

# MADISON PUBLIC MARKET

## Site Analysis Matrix Appendix A



Philadelphia Italian Market  
Philadelphia, PA

May, 2010

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
1	Address	215 S. Pinckney St.		1 S. Butler & E. Wash 53703		925/945 E. Washington & 924/946 E. Main St		2340,3504, & 2507 Winnebago St.	
2	Current Owner	City of Madison	3	@2/3 City, 1/3 State	2	Arch...Village & 945 E wash Ave LLC	1	Union Corners LLC	1
3	Site Size (SF)	52,272	3	87,120 (with State, @57,500 without State)	2	185,130	1	497,191	3
4	Building Size	Plan for building demolition	2	0 SF – No Building - Parking	3	Current building - not appropriate	1	Vacant site	1
5	Current Zoning	C4		C2		M1		PUD (SIP)	
6	Size Adequacy	Could accommodate all uses with a partial second story in a mixed-use project – parking underground, office or residential above	3	May be too large with State parcel. About right without State parcel.	2	Would accommodate new MPM building and surface parking. Size is excessive for use.	1	Far more space than necessary. High cost of improving open space.	1
7	Age of Main Structure	N.A.		N.A.		Turn of century Kleuter Warehouse (1915)		N.A.	
8	Current Assessment	Publically owned		Publically owned		\$3,803,200		\$4,548,000	
9	Cost for public market site acquisition	Unknown – but could be a public sector contribution to the project	3	Unknown – but could be a public sector contribution to the project	3	Likely high – plus demolition	1	Likely high	1

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
10	Listed?	No		No		Yes		Available	
11	Site Condition	Existing parking deck to be demolished		N.A.		5 Story structure to be maintained. Remaining structures likely demolished.		Vacant site	
12	Available Parking	New 500-1,000 car deck to be constructed underground – use would be somewhat countercyclical with market. Would need parking validation program	3	Existing 240 spaces would need to be replaced. Public market parking added, plus new parking for uses above MPM. Parking Utility engaged in a significant redesign of parking on an adjacent to the site.	3	With demolition, site is large enough to accommodate surface parking.	3	Plenty of room for parking.	3
13	Access and Circulation	Centrally located, 1 block from the “Square” and close to Monona Terrace - somewhat off the well-travelled path	2	Good access all 4 sides. Good exposure on E. Washington.	3	Good access off East Washington only – Near East side neighborhood.	2	Neighborhood, not citywide ease of access, adjacent an area East Side. Outside City center.	1
14	Visibility	Easy downtown access but somewhat off the well travelled path.	2	Excellent – part of downtown, Centrally located, 4 side exposure.	3	Good – East side only	2	Near E. Washington and Milwaukee but primarily visible to surrounding community	1
15	Ease of Acquisition	Great- if City Parking Utility cooperates.	3	Excellent - if City and State cooperate. Complicated due to mixed development / ownership.	2	Presumably Cooperative owner but would likely need to be part of a larger development / acquisition process	1	Presumably Cooperative owner but would likely need to be part of a larger development / acquisition process	1

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
16	<b>Adjacencies</b>	Immediate uses compatible, larger area mostly positive. Immediate retail Dane Brewery/Pub and on King St (15 shops w/in .5 mi)	<b>3</b>	Immediate uses compatible, larger area mostly positive. Not much immediate retail. (15 shops w/in .5 mi)	<b>3</b>	Possible negative effect on Willy St Co-Op. Other uses acceptable (6 shops w/in .5 mile)	<b>1</b>	Some neighborhood retail (6 shops within 0.5 mile)	<b>1</b>
17	<b>Potential For Catalyst – Surroundings</b>	Will help bridge the area from Monona Terrace and the Square	<b>3</b>	Will reinforce downtown density and protect neighborhoods	<b>3</b>	Will help realize E. Washington Capitol East District Plan	<b>2</b>	Unlikely to spur much nearby commercial development	<b>1</b>
18	<b>Capacity to Expand</b>	Not likely once developed. Site is of minimum size.	<b>1</b>	Not likely once developed	<b>1</b>	Possible if balance of site is not used	<b>2</b>	Possible if balance of site is not used	<b>2</b>
19	<b>Design Potential</b>	Could be a terrific new building that would enhance and grow the downtown user and visitor experience.	<b>3</b>	Could be a terrific new building that would enhance and grow the downtown user and visitor experience.	<b>3</b>	Limited	<b>1</b>	Limited	<b>1</b>
20	<b>Nearby Farmers' Market</b>	DCFM (2 blocks)	<b>3</b>	DCFM <b>B</b> : (2 blocks)	<b>3</b>	Eastside FM at 201 S. Ingersol St. (2 blocks)	<b>3</b>	None nearby	<b>1</b>
21	<b>Likely Effect on Farmers Market</b>	Positive (this need to be tested) <b>B</b> : Pickney St. to the Square should be closed on DCFM day and DCFM should expand to PM site. More selling space and reinforcing uses and expanded customers for both.	<b>3</b>	Positive <b>B</b> : E. Washington should be closed on market day and DCFM should expand to MPM site. More selling space and reinforcing uses and expanded customers for both.	<b>3</b>	Minimal <b>B</b> :	<b>2</b>	None	<b>1</b>

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
22	<b>Political Viability</b>	Positive bridge between Monona Terrace, King St Commercial, and the Square.	<b>3</b>	Current plan include a PM	<b>3</b>	Positive – for Near East Siders	<b>2</b>	Benefits accrue primarily to far East side residents.	<b>1</b>
23	<b>Potential if not developed</b>	Mixed-use - commercial		Mixed-use – commercial		Mixed-use - commercial		Neighborhood retail/housing	
24	<b>Potential for NMTC</b>	Eligible	<b>3</b>	Eligible	<b>3</b>	Eligible	<b>3</b>	Eligible	<b>3</b>
25	<b>Potential for HTC, Façade Easement, Sale of Air rights</b>	No	<b>1</b>	No	<b>1</b>	No	<b>1</b>	No	<b>1</b>
26	<b>Competition</b>	Other nearby uses are complementary	<b>3</b>	Other nearby uses are complementary	<b>3</b>	Possible issue with Willy St Co-Op	<b>1</b>	Less nearby similar retail	<b>2</b>
27	<b>Dakota projections</b>	Predicted East side location was best	<b>3</b>	Predicted East side location was best	<b>3</b>	Predicted East side location was best	<b>3</b>	Predicted East side location was best	<b>2</b>
28	<b>Proximity of nearest Supermarket</b>	Trader Joes – 2.2 miles	<b>3</b>	Willy St. – 1 mile Woodman’s – 3.87 miles Trader Joes – 2.47 miles	<b>2</b>	Willy St. - .5 miles Woodman’s – 3.24 miles Trader Joes - 3.41 miles	<b>1</b>	Jennifer St. Market - .5 m Copps – 1 mi Woodman’s – 1.5 mi Hy-Vee – 2.3 mi	<b>1</b>
29	<b>Protect Capital Views</b>	Yes		Yes		Yes		N.A.	

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
30	<b>Enhance Pedestrian Walkability</b>	Centrally located. Easiest walk from Square and Monona Terrace.	3	Centrally located. Easy walk for many already nearby.	2	Somewhat inconvenient except for neighbors	2	Inconvenient except for neighbors	1
31	<b>Historic Preservation</b>	N.A.	1	Immediately adjacent to a historic area	2	Kleuter Warehouse (1915) building adjacent. May have some effect.	1	N.A.	1
32	<b>Transit Compatible</b>	Many busses	3	Many busses Likely near any future light rail.	3	Some busses	2	Limited bus service	1
33	<b>Minimize Negative Parking Impact</b>	Would underground existing parking	3	Would underground existing surface parking	3	Would require surface parking	1	Would require surface parking	1
34	<b>Utilize Existing Infrastructure</b>	Transit and density already concentrated at the Capitol	3	Transit and density already concentrated at the Capitol	3	Some transit nearby but lacks density	2	Minimum transit nearby and lacks density	1
35	<b>Protect Neighborhood Character</b>	By building up downtown, helps protect neighborhoods	3	By building up downtown, helps protect neighborhoods	3	Possible negative effect on East side neighborhoods	2	Out of character with existing uses	1
36	<b>Create Live/Work Environment</b>	Location with uses above allows walk to work and shopping	3	Location with uses above allows walk to work and shopping	3	More isolated	1	Most isolated	1
37	<b>Potential timing of project</b>	Supports City Goals. With City cooperation – could move relatively quickly	3	Multiple ownership and replacement parking will take time to resolve	1	Private ownership complicates acquisition	1	Private ownership complicates acquisition	1

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
38	Supportive Demographics	Most accessible to diverse neighborhoods	3	Most accessible to diverse neighborhoods	3	East side likely supportive of use. Lower income, smaller household size	2	Location might put off residents of other Madison neighborhoods	1
39	<u>2005 Surrounding key zip code demographics</u>	53703		53703		53703		53704	
40	2005 projected population	29,095		29,095		29,095		47,022 (larger area)	
41	Population per sq. mi.	15,344 (high)	3	15,344 (high)	3	15,344 (high)	3	2,112 (low)	1
43	Largest minority	Asian		Asian		Asian		African American	
44	# of Households – 1 mi	12,292	3	Similar to Government East	3	8,055	2	8,530	2
45	Total jobs – 1 mi	37,697	3	Similar to Government East	3	25,593	2	10,357	1
46	% below poverty – 1 mi <b>D</b>	22.8%	3	Similar to Government East	3	15.3%	2	7.4%	1
47	Existing TIF?	Yes	3	Yes	3	Yes	3	Yes	3
48	Potential for street level active pedestrian-oriented uses	Fine site for this – except: no green space	2	Best site for this – except: no green space	2	Lots of space. Not a pedestrian area.	1	Lots of space. Not a pedestrian area.	1

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
49	Potential for day/night use	Fine site for this – Downtown is active location, Easy stopover after work	3	Fine site for this – Downtown is active location, Easy stopover after work	3	More possible from East side neighborhood	2	Neighborhood only	1
50	Highest Vehicular weekday traffic count at public market entry	13,400 (E. Doty) 4,700 (S. Pickney) 6,350 (E. Wilson)	2	34,500 (E. Washington) 3,500 (Main)	3	45,500 (E. Washington) 2,650 S Patterson. Primarily pass through.	2	46,100 on E. Washington, 9,700 on Milwaukee. Primarily pass through.	2
51	Likely nearby Retail Vacancy	Highest occupancy	3	Highest occupancy	3	Lower occupancy	2	Lower occupancy	2
52	Likelihood of Business Success	Most likely - central location, not just a destination. Concentration of residents and workers.	3	Most likely - central location, not just a destination location. Concentration of residents and workers.	3	Possible but not the best	2	Would need to be smaller neighborhood market	1
53	Traffic Flow in late afternoon - when workers shop	More limited	2	Yes	3	Yes	3	Yes	3
54	Likely Benefit to Low Income / Minority Residents	Near East side has lowest household income	3	Near East side has lowest household income	3	Near East side has lowest household income	2	Less poverty	1
55	Conformance with City Plans	Enhances existing uses	3	(B.L.) Plan calls for grocery	3	E. Wash Build Plan calls for grocery. Less complementary uses.	2	Important site – more appropriate for neighborhood commercial	1
56	Environmental Issues <a href="#">C:</a>	None expected	3	None expected	3	Likely – paint use	1	Prior issues, cleanup reportedly complete	2

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
57	<b>Strengths of surrounding uses</b>	Entertainment district on King St. Will pick up synergy from Square, DCFM, UW, and Monona Terrace	3	Synergy from DCFM, Downtown, UW, Capitol, existing nearby retail, etc.	3	Supportive neighborhood, less synergy.	1	More isolated neighborhood retail. Perceived as an East side site.	1
58	<b>Weaknesses of surrounding uses</b>	Primarily commercial area. Some mixed-income high-rise residential.	3	“Backdoor” uses could negatively affect surrounding housing	2	Could possibly harm Williamson St. Co-Op. Not much nearby compatible retail	2	Absence of synergetic uses	1
59	<b>“Turf” issues</b>	Capitol/downtown is everybody’s neighborhood	3	Capitol/downtown is everybody’s neighborhood - slight East side character	2	East side has distinctive and supportive character. Might be problematic for some non East siders.	2	Further East location. Might put off West siders.	1
60	<b>Potential for positive effect on surrounding neighborhood</b>	Would have a broadly positive effect on downtown and near East side	3	Would have a broadly positive effect on downtown and near East side	3	Would strengthen East side as a city destination	2	Positive neighborhood, not city effect	1
61	<b>Potential for negative effect on surrounding neighborhoods.</b>	Already a commercial area	3	Will increase traffic on E. Washington	2	Will add to congestion on E. Washington Possible negative for Williamson St.	2	Intense urban use in a less urban location	1
62	<b>Likely Traffic Effects</b>	Traffic flow needs to be analyzed	2	Less traffic density on E. Washington at this location	3	High E. Washington traffic density will worsen	2	High E. Washington traffic density will worsen	2

#	Characteristic	Government East Parking	Rating	Brayton Lot	Rating	Mautz Paint	Rating	Union Corners	Rating
63	<b>Unique Site Issues</b>	Government East has the advantage of the closest proximity to the most synergetic uses. It is also the most straight forward development project – being solely owned by the City’s Parking Utility. It is less visible and traffic issues may need to be addressed. It is appropriately sized if Market is somewhat downsized. Site is somewhat tucked away but marketing and central location could overcome any disadvantage.		Brayton Lot may be a more complicated development due to the need to replace the parking and to work with a private developer on the upper floor uses. The relationship with the State property also presents issues that may take time to resolve. It is the most visible site. If scaled down, the Market would only need to occupy the City-owned portion of the site.		Mautz may be an acceptable site. Environmental issues need to be explored. Cost of demolition adds to cost. Private ownership complicates development timeline and budget.		Union Corners is in a primarily outlying location with relatively little city-wide visibility. It could house a neighborhood-oriented Market but the kind of regional facility that addresses a broad array of public goals is probably not appropriate for this site.	
64	<b>Recommendations if used for a public market</b>	Parking should be underground. Best upper floor uses would be municipal offices and/or residential. Parking validation program will be necessary. Huge advantage to tying in to Square, Monona Terrace, DCFM, Entertainment district, and closest to UW. Traffic flow needs to be analyzed and perhaps altered. City could do multi-story development with ground		City could work with the PM working group to create an RFP for a private developer. First floor and a portion of the upper floor and/or basement (except parking entry and upper floor entry), should be condominiumized and leased to the PM for \$1.) 2-3 levels of		If Mautz is selected, the MPM should be located on part of the site and surface parking on the balance of the site.  While demolition and likely environmental remediation will add to costs, the actual project would be relatively straightforward since other complicating (but potentially synergistic) uses		A Union Corners market would be a terrific boon to a site in need of a use. However, the Market would need to be much smaller and designed as a neighborhood and not a regional facility.	

		floor MPM (also parking and upper floor access on the ground floor). Higher tourist use and Square lunch time use will require a bit more prepared food options.		parking will be required, plus basement and/or upper floor utilities and storage for MPM and upper floor uses.  PM could share paid parking uses with a favorable parking validation program. Second floor should be MPM and other office uses. Floors 2-4 might be elderly (to minimize parking requirements) and all other upper floor uses (great lake views) could be upper income housing which could offset value lost in subsidizing MPM uses.		would not be involved			
<b>#</b>	<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Government East Parking</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Brayton Lot</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Mautz Paint</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Union Corners</b>	<b>Total</b>
65	Total Points		137		132		89		64

## Footnotes:

**A:** City will derive far more in new taxes, jobs, and boosts to surrounding development, than purchase price would bring. City should retain land ownership and provide a very long-term, nominal lease rate to the non-profit operator – subject to conformance with public goals.

**B:** The author believes that the proximity to the Dane County Farmers Market (DCFM) would be of tremendous benefit to both the MPM and the DCFM. The MPM will bring new customers to the DCFM and vice versa. Together, regional residents would be able to do virtually all of their food shopping year round. The experience of the author is that Public Markets and Farmers Markets located near each other reinforce each others visibility and uses. A portion of the winter market could occur on Saturday mornings in PM indoor multipurpose plaza space. If the Brayton site is chosen, the DCFM should be allowed to continue down E. Washington Ave. to the front door of the Public Market. If the site is Gov't East, the DCFM should expand down Pinckney. Either option will relieve the current congestion and provide for needed vendor expansion. Tying the DCFM to the MPM will benefit both institutions.

**C:** After a site is selected, but before final decision is made and property is optioned, a Phase 1 Environmental Report should be completed. Alternatively, the Option could be conditioned on an acceptable Environmental study.

**D:** This assumes that part of the Market's mission is to provide jobs, entrepreneurial opportunities and fresh food shopping opportunities to a diverse demographic base of customers