



City of Madison
Meeting Minutes - Final
PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR
VEHICLE COMMISSION

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Tuesday, November 22, 2005

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)
(After 6 pm, use Doty St. entrance.)

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Present: Ald. Robbie Webber, Ald. Paul E. Skidmore, Michael Forster Rothbart, Mark N. Shahan, Matthew A. Logan, Mary P. Conroy, Susan M. De Vos, Charles W. Strawser III and Carl R. Kugler

Excused: Ald. Judy Compton and Cheryl E. Wittke

Skidmore: 5:05-6:05 p.m.

Staff Present:

*David Dryer, City Traffic Engineer and Executive Secretary
Arthur Ross, Traffic Engineering*

A PUBLIC COMMENT

None

B APPROVAL OF MINUTES - October 25, 2005

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Logan, to Approve the Minutes.
The motion passed by acclamation.

C MADISON POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON TRAFFIC RELATED ITEMS - None

None

D PUBLIC HEARING/PUBLIC PRESENTATION - None

None

E OLD BUSINESS - (Items may require action)

E1 [02207](#) Adopting and confirming the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

Attachments: Exhibit A, CommitteeReport.pdf, UDCCCompPlanRpt111605.pdf,
Attachment to 120505 PC Minutes .pdf, Final
Comments/Recommendations.pdf

Motion by Conroy/Logan to approve the resolution and to forward comments from the prior 10/25/05 meeting and the comment from the 11/22/05 meetign carried unanimously. (Comments available in PBMVC minutes of 10/25/05 and 11/22/05.)

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Logan, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Approve as Substituted to the PLAN COMMISSION

Dave Trowbridge and Linda Horvath were present on the item and available to respond to questions.

DeVos asked for a change initially in Policy 7 on page 3-13 of the October document to include the term curb cuts. Her intent was to acknowledge that people in wheelchairs are pedestrians too and she didn't believe this was clear. Trowbridge wondered if it might be better placed as a part of Policy 2 and she supported the recommendation.

Trowbridge explained that staff would prepare a response for the Plan Commission to comments that had been submitted, such as those the PBMVC would submit, and for the most part he expected the recommendations to be incorporated in the final document.

Shahan reported on a recommendation made by the LRTPC as a result of a request from Mike Rewey where it referenced education and law enforcement in the bike section and since it was not specifically referenced in other sections, it should be removed.

The motion passed by acclamation.

[02253](#)

Attachment of Transportation Elements of Comprehensive Plan

Attachments: _1020151649_001.pdf, _1020151913_001.pdf

E2

[02190](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Providing for a change on the Official Map of the City of Madison, which will add a proposed public street reservation for the widening of North and South Broom Street right-of-way to increase the width of the terrace, sidewalks, and street for bike and parking purposes on platted lands, located in part of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 23, Town 07 North, Range 09 East, City of Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin. 4th Ald. Dist.

Attachments: broom street reservation.pdf

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Conroy, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Shahan referred to the substitute that provided more clarification in the title to indicate the widened right of way was to provide for increased width of terrace, sidewalk and street for bike and parking purposes.

The motion passed by acclamation.

[02254](#)

Attachment to Legistar Item 02190 re. Broom Street

Attachments: cs_Broom St Setback.doc, mn113004excerptBROOM.doc, _1020155028_001.pdf

E3

[02080](#)

Report re: Parking on the Capitol Square.

Attachments: _repcapsqpkg.pdf, _commentscapsqpkg.pdf, Capitol Square pkg_Ald

Webber memo 10.25.05.pdf, 112205parking on square.doc

Motion made by Logan/Webber to:

- 1) Recommend that the Capitol Square be configured, no later than the next curb reconstruct, to include a bicycle lane as part of an overall design that meets AASHTO standards with regard to lane widths.
- 2) Recommend that parking around the Square be restricted during the following times:
 - a. During Farmer's Market (6 am-2 pm Saturdays)
 - b. Weekdays from 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.
- 3) Request that Traffic Engineering provide a more effective indicator to motorists of the bus/bike lane restriction. Options to explore should include pavement markings and moving the existing signage to a more visible location.
- 4) Recommend that the City of Madison ensure an ample supply of bicycle parking around Capitol Square.

Webber commented on her concerns as it related to improving the awareness of the motoring public of the restricted lane and she referred to the memo she had provided at the previous meeting. Accordingly she strongly urged the Traffic Engineering Division to come up with a better way to inform people of this fact and suggested this could be done through lane markings in the road and signs within sight lines. She pointed out the need to maintain the integrity of the lane in terms of the monies the City received for its designation as a restricted lane. Strawser referred to prior recommendations made by Mike Rewey for marking a right turn arrow at the intersections except for State Street that would apply to motorists but not for buses and bicyclists who could legitimately travel through the intersection.

DeVos referred to comments made at a prior meeting about limiting parking time periods to something less than 2 hours, e.g. 20 minutes to an hour.

Although some had tried to separate the issue of bus shelters, DeVos believed it was related and referred to earlier discussions about eliminating bus stops as well as shelters. She was uncomfortable with having parking on the Square be at the expense of bus users.

Kugler asked the purpose of removing parking for Farmers' Market Saturdays and during weekday peak periods since he understood that Farmers' Market representatives did not support parking removal any longer. He contended that the issue of parking on the Square and the number of bus shelters were two different issues.

Shahan relinquished the Chair to Logan during portions of the discussion on this item.

Shahan reviewed the origins of the recommendations as it related to removing bus stops and shelters and how it evolved without minimal disruption to bus riders in terms of maintaining stop locations. He contended the removal of the shelters was an issue that was related to something larger than "parking on the Square" and dealt with the City's desire to update the look of the Square-as it was doing with State Street. He suggested that if it were something that DeVos wanted to pursue, it would be more appropriate for it to be addressed by TPC. Referring to the Farmers' Market, he reminded members of testimony at the

meeting from a bicyclist on her experience since adding parking on the Square. He acknowledged that his wife had made this testimony, and he, too, had experienced the nasty conditions described. He pointed out buses had been removed from the Square because it was felt unsafe for them to be on the Square-and these were professional drivers. He contended there were more vehicles on the Square with parking because you now had not only those motorists who would be on the Square to stop and pick up merchandise purchased at the market, but also you would have those motorists circling the Square looking for a parking space. He believed parking should be restricted such that it would allow for the pre-parking on the Square conditions; that is, motorists were allowed to stop at the curb to pick up merchandise, but not allowed to park for any length of time. In terms of restricting parking during peak hours on weekday, he saw it as an advantage because of the increased traffic during peak times and the increased conflicts in the restricted lane as a result. He reminded members, too, that conditions were affected to some extent by the construction of the fountains at the Square.

Webber/Strawser requested separation on item 2.

Webber added that on Farmers' Market Saturdays they could expect more chaotic conditions and she didn't believe having parking available made that much difference. She believed they had to provide opportunities for people to pick up their merchandise rather than expect them to carry it some distance from the Square. She pointed out the Market sponsors had experience with parking and with bagged meters and had found the bagged meter situation was more confusing for customers of the Market in terms of whether they could stop and pick up merchandise. Therefore, she was inclined to not include the restriction unless the Farmers' Market sponsors found it desirable. In terms of restricting parking during peak periods on weekdays, she suggested that by removing the parking during this time, basically gave the illusion of a third lane which caused more confusion and problems for the users of the restricted lane. She was not sure restricting the lane would be useful.

Kugler agreed with comments made by Webber as it related to the Farmers' Market. In terms of restricting parking during the peak-hour, he suggested that having parallel parking with thus narrower lanes would tend to slow traffic. From a business perspective, he believed inconsistencies in parking availability periods undermined the perception of the available parking.

Forster Rothbart asked about the access driveways to the Capitol and whether parking could be made available along these driveway sides. Ross indicated that any parking along the drives as well as in the inside perimeter of the Outer Ring was under the control of the State. He believed the State might have agreements on some of its use by the Market. Ross did not believe public use of the driveways should be encouraged because of the crossing conflicts for pedestrians and motorists.

Strawser agreed with comments made by Webber and Kugler as it related to peak-hour parking restrictions and referred to the impact these restrictions had on Williamson Street; that is, basically it removed a de-facto bike lane.

DeVos asked about the prior comments about the length of meter time limits and Dryer suggested that meter time limit duration was more a function of the Parking

Utility working with TPC.

Relinquishing the Chair again, Shahan suggested that on Farmers' Market Saturdays he had witnessed parking behavior he hadn't seen before; and with the congestion at State Street and the lack of bicycle parking, he had to travel around the Square looking for available bike parking. Besides the parking, that was occurring where there were metered spaces, parking was occurring in other places and this basically narrowed traffic lanes more. He accounted this to an increase in traffic volume with motorists coming up to the Square to find a place to park. This is not compatible with the pedestrian nature of the Farmers' Market. He suggested parking did not need to be eliminated entirely; provisions could be made to provide for loading zones similar to the way it had functioned before installing meters. In terms of the issue of convenience, he noted the inconvenience for bus riders frequenting the market; they had to walk the extra block; shouldn't motorists be expected to do the same? In terms of the argument of narrower lanes resulting in slower traffic, he pointed out signals were already timed for 17-20 mph. Shahan said he was not as strongly committed to the peak-hour weekday restriction, but thought it would improve capacity for bicyclists-not motorists and he noted the peak-hour restrictions that exist for the outer loop. Related to comments about convenience for the stores, he pointed out the lack of parking was a "perceived" problem; parking was available as close as one would find available at a Mall.

Strawser supported having a loading/unloading lane on Farmers' Market Saturdays but wondered how effectively it would be enforced. Dryer said what would probably have to be done would be that meters would have to be bagged "no parking" which would allow active loading/unloading.

Motion to restrict parking on Farmer's Market Saturdays carried on a 4 to 3 vote (For Shahan, Forster Rothbart, Conroy, Against: Strawser, Webber, Kugler; Vice Chair Logan not voting)

Motion to restrict peak hour parking failed on a 3-4 vote, (For: Shahan, Skidmore and Conroy; Against: Forster Rothbart, Strawser, Webber, Kugler; Vice Chair Logan not voting).

Motion on the balance of the motion carried unanimously.

E4 [01191](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Revising the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) to allow for the use of speed humps on local or collector streets with volumes of 5000 vpd or less.

Attachments: RPT_2 version 9_112205.doc

A motion was made by Logan, seconded by Ald. Webber, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

Staff referred to the handout which provided a change in the resolution and the report to reflect the discussion at the previous meeting as it related to not changing the policy of review as it applied to speed hump application for locations with average weekday traffic less than 3000 vehicles.

Elaine Glowacki registered in support of the change to the speed hump policy. She lives in the North Allen Street and was representing the Allen Street neighborhood and the Regent Neighborhood Association sanctioned their position. Allen Street was in the NTMP program for two years and they had been asking for the ability to explore speed humps or speed tables as an option in designing the most effective street calming project. Their goal is to reduce current traffic speeds to the 25 mph posted speed limit on their residential street. She pointed out their group had conducted extensive research about the effectiveness of various types of street calming devices and engineering and concluded that speed humps or tables should be seriously considered because of their proven effectiveness. They did not claim to be experts and had confidence in the professionals to develop the best possible solution to achieve their goal. But they believed the existing policy limited the engineers' ability to consider some options in developing the most effective solutions.

Webber referred to Metro's concerns about the need to reroute their buses if speed humps were placed on Allen Street and she wondered if the neighborhood had concerns about rerouting buses. Glowacki said it was important to give the neighbors an option to make that decision.

Motion was made by Logan/Webber to adopt the substitute resolution to approve the revision to the NTMP and include those changes handed out at the meeting.

Webber referred to the two neighborhoods asking for the change, both within her district, and she referred to the extensive research done by the neighborhood and pointed out the research showed that speed humps were used in other areas of the country on streets with higher traffic volumes. In terms of concerns by emergency response agencies, she pointed out many communities had primary response routes identified and those routes remained unrestricted. However, Madison's Police and Fire did not prioritize routes. She supported the change so that cases such as Allen Street could be considered for speed humps.

Skidmore asked if Fire and Metro came up with a negative recommendation would that stand, or would it be taken under advisement? Dryer said in that situation, the issue would be reported to the Council, who likely would refer it to PBMVC for a recommendation. Skidmore said he was torn in his position on this since there was a part of him that felt that speed humps might be very effective in slowing speeds, but he was concerned about emergency vehicle use. He believed he would support it, but acknowledged there would be political decisions made which might compromise public safety or public transit.

DeVos reported on her experience riding over the Fisher Street speed hump and after traveling over it she asked the driver his speed, and he indicated 10 mph since any speed higher was not good for the bus. She did not believe a speed hump would be appropriate on Allen Street and she doubted the bus could be rerouted.

Strawser said the item before the body was the policy in general and not specifically Allen Street and he supported allowing Traffic Engineering to consider more traffic calming options on higher volume residential streets.

Shahan asked if there were a strong response from Fire to not put in a traffic-calming device, what would staff likely ask PBMVC to do? Dryer said that would be difficult to answer without dealing with the specifics since every street had its own unique characteristics so that they would have to look at each street on a case-by-case basis.

Skidmore asked if there would be any increased liability for the City by placing speed humps on a street in which Fire, for example, recommended against doing so. Dryer said the City Attorney would need to respond to the question. He added that the City has authority to install such devices and would be offered some protection. He thought it might be similar to issues related to parking regulations in which the Fire Department asks for change and it essentially is a decision made by the Council who would weigh the issue of public safety against the need for parking, for example.

Webber referred to comments made when LRTPC was considering narrower street standards and concerns from Fire about narrower streets slowing response to fire calls. She had provided an article that pointed out that for the majority of emergency calls, there is a higher number of traffic crashes than there are fire calls and someone in the Fire Dept is much more likely to be responding to someone injured because of a traffic situation than a fire situation. Her point was that if traffic can be slowed and, in turn, the number of people injured by speeding cars reduced, it might result in fewer responses and this should be taken into consideration as well.

Conroy said that although she had some concerns, she also was cognizant of the speeding issues in the community and believed traffic calming measures provided some remedies to that. She believed they had included safeguards and accordingly was more inclined to support the motion.

Shahan concurred with comments being made and added that he wondered if they couldn't consider some design alternatives for locations based on the travel uses so as to make the speed hump less harsh on higher volume collectors.

Motion to approve a substitute resolution incorporating the changes provided was made by Logan/Webber and carried by a majority with DeVos voting no. The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: Compton and Wittke

Aye: Webber, Skidmore, Forster Rothbart, Logan, Conroy, Strawser III and Kugler

No: De Vos

Non Voting: Shahan

F NEW BUSINESS

- F1 [02307](#) SUBSTITUTE - Authorizing the Traffic Engineering Division to accept a grant for \$100,560 \$107,200 from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to maintain and expand a safety education program and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to enter into the grant contract.

Attachments: _contracttrafficsafetyeducation.pdf

A motion was made by Conroy, seconded by Ald. Webber, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER

Ross indicated this was a routine, ongoing program, which funded the Traffic Safety Educator position in the agency.

The motion passed by acclamation.

- F2 [02205](#) Amending Section 1.08(3)(a). of the Madison General Ordinances to increase several bail deposit amounts.

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by De Vos, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the DOWNTOWN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Logan wondered why the difference in the dollar amount between the street sweeping and the others. Dryer said he did not know; but felt the higher fine was probably an effort to ensure that vehicles were removed during street sweeping operations.

The motion passed by acclamation.

- F3 [02139](#) Creating Section 28.06(2)(a)3138. of the Madison General Ordinances rezoning property from C2 General Commercial District to PUD(GDP) Planned Unit Development (General Development Plan) District and creating Section 28.06(2)(a)3139. of the Madison General Ordinances rezoning property from PUD(GDP) Planned Unit Development (General Development Plan) District to PUD(SIP) Planned Unit Development (Specific Implementation Plan) District. Proposed Use: Demolish Shopping Center and Build 12-Story Mixed Use Building with 130,000 Square Feet Retail, 73,500 Square Feet Offices, 91,000 Square Feet Health Center, 60,500 Activity Center and 430 Dwelling Units; 8th Aldermanic District: 700 Block University Avenue.

Attachments: Maps&Plans.pdf, Renderings.pdf, 02139Comments.pdf

Motion was made by Webber/Conroy to approve the ordinance and forward comments to the Plan Commission, Common Council and Developer.

An amendment to the motion to include language that pedestrian access would be maintained on Murray Mall during construction was made by Forster Rothbart/Logan and carried on a 5 in favor, 1 opposed (Kugler) and 1 abstention (Webber).

Motion as amended to approve the ordinance with the change related to maintaining pedestrian access on Murray Mall and forwarding comments related more to the SIP process to the Plan Commission, Common Council and Developer carried unanimously. (Note: These comments will be available in the Minutes of 11/22/05 PBMVC meeting.)

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Conroy, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation to Approve as Substituted to the PLAN COMMISSION

Gregg Rice, representing Madison Real Estate Properties; Executive Management Inc., registered in support. Also present were Rick Gilbertson, representing Executive Management as an architect with the Potter Lawson firm, Erik Lawson, representing Executive Management, and Adam Smith, representing Executive Management, and they were available to respond to questions.

Rice referred to his presentation before the body several years ago and said he was here today to bring the Commission up-to-date on the latest thinking for the property bounded by University Avenue, Lake Street, Johnson Street, and Murray Mall (East Campus mall).

Gilbertson provided an overview of the project and then the site development elements. They would be submitting the project as a GDP followed by an SIP in early 2006. The project is located in Downtown Design Zone 2, which includes some special zoning requirements. It is a mixed use facility with three primary uses: retail component (two story); 10- story residential apartment tower fronting on University Avenue and around Lake Street; and 9 story UW office tower along Johnson street and East Campus mall. The UW element consisted of a student activity center that would house student organizations on campus, a health service facility, and student services functions such a financial aid, registrar and bursar.

Kugler asked how the second floor retail was to be accessed. Gilbertson said the retail was pedestrian focused and entered from the sidewalk; no internal mall was planned, with some of the retail uses expected to be two stories. Other second story retailers would have an entry from the first level to the second level and consideration would be given to stairways, elevators or escalators. Rice pointed out that there was roughly 130,000 sq. ft. of retail space available and the retail consultant had said there wasn't enough mass to create an internal mall and support it. Gilbertson referred to the UW's plans to develop the East Campus Mall that would virtually extend to the lake and they would expect retail to be a major element along the mall. He referred to the plans for the retail terrace and sidewalks around the project. Since the East Campus Mall was primarily for pedestrians, bicycle travel through it would not be encouraged. They considered the site very pedestrian friendly and would result in a lot of foot traffic and he reviewed the building setbacks to provide a decent depth walk at the retail frontages and then a buffer between that and the major streets of Johnson and University Avenue. The buffer would likely be a raised planting bed with some vegetation and possibly include some low seat walls. There would be opportunities for bicycle parking, although not as much so on Johnson Street. He reviewed the floor plans including entrances to the lower level parking, housing entry, UW facility entry, loading docks, etc. There were two ramp entrances; one off Lake street served the below grade, public parking and the other to the second level private parking for the residential parking. On the first floor, they anticipated in the neighborhood of 100 surface bicycle stalls in the Campus Mall area and 75 other surface bike parking stalls were dispersed on the remaining three streets. There would be a dedicated moped parking area (25 stalls) in the Campus mall. The remainder of bike parking would be in the ramp and a dedicated bike lane was shown.

Shahan asked the width for the driving lane and then the bike lane. Gilbertson

said it looked as if the car lanes were 10 ft. and 4 ft. clear for the bike lane and due to the columns there were some areas where this was wider. Shahan said if the lane is too tight for the bicyclists it might be better to not have a dedicated lane and to just let the bicyclist take the traffic lane; speeds are slow enough in a ramp for this not to be much of a problem. Gilbertson said these were things that would be taken under advisement since they expected changes to be made.

DeVos asked the determinants in the height and number of stories and if the private housing was in competition with the UW dorms. Gilbertson said it was private housing that they expected primarily students would occupy it although it wouldn't be limited to students. Rice added that when the project was first conceived, they had thought of a venture with UW on the housing, but as the project proceeded the UW moved away from that concept. Rice explained the UW tower has 11 stories (2 stories retail and 9 stories UW); the housing tower has 12 stores (2 stories retail and 10 stories housing). The UW tower was taller than the housing tower because the floor-to-ceiling height for the office tower varies depending on the uses whereas the floor-to-ceiling height for the housing tower is static.

Conroy sought clarification on whether cars would have access off University and Gilbertson said no, the access points he had identified were pedestrian access points.

Logan asked about the bike access in the parking level closer to University Avenue, which Gilbertson identified. There would be about 128 spaces off the entrance from Lake Street but there were another 100 stalls that were reached by traveling through the parking structure. He said they were looking yet at the amount and location and who would be the users of the bicycle parking and changes could be made after opening when they had experience with its usage. Logan asked if more remote parking was intended to supplement the housing needs; Gilbertson said it could but it was public and it was located near the elevators. Logan wondered about identifying the more peripheral location for bicyclists entering the facility; how would they know it existed. Gilbertson agreed that signage would be important and Rice elaborated somewhat on this.

Forster Rothbart referred to the entry into the second story secure parking; that it should be set up so that it was easily used by bicyclists as well as motorists. He wondered if there was adequate bicycle parking. For the project, he had counted 658 bicycles parking inside and outside the facility and 140 moped spaces and yet the housing anticipated 1010 beds. If you ignored the office and retail, he wasn't sure there was adequate bicycle parking for the residential. Rice said an analysis had been done. The UW portion basically stood on its own but there was the retail and housing element and they had limited research to rely on as it related to bicycle/moped needs. He saw it as a work in progress and they had done an initial analysis but by the time the project is built he believed the number of bicycle and moped facilities would change-in number and probably location. Gilbertson said that Executive Management had partnered with UW's Rob Kennedy on the numbers and he reviewed the analyses. One was based on the existing zoning requirements and resulted in a total of 387 stalls. Then based on the numbers used by the UW for their properties for their dorms they came up with 537 bike/137 mopeds. Their current proposal was for 658 bike/140 mopeds.

Strawser pointed out one discrepancy; and referred to the footnote about the housing having one bike parking per dwelling units (350) so he said the number

shown as 200 for the housing should be bumped to 350. Gilbertson explained the reason for the difference.

Although she applauded the effort they made with the analysis on the amount of bicycle parking, Webber did not believe there was enough and noted the inadequacy of bicycle parking supply on Campus and she wondered about other bicycle amenities which might be provided. She pointed out that often on the periphery two parking spaces are provided per dwelling unit compared to the downtown of 1.4 spaces since downtown residents are likely to have less reliance on the automobile. There was a tendency to over plan for car parking and yet this wasn't done for bicycle parking. She suggested it was easier to provide the bike/moped parking. Rice said based on research for newer residential properties, the number of parking stalls and their ratio of 262 parking stalls for 350 units (or 1010 beds) is a lower ratio than newer projects being approved. For retail, it was critical in selling the project that there is sufficient parking-retailers always wanted to see more. It was a balancing act for them to match reality with the reality of getting tenants for the project. Rice assured members changes were expected as they moved closer to project finalization.

Strawser asked for a copy of the bike parking analysis that was provided by Gilbertson and they indicated they would share it. Strawser referred to that parking in the northeast area of the parking structure and supported the idea of making it secure parking for residents since he didn't believe those coming off the street would travel through the ramp to use it. If there was incentive to park next to the elevators and it was secure, he could see it being used by tenants. Strawser suggested use of off-the-shelf bike parking lockers that could be used in that area and it might be leased parking.

Forster Rothbart thought they were at a good starting point in the bike parking that was being provided but he felt they were short on bike parking for the housing since he did not believe they would have less than one per unit. For the moped retail parking on the street, he thought they would be short in supply and suggested another location would be for westbound traffic coming off University at Lake. Gilbertson said they would be looking at providing a curb cut off Johnson Street for a segregated moped parking area and possibly it could be carried over to Lake Street. He pointed out the majority of Lake Street would be rolled curb loading zone and they might be able to provide some there.

Rice said another challenge in the Lake Street area was the truck traffic associated with serving the facility. Hopefully, this service could be done during off-hours to minimize the congestion on Lake Street during the heavier user periods. With that in mind, they might be able to provide moped parking on Lake Street. He emphasized the difficulty in putting a number on the demand because of the number of unknowns and they were trying to develop the project so that it was as flexible and fluid as it could be. He said he would not have a good handle on the retail users for another 18-20 months-they hoped to open in the summer of 2009. Forster Rothbart suggested that they come back as the plans are more formalized.

Forster Rothbart asked about the pedestrian circulation for the third floor and referred to the importance of having good pedestrian connections between the residential and the Student Life building. Rice said that was not in the plans for security reason. The housing tower would be separate from the University tower. Both uses would have roof gardens with access and landscaping but all of this

would be separate for each use. Gilbertson said they were looking at the UW having a plaza area adjacent to the core and staff and students would have access to this. It would overlook the East Campus Mall. The housing tower would have access points in the corner of the "L" and would have a patio and access would be controlled through card security. They would be looking into introducing green plantings to make the area pleasant. To maintain the separation they would be looking at passive ways, seat walls, plantings, etc. Forster Rothbart cautioned that the two uses would be linked unless they were effective in separating them.

Forster Rothbart urged that during construction it was important that sidewalks around the building be maintained. Rice said their contractor had been looking into this and had some preliminary discussions with the City. Shahan referred to comment #5 in the Traffic Engineer's comments to the Plan Commission. Gilbertson noted that Murray Mall would be redeveloped as part of the project and so there may be times when access might be shut down entirely.

Shahan suggested areas for additional bike parking, e.g. corners such as at Murray Mall and Johnson and University and along Lake and University. With the contra-flow bike lane and retail front, he wondered about another curb cut between Murray Mall and Lake Street for bicycles and include in it some bicycle racks. Gilbertson said this had been debated; a first thought was it would encourage bicyclists to cut through the site so currently they were not supporting a central curb cut. Shahan said he was looking at places where additional bike parking could be accommodated in the strip area being landscaped where racks could be interspersed, such as is done presently on State Street and Monroe Street. Shahan asked the setback from the street to the storefront; Gilbertson said 12 ft. clear sidewalk around the facility. From the curb edge and University to the building was in the neighborhood of 25 ft. and they had planned to space bike parking in the planted areas, but wanted to place it closer to the intersections. Rice said another place might be locations along Lake Street.

Referring to Murray Mall as it related to the parking on the east face Shahan wondered if it was possible to add some to the west face. Gilbertson said initially they were looking at strategies for parking along East Campus mall (currently they identified 100 bike parking and 25 mopeds). The opinion of the team at this point was that if much more were added it would become more a bike parking area than pedestrian mall. Shahan said if there were sufficient demand from residents and other users of the development, would they consider removing car parking to increase the bike parking in the lower ramp. Rice said it was too soon to be able to answer that; it would be a consideration, however. Their goal would be to keep the tenants happy and satisfy their needs.

Shahan asked about the bike access to the second floor parking with the exit onto Johnson Street, which he did not consider the most bike friendly street. Was there a way to get them to this access without using the sidewalk? Gilbertson said that to get the two parking ramps on the site, both access points couldn't be from Lake street and the decision was to have the residential, every day users take access form Johnson Street. He pointed out there would be a service elevator which would let a resident gain access from Lake Street. Shahan suggested signing this availability would be appropriate.

Shahan referred to the comments in the staff report about the parking ramp and dimensions and wondered in the developers had any response to it. Gilbertson

said they were aware of the comments and were working on the suggestions. The only concern that he remembered had to do with the 10 ft. separation between the loading dock and car ramp but they intended to comply with the other items mentioned. Shahan suggested that if the separate designated lane for bicyclists and the travel lane weren't needed, they might be able to go to something like 12 ft. and gain some space. Gilbertson said combining the car and bicycle lane might be a strategy for them to consider. Strawser said he liked the designated lane since it was an easy way to let people know there is bicycle parking in the ramp so he had mixed feelings about this.

Webber referred to the grade on the ramps and said people might find that they preferred to walk their bicycles up or down and she wondered about the mix of pedestrians, bicyclists and cars in this area. In terms of parking for retailers, an issue looked at for State Street in locating bicycle racks was the fact that sites desiring sidewalk cafes space where bike racks might have been used would not be available. Rice said they definitely believed they would have outside seating associated with the retail and it would have to be factored in. Webber urged that they designate the outdoor bicycle parking up front so that it is not subsequently removed because of an outside café.

Shahan asked about reconstructing Lake Street; Gilbertson understood that this related more to the disruption to the street associated with building a facility of the magnitude of this. Shahan asked if they had any specifics on the design for Murray Mall. Rice responded that the University was taking the lead on it and they were working with their consultant and he did not believe they were at the point of making a formal presentation. Shahan indicated a desire to see this when it was available.

The Plan Commission was considering the GDP and comments from PBMVC would be forwarded as a part of that consideration process even though many of the comments were probably more relevant to the SIP.

Motion was made by Webber/Conroy to approve the ordinance and ask that the comments be forwarded to the Plan Commission, Common Council and Developer.

Forster Rothbart/Logan made an amendment to the motion as it related to TE comment #5 on construction staging to include language that pedestrian access must remain open on Murray Mall during construction.

Kugler wondered about adding a caveat that recognized safety considerations with the construction machinery that would be needed for a project of this size. He understood this as a worthwhile goal but was not confident that the contractor would be able to follow through. Forster Rothbart referred to use of covered walkways for other projects to maintain pedestrian access

Webber asked if maintaining at least a pedestrian walkway through Murray Mall was possible. Gilbertson said that they weren't able to speak to the issue; it would be up to the contractor. He pointed out the contractor had been in contact with City Staff. Rice pointed out it would be a 3-year construction project and it was a huge project and the contractors were well aware of the desires to maintain access on not only Murray Mall, but University Avenue, Lake and Johnson Streets. They referred to the condition asking for a construction-staging plan in the Traffic Engineering comments. Shahan wondered about softening the

language somewhat to try to maintain, recognizing that it might not be possible. Forster Rothbart referred to the project on Charter Street and the closing of the bike lane, which was to have been kept open. Forster Rothbart believed it was important enough to be clear and have the contractor figure out a way to accommodate the request. Motion as stated to keep pedestrian traffic open to Murray Mall carried on a 5 in favor, 1 opposed (Kugler) and 1 abstention (Webber).

Motion as amended to approve the ordinance with the change related to maintaining pedestrian access on Murray Mall and forwarding comments related more to the SIP process to the Plan Commission, Common Council and Developer carried unanimously. (Note: These comments will be available in the Minutes of 11/22/05 PBVC meeting.)

The motion passed by acclamation.

[02467](#)

Attachment for Legistar 02139 for 11/22/05 PBVC Meeting

Attachments: cs02139700univave.doc, _attach02139_700univave.pdf

F4

[02475](#)

Petition for stop signs at MacArthur and Sycamore (Kempfer, et al)

Attachments: _macarthur_sycamore_mayfair.pdf, _macarthur_sycamorecorres.pdf,
_macarthur_sycamoremaps_speed.pdf,
_macarthur_sycamore_petition.pdf

Dryer referred to the material presented.

Strawser asked if the amount of work evidenced by the material provided was typical of stop sign requests; Dryer said it would depend on the nature of the request. Often a cursory review is made and a response made; if there is follow-up contact, more detailed studies are undertaken. Strawser said that if this were the detail needed for a stop sign request, he'd consider withdrawing some requests.

DeVos questioned if any stop sign requests were approved; Dryer responded they were, and added that with the traffic calming program fewer stop signs were being requested. The all-way stop sign list that is presented to the Commission on a yearly basis was indicative of the stop sign requests. Dryer pointed out the Commission had the latitude to install a stop sign if they desired; staff did not want to be recommending the installation of any stop sign that did not meet warrants since it put staff in a difficult situation when weighing other locations. Experience has shown that the installation of unwarranted stop signs results in additional requests within the neighborhood. DeVos pointed out the motivation for her question was that during discussions about having traffic calming device on Glenway, requests were made to consider stop signs and the response in every case regardless of whether the request appeared reasonable or ludicrous was no. She had felt this was unreasonable at the time. Shahan explained the process as it related to stop sign consideration and the impacts of placing unwarranted stop signs rather than pursuing traffic calming measures.

Forster Rothbart referred to the extension of Parkside Drive as mentioned in the material from the neighborhood and wondered about the impacts. Dryer believed it would have some effect but he didn't know to what extent it would on MacArthur. Parkside is an extension from Lien to Sycamore and City Engineering was to respond to that part of the communication and he would have to check with Engineering to see where it is scheduled. Forster Rothbart felt if it did happen, it would likely decrease traffic at the intersection in question. Dryer agreed there would be more circulation options.

Motion by Conroy/Strawser to accept the petition and place it on file carried unanimously.

G REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES - SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

G1 Plan Commission

Forster Rothbart said the Plan Commission dealt with Comprehensive Plan with the goal of completing it by the December meeting. Another issue was discussion related to building size and when it was appropriate to not follow an approved neighborhood plan-such as the projects planned for Shenks Corners and East Washington.

G2 Long Range Transportation Planning Commission

Shahan reported that comments were formulated on the Comprehensive Plan and they had looked into the MPO work program for next year.

G3 Joint West Area Campus Committee
Meeting Scheduled December 9.

G4 Joint SE Campus Area Committee
Meeting scheduled November 28, 2005.

H REPORT OF OFFICERS AND/OR MEMBERS FOR INFORAMTION/DISCUSSION

H1 Executive Secretary
2006 Calendar - Left 2006 calendar stand without scheduling a December meeting at this time, rather one could be scheduled later in the year.

H2 Items by the Chair
None

H3 Items for referral and/or announcements
Webber noted discussions she and Ross were having with the Zoning Administrator due to a request of a resident from Metropolitan Place about the difference between off-street bicycle parking and storage-should storage lockers for residents count as bike parking?

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:50 p.m.

A motion was made by Ald. Webber, seconded by Logan, to Adjourn. The motion passed by acclamation.