

PLANNING UNIT REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
June 9, 2005

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, FILE I.D. 01229 LOCATED AT 1725 WALDORF BOULEVARD:

1. Requested Action: Approval of a rezoning from PUD(GDP) to Amended PUD(GDP)-PUD(SIP) to allow the construction three buildings containing a total of 60 condominium units and 5,700 square feet of retail and office space.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.07(6) provides the framework and guidelines for Planned Unit Development Districts. Section 28.12(10) provides the guidelines for zoning map amendments.
3. Report Drafted By: Peter Olson, Planner II.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. Applicant: Terrence Temple, Barrow Ridge, LLC, 429 Gammon Place, Suite 200, Madison, WI 53719; and J. Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects, 7601 University Avenue, Suite 201, Middleton, WI 53562.
2. Status of Applicants: Property owner/developer and architect.
3. Development Schedule: The applicant wishes to commence construction in the fall of 2005. The applicant hopes to have initial occupancy of the proposed development by fall 2006 with completion of this project by 2008.
4. Parcel Location: Northeasterly intersection of Waldorf Boulevard with Mayo Drive approximately one block north of Mid-Town Road and midway between South High Point Road and County Trunk Highway M in the Mid-Town Commons Traditional Neighborhood Development, Aldermanic District 1, Madison Metropolitan School District.
5. Parcel Size: 65,545 square feet (1.50 acres).
6. Existing Zoning: PUD(GDP) Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan District. The underlying General Development Plan authorizes this site to be provided with a mixed-use development providing a variety of commercial and residential land uses.
7. Existing Land Use: Vacant lot.
8. Proposed Use: A mixed-use building containing 32 dwelling units and 24-unit and 4-unit condominium buildings. The overall development will provide 5,700 square feet of retail and office space and 60 total condominium units.

8

9. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning (See map):

- North – Multi-family, single-family and duplex units zoned PUD(SIP).
- East – Multi-family and single-family homes zoned PUD(SIP), R1, R2T and R3.
- South – Vacant lands approved for mixed-use development and apartments zoned PUD(GDP) and R5 in the City of Madison and scattered single-family homes zoned County A-1 in the Town of Verona.
- West – Vacant lands approved for mixed-use development and multi-family homes zoned PUD(GDP) and PUD(SIP) in the City of Madison and single-family homes and farmland zoned County A-1 in the Town of Middleton.

10. Adopted Land Use Plan: The Mid-Town Commons Development has been designated for medium density residential uses in the adopted High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan (26-40 units per acre). The subject property has further been designated for a mixed-use development, including commercial retail and office space and a maximum of two dwelling units within the underlying approved Mid-Town Commons General Development Plan.

11. Environmental Corridor Status: This property is not located within a mapped environmental corridor.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICES:

A full range of urban services are being extended to the neighborhood as development continues.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

This application is subject to the Planned Unit Development District standards.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION:

- Existing Site Characteristics

The proposed project site consists of 65,545 square feet (1.50 acres). This site was created in late 2000 as part of the Mid-Town Commons Traditional Neighborhood Development and underlying General Development Plan to guide the physical development of this project. The final plat of Second Addition to Mid-Town Commons, which created the underlying lot was recently recorded. Please note that lot configurations in the Section Addition to Mid-Town Commons vary slightly from those shown on the preliminary plat and approved General Development Plan map. The subject property is now known as Lot 95, Second Addition to Mid-Town Commons (see attached final plat map and General Development Plan revision dated April 25, 2005). The subject property is located at the northeasterly intersection of Waldorf Boulevard and Mayo Drive.

This parcel is relatively level with an undulating topography varying approximately 6-feet in elevation throughout the site. A previously approved 81-unit apartment development is currently being constructed along the easterly property line. A public, urban plaza will be constructed by the subdivider on Lot 94, adjacent on the north. Vacant lots across Waldorf Boulevard will be developed with 10 dwelling units and a public sub-neighborhood park. Lands to the south of Mayo Drive will be additional mixed-use development providing retail and office space, upper level dwelling units and townhouses.

- Site Plan

The proposed development will consist of three individual buildings. The southeasterly-most structure will contain 24 dwelling units. The southwesterly building will provide 5,700 square feet of first floor retail and office space, live-work units and 32 total dwelling units on the first through fourth floors. The northerly-most building will be a 4-unit townhouse building. Off-street parking will be provided in the basement of the proposed buildings and a surface parking facility will be located in the northeasterly portion of this lot. All buildings will be interconnected by a private walkway system, which will also provide direct connections from multiple building entrances directly to the public walkway system along Mayo Drive and Waldorf Boulevard. Front yard setbacks will range from approximately 12 to 14-feet as specified by the commercial/mixed-use (Type V) district within the Mid-Town Commons General Development Plan. It should be noted that the provided front yard setback is slightly greater than the maximum 10-foot setback the General Development Plan requires due to a 12-foot wide utility easement recorded on the final plat as part of the subdivision approval. This easement supersedes the GDP zoning text requirement. The zoning requirements such as side yard and rear yard setbacks will also be met and the proposed structure will not exceed four stories nor 60-feet in height, as specified. The proposed landscape plan indicates a significant quantity of foundation plantings surrounding the proposed structure, in addition to canopy shade trees and understory plants.

- Building Plans

The 24-unit and 32-unit buildings will each be four stories in height with a flat roof. Siding type will include horizontal plank siding along the base with smooth concrete masonry units with a recessed brick course for detail. The three upper floors will include 6-inch horizontal siding and brick veneer. Window detail and the building cornice will include precast detail and aluminum coping. These two structures represent a neo-traditional, urban style architecture. The proposed 4-unit building will be three stories in height with a similar siding and appearance, but will feature a predominantly hip roof with gable end detail. The building is intended to be compatible in design with the previously approved 6-unit apartment building immediately to the east of the location of this proposed 4-unit dwelling. This proposed 4-unit building and the previously approved 6-unit building will provide a visual background for the proposed urban plaza to be located north of these buildings at the intersection of Waldorf Boulevard and Ridge Drive.

The proposed dwelling unit mix will include sixteen 1-bedroom units, thirty-two 2-bedroom units, four 2-bedroom townhouse units (in the 4-unit building) and eight live-work units located in the 32-unit building. These 60 dwelling units will provide an overall density of 39.9 dwelling units per acre on this 1.50 acre development site. This density is at the upper end of the

8

recommended 26-40 dwelling units per acre contained within the adopted High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan.

- Off-Street Parking

This proposal will include 25 lower level parking stalls in the 24-unit building, 36 lower level parking stalls in the 32-unit building, and four 2-car garages in the lower level of the 4-unit building containing a total of 8 garage stalls. In addition, 28 surface parking stalls will be provided in the northerly and easterly portions of this site. This overall parking provision includes 97 off-street parking stalls providing a parking ratio of 1.62 off-street parking stalls per dwelling unit.

In addition to motor vehicle parking, the lower level of the 24-unit building will include 6 bicycle stalls, the 32-unit building 14 bicycle stalls, with additional bicycle parking in the garages of the 4-unit building. Three surface bicycle racks providing 8, 10 and 13 bicycle stalls respectively will be provided for visitor and resident use. In addition, residents may park bicycles within their private storage lockers.

- Consistency With Adopted Plans

The adopted High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan designates this site for medium density residential purposes. This designation recommends a density range of 26-40 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development will yield a residential density of 39.9 dwelling units per acre, which is at the top of this range.

The R5 zoning district has been chosen for review comparison for this development (see attached Zoning staff report) because it is most similar to the 26-40 units per acre density range recommended by the High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan and its consistency with the density objectives of traditional neighborhood development concepts. In addition, the R5 District criteria are used for residential developments in commercial zoning districts. The R5 zoning criteria generally allows residential densities of approximately 35-40 dwelling units per acre based upon an average of 2-bedroom dwelling units. The Zoning staff report provides a detailed comparison of the compliance of this development proposal with the specific R5 zoning criteria. It should be noted, however, that the design guidelines approved for this traditional neighborhood development include front and rear yard setbacks which are considerably smaller than those specified by City of Madison conventional zoning district regulations. This proposal complies with most of the R5 setback requirements and also complies with the required setback regulations as specified by the Mid-Town Commons General Development Plan, except the front yard, as previously noted.

- Standards For Review For Planned Unit Development

In addition to compatibility with the recommendations of adopted plans, the review of Planned Unit Development proposals requires consideration of other specific criteria to ensure that the project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the ordinance and has the potential for producing significant community benefit in terms of environmental and aesthetic design. These criteria include character and intensity of use, community impact, and preservation and maintenance of open space. The Mid-Town Commons Traditional Neighborhood Development established a

character and intensity of use via its adopted General Development Plan. This includes development at densities generally ranging from 25-40 dwelling units per acre throughout this neighborhood, a variety of housing types, public parklands, mixed-use developments, the expectation of a future Madison Metro Transit corridor via Waldorf Boulevard running north-south through this neighborhood, creating a walkable neighborhood, and the objective to reduce the need for private motor vehicle transportation. Traditional neighborhood design standards include front porches, smaller front and rear yard setbacks than that which is typical for developments today to encourage a "street presence" for residential buildings and reduced off-street parking requirements. In addition, a private design review committee must approve all development plans. The proposed development complies with the underlying General Development Plan regulations and design guidelines for this neighborhood.

A thorough analysis of the potential community impact of the Mid-Town Commons Traditional Neighborhood Development was considered at the time of the review and approval of the preliminary plat and General Development Plan. This proposed development is consistent with the requirements set forth in the General Development Plan and should not result in an impact greater than that which was envisioned at the time of the approval of the underlying General Development Plan. The goal of the Mid-Town Commons Neighborhood was to provide residential densities sufficient to support the future success of the neighborhood commercial center which will be developed along the Mid-Town Road right-of-way at the Waldorf Boulevard intersection in the near future.

A basic requirement for all residential developments is the provision of adequate usable open space. This proposed development provides a central courtyard framed by the 24-unit and 32-unit buildings and is adjacent to the proposed off-street parking facility. A sub-neighborhood public park will be provided across the street from the proposed development. In addition, a large neighborhood park will be located approximately two blocks north of the subject property. This private and public open space should meet the needs of the proposed development.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION REVIEW:

The Urban Design Commission, at their April 20, 2005 meeting received an informational presentation regarding the proposed development. At their May 4, 2005 meeting, the Urban Design Commission granted initial approval for this development proposal (see attached reports).

INCLUSIONARY DWELLING UNIT REQUIREMENTS:

The applicant has submitted an Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan application indicating intent to comply with the inclusionary zoning provisions of the Zoning Code. The IDUP indicates that 9 of the 60 condominium units will be constructed to meet affordability criteria. All 9 units will be available at 80% of area median income (AMI). Geographic dispersion of the affordable dwelling units has generally been accomplished with the exception noted in the conclusion to the attached inclusionary zoning staff review report dated June 7, 2005 from the Community Development Block Grant Office.

The 9 affordable housing units complies with the 15% requirement for owner-occupied developments. The dispersion exception noted suggests that one inclusionary dwelling unit be provided in the 4-unit building located at the northerly corner of the subject property. This

project has earned two incentive points for use in the incentive matrix based on the percentage of units being provided at 80% of AMI. The applicant has requested to utilize these points to provide incentives for a 10% density bonus as noted on page 3 of the inclusionary zoning staff report. The proposed development yields an overall density of 39.9 dwelling units per acre. The subject property is a 1.50 acre site and the underlying Mid-Town Commons General Development Plan recommends mixed uses (commercial and residential) for this site. Somewhat in contradiction, the General Development Plan only allocates a maximum of 2 dwelling units to this 65,000 square foot parcel. This is presumed to be an error since a maximum of two dwelling units on a 1.5 acre "mixed-use" site makes no sense, but staff were unable to determine when the error was introduced to the General Development Plan. The GDP will be revised as part of this approval, and a recommended condition of approval is that a revised table be prepared showing the approved number of dwelling units on each lot in the development. The High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan recommends the Mid-Town Commons area for an overall density range of 26-40 dwelling units per acre. The Mid-Town Commons General Development Plan, as approved, allows for a maximum of 708 dwelling units on a 38 acre site. This yields a density of approximately 18.6 dwelling units per acre, below the minimum recommendation provided for in the adopted High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan. Planning Unit staff supports the density bonus incentive as requested and recommends approval of the Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan, subject to the CDBG Office recommendation regarding the dispersal of the inclusionary dwelling units.

CONCLUSION:

The Plan Commission and Common Council are being asked to approve a Planned Unit Development District, which includes the construction of 30 condominium units in a single residential building on a 0.95 acre vacant site located in the Mid-Town Commons Traditional Neighborhood Development.

In considering this application, the Planned Unit Development District standards and the rezoning process require that the Plan Commission and Common Council give due consideration to the City's adopted neighborhood development plan. As described above, the recommended land use for this area is medium density, multi-family residential development with a density range of approximately 26-40 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development, yielding 31.6 dwelling units per acre, is within this recommended density range.

This development proposal substantially complies with the basic intent of the R5 zoning district and the bulk requirements as shown in the Zoning staff report. This project also complies with the underlying requirements of the approved and recorded General Development Plan for this neighborhood except for the erroneous dwelling unit allocation for this lot, which will be corrected in the revised GDP. Staff supports the proposed Specific Implementation Plan to allow 30 condominium units to be constructed on this site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Unit recommends that the Plan Commission forward Ordinance, File I.D. 01229 to rezone property at 8301 Mayo Drive from PUD(GDP) Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan District to Amended PUD(GDP)-PUD(SIP) Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan District to the Common Council with a favorable recommendation

subject to input at the public hearing, reviewing agency comments, final Urban Design Commission approval, and the following condition:

1. The applicant shall prepare a revised table showing the number of dwelling units approved on all lots within the Mid-Town Commons developments for which a Specific Implementation Plan has been adopted, and the minimum and maximum number of dwelling units allowed by the General Development Plan on all lots for which a Specific Implementation Plan has not been adopted. The lot numbers shall be consistent with the most current approved plat. This table shall be reviewed by Planning Unit staff and included in the revised General Development Plan.

Final Plat		Permitted Dwelling Units		
<u>Lot Number</u>	<u>Permitted Use (Type)</u>	<u>Lot Area</u>	<u>Min:</u>	<u>Max:</u>
Lot 62:	Duplex (Type II-A)	10,784	2	2
Lot 63:	Duplex (Type II-A)	9,858	2	2
Lot 64:	Apartment/Condominium (Type IV-B)	20,903	6	6
Lot 65:	Apartment/Condominium (Type IV-B)	17,715	6	6
Lot 66:	Apartment/Condominium (Type IV-B)	13,783	4	4
Lot 67:	Duplex (Type II-B)	8,010	2	2
Lot 68:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,662	2	2
Lot 69:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,630	2	2
Lot 70:	Mansion (Type VI-B)	11,079	4	4
Lot 71:	Mansion (Type VI-B)	10,124	4	4
Lot 72:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,495	2	2
Lot 73:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,516	2	2
Lot 74:	Apartment/Condominium (Type IV-C)	10,761	4	4
Lot 75:	Single Family (Type I-B)	4,408	1	1
Lot 76:	Single Family (Type I-B)	4,408	1	1
Lot 77:	Single Family (Type I-B)	4,408	1	1
Lot 78:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,612	2	2
Lot 79:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,612	2	2
Lot 80:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,612	2	2
Lot 81:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,612	2	2
Lot 82:	Duplex (Type II-B)	6,589	2	2
Lot 83:	Mansion (Type VI-B)	10,028	4	4
Lot 84:	Mansion (Type VI-A)	11,250	4	4
Lot 85:	Rowhouse/Townhouse (Type III-A)	23,721	7	14
Lot 86:	Mansion (Type VI-A)	13,862	4	4
Lot 87:	Civic/Institutional (Type VIII)	73,846	0	0
Lot 88:	Flex Use	15,320	2	6
Lot 89:	Rowhouse/Townhouse (Type III-A)	42,225	14	24
Lot 90:	Mixed Use (Type V) Residential	170,971	1	12
Lot 91:	Apartment/Condominium (Type IV-A)	41,333	29	30
Lot 92:	Park/Village Green	78,167	0	0
Lot 93:	Flex Use	21,866	4	10
Lot 94:	Plaza (Type IX)	6,470	0	0
* Lot 95:	<u>Mixed Use (Type V)</u>	<u>65,545</u>	1	<u>2</u>
Lot 96:	Flex Use	79,824	11	11
Lot 97:	Mixed Use (Type V)	79,839	0	5
TOTALS			631	708



5. **Commercial/Mixed Use (Type V):** Any commercial use or combination of commercial uses with civic and/or residential uses. Uses shall include the permitted and conditional uses in the C-2, O-1 and R-5 zoning districts or other uses defined herein. Commercial use is required on the ground floor of Main Street Commercial Lots.
- a. **Lot Area:** As shown on the Preliminary Plat of Midtown Commons.
 - b. **Height Regulations:** No building shall be less than 2 stories or 25' in height or greater than 4 stories or 60' in height.
 - c. **Yard Requirements:**
 - Front Yard: 4 foot minimum/10 foot maximum
 - Side Yard: none required
 - Corner Street Side Yard: none required
 - Rear Yard: 8 foot minimum
 - d. **Site Landscaping:** Site landscaping will be provided as shown on the approved S.I.P. plans.
 - e. **Usable Open Space Requirements:** Usable open space will be as provided in the approved SIP plans.
 - f. **Parking & Loading:** Accessory parking and loading will be provided as shown on the approved S.I.P. plans. Off-street parking is required to be behind or beside the buildings. (If beside a street, a wall may be required.)
 - g. **Family Definition:** The family definition shall coincide with the definition given in M.G.O. 28.03 for the R-5 zoning district.
 - h. **Signage:** Signage will be allowed as approved on the S.I.P. plans.

AGENDA # VLC

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 4, 2005

TITLE: Lot 95 (formerly Lot 94), Mid-Town Commons, Waldorf Boulevard At Mayo Drive - PUD(SIP), Multi-Family

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 4, 2005

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Robert March, Michael Barrett, Lisa Geer, Bruce Woods, Ald. Noel Radomski, Jack Williams, Todd Barnett, and Lou Host-Jablonski.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 4, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located on Lot 95(formerly Lot 94) at the intersection of Waldorf Boulevard and Mayo Drive in Mid-Town Commons. Appearing on behalf of the project was Donald Schroeder, architect. Staff noted to the Commission that recent modifications to the subdivision plat, prior to its recording, resulted in a change in its lot number from formerly Lot 94 Mid-Town Commons to Lot 95. Schroeder provided an update to the Commission on modifications to the plan since its informational presentation as follows:

- The building façade of the four-unit building (Building #3) has been modified to feature a combination of gable/hip roofs with the same overall massing building materials and colors.
- Bike parking has been adjusted to be distributed throughout the entire development site.
- The centrally located green commons area has been reconfigured with a relocated activity area.

Following the review of the plans, it was noted by the Commission that the centrally located surface parking area lacked the inclusion of interior landscape tree islands.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the project. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion required that upon final consideration of the project, that the landscape plan be modified to include tree islands within the central surface parking area, in addition to providing a completely detailed landscape plan, lighting/photometrics and cutsheets.

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, 6, 6, 6, 6.5, 7.5 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Lot 95 (formerly Lot 94), Mid-Town Commons, Waldorf Boulevard At Mayo Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	8	7	-	-	7	8	7.5
	6	6	5	-	-	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	8	7	-	-	7	7	7.5
	5	6	-	-	-	5	5	6
	6	6	-	-	-	6	7	6
	6	7	6	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Comments:

- Move the shade trees into the interim landscape island.
- This should have been better integrated with adjacent buildings.

AGENDA # V.F.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 20, 2005

TITLE: Waldorf Boulevard at Ritz Drive and Mayo Drive (Lot 94, Mid-Town Commons) - PUD(SIP), 60 Units

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 20, 2005

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Robert March, Michael Barrett, Lisa Geer, Bruce Woods, and Ald. Noel Radomski.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 20, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(SIP) on Lot 94, Midtown Commons. Paul Wagner, Chair, abstained from consideration of this item. Appearing on behalf of the project was Donald Schroeder and Randy Bruce, architects. Bruce pointed out the development site's location on the southwesterly corner of the intersection of Ritz Drive and Waldorf Boulevard. The provisions of the overall General Development Plan for (GDP) for "Midtown Commons" required that each of the two five-unit townhouse buildings proposed address the streetscape, utilizing shared driveway access to minimize the number of driveway openings to serve the two structures on the site. Bruce noted that the plan appeared to provide for an excessive amount of surface parking area/drive aisle behind the buildings. He felt that the situation required further examination in order to evolve a better site design which maintains both buildings' orientation to the street, while at the same time minimizes surface parking and drive aisles with the development proposal.

ACTION:

Since this was an informational presentation, no formal action was taken by the Urban Design Commission. Wagner abstained from consideration of this item.

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 6, 8, and 8.3.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Waldorf Boulevard at Ritz Drive and Mayo Drive (Lot 94, Midtown Commons)

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	7	5	-	-	5	5	6
	6	7	6	-	-	-	7	8.3
	7	8	-	-	-	7	9	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Comments:

- Architecture is really nice – nice street presence. But the street/drive-aisles could be better integrated; e.g., make them small streets with parallel parking.

**Lot 95 Midtown Commons
Inclusionary Zoning Staff Review
for the Plan Commission:
(June 7, 2005)**

Name of Development	Lot 95 Midtown Commons
Address	Waldorf Blvd at Mayo Drive
Developer/owner	Barrow Ridge LLC
Contact Person	Terrence Temple or J. Randy Bruce
Contact Phone	Knothe and Bruce Architects 7601 University Ave. Suite 201 Middleton WI 53562
Contact-mail	rbruce@knothebruce.com

SUMMARY FOR PLANNING UNIT REPORT TO PLAN COMMISSION:

This mixed-use project on the West side which includes a mix of residential and retail space with a total of 60 residential condos, of which 9 are proposed to be inclusionary dwelling units.

CONCLUSION:

The project as proposed, based upon the available information furnished by the developer,		
	Will comply with MGO 28.04 (25)	
X	Will comply with MGO 28.04 (25) if the following conditions or changes are met:	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed IDUP places the IZ units on each of the three floors and in two of the three buildings. 2. The developer has asked to establish the prices for all the inclusionary units for this project at the 80% of the area median income level. Since this phase includes 4 or more stories with the 75% of the parking underground, the ordinance indicates that all of the inclusionary units could be set at 80% of the median. 	In order to achieve better dispersion of the IZ units developer should move one of the units to Building #1.
	Does not comply for the following reasons:	

Reviewed by	Barbara Constans, Grants Administrator Hickory R. Hurie, CD Grants Supervisor
	Date: May 20, 2005

1. PROPOSED ALLOCATION OF AFFORDABLE UNITS

Number of units	At Market	At 80%	At 70%	At 60%	At 50%
60 owner units	51	9			

8

2. TABLE TO CALCULATE POINTS

This Project's points		At 80% of AMI			
5%					
10%					
15%		2			
20%					
TOTAL for project					2

Ordinance Basis for Points

For-sale: Per cent of dwelling units	At Market	At 80% of AMI	70%	60%	50%
Ord. points					
5%		0	1	2	3
10%		1	2	3	4
15%		2	3	4	5
20%		3	4	5	6

Rental: Per cent of dwelling units	At Market	At 60% of AMI	50%	40%	30%
Ord. points					
5%		0	1	2	3
10%		1	2	3	4
15%		2	3	4	5
20%		3	4	5	6

3. ISSUES RELATED TO DESIGN, PRICING, OR TERMS OF IZ UNITS

Standards for Inclusionary dwelling units (IDUs)	Complies	Does not comply	Additional comments
Exterior Appearance of IDUs are similar to Market rate	Yes		
Proportion of attached and detached IDU units is similar to Market rate.	Yes		All units are attached.
Mix of IDUs by bedroom size is similar to market rate	Yes		3 of the IZ units will be one-bedroom units; 6 of the IZ units will be two-bedroom units.
IDUs are dispersed throughout the project	No		IZ units are located in three of the four residential buildings . Within those buildings the units are well dispersed.
IDUs are to be built in phasing similar to market rate	Yes		
Pricing fits within Ordinance standards	Yes		SIP suggests a Range of \$115,000 to \$140,000 for the units. The final price will be established upon issuance of the building permit and will need to include calculation of the base condo fee.
Standard Process Items for Compliance	Complies		Issues:

8

Developer offers security during construction phase in form of deed restriction	Yes		None noted
Developer offers enforcement for for-sale IDUs in form of option to purchase or for rental in form of deed restriction	Yes		None noted
Developer describes marketing plan for IDUs	Yes		None noted
Developer acknowledges need to inform buyers/renters of IDU status, responsibilities for notification	Yes		None noted
Terms of sale or rent	Yes		None noted
Additional areas of interest	Area of interest		Additional Comment
Developer has arranged to sell/rent IDUs to non-profit or CDA to meet IDU expectations	No		None noted
Developer has requested waiver for off-site or cash payment	No		NA
Developer has requested waiver for reduction of number of units	No		NA
Other:	None identified		

4. INCENTIVES REQUESTED

A) Density bonus of 10% (except developments of 4 or more stories and >75% of parking is underground, or has 30 or fewer detached du, then density-of-20% per point) (limited to 3 points)

B) Reduction in Park development fees (limit of 1 point)

C) Reduction in Park Dedication requirements (limit of 1 point)

D) 25% reduction in parking requirements (limit of 1 point)

E) Non-city provision of street tree landscaping

F) Cash subsidy from IZ fund, \$10,000/IZ unit for up to 50% of the on-site IZ units (Limit of 2 points)

G) Cash subsidy from IZ fund, \$5,000/IZ unit for lower range column of households, up to 50% of on-site IZ units with 49 or fewer detached du or developments with 4 or more stories and at least 75% of parking is underground. (Limit of 2 points)

H) One additional story in downtown design zones, not to exceed certain height requirements

I) Eligibility for residential parking permits equal to number of IZ units in PUD

J) Assistance in obtaining other funds related to housing

K) Preparation of a neighborhood development plan from non-city sources (if development located in Central Services Area, is contiguous to existing development and no such plan exists.

L) Expedited review

M) Other benefits requested:

5. ISSUES OF PROCESS

Are there issues in any of the following steps that should be identified now for closer attention?

Step	Standard Step Activity	Special Issues
<u>Pre-conference</u> with City Planning Staff	April 5, 2005	None identified
Presentation of <u>Concept</u> to City's Development Review Staff Team	April 21, 2005	None identified
Submission of Zoning Application and <u>IZ Dwelling Unit Plan</u>	IDUP submitted April 27, 2005.	None identified
<u>Formal Review</u> by City's Development Review Staff Team	Reviewed	None identified
<u>Formal Review</u> by <u>Plan Commission</u>	Pending	None identified
<u>Appeal</u> Plan Commission Decision to Common Council (optional)	Developer has not requested waiver.	None identified
<u>Compliance</u> with Approved Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan	Deed restriction to recorded for construction phase; Marketing Plan to be implemented	None identified
<u>Construction</u> of development according to Inclusionary Dwelling Unit PI	Developer is ready to begin upon approval	None identified
Comply with any continuing requirements	City will retain option to purchase on initial sales of IZ units.	None identified



Department of Public Works
City Engineering Division

608 266 4751

Larry D. Nelson, P.E.
City Engineer

City-County Building, Room 115
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
608 264 9275 FAX
608 267 8677 TDD

Deputy City Engineer
Robert F. Phillips, P.E.

Principal Engineers
Michael R. Dailey, P.E.
Christina M. Bachmann, P.E.
John S. Fahrney, P.E.
David L. Benzschawel, P.E.
Gregory T. Fries, P.E.

Operations Supervisor
Kathleen M. Cryan

Hydrogeologist
Joseph L. DeMorett, P.G.

GIS Manager
David A. Davis, R.L.S.

DATE: June 13, 2005

TO: Plan Commission

FROM: Larry D. Nelson, P.E., City Engineer

SUBJECT: 1725 Waldorf Boulevard Planned Unit Development (GDP/SIP)

The City Engineering Division has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments.

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

1. Applicant shall provide plans and calculations showing compliance with NR-151 with regards to sediment control and infiltration prior to final approval.
2. Fees associated with the Upper Badger Mill Creek Impact Fee District shall be paid prior to approval.
3. All utility installations shall be coordinated with street construction.
4. Sewer laterals 8" in diameter or greater shall be labeled as private sanitary mains.

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

Engineering Division Review of Planned Community Developments, Planned Unit Developments and Conditional Use Applications.

Name: 1725 Waldorf Boulevard Planned Unit Development (GDP/SIP)

General

- 1.1 The construction of this building will require removal and replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and possibly other parts of the City's infrastructure. The applicant shall enter into a City / Developer agreement for the improvements required for this development. The applicant shall be required to provide deposits to cover City labor and materials and surety to cover the cost of construction. The applicant shall meet with the City Engineer to schedule the development of the plans and the agreement. The City Engineer will not sign off on this project without the agreement executed by the developer. The developer shall sign the Developer's Acknowledgement prior to the City Engineer signing off on this project.
- 1.2 The site plan shall identify lot and block numbers of recorded Certified Survey Map or Plat.
- 1.3 The site plan shall include all lot/ownership lines, existing building locations, proposed building additions, demolitions, parking stalls, driveways, sidewalks (public and/or private), existing and proposed signage, existing and proposed utility locations and landscaping.

8



- 1.4 The site plan shall identify the difference between existing and proposed impervious areas.
- 1.5 The site plan shall reflect a proper street address of the property as reflected by official City of Madison Assessor's and Engineering Division records.
- 1.6 The site plan shall include a full and complete legal description of the site or property being subjected to this application.

Right of Way / Easements

- 2.1 The Applicant shall Dedicate a _____ foot wide strip of Right of Way along _____.
- 2.2 The Applicant shall Dedicate a _____ foot wide strip of Right of Way along _____.
- 2.3 The Applicant shall Dedicate a Permanent Limited Easement for grading and sloping _____ feet wide along _____.
- 2.4 The City Engineer has reviewed the need for pedestrian and bicycle connections through the development and finds that no connections are required.
- 2.5 The Applicant shall Dedicate a Permanent Limited Easement for a pedestrian / bicycle easement _____ feet wide from _____ to _____.
- 2.6 The Developer shall provide a private easement for public pedestrian and bicycle use through the property running from _____ to _____.
- 2.7 The developer shall be responsible for the ongoing construction and maintenance of a path within the easement. The maintenance responsibilities shall include, but not be limited to, paving, repaving, repairing, marking and plowing. The developer shall work with the City of Madison Real Estate Staff to administer this easement. Applicable fees shall apply.

Streets and Sidewalks

- 3.1 The Applicant shall execute a waiver of notice and hearing on the assessments for the improvement of [roadway] _____ in accordance with Section 66.0703(7)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and Section 4.09 of the MGO.
- 3.2 **Value of sidewalk installation over \$5000.** The Applicant shall Construct Sidewalk to a plan approved by the City Engineer along _____.
- 3.3 **Value of sidewalk installation under \$5000.** The Applicant shall install public sidewalk along _____. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation Permit for the sidewalk work, which is available from the City Engineering Division. The applicant shall pay all fees associated with the permit including inspection fees. All work must be completed within six months or the succeeding June 1, whichever is later.
- 3.4 The Applicant shall execute a waiver of their right to notice and hearings on the assessments for the installation of sidewalk along [roadway] _____ in accordance with Section 66.0703(7)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and Section 4.09 of the MGO.
- 3.5 The Applicant shall grade the property line along _____ to a grade established by the City Engineer. The grading shall be suitable to allow the installation of sidewalk in the future without the need to grade beyond the property line. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation permit prior to the City Engineer signing off on this development.
- 3.6 The Applicant shall close all abandoned driveways by replacing the curb in front of the driveways and restoring the terrace with grass.
- 3.7 **Value of the restoration work less than \$5,000. When computing the value, do not include a cost for driveways. Do not include the restoration required to facilitate a utility lateral installation.** The Applicant's project requires the minor restoration of the street and sidewalk. The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation Permit for the street restoration work, which is available from the City Engineering Division. The applicant shall pay all fees associated with the permit including inspection fees.
- 3.8 The Applicant shall make improvements to _____ in order to facilitate ingress and egress to the development. The improvement shall include a (Describe what the work involves or strike this part of the comment.) _____.
- 3.9 The Applicant shall make improvements to _____. The improvements shall consist of _____.
- 3.10 The approval of this Conditional Use does not include the approval of the changes to roadways, sidewalks or utilities. The applicant shall obtain separate approval by the Board of Public Works and the Common Council for the restoration of the public right of way including any changes requested by developer. The City Engineer shall complete the final plans for the restoration with input from the developer. The curb location, grades, tree locations, tree species, lighting modifications and other items required to facilitate the development or restore the right of way shall be reviewed by the City Engineer, City Traffic Engineer, and City Forester.

8

- 3.11 The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer with a survey indicating the grade of the existing sidewalk and street. The Applicant shall hire a Professional Engineer to set the grade of the building entrances adjacent to the public right of way. The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer the proposed grade of the building entrances. The City Engineer shall approve the grade of the entrances prior to signing off on this development.
- 3.12 The Applicant shall replace all sidewalk and curb and gutter which abuts the property which is damaged by the construction or any sidewalk and curb and gutter which the City Engineer determines needs to be replaced because it is not at a desirable grade regardless of whether the condition existed prior to beginning construction.
- 3.13 The Applicant shall obtain a privilege in streets agreement for any encroachments inside the public right of way. The approval of this development does not constitute or guarantee approval of the encroachments.
- 3.14 The Applicant shall provide the City Engineer with the proposed soil retention system to accommodate the restoration. The soil retention system must be stamped by a Professional Engineer. The City Engineer may reject or require modifications to the retention system.
- 3.15 The Applicant shall complete work on exposed aggregate sidewalk in accordance with specifications provided by the city. The stone used for the exposed aggregate shall be approved by the City. The Construction Engineer shall be notified prior to beginning construction. Any work that does not match the adjacent work or which the City Construction Engineer finds is unacceptable shall be removed and replaced.
- 3.16 All work in the public right-of-way shall be performed by a City licensed contractor.

Storm Water Management

- 4.1 The site plans shall be revised to show the location of all rain gutter down spout discharges.
- 4.2 Storm sewer to serve this development has been designed and constructed. The site plans shall be revised to identify the location of this storm sewer and to show connection of an internal drainage system to the existing public storm sewer.
- 4.3 The plan set shall be revised to show a proposed private internal drainage system on the site. This information shall include the depths and locations of structures and the type of pipe to be used.
- 4.5 The applicant shall show storm water "overflow" paths that will safely route runoff when the storm sewer is at capacity.
- 4.6 The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.
- 4.7 This site is greater than one (1) acre and the applicant is required by State Statute to obtain a Notice of Intent Permit (NOI) from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Contact Jim Bertolacini of the WDNR at 275-3201 to discuss this requirement.
- 4.8 This development includes multiple building permits within a single lot. The City Engineer and/or the Director of the Inspection Unit may require individual control plans and measures for each building.
- 4.9 If the lots within this site plan are inter-dependent upon one another for stormwater runoff conveyance, and/or a private drainage system exists for the entire site an agreement shall be provided for the rights and responsibilities of all lot owners. Said agreement shall be reviewed and placed on file by the City Engineer, referenced on the site plan and recorded at the Dane Co Register of Deeds.
- 4.10 Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Please contact Greg Fries at 267-1199 to discuss this requirement.
- 4.11 The plan set shall be revised to show more information on proposed drainage for the site. This shall be accomplished by using spot elevations and drainage arrows or through the use of proposed contours. It is necessary to show the location of drainage leaving the site to the public right-of-way. It may be necessary to provide information off the site to fully meet this requirement.
- 4.12 A portion of this project comes under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corp of Engineers and WDNR for wetland or flood plain issues. A permit for those matters shall be required prior to construction on any of the lots currently within the jurisdictional flood plain.
- 4.13 The Applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital CAD files to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital copies shall be to scale and represent final construction.

CAD submittals can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) formats and contain the following data, each on a separate layer name/level number:

- a) Building Footprints
- b) Internal Walkway Areas
- c) Internal Site Parking Areas
- d) Other Miscellaneous Impervious Areas (i.e. gravel, crushed stone, bituminous/asphalt, concrete, etc.)

NOTE: Email file transmissions preferred lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com. Include the site address in this transmittal.

8

- 4.14 NR-151 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code will be effective on October 1, 2004. Future phases of this project shall comply with NR 151 in effect when work commences. Specifically, any phases not covered by a Notice of Intent (NOI) received from the WDNR under NR-216 prior to October 1, 2004 shall be responsible for compliance with all requirements of NR-151 Subchapter III. As most of the requirements of NR-151 are currently implemented in Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances, the most significant additional requirement shall be that of infiltration.

NR-151 requires infiltration in accord with the following criteria. For the type of development, the site shall comply with one of the three (3) options provided below:

Residential developments shall infiltrate 90% of the predevelopment infiltration amount, 25% of the runoff from the 2-year post development storm or dedicate a maximum of 1% of the site area to active infiltration practices.

Commercial development shall infiltrate 60% of the predevelopment infiltration amount, 10% of the runoff from the 2-year post development storm or dedicate a maximum of 2% of the site area to active infiltration practices.

Utilities General

- 5.1 The Applicant shall obtain a Street Excavation permit for the installation of utilities required to serve this project. The Applicant shall pay the permit fee, inspection fee and street degradation fee as applicable and shall comply with all the conditions of the permit.
- 5.2 The applicant shall obtain all necessary sewer connection permits and sewer plugging permits prior to any utility work.
- 5.3 All proposed and existing utilities including gas, electric, phone, steam, chilled water, etc shall be shown on the plan.
- 5.4 The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction.
- 5.5 The site plans shall be revised to show the location of existing utilities, including depth, type, and size in the adjacent right-of-way.
- 5.6 The developer shall provide information on how the Department of Commerce's requirements regarding treatment of storm water runoff, from parking structures, shall be satisfied prior to discharge to the public sewer system. Additionally, information shall be provided on which system (storm or sanitary) the pipe shall be connected to.

Sanitary Sewer

- 6.1 Prior to approval of the conditional use application, the owner shall obtain a permit to plug each existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves a building that is proposed for demolition. For each lateral to be plugged the owner shall deposit \$1,000 with the City Engineer in two separate checks in the following amounts: (1). \$100 non-refundable deposit for the cost of inspection of the plugging by City staff; and (2). \$900 for the cost of City crews to perform the plugging. If the owner elects to complete the plugging of a lateral by private contractor and the plugging is inspected and approved by the City Engineer, the \$900 fee shall be refunded to the owner.
- 6.2 All outstanding Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) and City of Madison sanitary sewer connection charges are due and payable prior to connection to the public sewerage system.
- 6.3 Each unit of a duplex building shall be served by a separate and independent sanitary sewer lateral.
- 6.4 The site plan shall be revised to show all existing public sanitary sewer facilities in the project area as well as the size and alignment of the proposed service.

**CITY OF MADISON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: June 13, 2005

To: Bill Roberts, Planner III

From: Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator

Subject: 1725 Waldorf Blvd.

Present Zoning District: PUD(GDP)

Proposed Use: 60 Condo units & 5,700 sq. ft. retail/office space

Requested Zoning District: PUD(GDP-SIP)

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project). **NONE**

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Section 28.04(24) provides that Inclusionary Zoning requirements shall be complied with as part of the approval process. Submit to Zoning, a copy of the approved plan for recording prior to zoning sign off of the plat.
2. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:
 - a. Show signage at the head of the stalls.
 - b. Show the accessible path from the stalls to the buildings.
3. Provide two additional bike stalls (a total of 57) or show a reserved area for the additional two bike stalls can be provided, if needed.
4. Parking lot plans with greater than twenty (20) stalls, landscape plans must be stamped by a registered landscape architect. Provide a landscape worksheet with the final plans that shows that the landscaping provided meets the point and required tree ordinances. In order to count toward required points, the landscaping shall be within 15' and 20' of the parking lot depending on the type of landscape element. (Note: The required trees do not count toward the landscape point total.) Planting islands shall consist of at least 75% vegetative cover, including trees, shrubs, ground cover, and/or grass. Up to 25% of the island surface may be brick pavers, mulch or other non-vegetative cover. All plant materials in islands shall be protected from vehicles by concrete curbs.

5. Include in the zoning text under permitted uses "offices" since they are currently a conditional use in the C-1 district.

ZONING CRITERIA

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	73,200 sq. ft.	65,340 sq. ft.
Lot width	50'	adequate
Usable open space	16,640 sq. ft.	5,730 sq. ft. + balconies *
Front yard	20'	13' *
Side yards	16.5' right side, 10 left side	12' right side, 10' left side *
Rear yard	30'	18' *
Floor area ratio	n/a	n/a
Building height		3 stories and 4 stories

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	86 residential <u>19 commercial/office</u> 105 total	60 garage <u>28 surface</u> 88 total *
Accessible stalls	as shown	adequate (2)
Loading	1 (10' x 35') area	provided
Number bike parking stalls	55 residential <u>2 comm/office</u> 57 total	24 in garages <u>31 surface</u> 55 total
Landscaping	as shown	(4)
Lighting		

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes
Flood plain	No
Utility easements	none shown
Barrier free (ILHR 69)	Yes

With the above conditions, the proposed project **does** comply with all of the above requirements.

* Since this project is being rezoned to the **(PUD)** district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, we are reviewing it based on the criteria for the **R-5** district, because of the surrounding land uses.



Traffic Engineering Division

David C. Dryer, City Traffic Engineer

Madison Municipal Building
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2986
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2986
PH 608/266-4761
TTY 608/267-9623
FAX 608/267-1158

June 9, 2005

TO: Plan Commission

FROM: David C. Dryer, P.E., City Traffic Engineer

SUBJECT: **1725 Waldorf Blvd. – Rezoning – PUD (GDP) to Amended PUD (GDP-SIP) –
60 Condominium Units & 5700 Sq. Ft. Retail & Office Space**

The City Traffic Engineering Division has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments.

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

1. None

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

2. When the applicant submits final plans for approval, the applicant shall show the following: items in the terrace as existing (e.g., signs and street light poles), type of surfaces, existing property lines, addresses, one contiguous plan (showing all easements, all pavement markings, building placement, and stalls), adjacent driveway approaches to lots on either side and across the street, signage, percent of slope, vehicle routes, dimensions of radii, aisles, driveways, stalls including the two (2) feet overhang, and a scaled drawing at 1" = 20'.
3. A "Stop" sign shall be installed at a height of seven (7) feet at all driveway approaches. All signs at the approaches shall be installed behind the property line. All directional/regulatory signage and pavement markings on the site shall be shown and noted on the plan.
4. The intersection shall be so designed so as not to violate the City's sight-triangle preservation requirement which states that on a corner lot no structure, screening, or embankment of any kind shall be erected, placed, maintained or grown between the heights of 30 inches and 10 feet above the curb level or its equivalent within the triangle space formed by the two intersecting street lines or their projections and a line joining

points on such street lines located a minimum of 25 feet from the street intersection in order to provide adequate vehicular vision clearance.

5. The Developer shall post a deposit or reimburse the City for all costs associated with any modifications to Street Lighting, Signing and Pavement Marking including labor and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.
6. Public signing and marking related to the development may be required by the City Traffic Engineer for which the developer shall be financially responsible.

Please contact John Leach, City Traffic Engineering at 267-8755 if you have questions regarding the above items:

Contact Person: Terrance Temple
Fax: 608-833-9079
Email: jtemple@knothebruce.com

DCD:DJM:dm

8



CITY OF MADISON FIRE DEPARTMENT

Fire Prevention Division

325 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53703-2295

Phone: 608-266-4484 ♦ FAX: 608-267-1153

DATE: 6/7/05
TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Edwin J. Ruckriegel, Fire Marshal
SUBJECT: 1725 Waldorf Blvd.

The City of Madison Fire Department (MFD) has reviewed the subject development and has the following comments:

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project.)

1. None.

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

In addition, we offer the following General or Standard Review Comments:

2. Provide fire apparatus access as required by Comm 62.0509 and MGO 34.19, as follows:
 - a. The site plans shall clearly identify the location of all fire lanes.
 - b. Provide a completed MFD "Fire Apparatus Access and Fire Hydrant Worksheet" with the site plan submittal.
 - c. Provide a fire lane that extends to within 150-feet of all exterior portions of the structure.

Please contact John Lippitt, MFD Fire Protection Engineer, at 608-261-9658 if you have questions regarding the above items.

cc: John Lippitt