

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION**

**PRESENTED:** May 16, 2012

**TITLE:** 801 South Park Street – New PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development (Erin Square) in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (16320)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** May 16, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton\*, Todd Barnett, Melissa Huggins, Tom DeChant and John Harrington.

\*Slayton recused himself on this item.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 16, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 801 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was John Bieno. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Greg Kopish, representing the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association; and John Lombardo. Bieno presented revised plans which maintain the square footage of the building and keeps everything on their property. Compromises were made along the southern edge with the fence remaining at the request of the neighborhood, with 7.5-feet of frontage. The Secretary stated that the Planning Division had concerns about using the alleyway and requested that the architecture be more consistent with the previous approval for the 3-story version of the building, rather than the redesigned proposal presented last time.

John Lombardo spoke positively about the alleyway. His building is 707 South Park Street with a second floor residential tenant. He inquired about the possibility of putting a sound barrier similar as will be done for the surrounding homes. The Chair stated that this is an issue for the Plan Commission.

Greg Kopish spoke, pleased with the escape lane. He also asked if the sound barrier could be extended and presented a list of conditions the neighborhood has sent to the board; that goes to the Plan Commission as part of their review of the project.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The balconies directly above the awnings seem a bit uncomfortable and repetitive.
  - We looked at taking out the awnings that were underneath them but that didn’t feel comfortable. We prefer to leave the awnings going across there. There’s no rhythm if we remove some of them.

Is there no space between the two? Does it abut directly to the balcony?

- Not a noticeable amount.

It feels awkward to me.

- They will be used for signage. That will come back.

- The piece that takes the curb, that should be a major gesture. It's not a very substantial volume that is treated differently; the material and scale look the same.
- I'm sad that you've gone back, it was a much more exciting project before.
- The corner just doesn't seem to do enough. The shed roof concerns me the most, it looks like a little bit "cartoonish;" shape should be more profound and substantial. Water is going to dribble down it, you're going to have to have a gutter. It seems like that should be something more profound on the building. It just doesn't work.
- Drop sill on second floor corner element to make more vertical.
- I'm concerned about the stacked brick underneath the windows. I think it detracts from the simplicity.
- Window size and proportion along Park Street needs more consistency.
- The trees in the back, it would be nice to push them closer to the street so it ends up in the little triangle area. It'll help give it more wrapping to the building and help from the alley to tie in and make a stronger edge.
- Push canopy trees more out to the street.
- Can you do something with your rooftop mechanical screening to strengthen the piece that's skewed?
  - Yes, we can even tie it together at the corner with a similar piece that is going on elsewhere.
- If the awnings are crashing into this piece that's now holding the curb, I would run those straight as opposed to turning them. Are we walking people to that end door or are we telling them to zig zag in and out. I think that end piece needs to be stronger and that will resolve that line. It hasn't hit the sweet spot yet.
- I'm glad they found a way to put the use on this site (drive-up).
- Look at creating a pattern with the brick that will make it more pronounced.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Slayton recusing himself. The motion provided initial approval for the site, massing and materials with address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Site, massing, materials, with the architectural features and landscaping discussed to return.
- Try to find another way to address the integration of the balconies with the awnings.
- Window pattern and sizes on the base story.
- Eliminate the shed roof at the entry.
- Reset the stack bond element.
- Reexamine materials and details for the balconies.

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, 6, 6 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 801 South Park Street.**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	8	4	5	-	-	-	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	5	6	-	-	6	7	6

**General Comments:**

- Thanks for solving circulation issues on site.
- Much improved site design. Architectural details need improvement. Main entrance very weak.
- Site fine, architectural details not there.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION**                      **PRESENTED:** April 18, 2012

**TITLE:**    801 South Park Street - New  
              PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development  
              (Erin Square) in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald.  
              Dist. (16320)

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary                      **ADOPTED:**                      **POF:**

**DATED:** April 18, 2012                      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Henry Lufler, Acting Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Marsha Rummel, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton\* and John Harrington.

\*Slayton recused himself on this item.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 18, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD located at 801 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build; and Jeremy Alsaker, representing Travel Mart, Inc. Appearing in opposition but not wishing to speak was C. Snyder. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Seth Nicholson and Mike Pudelwitts. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Aaron Crandall. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions were Theresa Kopish and Greg Kopish, representing the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association. Bieno stated that sound from the menu board is no longer an issue after testing. He presented a letter from the neighborhood group in support of the project, with a few contingencies; they are open to those contingencies except for the fence which they request remain at 8-feet. They took the opportunity to go back to the drawing board and use an architectural element that matches the curve of Park Street at that location; the curve of that element is anchored by the entry into the tenant space. Simple masonry on the backside of the building and a warm color palette will tie things together while keeping it simplistic.

Huggins remarked that the landscape plan is excellent. Rummel inquired about signage; a blade sign will face Park Street and the live-work space entry will face Park Street as required by UDD No. 7.

Seth Nicholson spoke to the changes since the last draft of plans. He lives in the house directly behind this space and will be highly impacted. His concerns include access to the alleyway; when you look at the proposed dual lanes, he sees a 3-foot adjustment in the building that could realistically run a fence all the way along the alley and not allow access. He is also concerned with light pollution in his backyard.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke to the alley. She spoke with City Engineering, who suggested putting a sign opposite that driveway that goes into the alley saying “left turn only.” They were not willing to block the alleyway.

Nicholson replied that his concerns center on increased traffic coming through the alleyway and it will get congested.

Mike Pudelwitts inquired about fencing and where it would be located. He supports the fencing and shares concerns about the increased traffic in the alleyway. Huggins stated that this is really the purview of City Traffic Engineering and they have reviewed this. In terms of solutions, putting a sign was the answer the alder got in prohibiting traffic turning to the east; she did not ask about making the alley bigger.

O’Kroley talked about this more modern form and the understanding of the building’s planes. The portion of the building for the technicality of the live-work unit, she can’t understand if that’s something applied to the building or is the building form now undulating to strictly meet the letters of the code. She suggested studying the change in material from metal panel to hardiplank which goes to a more “residential” structure; where the geometry of the building’s elevations needs to be resolved and cohesive.

Harrington inquired as to what happens when traffic at the two ends of the alleyway meet; there’s a concern about the exiting pattern. Most alleys are not used for an escape lane for drive-thru restaurants. He has concerns about how this could be resolved. Rummel asked if the alley was not there, how would the circulation pattern move through the site? Bieno responded that the basic answer was that there is an alley so they do not have to look at other options.

Theresa Kopish spoke to concerns about the hours of operation. She also inquired about what would happen if this particular business didn’t make it; would the contingencies with this development apply to another business as well? Alsaker (the local franchisee) stated that he read the neighborhood association requests and Dunkin Donuts is fine with their requests. Kopish is pleased with the developer’s response to their concerns and the neighborhood is happy with the new “squawk box.”

#### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (3-2) with O’Kroley and Rummel voting no; Harrington and Huggins voting yes, and Lufler, acting as Chair, breaking the tie; Slayton recused himself on this item. The motion provided for the following:

- Acknowledgement of conditions supported by the applicant from the neighborhood association.
- Resolve conflicts/make more comfort with two cars coming together in the 8-foot alley as much as possible with adjustments to the building, on-site amenities the overflow lane issue, including the size of parking stalls, drive aisle width, landscaping and screening, including options to facilitate drive-thru circulation on-site.
- Address comments on the current form of the building.
- Report from Traffic Engineering on the use of the alleyway; specifically how two cars can move through this driveway without any problems.

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 rating for this project is 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 801 South Park Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	7	7	-	-	6	7	7

**General Comments:**

- Struggling with circulation issues and reliance on alley.

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> January 18, 2012
TITLE: 801 South Park Street – New PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development in UDD No. 7. 13 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (16320)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: January 18, 2012	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington, and Henry Lufler.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 18, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a new PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 801 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Pat McCaughey, John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build; Jeremy Alsaker and Ald. Tim Bruer. Appearing and speaking in opposition were Ald. Sue Ellingson, Theresa Kopish, Greg Kopish and Mike Pedelwitts. Bieno stated that a four-story building with underground parking has been approved for this site, but the commercial aspect wasn’t getting any bites. Once the drive-thru was added and the underground parking was removed, a possible client came forward. It has been scaled back to a two-story slab on grade building. The footprint and parking lot remain the same. Preliminary sketches shown to the neighborhood did not show the “escape” drive through the alleyway. The drive-thru lane dumps onto Park Street with the escape lane angled to minimize any flow-back into the neighborhood itself. To help minimize the concerns of the menu board they have agreed to install a 10-foot fence at the corner location, and redirected traffic even further up the existing alleyway. The building itself would use cedar siding, masonry base, brick corner elements, aluminum storefront with residential windows on the second floor in a mixed color palette.

Greg Kopish spoke in opposition representing the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association. The main concern is the orientation of the drive-thru and ordering system. The proposed placement for the speakers is on the northeast corner of the building within 50-feet of existing homes. Having a speaker system that close to a residence is a major concern. Having the “escape” route emptying into a sub-sized alleyway is another concern. He would like to see a rearrangement of the lot itself, this would allow the speaker system to face the existing buildings on the south side of the lot.

Theresa Kopish spoke in opposition as currently designed, but would support the project with certain changes. This site is not only located close to residences but also a City park. She would like to protect that quality of life for all the people who use that park daily. The drive-thru traffic and speaker box are the biggest concerns. The development is a very tight fit on this lot. The Zoning Code specifies that a drive-thru sales and service window be 60-feet from any residential property; this is about 28-feet. Exit lanes should be 60-feet from residential

property; this exit lane is 11-feet. She asks that the site be designed so the speaker cannot be heard at all from neighboring homes.

Mike Pedelwitts spoke as a neighbor whose house would be affected by the speaker. This development would disrupt their lifestyle. He thinks people will be making turns to the right and turn into his driveway to turn around using the adjacent public alleyway.

Ald. Tim Bruer spoke to the difficulties of this site and to the credibility of this particular developer. They have been more than responsive and can hopefully find a win-win situation. He stated his constituents as well as many others in the neighboring area want a Dukin' Donuts in this location.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke of two neighborhood meetings they've held for this project. The neighborhood supports Dunkin' Donuts but do have issues. She feels they can come up with good solutions to most of the concerns, but the speaker box is a big issue. She encouraged the developer to find solutions that the speaker box because this site really needs to be developed and it not benefitting Park Street as it currently exists.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Have you responded to the comments from the MBNA as to what is doable and not doable?
  - The 6-foot high fence is already in place with a proposed option of a 10-foot fence at the alley to control noise. The setback is something we have not done. They have skinned up the lanes and added a combination of alternating bushes and grasses to help soften the sound. The ordering system, the speaker is not the analog speaker we're all used to. They are digital speakers that are adjusted automatically to the background noise going on. The average level on Park Street in the middle of the afternoon is 69 decibels. The level of these speakers is 70 so it's about comparable. Dunkin' Donuts is OK with limited drive-thru hours of 6 a.m. to 9 p.m.
- Have you explored a touch screen as opposed to a speaker box?
  - I can't say that I've seen a touch screen. I've seen two windows with two live people. The decibel readings that come out of the speaker system that Dunkin' Donuts uses is the same decibel as normal conversation. The maximum volume is 70 decibels.

If we could include language that this requirement is met at all times, I don't know if the neighborhood would be OK with that.
- Can you explain the alley, why you want to use it?
  - Putting the drive-thru on the other side would cause us to lose too many parking stalls. And queuing would back up onto Park Street which would be a huge issue.
- Tell me why the second lane to the alley is important.
  - If somebody comes in here and realizes that they don't want to do through the drive-thru, it gives them the option to get out without having to back up and wait for the queue. Secondly, if things did back up it would back up into the parking lot and cause people not to be able to back out of their stalls. They run their places very cleanly and neatly, very differently than they did 30 years ago. This is a rebranded Dunkin' Donuts with new owners.
- How does garbage get collected?
  - Those can be scheduled so it doesn't conflict with the operation of the drive-thru.
- Did you look at moving the "squawk box?"
  - We have moved it from 5 cars back to 4 cars. At 5 cars it points directly to the neighborhood; now it's angled down the angle more than directly at somebody's house.
- We have the UDD guidelines in front of us. Can you walk us through some of those basic elements and how the project fits it.



- Every commercial business has access out to the street. There is one live-work unit on the first floor. The upstairs has six apartments and they are accessed off of one entryway and an escape one. All four sides have the same level of finish.
- Can you control the decibel level so it doesn't go above 65 decibels?
- The massing and use seem fine outside of the drive-thru issues.
- How many visits per day do you expect or the drive-thru?
  - The projected number based on traffic and number in the community is around 375 cars per day through the drive-thru, with peak being 7-10 a.m.
- What is the purpose of the 8-foot setback?
  - In the future if they want outdoor seating. Part of the Park Street plan includes creating outdoor spaces and this allows flexibility to do that.

I wonder about the idea of running this building closer to the zero lot line or changing the shape of the building so you get some seating space on this side that's better protected. It seems like the 8-feet is neither urban nor open space.

- I see there are two units that do not have balconies.
    - That is my mistake. There are balconies for those units, at a depth of 5-feet.
  - I think this looks like a building that I would more expect to see out in a new development that's trying to be old. I think the materials take away from the strong street edge and doesn't give a sense of permanence from my perspective. It's a big red brick box.
  - If you pulled the building up so this was closer to the street you could get the open space. Or slide the building back 5-feet.
  - I think if you look at different materials you could get rid of the arched windows, which would look better with stone.
  - Why is there no street parking for tenants? Philosophically, streets are for parking.
    - Staff noted that's a long-standing policy by Traffic Engineering: if you're not accommodating your own need don't expect it'll be accommodated on the street for your exclusive use.
  - It's pretty clear to me that it's going to be complicated to write down what needs to be written down to satisfy the applicants and the neighbors. I would therefore move referral.
  - The architecture needs to be looked at very substantially. You have a tough site and will take some study in terms of proportion and strength on that corner.
  - Take a look at your rooftop elements. Maybe if integrated that would help you.
  - The spirit of older buildings is what you're looking for here, not to copy history.
  - Do the box and drive not quite meet code?
    - That's correct. Distance-wise. It doesn't meet the new code.
- I do like the touch screen suggestion. Plants are going to help aesthetically but not with noise levels. I think going with a touch screen is much more appropriate.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Slayton abstaining.

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 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 801 South Park Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	6	6	-	-	5	5	5
	5	5	-	-	-	6	7	-
	6	6	6	-	-	6	7	6

**General Comments:**

- Work on site plan and architecture.
- Work to go.

**Stouder, Heather**

---

**From:** Ellingson, Susan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2012 9:52 AM  
**To:** Stouder, Heather; Firchow, Kevin  
**Cc:** LURICAN CDM ONRS ASSC INC  
**Subject:** Support for Erin Square, 801 S Park St

To the Plan Commission:

I support Erin Square, the proposed development at 801 S Park St.

We have had several neighborhood meetings about this. The developer has worked hard to accommodate neighborhood concerns.

- They put an acoustical material on the fence and set up the ordering system for a test. Neighbors were satisfied that the sound from the speaker would not be intrusive.
- They brought the "escape lane" onto the site and will not use the existing alley.
- They agreed to reduced hours for the Dunkin' Donuts.

The site has been defunct for many years now. We look forward to a new building and a new business on Park St. Please support this proposal.

Thank you.

Sue Ellingson

.....  
Sue Ellingson, Alder • Madison District 13 [district13@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district13@cityofmadison.com) • 320-8206  
Subscribe to my updates: [www.cityofmadison.com/council/district13/updates](http://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district13/updates)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ellingson, Susan  
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2012 7:56 AM  
To: Martin, Al; Stouder, Heather; Rummel, Marsha;  
dokroley@dorschnerassociates.com; trbarchi@aol.com; jaharrin@tds.net;  
rslayton@erdman.com; mhuggins@charter.net; lufler@education.wisc.edu  
Cc: Pat McCaughey [info@mccaugheyproperties.com]; Aaron Crandall  
[aaron.crandall@yahoo.com]; John Bieno [jjbienotjkdesignbuild.com]; Tim Kritter  
[tkritter@tjkdesignbuild.com]  
Subject: 801 S Park St

To the Urban Design Commission:

I oppose the "squawk box" associated with the drive-up window for the proposed development at 801 S Park St. We have had two neighborhood meetings about this development. In both cases, the neighbors were strongly opposed to the speaker and had concerns about regular use of the very narrow public alley.

Otherwise, the proposal is good. It's an attractive building. It's on a vacant site that badly needs a new development. Discussions with the developers have given me a positive impression of the Dunkin' Donuts franchisee, who will provide benefits for his employees.

I, and others, have suggested putting the speaker at the south end of the site, where it would aim toward Park St and away from the neighbors. This could be achieved either by flipping the building to the other end of the lot or by dissociating the menu board and speaker from the building. Despite our requests, the developers have not presented this option. They say that it would reduce the amount of parking too much. They also hope to acquire additional property to the south of the site someday. Although they have no agreements with any of those owners, they feel that the parking lot in its current location would fit better with that hoped-for development.

This speaker is on a business that will operate \*every day\*. It's a grating sound that, even if quieter, is far more annoying than the sound of traffic. Sound is very disruptive; I get many complaints about noise from constituents. And it's hard to control -- sound barriers are seldom effective. A speaker just 70' away is an unreasonable intrusion on the lives of people who live there. If a drive-through is built here, it will be there forever.

Neighbors are also concerned that the "escape lane" next to the drive-through will cause customers to use the tiny alley regularly, including to get to parking on West Shore Dr.

I urge you to ask the developers to explore other site designs that will aim this speaker away from the neighborhood, and to deny the current layout.

Sincerely,

Sue Ellingson

.....  
Sue Ellingson, Alder

City of Madison, District 13  
[district13@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district13@cityofmadison.com)  
259-1824

**From:** Aaron Crandall [mailto:aaron.crandall@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2012 12:15 AM  
**To:** Martin, Al; Stouder, Heather; Rummel, Marsha; dokroley@dorschnerassociates.com; trbarchi@aol.com; jaharrin@tds.net; rslayton@erdman.com; mhuggins@charter.net; lufier@education.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** Pat McCaughey [info@mccaugheyproperties.com]; John Bieno [jjbienot@tjkdesignbuild.com]; Tim Kritter [tkritter@tjkdesignbuild.com]; Ellingson, Susan  
**Subject:** 16320, 801 S Park St

Urban Design Commission:

The Monona Bay Neighborhood Association (MBNA) has reviewed the most recent iteration of Capital Bassett, LLC's redevelopment proposal for 801 S. Park St. After our meeting with the site owner, developer, and a representative of the Dunkin' Donuts franchisee proposing to do business there, the association has taken a formal position.

MBNA is mindful of the need to redevelop the site in question. The Association supported the initial iteration of this proposal, when a four story building was being contemplated. However, with regard to the current, revised proposal, MBNA has strong concerns about the suitability and appropriateness of the site for a drive-through operation as proposed by Dunkin' Donuts franchisee. Hence, MBNA will support the current proposal only if all conditions listed below are met. Absent of these conditions being met, MBNA opposes the current proposal.

MBNA's support is contingent on meeting all of the following conditions:

1. A six foot set back of any structure or vehicle lane along the eastern border of the property.
2. Drive-thru ordering system ("squawk box") must be inaudible inside the adjoining, existing residential properties both in winter (windows closed) and summer (windows open). Suggested, but not a requirement: touch screen device or phone ordering system to eliminate the need of a speaker.
3. Hours of operation be confined to 6 AM to 9 PM on both weekdays and weekends, including limiting parking lot lighting and lit signage when not in operation (closed).
4. An acoustical and optical barrier at least 10' (ten feet) high be erected along the eastern border of the property, with it continuing along part of the northern edge (at least the eastern 3/4 of it) of the property. This barrier must meet the reasonable aesthetic and function demands of the adjoining property owners and the Urban Design Commission.
5. Either the City of Madison to close the alley at the northern end of the property to through traffic to only allow "escape traffic" to exit towards Park Street, or the developer removes the planned "escape lane" that feeds into the alley in its entirety.

Thank you for any and all consideration to our list of items above that would be required to gain our neighborhood's approval and acceptance of this proposal. Please contact me at [aaron.crandall@yahoo.com](mailto:aaron.crandall@yahoo.com) or 608-294-9505 if you have questions or need further information.

Aaron Crandall  
Monona Bay Neighborhood Association

**From:** Aaron Crandall [mailto:aaron.crandall@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, March 11, 2012 11:22 PM

**To:** Martin, Al; Stouder, Heather; Rummel, Marsha; dokroley@dorschnerassociates.com; trbarchi@aol.com; jaharrin@tds.net; rslayton@erdman.com; mhuggins@charter.net; luffler@education.wisc.edu

**Cc:** Pat McCaughey [info@mccaugheyproperties.com]; John Bieno [jjbienot@tjkdesignbuild.com]; Tim Ritter [tkritter@tjkdesignbuild.com]; Ellingson, Susan

**Subject:** 16320, 801 S Park St

**Urban Design Commission:**

After the UDC deferred this project on 1/18/12, project representatives modified the plans in response to the concerns expressed by neighbors and the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association (MBNA). We appreciate their collaboration and effort, and in response have adjusted the conditions upon which MBNA can formally support this development. The conditions below document the discussions between neighbors, MBNA, and the project representatives present at the 2/15 demonstration held at the site. Based on those discussions it is the understanding of the MBNA that the project representatives are willing and able to meet the conditions below, and thus will gain the support of the MBNA. MBNA respectfully requests that our six concerns below be formally recorded by the city as conditions of approval so that future changes to the project will not violate these agreements.

MBNA is mindful of the need to redevelop the site in question. The Association supported the initial iteration of this proposal, when a four story building was being contemplated. However, with regard to the current, revised proposal, MBNA has strong concerns about the suitability and appropriateness of the site for a drive-through operation as proposed by Dunkin' Donuts franchisee. Hence, MBNA will support the current proposal only if all conditions listed below are met. Absent of these conditions being met, MBNA opposes the current proposal.

MBNA's support is contingent on meeting all of the following conditions:

1. A six foot set-back of any structure or vehicle lane along the eastern border of the property.
2. Drive-thru ordering system ("squawk box") must be inaudible inside the adjoining, existing residential properties both in winter (windows closed) and summer (windows open).
3. Hours of operation of the drive-through ordering speaker will be confined to 6 AM to 9 PM on both weekdays and weekends.
4. Business hours will be confined to 4 AM to midnight on both weekdays and weekends including limiting parking lot lighting and lit signage when not in operation (closed).
5. An acoustical and optical barrier at least 10' (ten feet) high will be erected along the eastern border of the property, continuing along as much of the northern edge of the property as feasible. This barrier must meet the reasonable aesthetic and functional demands of the adjoining property owners and the Urban Design Commission. The structure and material proposed at the 2/15/12 demonstration consisting of two layers of wooden fencing with a layer of acoustically absorbent

material between is acceptable to MBNA, so long as the middle acoustically absorbent layer run the entire length of the property along with the fencing.

6. Encourage traffic to enter and exit from Park St. using site design and signage, including designing and building the traffic lanes so that executing a right turn onto the alley would be an extremely difficult maneuver.

Thank you for your consideration of our conditions of support. Please reply to this message if you have questions or need further information.

Aaron Crandall  
Monona Bay Neighborhood Association  
108 Proudfit St  
Madison, WI 53715