

Additional comments on the proposed revised Peloton plans - January 13, 2019

This document serves as an update to the two documents that I submitted earlier to the Madison Planning Department on December 31, 2018 and on January 4, 2019.

I recently discovered that I had made some mistakes trying to count the total number of units and bedrooms in the proposed new plans for the Peloton as well as in the already approved 2017 Peloton plans. After looking over my notes and both sets of plans I noticed that I had miss-counted 6 one bedroom apartments in both sets of plans.

The LOI for the approved 2017 Peloton plans gives the following:

Dwelling Unit Mix:

Live/Work	5
Studio	31
Studio Loft	5
1 Bedroom	75
1 Bedroom Loft	10
2 Bedroom	35
2 Bedroom Loft	1
<hr/>	
Total	162 total units

The total number of bedrooms would be 208 bedrooms with this unit mix.

Here are my updated unit and total bedroom counts based on the actual total units and total bedrooms drawn on the approved 2017 plan pages:

Dwelling Unit Mix:

Live/Work	5
Studio	31
Studio Loft	5
1 Bedroom	67
1 Bedroom Loft	0
1 Bedroom plus den	3
2 Bedroom	35
2 Bedroom Loft	11
<hr/>	
Total	157 total drawn units

The total number of actual bedrooms drawn in the approved 2017 plans is 208 bedrooms. However 10 of these bedrooms are in the 10 units labeled as one bedroom units but are drawn as 2 bedroom units. I believe the intended number of bedrooms in the approved 2017 plans is 198 total bedrooms based on the actual number of drawn units on those plans and the LOI statement that there are 10 one bedroom loft units not 10 two bedroom loft units.

Note: My counts are based on the actual count of bedrooms drawn on the approved 2017 plans; not the type of unit written on the plan pages for each floor. For instance, the 10 one bedroom lofts listed in the LOI are actually drawn as two bedroom lofts on the plan 4th and 5th floor pages. Even though these 10 loft units have the words "one bedroom loft" written on each of these units they are actually drawn as 2 bedroom units. There is also a discrepancy of 5 more units listed in the LOI than are drawn on the approved 2017 plans. I am not sure how the LOI numbers came about but they give 5 more units than are actually drawn on the plans.

The most recent revised LOI submitted to the UDC on January 2, 2019 for the revised proposed Peloton plans gives the following:

Dwelling Unit Mix:

Live/Work	5
Studio	38
1 Bedroom	90
1 Bedroom + Den	3
2 Bedroom	37
Total	173 total units

The total number of bedrooms would be 215 bedrooms with this unit mix.

Here are my updated unit and total bedroom counts counted from the units and bedrooms drawn on the revised proposed Peloton plan pages:

Dwelling Unit Mix:

Live/Work	5
Studio	41
1 Bedroom	88
1 Bedroom plus den	2
2 Bedroom	37
Total	173 total units

The total number of bedrooms would be 215 bedrooms with this unit mix.

Although the total units and total bedrooms are the same there is a discrepancy between the new revised LOI and the new proposed drawn plans as to the number of studio and 1 bedroom units.

From these numbers it is obvious that the intended number of total units and total number of bedrooms in the approved 2017 plans is 157 total units and 198 intended total bedrooms. An additional 10 bedrooms were actually drawn in the ten 1 bedroom loft units in these plans giving a total counted drawn bedroom total of 208 bedrooms.

Therefore, if the proposed Peloton plans contain 173 total units and 215 total bedrooms, then there are 16 additional units and 17 additional bedrooms in the proposed Peloton plans over the intended number of units and bedrooms in the approved 2017 Peloton plans.

The total parking spaces available in the basement level of both plans is the same at 159 vehicle stalls. At the city required one parking space per unit, this means there are 14 more units than available parking stalls. While some tenants may have one vehicle per rented unit. While some tenants may not own a vehicle at all and therefore not need a reserved parking stall, many units will likely contain more than one adult and may have two vehicles. Some units may also have guests that spend the night who also would need a place to park if they arrived with their own vehicle.

Also, there is no reserved parking on site for any of the customers or employees of the commercial areas proposed on this property. Where will all of these people park their vehicles?

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. 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 already realize the problems caused by excessive demand for on street parking as there are large areas of the city where this is 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.

A total of 173 apartment units containing a total of 215 bedrooms is too much for this property. If the developer cannot provide for off street parking for all of the units and all of the tenants, this proposed revision of the Peloton should be denied.

A better plan for this area due to the parking issues would be to remove the entire 5th floor of apartments and place the 6th floor commercial space and rooftop open space on the 5th floor instead. But even then there would still be a shortage of parking for the commercial customers and employees. The proposed Peloton Residences is just too big for this triangular piece of property. Surrounding nearby properties will suffer from its existence.

Ron Shutvet
Madison WI