PLAN REVIEW**

The applicant is requesting approval of a specific implementation plan to allow construction of 24 townhouse units in four buildings on a 1.6-acre site addressed 302 Cross Oak Drive (Lot 149 of the Cardinal Glenn subdivision). Though the parcel is addressed on Cross Oak Drive, the lot also fronts Silicon Prairie Parkway and South Point Road. The property is undeveloped and devoid of existing vegetation, with a modest slope present from northwest to southeast.

The four buildings will consist of two seven-unit buildings that will extend along the Silicon Prairie Parkway frontage, a four-unit building that will front Cross Oak Drive in the southeastern corner of the property and a six-unit building in the southwestern corner of the site that will front South Point Road. Primary access to the four buildings will be provided by a 26-foot wide drive from Cross Oak. A secondary driveway leading to an alley adjacent to the southern edge of the site is also proposed. The adjacent alley is shared five single-family homes that front Briar Haven

Drive. Seven parking spaces will be provided between the four-unit and six-unit buildings for visitors to the site.

Units in the two seven-unit buildings located along Silicon Prairie Parkway (shown as Buildings 1 & 2) will include 2 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and individual tandem two-car basement garages. Each unit will have a front entrance facing Silicon Prairie Parkway and a balcony that will extend the length of the rear wall above the garage. The buildings will be sided with two-toned horizontal cement board siding and topped with cross-gable roofs. Unit entrances will be covered by either a first floor porch roof or wood trellis.

The four-unit building (Building 3) and the six-unit building (Building 4) will be similar in regard to exterior architecture and interior floorplans. Units in both buildings will include three bedrooms, 2.5 baths, unfinished basements and a one-story, two-car garage attached to the unit by an enclosed corridor. The interior units of both buildings will share open courtyards formed by the attached garages and main building. Both buildings will be sided using a combination of two varieties of horizontal cement board siding and a staggered or scalloped cement board, with brick pilasters used to frame the entry porches facing the public streets. The buildings will be topped with gabled roofs and will include various cross gables, bay elements and dormers in an effort to reduce the mass of the building and provide greater fenestration along the street.

The developer has submitted a comprehensive landscaping plan for the site that will include the planting of a wide variety of deciduous and coniferous shrubs and perennials around the base of the various buildings and a variety of shade trees around the perimeter of the site and along the driveways and visitor parking area.

#### Inclusionary Zoning:

At the time the rezoning and subdivision of the Cardinal Glenn development was approved in 2005, the developer submitted an Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan (IDUP) indicating that 15% of units in the two-unit and multi-family sections of the development zoned PUD-GDP would comply with Inclusionary Zoning at the time of specific implementation plan approval.

The applicant has submitted an IDUP with the specific implementation plan that calls for 4 of the 24 units proposed to be affordable under the terms of the Zoning Ordinance, including one unit at 70% of the area median income. One inclusionary dwelling unit will be located in each of the four buildings, resulting in 2 two-bedroom and 2 three-bedroom affordable units. Staff feels that the proposed dispersion adequately satisfies the unit dispersion requirement found in the Zoning Ordinance.

#### **ANALYSIS & CONCLUSION**

At the time that the general development plan was approved for the two-unit and multi-family components of the Cardinal Glenn subdivision, the subject site was tentatively identified for the development of 36 multi-family units. The recorded general development plan did not include a preliminary layout for this site, and the number of buildings and specific type of dwelling units that would be developed were not identified, though the photos in the plan document included with the application suggested that attached multi-family apartments were envisioned. While the general development plan specifically identified another area of the planned unit development for townhouse development, the Planning Division does not feel that the development of townhouses on the subject site would be an inappropriate use of the property and supports the project as proposed. The 24 units on the 1.6-acre site results in a density of 15 units per acre, which is slightly below the 16 to 25 units an acre recommended for the south side of Silicon Prairie Parkway in the Pioneer Neighborhood Development Plan, which identifies that area for medium-density residential uses.

The townhouses proposed, as well as the two-family units and townhouses proposed further east along Silicon Prairie Parkway, will serve as a buffer between the single-family residences to the south in the rest of the Cardinal Glenn development and future commercial uses proposed north of Silicon Prairie Parkway in the Pioneer Neighborhood Development Plan. The neighborhood plan calls for employment and neighborhood commercial uses to generally be developed between Silicon Prairie Parkway and Mineral Point Road from South Point Road to Pleasant View Road, including on the land immediately north of the subject site.

The Planning Division believes that the buildings proposed are generally well designed and that the proposed specific implementation plan can meet all of the standards for planned unit developments in the Zoning Ordinance. The Urban Design Commission reviewed this specific implementation plan on April 11, 2007 and recommended final approval (see attached report). Though staff feels that the townhouses proposed with this plan are architecturally acceptable, it joins the Urban Design Commission in encouraging the developer to consider expanding their palette of architectural styles as it prepares plans for the future multi-family components of the Cardinal Glenn development to ensure that a diverse array of building styles are represented through the entire project.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Unit recommends that the Plan Commission forward Zoning Map Amendment 3270, rezoning 302 Cross Oak Drive from PUD-GDP to PUD-SIP, to the Common Council with a recommendation of **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing and the following conditions:

- 1. Comments from reviewing agencies.
- 2. That the zoning text be revised per Planning Division and Zoning approval as follows:
  - a.) the floor area ratio and building heights shall be "as shown on the approved plans."
  - b.) the addresses for projects in Grandview Commons shall be removed from the revised zoning text;
  - c.) uses for this project shall be listed as: "Multi-family residences as shown on the attached plans and any accessory uses related thereto."

#### AGENDA#8

#### City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 11, 2007

TITLE:

302 Cross Oak Drive, 9439 Silicon Prairie

Parkway, 301 South Point Road (Lot 149)
– PUD-SIP, 24 Townhome Units, 9<sup>th</sup> Ald.

REREF

Dist. (05826)

REREFERRED:

REFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: William Fruhling, Acting Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 11, 2007

**ID NUMBER:** 

Members present were: Paul Wagner (Chair), Richard Slayton, Ald. Noel Radomski, Michael Barrett, Lou Host-Jablonski and Bruce Woods.

#### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 11, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP for 24 townhouse units at 302 Cross Oak Drive, 9439 Silicon Prairie Parkway and 301 South Point Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Chris Landerud and Brian Munson. Landerud gave an overview of the project stating that the plan consists of four buildings. The Commission's discussion focused on the site layout noting that there were not a lot of outdoor spaces, but expressing support for locating the buildings fronting on each of the three streets that border the site. The Commission also expressed some concern about the architectural style of the buildings. Munson stated that the design direction for the buildings reflects the adjacent residential architecture.

#### ACTION:

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by Host-Jablonski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP for 24 townhouse units at 302 Cross Oak Drive, 9439 Silicon Prairie Parkway and 301 South Point Road with the condition that 2-feet be added to the depth of each front porch. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1) with Wagner voting no.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 5, 6, 6, 6 and 6.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 302 Cross Oak Drive, 9439 Silicon Prairie Parkway, 301 South Point Road (Lot 149)

|                | Site Plan | Architecture  | Landscape<br>Plan | Site<br>Amenities,<br>Lighting,<br>Etc. | Signs      | Circulation<br>(Pedestrian,<br>Vehicular) | Urban<br>Context | Overall<br>Rating |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|---|------------|---|------------------|-------------------|
|                | 5         | 4             | 6                 | 6                                       | -          | 5   | 4                | 5                 |
|                | •••       | . <del></del> | <u>-</u>          | -<br>-                                  | -          | · 🕶                                       |                  | 6.5               |
|                | 6         | 6             | 7                 | 7                                       | <u>.</u> . | 6   | 5                | 6                 |
| SS             | 6         | . 6           | 6                 | -                                       | -          | 6   | 5                | 6                 |
| Member Ratings | ، 5       | 6             | 6                 | -                                       | -          | 6   | -                | · 6               |
| mber           | 5         | 5             | . 6               | -                                       | -          | 5   | 5                | 5                 |
| Me             |           |               |                   |   |            |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |               |                   |   |            |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |               |                   |   |            |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |               |                   |   |            |   |                  |                   |

#### General Comments:

- This style of architecture does not enhance the Madison urban environment. Too bad this developer is stuck on this.
- Isn't Madison ready for a fresher architectural treatment for housing? This site is virtually paved over, with very little opportunity for stormwater infiltration.
- More of the same...maybe it is time for a new architectural recipe.
- % of asphalt appears high. Good species selection and design.
- Same old, same old style of housing. Let's try to be more creative next time.

#### 302 Cross Oak Drive : Cardinal Glenn Staff Review of the Inclusionary Development Unit Plan: (May 11, 2007)

| Name of Development | Cardinal Glenn Townhomes  |
|---------------------|---|
| Address             | 302 Cross Oak Drive   |
| Developer/owner     | Great Neighborhoods West : Veridian                                 |
| Contact Person      | Don Esposito and Brian Munson/Chris Landerud, Vandewalle and Assoc. |
| Contact Phone       | 608-226-3100 and 255-3988   |
| Fax                 | 608-255-0814  |
| Contact-mail        | clanderud@vandewalle.com  |

#### SYNOPSIS:

This is a part of the Cardinal Glenn Plat Development. This development was approved under the first IZ ordinance.

Developer proposes to comply with IZ.

There are 24 town home units. There are fourteen 2-bedroom units and ten 3-bedroom units. Two 2 bedroom units have been designated as IZ Units and two 3 bedroom units have been designated as IZ units.

The developer has designated the IZ units by location and the IZ units are spread among the site and meet the requirements of the IZ Ordinance that applies to this development.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

| The p | project as proposed, based upon the available information furnished by eveloper. |                                       |
|-------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Χ     | Will comply with MGO 28.04 (25)  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|       |  |                                       |
|       | Will comply with MGO 28.04 (25) if the following conditions or                   |                                       |
|       | changes are met:   |                                       |
|       |  |                                       |
|       | Does not comply for the following reasons:                                       |                                       |

| Reviewed by | Barbara Constans, CD Grants Administrator . |  |  |
|-------------|---|--|--|
|             | Hickory R. Hurie, CD Grants Supervisor      |  |  |
|             | Date: May 11, 2007                          |  |  |

#### 1. PROPOSED ALLOCATION OF AFFORDABLE UNITS

| Number of      | At Market | At 80% | At 70% | At 60% | At 50% |
|----------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| units          |           |        |        |        | ,      |
| for-sale units | 20        | 3 .    | 1 .    |        |        |

| Number of units                 | Efficiency | 1-bedroom | 2-bedroom | 3 bedroom | 4-bedroom |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| For-sale:<br>Market-rate        |            |           | 12        | . 8       |           |
| For-sale:<br>Inclusionary units |            |           | 2 ·       | 2         |           |

#### 2. TABLE TO CALCULATE POINTS

#### THIS PROJECT:

|                   | At Market   | At 80% of AMI | 70% | 60% | 50% |
|-------------------|---|---------------|-----|-----|-----|
| 5%                |   |               | . 1 |     |     |
| 10%               |   | 1             |     |     |     |
| 15%               |   |               |     |     |     |
| 20%               | ing 1997 between this manifest and the color in the last of the color in the color |               |     |     |     |
| TOTAL for project |   |               |     |     | 2   |

#### **Per Ordinance**

| For-sale:<br>Per cent of<br>dwelling units | At Market | At 80% of AMI | 70% | 60% | 50% |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Ord. points                                |           |               |     |     |     |
| 5%   |           | 0             | 1   | 2   | 3   |
| 10%  |           |               | 2   | 3   | 4   |
| 15%  |           | 2             | 3   | 4   | 5   |
| 20%  |           | 3             | 4   | 5   | 6   |

#### 3. ISSUES RELATED TO DESIGN, PRICING, OR TERMS OF IZ UNITS

| Standards for Inclusionary dwelling units (IDUs)   | Complies | Does not comply | Additional comments   |
|--|----------|-----------------|---|
| Exterior Appearance of IDUs are similar to Market rate   | Yes      |                 |   |
| Proportion of attached and detached IDU units is similar to Market rate.   | Yes      |                 |   |
| Mix of IDUs by bedroom size is similar to market rate  | Yes      |                 | ·   |
| IDUs are dispersed throughout the project  | Yes      |                 |   |
| IDUs are to be built in phasing similar to market rate   | Yes      |                 |   |
| Pricing fits within Ordinance standards  | Yes      |                 | •   |
| Developer offers security during construction phase in form of deed restriction  | Yes      | ,               | Deed restriction will be placed on IZ units within the for-sale design. |
| Developer offers enforcement for for-sale IDUs in form of option to purchase or for rental in form of deed restriction | Yes      |                 |   |
| Developer describes marketing plan for IDUs  | Yes      |                 |   |
| Developer acknowledges need to inform buyers/renters of IDU status, responsibilities for notification                  | Yes      |                 |   |
| Terms of sale  | Sale     |                 |   |
| Developer has arranged to sell/rent IDUs to non-<br>profit or CDA to meet IDU expectations                             | No       |                 | •   |
| Developer has requested waiver for off-site or cash payment  | No       |                 |   |
| Developer has requested waiver for reduction of number of units  | No       |                 |   |
| Other:   |          |                 |   |

#### 4. INCENTIVES REQUESTED

| A) Density bonus of 10% (except developments of 4 or more stories and >75% of parking is underground, or has 30 or fewer detached units, then density of 20% per point) (limited to 3 points)              |
|--|
| B) Reduction in Park development fees (limit of 1 point)   |
| C) Reduction in Park Dedication requirements (limit of 1 point)  |
| D) 25% reduction in parking requirements (limit of 1 point)  |
| E) Non-city provision of street tree landscaping   |
| F) Cash subsidy from IZ fund, \$5,000/IZ unit for units designated for families at 60% AMI or less ( for owner occupied units) and 40% AMI or less for rental units (Limit of 2 points)                    |
| G) Cash subsidy from IZ fund, \$2,500/IZ unit for projects with 49 or fewer detached dwelling units or developments with 4 or more stories and at least 75% of parking is underground. (Limit of 2 points) |
| H) One additional story in downtown design zones, not to exceed certain height requirements  |
| I) Eligibility for residential parking permits equal to number of IZ units in PUD  |
|  |

| J) Assistance in obtaining | other funds related to housing   |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
|                            | orhood development plan from non-c<br>ntiguous to existing development and | city sources (if development located in no such plan exists. |
| L) Other :                 |  | •  |

ISSUE: The application as submitted is the old format and includes cash incentives not allowed under the Sept. 2004 version of the ordinance.

#### 5. ISSUES OF PROCESS

Are there issues in any of the following steps that should be identified now for closer attention?

|   | g steps that should be identified flow to  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Step  | Standard Step Activity   | Special Issues  |
| Pre-conference with City Planning Staff                                   | March 2006   | None identified   |
| Presentation of <u>Concept</u> to City's<br>Development Review Staff Team |  |   |
| Submission of Zoning Application and IZ Dwelling Unit Plan                | Feb 19, 2007   |   |
| Formal Review by City's Development AssistanceTeam                        | May 3, 2007  | IDUP revised after first submittal to move units into all buildings and allocate 2 3-bedroom units as IZ units. |
| Formal Review by <u>Plan</u> <u>Commission</u>                            | May 21, 2007   |   |
| Appeal Plan Commission Decision to Common Council (optional)              |  |   |
| Compliance with Approved Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan                  | Deed restrictions will be recorded<br>for units when GDP/SIP for this<br>phase of the development is<br>recorded | ·   |
| Construction of development according to Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan  | To be done at the same time as market rate units   |   |
| Comply with any continuing requirements                                   | Sample 5% of IDU annually for compliance review.   |   |



## Department of Public Works City Engineering Division

608 266 4751

Larry D. Nelson, P.E. City Engineer

**Deputy City Engineer** Robert F. Phillips, P.E.

City-County Building, Room 115 210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard Madison, Wisconsin 53703 608 264 9275 FAX 608 267 8677 TDD Principal Engineers Michael R. Dailey, P.E. Christina M. Bachmann, P.E. John S. Fahrney, P.E. David L. Benzschawel, P.E. Gregory T. Fries, P.E.

Operations Supervisor Kathleen M. Cryan

**Hydrogeologist** Joseph L. DeMorett, P.G.

**GIS Manager** David A. Davis, R.L.S.

DATE:

May 2, 2007

TO:

Plan Commission

FROM:

Larry D. Nelson, P.E.

SUBJECT:

302 Cross Oak Drive Rezoning & Inclusionary Zoning

The City Engineering Division has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments.

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

llon

- 1. All work within the right-of-way, including utility installations shall be coordinated with street construction.
- 2 Any damage to surface course of street pavement will require restoration in accordance with the City's Patching Criteria.
- 3. Revise proposed storm and sanitary sewer to be consistent with the City Engineer's design of these utilities within the public right-of-way.

#### **GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

Engineering Division Review of Planned Community Developments, Planned Unit Developments and Conditional Use Applications.

Name: 302 Cross Oak Drive Rezoning & Inclusionary Zoning

| Ger | 101 | ler |
|-----|-----|-----|
| Gei | ıei | aı  |

| 1.1 | The construction of this building will require removal and replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and possibly  |
|-----|---|
|     | other parts of the City's infrastructure. The applicant shall enter into a City / Developer agreement for the     |
|     | improvements required for this development. The applicant shall be required to provide deposits to cover City     |
|     | labor and materials and surety to cover the cost of construction. The applicant shall meet with the City Engineer |
|     | to schedule the development of the plans and the agreement. The City Engineer will not sign off on this project   |
|     | without the agreement executed by the developer. The developer shall sign the Developer's Acknowledgement         |
|     | prior to the City Engineer signing off on this project.   |

1.2 The site plan shall identify lot and block numbers of recorded Certified Survey Map or Plat.

1.3 The site plan shall include all lot/ownership lines, existing building locations, proposed building additions, demolitions, parking stalls, driveways, sidewalks (public and/or private), existing and proposed signage, existing and proposed utility locations and landscaping.

O

1

| L!     | 1.4        | The site plan shall identify the difference between existing and proposed impervious areas.   |  |  |
|--------|------------|---|--|--|
|        | 1.5        | The site plan shall reflect a proper street address of the property as reflected by official City of Madison Assessor's and Engineering Division records.   |  |  |
|        | 1.6        | Coordinate all necessary new interior addresses associated with this proposed development with City Engineering Program Specialist Lori Zenchenko <u>Izenchenko@cityofmadison.com</u> or (608) 266-5952   |  |  |
|        | 1.7        | The site plan shall include a full and complete legal description of the site or property being subjected to this application.  |  |  |
| Right  | of Way / I | Easements   |  |  |
|        | 2.1        | The Applicant shall Dedicate a foot wide strip of Right of Way along  |  |  |
|        | 2.2        | The Applicant shall Dedicate a foot wide strip of Right of Way along  |  |  |
|        | 2.3        | The Applicant shall Dedicate a Permanent Limited Easement for grading and sloping feet wide along   |  |  |
|        | 2.4        | The City Engineer has reviewed the need for pedestrian and bicycle connections through the development and finds that no connections are required.  |  |  |
|        | 2.5        | The Applicant shall Dedicate a Permanent Limited Easement for a pedestrian / bicycle easement feet wide from to   |  |  |
|        | 2.6        | The Developer shall provide a private easement for public pedestrian and bicycle use through the property running from to   |  |  |
|        | 2.7        | The developer shall be responsible for the ongoing construction and maintenance of a path within the easement. The maintenance responsibilities shall include, but not be limited to, paving, repairing, marking and plowing. The developer shall work with the City of Madison Real Estate Staff to administer this easement. Applicable fees shall apply.   |  |  |
| Street | s and Sid  | lewalks   |  |  |
|        | 3.1        | The Applicant shall execute a waiver of notice and hearing on the assessments for the improvement of [roadway] in accordance with Section 66.0703(7)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and Section 4.09 of the MGO.   |  |  |
|        | 3.2        | Value of sidewalk installation over \$5000. The Applicant shall Construct Sidewalk to a plan approved by the City Engineer along  |  |  |
|        | 3.3        | Value of sidewalk installation under \$5000. The Applicant shall install public sidewalk along  The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation Permit for the sidewalk work, which is available from the City Engineering Division. The applicant shall pay all fees associated with the permit including inspection fees. All work must be completed within six months or the succeeding June 1, whichever is later.   |  |  |
|        | 3.4        | The Applicant shall execute a waiver of their right to notice and hearings on the assessments for the installation of sidewalk along [roadway] in accordance with Section 66.0703(7)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and Section 4.09 of the MGO.   |  |  |
|        | 3.5        |   |  |  |
|        | 3.6        | The Applicant shall close all abandoned driveways by replacing the curb in front of the driveways and restoring the terrace with grass.   |  |  |
|        | 3.7        | Value of the restoration work less than \$5,000. When computing the value, do not include a cost for driveways. Do not include the restoration required to facilitate a utility lateral installation. The Applicant's project requires the minor restoration of the street and sidewalk. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation Permit for the street restoration work, which is available from the City Engineering Division. The applicant shall pay all fees associated with the permit including inspection fees. |  |  |
|        | 3.8        | The Applicant shall make improvements to in order to facilitate ingress and egress to the development. The improvement shall include a (Describe what the work involves or strike this part of the comment.)  |  |  |
|        | 3.9        | The Applicant shall make improvements to The improvements shall consist of  |  |  |
|        | 3.10       | The approval of this Conditional Use does not include the approval of the changes to roadways, sidewalks or utilities. The applicant shall obtain separate approval by the Board of Public Works and the Common Council for the restoration of the public right of way including any changes requested by developer. The City Engineer shall complete the final plans for the roadways with input from the developer. The city Logding grades, tree logdings  |  |  |

| 4-      |                          | tree species, lighting modifications and other items required to facilitate the development or restore the right of way shall be reviewed by the City Engineer, City Traffic Engineer, and City Forester.  |  |
|---------|--------------------------|--|--|
|         | 3.11                     | The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer with a survey indicating the grade of the existing sidewalk and street. The Applicant shall hire a Professional Engineer to set the grade of the building entrances adjacent to the public right of way. The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer the proposed grade of the building entrances. The City Engineer shall approve the grade of the entrances prior to signing off on this development.  |  |
|         | 3.12                     | The Applicant shall replace all sidewalk and curb and gutter which abuts the property which is damaged by the construction or any sidewalk and curb and gutter which the City Engineer determines needs to be replaced because it is not at a desirable grade regardless of whether the condition existed prior to beginning construction.   |  |
|         | 3.13                     | The Applicant shall obtain a privilege in streets agreement for any encroachments inside the public right of way. The approval of this development does not constitute or guarantee approval of the encroachments.   |  |
|         | 3.14                     | The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer with the proposed soil retention system to accommodate the restoration. The soil retention system must be stamped by a Professional Engineer. The City Engineer may reject or require modifications to the retention system.   |  |
|         | 3.15                     | The Applicant shall complete work on exposed aggregate sidewalk in accordance with specifications provided by the city. The stone used for the exposed aggregate shall be approved by the City. The Construction Engineer shall be notified prior to beginning construction. Any work that does not match the adjacent work or which the City Construction Engineer finds is unacceptable shall be removed and replaced.   |  |
|         | 3.16                     | All work in the public right-of-way shall be performed by a City licensed contractor.  |  |
|         | 3.17                     | Installation of "Private" street signage in accordance with 10.34 MGO is required.   |  |
| Storm W | Vater Ma                 | anagement  |  |
|         | 4.1                      | The site plans shall be revised to show the location of all rain gutter down spout discharges.   |  |
|         | 4.2                      | Storm sewer to serve this development has been designed and constructed. The site plans shall be revised to identify the location of this storm sewer and to show connection of an internal drainage system to the existing public storm sewer.  |  |
|         | 4.3                      | The plan set shall be revised to show a proposed private internal drainage system on the site. This information shall include the depths and locations of structures and the type of pipe to be used.  |  |
| _       |                          |  |  |
|         | 4.4                      | The applicant shall show storm water "overflow" paths that will safely route runoff when the storm sewer is at capacity.   |  |
|         | 4.4                      |  |  |
|         |                          | capacity.  The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate   |  |
|         | 4.5                      | capacity.  The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.  The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion   |  |
|         | 4.5                      | capacity.  The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.  The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required.  This development includes multiple building permits within a single lot. The City Engineer and/or the Director of the  |  |
|         | 4.5<br>4.6<br>4.7        | capacity.  The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.  The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required.  This development includes multiple building permits within a single lot. The City Engineer and/or the Director of the Inspection Unit may require individual control plans and measures for each building.  If the lots within this site plan are inter-dependent upon one another for stormwater runoff conveyance, and/or a private drainage system exists for the entire site an agreement shall be provided for the rights and responsibilities of all lot owners. Said agreement shall be reviewed and placed on file by the City Engineer, referenced on the site  |  |
|         | 4.5<br>4.6<br>4.7<br>4.8 | The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.  The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required.  This development includes multiple building permits within a single lot. The City Engineer and/or the Director of the Inspection Unit may require individual control plans and measures for each building.  If the lots within this site plan are inter-dependent upon one another for stormwater runoff conveyance, and/or a private drainage system exists for the entire site an agreement shall be provided for the rights and responsibilities of all lot owners. Said agreement shall be reviewed and placed on file by the City Engineer, referenced on the site plan and recorded at the Dane Co Register of Deeds.  Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to:  Detain the 2 & 10-year storm events.  Detain the 2, 10, & 100-year storm events.  Control 80% TSS (20 micron particle).  Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle).  Provide infiltration in accordance with NR-151.  Provide substantial thermal control.  Provide oil & grease control from the first 1/2" of runoff from parking areas. |  |
|         | 4.5<br>4.6<br>4.7<br>4.8 | The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.  The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required.  This development includes multiple building permits within a single lot. The City Engineer and/or the Director of the Inspection Unit may require individual control plans and measures for each building.  If the lots within this site plan are inter-dependent upon one another for stormwater runoff conveyance, and/or a private drainage system exists for the entire site an agreement shall be provided for the rights and responsibilities of all lot owners. Said agreement shall be reviewed and placed on file by the City Engineer, referenced on the site plan and recorded at the Dane Co Register of Deeds.  Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to:  Detain the 2 & 10-year storm events.  Detain the 2, 10, & 100-year storm events.  Control 40% TSS (20 micron particle).  Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle).  Provide infiltration in accordance with NR-151.  Provide substantial thermal control.   |  |

| t-        |        | provide information off the site to fully meet this requirement.  |
|-----------|--------|---|
|           | 4.11   | A portion of this project comes under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corp of Engineers and WDNR for wetland or flood plain issues. A permit for those matters shall be required prior to construction on any of the lots currently within the jurisdictional flood plain.  |
|           | 4.12   | The Applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, a digital CAD file (single file) to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital CAD file shall be to scale and represent final construction. The single CAD file submittal can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) format and contain the following data, each on a separate layer name/level number:   |
|           |        | a) Building Footprints b) Internal Walkway Areas c) Internal Site Parking Areas d) Other Miscellaneous Impervious Areas (i.e. gravel, crushed stone, bituminous/asphalt, concrete, etc.) e) Right-of-Way lines (public and private) f) Lot lines g) Lot numbers h) Lot/Plat dimensions i) Street names  |
|           |        | NOTE: Email file transmissions preferred <a href="mailto:lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com">lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com</a> . Include the site address in this transmittal.   |
|           | 4.13   | NR-151 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code will be effective on October 1, 2004. Future phases of this project shall comply with NR 151 in effect when work commences. Specifically, any phases not covered by a Notice of Intent (NOI) received from the WDNR under NR-216 prior to October 1, 2004 shall be responsible for compliance with all requirements of NR-151 Subchapter III. As most of the requirements of NR-151 are currently implemented in Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances, the most significant additional requirement shall be that of infiltration. |
|           |        | NR-151 requires infiltration in accord with the following criteria. For the type of development, the site shall comply with one of the three (3) options provided below:  |
|           |        | Residential developments shall infiltrate 90% of the predevelopment infiltration amount, 25% of the runoff from the 2-year post development storm or dedicated a maximum of 1% of the site area to active infiltration practices.   |
|           |        | Commercial development shall infiltrate 60% of the predevelopment infiltration amount, 10% of the runoff from the 2-year post development storm or dedicate a maximum of 2% of the site area to active infiltration practices.  |
|           | 4.14   | The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the Engineering Division (Jeff Benedict or Tim Troester). The digital copies shall be to scale, and shall have a scale bar on the plan set.  |
|           |        | PDF submittals shall contain the following information:  a) Building footprints. b) Internal walkway areas. c) Internal site parking areas. d) Lot lines and right-of-way lines. e) Street names. f) Stormwater Management Facilities. g) Detail drawings associated with Stormwater Management Facilities (including if applicable planting plans).  |
|           | 4.15   | The Applicant shall submit prior to plan sign-off, electronic copies of any Stormwater Management Files including:  |
|           |        | a) SLAMM DAT files. b) RECARGA files. c) TR-55/HYDROCAD/Etc d) Sediment loading calculations  |
|           |        | If calculations are done by hand or are not available electronically the hand copies or printed output shall be scanned to a PDF file and provided.   |
|           | 4.16   | The area adjacent to this proposed development has a known flooding risk. All entrances shall be 2-feet above the adjacent sidewalk elevation or 1-foot above the 100-year regional flood elevation (whichever is greater). This includes garage entrances.   |
| Utilities | Genera |   |
|           | 5.1    | The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation permit for the installation of utilities required to serve this project. The Applicant shall pay the permit fee, inspection fee and street degradation fee as applicable and shall comply with all the conditions of the permit.   |
|           | 5.2    | The applicant shall obtain all necessary sewer connection permits and sewer plugging permits prior to any utility work.   |
|           | 5.3    | All proposed and existing utilities including gas, electric, phone, steam, chilled water, etc shall be shown on the   |

| 4        |       | plan.   |
|----------|-------|---|
|          | 5.4   | The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction.   |
|          | 5.5   | The site plans shall be revised to show the location of existing utilities, including depth, type, and size in the adjacent right-of-way.   |
|          | 5.6   | The developer shall provide information on how the Department of Commerce's requirements regarding treatment of storm water runoff, from parking structures, shall satisfied prior to discharge to the public sewer system. Additionally, information shall be provided on which system (storm or sanitary) the pipe shall be connected to.   |
| Sanitary | Sewer |   |
| <u> </u> | 6.1   | Prior to approval of the conditional use application, the owner shall obtain a permit to plug each existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves a building that is proposed for demolition. For each lateral to be plugged the owner shall deposit \$1,000 with the City Engineer in two separate checks in the following amounts: (1). \$100 non-refundable deposit for the cost of inspection of the plugging by City staff; and (2). \$900 for the cost of City crews to perform the plugging. If the owner elects to complete the plugging of a lateral by private contractor and the plugging is inspected and approved by the City Engineer, the \$900 fee shall be refunded to the owner. |
|          | 6.2   | All outstanding Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) and City of Madison sanitary sewer connection charges are due and payable prior Engineering sign-off, unless otherwise collected with a Developer's / Subdivision Contract. Contact Janet Dailey (608-261-9688) to obtain the final MMSD billing a minimum of two (2) working days prior to requesting City Engineering signoff.  |
|          | 6.3   | Each unit of a duplex building shall be served by a separate and independent sanitary sewer lateral.  |
|          | 6.4   | The site plan shall be revised to show all existing public sanitary sewer facilities in the project area as well as the size, invert elevation, and alignment of the proposed service.  |



#### **Traffic Engineering and Parking Divisions**

David C. Dryer, P.E., City Traffic Engineer and Parking Manager

Suite 100 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard P.O. Box 2986 Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2986 PH 608 266 4761 TTY 866-704-2315 FAX 608 267 1158

May 10, 2007

TO:

Plan Commission

FROM:

David C. Dryer, P.E., City Traffic Engineer and Parking Manager

SUBJECT:

302 Cross Oak Drive - Rezoning - PUD (GDP) to PUD (SIP) - 4 Building / 24

**Unit Town House** 

The City Traffic Engineering Division has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments.

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

1. None

#### PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMENTS

2. None

#### **GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

- 3. When the applicant submits final plans for approval, the applicant shall show the following: items in the terrace as existing (e.g., signs and street light poles), type of surfaces, existing property lines, addresses, one contiguous plan (showing all easements, all pavement markings, building placement, and stalls), signage, percent of slope, vehicle routes, dimensions of radii, aisles, driveways, stalls including the two (2) feet overhang, and a scaled drawing at 1" = 20'.
- 4. Public signing and marking related to the development may be required by the City Traffic Engineer for which the developer shall be financially responsible.

Please contact John Leach, City Traffic Engineering at 267-8755 if you have questions regarding the above items:

## CITY OF MADISON INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

**Date:** May 16, 2007

To:

Plan Commission

From:

Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator

Subject:

302 Cross Oak Dr., Cardinal Glen, Lot 149

**Present Zoning District: PUD(GDP)** 

Proposed Use: 4 building (24-unit town house development)(two 7-unit buildings, one 6-unit building and one 4-unit building) (3 bedrooms each unit)

Requested Zoning District: PUD(SIP)

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project). **NONE.** 

#### GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

- 1. Section 28.04(24) provides that Inclusionary Zoning requirements shall be complied with as part of the approval process. Submit, to CDBG, a copy of the approved inclusionary zoning plan for recording prior to zoning sign off of the plan.
- 2. Meet applicable State building and State setback requirements. Contact the building permit staff regarding these requirements.
- 3. Provide a detailed landscape plan. Show species and sizes of landscape elements. Provide a landscape worksheet with the final plans that shows that the landscaping provided meets the point and required tree ordinances. In order to count toward required points, the landscaping shall be within 15' and 20' of the parking lot depending on the type of landscape element. (Note: The required trees do not count toward the landscape point total.)
- 4. Lighting is required. Provide a plan showing at least .5 foot candle on any surface on any lot and an average of .75 footcandles. The max. light trespass shall be 0.5 fc at 10 ft from the adjacent lot line. (See City of Madison lighting ordinance).
- 5. The final plans for sign off shall include addresses on the buildings.
- 6. The zoning text shall not include Lots 455 and 456 and addresses of these parcels. Include the address of Lot 149. Include accessory uses to the multi-family use.

#### **ZONING CRITERIA**

| Bulk Requirements | Required          | Proposed                 |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Lot Area          | 38,400 sq. ft.    | 69,532 sq. ft.           |
| Lot width         | 50'               | adequate                 |
| Usable open space | 11,520 sq. ft.    | 5,964 sq. ft. *          |
| Front yard        | 20'               | 14' Cross Oaks Dr.       |
| Side yards        | 6' min, 15' total | 5.5' min. *, 20.5' total |
| Through lot       | 20'               | 16' South Point Rd.      |
| Building height   | 3 stories         | 2 stories                |

| Site Design                | Required           | Proposed                |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Number parking stalls      | 42                 | 34 garage               |
|                            |                    | 7 surface               |
|                            |                    | 41 total *              |
| Accessible stalls          | n/a                | n/a                     |
| Loading                    | 1 (10' x 35') area | provided in drive aisle |
| Number bike parking stalls | 24                 | provided in garages     |
| Landscaping                | Yes                | (3)                     |
| Lighting                   | Yes                | (4)                     |

| Other Critical Zoning Items |            |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Urban Design                | Yes        |
| Historic District           | No         |
| Landmark building           | No         |
| Flood plain                 | No         |
| Utility easements           | None shown |
| Barrier free (ILHR 69)      | No         |

With the above conditions, the proposed project does comply with all of the above requirements.

<sup>\*</sup> Since this project is being rezoned to the (PUD) district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, we are reviewing it based on the criteria for the R-5 district, because of the surrounding land uses.



### CITY OF MADISON FIRE DEPARTMENT

#### Fire Prevention Division

325 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53703-2295 Phone: 608-266-4484 • FAX: 608-267-1153

DATE:

May 14, 2007

TO:

Plan Commission

FROM:

Edwin J. Ruckriegel, Fire Marshal

SUBJECT:

302 Cross Oak Drive

The City of Madison Fire Department (MFD) has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments:

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

- 1. Provide fire apparatus access as required by Comm 62.0509 and MGO 34.19, as follows:
  - a. A dead-end fire lane that is longer than 150-feet shall terminate in a turnaround. Provide an approved turnaround (cul-de-sac, 45 degree wye, 90 degree tee) at the end of a fire lane that is more than 150-feet in length. Provide turnaround for fire lane.

#### **GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

- 2. Provide fire apparatus access as required by Comm 62.0509 and MGO 34.19, as follows:
  - a. The site plans shall clearly identify the location of all fire lanes.
  - b. Provide a completed MFD "Fire Apparatus Access and Fire Hydrant Worksheet" with the site plan submittal.

Please contact Bill Sullivan, Fire Fire Protection Engineer at 608-261-9658 if you have questions regarding the above items.

cc:

Scott Strassburg