

CITY OF MADISON
Common Council
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Rm. 417
266-4071

DATE: April 5, 2007

TO: Nan Fey, Chair, Plan Commission
Members of the Plan Commission

FROM: Ald. Ken Golden, District 10
Ambassador to Pluto

SUBJECT: **Monroe Arbor Drive Redevelopment**

I write in strong support of Jim Corcoran and Randy Bruce's development on the 2600 block of Monroe Street and Arbor Drive. The project is a model for how to integrate higher density infill development involving taller buildings into an existing business district and neighborhood. It merits approval and high praise for the PUD and for the demolition permits.

Let me touch on the neighborhood process and the factors I think merit your positive consideration. Two neighborhood meetings were held on the project. In the first, while the general reaction to the concept presented was favorable, there were ten or eleven separate issues that folks in the audience raised, and we asked the developer to consider alternative strategies. The major areas of concern were whether or not to have the walkway designed to segregate cars from pedestrians or use a Woonerf; whether to demolish the corner building and incorporate the lot into the project; roof line details; Monroe Street access; and other important issues. At the second meeting, each of these issues was raised and discussed again. Randy Bruce presented very viable and constructive alternatives to the neighbors and a final, consensus version of the project was approved by those in attendance. There are some in the neighborhood who do have concerns, some of whom were at the first meeting, but some opponents chose not to be part of the process. I don't think their strategy should be rewarded nor do I think their points are valid. Consider the project as presented on its merits.

The project has a number of strong points worthy of mention:

- ♦ While I never thought I would even see another 4+ story building, the way this building is tucked in 90+ feet from Monroe Street makes it a wonderful example of how to hide height, bulk and mass. I think the step backs on both sides succeed in maintaining the character of the neighborhood, the blocks on which they are placed, and the general scale of the neighborhood while still providing a higher density product in the middle of the block.
- ♦ The creation of this kind of condominium unit speaks to a changing demographic in both the city and the neighborhood. People who have finished raising their children can now aspire to maintain residence in the neighborhood without having to own a single-family home. I think that is a good thing.
- ♦ I will let the architecture of the building speak for itself. In my estimation, it is exceedingly positive. The fenestration on the Arbor Drive side coupled with the anticipated planting of

additional trees in the park make for a successful rendering.

- ♦ The mixed-use aspect of the project is extremely positive. Having another restaurant on Monroe Street is not a bad thing, given current lifestyles. You may want to consider mandating Thai food.
- ♦ At last report, the inclusionary zoning plan appears to be adequate and justified. For the critics of inclusionary zoning, it is interesting that the neighborhood is quite happy to see some level of income diversity in this and other projects. The price points discussed were also seen as a positive. There will be greater income diversity, albeit at levels above median income – not a bad thing.
- ♦ Mention also needs to be made of the walkway between Monroe Street and Arbor Drive, connecting Monroe to Wingra Park. In the project's early phases, this was something I wanted to see if the developer could accomplish, and I think they've done so in a wonderful way. While the mixing of vehicles and pedestrians on the Arbor Drive side is certainly not ideal, I think the conversion of the walkway to a sidewalk with a driveway addresses any safety concerns people expressed. Frankly, I think those concerns were somewhat overblown given the projected traffic volume. I would have preferred to see the entire driveway with consistent and inviting pavers, but I think the general consensus of the neighborhood was otherwise.

One condition suggested by the Traffic Engineer may be considered for removal. I do not think this project should be excluded from permit parking programs. The ratio is on the low end of moderate, and the transit-oriented potential is high, given the location. This is not currently a commuter-impacted area and, frankly, even if it were to become so, I do not think this building is providing too few spaces.

Finally, it did not escape me that there are some demolitions involved that may be of potential concern. At least two of the buildings in question appear to be in reasonable shape. The plan originally called for retaining the third building, on the corner, and it is probably in worse shape than the other two. It might actually be in a sufficiently poor condition to justify demolition. In this case, however, I would prefer that the Plan Commission look at the comp plan and the overall plan for the Monroe Street Business District and its implications for the neighborhood and to approve the demolition on the basis of that plan. If we are going to have infill development along this transit corridor and in this business district, given the age of the neighborhood, we will run out of decrepit buildings fairly quickly and get nowhere. I think it is important that we approve these demolitions on the basis that our Comprehensive Plan and our Monroe Street Plan are calling for a change in land use along the corridor to create greater density and different and additional housing opportunities. I don't think the buildings are so great as to offer their retention as a viable alternative, so I think the demolition should be done on the basis of planning principles. I hope those of you on the Demolition Subcommittee take note of that and permit demolitions of this type to continue. Obviously, recycling, moving, etc. have been considered and adopted as conditions of approval, so that should not be an issue.

It's been a pleasure working with Mr. Corcoran and Mr. Bruce. They may have been the most responsive developers I have ever dealt with in all my years on the Council. I hope this project is approved at both the Plan Commission and Common Council level. I'll be here for the Plan Commission level and will leave it to the new Council to approve this development at a meeting I will probably watch on TV.

April 5, 2007

Page 3

Thanks much for your consideration. Show the wisdom of Solomon and approve this!

cc: Mayor Dave Cieslewicz
Brian Solomon, Alder Elect
Members of the Common Council Elect
Audrey Highton, President, Dudgeon-Monroe Neighborhood Association
Jim Corcoran, J Michael Real Estate
Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC
Brad Murphy, Director, Plan Unit



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

April 6, 2007

TO: Plan Commission
 FROM: Simon Widstrand, Parks Development Manager
 SUBJECT: **2607 Monroe Street**

S.W.

1. The developer shall pay \$56,262.83 for park dedication and development fees.
2. Prior to City signoff on this project, the developer shall select a process for paying the park fees, and meet the requirements of that process.
3. There are no features of this SIP that qualify for IZ park fee reduction credits.
4. The developer has agreed and been granted permission to plant additional trees in Wingra Park to screen the new building from the park.

Calculation of fees in lieu of dedication plus park development fees for 45 units minus 14 existing units removed:

Park Dedication = 31 multifamily units @ 700 square feet/unit = 21,700 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 \$1.82 / square foot). **Fee is \$39,494.00**

Park Development Fees = (31 @ \$540.93) = \$ 16,768.83

TOTAL PARK FEES = \$56,262.83

Park fee payment checks shall be payable to the City of Madison Treasurer, and all questions, payments and deliveries shall be made to the office of the Madison Parks Division. Prior to City signoff on this project, the developer shall select one of the following options for paying these fees:

1. Payment of all fees in a lump sum prior to City signoff on the project.
2. The developer may pay half the fees and provide a two-year letter of credit for the remaining half of the fees, both prior to City signoff.

3. The fee payment may be paid within fourteen days of issuance of any zoning, conditional use or building permit. No certificate of occupancy may be issued for buildings on any parcel for which there are unpaid impact fees. Under this option, the fees shall be calculated and prorated to each lot on the development, and the developer shall record a notice of the outstanding impact fees for each lot prior to receiving City signoff for the project. All fees shall be paid at the rate in effect at the time of payment.

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.

Murphy, Brad

From: McCormick, Dan
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2007 3:48 PM
To: Parks, Timothy; Wheeler, Jim
Cc: Ross, Arthur; Leach, John; Golden, Ken; Dryer, David; Dettmann, Dan; Murphy, Brad
Subject: RE: Condos to be built at 2607 Monroe St

Jim, Tim,

Thanks for passing along the comments. The issue of doing more treatments on Monroe St really rests with the neighborhood--our understanding is that they are not in support of traffic signals, or if they are they also want several streets closed concurrently. Alder Golden and others may want to add comments as well, particularly if there has been any recent indication of change from the neighborhood.

TE noted at the past two neighborhood meetings re. this development, that we have offered several iterations of traffic signal proposals over the last decade with the neighborhood. TE has tried to forward past traffic signal studies aimed to improve traffic management and pedestrian needs, including potential traffic signals at Knickerbocker. However, any of these plans keeps getting shot down by the neighborhood. Our understanding is that the residents cannot develop any consensus or support.

TE has also reviewed the street area from Commonwealth to Knickerbocker and determined that pedestrian safety enhancements are desirable, and safety could be enhanced by the installation of pedestrian activated yellow flashers that would operate when activated by pedestrian push button at Sprague. This would cost approximately \$20,000 to \$30,000, and also needs some additional study and input.

At the request of the Alder, TE has also lowered the speed limit on sections of Monroe St from 30 mph to 25 mph. There is a request to extend this to the westernmost section, but the signs have limited effect.

With the Trader Joe's project, we fought hard to get some kind of pedestrian refuge island on Monroe St. at Harrison--our fight was only partially successful as the island is a bit small, but still helpful to protect the in-street Yield to Pedestrian sign installed there several years ago.

The traffic signal at Leonard, Edgewood HS/College has been beneficial but this is only one section. Plans to realign and signalize Edgewood Ave have also run into opposition.

Lastly, we repeated similar comments in the recent draft Monroe Street Commercial District Plan. We noted that the Plan should include a reference to past traffic signal studies aimed to improve traffic management and pedestrian needs, including potential traffic signals at Knickerbocker with a fiscal note of \$60,000.

We also noted that the Plan needs to recognize that many of the desires/recommendations will have fiscal and budget implications for the recommendations to improve the corridor's pedestrian access, safety and environment (page 50, 56, 57). Pedestrian crossing treatments at three locations (e.g., Arbor, Sprague and Edgewood) are estimated to cost approximately \$15,000 apiece for a total of \$45,000. The plan should also note that pedestrian islands need additional right of way to be installed; therefore, other treatments likely will need to be pursued.

Again we are, and have been for many years, supportive of doing more for this corridor if and when the residents and neighborhood association are ready and willing. To date we have not seen that support.

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

From: Parks, Timothy
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2007 11:04 AM
To: Wheeler, Jim
Cc: McCormick, Dan; Ross, Arthur; Leach, John

Subject: RE: Condos to be built at 2607 Monroe St

Jim,

We are well aware of the very same issue, and I think that's probably the number one or only concern about the project from the neighborhood. I have copied Dan McCormick, John Leach and Arthur Ross in Traffic Engineering to make them aware of your concern as they prepare their comments for the April 9 Plan Commission meeting. I will also put a copy of your e-mail in the materials that go to the Plan Commission as part of their review.

All the best,

TIM PARKS
Planner, Planning Division
Dept. of Planning and Community
and Economic Development
City of Madison, Wisconsin
T: 608.261.9632
F: 608.267.8739

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

From: Wheeler, Jim
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2007 9:50 AM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Condos to be built at 2607 Monroe St

Good morning Tim,
I am Captain Jim Wheeler, the commander of the South Police District. I have been thinking about the plans regarding the construction of Condos in the 2600 blk of Monroe St. I want to pass along to you a concern that I have in reference to this plan.

I receive numerous traffic complaints along Monroe St. especially in the areas of Trader Joe's, Edgewood, and Knickerbocker. The complaints go from speeding to pedestrians not being able to cross Monroe St safely. I am wondering if some thought has been put into additional stop light/s in the area, especially at Knickerbocker since the potential is that there could be up to 90 more vehicles in the area.

I am not opposed to the construction of the Condos. I just wanted to put this out since the additional vehicles in the area would most likely lead to an increase in traffic complaints. Thank you

Jim Wheeler, Captain of Police
South District
825 Hughes Pl
Madison, WI 53713
ph: 608 266-5938
fax: 608 266-4453



TO: Members of the Plan Commission
FROM: Hickory R. Hurie
SUBJECT: Analysis of request for waiver for 2607 Monroe Street
DATE: April 6, 2007

SUMMARY:

Corcoran Development has proposed the construction of a 45-unit condominium on a site in the Dugeon-Monroe neighborhood near Lake Wingra, Knickerbocker Place and an existing neighborhood business district. The developer requested a waiver and reduction in the number of required inclusionary zoning units. The current zoning includes two parcels; Planning staff analyzed the current density of these parcels and concluded that the proposed development requested an increase of 17 residential units above the current zoning level of 28.

Staff recommend Plan Commission rejection of the request for a wavier reduction and instead require the development to include the 15% level of inclusionary zoning units established in the ordinance. However, since the Oversight Committee is still in the process of developing the 'gap analysis tool', staff recommend that the Plan Commission permit the developer to return to the Plan Commission for review of the placement of the iz units, if the Oversight Committee completes its adoption of the gap analysis tool within 60 days.

This analysis for an inclusionary zoning waiver is based upon data furnished by the developer and by the Planning Unit during March 2007.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS:

The Council adopted a waiver provision as part of the inclusionary dwelling unit ordinance that requires an analysis of project financial feasibility. The method consists of running three or more scenarios, using data provided by the developer. The first run is based upon a scenario whereby the project, using current zoning levels, is set at market rate rentals. If this version is financially feasible according to the standards adopted by the Common Council, the project is then run with the full 15% inclusionary dwelling units included in the project. If this full IZ scenario does not meet the Council standards for financial feasibility, staff are to recommend a third 'waiver' scenario with attributes (a combination of a partial percentage of IZ units, with units off-site, or payment in lieu of units on-site or reduction of expected number of units) that will provide a sufficient return for financial feasibility.

MARKET RATE SCENERIOS:

Staff conducted an initial 'market run at current density of the proposed site, using the developer-provided information and the Planning Unit-provided current base density analysis. Planning Unit staff concluded that current zoning permitted 28 residential units on the site; the proposed development seeks an additional 17 units. The initial analysis at 28 units suggested that a development at current zoning would produce a gross profit margin within the adopted City standards of 12.5% to 17.5%, and therefore qualifies for waiver consideration.

SECOND STEPS SCENERIOS, with iz units and incentives/offsets:

Staff then ran a second scenario with the pro forma for the development at the proposed density level, and included the effect of a full 15% inclusionary unit requirement.

The combined effect of greater density and other incentives were sufficient to produce an estimated gross profit margin within the standards adopted by the Council, since the density bonus represents a two-thirds (17/25) increase in the current density. Hence staff recommend no waiver for this project.

CONCLUSION:

Based on current information, staff recommend that the developer be expected to provide a total of 7 inclusionary dwelling units as part of the development.