

PLANNING UNIT REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
January 2, 2007

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, I.D. 04594: TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 9701 BRADER WAY FROM PUD-GDP TO PUD-SIP.

1. Requested Action: Approval of a zoning map amendment from PUD-GDP to PUD-SIP for an office building.
2. Applicable Regulations: Section 28.07 provides the requirements for review and approval of Planned Unit Developments. Section 28.12 provides the guidelines and process for zoning map amendments.
3. Report Drafted By: Bill Roberts, Planner IV.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. Applicant: Baer Insurance Company/K.F. Sullivan Company, 1314 Emil Street, Madison, WI 53713.
2. Status of Applicant: Owner and contractor.
3. Development Schedule: 2007.
4. Parcel Location: North side of Mineral Point Road at South Point Road between Pioneer Road and Pleasant View Road, Madison Cross Plains School District, 9th Aldermanic District.
5. Parcel Size: 1.86 acres.
6. Existing Zoning: PUD-GDP.
7. Existing Land Use: Vacant platted lot.
8. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning (See map): This site is surrounded predominantly by undeveloped agricultural lands. The land adjacent to this site to the northeast is under development for the Blackhawk Church. The recently approved "Silicon Prairie Business Park" is located directly to the south of Mineral Point Road zoned SM, Specific Manufacturing District.
9. Adopted Land Use Plan: The adopted Elderberry Neighborhood Development Plan, March 2002, designated this site as office employment. The adopted City of Madison Comprehensive Plan shows this site as E-Employment District.
10. Environmental Corridor Status: There are no environmental corridors on this property.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICES:

The full range of urban services can be provided to this property as development occurs.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

This property is subject to Planned Unit Development standards.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION:

On September 6, 2005 the Common Council approved a PUD-GDP Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan and a preliminary plat for an approximately 40-acre mixed-use development to be known as "Blackhawk Church Town Center". On October 18, 2005 the Common Council approved the final plat as well as the first SIP for this development. The first SIP is for the Blackhawk Evangelical Church which is now under construction within this subdivision.

This is the second SIP application within this development known as the Blackhawk Church Town Center PUD-GDP.

The proposal before the Plan Commission at this time is for a new 3-story, approximately 46,000 square foot office building to be built on one of the existed platted lots. A 136-stall parking lot is proposed in addition to 39 underground garage parking spaces. The site is on the corner of Mineral Point Road and Veritas Drive. However, single access to the site will be provided from Brader Way.

The Plan Commission and Common Council asked that an overall transportation demand management plan for the entire plat be submitted with the first SIP for staff review and approval. That occurred with the first SIP for the church building that was approved in October of 2005. City Traffic Engineering staff will review and comment if there are additional matters that need to be addressed regarding transportation management as a result of this second SIP proposal.

Consistency With Adopted Plans

This site is located within the Elderberry Neighborhood Development Plan which was adopted by the Common Council in March 2002. As noted above, the Plan designated this site as office employment. The adopted City of Madison Comprehensive Plan shows this area as E-Employment District. The approved overall PUD-GDP (Lot 2 of the Blackhawk Church Town Center plat) shows this site as "mixed use, office with first floor retail." The Plan Commission and Common Council imposed the following specific condition regarding retail use on Lot 1 and 2.

"That the square footage devoted to retail on Lot 1 and 2 be limited to 50% of the first floor area of each building and that retail uses in these buildings not be allowed until buildings on Lot 3, 5, 6 have been approved and building permits have been issued for each."

The GDP also specified the range of building size for Lot 2 to be between 30,000 and 60,000 square feet and buildings to be 2 to 3 stories in height.

This proposal is consistent with the Elderberry Neighborhood Development Plan, the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan, the preliminary and final plat, and the PUD-GDP for this site. The final plans will require a note indicating the amount of first floor retail space to be available and the provisions regarding the condition of approval about other retail uses occurring within the plat. No additional retail development has been built at this time and staff knows of no immediate plans for other building proposals within the plat.

Urban Design Commission Review:

The Urban Design Commission referred action on this proposal at their September 20, 2006 meeting because of concerns about the parking, stair towers, glazing system and building design elements (see attached report dated September 20, 2006). The applicant modified the plans and returned to the Commission on October 18, 2006. The Commission again referred action and asked the applicant to address the relationship of the building to Brader Way and Veritas Drive and other points listed in the Commission's report dated October 18, 2006 (copy attached).

On December 6, 2006 the Urban Design Commission granted final approval of the revised plans (report attached).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Unit recommends that the Plan Commission forward this zoning map amendment for a PUD-SIP to the Common Council with a favorable recommendation subject to the following:

1. All the conditions of approval contained in the PUD-GDP preliminary plat and final plat letter applicable to Lot 2 shall be addressed. This includes the provision that a note be added to the plans and the zoning text that: "the square footage devoted to retail Lots 1 and 2 shall be limited to 50% of the first floor area of each building and retail uses in these buildings shall not be allowed until buildings on 3, 5, and 6 have been approved and building permits have been issued for each."
2. Final approval of the Urban Design Commission will be required.

AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 6, 2006	
TITLE: 9701 Brader Way – PUD(SIP), Office Building. 9 th Ald. Dist. (04545)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: December 6, 2006	ID NUMBER:	

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 6, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 9701 Brader Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Alex King, Keith Kaetterhenry, Tom Knoop, Jeremy Homstadt and Ross Menard. In response to the Commission's previous review of the project at its meeting of October 27, 2006 both the site and building plans have been revised with the applicant providing an overview of the modifications based on an outline of issues provided within the application packet.

- To address concerns requiring the building to address the street and to provide prominent entries (dedicated) an architecturally prominent entry has been provided on Brader Way, including a canopy, large landscape planters, benches, patterned entry pavement that extends into the public walk and incorporating recessed double glass doors. In addition, an 8-foot wide stairway up to an 18-foot deep patio has been provided off of Veritas Drive where the patio may be utilized as an employee break area with tables and chairs. In addition, metal awnings have been provided over the first floor windows along Veritas and Brader Way to provide further fenestration of the first floor level at the street.
- In response to a request to consider the use of opaque glass to conceal the floor to ceiling areas, the applicant maintained its use but provided further enhancement with the introduction of awnings over the first floor window to reduce the visibility of the spandrel at that level.
- Requests to modify the landscape plan was accommodated with the incorporation of shade trees as a replacement for crab trees, along with additional screening around the perimeter of the surface parking area and entrance to underground parking.
- A request to look at different treatment of glazing on various elevations was addressed with modifications as shown on perspective renderings within the submittal packet.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Concerns with the height of the fascia still being out of proportion with the base and the rest of the building were noted with the applicant emphasizing its function to screen mechanicals.
- The CMU above the base needs to be smooth masonry material.
- Staff noted the need to provide a building material and color reference details for the various elevations.

- Still an issue with the amount of parking and impervious area.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Geer abstaining. The motion for final approval required that the applicant make sure the planters stay large at the entry off of Brader Way and the raised patio area on Veritas Drive. In addition, relevant to the overhangs as shown in elevation, the applicant had the latitude to make them deeper with smooth face masonry to be utilized as a replacement for split face masonry and with the elevations to be modified to show the patio doors.

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, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9701 Brader Way

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	7
	5	6	7	7	-	5	6	6
	8	8	9	8	-	7	7	8
	6	7	8	8	-	7	7	7
	7	7	7	7	-	7	7	7
	2	5	-	-	-	-	2	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Much improved.
- Much improved.
- Good improvements, thanks for your cooperation.
- The entry treatments are a major improvement, as is the lighter window tint. The overall site plan fails because it does not follow the promise of drastically reduced parking through shared parking arrangements with the church.
- Overhang at east/west sides – provide both sides for solar (west critical) top band (fascia) way to heavy.

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 18, 2006	
TITLE: 9701 Brader Way – PUD(SIP), Office Building, 9 th Ald. Dist. (04545)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: October 18, 2006	ID NUMBER:	

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 18, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of a PUD(SIP) for an office building located at 9701 Brader Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, Keith Kaetterhenry, Tom Knoop, Fredric Schuhmacher, Bruce Hollar and Leslie Portz. The modified plans as presented featured the following:

- Widened planting areas peripheral and internal to the surface parking lot.
- An outdoor break area has been provided, along with a pedestrian connection to pathways to the adjacent detention pond facilities on the outlot to the east, in addition a pedestrian access has also been provided along the south elevation to provide access to the parking lot oriented entranceway.
- A pedestrian walkway has been provided along the westerly elevation of the building to Brader Way.
- A walkway has been provided along the building's frontage to Brader Way to provide for potential first floor access.
- Bike stalls have been distributed both internally and externally on the site, including within the lower level parking facility.
- Loading has been incorporated within a drive aisle to increase the amount of landscaped open space within lawn covered planting infiltration areas located between perpendicularly oriented bays of parking.
- Additional first floor building entries can be provided with the conversion of oversized windows on both the street sides of the building combined with the conversion for individual tenants spaces.
- The landscaping plan features enhancement of landscaping amenities along Mineral Point Road. The overhead canopy has been eliminated; the parapet now follows the curve of the upper front entry elevation oriented to the surface parking lot.
- The array of building materials include a field utility brick, "Iron Spot" an accent brick in a modular size, green glass, smooth face masonry block with the utilization of EIFS on upper portions of all elevations, and precast stone with a limestone finish.

- In response to a request to provide for more on-site infiltration, the applicants noted that the soils limit true infiltration, only water quality can be affected utilizing the proposed bioretention area along Mineral Point Road.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- The proposed use of crabapple species within the surface parking lot is inappropriate. Replace with a better/larger shade tree.
- The building turns its back on its street frontages, as well as the corner with its entry oriented to the backside (parking lot). There is no guarantee that the proposed door entry along Brader Way will be active, entry needs to be at corner.
- Parking at 3-4 stalls per 1,000 square feet as described in the GDP is at the high end; need to encourage parking on street, which is allowed but is discouraged if the front door is not on the front street and with the on-site parking levels as proposed.
- Need more transparency of the building to the street.
- The opaqueness of the glass is bothersome; consider other means available for solar control.
- The architecture with the site and building orientation does not have urban sensibility.
- The glass needs to have interaction to be able to see people in the building.
- Reluctantly voted for the GDP based on the promise of shared parking with the church. This building's peak parking needs could utilize this measure. The GDP text relevant to the provision of underground parking to be encouraged means the 3-4 stall per 1,000 square foot ratio should be satisfied with this provision. Building parking as you need it; not years in advance of need.
- Relative to architecture, the column spacing grid doesn't relate to the architecture of the façade, need to make building more friendly, consider modifications to the material palette, column spacing and other measures such as a heavier base than cornice treatment.
- The main view from Mineral Point Road of the south elevation is of the garage door entry to lower level parking; needs screening.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED**

CONSIDERATION. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Geer abstaining. The motion required address of the above and the following:

- Examine ways for building to address street and to provide prominent entries (dedicated).
- Look at the scale of the architecture of the building, use of materials and scale of windows and openings.
- Look at alternatives to opaque glass.
- Modify the landscape plan to address comments by the Commission.
- Reexamine how the building relates to the corner of Brader Way and Veritas Drive.
- Third floor level is not correctly expressed on drawings in regards to utilization of spandrel glazing, correct.
- Look at different treatment of glazing on the various elevations.

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 4, 5, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9701 Brader Way

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	6	-	-	5	5	5
	5	4	6	-	-	5	5	5
	4	4	-	-	-	-	4	4
	5	5	5	6	-	5	5	5
	6	5	6	-	-	7	6	6
	5	4	5	6	-	6	4	5

General Comments:

- This building will be a black box with no views into building due to dark glass. Better solar control can be done with different materials.
- Building is unlovely, and with the mirrored green glass, unwelcoming. Turns it back emphatically to the street.
- Not a friendly building.
- Wheelchair entry at main entry; solar gain can be handled with architectural devices such as overhangs and awnings; entry at parking lot is not acceptable; parking count is way too high; poor soils, should not be a crutch for excuse for lack of landscaping.
- GDP, text ended up being completely different from what we approved at UDC: the shared parking, as promised, at the GDP submittal ended up getting “switched” out for a lot more paving. This should not be approved until the shared parking is reintroduced. Lack of a corner entrance makes for just another suburban office park building.

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 20, 2006	
TITLE: 9701 Brader Way – PUD(SIP), Office Building, 9 th Ald. Dist. (04545)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: September 20, 2006	ID NUMBER:	

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 **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(SIP) for an office building located at 9701 Brader Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Fred Schuhmacher, Alex King, Tom Knoop and Keith Kaetterhenry. The project provides for development of a 3-story, 46,000 square foot office building (Baer Insurance building) located off of the southeasterly corner of the intersection of Veritas Drive and Brader Way within the Blackhawk Church Town Center Planned Development. Prior to the presentation staff noted to the Commission that this project represented the first non-church affiliated development within the Planned Development. Staff noted that the development of the site required address of specific provisions within the previously approved overall PUD-GDP for the Blackhawk Church Town Center. The office structure features the development of both surface and underground parking providing for a combination of 175 stalls on the site. A review of the building elevations emphasized the use of utility brick, green tinted windows, in combination with split face block and EIFS applications on portions of the upper elevations of the building. The site plan features pedestrian access to the building off of the property's frontage to Brader Way along the easterly and southerly elevations of the L-shaped building. Following the presentation, the Commission noted concerns on the following:

- The parking levels are in excess of that required under the code with the site plan as a result there is an excessive amount of hard surface on the site.
- Look at alternatives to providing grass within the infiltration and bioswales areas to provide for more efficient function of these areas.
- Pull back parking from 17 and 18-foot deep stalls to 16-feet, with a 2-foot overhang, and provide appropriate areas and width for landscaping around the perimeter of the site.
- Reexamine the connection between the stair towers and curtain wall and how they meet at the corner to provide relief with a change of plane (the curve).
- Look at handling more roof water on-site.
- The site is primarily impervious; look at more structured parking to off-set the level of surface parking provided on the site.
- The tinting on the glass might be too dark with the proposed glazing system.
- Look at providing an employee outdoor area on the site.

- The previously approved PUD-GDP for the Blackhawk Church Town Center has a requirement for shared parking. The plan as presented features too much on-site parking.
- Within the lower level underground parking, bike parking shall be shown in further detail.
- More roof water should be managed on-site with infiltration facilities.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Geer abstaining. The motion required address of the following:

- Reexamine the connection between the stair towers and the curtain wall.
- Modify the landscape plan to provide for more appropriate plantings within bioswales and infiltration areas as a replacement for lawn.
- Provide an outdoor break area accessible to all employees.
- Reduce and modify the extent of surface parking sufficient enough to allow for roof water infiltration on-site.
- Provide a follow-up to the provisions of the PUD-GDP for the Blackhawk Church Town Center relevant to development of this site, especially in regards to parking, landscaping and other required provisions.
- Further examine the front canopy of the building. The building front should follow the roof curve.
- Examine the use of EIFS on top portions of the building; it's application is so minimal that it takes away from the appearance and use of other materials.
- Look at how pedestrians get from sidewalk to the front door; want to see a front door entry to the street, including protective features such as an overhang.
- Concern with the use of EIFS on the curve form. The rough surface catches dirt; consider the use of precast for the long-term.
- Not clear on the elevations and plans on how glazing occurs, indented/curved.
- Corner entrance issue needs to be addressed appropriately.
- Given size of building, question the appropriateness of the size of brick needed, modular.
- Provide elevation details necessary to show the size of brick.
- Building was intended to provide more of an urban feel. Building doesn't address corner at all; need to engage its other sides (street sides).

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 4, 4, 5, 5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9701 Brader Way

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
Member Ratings	5	6	6	6	-	5	5	5	
	4	5	6	6	-	4	3	4	
	5	-	-	-	-	5	4	5	
	4	6	7	2	-	3	2	4	
	7	8	6	7	-	6	9	7	

General Comments:

- Given that this is a PUD, within which parking was to be shared, the paved area should be significantly reduced. Bike parking should be provided in underground ramp. Consider a street entrance at corner.
- Connection to sidewalk is weak; too much parking.
- Good start, details of landscaping important.



Department of Public Works
City Engineering Division

608 266 4751

Larry D. Nelson, P.E.
City Engineer

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

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

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

Operations Supervisor
Kathleen M. Cryan

Hydrogeologist
Joseph L. DeMorett, P.G.

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

DATE: October 23, 2006

TO: Plan Commission

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

SUBJECT: 9701 Brader Way Rezoning

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. A maintenance agreement shall be required and shall be recorded for the boulder wall adjacent to the public pond.
2. Applicant will be responsible for payment of the South Point Lift Station Sanitary Sewer Area Fees (current 2006 rate \$53.86/1000 SF)

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: 9701 Brader Way Rezoning

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

9

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 signoff.

- 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 . 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.



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

October 27, 2006
December 15, 2006

TO: Plan Commission

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

SUBJECT: **9701 Brader Way – Rezoning – PUD (GDP) to PUD (SIP) – 3 Story, 46000 SF Office Building**

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

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

1. The applicant shall provide a deposit of \$15,213.00 prior to final approval for future area traffic signals and associated intersection changes at the intersections the City plans to signalize. The proportional share of the cost based on the parcel's 507.1 daily trips generated as defined by the industry standard known as the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual. As of 2004, the City is assessing approximately \$30 per trip for the capital cost of improvements for this area.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMENTS

2. The site plan shall include a defined pedestrian access route connecting the building to Mineral Point Road.
3. The site plan shall show the accessible pedestrian route from the parking spaces for people with disabilities to the building entrance.
4. The pedestrian route between the building and the area indicated as "employee outdoor area" shall be shown as an accessible pedestrian route, including curb ramps where appropriate.

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

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

5. 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'.
6. A "Stop" sign shall be installed at a height of seven (7) feet at the driveway approach. All signs at the approaches shall be installed behind the property line. All directional/regulatory signage and pavement markings on the site shall be shown and noted on the plan.
7. 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.
8. The applicant shall dimension 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. Aisles, ramps, columns, offices or work areas are to be excluded from these rectangular areas, when designing underground parking areas.
9. 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: Alex King
Fax: 608-257-2906
Email: alex@kfsullivan.com

DCD: DJM: dm

**CITY OF MADISON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: December 28, 2006

To: Plan Commission
From: Kathy Voeck, Assistant Zoning Administrator
Subject: 9701 Brader Way

Present Zoning District: PUD(GDP)

Proposed Use: 3 Story 45,000` s.f. office building

Requested Zoning District: 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. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:
 - a. Provide a minimum of **six** accessible stalls striped per State requirements. A minimum of one of the stalls shall be a van accessible stall 8' wide with an 8' striped out area adjacent.
 - b. Show signage at the head of the stalls. Accessible signs shall be a minimum of 60" between the bottom of the sign and the ground.
 - c. Show the accessible path from the stalls to the building. The stalls shall be as near the accessible entrance as possible. Show ramps, curbs, or wheel stops where required.
2. Provide **one** 10' x 35' loading area with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan. The loading area shall be exclusive of drive aisle and maneuvering space.
3. Provide **17** bike parking stalls in a safe and convenient location on an impervious surface, the number provided, 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.

4. Parking lot plans with greater than twenty (20) stalls, landscape plans must be stamped by a registered landscape architect. Provide a landscape worksheet with the final plans that shows that the landscaping provided meets the point and required tree ordinances. In order to count toward required points, the landscaping shall be within 15' and 20' of the parking lot depending on the type of landscape element. (Note: The required trees do not count toward the landscape point total.) **Planting islands shall consist of at least 75% vegetative cover, including trees, shrubs, ground cover, and/or grass. Up to 25% of the island surface may be brick pavers, mulch or other non-vegetative cover.** All plant materials in islands shall be protected from vehicles by concrete curbs.
5. Lighting is not required. However, if it is provided, it must comply with City of Madison outdoor lighting standards. (See parking lot packet). Lighting will be limited to .08 watts per square foot.
6. The plan sheets shall be consistent, parking stall configuration, accessible stall locations, drive aisles, etc.
7. Provide a PUD(SIP) zoning text that is site specific to this project. **Meet with Zoning/Planning staff regarding the text.** Allowed retail uses for first floor shall be listed specifically in the text. The zoning text for "signage will be allowed as per Chapter 31 of the Madison General Ordinances, as compared to the O-4 district. Signage shall be approved by the Urban Design Commission."

ZONING CRITERIA

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	6,000 sq. ft.	81,062 sq. ft.
Lot width	50'	adequate
Usable open space	n/a	n/a
Front yard	0'	12'
Side yards	0' (zoning)	12 & 82'
Through Lot (rear)	0'	155'
Floor area ratio	3.0	less than 1.0
Building height	---	3 stories

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	150	131 surface <u>38 garage</u> 169 total
Accessible stalls	6	(1) 5 surface, 1 garage
Loading	1 (10' x 35') area	(2)
Number bike parking stalls	17	(3)
Landscaping	Yes	(4)
Lighting	No	(5)

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes
Historic District	No
Landmark building	No
Flood plain	No
Utility easements	yes
Water front development	No
Adjacent to park	No
Barrier free (ILHR 69)	Yes

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

* Since this project is being rezoned to the **(PUD)** district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, we are reviewing it based on the criteria for the **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: **9701 Brader Way**

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.