

## Comments and concerns regarding the new proposed plans for 1004 - 1032 South Park Street

The city received a land use application from Peloton Residences LLC dated October 30, 2018. This application was made available to the public on November 21, 2018. I began reviewing these plans and immediately found numerous errors and inconsistencies when comparing it to the Peloton plans approved by the city in 2017. On November 28, 2018, I talked to Kevin Firchow in the Madison Planning Department to explain that there were numerous errors and inconsistencies between these proposed plans and the Peloton plans approved by the city in 2017. On November 30, 2018 I sent a PDF document to the city planning department detailing all the errors and inconsistencies I had found so far in both the proposed revised plans and in the plans already approved by the city in 2017.

I wish to point out that the proposed plans submitted to the Planning Department on October 30, 2018 are no longer available on the City Planning website. They have been replaced with a new set of plans that are back dated October 30, 2018 but were actually created sometime after November 28, 2018. Pages 8, 10, 12, and 14 have the date December 12, 2018 on the page. On December 26, 2018 I found out from a neighbor that city planning received the revised proposed plans and placed them on the City Planning website on December 14, 2018. But, neither the Bay Creek Neighborhood association or the District 13 Alder received notice of the availability of the revised proposed plans until December 26.

The Letter of Intent and the plans first submitted to the city on October 30, 2018 and placed on the City Planning website on November 21, 2018 were so full of errors and inconsistencies that there was no way they could be used in an approval process for modifying the plans approved in 2017. Perhaps it was the developer's intent to provide some temporary revised plans on October 30, 2018 and then at a later date replace them with corrected and more complete plans. But the Letter of Intent and the first set of plans submitted on October 30, 2018 were completely inaccurate and incomplete. Comparing these documents to the plans approved in 2017 was impossible. The city should have figured this out shortly after receiving the application and plans on October 30, 2018 and immediately rejected the application as incomplete and full of errors and inconsistencies. After receiving a corrected set of plans, the city should have immediately announced the availability of the new plans and reset the timeline for the review process to allow the intended amount of time for each stage of the review process. But the city did not announce the availability of the new revised plans when they were placed on the city website. Only after a Bay Creek resident contacted the city on December 26 and asked when the new set of plans would be available did the city finally let it be known that the plans had been available for 12 day already. This gave the general public only 7 days to review the new plans before the initial UDC meeting was set to take place on January 2, 2019.

It is my belief that the UDC and the Plan Commission should not review or approve the proposed changes to this redevelopment project until the city has given proper notice to the general public, the UDC, and the Plan Commission of the availability of the proposed plans for review.

In the PDF document I sent to the city on November 30, 2018, I completely detailed all the errors and inconsistencies in the proposed plans that were originally submitted on October 30, 2018. I have uploaded a copy of that PDF to Google Docs for your reference because the city has yet to create a Legistar file for this application to amend the already approved plans. I have also uploaded the original proposed revised plans to Google Docs so that you can compare them to the approved plans and to the new revised proposed plans. The city has removed the link to the original proposed revised plans from the City Planning website making it impossible for you to otherwise compare the different sets of plans to verify that my assertions are correct. Use the links below to access and compare the various documents.

Link to the Peloton plans approved by the city in 2017:

<https://madison.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5444641&GUID=E5AF23A7-F670-4D8F-9716-9C13A6A5F128>

As of December 28, 2018, the original revised plans submitted to the city on October 30, 2018 are still available on the Madison Planning website using the following link:

[https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/1004sps\\_site.pdf](https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/1004sps_site.pdf)

Note that the cover page of these plans has an erroneous date of May 10, 2017.

In case the city removes the link to these original revised plans, I have uploaded the original proposed plans received by the city on October 30, 2018 to Google Drive and they can be viewed using the following link:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Petpqlmxv1CZ2ZfpxCP\\_QOWrDpB7DAZFR/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Petpqlmxv1CZ2ZfpxCP_QOWrDpB7DAZFR/view?usp=sharing)

I have also uploaded to Google Drive my original document detailing all the errors and inconsistencies in both the approved 2017 plans and the original revised plans. This document is identical to my original PDF sent to the city on November 30, 2018 with the exception of edits to the first page to provide additional links to the documents discussed in that document in case the original documents are no longer available on the city planning website. Here is the link to that document:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fLdmUMaCcQNbDsgXfA11Ni5m-vQv0D5\\_dPJY7fciWAo/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fLdmUMaCcQNbDsgXfA11Ni5m-vQv0D5_dPJY7fciWAo/edit?usp=sharing)

**The remainder of this document is devoted to errors; inconsistencies; and concerns I have that still remain even though the developer has submitted a new revised plan document that has attempted to correct the errors and inconsistencies in the previous document. Unfortunately the new revised plan documents and even the plans previously approved by the city in 2017 still contain many errors and inconsistencies that will affect the ability of the public ; the UDC; and the Plan Commission to properly understand what changes are being proposed and how those changes could affect the Bay Creek neighborhood.**

The Letter of Intent included with the proposed revised plan application is dated October 30, 2018 and gives the following reasons for the submittal of this land use application:

"We are requesting an amendment to a previously approved and recorded Specific Implementation Plan for Peloton Residences. This development was first approved by Planning Commission and Common Council in June of 2015 and then received approval for an amendment in September of 2017.

Specifically, we are requesting approval to convert the 16 lofts, the second floor of the 2 floor unit (5 studio lofts, 10 one bedroom lofts, and 1 two bedroom loft), to individual units; 5 additional studios, 10 additional one bedrooms, and 1 additional two bedroom. The only difference being that they'll each have a door. All of the existing 16 loft units already have bedrooms included in the loft area except for the 1 two bedroom, so the net new bedrooms being added is only 1. Further, the additional gross square footage being added, due to the loft-unit conversion, is less than 400 g.s.f. This conversion will occur within the currently approved building envelope."

The logic in the above set of paragraphs that gives a total of only one net new bedroom as a result of converting the 16 loft areas into 5 additional studios; 10 additional one bedroom units; and 1 additional two bedroom unit is flawed. The total number of new bedrooms created with the proposed revised plans is not 1 new bedroom but 17 new bedrooms.  $5 + 10 + 2 = 17$  NOT 1. The 10 loft one bedroom apartments in the approved 2017 plans are marked as one bedroom loft apartments on the plans, however, looking closely at these approved plans, the 10 one bedroom loft apartments actually have two bedrooms. One bedroom is on the fourth floor and another bedroom is on the fifth floor loft of that loft apartment actually making the 10 one bedroom loft units really 10 two bedroom loft units. If that is the actual intent of the plans then the total number of actual bedrooms in the approved plans would be 213 bedrooms as shown below:

#### Dwelling Unit Mix

Live/Work: 5 (the Live/work units each have 2 bedrooms)

Studio: 31

Studio Loft: 5

1 Bedroom: 75

2 Bedroom Loft: 10 (as shown on the approved plans)

2 Bedroom: 35

2 Bedroom Loft: 1  
Total Units = 162  
Total Bedrooms calculated from the above numbers = 213 bedrooms

But the Letter of Intent included with the approved 2017 plans gives these figures:

Dwelling Unit Mix

Live/Work: 5 (the Live/work units each have 2 bedrooms)  
Studio: 31  
Studio Loft: 5  
1 Bedroom: 75  
1 Bedroom Loft: 10  
2 Bedroom: 35  
2 Bedroom Loft: 1  
Total Units = 162  
Total Bedrooms calculated from the above numbers = 203 bedrooms

This shows a 10 bedroom discrepancy in the approved 2017 plans and the Letter of Intent for those plans.

If you look at the new Letter of Intent for the new proposed plans you see these figures:

Dwelling Unit Mix

Live/Work: 5 (the Live/work units each have 2 bedrooms)  
Studio: 38  
1 Bedroom: 90  
1 Bedroom + Den: 3  
2 Bedroom: 37  
Total Units = 173  
Total Bedrooms calculated from the above numbers = 215 bedrooms

But these numbers don't correlate with the fact that if  $5 + 10 + 2 = 17$  why doesn't the change in units add up to the expected total of 16 new units and 17 new bedrooms as one would expect? I couldn't figure out which documents were correct and which had the errors. So I set out to actually count the number of units and bedrooms drawn on the 2017 approved plans and on the new proposed plans. I double checked my numbers for each floor and created a spread sheet to better be able to see where the discrepancies are. Here is what I got for results and I fully believe these numbers are accurate:

Peloton 2017 approved plan LOI total units	162 units
Peloton 2017 approved plan total actual drawn units	151 units
Peloton 2017 approved plan total actual drawn bedrooms	202 bedrooms
Peloton proposed plan LOI total units	173 units
Peloton proposed plan total actual drawn units	167 units
Peloton proposed plan total actual drawn bedrooms	209 bedrooms

I have placed the spreadsheet with all the details on my Google Drive for those who want to check my work. Here is the link to that spreadsheet:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1N9SWnmFrU4OK4X3eUJQ6Gy76iw5WOUWqMlqcyfowmEA/edit?usp=sharing>

As you can see there is a discrepancy between the Letter of Intent unit numbers and the actual drawn unit numbers in both the approved 2017 plan and the proposed plan. The developer needs to recalculate the correct number of units and revise all documents that are in error. I believe the city should also double check that the final numbers are correct as well as thoroughly review all revised plans for accuracy. I don't see how the city can move forward and allow the UDC and the Plan Commission to review the request to modify the approved 2017

plans when both the Letters of Intent for the approved 2017 plans and the new revised proposed plans don't even state the correct number of units that would be built according to each set of plans.

**I will now detail remaining issues; concerns; and inconsistencies with the new revised plans for the Peloton.**

- According to my calculations given earlier in this document, the proposed plans will increase the total number of individual units from 151 to 167 and increase the total bedrooms from 192 to 209. The city requires off street parking to be provided at a ratio of one parking stall per unit. There are only 159 parking stalls provided in the building basement will only provide 0.95 parking stalls per unit. The proposal to use spare parking at Wingra Point across the street should be denied. The only reason they have spare parking stalls there is that the parking costs extra for the tenants living at Wingra Point. Already enough tenants at Wingra Point are parking on nearby residential streets that owners of other properties nearby are complaining about congested parking and blocked driveways in the vicinity of Wingra Point. There is also the need for parking for employees and customers of the commercial properties within the Peloton building complex. I do not see how this immediate neighborhood can absorb the expected additional street parking demands that the Peloton will require. It is difficult already to find on street parking in the immediate vicinity of the Peloton due to the parking demands of existing nearby businesses; apartment buildings; and the St. Mary Hospital complex. The city should realize the problems caused by excessive demand for on street parking as there are large areas of the city where this is already a major concern. It not only becomes more difficult to find a parking spot. It becomes more difficult for the city to pick up trash and recycled items; plow snow in the winter; and to clean the streets of debris that otherwise ends up in our lakes. The ambiance of the affected residential areas changes from having an open streetscape of green front yards with areas of flower gardens to having a walled appearance blocked off by two lines of parked vehicles filling each side of the street with their bumpers nudging the boundaries of every driveway. The area becomes less inviting to pedestrians and bicyclists and the neighborhood suffers for it.
- There are conflicts with the stated number of bike parking stalls that are available for Peloton tenants. the Letter of Intent states that there are 48 stalls in the basement parking area and an additional 76 stalls in a secure room in the basement plus 16 surface stalls outside. The revised proposed plans gives 48 stalls in the basement parking area and 80 stalls in a secure basement room and I can count 26 stalls outside on the first floor plan. Either way this is way too few bicycle parking stalls in a building complex having 209 bedrooms. With 209 bedrooms and only around 128 bike parking stalls in the basement and only maybe 26 bike parking stalls max. outside on the property, I foresee an abundance of bikes being carried up and down the elevators each day so the bikes can be secured inside apartment units. This is not the proper way to handle parking for bicycles in a residential building complex named Peloton Residencies. Tenants are going to get tired of schlepping their bikes up and down the elevators and the walls and carpeting of the building will be dinged up in the process. The lack of adequate bike parking will become a thorn in the side for many who chose to live at the Peloton.
- Are tenants going to be allowed to have dogs? There is not a single square foot of land on this property or nearby that is suitable for dogs to pee or poop on. I am a dog person, but I recommend a condition of approval that no dogs be allowed in these apartment units. The lawns of the nearest single family homes will bear the brunt of a constant assault of dog owners letting their dogs relieve themselves on private property. Furthermore, the Peloton is nearly surrounded with the heavy traffic of Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road. This is not safe or inviting place to be a dog.
- The new windowless hallway on the fifth floor along an exterior wall will create a featureless exterior wall visible to those at higher elevations to people looking out of windows at various locations within the Peloton apartment complex and from higher elevations in yet to be built buildings on the east side of Park Street in that block when that part of Park Street is redeveloped to higher density. Some windows along this hallway would help to break up an otherwise boring exterior wall. Windows along this hallway will also help to brighten the mood of occupants of these proposed tiny pigeon hole fifth floor apartment

units having only two small windows on one side of the apartments on the Fish Hatchery Road side of the building.

- The added fifth floor apartments are mostly tiny and have tiny windows and no balconies. This is not what you would expect on the top floor of a brand new luxury five floor apartment complex. The best units with gorgeous views of the city skyline should be on the top floors, not tiny little pigeon hole units with small windows and not even a balcony to sit out on. The Peloton is being build to make lots of money for the developer not to provide quality housing that anyone would want to live in for any length of time.
- The new stairwell box to the rooftop needs to have windows to break up that box and give natural lighting to the stairwell.
- I see no landscaping features shown on the rooftop open space. Need something to make this space more than a rooftop with a bunch of tables, chairs, and umbrellas surrounded by a guardrail. I worry about the umbrellas. if not properly secured, they could end up raining down on Park Street on a windy day and cause injuries. There is so little green space being provided for this redevelopment project that some greening of the rooftop area would be welcoming to tenants and guests. The ground level green space in the internal courtyard of this building complex is surrounded by tall building walls and offers little direct sunlight most of the day. Greening up of the rooftop open space would help a lot.
- The rooftop open space appears to not be handicap accessible whenever the commercial space on the sixth floor is closed. The two elevators to the sixth floor open into the commercial space on that floor and elevator access to this floor would probably not be available when this commercial space is closed. This issue needs to be corrected.
- Page 19 of the new plans has been replaced with page 20. Page 20 still incorrectly shows the rooftop open space as being smaller than shown on other pages of the plans. That image shows the perimeter guardrail only running part way down the Park Street side of that rooftop not all the way down the length of that roof top as shown on other pages.
- The address signage "1010" in large letters at the top of the building on Park Street will not be totally visible to people traveling on Park Street at all times due to the roof overhang blocking the view of some of the numbers from some locations along Park Street.

This document was thoughtfully provided by Ron Shutvet.

The document was a lot of work with such short notice of the availability of the revised proposed plans. I hope people read it and can see the concerns I have noted have merit and deserve the attention of the Madison Planning Department; the UDC; and the Plan Commission. The City of Madison seems to bend to the wishes of developers with each new project proposal and repetitively allow the developers to submit inaccurate plans for approval. The developers are then allowed to submit revised plans with such short notice of availability to the general public that it is nearly impossible for the public to take part in a meaningful discussion of the proposed redevelopment project before the various commissions and Common Council review and make their decisions on the proposed project.