

# PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

---

AUGUST 12, 2015 URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

AUGUST 24, 2015 PLAN COMMISSION



**Project Address:** 115-117 South Bassett Street (District 4- Ald. Verveer)  
**Application Type:** Planned Development Rezoning  
**Legistar File ID #** 39301  
**Prepared By:** Kevin Firchow, AICP, Planning Division  
Report Includes Comments from other City Agencies, as noted  
**Reviewed By:** Jay Wendt, Principal Planner  
Katherine Cornwell, Planning Division Director

## Summary

**Applicant and Owner:** Brandon Cook; PO Box 694; Madison, WI 53701

**Contact:** Matt Aro; Aro Eberle Architects; 116 King Street; Suite 202; Madison, WI 53703

**Requested Action:** The applicant requests approval to rezone the property from PD-GDP-SIP (Planned Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to Amended PD-GDP-SIP.

**Proposal Summary:** The applicant proposes to amend the Planned Development zoning on the subject site to construct a three-story, four-unit apartment building with 14 bedrooms at the rear of the subject site. The subject Planned Development includes two existing buildings, a two-unit (seven-bedroom) at 115 South Bassett Street and a four-unit (10-bedroom) at 117 South Bassett Street. Those buildings would remain.

**Applicable Regulations & Standards:** This proposal is subject to the standards for Zoning Map Amendments [MGO 28.182(6)] and Planned Developments [MGO 28.098(2)].

**Review Required By:** Urban Design Commission, Plan Commission, and Common Council

**Summary Recommendation:** The Planning Division does not believe the standards for Planned Developments and Zoning Map Amendments are met and recommends that the Plan Commission forward SUBSTITUTE Zoning Map Amendment 00180, rezoning 115-117 South Bassett Street from PD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to Amended PD-GDP-SIP to the Common Council with a recommendation to **Place on File**. Should the Plan Commission recommend believe the standards are met, a recommendation to approve this item should be forwarded subject to conditions specified in this report from reviewing agencies.

## Background Information

**Parcel Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of South Bassett Street, between Main and Doty Streets; Aldermanic District 4, Madison Metropolitan School District.

**Existing Conditions and Land Use:** The subject property includes two existing buildings, a two-unit (seven-bedroom) at 115 South Bassett Street and a four-unit (10-bedroom) at 117 South Bassett Street. The site includes an un-striped gravel parking area, which is not consistent with approved plans. As discussed in the body of the report, several approved site and building elements have not been installed per the approved plans.

**Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:**

North: Apartment buildings including an adjacent 30-unit building zoned DR-2 (Downtown Residential 2);

South: Three-units homes, zoned DR-2 and PD;

East: Backyards of one and two-unit homes (with some three and four-unit homes beyond), zoned DR-2; and

West: One and two-unit homes with some larger apartments beyond, zoned DR-2.

**Adopted Land Use Plan:** The Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2006, includes this site within the Mifflin-Bassett Downtown Sub District. That plan recommends buildings be two to four stories in height and recommends residential densities up to 60 dwelling units per acre. A key issue in this sub-district is whether redevelopment is consistent with the predominant (two and three story scale) of buildings in the area.

The Downtown Plan, adopted in 2012, includes this site within the Bassett District. That plan identifies the neighborhood as a potential neighborhood conservation district, a tool in the zoning ordinance to help ensure consistent development patterns and design features are conserved. The plan calls for the rehabilitation of some structures as well as selective redevelopment that is compatible with the scale and character of the existing buildings. Slightly larger buildings are recommended to the ends of the blocks.

The Bassett Neighborhood Master Plan, adopted in 1997, includes this area within the “Bassett Residential District.” The plan recommends “residential rehabilitation and new infill development in scale with the existing neighborhood. Improvements to residential streets, zero-lot line buildings and blocks dominated by rear parking lots will be necessary to create an environment that will attract owner occupants and long-term renters.” That plan does reference the possibility of new garages with carriage houses and creating open space around all units for landscaping and resident use.

**Zoning Summary:** The site is zoned PD-GDP-SIP (Planned Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan.) Comments will be provided in a separate report.

**Environmental Corridor Status:** The subject site is not located in a mapped environmental corridor.

**Public Utilities and Services:** This property is served by a full range of urban services.

## Project History

The two subject properties were rezoned to the Planned Development (PD) zoning district in January 2010. The applicant sought this rezoning after having been denied a variance to approve foundation work not done in compliance with building permits for the existing structures. Both the foundations at 115 and 117 South Bassett Street were raised approximately 18 inches in order to accommodate new basement dwelling units. This modification brought the site out of conformance with the property’s then R6-General Residence District Zoning.

That 2010 rezoning approval provided conforming zoning and allowed the applicant to convert 115 South Bassett Street from a single-family home into a two-unit structure and to convert 117-South Bassett Street from a three-unit to a four-unit structure. While the applicant’s initial rezoning request included a similar 6-unit, 16-bedroom rear-yard apartment building, that portion of the request was not approved.

In December 2010, the applicant applied for an amended Planned Unit Development to add a slightly smaller three-story rear-yard apartment building. That request was placed on file-without prejudice by the Common Council at the request of the applicant. Issues included concerns from the Fire Department and the history of

unresolved zoning compliance issues on the subject site and the applicant’s other properties. While acknowledging the slightly smaller building was an improvement, the Planning Division raised concerns on the building’s density, mass, and the overall desirability of the basement unit.

This current submittal was made in June 2015. At the time of report writing, there remain several zoning violations on the subject site, including items that have not been constructed or installed consistent with previous UDC, Plan Commission, and Common Council approvals. Zoning has sent official notices to the applicant and the City’s Attorney’s Office is in the process of prosecuting the applicant for these issues. Zoning has noted the following violations:

- Properly install and maintain all features of the approved parking facility, including asphalt paving, accessible parking stall, signage, striping, and bicycle parking facilities, trash and recycling enclosure, patio area, sidewalks and useable open space.
- Properly install and maintain all features of the buildings, including the “Galvalume Plus Metal Roof” as shown on the approved plans. (Asphalt shingles were installed).
- Properly install and maintain all landscaping as shown on the approved plan.
- Discontinue parking moped parking in the front yards and the designated bicycle parking areas
- Discontinue allowing cross-access with the property at 444-446 W. Doty Street.
- Discontinue parking all vehicles in a manner that is not consistent with the parking as shown on the approved plans.
- Discontinue the use of all exterior lighting fixtures that produce light glare and/or spill into adjacent properties.
- Existing door to the rear of the building at 117 S. Bassett Street not installed.
- Properly trench and bury all utility lines, including television and communication lines, on the property.

## Project Description

The applicant proposes to add a rear-yard apartment building to the subject site. The proposed three-story building includes four (4) dwelling units and 14 bedrooms. The existing buildings, which will remain, include six (6) units and 17 bedrooms, as summarized in the below table.

	Total Dwelling Units	Total # of Bedrooms
“115 S Bassett” Building (Existing)	2	7
“117 S Bassett” Building (Existing)	4	10
<b>Sub Total (Existing)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>
Proposed Building		
1 Bedroom Unit(s)	1	1
4 Bedroom Unit(s)	2	8
5 Bedroom Unit(s)	1	5
<b>Sub Total (Proposed)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>PROJECT TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>31</b>

The proposed below-grade, lower level dwelling unit includes four (4) bedrooms, one half-bath, and one full bathroom. Four window wells are proposed to provide day-lighting and egress windows. The first floor unit also

includes four bedrooms with one full and one half-bathroom. A shared laundry facility is also provided on this level. The second floor includes a five bedroom unit with one half and one full bathroom. The third floor includes a one-bedroom unit with a roof terrace for use by tenants of the third floor unit.

The three story building is just under 30 feet in height. It is clad in a combination of larger smooth fiber cement panels and horizontal fiber cement siding.

The “L”-shaped structure has a footprint of approximately 1,600 square feet. It is sited about 23 feet behind the existing “117 Bassett” structure, at its closest point. The new building sits just over nine (9) feet off the southern (side) property line and just over five (5) feet of the western (rear) property line. Light wells to lower level units extend closer to the setback. According to the site plan, the amount of impervious area will be reduced from about 96% to 85% with the proposed improvements. Note that the 96% impervious figure reflects the existing condition and not the approved site plan. The site includes two surface automobile parking stalls, two moped stalls and 31 bicycle parking stalls.

## Analysis and Conclusion

This request is subject to the Zoning Map Amendment [Section 28.182(6)] and Planned Development standards [Section 29.098(2)] of the Zoning Code. The analysis below begins with a summary of the adopted plan recommendations as the specific approval standards reference these documents.

### Conformance with Adopted Plans

The Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2006, includes this site within the Mifflin-Bassett Downtown Sub District. The plan states that a key issue in this sub-district is whether redevelopment is consistent with the predominant scale of area buildings. That plan generally recommends buildings be two to four stories in height and recommends residential densities up to 60 dwelling units per acre. At a calculated density at about 50 units per acre, the project is within the recommended density range. The Plan includes policies related to infill development and established neighborhoods. This includes “Policy 1” under Objective 42 stating “Infill development or redevelopment in existing neighborhoods should be designed to incorporate or improve upon existing positive qualities such as building proportion and shape, pattern of buildings and yards, building orientation to the street, and materials and styles.”

The Downtown Plan, adopted in 2012, includes this site within the Bassett District. It is the most current among the adopted plans. That plan identifies this neighborhood as a potential neighborhood conservation district, a tool in the zoning ordinance to help ensure consistent development patterns and design features are preserved. This addresses items such as building size, scale, and placement. Staff note that the introduction of a rear-yard apartment building, larger than the fronting buildings, is not in keeping with the predominant character of the area. However, no conservation district has yet been created. The plan also recommends selective redevelopment that is compatible with the scale and character of the existing buildings.

The Bassett Neighborhood Master Plan, adopted in 1997, includes this area within the “Bassett Residential District.” The plan recommends “residential rehabilitation and new infill development in scale with the existing neighborhood. Improvements to residential streets, zero-lot line buildings and blocks dominated by rear parking lots will be necessary to create an environment that will attract owner occupants and long-term renters.” That plan does reference the possibility of reorganizing blocks with alleys serving new garages and possibly carriage houses and also recommends creating open space around all units for landscaping and resident use.

## Zoning Map Amendment Standards

These standards are relatively broad and state that such amendments are legislative decisions of the Common Council that shall be based on public health, safety and welfare, shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and shall comply with Wisconsin and federal law. The recommendation of the Plan Commission may also include conditions that are consistent with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and will protect the public interest including consideration the applicant's history of compliance with relevant ordinances and approvals. The Planning Division notes its ongoing concern with the applicant's history of non-compliant properties, including the numerous issues on this site.

Chapter 66.1001(3) of Wisconsin Statutes also requires that zoning ordinances (of which the zoning map is part) enacted or amended after January 1, 2010 be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. 2010 Wisconsin Act 372 clarified "consistent with" as "furthers or does not contradict the objectives, goals and policies contained in the comprehensive plan." As noted above, the project is within that Plan's broad height and density recommendations though it does not provide specific guidance on rear-yard apartments in this area. As such, the Planning Division does not believe the establishment of a relatively large rear-yard apartment necessarily contradicts the Comprehensive Plan though consideration should be given to policies such as Objective 42/Policy 1 cited above.

## Planned Development Standards

Planned Developments are established as a voluntary regulatory framework to facilitate unique development to encourage high-quality architecture and materials and development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations. The Planning Division does not believe that the Planned Development Standards are met with this proposal. Specific standards not believed to be met are discussed below. Staff notes that the current PD Approval Standards [Sec. 28.098 (2)] are different and generally more restrictive than what applied under the 1966 Zoning Code's PUD standards under which previous submittals were reviewed.

Among staff's concerns is Planned Development Standard 2(a) that states:

The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above... (Emphasis added).

Staff does not believe this proposal meets any of the stated objectives (1 a-f) that would support the requested density increase as a Planned Development. Objective (f) is perhaps the most applicable as it references "Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of adopted plans." In addition to concerns as to whether this is a "high-quality development," staff does not believe there is adopted plan guidance supporting this form.

While the resulting density and building height remain within the broad parameters of adopted plans, staff does not believe there is more definitive policy guidance on establishing a stand-alone rear-yard apartment. In discussions with staff, the project architect has cited the Bassett Neighborhood Master Plan that encourages the consideration of new mid-block alleys with rear-yard garages or carriage houses in various neighborhood locations. Staff notes that one of the stated intents was to eliminate individual driveways to increase on-street parking and open space. Staff notes the proposed apartment is neither a garage or carriage house. Nor does it advance the possibility of a mid-block alley. Further, that plan recommends the relocation and consolidation of

rear yard parking to provide at least one enclosed or surface parking stall per unit and create open space around all units for landscaping and resident use. Only two stalls are proposed to serve 10 units and 31 bedrooms.

The Planning Division also question the quality of the open space related to Planned Development Standard 2(f):

The PD District Plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of the development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use residents and visitors. Areas for storm water management, parking or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.

The primary shared open space area is a small patio area between the “117 Bassett” structure and the proposed building. The area is roughly 23 by 20 feet in area and includes a small lawn. Staff questions the overall usability and desirability of this area to serve a 31-bedroom development. Staff notes that this relatively small area is situated between buildings of about 30 feet height. Other areas identified as useable open space on the plan are more questionable as to their desirability. Further, the new building does not include individual unit balconies, with the exception of the one-bedroom unit that has sole access to a large roof-top patio. The site plan labels 952 square feet of useable open space, but further details on how this was calculated has not been provided.

The Planning Division is also concerned with Planned Development Standard 2(g) stating:

The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.

Noting the applicant’s history of non-zoning compliance on this and other properties, the Planning Division does not believe this standard is met. Previous approvals allowed for the applicant to increase the density on the existing building, though the site plan remains out of compliance over five years after the initial approval.

Design Related Considerations:

The Planned Development standards also include design-related standards. The Urban Design Commission (UDC) is required to make a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in subsections 28098(1) and (2) and the other requirements of this subchapter. The UDC has recommended approval of two earlier versions of this request, under the previous zoning code standards.

Staff notes that Planned Development Standard 2(e) related to the coordination of architectural styles and building forms:

The PD District Plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve a greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of this PD District.

The Planning Division has several concerns related to this standard. These have been listed below for review by the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission.

- **Project Massing and Setbacks.** While the applicant has incorporated some of staff’s previous recommendations to reduce the building size, the Planning Division remains concerned about the mass of building at the back of the site. The building has a relatively large “L-shaped” footprint. Staff had

previously suggested that the applicant minimize the footprint by increasing the setbacks and exploring a rectangle-shaped structure. With a height of three stories and a flat roof, the massing of the proposed apartment is more reflective of the larger apartment buildings found north of the subject site.

The proposed building is considerably larger than either of the Bassett Street-fronting structures. This creates additional mid-block building mass. This mid-block building mass would also be highly visible through several Doty Street side yards. This is not the predominant character along Doty Street, though there are some larger buildings that already visually “wall-off” the side and rear yards of other properties. Staff does not believe this to be desirable.

The building has a rear yard setback that is just over five feet in area. For comparative purposes, most buildings in the subject block have rear-yard setbacks between 60-70 feet. Some longer buildings have setbacks between 30-40 feet. The adjacent apartment building which is set at the middle of the site provides an approximate 40 foot setback. Minimally, the DR-2 Zoning District, which comprises most of the block requires a minimum 20 foot rear yard setback.

- **Building and Unit Desirability.** Staff continues be concerned about the overall desirability of the development. Among the concerns is the desirability of the four-bedroom basement unit. The windows are beneath grade and open onto wells depicted on the plans. The applicant indicates that these are functional windows that would provide required emergency egress. Compared to initial submittal, the revised floor plans now provide windows in the living and kitchen areas. Additionally, all bedrooms have access to a window. However, staff still questions the actual amount of light these will provide. A storage room is shown adjacent to this unit, though staff does not know if this is an amenity available to occupants of the basement unit or if it will be utilized by the owner.

Staff also notes that the building lacks individual deck spaces. A large roof-top deck exists, but it appears only accessible to the third floor tenant. The submitted plans lack details on the design of that feature. Concerns on the adequacy of useable open space are noted above. The applicant generally refers to installing “types of finishes that will be used to make these properties attractive for years to come” though no further information is provided.

- **Character.** While a new building does not have to be historic in character, staff questions the building’s exterior relationship to the existing buildings as part of a cohesive development. The latest versions of the plan appear to reduce the amount of horizontal siding in exchange for increasing the amount of large fiber cement panels. The project architect previously indicated to staff that the use of horizontal fiber cement siding was selected to reflect the character of the smaller residential buildings, including the structures on site. Now the larger panels are now the primary material with the horizontal siding as an accent. The new building also includes a bolder color pallet.
- **HVAC and Wall Penetrations.** No information on HVAC and related wall penetrations are provided. Staff is concerned regarding the visual impact of such grates.
- **Landscape Plan.** Staff note that the perimeter plants are primarily flowering perennials. Staff recommend that these plans be revised to provide some more shrubs intermixed within these plantings.

#### **Other PD Considerations**

The Planning Division notes that applicant has not submitted a revised zoning text or proof of financing capability. Staff also notes a Certified Survey Map will be required to combine the subject properties.

## Public Input

At the time of report writing, staff has not received any comments on the proposed request.

## Conclusion

The applicant proposes to amend the existing Planned Development (PD) zoning on the subject site to add a three-story, four-unit apartment building with 14 bedrooms at the site's rear. This would be in addition to the two existing buildings, a two-unit (seven-bedroom) at 115 South Bassett Street and a four-unit (10-bedroom) at 117 South Bassett Street. In total, the development would have 10 units and 31 bedrooms.

The two subject properties were rezoned to the then Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning district in January 2010. That rezoning increased the densities on the existing buildings and provided conforming zoning to the site after unpermitted foundation alterations brought the site out of conformance with the property's then R6-General Residence District Zoning. While the applicant's initial rezoning request included a similar 6-unit, 16-bedroom rear-yard apartment building, that portion of the request was not approved. A subsequent request to add a slightly smaller 4-unit, 16-bedroom building was placed on file without prejudice, at the applicant's request due to unresolved issues from Fire, Zoning, and Planning staff. As noted in this report and the information provided by the Zoning Administrator, the applicant has a history of zoning violations and non-compliance including several elements of the subject site that have not been constructed or installed per the 2010 approval.

This request is subject to the standards for Zoning Map Amendments and Planned Developments. As discussed in this report, the Planning Division does not believe several of the Planned Development standards are met and does not support this request. Primary concerns relate to both the applicant's ability to complete the project if approved and also the overall fit and desirability of this rear yard apartment. As noted, previous submittals for similar rear-yard apartments have been requested, but ultimately none approved. This current request is subject to the new Planned Development Standards, which are different and generally more restrictive than what applied under the 1966 Zoning Code's PUD standards under which previous submittals were reviewed.

## Recommendation

### Planning Division Recommendation (Contact Kevin Firchow, 267-1150)

The Planning Division does not believe the standards for Planned Developments and Zoning Map Amendments are met and recommends that the Plan Commission forward SUBSTITUTE Zoning Map Amendment 00180, rezoning 115-117 South Bassett Street from PD-GDP-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan-Specific Implementation Plan) to amended PD-GDP-SIP to the Common Council with a recommendation to **Place on File**. Should the Plan Commission recommend believe the standards are met, a recommendation to approve this item should be forwarded subject to the below conditions specified in this report from reviewing agencies.

### **Recommended Conditions of Approval** Major/Non-Standard Conditions are Shaded

### Planning Division (Contact Kevin Firchow, 267-1150)

1. That the applicant submit proof of financing which provides assurances that the project will be completed once started, in a form acceptable to the Director of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development prior to the sign-off and recording of the PUD and any permits being issued.



2. That the site plan be revised to provide a minimum of six moped parking stalls. The location(s) shall be approved by staff.
3. That the landscape plan be revised to replace some of the perimeter perennial plantings with larger shrubs for approval by staff.
4. That the applicant combines the properties through approval and recording of a certified survey map.
5. That the letter of intent be revised to accurately label the previously approved bedroom count in the
6. That the applicant provides supplemental information on the proposed level of interior finishes and amenities for each unit, for approval by Planning Division staff.
7. No HVAC "wall-pack" penetrations/louvers are shown on the submitted plans. The addition of HVAC vents, grills, or louvers on outward-facing walls is not included in this approval and will require approval of an alteration to this PD should they be proposed at a later time.

**City Engineering Division** (Contact Janet Schmidt, 261-9688)

8. There are existing drainage problems in this block that the subject property contributes to. The applicant shall provide volumetric matching of the 1-, 2-, 5-, and 10-year storm events from the existing site to the new site or revise plan to discharge to the existing storm sewer within South Bassett Street. Existing or proposed storm runoff cannot be discharged to the sanitary sewer system. The applicant is advised that safe discharge of the proposed runoff may require a pumping system for discharge to the storm on Bassett.
9. The plans state "Building has interior downspouts from roof" for the new building. Provide further detail to confirm this discharge does not enter the sanitary sewer.
10. The applicant shall provide a separate sanitary sewer lateral for each building. Provide detail for the sanitary sewer service to the new building.
11. The address of the proposed four-unit is 113 S. Bassett Street. Apartment addresses are: 113 S. Bassett Street # 1, 101, 201 & 301.
12. This site is comprised of two tax parcels and the proposed building is within both parcels. The applicant shall provide a written request to Sally Sweeney of the City Assessor's office to combine the tax parcels into one. (ssweeney@cityofmadison.com - 267-8747) Combining Current Parcel No's 0709-231-2620-9 and 0709-231-2621-7.
13. The applicant shall replace all sidewalk and curb and gutter that abuts the property that 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.
14. All work in the public right of way shall be performed by a City-licensed contractor.
15. All damage to the pavement on S. Bassett Street adjacent to this development shall be restored in accordance with the City's Pavement Patching Criteria.

16. This project falls in the Rock River TMDL Zone and is subject to increased erosion control enforcement as authorized by Resolution 14-00043 passed by the Common Council on January 21, 2014. The project will be expected to meet a higher standard of erosion control than the minimum standards set by the Wisconsin Department Natural Resources (WDNR).
17. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of 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 5.0-tons per acre per year.
18. For commercial sites less than 1 acre in disturbance the City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce and WDNR. As this project is on a site with disturbance area less than one (1) acres, and contains a commercial building, 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.
19. Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to reduce TSS by 80% off of the proposed development when compared with the existing site.
20. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the City Engineering Division. The digital copies shall be to scale, shall have a scale bar on the plan set, and shall contain the following items: building footprints; internal walkway areas; internal site parking areas; lot lines and right-of-way lines; street names, stormwater management facilities and; detail drawings associated with stormwater management facilities (including if applicable planting plans).
21. The applicant shall submit prior to plan sign-off, electronic copies of any Stormwater Management Files including SLAMM DAT files, RECARGA files, TR-55/HYDROCAD/Etc., and 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).
22. The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction.
23. The site plan shall be revised to show all existing public sanitary sewer facilities in the project area as well as the size, invert elevation, and alignment of the proposed service.
24. All outstanding Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) are due and payable prior to City Engineering sign-off, unless otherwise collected with a Developer's/ Subdivision Contract. Contact Janet Schmidt (608-261-9688) to obtain the final MMSD billing a minimum of 2 working days prior to requesting City Engineering signoff.

**Traffic Engineering Division** (Contact Eric Halvorson, 266-6527)

25. Provide a turning movement template for entering and exiting the two proposed parking stalls to be reviewed by Traffic Engineering.

26. The applicant shall submit one contiguous plan showing proposed conditions and one contiguous plan showing existing conditions for approval. The plan drawings shall be scaled to 1" = 20' and include the

following, when applicable: existing and proposed property lines; parcel addresses; all easements; pavement markings; signing; building placement; items in the terrace such as signs, street light poles, hydrants; surface types such as asphalt, concrete, grass, sidewalk; driveway approaches, including those adjacent to and across street from the project lot location; parking stall dimensions, including 2 feet of vehicle overhang; drive aisle dimensions; semitrailer movement and vehicle routes; dimensions of radii; and percent of slope.

27. The developer shall post a security deposit prior to the start of development. In the event that modifications need to be made to any City-owned and/or maintained traffic signals, street lighting, signing, pavement marking and conduit/handholes, the developer shall reimburse the City for all associated costs including engineering, labor and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.
28. The City Traffic Engineer may require public signing and marking related to the development; the developer shall be financially responsible for such signing and marking.
29. All parking facility design shall conform to the standards in MGO Section 10.08(6).

**Zoning Administrator** (Contact Matt Tucker, 266-4569)

→ **Comments from the Zoning Administrator will be provided separately once available.**

**Fire Department** (Contact Bill Sullivan, 261-9658)

30. Exiting from the second and third floors, including the roof terrace, shall comply with IBC 1021.
31. Provide fire apparatus access as required by IFC 503 2012 edition, MGO 34.503, as follows:
  - a. The site plans shall clearly identify the location of all fire lanes.
  - b. MGO 34.503/IFC 503 Appendix D105, Provide an aerial apparatus access fire lane that is at least 26-foot wide, if any part of the building is over 30 feet in height. The near edge of the aerial fire lane shall be within 30-feet and not closer than 15 feet from the structure, and parallel to one entire side. The aerial fire lane shall cover not less than 25% of the building perimeter.
32. Location of dumpster/trash containers shall comply with IFC 304.
33. The kitchen faucet shall not extend into the required emergency escape window open clearances.
34. Provide address signage at the street.

**Water Utility** (Contact Dennis Cawley, 261-9243)

35. All wells located on this property shall be abandoned if no valid well operation permit has been obtained from the Madison Water Utility in accordance with MGO Section 13.21. The Water Utility will not need to sign off the final plans for the building, and will not need a copy of the approved plans.

**Parks Division** (Contact Kay Rutledge, 266-4714)

36. Park impact fees (comprised of the Park Development Impact Fee per MGO Sec. 20.08(2) and the Parkland Impact Fee in lieu of land dedication per MGO Sec. 16.23(8)(f) and 20.08(6)) will be required for all new residential development in this project. The developer shall pay park impact fees prior to issuance of a building permit. This development is within the Vilas-Brittingham park impact fee district (SI27). Please reference ID# 12102 when contacting Parks Division staff about this project.

37. Existing street tree shall be protected. Please include the following note on the site plan: "Contractor shall install tree protection fencing in the area between the curb and sidewalk and extend it at least 5 feet from both sides of the tree along the length of the terrace. No excavation is permitted within 5 feet of the outside edge of a tree trunk. If excavation within 5 feet of any tree is necessary, contractor shall contact City Forestry (266-4816) prior to excavation to assess the impact to the tree and root system. Tree pruning shall be coordinated with City Forestry." Tree protection specifications can be found in Section 107.13 of City of Madison Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction.

**Metro Transit** (Contact Tim Sobota, 261-4289)

This agency did not provide comments for this request.