

**PLANNING UNIT REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
of May 30, 3006**

RE: I.D. # 03697: Zoning Map Amendment I.D. 3188 To Rezone 625-627 E. Mifflin Street from C3 (Highway Commercial District) to PUD-GDP-SIP

1. Requested Actions: Approval of a request to rezone 625-627 E. Mifflin Street from C3 (Highway Commercial District) to Planned Unit Development, General Development Plan/ Specific Implementation Plan (PUD-GDP-SIP) to allow demolition of an existing auto-repair garage and the construction of a 66-unit condominium building.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.07 (6) of the Zoning Ordinance provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Developments; Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments; Section 28.04 (22) provides the guidelines and regulations for the approval of demolition permits.
3. Report Prepared By: Timothy M. Parks, Planner.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Applicant & Property owner: Mike Fisher & Karl Madsen, Great Dane Development; 2249 Pinehurst Drive; PO Box 620800; Middleton.
2. Development Schedule: The applicants wish to commence construction in October 2006 with completion scheduled for December 2007.
3. Location: Approximately 0.72 acres located at 625-627 E. Mifflin Street, Aldermanic District 2; Madison Metropolitan School District.
4. Existing Conditions: A one-story auto repair and storage garage, zoned C3 (Highway Commercial District).
5. Proposed Land Use: A five-story, 66-unit condominium building.
6. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:
North: One and two-family residences, zoned R5 (General Residence District) and C3 (Highway Commercial District), Coachyard Square and Dayton Row townhouses, zoned PUD-SIP;
South: Goodyear Tire and Salvation Army, zoned C3;
W&E: Surface parking lots, zoned C3.

7. Adopted Land Use Plan: The Comprehensive Plan identifies the 600 and 700 blocks of E. Washington Avenue as Community Mixed Use. The opposite two blocks on the north side of E. Mifflin Street are recommended for High-Density Residential Uses. The draft East Washington Avenue BUILD Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan recommends Employment uses on the E. Washington Avenue frontage of these blocks, and Residential/Employment on the E. Mifflin Street frontage. The draft of the new Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan recommends Medium-Density Residential uses on the E. Mifflin Street frontage of these blocks. Neither of the latter plans have been extensively reviewed or considered for adoption at this time. (See more-detailed discussion in report.)
8. Environmental Corridor Status: The property is not located within a mapped environmental corridor.
9. Public Utilities & Services: The property is served by a full range of urban services.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

This application is subject to the demolition standards of Section 28.04 (22) and the Planned Unit Development District standards.

PLAN REVIEW

The applicants are requesting approval of a request to rezone the property from C3 commercial zoning to PUD-GDP-SIP to allow future development of a five-story, 66-unit condominium building to be known as The Colony. The project will contain 40 one-bedroom units and 26 two-bedroom units, including six two-bedroom townhouse units.

The condominiums will replace an existing one-story, 15,606 square-foot brick structure occupied with an auto repair and storage business. The existing building occupies the depth of the lot and slightly less than half of the property frontage along E. Mifflin Street, with surface parking surrounding the building on both the west and east sides of the building.

The site is generally surrounded by a mix of land uses, including surface parking lots occupying the remainder of the south side of this block of E. Mifflin Street between Blair and Blount streets. Lands to the south of the site along E. Washington Avenue are non-residential in nature, with the Salvation Army headquarters and Goodyear Tire Center located south of the subject site. Properties north of the site across E. Mifflin Street are exclusively residential in nature, with a mix of one and two-family residences and the Coachyard Square and Dayton Row townhouse developments.

The proposed building will be oriented towards the western property line of the parcel, with a 26-foot wide driveway to extend the length of the eastern property line to serve two under-building parking levels. A total of 86 automobile parking spaces will serve the 66-unit development at a ratio of 1.3 parking spaces per unit, with 34 of the spaces to be located at ground level behind the first floor façade and 52 spaces to be located one floor below in an under-building parking level. Parking for 58 bikes is proposed, of which 19 spaces will be located in racks at the front of the building and at the bottom of the driveway. The project is not providing an off-street loading stall to serve the new building; a trash enclosure will be provided in the basement. The project is requesting that a waiver to this requirement be granted as part of the approval of this planned unit development. A recent amendment to the Zoning Ordinance allows a waiver to providing off-street loading to be considered as part of a PUD approval similar to other facets of a development such as yards, building height, usable open space or off-street parking.

The building is proposed as a U-shaped structure that will scale down from five stories covering most of the site down to three stories along E. Mifflin Street to provide a transition from higher-intensity uses envisioned along E. Washington Avenue into the mostly one and two-story residential uses north of E. Mifflin Street. The building will be faced primarily with brick veneer atop a concrete masonry base with various precast and brick reveals and ornamental metal roof overhangs used to create visual interest along the E. Mifflin Street elevation. Primary public access to the 66-unit building will be through an entrance located at the end of a landscaped courtyard created by the shape of the building. The three-story component of the building facing Mifflin is intended to evoke a townhouse style, with eight entry doors facing the street. According to the floorplans submitted with the project, those doors will lead to either to first floor dwellings or to two-story townhouse units to be located on the second and third floors facing E. Mifflin Street. Two other first floor units will have direct access from the courtyard and another first floor unit will have a side-loaded entrance along the west wall with a walkway from the street. Units in the five-story section of the building will have a mixture of recessed patios or balconies located primarily along the south, east and west walls, though fourth floor units facing E. Mifflin Street will have patios on the roof of the three-story section of the building.

The new building will occupy the majority of the site, with an 11-foot setback from the street property line and approximately a ten-foot setback from the western, side property line and 13-foot setback to the southern, rear property line. Most of the yard space will be seeded with a “no-mow” fescue mix with canopy trees to be planted at 30 to 40-foot intervals along the western and southern sides of the building. Landscaping of the rest of the site will consist primarily of mound alpine currant shrubs to be planted in a row adjacent to the sidewalk, along the western wall of the building adjacent to the side-loaded first floor unit and along the courtyard path leading to the main apartment entrance. Beds of perennials will be planted in the remainder of the front yard.

Inclusionary Zoning

The applicants have submitted an Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan (IDUP) indicating their intent to comply with the inclusionary zoning provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. The IDUP indicates that 10 of the 66 units will be constructed to meet the affordability criteria, with all ten units to be available to families earning 80 percent of the area median income (AMI). Four of the affordable units will be two-bedroom units, with the six remaining affordable units to contain one bedroom. The proposed unit breakdown represents 15% of each unit type in conformance with ordinance requirements as well as 15% of the overall project. A dispersion plan submitted with the IDUP shows units located on every floor of the building including one first floor unit facing E. Mifflin Street and two units overlooking the courtyard. The Planning Unit feels that the dispersion of the ten affordable units is acceptable.

This project has earned one incentive point, which the applicant is using to request funds from the Inclusionary Zoning Special Reserve Fund. A report from the Community Development Block Grant Office regarding the project's conformance with the inclusionary zoning provisions is attached.

The project is also receiving a substantial density bonus. The project proposes a density of 91.67 units per acre based on 66 units on the 0.72-acre site. The benchmark density for consideration of a density bonus is based on the existing zoning, or C3 in this case, which has a benchmark density of 38 units per acre. The Zoning Ordinance provides a ten percent bonus per incentive point (up to three points) for any project, unless a project contains four or more stories and provides at least 75 percent of its parking underground. In that case, a density bonus of twenty percent per incentive point is allowed. The proposed building exceeds the four-story threshold. While only 60% of the 86 parking spaces are located below ground, all of the parking will be enclosed in the building, which in staff's opinion satisfies the intent of the incentive provision and makes the project eligible for the 20% per point allowance. The density bonus would suggest 45.6 units per acre to be developed on the site with a twenty percent bonus above the 38-unit benchmark using the one incentive point. The 45.6-unit per acre density would result in 32 units being built on this 0.72-acre parcel. The 91.67-unit per acre density of this project is twice the density bonus the project could be provided based on the points it has earned. However, the ordinance allows the Plan Commission and Common Council to approve the planned unit development based on the overall merits of the project and density proposed.

ANALYSIS & CONCLUSION

The applicants propose demolition of a one-story auto-repair building to facilitate development of a five-story, 66-unit condominium building. A windshield survey of the existing building by staff found the condition of the building and site to be commensurate with its age and use as an

auto repair and storage business. Staff has no information that would indicate that the building is not structurally sound or capable of being rehabilitated or repaired. However, staff believes that the proposed alternative use of the site will allow it to be more economically productive for the foreseeable future. Further, the proposed condominium project will achieve many of the goals outlined for this block of E. Mifflin Street in various City and neighborhood plans.

Consistency with Adopted Plans

The proposed project is a five-story structure with the top two stories set back about twenty feet from a three-story front facade located about 11 feet from the sidewalk. The overall net density of this 66-unit condominium on a 0.72-acre site is about 92 units per acre.

As noted in the "General Information" section, the Comprehensive Plan recommends the area bounded by Blair, E. Mifflin and Livingston streets and E. Washington Avenue for Community Mixed Use development—a recommendation that would support both residential and commercial buildings, as well as mixed-use buildings. There are no fixed height or bulk standards established for Community Mixed Use districts, and the design recommendations for these districts need to be specified in more detailed neighborhood or special area plans. It is generally expected that residential densities in Community Mixed Use districts would not exceed 60 units per acre, but smaller areas of higher density may be recommended in detailed neighborhood or special area plans provided that the development is also compatible with the scale and character of the surrounding uses and neighborhood. Currently, there are two separate small-area plans being prepared that include this block, but neither have been formally submitted to the City for review or adoption at this time.

The draft East Washington Avenue BUILD Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan is being prepared by a consultant for the Department of Planning and Development, under the guidance of a steering committee comprised of property owners, neighborhood leaders, City staff and others. The plan makes broad land use recommendations and more-detailed design recommendations for the blocks along both sides of E. Washington Avenue between Blair Street and First Street. The Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan recommends the subject block for Community Mixed Use development and further specifies "Residential/Employment" uses on the E. Mifflin Street frontage. Design recommendations in the draft plan include a maximum eight-story height limit on the interior of the block, with a "45-degree" step-back for all stories above the third story on the E. Mifflin Street frontage, and a lesser step-back on the E. Washington Avenue frontage. The plan notes that the scale of developments should be compatible with new residential buildings on the west side of E. Mifflin Street. The proposed development appears to comply with the draft plan recommendations, with an 11-foot setback off of E. Mifflin Street, a three-story element adjacent to the street, and a 45-degree stepback between the top of the third-story parapet and the cornice on the front of the fifth story.

The project is also located within the limits of Tenney-Lapham neighborhood, which is in the process of revising their 1995 neighborhood plan with limited assistance from Planning Unit staff. The Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan also recommends Community Mixed Use development on the E. Washington Avenue frontage of this block, but specifies that developments on the E. Mifflin Street frontage should be residential only by designating that half of the block for medium-density residential uses at 26-40 units per acre. The plan recommends similar medium densities on the north side of E. Mifflin Street, in contrast to the High-Density Residential (41-60 units per acre) recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Unit has advised the neighborhood that the proposed density recommendations may be unrealistically low for this location, particularly on the south side of E. Mifflin Street.

The draft Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan generally encourages residential development along the south side of E. Mifflin Street to serve as a buffer between community mixed-use and commercially oriented development along E. Washington Avenue into the neighborhood to the north. The plan calls for maximum building heights along E. Washington Avenue not to exceed six stories, stepping down to three stories along E. Mifflin Street to better relate to the lower-scale buildings to the north. Front setbacks along E. Mifflin Street should mirror similar setbacks elsewhere along the street. The plan recommends that parking be limited in development in the 600- and 700-blocks to 1-1.5 spaces per unit. In general, the Planning Unit believes that the scale and massing of the project largely conform to the draft tenets of the revised Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan, especially in respect to the height of the building, the ratio of off-street parking and the setback from E. Mifflin Street proposed.

The recommendations for this block made in both the draft Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan and the draft Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan would be generally consistent with the Community Mixed Use recommendation in the Comprehensive Plan. However, the recommendations in the two draft plans are not fully consistent with each other, and this inconsistency will have to be resolved before these plans are adopted. Despite the inconsistencies, however, the Planning Unit considers the recommendations in both draft plans to be generally supportive of the proposed project. The residential use along E. Mifflin is consistent with both the Residential/Employment recommendation in the draft Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan, as well as the Residential recommendation in the draft Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan. The three story building height on the E. Mifflin frontage is also consistent with both draft plans, and the 20-foot step-back of the fourth and fifth stories is consistent with the 45-degree step-back recommended for the E. Mifflin Street frontage in the draft Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan. The 11-foot set back of the building from the sidewalk appears to be consistent with both draft plans.

The proposed 92 unit per acre net density is outside the typical range anticipated in most Community Mixed-Use districts, but is consistent with the recommendations for the site included

in one of the two more-detailed draft plans currently being prepared. The 600-block is directly adjacent to both the Downtown District, where average densities are considerably higher than elsewhere in the community, and to the E. Washington Avenue corridor, which is being planned as a relatively high-density extension of the downtown employment and mixed-use core. At this location, residential densities greater than 60 units per acre are reasonable and consistent with the policy intent of the Comprehensive Plan to concentrate density downtown and along major transportation corridors. The draft Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan does not make a specific residential density recommendations for this block, but, as noted in the Comprehensive Plan, and particularly at higher densities, building design and compatibility often become much more important than nominal density in determining whether or not a proposed development is consistent with the intent of plan recommendations. The draft Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan recommends medium-density residential uses on the E. Mifflin Street half of this block, but this density appears low, both for the location, and for the building types that would be supported by the design recommendations.

The proposed building height, setbacks, upper-story step-backs, and general design character of the project appear to staff to be largely consistent with the design recommendations included in the two draft small area plans currently being prepared – although the density is significantly higher than recommended in the draft Tenney-Lapham plan. Staff considers the project to be well designed and to provide a good transition to the lower-scale buildings that exist or may be developed on the north side of E. Mifflin Street. While the density proposed in the draft Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan is much lower than the density of this project, staff believes that the Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan provides more realistic recommendations for this location. Until the inconsistencies are resolved at the time that these draft plans are reviewed and adopted, staff would be comfortable with a conclusion that the density of the proposed project is sufficiently consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The net density of residential developments within Community Mixed Use districts may exceed 60 units per acre if the project is consistent with the more detailed recommendations of a neighborhood or special area plan and is compatible with the surrounding uses and developments.

Staff believes that the project will meet all of the standards for planned unit developments found in the Zoning Ordinance.

The Urban Design Commission (UDC) reviewed the project and recommended final approval on May 24, 2006.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Unit recommends that the Plan Commission forward Zoning Map Amendment 3188, rezoning 627 E. Mifflin Street from C3 (Highway Commercial District) to Planned Unit

ID #03697
625-627 E. Mifflin St.
May 30, 2006
Page 8

Development, General Development Plan/ Specific Implementation Plan (PUD-GDP-SIP) to the Common Council with a recommendation of **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing and the following conditions:

1. Comments from reviewing agencies.
2. That the applicants submit a final Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan for approval and recording as part of the PUD-GDP-SIP for the project that includes a complete IDUP, marketing plan and Land Use Restriction Agreement (LURA).

**CITY OF MADISON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: May 31, 2006

To: Plan Commission
From: Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator
Subject: 625-629 E Mifflin St

Present Zoning District: C-3

Proposed Use: Demolish vacant garage building & build 5 story, 66 unit condo building

Proposed Zoning District: PUD(GDP-SIP)

Conditional Use: 28.04(22) Demolition of a principal building requires PC approval

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 CDBG, a copy of the approved plan for recording prior to zoning sign off of the plans.
2. Show building setbacks on the site plan. Show cantilevered portions of the building on the site plan.
3. Show the height of the building per City Datum. No portion of any building or structure located within one mile of the center of the State Capitol Building shall exceed the elevation of the base of the columns of the Capitol Building or one hundred eighty-seven and two-tenths (187.2) feet, City datum. Except this prohibition shall not apply to elevator penthouses, and chimneys exceeding such elevation, when approved as a conditional use. For the purpose of this subsection, City datum zero (0.00) feet shall be established as eight hundred forty-five and six-tenths (845.6) feet above sea level as established by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.
4. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:
 - a. Provide a minimum of two accessible stalls striped per State requirements. A minimum of one of the stalls shall be a van accessible stall 8' wide with an 8' striped out area adjacent.

- b. Show signage at the head of the stalls. Accessible signs shall be a minimum of 60" between the bottom of the sign and the ground/floor.
- c. Show the accessible path from the stalls to the elevator. The stalls shall be as near the elevator as possible.

5.

ZONING CRITERIA

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	73,800 sq. ft.	31,400 sq. ft. *
Lot width	50'	adequate
Usable open space	14,720 sq. ft.	5,210 sq. ft. + balconies *
Front yard	20'	6' approx.
Side yards	17.8' right, 15.3' left	10.6' right, 26' left
Rear yard	28' (55% of bldg. ht. 51')	12.9'
Building height	187.2' City Datum	6 stories (3)

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	89 (If in conventional zoning)	86 (garage)
Accessible stalls	2	(4)
Loading	1 (10' x 35') area	0 *
Number bike parking stalls	58	58 (19 surface, 39 gar)
Landscaping	As shown	adequate
Lighting	Yes	(5)

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes
Historic District	No
Landmark building	No
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.



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: May 1, 2006
TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Larry D. Nelson, P.E., City Engineer
SUBJECT: 625 East Mifflin Street Demolition, Rezone, Inclusionary Zoning

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. Provide details of proposed retaining wall with design certified by a Professional Engineer. If retaining wall system encroaches onto neighboring properties, provide proof of easement.
2. Prior to approval, owner shall execute a maintenance agreement for retaining walls and storm water management components.
3. Revise sanitary lateral connection to City main to existing manhole SAS 5247-036 located in East Mifflin Street approximately 30-feet away from the east property line of the development.

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: 625 East Mifflin Street Demolition, Rezone, Inclusionary Zoning

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.
- 1.4 The site plan shall identify the difference between existing and proposed impervious areas.

9



- 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.
- 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

9

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 The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required.
- 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. Specifically, this development is required to:
 - Detain the 2 & 10-year storm events.
 - Detain the 2, 10, & 100-year storm events.
 - Control 40% TSS (20 micron particle).
 - Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle).
 - Provide infiltration in accordance with NR-151.
 - Provide substantial thermal control.
 - Provide oil & grease control from the first 1/2" of runoff from parking areas.

Stormwater management plans shall be submitted and approved by City Engineering prior to signoff.

- 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.)
- e) Right-of-Way lines (public and private)
- f) Lot lines
- g) Lot numbers
- h) Lot/Plat dimensions
- i) Street names

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

- 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 dedicated 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.

- 4.15 The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the Engineering Division (Jeff Benedict or Tim Troester). The digital copies shall be to scale, and shall have a scale bar on the plan set.

PDF submittals shall contain the following information:

- a) Building footprints.
- b) Internal walkway areas.
- c) Internal site parking areas.
- d) Lot lines and right-of-way lines.
- e) Street names.
- f) Stormwater Management Facilities.
- g) Detail drawings associated with Stormwater Management Facilities (including if applicable planting plans).

- 4.16 The Applicant shall submit prior to plan sign-off, electronic copies of any Stormwater Management Files including:

- a) SLAMM DAT files.
- b) RECARGA files.
- c) TR-55/HYDROCAD/Etc...
- d) Sediment loading calculations

If calculations are done by hand or are not available electronically the hand copies or printed output shall be scanned to a PDF file and provided.

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 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.

9



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

May 25, 2006

TO: Plan Commission

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

SUBJECT: **625 East Mifflin Street – Rezoning–C3 to PUD (GDP-SIP) – 66 Unit / 5 Story Building**

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. City of Madison radio systems are microwave directional line of sight to remote towers citywide. The building elevation will need to be review by Traffic Engineer to accommodate the microwave sight and building. The applicant shall submit grade and elevations plans if the building exceeds four stories prior to sign-off to be reviewed and approved by Keith Lippert, (266-4767) Traffic Engineering Shop, 1120 Sayle Street. The applicant shall return one signed approved building elevation copy to the City of Madison Traffic Engineering office with final plans for sign off.

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. The ramp down and up to the Basement & First Floor underground parking and its percent of slope shall be designed to accommodate low-clearance vehicles for a transition. The ramp breakover angle (limited by vehicle wheel-base and ground clearance) and angles of approach (affected by front overhang of vehicles) and

departure (affected by rear overhang) are critical vehicle clearance points. Standards established by the Society of Automotive Engineers limit the ramp breakover angle to no less than 10 degrees; angle of departure, no less than 10 degrees; and angle of approach, no less than 15 degrees. The applicant shall provide a profile of the ramp showing the slopes critical clearance, when plans are submitted for approval. The applicant should explore ramp slopes (grades) less than 10 % that can be blended satisfactorily with an 8-foot transition length.

4. The applicant shall note the truck loading area on the First Floor Plan to underground parking. The area shall be dimensions for proposed the enclosed bike racks and turning area into the garage. The applicant shall demonstrate a vehicle turning into the First Floor Area.
5. 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.
6. The Developer shall post a deposit and reimburse the City for all costs associated with any modifications to Traffic Signals, Street Lighting, Signing and Pavement Marking, and conduit and handholes, including labor, engineering and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.
7. 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: J. Randy Bruce
Fax: 608-836-6934
Email: rbruce@knothebruce.com

DCD:DJM:dm

↑



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: 5/18/06
TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Edwin J. Ruckriegel, Fire Marshal
SUBJECT: **625 E. Mifflin St.**

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. If building is fully sprinklered, the Madison Fire Department will accept up to 250' of hose reach.

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.

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

cc: John Lippitt



Department of Public Works
Parks Division

Madison Municipal Building, Room 120
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2987
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2987
PH: 608 266 4711
TDD: 608 267 4980
FAX: 608 267 1162

May 26, 2006

TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Simon Widstrand, Parks Development Manager
SUBJECT: **625 East Mifflin**

S.W.

- 1. The developer shall pay \$114,982.56 for park dedication and development fees.**
- 2. Park Fees shall be paid prior to signoff for each SIP, or the developer may pay half the fees and provide a letter of credit for the other half. Developments with multiphase subdivision contracts may pay with each phase.**

Park dedication = 66 multifamily @ 700 square feet/unit = 46,200 square feet. The developer shall pay a fee in lieu of dedication based on the land value of the square footage of parkland required (up to a maximum of \$1.74 / square foot). **Estimated fee is \$80,388.00**

Park Development Fees = (66 @ \$524.16) = \$ 34,594.56

TOTAL PARK FEES = \$114,982.56

This development contains no private open space or recreational improvements that qualify for IZ credits.

Approval of plans for this project does not include any approval to prune, remove or plant trees in the public right-of-way. Permission for such activities must be obtained from the City Forester, 266-4816.

Please contact Simon Widstrand at 266-4714 or awidstrand@cityofmadison.com if you have questions regarding the above items.

April 25, 2006

Karl Madsen and Mike Fisher
Great Dane Development
2249 Pinehurst Drive
P.O. Box 620800
Middleton, WI 53562-0800

Dear Mr. Madsen and Mr. Fisher,

The Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association council wishes to extend our gratitude for this chance to provide input on your proposed development at 627 E. Mifflin Street. The council endorsed your development plan at our April 5, 2006 meeting. We based this endorsement on the plan that was presented to the neighborhood at a public meeting held March 27, 2006 at Fyfe's Bistro. We very much appreciate that this development plan conforms to our recently updated neighborhood plan.

Plan aspects favored by the neighborhood:

- Owner occupancy
- Townhouses with private entryways on East Mifflin
- Diversity of floor plans
- Lower building massing on East Mifflin graduating toward higher massing on the block interior.
- Distinctive, quality architecture with interesting details

The council expressed a desire that a portion of the townhouses along Mifflin Street include a 3 bedroom layout. These townhouses, each with individual entry, could attract more families to the area – an important neighborhood goal.

One council member was concerned that we don't know what the back (south face) of the building will look like. Upon completion, the south facing portion of the building will be quite visible from East Washington Avenue, and it is hoped that some attention will be paid to design detail on that side of the building.

The Tenney-Lapham neighborhood strongly encourages the use of green, environmentally sensitive design and construction. Given our proximity to the lakes, technologies that reduce storm water run off such as green roofs and rain garden landscaping are desired. In addition, outdoor lighting should be sensitive to dark sky initiatives.

In conclusion, we thank you for your sensitivity to our neighborhood, and please keep us informed and involved as the plan winds its way through the city application process. We have set up a web page in order to keep our residents up to date on the progress of this development. That address is <http://eastmifflin.com/627>.

Regards,

David Waugh
Tenney Lapham Neighborhood Association

CC: Cheryl Wittke, President, Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association
Brenda Konkel, Alder, Second District

DRAFT

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 24, 2006

TITLE: 625 East Mifflin Street – PUD(GDP-SIP),
Sixty-Six Unit Condominium Project. Ald.
Dist. 2. (03553)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 24, 2006

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 24, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a sixty-six unit condominium project located at 625 East Mifflin Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce, architect. Bruce noted to the Commission that the plans had been modified to reflect the following:

- Based on input from the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, the project has been downsized from a previously proposed 80 condominium units to the 66 condominium units with reduction in height from a proposed 7-story to a 5-story structure. The new design features the same interior courtyard and setback from the street, in addition to a building setback above the third floor level.
- The proposed side entry underground parking has been enhanced to provide for two levels with separate entries.
- The first through third stories are prominently all brick with fiber cement siding utilized on the fourth and fifth levels.

Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the lack of infiltration areas on the site or an equivalent alternative, as well as considerations for a green roof treatment.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Wagner abstaining. The motion required that the plans be modified to provide for infiltration areas and/or alternatives such as a catch basin or storage area for stormwater, including consideration for a green roof treatment on the lower roof deck above the third floor, as well as considerations for a bioswale at the rear of the building or yard inlet. In addition, provisions for the distribution of both covered and uncovered additional bike parking were requested.

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, 7, 7, 7, 8 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 625 East Mifflin Street

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

General Comments:

- Nice project.
- Fine development, nice scale, appropriate architecture. Needs much more bike parking in this location.
- Nice project. Needs significantly more bike parking. There should be a green roof on the deck. Bioinfiltration should be incorporated with any piping system.
- Upper level parking entry in conjunction with townhouse entry concept is great. Great restraint from not being too cutesy.
- Look into a bioswale along the southeast side of the property for some stormwater collection and infiltration.