

Background

- The South Park Development and Wingra BUILD plans place conservative limits on height (4 stories) and density (about 50 units per acre) for some sites along South Park. These plans combined the input of neighbors, business owners, and city planners in a democratic process that was years in the making.
- In the fall of 2011, the Common Council (with the support of Sue Ellingson) voted to approve new GDP guidelines for the entire length of South Park, allowing for buildings of importance and outstanding design of up to 7 stories provided they do not interfere with existing neighbors' enjoyment and right to use of their property.
 - The site in question was approved for a building of up to 7 stories with the plans for the Wingra clinic.
- The majority of neighbors in Bay Creek and the BCNA were not consulted in changing the zoning for the site in question. Only property owners within 200 feet in all directions were notified when the change was being considered and asked to voice their opinions prior to the Common Council vote.
- The UDC, whose role is advisory, wants to see high-density, mixed-use housing along the South Park corridor. Their emphasis is less on how the building design fits with the surrounding neighborhood and more on creating a dense urban corridor from the beltline to the university.
 - It likes what it considers to be buildings with "wow" factor, which are largely very large, blocky buildings with glass and metal and surface design features. (SEE UDD7 Guidelines.) They support T. Wall's going to 6 stories and could recommend that he do so.
 - At the April 8 UDC meeting, commissioners were qualifiedly positive about the newest version of T. Wall's plans. They are still pushing for a more dramatic "prow" on the building.
- The Planning Commission is looking for "a well-designed, fully-functional, and higher density building because of the central location and confluence of busy streets at the location."
 - Tim Parks, City Planning staff person assigned to this project, will probably recommend support of the project to the Plan Commission. (SEE revised GDP guidelines.)
 - The Plan Commission also will look for the perspective of the community. This perspective must focus on claims that can be "substantiated." For example, why would a building more than 4 stories be too tall? Is it because of shadowing, spillover parking, density, etc.?

About the Building See www.cityofmadison.com/planning/projects/rezoning/1004sps.html for more detail.

- The development consists of a ring of three, five, and six story buildings totaling 173 efficiencies to 2-bedrm units.
- It is less expensive for T. Wall to build 5 than 6 stories. He says he cannot afford to go to 4 stories.
- There is commercial space on the first floor, some of which may initially serve as artists' work/living spaces.
- There is interior parking one level below ground and a first level green courtyard for residents only for a total of 177 vehicle parking spots and 200 bike parking spots.
- Parking will be flex parking—for tenants by day and for tenants and patrons of the buildings' businesses by day.
- There is no emphasis on including low-income housing on the site. In response to the South Madison Planning Council's request to see some low-income units, T. Wall proposed the 5 or 6 ground-level live/work units for artists that can be converted back to commercial space in the future. He may seek TIF funding for these units.
- T. Wall's plans become "final" when he submits them to the UDC for final review on April 29. For the latest plans, see www.cityofmadison.com/planning/projects/rezoning/1004sps.html.
- The parking entrance to the building is a West Lakeside Street. The city is considering installing a left-turn lane at the intersection and allowing only right turns out of the parking. Whether left turns will still be possible out of West Lakeside is unclear.

City Approval Process

- T. Wall submits his final plans 4/ 29. UDC recommendation 5/6; Plan Commission vote 5/16; Common Council vote 6/2.
- A development project typically requires support of 2 of these 3 to pass the Common Council—NA, alder, Plan Commission.
- Planning and the Common Council will look to BCNA to submit a letter to each of the above bodies about a week before meetings.
- If Planning approves the T. Wall's plans they will likely attach "conditions for approval" to it.
- After approval the plans will be reviewed by multiple city bodies, including traffic engineering, fire, etc.
- BCNA may support, oppose, take no position, or simply list what it likes or doesn't like about the proposed project, being sure to substantiate those it opposes.
- Our new alder can request a "referral" on the development decision before us, on the grounds that she has not had sufficient time to get up-to-speed on the sentiments of her district toward it.
 - According to Tim Parks of City Planning, this would lead to a year's delay in building on the site.
 - T. Wall says he will lose his option to purchase the land if he does not gain approval on June 3; however T. Wall doubts that a different developer would submit plans.

- A referral could provide the time to come up with revised or different plans.

POSITIONS OPEN TO BCNA

Referral – Postponed decision by the Common Council on the grounds that our new alder has not had adequate time to fill herself in on the plans, our points of view, where we are in the process	
<i>Pro</i>	<i>Con</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for Sara to get up to speed on the project, its history, the perspectives of BCNA, other alders, and the Plan Commission • BCNA can have more of a voice in the development design process • 7 new members on the Common Council are in training together (including Sara), allowing for time for Sara to gain influence for our viewpoint. • T. Wall may exit and a new developer may come on the scene with different plans. (T. Wall raised this possibility, which Tim Parks considers highly likely.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T. Wall says he loses the option to buy the land if a positive decision is not delivered by June 2. • T. Wall may exit and a new developer may come on the scene with different plans. (T. Wall raised this possibility, which Tim Parks considers highly likely.) • Requires the support of the Common Council.
Support – We approve the construction of T. Wall’s proposed building as is or with a list of substantiated requested changes. (This does not mean these changes will be adopted.)	
<i>Pro</i>	<i>Con</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Commission will likely add some of our points to its list of conditions. • The plan you know is better than the plan you don’t know...We work with T. Wall to revise the plans <u>if he is open to this</u>. • With a 5-story building we set the precedent for adhering to Park Street Corridor and Wingra BUILD plans—or sort of (since the plans approved building of up to 4 stories—and a more human scale Park Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T. Wall’s plans are not yet complete. We don’t know ultimately what they will look like. • We do not know whether our concerns will be heeded or dismissed by Planning. • With a 5-story building we set the precedent for the new GDP with its larger buildings. • The final plan approved by the Common Council may look different than the plan we approve.
Opposed – We oppose this building project on the grounds of its negative impact on the community	
<i>Pro</i>	<i>Con</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan you don’t know may be better than the plan you know. • We have the chance to work with T. Wall or a new developer on a new development plan—from the start. • Supported by our new alder, we may just hold sway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not what Planning will recommend, requires the Common Council support to be enacted. • We do not know whether our concerns will be heeded or dismissed by the Common Council.
Neither Support Nor Oppose – List what we like and don’t like	
<i>Pro</i>	<i>Con</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for a diversity of neighbors’ positions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaves the decision about what is built in our neighborhood in the hands of others. • The City may dismiss our concerns as unsubstantiated. • The final plan approved by the Common Council may look different than the plan we approve.

