

**Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara
Neighborhood Association**

Preliminary Response

Union Corners
General Development Plan (GDP) Submittal
(October 26, 2005)

December 5, 2005

Contents

Introduction	1
Summary description of development site	2
Gold stars and commendations	2
The “A” List: Issues about the General Development Plan the Urban Design Commission should consider before approval	3
A1. Rebuild French Battery Building in its current historic location.....	3
A2. Emphasize connections to surrounding neighborhoods.....	4
A3. Set a maximum building height — and vary heights of buildings	6
A4. Reduce street widths – and reduce square feet devoted to parking	7
The “B” List: Additional issues Urban Design Commission should consider before approval	8
B1. Take better advantage of the site’s unique location and shape	8
B2. Place corner building flush to Milwaukee Street sidewalk with parking behind.....	9
B3. Design Building A to follow streetscape.....	9
B4. Design buildings to respond to elements in area buildings	10
B5. Reject use of eminent domain	11
B6. Include “family-friendly” housing	11
B7. Don’t segregate affordable housing	11
B8. Include affordable office space to increase types of jobs.....	11
B9. Provide opportunities to move houses set to be demolished.....	11
B10. Exchange community benefits for city tax incremental finance assistance	12
Appendix A: Public input context	13
Appendix B: Analysis for reducing street widths and square feet devoted to parking	16

Introduction

This preliminary report from the Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association (SASYNA) council responds to the October 26, 2005, General Development Plan submitted to the City of Madison by McGrath and Associates. The SASYNA council's recommendations herein are based on input from neighborhood residents who attended more than two years of "planning studios" to explore options for the Union Corners site, many presentations Union Corners developer Todd McGrath made to the SASYNA council and to the public, networking by SASYNA council members with city officials and neighborhood residents, and the experiences of neighborhood residents and business owners living adjacent to the development site. For more on the context of public input into the development planning, please see Appendix A.

Neighbors welcome the applicant's intent to mix residential and commercial. We particularly welcome his efforts to locate a grocery store here.

We commend Mr. McGrath for his open approach to the planning process and for his willingness to meet with small and large neighborhood groups for more than two years to gather input from area residents and business owners.

Despite this, until now, organized response to the applicant's proposals has been difficult because many of the plans presented have been termed "conceptual." The constantly changing layout of the site as the applicant has assembled more parcels of land also has made coherent, proactive comment difficult. Multiple design concepts for facades and layout presented at public meetings create the atmosphere of choice among area residents at meetings, but neighbors – even those who have been involved in the process all along – seem surprised and perplexed by the ever-changing site plans. For example, some of the design possibilities presented at meetings in September 2005 included the December 2004 design that shows carriage houses along the railroad-bicycle path corridor.*

What follows is a collection of hopes and dreams from neighborhood residents, people who spent more than two years as part of the Union Corners planning studio and members of the SASYNA council, all volunteers from different professional and socioeconomic backgrounds who have been vested in the history and nature of the broader area.

* A longtime resident on Division Street, near La Follette Avenue, told a member of the SASYNA council in early December that deletion of the carriage houses is regrettable. This neighbor attended many of the planning studio sessions in which members of the public shared their thoughts on the project with the developer. The neighbor said he did not want to see the development become an "isolated," "walled-in city." That's his number one concern about the space. He said he'd like it to be "part of the neighborhood," "integrated" and "connected." The two-story carriage houses along the rail right-of-way helped create this feeling for him. Those carriage house units, like other aspects of earlier site plans that we liked, are no longer part of the plan.

Summary description of development site

- 14.6 acres
- 450 residential units, about 70 people per acre without commercial or office space
- 238 surface parking spaces = 3,000-foot-long road with parallel parking on both sides of the street = 16 parking spaces per acre of lot
- The site is six-sided, bounded by:
 1. Sixth Street
 2. East Washington Avenue
 3. East Washington Avenue at Milwaukee Street, where East Washington Avenue curves with the Isthmus
 4. Milwaukee Street
 5. Farwell Street and Anzinger Court
 6. Railroad tracks

Gold stars and commendations

SASYNA would like to praise the applicant for various elements in the General Development Plan (GDP) as submitted, including (in no particular order):

- Commercial space suitable for a grocery store
- Green roofs and terraces
- Environmental benefits of infill development (added urban density)
- Generous amount of planned green space
- LEED certification
- Commercial space with residential above
- Diagonal and parallel parking
- Placing the tallest buildings along East Washington Avenue and buildings not as tall closer to single-family homes along southern and eastern edges of the site
- Town square concept
- No large parking lots on railroad corridor, Anzinger Court or Farwell Street
- Double row of trees along East Washington Avenue
- Underground parking
- Pedestrian-bicycle path along north side of railroad right-of-way to cap remaining battery waste difficult to remove because of underground power line along railroad tracks
- New bicycle-pedestrian path crossing the railroad tracks at Jackson Street

The “A” List: Issues about the General Development Plan the Urban Design Commission should consider before approval

We urge the Urban Design Commission to address the following concerns before granting initial approval:

1. Rebuild the French Battery Building in its current footprint
2. Improve connectivity to the surrounding neighborhoods for pedestrians and bicyclists
3. Set a maximum building height – and vary building heights
4. Reduce the width of streets — and square feet devoted to parking

A1. Rebuild the French Battery Building in its current historic location

If the applicant is going to tear down the French Battery Building and build a facsimile, we think it should be built in the exact footprint the building is in now. We would reluctantly go along with a demolition request but only if a facsimile is built in the exact footprint, location and orientation, not at another location on the site.

Through much of the planning studio process, the applicant assured neighbors that the French Battery Building would not be torn down. A significant number of neighbors still feel strongly today that it should not be.

It’s not just the familiar old building neighbors respond to — neighbors also feel strongly about preserving the mature oak trees and significant, familiar green space that frames the French Battery Building. A majority of neighbors have said they want the entire setting — the oak trees, the green space and the building (or a facsimile) preserved.

Preservation of the building’s location would honor the area’s historic significance and the contributions of generations of employees, many of whom walked from the surrounding neighborhoods to work there, as recently as 2003. In this development plan, the French Battery Building and its placement comprise the only remaining historical reference to our important industrial heritage on this site. The building and its location are a gateway and marker where the isthmus turns. Retention of the structure’s footprint enables designers to take advantage of the uniqueness (and challenges) of a development site with six sides.

In addition, the orientation of the building provides a visual link to the neighborhoods to the south and east of the development site. The French Battery Building is oriented

to the existing street grid south of the RR tracks (Division and Dunning streets), as the photo below shows.



This detail of a photo from the March 2000 Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Worthington Park Neighborhood Plan shows how the front of the original French Battery Building near the intersection of Winnebago and Division streets is parallel to Division and Dunning streets. That building’s orientation connects that area to the neighborhoods to the south and east.

In addition, Rayovac’s “front yard” is home to significant green space and mature oak trees.

A2. Emphasize connections to surrounding neighborhoods

A second concern is connections to the existing neighborhoods — and orientation of this most recent site plan solely to East Washington Avenue. Linkages between the Union Corners development and neighborhoods to the south and east are essential for preserving the long-term health of the area. The development site is naturally hemmed in on all but its east side, with East Washington Avenue, Milwaukee Street and the railroad tracks forming many of its boundaries.

We should think ahead and try to avoid creating a situation where, years from now, investors may buy up then-“aging” properties and turn them into rental units. We need to avoid situations we’ve seen in other areas of the city where areas become isolated “islands,” hemmed in by highways, waterways and other barriers.

To improve neighborhood connections, we suggest that entry points (perhaps at Farwell, Jackson and vacated Division streets) from the new bicycle path on the development’s south side be treated with the same thought and importance as entrances for motor vehicles. Entrance monuments (on the same scale as those marking the entry points for motorized traffic) on the bike path would help facilitate this goal.

A pedestrian-bicycle connection at Farwell Street was part of the Union Corners site plan through much of the planning studio process. We suggest this Farwell Street

pedestrian-bicycle link be made part of the site plan once again to connect Farwell Street to the pedestrian-bicycle path and to connect the path to the development's southeast edge with an entrance monument. This path could connect to the 20-space parking lot, and easy, safe pedestrian access to the grocery store and other business should be included. Landscaping should make clear that this connection is not for motorized traffic, as should new landscaping at the south end of Farwell Street.

A third change involves reorienting Building G1 so that the Jackson Street pedestrian-bicycle path leads naturally into the core of the development, ideally to a pedestrian-friendly entrance to the grocery store. The submitted plan shows the path running into a back corner of residential Building G1 (see map below from developer Exhibit 9). This path should lead somewhere other than into a rainwater infiltration space at the back of a building.



Map from developer exhibit 9 shows proposed at-grade pedestrian-crossing to bike trail from dead-end of Jackson Street running into back of building G1. A second entrance from the new bike path should be added to the bottom of Farwell Street and a path should connect the path to the parking lot east of building G3. These entrances into Union Corners from the south and east should be deemed as important as those from East Washington Avenue and Milwaukee Street. The addition of entrance monuments on the bike path at each connection to the development, plus reorientation of Building G.1 should go a long way into inviting people into the development. A third connection could be considered where Division Street is to be vacated on the west edge.

These changes will help the development take advantage of the surrounding “walking neighborhood” and better enable development residents to access by foot and bicycle the businesses, churches, residences and nonprofit agencies in the Atwood Avenue

business district four blocks south. Residents of the surrounding areas similarly will be better able to access development businesses by foot and bicycle.

If this development is as successful as we all hope, people will create informal paths across the railroad tracks, such as the footpath across the railroad tracks connecting Ohio Avenue with Farwell Street. Union Corners retail stores should be easily accessible by foot even if a new pedestrian-bicycle railroad crossing is not constructed at the foot of Jackson Street.

A3. Set a maximum building height — and vary building heights

The General Development Plan as submitted proposes seven-story buildings. That would create the tallest buildings outside the immediate downtown. This is out of scale with the rest of the city and grossly out of scale to the surrounding neighborhoods. (See drawing from developer’s exhibit 16 below for illustration of contrast.) We ask that the Urban Design Commission consider setting a maximum building height of five stories — and that the tallest buildings be constructed along East Washington Avenue.

We also strongly urge architects to vary building heights, even along East Washington – including varying building heights within the same building.



This illustration from developer’s exhibit 16 shows the contrast between the development and neighborhoods to the south (top of illustration) and east (left). Note how Union Corners marks the turn of the Isthmus and what people traveling into downtown (from bottom left) would see as they approach this “gateway” corner.

A4. Reduce street widths — and square feet devoted to parking

The width of the streets should be reduced to the minimum allowed by law. The current plan positions the buildings too far apart. Internal streets are too wide. Streets should be narrower and more intimate. A standard roadway driving lane is 12 feet wide. For one lane in each direction, the roads should be no more than 24 feet wide.

A fire lane next to large buildings needs to be 26 feet wide to allow access to two fire trucks at the hydrants. No more than 20 feet is needed on each side of a hydrant.

Appendix B shows all the pavement cross sections can be reduced by 4 feet at almost every location without sacrificing fire access safety, vehicle safety or ease of parking.

Narrower roads will improve street life and safety in a walking neighborhood.

The “B” List: Additional issues the Urban Design Commission should consider before approval

In addition to

1. rebuilding the French Battery Building in its current historic location;
2. emphasizing connections surrounding neighborhoods;
3. setting a maximum building height and varying heights of buildings; and
4. reducing width of streets and square feet devoted to parking,

SASYNA urges the Urban Design Commission to consider these factors before granting initial approval:

B1. Take better advantage of the site’s unique location and shape

Rather than using only rectangles, the footprints of the Union Corners buildings should take advantage of the overall building site and its location at the point where the Isthmus ends. The site’s six sides should be considered an asset that challenges designers to be creative. The current site plan orients all buildings to East Washington Avenue and Sixth Street. The other edges (East Washington Avenue at Milwaukee Street, Farwell Street and the railroad-bicycle path corridor) feature lost space around them so that the designers’ rectangle can fit into the funny corners. Relocating the French Battery Building makes all of this possible. Designers should consider buildings with five or more sides in addition to non-rectangular, four-sided, structures.

Movement of the French Battery Building allows designers to fall back on the simplicity of a grid oriented on East Washington Avenue, rather than the French Battery Building and the residential areas south and east of the development. This grid, as developer Exhibit 9 (on an earlier page) shows, forces designers to ignore the curve of the railroad corridor and the curve of East Washington Avenue at Milwaukee Street. (Note that the building across East Washington Avenue, No. 2528, at North Street takes advantage of the Isthmus’ curve.) This reduces the natural connections of the development to the surrounding areas and emphasizes the feel of an office park with a drive-through grocery store conveniently placed for commuters heading home after work. This design fails because of its reliance on rectangular shapes.

Union Corners is where people traveling west on East Washington Avenue turn the corner and look straight up at the Capitol. Prior to arriving at that intersection, people are looking pretty close to straight down Winnebago Street. With this site design, travelers would be looking into the face of a building and the grocery store sign. The boulevard of the town square opposite Seventh Street is not in line with that viewshed, so that new inviting green space will not be highly visible from East Washington Avenue.

If the French Battery Building remains in its original location, it would provide a view from East Washington Avenue prior to seeing the Capitol and enhance the gateway feeling the city is trying to create in this corridor.

As for the development's other buildings, because the views are oriented to be perpendicular to East Washington Avenue (after Milwaukee Street), the majority of the buildings overlook residential neighborhoods. If the buildings were aligned or oriented at different angles, like the French Battery Building, one side would look out over neighborhoods and the other face toward the downtown Madison skyline.

To better take advantage of the site, the buildings' alignments, shapes and footprints should be re-examined. We ask that the building designers look to earlier drafts of Union Corners plans that featured non-rectangular buildings. Keeping the rebuilt French Battery Building in its original location and moving grocery store Building B right up to the Milwaukee Street sidewalk will prompt new ways of thinking about building shape and connections to established neighborhoods. Designers might consider swinging building G3 into the 20-space parking lot, for example, and moving buildings G1 and G2 to follow that shift to reorient the structures to respond to alignment of the single family homes along Farwell and street grid south of the railroad tracks.

B2. Place corner building flush with Milwaukee Street sidewalk with parking behind

For much of the planning studio process, we saw site plans that placed the building at the corner of Milwaukee Street – East Washington Avenue flush up against the Milwaukee Street sidewalk edge – with parking “behind” the building, on the site's interior, not visible from East Washington Avenue. Now, suddenly, in the General Development Plan as submitted we see 84 parking stalls in front of Building B (the proposed grocery store) between the store and the Milwaukee Street sidewalk. This is exactly the kind of “suburban” parking lot in front of the store that neighbors — and our city-approved neighborhood plan — say we don't want. The positions of Building B and the parking lot on this latest site plan should be reversed, as it was for much of the planning studio process. Building B should be constructed right up to the edge of the Milwaukee Street sidewalk. Landscaping and pedestrian paths should be used to integrate the parking lot visually with the proposed town square.

B3. Design Building A to follow streetscape

Building A should be designed with a footprint that responds to the shape of the road and the corner created by the roadway. It should follow the curve of East Washington Avenue, perhaps going out to the corner with Milwaukee Street. Building A's design should acknowledge its importance as being the first edifice people see as the Isthmus curves and as they travel inbound on East Washington Avenue into town.

B4. Design buildings to respond to elements in area buildings

We'd like to see building designs complement those of nearby buildings such as Rebecca-Lynn Studio at 2632 Milwaukee Street and the Victory Arms apartment building in the 2400 block of East Washington Avenue. We recommend these buildings be looked to for inspiration and assistance in creating new buildings that fit in the neighborhood's history and character. When the Minneapolis-St. Paul consulting firm Biko & Associates was here to help write an East Washington Avenue BUILD plan for the stretch of East Washington Avenue from Highway 30 to East High School, they specifically noted the Rebecca-Lynn Studio building, across Milwaukee Street from the Union Corners site, and the Victory Arms apartment building, across East Washington Avenue from the Union Corners site, as exemplary — and urged developers to look to them for inspiration.



The Rebecca Lynn Studio, top, across Milwaukee Street from the now closed Kohl's grocery store, and the Victory Arms apartment building, below left, are good examples of architectural styles and scale of building for the Union Corners development to complement.



Victory Arms is in the 2400 block of East Washington Avenue, across from the Union Corners development.

B5. Reject use of eminent domain

We ask that the city not use eminent domain or condemnation to acquire properties or to help a developer acquire properties. We do not support the use of eminent domain. Even if negotiations may be protracted and difficult, we ask UDC to require the applicant to deal face to face with longtime local businesses owners, such as the owner of the radiator shop at Fifth and Winnebago streets, to acquire properties in a fair and equitable manner.

B6. Include “family-friendly” housing

We would like to see a percentage of Union Corners housing units be large enough to accommodate families. We wouldn’t want to see predominantly one-bedroom units for childless young professionals and empty-nesters. The green space and roof terraces should be available for outdoor play by children. Units with three bedrooms should be distributed throughout the development, not segregated to one building or one floor or wing. We’d like to see families with children encouraged to rent or purchase units in this development — to help provide employees for area businesses and to help support nearby elementary schools, which are under pressure due to demographic changes.

B7. Don’t segregate affordable housing

The applicant should disperse affordable and low-income housing units equally throughout the site, rather than concentrate them in a single building or area.

B8. Include affordable office space to increase types of jobs available

In addition to retail space, we’d like to see the applicant include office space in his plans, especially affordable office space, that would help provide varied employment in the neighborhood, and enhance opportunities to live, work and shop.

B9. Provide opportunities to move houses set to be demolished

We’d like to see the applicant provide opportunities to individuals or organizations who may be willing to move the single-family homes on Winnebago Street between Fifth and Sixth streets, rather than demolish them. These homes were not part of the planning studio discussions because the applicant did not purchase them – and include the land between East Wash and Winnebago in his site plan – until after the studio process had concluded.

B10. Exchange community benefits for tax incremental financing assistance

The applicant will likely seek tax incremental financing (TIF) to assist with project costs. In exchange for TIF aid, we think specific, measurable benefits should be identified. For example, we'd like to see all contractors and subcontractors be required to pay a living wage for all aspects of project construction – on any project that receives city TIF assistance, and all contractors be required to hire members of disadvantaged groups and women in proportion to their representation in the community.

Appendix A: Public input context

Since the summer of 2003, people living around the former Rayovac factory site have been working with developer Todd McGrath to share their ideas and concerns about redevelopment of the site. This includes small-group meetings, ongoing direct contact via e-mail and telephone, meetings with the Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association (SASYNA) council, public meetings, several tours of the site and buildings, and a two-year “planning studio” process. While the studio provided an ongoing forum for discussion and brainstorming, it did not issue formal recommendations.

When city staff told the SASYNA council that the applicant would be presenting his General Development Plan (GDP) to the Urban Design Commission on Wednesday, December 7, SASYNA council designated a subcommittee to go over the GDP and make a recommendation to the council, which then issued this preliminary response.

To gather neighborhood input from area residents, the subcommittee announced its meetings on the neighborhood e-mail list and leafleted about 100 residences along Farwell Street, Milwaukee Street, Anzinger Court, the north side of La Follette Avenue, and the dead-ends of Dunning, Jackson and Talmadge streets and of Ohio Avenue. That leaflet included a map from Mr. McGrath’s packet, a description of the short-term decision-making process and a request for input. One person who received that leaflet joined the SASYNA council subcommittee. The subcommittee included people who live on La Follette and Ohio avenues, and Marquette, Winnebago, Milwaukee and Division streets.

Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Worthington Park Neighborhood Plan

The neighborhood steering committee, city project staff and the city resource team who worked for more than two years to create the Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Worthington Park Neighborhood Plan that the city council adopted in March 2000 did not anticipate the closing of Rayovac and subsequent redevelopment of that site.

However, the group did anticipate the closing of the Kohl’s grocery and made many recommendations in conjunction with the redevelopment of the East Washington Avenue corridor. Many of these recommendations are pertinent to the General Development Plan and subsequent Specific Implementation Plan for Union Corners. Several are highlighted here. Page numbers refer to the plan, which is available at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/neighborhoods/saswplan.pdf>.

The opening section of the 2000 plan includes a Neighborhood Vision Statement for census tract 20, the area bound by Lake Monona, Division and Winnebago streets,

East Washington and Commercial avenues and the east branch of Starkweather Creek. The statement is:

Neighborhood Vision Statement

The Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Worthington Park Neighborhood envisions diverse, community-oriented places, activities, and people. Achieving this vision will require community, citizen, public, and business interests to continually work together. This will be a neighborhood where vibrant residential areas, community activities, and business corridors continually build upon each other's strengths.

The neighborhood must continually face challenges, including ex-urban commuter traffic, rising housing costs, and stressed community services. This neighborhood plan contains detailed proposals to address these challenges and to move toward the vision of a neighborhood in which:

- traffic is calmed for a safe and pleasant walking, bicycling, and transit environment;
- mixed-use, urban in-fill, and owner-occupied housing are developed so the elderly will be able to stay in their house and all people will be able to flourish throughout the neighborhood;
- social services/community facilities serve all residents;
- schools are maintained to the highest standards;
- all residents feel safe and secure;
- each neighborhood resident is represented and supported;
- strong, community supported businesses preserve the human-scaled neighborhood character;
- neighborhood parks, waterways, and rail-trails are linked by park-like neighborhood streets;
- East Washington is an attractive, safe corridor; and
- District Alderpersons work with neighborhood associations to develop and utilize a mechanism to keep track of public improvement projects funded by the City, County, or State so that the neighborhood has input into the planning process.

In short, neighbors want to improve on the many great qualities in their neighborhood and keep an eye to its long-term sustainability (page 6).

The plan includes a specific vision and recommendations for the East Washington Avenue corridor, which the plan recognizes as “a major gateway into both the City

and the neighborhood. ... New construction includes high quality materials with well-maintained landscaping; the shopping areas have attractive, well-maintained facades with well-landscaped parking lots and terraces; and new construction reflects to the fullest extent possible a traditional neighborhood character. Mixed-use buildings of at least two stories with commercial uses on the street level and residential units or offices above the first floor enhance the gateway aesthetic of the corridor” (page 11).

To enhance the gateway effect, the neighborhood plan recommends buildings of at least two stories and no more than five stories; including of affordable residential or office space above the first floor; at least a percentage of new buildings constructed up to the sidewalk; and “encouraging “uniform architectural character in new construction in areas that have a mass of similarly styled buildings, such as the north side of the 2500 block of East Washington Avenue” (page 11).

The recommendation for the parking lot at 2729 Hermina Street behind the East Madison Shopping Center, four blocks from Union Corners’ northeast corner, is for a two-story affordable housing development. “This parcel is adjacent to single-family homes and can serve as a transition between the [adjacent] residential and commercial properties” (page 16).

The plan recommends burying powerlines and using trees and lighting fixtures to enhance the corridor’s appearance. Plan lists the East Washington Avenue-Milwaukee Street-North Street intersection as a priority (page 12).

In its recommendations for the redevelopment of the East Washington Avenue corridor, the neighborhood plan supports the continued presence of a neighborhood grocery store at Milwaukee Street. “In the event that the property becomes vacant, encourage the opening of another medium-size grocery store. Otherwise, encourage the construction of medium-density, affordable housing on the northern portion of the site and retail or mixed use development at the corner of East Washington Avenue and Milwaukee Street with a grocery store as anchor” (page 15).

For the south side of the 2400 block of Winnebago Street, which is part of the Union Corners redevelopment, the plan calls for “construction of mixed-use commercial development on the first floor with affordable residential on the second floor or above.” The plan also suggests that a “redesign of Winnebago Street might facilitate appropriate development and traffic safety” (page 17)

Related to transportation and safety, the plan calls for increased attention to pedestrian and bicycle transportation and engineering through traffic calming, additional paths for non-motorized traffic. It also calls for attention to mass transit opportunities. Areas of the neighborhood are frequent cut-through streets as east-bound motorists seek efficient connections between Atwood Avenue and Milwaukee Street and East Washington Avenue (pages 38-50); this transit pattern may replicate itself with the streets in Union Corners development.

Appendix B: Analysis for reducing widths of streets and space devoted to parking

The Schenk-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association council asks the applicant to reduce street width to 24 feet, the minimum that the law allows. Fire lanes next to large buildings need to be no more than 26 feet wide to allow access to two fire trucks at the hydrants; no more than 20 feet are needed on each side of a hydrant. Reducing pavement widths will help the development achieve a LEED rating.

The current plan positions the buildings too far apart; the internal streets are too wide. Streets should be narrower and more intimate to encourage safe pedestrian and bicycle movement within and through the development area. This will help address a second major concern of the council, lack of connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods.

The analysis in this appendix shows that all the pavement cross sections can be reduced by 4 feet at almost every location without sacrificing fire access safety, vehicle safety or ease of parking. Narrower roads facilitate pedestrian and bicycle movement through and within the development, and improve street life and safety in a walking neighborhood. Please consult developer exhibits 10 and 11 regarding the street and parking cross sections discussed below.

Cross section A-A1

On the plan, two-way with no parking is 32 feet of pavement width. *This cross section should be standard 24 feet wide.* If wider pavement is shown to enhance truck access, wider street should be allowed only if a truck-turning analysis demonstrates its need.

Cross section B-B1

On the plan, two-way with parallel parking on one side is 38 feet of pavement width. A parallel parking space for large vehicles is shown to be 9 by 25 feet and for small vehicles to be 7.5 by 20 feet. An 8-foot-wide parallel parking space provides enough space in the proposed semi-urban environment for a vehicle. This leaves a driving lane 30 feet wide (two 15-foot-wide lanes), which is significantly larger than the widest space needed for two fire trucks. *This street should be reduced to no more than 24 to 26 feet wide, depending on the fire access needs.*

Cross section C-C1

On the plan, two-way with parallel parking on both sides is 46 feet of pavement width. Two 8-foot-wide parallel parking lanes means the driving lane width is 30 feet (two 15-foot-wide lanes). *This driving lane should be reduced to no more than 24 to 26 feet wide, depending on fire truck access needs.*

Cross section E-E1

In the plan, the connection to Winnebago Street features parallel parking at both sides and is 44 feet wide. Two 8-foot-wide parallel parking lanes means the driving lane width is 28 feet (two 14-foot-wide lanes). *This driving lane should be reduced to no more than 24 to 26 feet wide, depending on fire truck access needs.* Note that the city has committed to narrow Winnebago Street to help calm traffic. This cross section (the smallest driving lane in the Union Corners development) connects to the extra wide street so it would *current* width of Winnebago Street, which the city is planning to shrink because it is too wide. *We recommend that the developer and the city coordinate this connection and use the narrowest street widths that the law permits.*

Cross section F-F1

In the plan, one-way with angled parking on both sides has a pavement width of 60 feet (18+24+18= 60 feet). *This area should be treated as a parking lot, not as some sort of a private street.* A parking space on a 60-degree angle requires a length of 18 feet if a vehicle is allowed to hang over the sidewalk. This is possible with this design because of the extra wide sidewalks. Two 10-foot driving lanes in a parking lot are sufficient for allowing two vehicles to pass each other. A small vehicle only needs 16 feet for the parking area and a 16.5-foot pullout area. *The driving lane must be limited to 20 feet wide and the parking sizes be held at 18 feet.*