

**Notes from 28 April 2016 Steering Committee Meeting
on the 1000 block E. Washington Proposal
from Summit Credit Union and Stone House Development**

Attendees:

- Patrick Heck, TLNA Development Chair
- Alder Ledell Zellers
- Summit Credit Union
 - Jeremy Eppler, Rebecca Gerothanas
- Strang, Inc.
 - Peter Tan, Matthew Long
- Stone House Development
 - Helen Bradbury
- Neighbors and Interested Parties
 - Pat Kelly, Marsha Cannon, Matt Coogan, Chris Oddo, Karen Banaszak, Jeff Reinke, Curt Brink, Bob Klebba

After introductions, Patrick Heck mentioned the charge of Steering Committee – to conduct a collaborative process, expressing both positives and negatives from the neighborhood’s perspective, with an interactive discussion involving all stakeholders that will hopefully result in a win-win for all involved – the developer, the neighborhood and the City.

Eventually, the steering committee will issue summary findings to TLNA Council who will then vote on some level of support for the proposal. The Steering Committee can also choose to issue stronger findings rather than or in addition to issuing a summary, but that is often not the result of TLNA Steering Committee processes. It is difficult to establish who is a voting member of a steering committee due to variable attendance, etc., so oftentimes formal voting does not occur in committee. Typically, after TLNA Council receives a committee’s report, the Council does vote to recommend, recommend with conditions, register a neutral stance, or reject a proposal.

Patrick asked Summit and Strang representatives to review the schedule they are considering for the proposal. Peter Tan and Rebecca Gerothanas indicated that their proposed schedule hasn’t changed since the April 7 neighborhood meeting (see slide 34 in neighborhood meeting presentation on the TLNA development website).

Their plan hinges on obtaining a change to Urban Design District-8 requirements, which would allow Summit’s office tower to have larger floor heights than City ordinance currently permit (see neighborhood meeting presentation slides 10, 11 and 15). They hope that the neighborhood and City will agree to that change and that the process of modifying UDD-8 language will be completed by about June 30, 2016. Alder Ledell Zellers said that she has talked with city staff about this change. She and Alder Marsha Rummel (District 6, which includes the other side of E. Washington, some of which is also in UDD-8) were concerned that if this is proposed, we need to figure out and

understand how the height differences could impact other parcels on E. Washington. Heather Stouder of City Planning has shown Ledell some shadow studies of potential impacts from other parcels. Her first reaction was that the proposed change would have negligible shadowing impacts on adjacent parcels if future developments utilize the same changes to allow larger floor-to-floor heights in commercial structures, but she hopes that those shadow studies can be shown at the next steering committee so everyone can evaluate the impact. She has had some suggestions from Heather as to how this change could be framed in an ordinance change. That change would need to go through Urban Design Commission and Common Council, as well as likely going through Plan Commission. This all assumes that the neighborhood, the developer, Alder Rummel and she are all on the same page.

Peter Tan added that their wanting the UDD-8 change early in the process is a risk management thing; they can't afford to put too much into building design, etc., until they have an indication that their floor-to-floor needs are possible.

Chris Oddo asked when they would be going to UDC for their initial presentation. Peter said that a rough estimate is that if the ordinance change that makes commercial floor heights possible is changed by July 5, then they could formally submit in mid-July with their first UDC informational meeting in mid-August.

Karen Banaszak asked if the ordinance change would have an impact further down the avenue if future developments are built. Ledell said any change in this ordinance could have an impact, but she thinks it will be negligible in terms of shadowing of adjacent parcels, particularly on the north side of E. Washington. For instance, if tall buildings go up in the 1400 block north of E. Washington, any additional allowable shadowing would be negligible and concentrated east of any building on E. Washington. That said, Ledell will make sure the city's shadowing study is available for all to see.

Karen asked who will own the parcel that Summit is proposing to build on. Rebecca Gerothanas from Summit said that currently Stone House owns the parcel, but Summit will buy it. This is a win-win situation for Summit because they want to own their building and land.

Karen asked if it is cheaper to build a taller building rather than a building that fits into the neighborhood. Peter Tan said that with their design, there is no overlap between the tower and the parking structure, which keeps cost down. If they designed it so that some of the building was over the parking structure, it would be more expensive to build. He added that the shadows are better in the current design than if they had mass above the parking structure (see shadow studies in neighborhood presentation slides).

Ledell was asked why it is necessary to change the ordinance for all of UDD-8 rather than just for the Summit parcel. Ledell said that they are considering changing it for all of UDD-8 because the Capitol East Build Plan and city's Comprehensive Plan both call for employment rather than residential uses in many places, so commercial structures are likely to be built in many places in UDD-8, particularly in Aldermanic District 6 on the

other side of East Washington. Commercial floor-to-floor standards should probably be allowed in places likely to be non-residential rather than just having the current residential standards. Patrick Heck asked if it was really an issue related to a shortcoming of the zoning ordinances – Ledell said yes it was. Matt Coogan asked if the changes to the one parcel and to UDD-8 are mutually exclusive. Ledell said that changing UDD-8 could possibly take longer than the approximately 8 weeks that Summit hopes for, but she feels confident that if the neighborhood is supportive, she is supportive and Marsha is supportive that it is likely that UDC, Plan Commission, and Common Council will be supportive and act. Changing the zoning just for that parcel could be possibly be slightly faster, but not necessarily.

Rebecca Gerothanas said that Summit has hired Ayers Associates to do a traffic impact analysis of the proposal's impact on the neighborhood. They will be looking along N. Ingersoll and E. Washington at morning and afternoon peak traffic times to study the impact. They are also studying who works for Summit and where they live. They already estimate that 80% of those working in the building would be coming on E. Washington rather through the neighborhood. The entrance/exit of the parking structure on N. Ingersoll would be used by that 80% after coming from/to E. Washington. They will be required by the City to do traffic demand management assessment too, which is an assessment of how they can reduce traffic by taking proactive measures, e.g., bus usage, bus passes, promoting biking, etc.

Chris Oddo suggested that all traffic exiting the Summit parking structure on N. Ingersoll should be forced to make a right hand turn only - nothing should be allowed to go towards the north into the neighborhood and towards Lapham School. He also suggested 4-way stop signs at Ingersoll/Mifflin and Ingersoll/Dayton to help with safety for the students at the school.

Ledell added that there can sometimes be unintended impacts of a new development – City Traffic Engineering will provide information and solutions on those when the proposal goes through the City process.

Pat Kelly asked to see the slide with the parking structure shown from the side (slide 15). She asked if there was a way to have traffic enter/exit on E. Washington so it doesn't have to come onto Ingersoll. Peter Tan said there is an outlet mid-block between Stone House's tower and the Summit's proposed tower, but that would only be right turn in and right turn out, so wouldn't work for everyone – there still needs to be an Ingersoll entrance/exit. They won't have a lot of deliveries but there will be some – trucks will use that mid-block turn to get to Summit's loading dock area on that corner of the tower. Peter mentioned that a condition of approval for Stone House's project on the adjacent parcel was for their parking garage traffic to be able to enter/exit on N. Ingersoll and that will be honored. Traffic entering or exiting Stone House's parking structure will be allowed to cross Summit's structure on the 1st floor to access Ingersoll. Pat Kelly asked again why not just limit traffic to E. Washington. Rebecca said that traffic to/from Summit's drive-thru branch also needs Ingersoll access, so there will be some traffic no matter.

Bob Klebba said that if 80% of Summit's traffic will be coming/going via E. Washington, that means 20% will be coming/going through the neighborhood. He also thinks that during rush hours, a good part of that 80% will also filter through the neighborhood as they look to avoid congestion. That is something that we might be able to accommodate, but we need to be very careful on how to plan it. What about decreasing the number of people who have to drive there in the first place? Their traffic study should include how much it costs to build parking vs. supplying bus passes to employees for 20 years. With Stone House's garage included, there will be 800 parking spaces on this block; it will draw a significant amount of traffic in the neighborhood. Bob added that there are 6 bus lines on Johnson/Gorham, 6 on E. Washington, and 5 on Willy/Jenifer. Rebecca said that supplying bus passes to employees will be studied. She added that a lot of current employees don't live in Madison; they live on the far eastside, far westside, suburbs, etc., where there is little or no bus service. The new building will also be their training center for employees from outside Madison so bus passes won't work for them either. She doesn't think they can get half their people to take the bus, although some who work in the building daily may be able to do it. Overall, about 50% of their employees are dispersed elsewhere and won't be working daily in the building. A couple of years from now, they hope that this location and this building will make Summit a more attractive place to work and that more employees will live nearby without needing to drive. Bob said that through their TIF request, he will be subsidizing parking that will make problems in the neighborhood. Peter Tan added that the proposed building is already causing a shift in parking ratios for Summit; currently they have 4.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of existing office space while their proposal is for 3.0. This is already a 25% reduction and they want to do it.

Rebecca said that Summit will be residents in the neighborhood too; they want to be part of the neighborhood and want their employees to be part of the neighborhood. Now, their employees drive all over the place for meetings/trainings, contributing to more traffic in the City, but they hope that people will move a lot less during the day when they have a centralized location. Peter added that the City has parking requirements for commercial buildings that they must abide by: 2.5 to 4.0 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. and they are close to the low end at 3.0.

Karla Handel brought up a broader issue – the City needs to bring employment to the city center, but they are ignoring mass transit, park and rides, shuttles, etc. The City is not investing in these areas. Ledell answered that the City has one of the better and bigger bus systems compared to cities our size, but we do need to do more. Bus Rapid Transit and other options are being looked at and we have to do something. She agrees we need to do more; it is not yet as good as it should be.

Matt Coogan asked how many employees would work in the building. Rebecca answered that there would be about 250 on day one with more employees later. She said there would be a total of 140k square feet of office space. The parking does sound like a lot, but when she looks 10 years in the future, they anticipate there will be more than 420 employees working there, so more employees than parking spots. Currently, Summit is adding 20 to

25 new employees per year, so there could be maybe 500 there in 20 years. Matt asked about their plans for leasing out some of the space on day one since they won't fill it at first – would they lease half of it? Rebecca said they would occupy 80-90k sq. ft. of the 140k on day one. It was noted that the mix of commercial tenants could potentially make a big difference on traffic. Rebecca said that they think the commercial tenants would take 75 to 100 stalls. Helen Bradbury said that Stone House will be using 10 of the stalls for their proposed E. Mifflin townhomes that will be behind the Summit parking structure, so Summit will actually have 410 parking spaces.

Marsha Cannon asked what their typical office hours are - when do people come and go? Rebecca said that the drive-thru branch will probably open at 7:30am, so those employees will be early, but most others come in by 9:00am and leave anywhere from 4:30 to 6:30pm. There is some variation, e.g., employees answering phones might work a little later – they have to be available when members need them. Marsha asked what were considered rush hours in their traffic study. Rebecca said about 8:00-9:00am, Monday through Friday. She noted that on Saturdays, traffic would be mostly just branch traffic. Ledell said that she hopes the parking structure can help alleviate parking problems in the neighborhood, e.g., when there are large events. Rebecca agreed.

Patrick Heck said that in a recent parking committee meeting that is addressing mostly street parking options in the neighborhood, a suggestion was made that Summit's garage could become a parking resource for the neighborhood on weeknights and weekends regardless of there being a big event. For instance, if the parking permit system is expanded to make parking more restricted for those without permit stickers, visitors could pay to use the Summit structure. Peter Tan said that shared parking with a business is a great opportunity because business needs are typically the opposite of residential needs. Marsha Cannon suggested that their parking structure could be used snow emergencies.

Pat Kelly said that she doesn't have a problem with the number of parking spots, but her concern is that they have to do everything they can to prevent impact on Lapham School, the E. Mifflin bike boulevard, and the neighborhood. She knows that is easier said than done, but Summit needs to be a strong voice in the process too. Rebecca said she agrees – they don't want to impact families at school.

Patrick Heck asked about the vision for the mid-block alley between Mifflin and Washington that divides the approved Stone House project and the proposed Summit project. Helen Bradbury from Stone House said that there will be an 8' strip for bike/pedestrian usage and a 24' lane for cars. Cars can't go through to Mifflin – the car lane is for access to either the Stone House or Summit parking structure. Jeff Reinke asked if that would all be one space or if there would be a barrier. Helen said that is TBD, but they want some sort of way of keeping bike/ped traffic safe. The Fire Department will determine some aspects of this because they need access. Helen noted that Stone House will have 220 bike spaces in their parking structure so they need to accommodate bike traffic. Peter Tan added that Summit's parking structure will have the required number of bike stalls, probably 70.

Karen Banaszak asked how much her input matters on this project. Is it already a done deal, is it already what people want? Is she here for a good purpose? She looks towards the future and she knows that cars are not the vision of the future. We are moving away from driving, yet parking is more than half of the land used in this proposal; it is the wrong direction. She also thinks they could double the housing component - people want to live in homes, people could own and some could work at Summit. Where she works at Meriter, she pays for parking and thinks employees should pay so they will drive less. Cars will not be part of the future in 25 years so they are overbuilding for cars.

Karan also said she is opposed to taking away green space. Green space keeps people healthy. Addressing Peter Tan, she said that as an architect, green should be included. She also thinks the existing Stone House buildings have fit into their neighborhoods and wishes the Summit building would. She mentioned that the nearby neighbors petitioned against the McGrath project (E. Washington and N. Few) – no one wanted the height or numbers (density). To a person, the neighbors were worried about traffic, which by the way, isn't an unintended consequence – we know traffic is going to happen.

Patrick Heck asked Karen if she thinks the proposed size or design doesn't fit into the neighborhood. She said both. Rebecca mentions that the renderings are not a design at all, they are just massing at this point. Helen Bradbury says they are just lego blocks.

Rebecca says that she doesn't know how it will be solved, but Summit wants to work with the neighborhood to minimize impacts wherever possible. She said that they don't feel it is fair for their employees, who now have free parking, to pay the price of Summit being forward-thinking by moving to the city center. It was mentioned that there are ways to pay employees back for not parking, i.e., incentivizing not parking.

Pat Kelly said that she likes credit unions, likes the prospect of employment in the neighborhood, but please don't put up an ugly building. It should either draw no notice or stick out as something unusual and creative. It would behoove Summit's reputation to have a nice building. Rebecca agreed – they want people to notice their presence and want to draw good attention to the building and increase their visibility.

Rebecca added that don't make revenue from this building directly like developers who lease residential and/or commercial space. Pat Kelly said that green space catches the eye of those passing by. Peter Tan said that he thinks we are all kindred spirits on green space. Pat says green space is calming and she hopes for beautiful trees. Stone House does that by breaking up the front of their buildings with tiny green spaces. It is mentioned that Summit and Stone House will have more green space to work with on E. Washington than Stone House has on E. Johnson. There is only 5' of setback on E. Johnson, but 15' is required on E. Washington. Helen said for the next meeting, she will bring Stone House's landscaping plan for their 15' setback area so that people can get an idea of what can be done in that 15'. Helen added that Summit's building in the end is not a rental to other businesses, so they will design it well. Rebecca added that they have been in Madison since 1935 and this building will be their headquarters – it will be designed appropriately.

Matt Coogan asked about the plan for the parking structure façade on Ingersoll. It was mentioned that the parking structure at St. Mary's Hospital is not attractive and hope it isn't like that. Peter said that the parking structure will have 11.5' floors, similar to residential floor heights. The façade would go above the 3rd floor so that cars on the top level can't be seen. Karla Handel added that if it is just a solid wall it won't be attractive. Peter said it will not be a solid wall – it will have some sort of rhythm and will be attractive. It might have windows, but it has to have a fun and engaging look. He noted that the first floor branch wraps around the corner at Ingersoll and there will be stepback atop the tower's 3rd floor on Ingersoll, both providing visual interest/breaks.

A discussion ensued of options for retail or offices along N. Ingersoll on the ground floor. Peter said that the engineering/design was not flexible because of the need to keep the tower separate from the parking structure. The narrowness of the lot also limits the ability to move the parking ramps anywhere else – the ramps that allow cars to go from one floor to another are almost the width of the entire parcel due to engineering requirements. Stone House's portion of the lot to the west is wider than the Summit portion, so they have enough room for apartments along Brearly. Matt Coogan suggested that they have more townhomes on Ingersoll rather than retail. Peter again said that they can't give up depth into the ground floor parking because it would destroy the between floor parking ramps. It was suggested that instead of a drive-thru branch on Ingersoll, they could have an ice cream shop or something smaller. Summit said they need to have a drive-thru with their branch.

It was suggested that some of their office spaces could be along Ingersoll, thereby allowing a lowering of the building. Perhaps the parking ramp could be higher on one end allowing retail/office on Ingersoll. Wouldn't it be wonderful to keep the park that was donated so many years ago? If they did, Summit employees could look out the window and see green space. Patrick Heck asked about any rooftop green space like Stone House is providing for their commercial tenants. Yes, they will try to maximize those opportunities, but haven't gotten far enough along in their design to do that. Pat Kelly said that the green space on top of Monona Terrace is visually striking – they should consider green space as they design their building. Peter said that the required 15' setback from E. Washington and 15' stepback on the 15th floor will allow for terraces, but they will also consider something on the rooftop if possible. He said once they get the ordinance change, they will be able to start considering design issues like this.

Peter then stepped through the shadowing studies that were previously presented at the neighborhood meeting (see online slides). Jeff Reinke said the shadows were bad for people living on N. Ingersoll. Both the proposed and allowable shadows show that those houses are in shadows all day long in the winter - not nice. One suggestion he has is that instead of a 10-story building on E. Washington (he doesn't like the canyon look anyway) is to have 5-6 stories E. Washington, then have a taller section along the mid-block lane. The shadow impact on N. Ingersoll would then be less. Peter said that the parking ramp would have to be spinned somehow to allow that, but their budget and the lot width are too restrictive. They aren't overlapping the building and the parking

structure, so putting something on top of parking would be difficult if they want to stay within their budget.

Rebecca pointed out that Summit is a not-for-profit owned by its members; they have to do everything they can to keep it financially feasible. They will be receiving no revenue from apartment rentals, etc, like in many developments. They are different from developers who are building residential or retail and Summit has different cost restrictions. For example, in Anchor Bank's new building and renovation on the square, the bank will occupy only a little part of their building – the rest will generate revenue for them. As a credit union, Summit can't do that regulation-wise. Peter also said that there is a gap between what Summit can afford and what the project will cost. TIF is helping to make it possible for Summit to be in an urban context rather than somewhere like Sun Prairie and as a result they won't be promoting more sprawl. This helps the vitality of the city. Ledell mentions that there have been early discussions about the TIF request, but the process will not get started until later.

Marsha Cannon said that she has been a Summit customer for ages and is delighted that they want to park in the neighborhood, but the parking is the big question. She likes the L-shaped building idea and also wonders if they can they make 4 stories of parking to allow that. She feels bad for the 4-5 houses on N. Ingersoll due to the traffic and shadows; it will make a big difference in their lives. If one of those were her house, she would be concerned. She asked if the drive-thru lanes could be in the center of the whole lot, closer to the mid-block ped/bike lane so that Ingersoll won't be such a traffic mess. When she goes through N. Ingersoll and E. Washington now, it is already a mess at rush hour; that intersection and N. Ingersoll need some attention in their proposal. She wants to know if it is feasible to dead-end Ingersoll and Mifflin to keep traffic out of the neighborhood.

Ledell asked when Summit will talk to City Traffic Engineering again. Summit said they probably have to finish their traffic study before that meeting. It was asked how soon it will be done, but they weren't sure. It is possible that it could be done relatively soon, but they will let everyone know.

Patrick suggested that meeting again on May 10, the tentative date for the next steering committee meeting, might be premature if there is not yet feedback from the City on Summit's traffic study and there aren't likely to be design updates. Ledell mentioned that the city's shadowing study for the UDD-8 change will be available, so meeting to go over that is likely a good idea.

Attendees agreed that the May 10 meeting at 5:30pm, also at Festival Foods, should stay on the calendar. Patrick will email everyone in advance of the meeting to verify.

Attendees and the developers were thanked for their attendance and good input.