



Department of Public Works
Parks Division

Madison Municipal Building, Room 120
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2987
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2987
PH: 608 266 4711
TDD: 608 267 4980
FAX: 608 267 1162

January 6, 2006

TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Simon Widstrand, Parks Development Manager
SUBJECT: **Union Corners**

S.W.

1. The developer shall pay approximately \$670,000 for park dedication and development fees.
2. Park Fees shall be paid prior to signoff for each SIP, or the developer may pay half the fees and provide a letter of credit for the other half. Developments with multiphase subdivision contracts may pay with each phase.

Calculation of fees in lieu of dedication plus park development fees for 450 units minus credit for 12 existing units:

Park dedication = 438 multifamily @ 700 square feet/unit = 306,600 square feet. The developer shall pay a fee in lieu of dedication based on the land value of the square footage of parkland required (up to a maximum of \$1.74 / square foot). **Estimated fee is \$533,484.00**

Park Development Fees = (438 @ \$524.16) = \$ 229,582.08

TOTAL PARK FEES = \$763,066.08

Maximum IZ park fee credit available = \$92,767.00

(IZ credit estimated for private open space land and improvements on 37,256 square feet in the town square and resident park, up to a maximum credit for land and improvements of \$2.49 per square foot).

Approval of plans for this project does not include any approval to prune, remove or plant trees in the public right-of-way. Permission for such activities must be obtained from the City Forester, 266-4816.

Please contact Simon Widstrand at 266-4714 or awidstrand@cityofmadison.com if you have questions regarding the above items.





Department of Planning & Development
Planning Unit

Website: www.cityofmadison.com

Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985
TDD 608 266-4747
FAX 608 266-8739
PH 608 266-4635

DATE: January 9, 2006
TO: Plan Commission members
FROM: Kitty Rankin, Preservation Planner
RE: French Battery Building

The French Battery Building as it currently stands has lost too much integrity to be considered historic and therefore required to remain in situ. The inherent problems with the building for renovating make it virtually impossible to retain it. In my opinion, rebuilding it at a slightly different location in a way that brings back more of its original character is the best option.

Brad Murphy

From: einpc-Union_Corners@yahoogroups.com on behalf of NAFTAIS@tds.net
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2006 10:26 PM
To: Brent Sieling; Judy K. Olson
Cc: SASYNA-Discussions@yahoogroups.com; einpc-Union_Corners@yahoogroups.com; jmelton@facstaff.wisc.edu; oscoda@tds.net; joycer@merr.com; jkrieg@chorus.net; dneulander@charter.net; meganberries@hotmail.com; jocillator@hotmail.com; Heartsinging@charter.net; pattiThompson@charter.net; rondo@chorus.net; joebock@cs.wisc.edu; jolson@operationfreshstart.org
Subject: Re: [einpc-Union_Corners] Re: [SASYNA-Discussions] Union Corners Response

Brent,

Thank you for these comments. I agree with your concerns about building height. Our neighborhood character would greatly change by the proposed construction of these 8 story buildings. The amount of visible sky and light would be greatly reduced by an eight story building. Think of the City County building or Oscar Mayer in a residential setting.

> Joe Schirmer

> From: Brent Sieling <bsieling24@charter.net>

> Date: 2006/01/09 Mon AM 04:51:16 GMT

> To: Judy Olson <district6@cityofmadison.com>

> CC: SASYNA-Discussions@yahoogroups.com, einpc-Union_Corners@yahoogroups.com,
> jmelton@facstaff.wisc.edu, oscoda@tds.net, joycer@merr.com,
> jkrieg@chorus.net, dneulander@charter.net, meganberries@hotmail.com,
> jocillator@hotmail.com, Heartsinging@charter.net,
> pattiThompson@charter.net, rondo@chorus.net, joebock@cs.wisc.edu,
> jolson@operationfreshstart.org

> Subject: [einpc-Union_Corners] Re: [SASYNA-Discussions] Union Corners
> Response

>

>

> Judy,

>

> I wanted to address a few points about your note on Union Corners. I agree completely with your statements on the street width and the Milwaukee St corner/parking lot. However, I have some significant disagreement with you on other points.

>

> 1) I think anyone involved with the Studio Process must feel they wasted their time - the plan presented is so far removed from what was proposed and discussed. When this whole project started, I told many people that McGrath was the best developer we could ask for, based on what he has done in the past. But this plan is so far removed from what we EVER heard (until the last 2 months), that it feels like we are blindsided. It feels like the only concern now is the "developer profit". I know Todd will do quality work with each building, but my enthusiasm for his approach to working with the neighborhood has changed 180 degrees. In my opinion, the Studio Process was a waste of time, unless this proposal (and all of the SIPs) still go before them. It feels unfair that after all the work of this process, the plan that went before Urban Design, and is now before the Plan Commission, is so far removed from what everyone was talking about.

>

> 2) I disagree completely with your statement on the building height: "If there is a ? right place? for taller buildings, this is it." I can understand these building heights near the Capitol and the University, where they create some connection to the other tall buildings, but there is NOTHING near that height anywhere near this location. I could also see tall buildings on the Anziger Farm, near the commercial end of the property. But this is a 1 to 2 story building neighborhood - it is so grossly out of scale. This will set a precedent for the ENTIRE length of E. Washington Avenue. What developer will now accept less than 8 stories? The "me too" & "oh - the economic viability of the project demands no less than 8 stories" sob stories will come pouring in. I can understand and accept 5 stories at this location (even though they will be dominating in comparison to the surrounding neighborhoods), but 8 stories? And why stop at 8 stories - why not 12, or 20? Where do you def!

ine the cutoff between reasonable and too much? The neighborhood plan calls for buildings along E. Washington to be no greater than 5 stories. Yes, I know this development is bigger than ever anticipated by that plan - but things always change. If the plans have no:

meanings in the face of change - then why even bother doing them? As you know the neighborhood association was split on the the issue of building height, so I don't think people realize what impact this will have until after it is too late - just like people woke up to Nolen Shores blocking the views of the Capitol from the John Nolen Causeway far too late.

>
> You make these statements: "With care, the developer can minimize impact on smaller structures, which are physically separated from the site by wide streets, the railroad corridor, and a significant hill." and "The site is physically separated from surrounding small-scale residential structures." Those physical separations are exactly why this development will become isolated, unless it has some aesthetic relationship to the surrounding neighborhood. I am concerned these height differences will only separate them more.

>
> Further you state: "The solar orientation of the proposed buildings will result in the least intrusive shadowing possible." I not sure how you arrived at that conclusion. From the limited shadow projections that were completed, the impact on buildings to the West in the morning was obvious. However, I noticed the projection only went up to 3 pm in the afternoon, including in the summer. If you were to deduce the morning shadows in the summer will be the same near sunset in the opposite direction, there will be vast blocks of houses to the East and some the South (due to the curve of the rail corridor) that will be in shadow much earlier in the evening. I know this for a fact, since for the past 8 years I have watched the sun set over the old Rayovac building from my front porch, where the plan now shows it will disappear behind an 8 story building. I hope that if the Planning Commission doesn't explicitly restrict the height to 5 stories, as the Neighborhood Plan calls for, !

that before any SIP greater than 5 stories moves forward, there is a complete shadow analysis.

>
> Brent Sieling, 105 Ohio Ave

>
> ---- Judy Olson wrote:
> > I have attached my comments on Union Corners, forwarded to the Plan
> > Commission via e-mail.

> >
> > Judy Olson

> >
> >
> >
> > Yahoo! Groups Links

> >
> > *> To visit your group on the web, go to:
> > <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/SASYNA-Discussions/>

> >
> > *> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
> > SASYNA-Discussions-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

> >
> > *> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
> > <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

> >
> >
> >

Union Corners Planning: <http://www.unioncorners.org/> List homepage:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/einpc-Union_Corners
Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/einpc-Union_Corners/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
einpc-Union_Corners-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
<http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>



REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS
103 N. HAMILTON STREET, MADISON WI 53703
608-255-3976/FAX 255-1132
www.mcgrathprojects.com

UNION CORNERS
French Battery Building and Project Timeline

We would like to respond to the recent concerns raised about the demolition of the remaining portion of the French Battery Building (FBB). Union Corners has been an incredibly complicated project that is approaching its third year of planning. Hopefully this will provide much needed background information to those concerned about the process and how we got to this point.

- McGrath Associates began working on this project in March of 2003 – when we were one of three developers selected by Rayovac to respond to their request for redevelopment proposals. We were selected a few months later, and spent the next several months negotiating an Option to Purchase.
- In September of 2003 we began working with the neighborhood Design Studio and our conceptual plans developed with input from this group included the restoration of the 3-story portion of the FBB. The Design Studio process concluded 8 months later with a large neighborhood meeting on May 26, 2004. This was very early in the development process and we knew that the FBB had some issues but we had not completed our due-diligence regarding the feasibility of the restoration.
- In order to perform the environmental remediation of the site – which resulted in the removal of approximately 60,000 tons of battery-related waste - the demolition of the factory outbuildings and the two-story wing addition began in the Fall of 2004. During the demolition we discovered some significant issues with the existing building – that are primarily a result of how the building was constructed.
- The original building was a 1-story factory building and was built in 1916, the ceiling heights range from approximately 12 to 15 feet with the high point being in the middle. In 1920 a 50-foot deep, 2-story office addition was built over the top of the front of the factory floor. This addition was built in a manner that did not disrupt factory operations - wood blocking was used to support the new 2nd floor joists on the roof structure of the original 1-story factory.
- These issues challenge the feasibility of renovating the French Battery Building:
 1. The first floor is low and floods during heavy rainfall events. The proposed site design adds 27,000 CY of fill to the site, including approximately 1.5 feet of fill at the FBB.
 2. There is only 1 stair – a second stair would be required to meet code.
 3. The existing column spacing is very narrow and would not accommodate today's uses.
 4. Cast-iron columns were used – these can present a safety-risk
 5. Due to structural issues the rear wall of the building would require a complete tear-down and rebuild – the exterior wall bears on a beam that bears on the old factory roof truss which sits outside the face of the exterior wall.
 6. The second floor was constructed with 2" x 8" joists - 24" on center – and as mentioned above - it was constructed over the top of the original factory roof using wood blocks.. This floor is very "springy" in areas and will not meet today's commercial building code.
 7. The existing roof structure is suspect and is definitely not adequate to support the load of a green roof.
 8. Environmental issues exist – asbestos, lead paint and manufacturing residue.

- Following the completion of the Design Studio process more properties became available and were acquired – expanding the scope of the project to 5th Street. A total of 22 parcels have been acquired.
- In the Summer of 2005 it was determined that renovating the FBB was likely not feasible and that its relocation allows for improved site access and circulation which dramatically improved the viability of the project as a whole. Specifically, it allowed us to terminate Winnebago near 5th St. and pushed the new street that runs parallel to E. Washington an additional 100' further away from the intersection of 6th and E. Washington, thereby increasing the traffic stacking ability of 6th St. and additionally providing enough room to install a traffic circle.
- The site plan was further refined – with the proposed reconstruction and relocation of the FBB at a new but adjacent location using the 1920 construction plans. Brick salvaged from the demolition will be used for the exterior walls of the reconstructed building. The concrete medallions and the “French Carbon and Battery Building” signage will also be salvaged and reused.
- In September of 2005, six informational meetings were held with the neighborhood to present our new site plan, including one large meeting on September 13th that was facilitated by Rebecca Krantz of the EINPC and had approximately 115 people in attendance. The demolition of the FBB and its reconstruction in a new location was clearly presented and discussed and no concerns were raised by those in attendance.
- The GDP was submitted on October 26, 2005.
- We went before the Urban Design Commission on 12/7/05 and were referred to the 12/21/05 meeting.
- On 12/8/05 we met with SASYNA, and presented a slightly modified plan that addressed most of the neighborhood concerns raised at the 12/7/05 UDC Meeting. Including, adjusting the Winnebago Street extension to allow for the preservation of two more large trees (an Oak and a Maple), relocating the rebuilt FBB to a more prominent location at the Winnebago entrance to the project - overlooking the resident park which includes the stand of preserved trees, and altering the A/B Buildings so that it extends to the E. Washington/Milwaukee St. intersection.
- On 12/14/05, this revised plan was submitted to the UDC for the 12/21/05 Meeting.
- On 12/20/05 the revised plan was submitted to the City as an amendment to the 10/26/05 GDP submittal.
- On 12/21/05 the project received Initial and Final Approval from the UDC.
- The Planning Unit Report to Plan Commission dated 1/9/06 acknowledges the necessity of the demolition and reconstruction.....*“This relocation is a key component of the overall redevelopment project and integral to the viability of the plan.”*

In summary, even though the condition of the existing building likely makes renovation infeasible, the removal of the FBB is required to create the best access to the site and is critical to the viability of the project. The historic reconstruction of the FBB at the Winnebago Street entrance to the project directly across the street from the preserved stand of oak trees acknowledges the historical significance of the building while repositioning it to successfully fit within the context of the project.