

**PLANNING DIVISION REPORT  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY  
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
of March 14, 2007**

**RE: I.D. # 04682: Zoning Map Amendment I.D. 3227, rezoning 2340, 2416, 2504 & 2507  
Winnebago Street from PUD-GDP to Amended PUD-GDP and PUD-SIP**

1. Requested Actions: Approval of a request to rezone 2340, 2416, 2504 & 2507 Winnebago Street from Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan (PUD-GDP) to Amended PUD-GDP and Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan (PUD-SIP) to allow construction of five buildings at Union Corners containing 140 condominium units, 63 rental apartment units and approximately 101,000 square feet of commercial space.
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.
3. Report Prepared By: Timothy M. Parks, Planner.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Applicant & Property owner: Union Corners, LLC – Lance McGrath, McGrath Associates; 103 N. Hamilton Street; Madison.
2. Development Schedule: Demolition of existing buildings and construction of infrastructure to serve the project is ongoing. The developer anticipates commencing construction of the first components of this specific implementation plan in Spring 2007, with completion of the phase to occur by 2009.
3. Location: The boundaries of the overall planned unit development include approximately 11.4 acres generally bounded by E. Washington Avenue and S. Fifth Street on the west, Milwaukee Street on the north, a line parallel to Azinger Court on the east and Wisconsin Southern Railroad right of way on the south. Most of the development in this phase will be centered on realigned Winnebago Street and the corner of E. Washington Avenue and Milwaukee street. The site is located in Aldermanic District 6, Urban Design District 5 and the Madison Metropolitan School District.
4. Existing Conditions: Most of the twenty buildings that previously occupied the subject site have been demolished or will soon be relocated, including the Kohl's grocery store and French Battery building. Installation of streets and utilities to serve the development was begun in September 2006 under a joint City-developer project, with completion of the infrastructure improvements for the entire site scheduled for the end of 2007.

5. Proposed Land Use: The first phase of development calls for the construction of five buildings that will include 140 condominium units, 63 rental apartment units and approximately 101,000 square feet of commercial space.
6. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:  
North: Gas station and neighborhood commercial along E. Washington Avenue, zoned C2 (General Commercial District) and one and two-family residences on the north side of Milwaukee Street, zoned R4 (General Residential District);  
South: Wisconsin Southern Railroad; one and two-family residences, zoned R4;  
East: One and two-family residences along Azinger Court and Farwell Avenue, zoned R4;  
West: One and two-family residences and neighborhood commercial uses located on the north side of E. Washington Avenue in R5 (General Residence District) and C2 zoning.
7. Adopted Land Use Plan: The Comprehensive Plan identifies the site as a potential redevelopment location for community mixed-use development and transit-oriented development. Most of the site is also included within the boundaries of the Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Worthington Park Neighborhood Plan, which while not providing a vision for redevelopment of the site, includes a number of smaller, specific recommendations germane to portions of the Union Corners site and surrounding area. The site is also located within the boundaries of the East Washington Avenue/ Old East Side Master Plan (BUILD). This plan did not anticipate the closing of the Kohl's grocery store or the Rayovac plant and included a number of recommendations for urban design and transportation.
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 standards for zoning map amendments and the standards for Planned Unit Development Districts.

## **PREVIOUS APPROVALS**

On October 4, 2004, the Plan Commission approved demolition permits to allow the developer to demolish the French Battery Building addition at 2317 Winnebago Street and CE's Bar located at 2415 Winnebago Street. In advance of this demolition permit, the Director of the Inspection Unit granted the developer permits to raze nine accessory buildings of various size and construction located east of the French Battery Building in an effort to expedite the developer's remediation of the site from the previous heavy industrial site.

On January 17, 2006, the Common Council approved the rezoning of 2313-2525 E. Washington Avenue, 2306-2422 Winnebago Street, 2317-2415 Winnebago Street and 11 S. Fifth Street from C2 (General Commercial District) and M1 (Limited Manufacturing District) to Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan (PUD-GDP) to allow the future development of 450 dwelling units and 110,000 square feet of commercial space in 11 buildings following demolition or relocation of approximately 20 principal and accessory buildings.

Following approval of the PUD-GDP, the Union Corners site was subdivided into three parcels by administrative approval of Certified Survey Maps, that also dedicated public rights of way for the new street arrangement shown on the approved redevelopment plans. Former Florence Street, Sullivan Street and the northernmost portion of Winnebago Street were also vacated to accommodate the project. Construction of the new street alignment is ongoing.

An area of approximately a quarter-acre located at the southeastern corner of the Union Corners redevelopment site at 54-58 Farwell Street was rezoned on November 7, 2006 from PUD-GDP to R4 to facilitate the relocation of two houses in the heart of the Union Corners project to that site.

## **PLAN REVIEW**

The developer is requesting approval of both an amended general development plan for the Union Corners redevelopment project and a specific implementation plan for the first phase of the project. The first phase will include 140 condominium units, 63 rental apartment units and approximately 101,000 square feet of commercial space. Most of the development proposed in the first phase will be centered on realigned Winnebago Street, with the exception of two largely commercial buildings that will be constructed at the southeast corner of E. Washington Avenue and Milwaukee Street. While the proposed first phase principally adheres to the original general development plan for the project, the developer has further refined the development concept for the site, including an overall reduction in the number of proposed dwelling units and a revised building layout for the southern tip of the project, and as such precipitated the GDP amendment.

Demolition activities on the site began in October 2004 with the demolition of the former

Rayovac production facilities on the southeastern portion of the property. Following the approval of the general development plan in January 2006, demolition work continued with the razing of various other buildings on the site, including the former Kohl's grocery store. The developer received a certificate of completion from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources for the former Rayovac site certifying that it has been rehabilitated to residential standards following the intensive manufacturing use. The developer also successfully petitioned the City to vacate northernmost section of Winnebago Street as well as the remaining portions of Florence and Sullivan streets. The site has also been subdivided into three lots, and the new street layout shown on the approved general development plan has been dedicated to the City. The installation of a portion of the street network and infrastructure that serve the Union Corners project is currently underway, with the remainder of that work to be completed during the City of Madison/State of Wisconsin reconstruction of Segment 3 of E. Washington Avenue this year.

Other ongoing activities include the renovation of the former Unpainted Furniture store located at 2323 E. Washington Avenue into the sales office for the development and the relocation of two single-family residences from 2306 and 2310 Winnebago Street to 54 and 58 Farwell Street. The developer has also filed suit against the owners of a billboard on the site of the former Trudy's Café in an effort to invalidate the lease for the sign, which will be dismantled as part of a future phase of this development.

The area surrounding the site features a variety of land uses, including low-density mostly one and two-family residences located east of the site along Azinger Court and Farwell Street and south of the railroad along Dunning, Division, Jackson and Ohio streets. The corner of E. Washington Avenue and North and Milwaukee streets features a variety of commercial uses, including a former Marathon gas station and the Union House Tavern at the northeasterly corner, Red Letter News and Ray's Bar at the southwesterly corner, and a multi-tenant commercial building at the northwesterly corner of the intersection. Moving west along the north side of E. Washington Avenue from Seventh Street are a mix of single-family residences, a muffler shop, Assumption Greek Orthodox church, the three-story Victory Arms apartments and a pair of two-story mixed commercial and residential buildings at Sixth Street. One and two-story commercial buildings occupy the north side of Milwaukee Street opposite the vacant Kohl's grocery store before transitioning into mostly one and two-family residences and Holy Cross Lutheran Church further to the east.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends the Union Corners site, the Washington-Milwaukee intersection and the north side of E. Washington Avenue west towards Fifth Street as a potential redevelopment location envisioned for community mixed-use and transit-oriented development. Community mixed-use districts are intended to be mid-sized nodes featuring medium to high-density residential development with a mix of employment, retail and service uses intended to serve both the residents of the area and surrounding neighborhood and "wider community

markets.” These areas are typically intended to be located along high-capacity transit routes such as E. Washington Avenue.

### Project Summary

The 140 condominium units, 63 rental apartment units and approximately 101,000 square feet of commercial space proposed in the first phase specific implementation plan will commence construction this spring, with completion anticipated in 2009.

A key component of the proposed Union Corners redevelopment involves a significant redesign of the pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation patterns through the subject site. Under the redevelopment plans for the subject site, Winnebago Street will instead curve slightly to the north to enter a new roundabout planned to intersect with the extension of Sixth Street across E. Washington Avenue. Winnebago Street will exit the eastern leg of the roundabout and curve to the north to ultimately end at a new intersection with Milwaukee Street. A private street paralleling E. Washington Avenue will enter the northern quadrant of the roundabout. The roundabout will include a center focal feature and perimeter plantings. The new intersection of Sixth Street and E. Washington Avenue will be signalized. Plans also call for a future bike path to be extended along the southern property line of the project and railroad right of way with connections provided into the site.

The street network for the project will be completed by the extension of two private one-way streets organized around a proposed “Union Green” common greenspace to be located opposite Seventh Street that will extend between E. Washington Avenue and the new alignment of Winnebago Street. The space will measure approximately 370 feet in length and 100 feet in width and will feature a sloped lawn, a water feature at E. Washington Avenue, a hardscape plaza opposite Union Main, a variety of seating options as well as perimeter landscaping.

The northernmost building proposed, Building A, will be a three-story commercial building that will extend along the E. Washington Avenue frontage between Milwaukee Street and the north side of Union Green, with a one-story wing that will extend along the northerly side of Union Green. The building will contain 36,950 square feet of office space to be located on the two floors of the building above 28,500 square feet of first floor retail space. The building includes an underground parking level for 87 automobiles, 14 bicycles and five mopeds. A second building, Building B, will be developed to the south of Building A along the north side of Union Green. The building, which will contain 5,216 square feet of commercial space, will anchor the eastern end of the north side of Union Green at Winnebago Street. The buildings will share a 115-space surface parking lot primarily located between the buildings and Milwaukee Street, of which 15 of the spaces will be located in an aisle between the buildings. Primary access to the surface lot will

be through an entrance from Winnebago Street, with a second driveway from Union Green East along the parking aisle separating the two buildings.

Building A will reflect a modern architectural styling, with aluminum-framed clear glass comprising the majority of the E. Washington Avenue façade, the northward, Milwaukee Street-facing facade and the south elevation of the one-story wing. Brick will comprise the majority of the remaining facades of Building A, which will feature sunshades, corrugated metal panel accents and louvers to heighten the modern appeal of the building. Building B is shown as a one-story structure with a partial second-story mezzanine and will similarly reflect a modern design aesthetic that will feature exterior brick, finished concrete panels, corrugated metal paneling and storefront glass. A partial second story clerestory has been added to provide the building with an enhanced vertical appearance.

Southeast of the A and B buildings across Winnebago Street is a cluster of three residential buildings (G.1, G.2 & G.3) containing a total of 124 condominiums to be located atop a single-underground parking level containing 136 automobile stalls. The 124 units proposed will include 57 one-bedroom and 67 two-bedroom units. A driveway along the north wall of the northernmost building from Winnebago Street will provide access to the structured parking, 16 surface parking stalls and a loading area to serve this cluster.

The three buildings, all four stories in height, will parallel Winnebago Street and are intended to frame the eastern end of the proposed town square. The three buildings will be constructed with a consistent monotone brick façade on all four elevations. A variety of architectural elements will be utilized to provide visual relief, including use of a second tone of brick in patio recesses and between lower floor window bands, the inclusion of a copper-colored vertical metal panel, and use of French patios. The developer indicates that the buildings are styled to evoke a simple, industrial architecture with modern elements like the copper-colored paneling, while the combination of French patios and balconies are intended to open the units outward and reduce the mass of the buildings. A green roof will be constructed over the structured parking to serve as an open space amenity for residents of the three buildings and will include a variety of planters, garden plots and seating areas.

Opposite this cluster of buildings across Winnebago Street, the developer proposes a four-story mixed-use building (Building C) that will extend the length of the block bounded by future Sixth Street on the south and the southern edge of Union Green on the north. Building C, which will also front the private street that will extend north from the Sixth Street roundabout and is referred to on the plans as "Union Main," will contain 20,260 square feet of ground floor retail, with three floors of residential space above containing 63 rental apartment units (39 one-bedroom and 24 two-bedroom units). Structured parking for 64 vehicles is proposed, with surface parking to provided by angled parking stalls that will line both sides of the Union Main.

Building C has been styled after other urban infill projects developed elsewhere in the city. The building will feature four distinct sections distinguished by varying building colors and a variety of recesses and building projections intended to reduce the scale and mass of the building. The elevations submitted suggest that the primary entry into the first floor commercial spaces will be from the northwesterly elevation facing Union Main, though entry doors are also shown along the Winnebago Street elevation. The ground floor along Union Main has been designed to accommodate a covered walkway along the storefronts that may provide opportunities for outdoor seating areas as well.

The remaining component of the first phase of development calls for the reconstruction of the three-story French Battery Building across Winnebago Street from its former location. As part of the demolition activities that have been undertaken since the earlier approval of the Union Corners PUD, the developer deconstructed the French Battery Building, which previously fronted the east side of Winnebago Street, facing generally to the northwest. The building is proposed to be reconstructed on the west side of realigned Winnebago Street and will generally face towards the railroad to the southeast. The original building will be reconstructed on the northern portion of the block nearest extended Sixth Street. The developer proposes to construct an addition to the south wall of the building that will extend it the remainder of the blockface to Fifth Street. The expanded and reconstructed sections of the building will include architecturally approximate replicas of the original windows and adornments, though a different colored brick will be used on the addition to distinguish it from the original section of the building. Kitty Rankin, the City's preservation planner, has preliminarily reviewed the plans for the relocated building and indicated her general support.

The French Battery Building will include eight commercial condominiums on the first floor, with individual entrances facing Winnebago Street. The upper two floors of the building will be divided into 16 unfinished "hard" residential lofts with exposed brick and mechanical elements. The residential floors will contain a total of 12 two-bedroom units and four three-bedroom units, with floor areas ranging between 1,027 and 2,181 square feet. An underground parking level will be constructed along the length of the building and will provide parking for 30 vehicles.

The relocated French Battery Building will be located across Winnebago Street from a small private greenspace that will occupy a remnant of land generally to the southeast of the proposed roundabout and relocated Winnebago Street. This greenspace will include a "tot-lot" play area, two locations for the placing of sculpture and space for four existing mature trees.

Finally, the developers are requesting approval to allow their sales office located in the former Unpainted Furniture Store at 2323 E. Washington Avenue (southeast corner of extended Sixth Street) to remain as a permanent part of the redevelopment project. The building, which was

renovated earlier this year prior to the final action on the rezoning from C2 to PUD-GDP, was initially identified for a future (third) phase of additional residential development in a three-story building on the general development plan. Parking for the retail/ sales office space is provided in an existing five-stall lot located between the building and E. Washington Avenue.

### Inclusionary Zoning

The developer has submitted an Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan (IDUP) with the first phase specific implementation plan. The IDUP requests a partial waiver from the requirement that 15% of the units in the project meet the affordable housing criteria and is asking instead that 10% of the units be affordable. Of the 140 owner-occupied dwelling units proposed in the Phase I, 14 will be affordable. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Office has prepared an analysis of the waiver request for your consideration. The 63 rental units are not subject to the ordinance as a result of the State Court of Appeals decision voiding the rental component of the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and as such are exempted from its provisions.

At the time the general development plan for the Union Corners project was submitted, a total of 450 dwelling units were proposed. Of that total, 350 units were proposed as owner-occupied units and 100 were identified as rental units, with 68, or 15.1% of the overall units to be affordable under the tenets of the affordable housing requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Subsequent to the approval of the general development plan, the developer has refined the development proposal and will be building fewer units than previously identified. Approval of the GDP included consideration of a density bonus based on the distribution of the 450 units across the site, which was previously zoned C2 and M1. Benchmark densities in those districts are 38 units per acre and 5.44 units per acre, respectively.

Based on the revisions to the redevelopment project proposed by the applicant with the amended general development plan and first phase specific implementation plan, the Planning Division calculates that 413 units will be developed through the entire Union Corners project. This amount includes the 203 units proposed in this phase and the 210 dwelling units identified in the initial GDP for the D.1, D.2, E.1 and E.2 buildings, which will be constructed in a future phase or phases.

The density of the 413-unit project equals 45.9 units per acre based on the 9.0 acres of the site given to residential development. This calculation excludes public rights of way and the site of commercial Buildings A & B. Of the 413 units proposed, approximately 277 of those units will be constructed on the approximately 6.2 acres of the site formerly zoned M1 [Buildings C, D.2, E.2, G.1, G.2 & G.3 and approximately 0.55 acres of Union Green], resulting in a density of approximately 44.7 units per acre. The remaining 136 units [in the French Battery Building and Buildings D.1 and E.1] will be developed on about 2.8 acres formerly zoned C2 for a density of



48.6 units per acre. The 6.2 acres of the site formerly zoned M1 would permit 33 units to be built at 5.44 units per acre, while the 38-unit per acre density of the former C2 zoning of the remaining 2.8 acres would result in 106 units. In conclusion, it seems that the portion of the former M1-zoned portion of the project is receiving a substantial density bonus nine times the original base zoning or 244 units, while the density of the C2-zoned portion of the site is nearly 25% greater than the base. Note that the actual densities down to the exact number of units are difficult to calculate due to the orientation of the proposed buildings, which cross the former zoning boundaries on site. In all, the Planning Division estimates the project is receiving a 274-unit density bonus (244 units over in former M1 plus the 30 units over in former C2).

## **ANALYSIS**

At the time the general development plan for Union Corners was reviewed by the Planning Division, staff expressed a general support for the redevelopment project, which represents a significantly new direction and character for the previously industrially and commercially oriented property and a new direction for this portion of the E. Washington Avenue corridor. Staff felt that the general development plan proposed a well-designed reuse of a site that presented a number of development challenges, including the network of streets and railroads that bound the site, the shape of the property and various environmental concerns created by the former use of nearly two-thirds of the site. Though generally supportive of the developer's efforts to redevelop this site, staff cautioned that there would likely be a significant number of details that would require careful consideration as the project moved through specific implementation plan review and construction.

Among the details identified at the GDP stage was the architectural treatment of the individual buildings. In order for this project to be a successful addition to the E. Washington Avenue corridor and neighborhood, staff indicated that individual buildings must contain an appropriate amount of architectural commonality within the development while incorporating a variety of architectural details that reduce the appearance of the buildings as monolithic structures and provide significant visual interest.

The Planning Division continues to support the redevelopment project and feels that the project will result in an excellent, urban reuse of the former predominantly industrial site, though specific components of the first phase require refinement. The Urban Design Commission (UDC) echoed this sentiment during their review of the first specific implementation plan on September 20, 2006, when a recommendation of initial approval was granted (see attached report).

The scale of the Union Corners project has changed since the approval of the GDP in January 2006, most notably in the northernmost portions of the site where Buildings A and B are proposed. At the time that the general development plan was approved, Building A was a three-

story commercial building in approximately the same location as shown on the SIP. However, Building A was to abut a larger Building B, which was approved as a four-story mixed-use building extending the length of the north side of Union Green East, with three floors of residential space above first floor commercial uses. The GDP-version of Building B was envisioned as a bookend for the northern edge of development along Union Main.

The Building A included on the SIP is largely true to the vision for the important intersection of E. Washington Avenue and Milwaukee Street and has been pushed closer to the northern tip of the site as directed to strengthen the corner. Building B, however, has been reduced to a pad site with a 5,200 square-foot commercial tenant space now proposed. When combined with the one-story wing of Building A projecting south from E. Washington Avenue, the result is less of a building wall along the north side of Union Green East a more modest frame for the Union Green open space and bookend for development to the south. The applicant has attempted to address the reduced scale of the two buildings by adding additional height through the use of a high parapet and clerestory on the one-story wing of Building A and the addition of a mezzanine level and clerestory in Building B, which will have an average height of 23 feet. These changes are acceptable to staff.

The reduction in scale of the A and B buildings also emphasizes the surface parking lot between the buildings and Milwaukee Street, which was identified as one of the weaker features at the time the GDP was reviewed, and an area the Plan Commission wished to see further explored at the SIP stage. Given the reduction in height along Union Green East and the new prominence of the rear lot, staff recommended that a second pad site-style commercial be considered for the Winnebago-Milwaukee intersection to strengthen that corner and reduce the visibility of the parking lot at the "back entrance" to the development site. It would also provide a stronger visual termination for Union Main. The applicant has responded in discussions with staff that the A-B site design is the result of the need to accommodate a workable design for a grocery store in the one-story wing of Building A. Staff supports the incorporation of a grocery and the A-B plan as presented, but in the event that this use changes, the developer is encouraged to consider providing a second pad site.

The C and G buildings are all generally one story shorter than originally envisioned on the general development plan, which the developer attributes to a cooling market for condominiums in Madison and an upward trend in building material costs since the redevelopment plan was initially conceived. However, despite the modest height reductions in these two buildings, staff believes that the general intent of the GDP will be followed on the SIP, with the first floor retail in Building C and the green roof over the Building G parking level generally well executed.

Architecturally, the Planning Division feels that the developer has responded to concerns about the articulation of Building C raised by staff in meetings. The long facades of the building have

been horizontally varied to a degree that should partially diminish the length of the building, while the common parapet has been varied in height to provide the building more rhythm at the street level. The developer might consider adding some architectural treatments to the vertical building sections to further enhance its visual interest. Staff would also agree with the UDC that a pass-through along the first floor between Winnebago Street and Union Main should be incorporated to reduce the physical and aesthetic length of the building along the street. The pass-through should include a strong visual connection from Winnebago Street to Union Main through the building and be open to the public for use generally from the hours of 7 AM to 10 PM daily.

The last component of the first phase of the redevelopment is perhaps the project's strongest: the relocation of and addition to the French Battery Building. Although the orientation of the building has been rotated about 180-degrees from its original orientation, the Planning Division feels that the re-creation of the building's original architecture on the site and the location of the building adjacent to the Winnebago Street sidewalk should result in a very strong southern gateway into the Union Corners development. Staff feels that the addition is architecturally appropriate and will serve as a better use of the southern half of the block between Fifth and Sixth streets than a small second building. The "hard" condominium units proposed in the French Battery Building will also provide a unit type not commonly found in the Madison market.

While the Union Corners project represents a dense and rather intensive redevelopment of the site, the Planning Division feels that the developer has provided a very reasonable amount of well-landscaped open spaces to serve future residents of this development and of the surrounding neighborhoods, particularly the Union Green open space in the northern half of the development. Staff also feels that the inclusion of a green roof atop the Building G parking level is an excellent use of that space, which results in usable open space amounts not typically seen in 124-unit central city residential infill projects. Staff feels that the project would be better served, however, through the inclusion of a second "tot-lot" play area in the northern portion of the development adjacent to the high-density locations in the project, particularly Building G. Staff feels that such an amenity is essential in the more densely populated areas of the project if Union Corners is to be successful in attracting families to live there.

Overall, staff feels the site is well landscaped, including the use of numerous bioretention basins throughout the project to improve water quality and mitigate stormwater runoff from the site, which otherwise includes a fairly high concentration of impervious surfaces. However, staff will work with the developer to ensure that there is appropriate screening from this project for the one and two-family homes located to the east of the site along Farwell Street and Anzinger Court.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the site as a potential redevelopment opportunity as a community mixed-use project and transit-oriented development (TOD). At the time the Union

Corners general development plan was reviewed, the Planning Division determined that the project generally conformed to the recommendations for community mixed-use developments. The Comprehensive Plan recommends that such developments either be located adjacent to medium or high-density residential areas or be large enough to accommodate high-density residential uses when adjacent to lower density areas, the latter of which would be the case for this project. Community mixed-use areas are recommended to have a focal point developed at high densities and focused on a commercial core, a plaza or square, a civic use or dense residential development. Buildings with these zones should be located close to the sidewalk with parking located at the rear of the buildings or underground, and pedestrian-level amenities should be provided. In general, the Union Corners project adheres to many of these criteria through the prevalence of neighborhood-oriented commercial uses, the density of the development and the provision of the common Union Green element.

Many of the proposed standards for transit-oriented developments contained in the Comprehensive Plan pertain to more horizontal developments spread across larger tracts of land. However, a number of standards apply to the Union Corners redevelopment. Among the facets of transit-oriented developments present in this project include the provision of a variety of land uses (housing, retail, limited employment, etc.), the placement of the buildings creating a sense of spatial enclosure and creation of a high-quality public realm, and the inclusion of uses that generate pedestrian activity, such as spaces for retail and offices at the ground floor. The density of the project comports to the 30 unit per acre density minimum recommended in the Comprehensive Plan for the core area of a TOD, which is recommended to be within 1/8 of a mile from a transit stop.

As noted in the "General Information" section of the report, the proposed Union Corners redevelopment project is located within the scope of the East Washington Avenue/ Old East Side Master Plan (BUILD) recommendations. The plan recommends that buildings along E. Washington Avenue be at least two and not more than four stories tall, with buildings within 60 feet of existing residences not to exceed 2.5-stories in height. The plan also encourages buildings to be architecturally distinguishable from their neighbors with specific direction about the articulation of street walls. The Union Corners project largely adheres to many of the design guidelines contained in the East Washington Avenue plan, though some of the recommendations on building height may no longer pertain due to the changing neighborhood context surrounding the subject site. At the time this plan was adopted in 2000, both the Kohl's grocery store and Rayovac facility were in operation and expected to continue into the foreseeable future. Hence, the plan is primarily geared toward smaller infill development projects instead of the considerably larger redevelopment project proposed. The unanticipated wholesale change in the context of the site creates opportunities for a more holistic redevelopment solution, which could allow for taller buildings to be considered. This is reinforced by the recommendations of the

Comprehensive Plan, which calls for this site to serve as the higher-density core of the community mixed-use district and transit-oriented development.

The plans presented are the culmination of the multi-year Union Corners Studio planning process organized in part by the developer and the Department of Planning and Community & Economic Development, in which the developer repeatedly engaged nearby neighborhood associations and interest groups as the redevelopment plan was shaped.

### **CONCLUSION**

In reviewing the standards for planned unit developments, staff believes the criteria can be met for the Union Corners redevelopment project. The proposed development will result in substantial benefits to the built environment that embodies the intent of planned unit developments. In particular, the proposed planned unit development is "compatible with the physical nature of the site or area" and "would produce an attractive environment of sustained aesthetic desirability, economic stability and functional practicality compatible with the [master] plan." The proposed redevelopment project presents a dynamic reuse of a former brownfield site and underdeveloped quadrant of a key eastside intersection. While the scale of the proposed project is significantly greater than buildings in the surrounding area, staff believes that the scale is appropriate given the area's designation as a transit-oriented development and community mixed-use center under the Comprehensive Plan.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission forward Zoning Map Amendment 3227, rezoning 2340, 2416, 2504 & 2507 Winnebago Street from PUD-GDP to Amended PUD-GDP and PUD-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 specific implementation plan set be revised per Planning Division approval as follows:
  - a.) that a second tot lot area provided in the northern/ northeastern portion of the development adjacent to the denser residentially developed Building G site, and;
  - b.) that a pass-through along the first floor between Winnebago Street and Union Main be incorporated into Building C to reduce the physical and aesthetic length of the building along the street; the pass-through should include a strong visual connection from Winnebago Street to Union Main through the building and be open to the public for use generally from the hours of 7 AM to 10 PM daily.

3. That the zoning text be revised per Planning Division approval as follows:
  - a.) that the off-street parking and loading sections of each of the component sections of the zoning text be revised to read "As shown on the approved plans;" the breakdown of vehicular and bike parking spaces should be clearly spelled out in the letter of intent for each component of the SIP;
  - b.) that the permitted use sections of the zoning text as they pertain to the residential components of the French Battery Building and Buildings C and G be revised to state: "Multi-family residences;" the unit breakdown of each component should be provided in the sections of the letter of intent devoted to each;
  - c.) all accessory uses proposed shall be listed in the zoning text and not in the letter of intent;
  - d.) that the signage sections of each component shall be limited to the maximum permitted in the R6 zoning district for residential uses and as per C2 for buildings containing commercial uses and as approved by the Urban Design Commission and Zoning Administrator.
4. That the applicant submit a colored rendering of the proposed screening fence (3-LC 604) for consideration by the Planning Division. It may be more appropriate to use a more traditional fencing material adjacent to the existing Farwell Street and Anzinger Court residences than the fence proposed based on this staff review.
5. That, following approval of the specific implementation plan, the applicant submit building elevations and any other relevant materials to the Planning Division for approval of the exterior finishes of individual tenant spaces for all retail spaces within the project.
6. That a general development site plan showing future phases of development in the Union Corners project be included with the final set of materials to be recorded with the specific implementation plan.
7. That the developer receive final approval from the Urban Design Commission prior to final approval of this specific implementation plan and recording.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>REPORT OF:</b> URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  | <b>PRESENTED:</b> March 7, 2007                                 |
| <b>TITLE:</b> 2340, 2416, 2504, 2507 Winnebago Street<br>(Union Corners) – PUD-SIP, Five<br>Buildings with 140 Condominium Units<br>and 63 Rental Units and<br>Commercial/Retail in Urban Design<br>District No. 5. 6 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (04486) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| <b>AUTHOR:</b> Alan J. Martin, Secretary   | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| <b>DATED:</b> March 7, 2007  | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Bruce Woods, Todd Barnett, Cathleen Feland, Lou Host-Jablonski and Michael Barrett.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of March 7, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-SIP for five buildings with 140 condominium units and 63 rental units and commercial/retail in Urban Design District No. 5 located at 2340, 2416, 2504, 2507 Winnebago Street (Union Corners). Appearing on behalf of the project were Lance McGrath, Todd McGrath, Paul Cuta, Christopher Thiel, Marc Schellpfeffer, Colin L. Godding, Ald. Judy Olson and Att. Bill White. Plans as presented emphasized the address of comments relevant to Buildings A and C with the French Battery Building as previously proposed. It was noted that all buildings within the initial use have been registered for LEEDS certification, a commitment requested by the Commission with initial approval of the project. The water tower element has been removed and replaced with a below-grade tank to be utilized for landscaping and site irrigation. A review of modifications to Building A emphasized address of the corner issue with the provision of landscape features and potential outdoor seating area. The modifications to Building A include vertical fabric sunshades, introduction of more light along with the integration of brick with the glass wall elements of the various building elevations. Building C has been modified to provide a variation in overall height with its various components; in substitution for a previously proposed uniform building height; in combination with adjustments to parapet heights. The removal of the previously proposed saddle element at its center. Building C also features the removal of eyebrow sunshades, along with the incorporation of a pedestrian pass-thru at the center of the building. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Appreciate the improvement to the architecture on both Buildings A and C. It was noted that the changes to the corner Building "A" had not been seen by the neighborhood according to Ald. Olson.
- Prefer Building C without the saddle roof. Still an issue with transparency of the center of the building, still big and blank as was noted with previously comments on the project. Consider pulling apart adjoining elevators and rotate 90 degrees to create a stronger visual connection between adjoining streets. The taller portions of Building C's upper sections appear stark without detailing such as clear story windows with detailing, taller floor to ceiling heights on upper floors, at cornice detailing, etc. In

addition, not sold on curtain wall corners. It was noted by the applicant that it was their intent to return with final materials and elevation details for Building C.

- Relevant to the site and landscape plan, like overall site layout, articulation, hardscape and materials, including central mall's sense of place; problem with plant selection and design of hedges of evergreen surrounding more natural plantings. Need to determine direction so as plantings do not fight each other, e.g. tall trees with prairie plants okay initially but eventually will shade out in addition to questioning the use of borderline trees such as Hemlock and Beech in the urban setting. Plants won't survive in the long run and will require replacement.
- Building A is much improved but still not there, still a problem with the lack of scale at corner, needs layers of scale architecturally with all the undifferentiated glass not enough architecturally for urban corner in an urban neighborhood, needs a door/entry even more. Building A's relationship to the corner calls out for a grand entrance.
- Like the cut-thru connection in Building C, the south side of the entry is underdeveloped.
- Relevant to lighting, correct the discrepancy between the catalog reference showing high-pressure sodium fixtures relevant to the use of metal halide fixtures as noted within the plans.
- Building A needs a strong architectural vision not to be designed by committee. The architectural vision should be guided by a strong sense of urban design; a glassy under-detailed corner doesn't work. The lack of detailing at corner is still an issue as was previously. It is too minimal, need to carry detailing around to corner.

#### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Woods, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Barnett voting no. The motion to refer cited the need to address the comments relevant to both Building A and C especially addressed of the corner with Building A as well as landscape issues. Building A needs a stronger treatment with more layers of scale that are removed from the "modernist approach"; corners and key vistas must be addressed with urban design. A whole blank corner with no reason to come there; need something to hold corner area.

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, 6, 6, 6.5, 7, 7, 8 and 9.



**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2340, 2416, 2504, 2507 Winnebago Street (Union Corners)**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | 8         | 6            | 6              | 7                              | -     | 7                                   | 6             | 6.5            |
|                       | -         | 7            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                       | 5         | A:3/C:6      | 7              | 7                              | -     | 5                                   | 5             | 6              |
|                       | 9         | 7            | 9              | 9                              | -     | 8                                   | 9             | 8              |
|                       | 7         | 5-8          | 5-8            | -                              | -     | 6                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                       | 6         | 6            | 5              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 5             | 6              |
|                       | 9         | 9            | 7              | 9                              | -     | 8                                   | 10            | 9              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

**General Comments:**

- The corner building is still not fully cooked. This is a key gateway into the City and into this project and good urban design demands a better scaled, layered and detailed architecture.
- Some of the plants chosen for this project are marginally hardy and urban tolerant, especially in a more commercial setting, reconsider the boxwood, beech and hemlock. Need more diversity in the bioinfiltration areas, especially the herbaceous plants to ensure success. Tall prairie mix will not be maintainable under a Bosquet of trees. Still think the Milwaukee Street corner is missing its potential.
- Verify that lighting will be metal halide. The fundamental problem with building A is in the planning of the whole corner parcel, including building B.
- Kudos on: a) Green elements, especially stormwater management; b) Building C's central passageway. Deficiencies: a) Traffic; this should be a main street experience only; the curvilinear suburban bypass is inappropriate; the width and broad turning radii promote suburban speeds, especially at the roundabout; b) Building A belongs in a suburban office park; it's lack of a prominent active corner entry kills it as an urban building.
- C building center "pavilion" is stark – needs to be truly transparent.
- Building A is very nice except for the corner on East Washington and Milwaukee. Building C needs just a little tweaking.
- Building C needs further refinement to central atrium. Overall building design not completely resolved.

 **DRAFT**

- Corner of A needs tweaking; would be better with uniform height.

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|   |   |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  | <b>PRESENTED:</b> September 20, 2006                            |
| TITLE: 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street (Union Corners) – PUD-SIP, Five Buildings with 140 Condominium Units and 63 Rental Units and Commercial/Retail, Urban Design District No. 5. 6 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (04486) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary   | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: September 20, 2006   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

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

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 20, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Andrew Hanson, Dan Melton, John Lichtenheld, Lance McGrath, Todd McGrath, Paul Cuta, Marc Schellpfeffer, Bruce Simonson, Colin Godding and Christopher Thiel. Prior to the presentation on this item, staff noted that address of the previous conditions established with the approval of the overall PUD(GDP) for Union Corners (December 21, 2005) would be provided by the applicant with the formal consideration of this first phase SIP. The building plans for this phase of the PUD consists of the development of Building A and B, a 2.4 acre portion of the site at the corner of Milwaukee Street and East Washington Avenue, in addition to Building C, Building G group (three associated structures overlying lower level parking and shared open space amenities), the relocated French Battery Building and addition and the renovated sales office. Cuta provided details on the development of Building A, a mixed-use retail office building with grocer and Building B, a commercial/retail building. Details of Building C, a 4-story mixed-use building overlying one level of the lower grade parking were presented by Bruce Simonson with details of the Group G buildings presented by Cuta. Details of the relocated and reconstructed French battery building were provided by architect Godding, in combination with a proposed addition featuring a similar architectural style in a contrasting complementary brick. Thiel provided an overview of the site/landscape plan emphasizing collective and separate amenities associated with each of the proposed buildings under development. Thiel also elaborated on innovations relevant to stormwater management and infiltration proposed with the project with John Lichtenheld spoke on sustainability green features, recycling, pedestrian/bicycle amenities and features, as well as traffic. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Concerns were raised regarding Building A (as referenced in a memo from Host-Jablonski) relevant to issues with its glass façade inappropriate for the corner, how it addresses the street and functional location of outdoor space.
- Like the green features, including stormwater provisions and other amenities but want to make sure that they are confirmed with approval of this phase of the PUD-SIP.

- Relevant to Building C the architecture is fine but the building is very long; creates a very long block. Want to see a through passageway to connect through with bikeway extension across the relocated Winnebago Street right-of-way.
- Need more unifying elements throughout with other buildings and provide some tie-back to the adjacent neighborhood.
- Need some relationship between the treatment of the Milwaukee Street and East Washington Avenue and treatment of parking lot; the building is pushing people away but not inviting people in from both the pedestrians' and drivers' perspective.
- Relative to French Battery Building, concern with the diminished value of original building with new addition eliminating symmetry of original building. Consider two-story addition with complementary original architecture. Consider creating symmetry by adding bookend additions to the original French battery building.
- Consideration of Building A should be weighed and balanced with development of future Phase 2 architecture and building development; should look at the transition from old to new architecture already portrayed with the first phase of development in juxtaposition with existing development along the East Washington Avenue corridor. In addition, building development and future Phase 2 should relate to other buildings along East Washington Avenue in terms of styling, additional detailing and differentiation on a lot level should be considered, including more windows, punched openings, etc.
- The appropriateness of the design of the water tower element should be reexamined; too cutesy.
- Wing on top of Building C is out of place.
- Consider incorporating complementary elements into Building A.
- Relevant to the Building G group; needs pedestrian-bicycle access off its easterly apex.
- Concern with soft turning radii on internal streets permitting faster car movements.
- Consider reducing the pavement with the roundabout.
- Need to provide pedestrian refuge within the roundabout area and its northerly extension.
- Provide more covered bike parking, for example, integrate into overhang areas.
- Consider incorporating large awnings on all buildings to provide sun and rain protection and to bring scale of large buildings down abutting walkways.
- The collective buildings have no continuity; need something to weave them all together, should be diverse but doesn't complement itself, common features are too subtle.
- Like Building A but doesn't relate to remainder of the overall site. Building doesn't connect or hold together.
- Building C-still don't like curve element, doesn't relate or connect with other buildings. Consider putting a galleria or pass-through in Building C.
- Site development looks innovative with the use of green and water retention facilities.
- Planning for Building A is OK, but still appears as an "object out there."
- Building A appears to be cold, looks civic, looks museum-like building but not reading as a retail commercial space, investigating.
- The big mass of Building A is an issue. Pull some brick in from other buildings. The signage component may help the building including landscaping. Signage should be down low to complement pedestrian level.
- The curve feature on Building C needs to be eliminated, along with areas of all brick with no openings reexamined to let in light. The balconies are too open, need more integration to the building. The little bit of EIFS is too small, eliminate. The eyebrows on the building should have mass and not look tacked on; needs more study.
- Consider providing more reference to the architecture of the French battery building as a unifying element with other buildings.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Barrett voting no. The motion required that the applicant look at details relevant to the French Battery Building and addition, Buildings A and C contained in the comments within this report, along with review of building materials and colors with consideration of final approval. In addition, the applicant was requested to reexamine Building A as it relates to the corner relevant to pedestrian orientation of the entry and landscape treatment. The proposed water tower element was also requested to be reexamined with a design alternative provided.

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, 8 and 9.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street

|                | Site Plan | Architecture                          | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|----------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 5         | A-5<br>B-5<br>C-6<br>G-6<br>Rayovac-7 | 9              | 6                              | 6     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                | 7         | 7                                     | 7              | 7                              | -     | 6                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                | 8         | A-8<br>B-7<br>C-6<br>G-7              | 8              | -                              | -     | 7                                   | 8             | 8              |
|                | 10        | A-7<br>B-7<br>C-6<br>G-8<br>FB-7      | 9              | 9                              | 8     | 9                                   | 10            | -              |
|                | 8         | 6                                     | 7              | 7                              | -     | 6                                   | 6             | 7              |
|                | 9         | 8                                     | 10             | 10                             | -     | 8                                   | 10            | 9.5            |
|                |           |                                       |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                |           |                                       |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                |           |                                       |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                |           |                                       |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- All of the green elements (stormwater management, solar, green roof, wind power, cistern, etc.) must be firmly committed to (i.e., not watered down over time). "A" building turns its back on the street – despite transparency – in the way that Overture does at Henry and State. "B" building needs better ped connectivity to "A". "C" needs a ped gallery (weather enclosed OK) in the middle to connect neighborhood to Main Street. "G" buildings are probably over uniform. There needs to be a ped/bike connector at the southeast corner to the back of the parking lot. Winnebago Street is too wide and is designed to be a high speed cut-through. The roundabout is still too big; the eastern leg does not provide ped refuge. Throughout, the corner curb radii are designed for speed, i.e. very anti-ped. Back-in diagonal parking would be safer for cyclists and more convenient for car drivers (who otherwise would be blocked by SUVs). Generally, there are scale issues that need to be dealt with to make this a more humane site; variation in height within each large building, providing porticos or giant awnings over some stretches of sidewalk would help scale down these buildings. The water tank will be a nice whimsical touch. Wind turbines at this location will have to be very high. The infiltration strategies proposed should be the model for the entire City.
- Superb planning, land use, green features. A-bit cold, reads more like corporate, civic, museum building; components don't read/express themselves on street; brick colors; signage will help B-fine, but similar

comments. Curve does not seem resolved and not integrated with architecture; linkage to roof? Static but could be a good background building. Balconies look uncomfortable. G-very well done. French-fine although one could quibble about brick colors/detailing between new and old. Needs more community garden spots.

- Would like to see more unifying architectural elements throughout development including Building "A" reflecting back possibly on the French battery building. The building entry and landscape at corner of East Washington and Milwaukee Street needs to be more inviting to the pedestrians. The landscape composition and open space is very inviting, how to get there is not always easy from outside of the development, from bike path from Farwell and Anzinger, across from East Washington Avenue mid-block. Sustainable elements make the project very unique and important.
- Masonry areas of Building "A" need some adornment.

TO: Members of the Plan Commission  
FROM: Hickory R. Hurie  
SUBJECT: Analysis of request for major modification re: Union Corners  
DATE: March 9, 2007



#### **SUMMARY:**

McGrath Development has proposed a change in their Union Corners development that affects the earlier Inclusionary Dwelling Unit Plan approved by the Common Council. Based on market and iz unit residential changes in response to the changing market, different construction costs estimates and TIF negotiations, the developer requested a waiver on both residential components of the first phase SIP: French Battery and Building G.

McGrath seeks a modification in their previously approved IDUP for the project due to the tight site constraints, projected costs of the building, and the lack of financial feasibility due to the limited density of the project.

Staff recommend Plan Commission modification of the original IDUP to recommend Council adoption of the following:

- a) Building G: Recommend no Waiver of iz units and require the full 15% for iz units (19 on a base of 124 units);
- b) French Battery Building: Recommend partial waiver to expect only 1 of 3 required iz units, and a payment in lieu of the two waived units of \$30,000.

This analysis for an inclusionary zoning waiver is based upon data furnished by the developer and by the Planning Unit during December 2006, and February 2007.

#### **METHOD OF ANALYSIS:**

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

#### **MARKET RATE SCENERIOS:**

This first phase includes two residential sites with different base densities, Building G (proposed for a total of 124 units) and the French Battery Building (proposed for a total of 16 units).

Staff conducted an initial 'market run at current density of both sites, using the developer-provided information and the Planning Unit-provided current base density analysis. Neither site met the specific feasibility standards established by the Common Council to qualify for a waiver analysis, since the gross profit margin for each did not fall within the 12.5% to 17.5% range. However, in other decisions where the site presented some unusual issues of size, density, or public goals, the Plan Commission has used the current market 'gross profit margin' of the specific proposed project as the target for the analysis of financial feasibility.

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

Staff then tried a second run scenario with the pro forma for each component at the proposed density levels, and included the effect of a full 15% inclusionary unit requirement.

In the case of Building G, the combined effect of greater density and other incentives were sufficient to produce an estimated gross profit margin almost ten times greater than the 'market-rate' project at current density/no-incentive levels (a negative .8% rather than a negative .089 % level). Hence staff recommend no waiver for this Union Corners component.



In the case of the French Battery Building, the combined effect of greater density and other incentives does not appear to be sufficient to make the project feasible at the 15% iz unit level (with 3 iz units). Therefore staff explored several scenarios with various combinations of fewer units or payment in lieu that are reviewed below.

**MODIFIED IZ SCENARIOS WITH FEWER IZ UNITS OR PAYMENT IN LIEU:**

Staff discussed the French Battery Building component with McGrath Development and the option of providing the inclusionary units off-site. Staff concluded that the provision of new off-site units was not likely, given ownership control in the area and a developer decision to forego counting (for purposes of iz) the two houses already provided to Operation Fresh Start for relocation off-site, renovation, and sale to lower income families. (In one sense, these already provide the two waived iz units.)

Staff ran several additional scenarios for the French Battery building:

- a) The 2-iz unit scenario with a standard payment in lieu produced a gross profit margin of 3.8%, a figure below the target of 8.5% for this project component.
- b) A one-iz unit with a standard payment in lieu for 2 units (\$70,420) produced a gross profit margin of 7.8%, still below the target margin of 8.5%.

Neither of these alternative scenarios do not achieve the target margin of 8.5%.

A third modified scenario of one iz unit and a reduced payment in lieu of \$30,000 does meet the target gross profit margin. The waiver payment is less than the one calculated on a formula defined in the ordinance (10% of the average projected value of all units in the development), but sufficient to help the proposed component meet the target margin range of 8.5%.

**CONCLUSION:**

Based on current information and TIF assistance of \$4.9 million provided to the project, staff recommend that the developer be expected to

- 1. Provide a total of 19 inclusionary dwelling units on the Building G site, and
- 2. Provide a total of 1 inclusionary unit in the French Battery Building and pay \$30,000 as a payment in lieu of the 2 'waived' on-site units.

This recommendation is conditional upon the same level of TIF as the level tentatively approved by the Board of Estimates.

**McGrath Development**  
**Building G Market at Current Zoning**  
**For Sale Parameters for Determining Financial Infeasibility of Inclusionary Zoning**  
**For the periods from May 01, 2007 through December 31, 2017**

| Project  |  | Within Adopted policy standards   | 7.0%                             |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Interest rate  | Prime plus 0.5   |   |                                  |
| <b>Project Costs</b>   |  |   |                                  |
| Land/Building acquisition - per square foot raw land   | \$5 per square foot - raw land<br>\$50 - \$55 per square foot, downtown - vacant land<br>\$90 - \$125 per square foot, downtown - improved with building                                     | This project falls within this category, and is within acceptable range given recent cost trends  | \$212.62<br>\$212.62<br>\$212.62 |
| Hard cost contingency  | 5% new, 8% rehab of AIA contract   | When TIF reduction is discounted, figure is still 9.4% which is still twice City standard: why??? | 0.0%                             |
| Soft cost contingency  | 5% new/rehab of soft costs   |   |                                  |
| Contractor profit  | 6% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  | Acceptable range:   | 13.4%                            |
| Contractor overhead  | 2% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  | Somewhat higher than City standards   | 2.5%                             |
| Contractor general requirements  | 4% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  |   | 0.0%                             |
| Parking  | \$1,000 per stall - surface<br>\$15,000 per stall - first level underground<br>\$20,000 per stall for second level underground<br>\$27,000 per stall for three levels or more of underground | Cost below standard   | \$2,297.21                       |
| Development fees   | 8% of total project costs, net of development fees and reserves  | This project fits within the adopted policy range   | 3.2%                             |
| Square foot cost of construction, includes buildings including profit overhead and general requirements, site improvements and personal property | 4 stories and under - \$62.50 per square foot, 5 to 8 stories - \$95, and 8 stories or higher \$110 - \$120  | The project figures is a net figure; the policy figure is a \$/gross square foot figure           | \$179.78                         |
| Soft cost  | 10% of cost of construction  |   | 20.2%                            |
| <b>Inflation index factor on sites</b>   |  |   |                                  |
|  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  | Acceptable  | 3.0%                             |
| <b>Inflation index factor on costs</b>   |  |   |                                  |
|  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  | Acceptable  | 3.0%                             |

|   |   |  |              |
|---|---|--|--------------|
| Range of market rate until selling prices | MLS or assessors website comps for market rate IZ as indicated in the ordinance (City of Madison annual calculation based on AMI) | Conforms to Standards  | See schedule |
| Sale/transaction costs                    | 6.5% of selling price   | Within Adopted policy standards  | \$276,835.00 |
| Internal rate of return                   | 15% - 30% (assuming 80% leverage, 20% equity) depending upon product type   | This calculation is not applicable to this project for analytical purposes   | -7.9%        |
| Ratio of sales to inventory (absorption)  | Submit similar comps for similar projects   |  | 1.0          |
| Gross profit assumption                   | 12.5 - 17.5 sales minus direct project costs (not costs of sale or transaction costs)   | This reflects current density project, without TIF or IZ. Project falls OUTSIDE lower range of adopted policy standard for gross profit margin, but becomes target threshold for GPA for iz scenario | -81.3%       |
| Assessment fees                           | Amount of fees  | Note: This figure varies by unit size, and includes insurance.   | \$175.00     |

This scenario is the first of several steps to consider an iz waiver request: the base density scenario.

This scenario assumes a base density permitted by current zoning of M1 or 14 units on the site, rather than the 114 proposed. It represents the market rate scenario, without any inclusionary zoning units

The project at current density with all-market-rate unit does not meet Council-adopted threshold standard for minimum.

However, the Ordinance permits the Plan Commission to consider unusual site attributes that contribute toward financial infeasibility and on other occasions, the Plan Commission has examined infeasibility for such projects by using the current based zoning density margin as the threshold target benchmark for consideration of alternative scenarios with full or partial percentages of the 15% iz expectation.

Conclusion: The project will be analyzed as proposed with 114 units, including 19 iz units, and a GPM test of -81.3%

Hickory R. Hurie  
December/ 15 /2006

**McGrath Development**  
**Building G 105 Market 19 iz at Proposed Zoning**  
**For Sale Parameters for Determining Financial Infeasibility of Inclusionary Zoning**  
**For the periods from May 01, 2007 through December 31, 2017**

| Category   | Requirements   | Assessment  | Value                         |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Financing  | Prime plus 0.5   | Within Adopted policy standards   | 7.0%                          |
| Project costs  |  |   |                               |
| Land/Building acquisition - per square foot raw land   | \$5 per square foot - raw land<br>\$50 - \$55 per square foot, downtown - vacant land<br>\$90 - \$125 per square foot, downtown - improved with building                                     | This project falls within this category, and is under the range.                                  | \$28.49<br>\$28.49<br>\$28.49 |
| Hard cost contingency  | 5% new, 8% rehab of AIA contract   |   | 0.0%                          |
| Soft cost contingency  | 5% new/rehab of soft costs   | When TIF reduction is discounted, figure is still 9.3% which is still twice City standard. why??? | 13.3%                         |
| Contractor profit  | 6% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  | Acceptable range:   | 2.5%                          |
| Contractor overhead  | 2% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  | Somewhat higher than City standards   | 2.5%                          |
| Contractor general requirements  | 4% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  |   | 0.0%                          |
| Parking  | \$1,000 per stall - surface<br>\$15,000 per stall - first level underground<br>\$20,000 per stall for second level underground<br>\$27,000 per stall for three levels or more of underground | Cost below standard   | \$18,705.88                   |
| Development fees   | 8% of total project costs, net of development fees and reserves  | This project fits within the adopted policy range   | 5.8%                          |
| Square foot cost of construction, includes buildings including profit overhead and general requirements, site improvements and personal property | 4 stories and under - \$62.50 per square foot, 5 to 8 stories - \$95, and 8 stories or higher \$110 - \$120  | The project figures is a net figure; the policy figure is a \$/gross square foot figure           | \$169.11                      |
| Soft cost  | 10% of cost of construction  |   | 20.2%                         |
| Inflation index factor on sale   | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  | Acceptable  | 3.0%                          |
| Inflation index factor on costs  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  | Acceptable  | 3.0%                          |

|  |   |   |                |
|--|---|---|----------------|
| Range of market rate initial selling price | MLS or assessors website comps for market rate IZ as indicated in the ordinance (City of Madison annual calculation based on AMI) | Conforms to Standards   | See schedule   |
| Sale transaction costs                     | 6.5% of selling price   | Within Adopted policy standards   | \$2,099,896.00 |
| Internal rate of return                    | 15% - 30% (assuming 80% leverage, 20% equity) depending upon product type   | This calculation is not applicable to this project for analytical purposes  | -0.3%          |
| Ratio of sales to inventory absorption     | Submit similar comps for similar projects   |   | 1.0            |
| Gross profit assumption                    | 12.5 - 17.5 sales minus direct project costs (not costs of sale or transaction costs)   | This scenario MEETS TARGET THRESHOLD for gross profit margin, based on target established in initial base density scenario. | -0.6%          |
| Association fees                           | Amount of fees  | Note: This figure varies by unit size, and includes insurance.  | \$175.00       |

This scenario is the SECOND of several steps to consider an iz waiver request: the base density scenario. This scenario assumes the requested density of the 114 proposed units, including 19 iz units and 24 'extra' parking stalls for sale.

The target Gross Profit Margin threshold derived from the base density scenario is a **negative 81.3%**. The project at the proposed density and a full 15% IZ units achieves a gross profit margin of **-0.6%** using these calculations.

Therefore this portion of the Union Corners project (Building G) does not meet the criteria established by the Council for financial infeasibility, and **should be approved only if it provides 19 iz units.**

Hickory R. Hurie  
December/ 15 /2006

**McGrath Development**  
**French Battery Building Market at Current Zoning**  
**For Sale Parameters for Determining Financial Infeasibility of Inclusionary Zoning**  
**For the periods from May 01, 2007 through December 31, 2017**

| ISSUES   | REQUIRED RANGE   | MAJOR ASSUMPTION   | AGREED                        |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Interest rate  | Prime plus 0.5   | Within Adopted policy standards  | 7.0%                          |
| <b>Project Costs</b>   |  |  |                               |
| Land/Building acquisition - per square foot raw land   | \$5 per square foot - raw land<br>\$50 - \$55 per square foot, downtown - vacant land<br>\$90 - \$125 per square foot, downtown - improved with building                                     | This price is outside standards but reflects cost sharing with commercial first floor??? | \$27.78<br>\$27.78<br>\$27.78 |
| Hard cost contingency  | 5% new, 8% rehab of AIA contract   | Nearly twice City standard; includes some of costs listed below                          | 0.0%                          |
| Soft cost contingency  | 5% new/rehab of soft costs   | See above  | 9.4%                          |
| Contractor profit  | 6% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  | See above  | 0.0%                          |
| Contractor overhead  | 2% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  | See above  | 0.0%                          |
| Contractor general requirements  | 4% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  |  | 0.0%                          |
| Parking  | \$1,000 per stall - surface<br>\$15,000 per stall - first level underground<br>\$20,000 per stall for second level underground<br>\$27,000 per stall for three levels or more of underground | Cost below standard  | \$11,201.67                   |
| Development fees   | 8% of total project costs, net of development fees and reserves  | This project fits within the adopted policy range  | 5.3%                          |
| Square foot cost of construction, includes buildings including profit overhead and general requirements, site improvements and personal property | 4 stories and under - \$62.50 per square foot, 5 to 8 stories - \$95, and 8 stories or higher \$110 - \$120  | The project figures is a net figure; the policy figure is a \$/gross square foot figure  | \$169.98                      |
| Soft cost  | 10% of cost of construction  |  | 28.2%                         |
| <b>Inflation Index Factor on Sales</b>   |  |  |                               |
|  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  | Acceptable   | 3.0%                          |
| <b>Inflation Index Factor on Costs</b>   |  |  |                               |
|  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  | Acceptable   | 3.0%                          |
| <b>Range of market rate/initial selling prices</b>   |  |  |                               |

|   |   |              |
|---|---|--------------|
| MLS or assessors website comps for market rate IZ as indicated in the ordinance (City of Madison annual calculation based on AMI) |   | See schedule |
| Sale/transaction costs  | 6.5% of selling price   | \$320,688.00 |
| Internal rate of return   | 15% - 30% (assuming 80% leverage, 20% equity) depending upon product type             | 4.7%         |
| Ratio of sales to inventory (absorption)  | Submit similar comps for similar projects   | 2.0          |
| Gross profit assumption   | 12.5 - 17.5 sales minus direct project costs (not costs of sale or transaction costs) | 8.5%         |
| Association fees  | Amount of fees  | \$175.00     |

This scenario is the first of several steps to consider an iz waiver request: the base density scenario.

This scenario assumes a base density permitted by current zoning of C2, or 13 units on the site, rather than the 16 proposed. It represents the market rate scenario, without any inclusionary zoning units

This project with 13 all-market-rate units at current density does not meet Council-adopted threshold standard for minimum gross profit margin. However the Ordinance permits the Plan Commission to consider unusual site attributes that contribute toward financial infeasibility and on some occasions, the Plan Commission has examined infeasibility for such projects by using the current base zoning density gross profit margin as the threshold target benchmark for consideration of alternative scenarios with full or partial percentages of the 15% iz expectation.

Conclusion: The project will be analyzed as proposed with 16 units, including 3 iz units, and a GPM test of 8.5%

Hickory R. Hurie  
January/ 23 /2007

**McGrath Development**  
**French Battery Building 15 Market 1 IZ and \$30K at Proposed Zoning**  
**For Sale Parameters for Determining Financial Infeasibility of Inclusionary Zoning**  
**For the periods from May 01, 2007 through December 31, 2017**

| Prime plus 0.5   |  | Required Range | Vintal Calculation   | Actual             |
|--|--|----------------|--|--------------------|
| Interest rate  |  |                | Within Adopted policy standards  | 7.0%               |
| <b>Project costs:</b>  |  |                |  |                    |
| Land/Building acquisition - per square foot raw land   | \$7 per square foot - raw land<br>\$50 - \$55 per square foot, downtown - vacant land<br>\$90 - \$125 per square foot, downtown - improved with building |                | This price is outside standards but reflects cost sharing with commercial first floor??? | \$24.66<br>\$24.66 |
| Hard cost contingency  | 5% new, 8% rehab of AIA contract   |                |  | \$24.66            |
| Soft cost contingency  | 5% new/rehab of soft costs   |                | Nearly thrice City standard: WHY   | 0.0%               |
| Contractor profit  | 6% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  |                |  | 12.9%              |
| Contractor overhead  | 2% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  |                |  | 0.0%               |
| Contractor general requirements  | 4% of AIA contract (net of profit, overhead and general requirements)  |                |  | 0.0%               |
| Parking  | \$1,000 per stall - surface<br>\$15,000 per stall - first level underground<br>\$20,000 per stall for second level underground                           |                | Cost below but close to standard   | \$13,786.67        |
| Development fees   | \$27,000 per stall for three levels or more of underground<br>8% of total project costs, net of development fees and reserves                            |                | This project fits within the adopted policy range  | 5.8%               |
| Square foot cost of construction, includes buildings including profit overhead and general requirements, site improvements and personal property | 4 stories and under - \$62.50 per square foot, 5 to 8 stories - \$95, and 8 stories or higher \$110 - \$120  |                | The project figures is a net figure; the policy figure is a \$/gross square foot figure  | \$179.20           |
| Soft cost  | 10% of cost of construction  |                | This is outside the standard adopted by the Council.                                     | 20.6%              |
| <b>Inflation index factor on sales:</b>  |  |                |  |                    |
|  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  |                | Acceptable   | 3.0%               |
| <b>Inflation index factor on costs:</b>  |  |                |  |                    |
|  | 5 year average economic change factor for DOR website or 5 year average HUD AMI increase for IZ units  |                | Acceptable   | 3.0%               |
| <b>Range of market rate initial selling prices:</b>  |  |                |  |                    |
|  | MLS or assessors website comps for market rate IZ as indicated in the ordinance (City of Madison annual calculation based on AMI)                        |                |  | See schedule       |



|   |   |   |              |
|---|---|---|--------------|
| <b>Sale/transaction costs</b>                   | 6.5% of selling price   |   | \$365,326.00 |
| <b>Internal rate of return</b>                  | 15% - 30% (assuming 80% leverage, 20% equity) depending upon product type             | This calculation is not applicable to this project for analytical purposes  | 5.2%         |
| <b>Ratio of sales to inventory (absorption)</b> | Submit similar comps for similar projects   |   | 2.0          |
| <b>Gross profit assumption</b>                  | 12.5 - 17.5 sales minus direct project costs (not costs of sale or transaction costs) | This reflects proposed density project with TIF and IZ. Project falls OUTSIDE lower range of adopted policy standard for gross profit margin, Plan Commission may compare this figure with GPM of 8.5% of all-market project at base density. | 8.5%         |
| <b>Association fees</b>                         | Amount of fees  | Note: This figure varies by unit size, and includes insurance.  | \$175.00     |

This scenario is the final one of several steps to consider an iz waiver request: the proposed density scenario with a partial % of iz included. This scenario assumes approval of the requested density of 16 units.

It represents the 5% iz unit scenario, with one inclusionary zoning unit and the application of \$334,539 in TIF funds to street and streetscape costs. Summary of analyses thus far:

The initial scenario of the project at current zoning (13 market, no iz units) yields a target gross profit margin target of 8.5%.

The project with 13 all-market-rate units and the 3 iz units at the proposed density does not meet Council-adopted threshold standard for minimum gross profit margin. The 3 iz unit scenario yields an estimated gross profit margin of 3.8%, compared to the threshold target of 8.5%

The 2 iz unit scenario, with 14 market units, yields a gross profit margin of 5.9%.

The 1-iz unit scenario, with 15 market units (and a payment in lieu for 2 units of \$70,420), yields a gross profit margin of 7.8%.

The 0-iz unit scenario, with 16 market units (with a payment in lieu of \$108,576), yields a gross profit margin of 9.6%.

The 1-iz unit scenario, with 15 market units, and a reduced payment in lieu to \$33,000, yields a gross profit margin of 8.5%, a scenario that does meet the target gross profit margin threshold.

**Recommendation for Plan Commission consideration: waive two on-site iz units, require one iz unit and a payment in lieu of \$30,000.**

Note: the developer has arranged for two of the existing pre-development homes to be moved off-site and provided to a non-profit for affordable housing, but has chosen not to count those units toward the iz target expectations.

Hickory R. Hurie

January/ 23 /2007



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. Dalley, 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: October 9, 2006

TO: Plan Commission

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

SUBJECT: 2340, 2416, 2504 & 2507 Winnebago Street Planned Unit Development

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. The developer shall coordinate the project phasing with the reconstruction of East Washington Avenue as a portion of the project lies on the right-of-way to be vacated after completion of the East Washington Avenue Reconstruction.
2. The developer shall coordinate the project phasing with the City's project to reconstruct Winnebago Street and construct Sixth Street.
3. The developer shall enter into a development agreement for sidewalk along Winnebago Street if required by the City after consulting with the developer. This comment may not apply if the City constructs the sidewalk.
4. Private connections are being made to the storm sewer. The applicant shall show that when the storm sewer is at capacity the resulting backwater will not cause structural problems or flood underground parking. This shall include designing the lowest entrance (or flood proofing) to an elevation one (1) foot above the regional 100 year flood elevation or two (2) feet above the top of adjacent curb, whichever is greater.
5. All existing utility information must match the City plan. All proposed utility connections must be in conformance with the City plans.
6. The sanitary lateral for Building B does not match the City plan.
7. The plan needs to be revised showing the RIM and invert elevations of existing and proposed sanitary sewer facilities.
8. The 8" lateral main on Union is not a legal connection. The pipe needs to be no larger than 6" diameter. Utility plans need to be revised to match City street reconstruction plans.
9. Comment 1.5. An addressing plan shall be submitted for building and individual unit addresses. Plan shall include the first, second, third and fourth story floor plans. Private street names need to be approved. Union Green East and Union Green West are not acceptable names. East and West cannot be used as a suffix. The suggestion of Union Green Blvd is acceptable for both sections of roadway. The street name Union Main needs a suffix.

12



## 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: 2340, 2416, 2504 & 2507 Winnebago Street Planned Unit Development

#### 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.
- 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 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.
- 3.17 Installation of "Private" street signage in accordance with 10.34 MGO is required.

**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.
- 4.4 The applicant shall show storm water "overflow" paths that will safely route runoff when the storm sewer is at capacity.
- 4.5 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.
- 4.6 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.
- 4.7 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.

- 4.8 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.
- 4.9 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 sign-off.

- 4.10 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.
- 4.11 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.
- 4.12 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 [lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com](mailto:lzenchenko@cityofmadison.com). Include the site address in this transmittal.

- 4.13 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.

- 4.14 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).

- 4.15 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.

**CITY OF MADISON  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL  
CORRESPONDENCE**

**Date:** October 20, 2006

**To:** Plan Commission

**From:** Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator

**Subject:** 2340 Winnebago St, Union Corners, Phase I SIP

---

**Present Zoning District:** PUD(GDP)

**Proposed Use:** Build five buildings with 140 condo units, 63 rental units and 100,673 sq ft. commercial space.

**Requested Zoning District:** Amended PUD(GDP) and PUD(SIP)

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

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Section 28.04(24) provides that Inclusionary Zoning requirements shall be complied with as part of the approval process. Submit, to CDBG, a copy of the approved inclusionary zoning plan for recording prior to final signoff of the rezoning.
2. Provide **one** 10' x 35' loading area with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan for building B, 5,216 sq. ft. commercial bldg. The loading area shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space.

Provide **three** 10' x 50' loading areas with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan for building A, 65,450 sq. ft. commercial bldg. The loading area shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space.

Provide **two** 10' x 35' loading areas with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan for building C, 20,260 sq. ft. commercial, 20,2600 residential. The loading areas shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space.

Provide **one** 10' x 35' loading area with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan for building the Battery building for 9,763 sq. ft. commercial use. The loading area shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space. (Residential 22,946 sq. ft. loading provided in drive aisle).

2340 Winnebago St.

October 20, 2006

Page 2

Provide **three** 10' x 35' loading areas with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan for building G residential building 209,125 sq. ft. The loading areas shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space.

**Note: Loading areas shall be provided as shown above, unless the Plan Commission specifically reduces a specific loading requirement.**

3. Put building addresses, number of residential units, sq. footage of residential portion of building, and gross sq. footage of commercial on each building on the site plans. Contact Lori Zenchenko of City Engineering to get addresses (608-266-5952). On the floor plans of each building list number of parking stalls and bike parking stalls provided.
4. In the Zoning Text, for each of the zoning texts, revise permitted use and/or accessory use to list additional permitted uses that will be allowed. (Do not refer to the letter of intent). These additional lists shall be added to the zoning texts and reviewed by Zoning and Planning staff prior to final submittal of plans. Label the zoning texts with the building letter and the building address.
5. In the Zoning Text, revise the signage to be allowed as per Chapter 31 of the Madison General Ordinances, as compared to the R-6 for the residential use and as per C-2 for buildings containing commercial uses, and signage shall be as approved by the Urban Design Commission and Zoning.
6. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:

If parking is designated for commercial or residential uses, designate on the plans. Residential parking requires 2% of the stalls be accessible. If it is a mixed use (residential and commercial) commercial requirements will apply. Where surface and garage parking are provided, the accessible parking shall be provided in each.

- a. Buildings **A & B**, 203 stalls total, (87 garage and 116 surface stalls), (commercial use). Provide a minimum of **seven** 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. Building **C**, 64 garage stalls, (commercial and residential). Provide a minimum of **three** 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.
- c. Building **French battery building**, 30 garage stalls and 2 surface stalls (commercial and residential)/ Provide a minimum of **one** accessible stall striped per State requirements. A min. of one of the stalls shall be a van accessible stall 8' wide with an 8' striped out area adjacent.



- d. Building G, 136 garage stalls and 17 surface stalls (residential). Provide **four** 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. Divide the required accessible stalls between the surface and garage parking.
  - e. 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.
  - f. Show the accessible path from the stalls to the building or elevator. The stalls shall be as near the accessible entrance/elevator as possible. Show ramps, curbs, or wheel stops where required.
7. Provide bike parking stalls in safe and convenient locations on an impervious surface to be shown on the final plan. The lockable enclosed lockers or racks or equivalent structures in or upon which the bicycle may be locked by the user shall be securely anchored to the ground or building to prevent the lockers or racks from being removed from the location. NOTE: A bike-parking stall is two feet by six feet **with a five-foot access area**. Structures that require a user-supplied locking device shall be designed to accommodate U-shaped locking devices. **Note: Many of the bike parking stalls, as shown, do not meet the access requirements, including but not limited to most of the garage bike stalls.** Provide one stall for each unit in a residential building up to 50 stalls and half a stall for the number of stalls over 50. Provide one bike parking stall for each 10 car stalls that would be required for any commercial or office spaces. (Note: car parking requirements would be one stall per each 300 square feet of gross floor area. Even though car parking is not required, bike parking is required per the amount that would be required if it were.) Provide the following : **Building A- 22 bike stalls, Building B- 2 bike stalls, Building C- 60 bike stalls, Battery building – 19 bike stalls, and Building G – 87 bike stalls that meet the above criteria.**
8. Parking lot plans with greater than twenty (20) stalls, landscape plans must be stamped by a registered landscape architect. Provide a landscape worksheet with the final plans that shows that the landscaping provided meets the point and required tree ordinances. In order to count toward required points, the landscaping shall be within 15' and 20' of the parking lot depending on the type of landscape element. (Note: The required trees do not count toward the landscape point total.) **Planting islands shall consist of at least 75% vegetative cover, including trees, shrubs, ground cover, and/or grass. Up to 25% of the island surface may be brick pavers, mulch or other non-vegetative cover.** All plant materials in islands shall be protected from vehicles by concrete curbs.
9. Submit lighting plans for each building that meet 10.085 per the Madison General Ordinances.

**ZONING CRITERIA**

| <b>Bulk Requirements</b> | <b>Required</b>              | <b>Proposed</b>                  |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Lot Area                 | 236,300 sq. ft.              | 411,642 sq. ft. Phase I, 9.45 ac |
| Lot width                | 50'                          | adequate                         |
| Usable open space        | 50,240 sq. ft. (160 sf bdrm) | 57,750 sq. ft. +                 |
| Front yard               | 0'                           | adequate                         |
| Side yards               | 0' commercial, 11' resident. | adequate com., adeq. resid.      |
| Rear yard                | 30' or 0' through lots       | adequate                         |
| Floor area ratio         | 3.0                          | n/a                              |
| Building height          | ----                         | 2-4 stories'                     |

| <b>Site Design</b>         | <b>Required</b>   | <b>Proposed</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Number parking stalls      | 281 residential uses<br><u>336 commercial/office</u><br>617   | 316 garage<br><u>138 surface</u><br>454 total *   |
| Accessible stalls          | Yes   | (6)   |
| Loading                    | 3 (10' x 50') Bldg. A Com<br>1 (10' x 35') bldg. B Com<br>2 (10' x 35') bldg C Com<br>1 (10' x 35') Battery bldg. Com<br>1 (10' x 35') Bat. bldg. res.<br>3 (10' x 35') Bldg G res. | 1 (10' x 50') 1 (10' x 35') *<br>0 (blocks drive aisle) *<br>2 (8' x 35') needs to be 10' w<br>0 (blocks drive aisle) *<br>1 provided in drive aisle-ok<br>0 (209,125 sq. ft. res. bldg.) |
| Number bike parking stalls | 2 Bldg. A (Com)<br>22 Bldg. B (Com)<br>60 Bldg. C (Com/res)<br>19 Battery bldg (Com/res)<br><u>87 Bldg. G (Res)</u><br>190 total  | (7)   |
| Landscaping                | Yes   | (8)   |
| Lighting                   | Yes   | (9)   |

| <b>Other Critical Zoning Items</b> |     |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Urban Design                       | Yes |
| 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 C-2 district, because of the surrounding land uses.



# 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: 11/7/06  
TO: Plan Commission  
FROM: Edwin J. Ruckriegel, Fire Marshal  
SUBJECT: **2340, 2416, 2504, 2507 Winnebago 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. None.

## **GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

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

2. Provide fire apparatus access as required by Comm 62.0509 and MGO 34.19, as follows:
  - a. The site plans shall clearly identify the location of all fire lanes.
  - b. Provide a completed MFD "Fire Apparatus Access and Fire Hydrant Worksheet" with the site plan submittal.
  - c. Provide an aerial apparatus access fire lane that is at least 26-feet wide, with the near edge of the fire lane within 30-feet of the structure, and parallel to one entire side of the structure.
3. All portions of the exterior walls of newly constructed one- and two-family dwellings shall be within 500-feet of at least one fire hydrant. Distances are measured along the path **traveled by the fire truck as the hose lays off the truck**. See MGO 34.20 for additional information.

Please contact Scott Strassburg, Fire Code Enforcement Officer at 608-261-9843 if you have questions regarding the above items.



## Traffic Engineering and Parking Divisions

David C. Dryer, P.E., City Traffic Engineer and Parking Manager

Suite 100

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard

P.O. Box 2986

Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2986

PH 608 266 4761

TTY 866-704-2315

FAX 608 267 1158

November 14, 2006

TO: Plan Commission

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

SUBJECT: 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street – Rezoning –PUD (GDP) – Amended PUD (SIP) – Five (5) Buildings Residential 140 Condo Units and 63 Rental Units & Commercial Development 100,673 SF Space

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

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

1. The City of Madison radio systems are microwave directional line of sight to remote towers citywide. The building elevation will need to be reviewed by the 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.
2. The approval of this facility does not include the approval of the as proposed improvements in the street right-of-way. The applicant should remove all proposed improvements or conditions in the right-of-way on the site plan sheets or note: "All right-of-way improvements require separate approval by the Board of Public Works and Common Council for the public right-of-way changes to be requested by the developer."
3. The applicant provides Building "A" loading/unloading docks on site. The Building "A" has proposed semi-trailer deliveries from Winnebago Street or East Washington Ave. The applicant will need to accommodate all semi-trailer deliveries from Public Street to loading dock behind the building. The applicant shall show semi-trailer movement ingressing and egressing from the street to the loading dock areas. The applicant may need to modify the parking lot to accommodate truck ingressing and egress the truck route to the public street system.
4. A special design "Street Type Entrances" proposed for Winnebago Av. intersections at Union Main, Union Green West and Union Green East. "These Street Type Entrances" ingress and/or egress shall note the following: A six (6) inch white lines for the six (6) wide crosswalk and twenty-four (24) inch white stop bar four (4) feet behind the crosswalk shall be epoxy at the intersections of the street entrances. The Applicant shall provide a detail drawing of the "Street Type Entrance" with plan sheets showing these details signage and pavement markings. In addition, a note shall be shown on the plan, "ALL EPOXY PAVEMENT MARKING AND SIGNAGE AS APPROVED BY TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

SHALL BE INSTALLED AND MAINTIAN BY THE PROPERTY OWNER.”

5. The ramp down to the underground parking and its percent of slope shall be designed to accommodate low-clearance vehicles for a transition. The ramp break over 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. The applicant should explore ramp slopes (grades) less than 10 % that can be blended satisfactorily with an 8-foot transition length.
6. A continuous sidewalk around Buildings G shall be provided, with further review and approval of this sidewalk and the interface to the planned bike path along the rail corridor.

#### PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMENTS

7. Sidewalks shall be installed across the the Union Green connecting the sidewalks along both sides of Union Main to the sidewalks along the driveway between Buildings A and B.
8. Sidewalk running east/west across the north end of the larger Union Green median shall connect across Union Green East and Union Green West with curb ramps and crosswalks.
9. Curb ramps connecting parking spaces for people with disabilities with the sidewalks shall have a minimim five foot flat area at the top of the ramp. This is an issue at several locations including Building A and Building C. All curb ramp locations should be reviewed.
10. All bicycle parking locations shall be reviewed for visibility and accessibility from the street and proximity to building entrances.
11. Bicycle parking near the southeast entrance to Building A conflicts with the curb ramp and sidewalk and should be relocated.
12. Please provide detail drawings of bicycle racks to be used to ensure they comply with City of Madison bicycle rack design specifications.
13. All sidewalks/walkways adjacent to the curb in areas with angle parking, including 90 degree parking, shall be at least seven feet wide to account for bumper overhang.

#### GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

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

14. 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), 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'.
15. The applicant shall install private street name and other signs that comply with Madison General ordinances 10.34(3). The applicant shall show detail drawing of signs and installation that comply with M.G.O.

16. All directional/regulatory signage and pavement markings on the site shall be shown and noted on the plan. 1) The applicant shall remove the "Right Turn Only" sign on Union Green West ingressing Winnebago St. two-way traffic.
17. The intersection shall be so designed so as not to violate the City's sight-triangle preservations requirement which states that on a corner lot no structure, screening, or embankment of any kind shall be erected, placed, maintained or grown between the heights of 30 inches and 10 feet above the curb level or its equivalent within the triangle space formed by the two intersecting street lines or their projections and a line joining points on such street lines located a minimum of 25 feet from the street intersection in order to provide adequate vehicular vision clearance.
18. The applicant shall show the dimensions for proposed parking stalls' items A, B, C, D, E, F, H, and degree of angle parking width and backing up, according to Figures II "Medium and Large Vehicles" parking design standards in Section 10.08(6)(b) 2. Signs and planting areas are to be excluded from the rectangular stall areas including the two (2) feet of vehicle overhang. The two (2) feet of vehicle overhang shall be shown on the plan and dimensioned. The applicant shall revised E. Washington Av. parking lot for Sales Office according to M. G.O. dimensions and encroachment onto the East Washington Ave. public sidewalk with a barrier and noted on the site plans. The applicant may need to modify angle parking on Union Main as H and A distances from the Winnebago St. at the traffic round about right-of-way eliminating a parking space as not to back into the right-of-way.
19. Per ordinance, the small car stalls shall not exceed 25% of the total number of Medium and Large Vehicles and Small Vehicles stalls for the facility. The site plan shall show small car parking spaces identified and properly controlled with a sign "Small Cars Only" per each space, when plans are submitted for approval.
20. The applicant shall design the underground parking areas for stalls and backing up according to Figures II of the ordinance using the 9' or wider stall for the commercial/retail area. The "One Size Fits All" stall shall be used for the residential parking area only, which is a stall 8'-9" in width by 17'-0" in length with a 23'-0" backup. Aisles, ramps, columns, offices or work areas are to be excluded from these rectangular areas, when designing underground parking areas.
21. 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.
22. 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: Lance T. McGrath  
Fax: 255-1132  
Email: [imcgrath@mcgrathprojects.com](mailto:imcgrath@mcgrathprojects.com)

DCD: DJM: dm



Bradley S. Livingston, AAE  
Airport Director

November 20, 2006

**VIA EMAIL**

Mr. Tim Parks  
City of Madison Plan Commission  
C/O Planning Unit

Re: Proposed Rezoning  
2340, 24116, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street  
Applicant: McGrath Associates  
Ordinance File #4682

Dear Mr. Parks:

The property involved in the above referenced proposed rezoning is under the final aircraft approach to runway 136 at the Dane County Regional Airport and is within the Airport Affected Area as established under section 62.23 (6) (am) of the Wisconsin Statutes. Therefore, the Dane County Regional Airport requests that the City of Madison require the recording of an avigation easement as a condition to the requested rezoning of the property.

The Airport requests that all owners of the subject property execute Dane County's standard form avigation easement and have it recorded before the rezone is effective. As you know, the easement is limited in scope to aircraft noise, height limitations and electronic interference or visibility obstructions that may be hazardous to aircraft in the area of the Dane County Regional Airport.

Please have the owner or the owner's representative contact me at the telephone number or email address provided below. I will then directly provide an avigation easement in a form that is ready for execution and recording.

Your consideration of this request is appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Rodney F. Knight  
Airport Counsel  
Email: knight@msnairport.com  
Telephone: (608) 246-3388  
Fax: (608) 246-3385