



Report to the Plan Commission

January 11, 2010

Legistar I.D. #16737

5801 Gemini Drive / 825 Jupiter Drive

Zoning Map Amendment (Amended PUD-SIP)

Report Prepared By:

Kevin Firchow, AICP

Planning Division

Requested Action: Approval of an amended PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development – Specific Implementation Plan) to allow modifications to approved building and site plans. Should this request be granted, the approved 33 and 36-unit buildings would be reconfigured into 40 and 29-unit buildings, respectively.

Applicable Regulations & Standards: This project is subject to the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments. Section 28.12 (9) provides the process for zoning map amendments. Section 28.07 (6) provides the requirements and framework for Planned Unit Developments.

Summary Recommendation: The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments are met and forward Zoning Map Amendment 3462, rezoning 5801 Gemini Drive and 825 Jupiter Drive from PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development – Specific Implementation Plan) to amended PUD-SIP, with a recommendation of **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing, and the conditions recommended by the Planning Division and other reviewing agencies.

Background Information

Applicant: David Baehr; 801 Jupiter Drive LLC; 3392 Brooks Drive; Sun Prairie, WI 53590
Agent / Contact: Casey Louthier; Louthier & Associates; 120 Telemark Pkwy; Mt. Horeb, WI 53577
Property Owner: Same as the applicant.

Proposal: The applicant proposes to modify an approved and recorded PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development – Specific Implementation Plan) to allow site and building changes needed to reallocate dwelling units between two buildings. The number of total dwelling units would remain at 69, consistent with the original approval.

Two apartment buildings were included in the original 2004 approval, and construction commenced (but was never completed) on one of the buildings. The applicant has indicated financial difficulties of the previous owner caused the stoppage in construction. Approval of this PUD amendment would allow the applicant to complete construction of that building and the other structure.

Please note, the building under construction is referenced in this report as the Phase I “**Gemini**” Building. The future building planned at the south of the site is referred to as the Phase II “**Jupiter**” Building.

Parcel Location: The subject properties are Lots 443 and 444 of the Grandview Commons subdivision. Combined, these lots are approximately 2.16 acres in area, located at 5801 Gemini Drive and 825 Jupiter Drive (southeast corner of Gemini and Jupiter Drives). The subject properties are in Aldermanic District 3 and the Madison Metropolitan School District.

Existing Conditions: The site includes a partially constructed apartment building. Construction commenced after the project was approved in 2004 and the zoning recorded in 2005. This work was not completed.

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning: The property is surrounded by apartment buildings and other undeveloped lands within the Grandview Commons subdivision. Properties are zoned PUD-GDP or PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan / Specific Implementation Plan).

Adopted Land Use Plan: The Comprehensive Plan and the Sprecher Neighborhood Development Plan recommend medium density residential uses for this area.

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.

Zoning Summary: This project is being rezoned to the **(PUD)** district. There are no predetermined bulk requirements, and as such, zoning staff have reviewed this proposal based on the criteria for the R5 district because of the surrounding land uses.

Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	78,800 sq feet (69 units)	94,182 sq ft (See Comment 28)
Lot width	50 '	Adequate
Usable open space	17,120 sq ft	39,586 sq ft
Front yard	20'	7'7" and 6'8" existing
Side yards	8' min; 20' total	38'
Rear yard	30'	100'
Building height	3 stories / 40'	3 stories
Number parking stalls	69	79 garage (1 per unit) 30 surface 109 Total
Accessible stalls	1 in each garage / 2 surface	1 in each garage / 4 surface
Loading	1 (10' x 35') area each lot	Provided in drive aisles
Number bike parking stalls	69	59 provided in garages / 10 surface stalls
Landscaping	As shown	(See Comment # 29)
Lighting	Yes	(See Comment # 27)
Other Critical Zoning Items	Utility Easements, Barrier Free (ILHR 69)	
	Table Prepared by Pat Anderson, Assistant Zoning Administrator	

(Recommended conditions that correspond to requirements are noted in parentheses)

Project Review

The applicant proposes to modify an approved and recorded PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development – Specific Implementation Plan) to allow site and building changes needed to reallocate dwelling units between two approved buildings. Construction of one of those buildings commenced, but was never completed. Approval of this PUD amendment would allow the applicant to complete construction of that building and move forward with a modified two-building plan.

The number of total dwelling units would remain at 69, consistent with the original approval. The dwelling units would continue to be market-rate apartments. This request is subject to the zoning map amendment and planned unit development approval standards.

Project History

The original approval was granted 2004 and the SIP plans were recorded in 2005. Construction of one of the buildings commenced, but was never completed. The applicant has indicated financial difficulties of the previous owner caused the stoppage in construction.

As a clarification, this is a new zoning map amendment request. A previous amendment to convert this site into a 66-unit senior housing facility was withdrawn by the applicant and placed on file (without prejudice) by the Common Council in November 2009.

Zoning Map Amendment Request

The property is currently zoned PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development-Specific Implementation Plan) and this proposal is a major alteration to that approval. This proposal would be consistent with the underlying General Development Plan.

The 2004 zoning approval included two apartment buildings: a 33-unit building on the northern portion of the site (the *Phase I - "Gemini" Building*) and a 36-unit building on the southern portion (the *Phase II- "Jupiter" Building*). Construction started (but was never completed) on the "Gemini" building. Work on the "Jupiter" building has not commenced. This proposal would convert the 33-unit building into a 40-unit structure, "transferring" units from the "Jupiter" building which would be reduced from 36 to 29 dwelling units.

The proposed plans are similar to what was previously approved. Both buildings are similar in design, layout, and character. The site and landscape plans appear to be nearly identical to what was previously approved. The physical modifications to the buildings include the following:

Phase I - Gemini Building (Under Construction- Proposed as a 40-Unit Building)

- The interior of the first floor would be reconfigured to remove (1) one-bedroom unit and (1) two-bedroom unit. One (1) efficiency unit would be added creating 14 total dwelling units. Each of the efficiency units will be 400 sf in area, compared to 672 sf as shown in previous plans. Some of the remaining one and two-bedroom units will be reduced in floor area.
- The interior modifications on the second floor would be similar to those on the first floor including the removal of a one-bedroom unit and a two-bedroom unit. One (1) efficiency unit would be added creating 14 total units. Each of the efficiency units will be 400 sf in area,

compared to 672 sf as shown in previous plans. Some of the remaining one and two bedroom units will be reduced in floor area.

- A third-story “stepback” on the building’s south side would be eliminated and replaced with three one-bedroom units. Plans also include the addition of a two-bedroom unit.
- Some façade modifications were previously been approved as a minor alteration. These include the removal of the brick tower details on the Gemini Drive façade and removal of the masonry tower elements between the first and second floor porches on the “angled” elevation facing Gemini Drive.

Phase II - Jupiter Building (Proposed as a 29-Unit Building)

- The footprint of the building has been reduced, with a portion of the building nearest to the surface parking lot being eliminated.
- Underground parking would be reduced from 43 to 37 vehicle stalls. Underground bicycle parking would be reduced from 26 to 23 stalls.
- The modifications on the first floor would reduce the number of efficiency units from two (2) units to (1) one. The number of one-bedroom units would be reduced from five (5) to two (2). The number of two-bedroom units on this floor would be increased from six (6) to seven (7), with two of those units now including dens. The individual units would generally be the same size as what was previously approved.
- The modifications on the second floor would reduce the number of efficiency units from three (3) units to two (2). The number one-bedroom units would be reduced from five (5) to two (2). The number of two-bedroom units on this floor would be increased from six (6) to seven (7), with two of those units including dens. The individual units would generally be the same size as what was previously approved.
- Third floor modifications include the reduction of a one-bedroom unit and the conversion of a two-bedroom unit into a two-bedroom unit with den.
- Façade modifications, similar to those shown on the “Gemini” building are proposed. This includes the removal of the two and three-story brick tower details marking building entrances. Portions of the east façade have been redesigned to accommodate changes in the building footprint.

Further information on the changes in the dwelling unit composition are noted in the below tables. The first table compares the overall dwelling unit counts for the entire project site. The second table compares the unit mix for each building, noting the changes between the original approval and this proposal.

Summary of Dwelling Units – Total Site Comparison (Both Buildings)

	Units – 2004 Approved Plans	% of Total Units (Both Buildings)	Units – Current Amended Proposal	% of Total Units
Efficiency Units	10	15%	11	16%
One-Bedroom Units	27	39%	21	30%
Two-Bedroom Units	32	46%	32	46%
Two-Bedroom w/ Den	0	0%	5	7%
Building Total Units	69	100%	69	100%

Summary of Dwelling Units – “Building by Building” Comparison

	Units – 2004 Approved Plans	% of Total Units (Each Building)	Units – Current Amended Proposal	% of Total Units
<i>Phase I – Gemini Building (Now Under Construction)</i>				
Efficiency Units	3	10%	6	15%
One-Bedroom Units	15	45%	16	40%
Two-Bedroom Units	15	45%	18	45%
Two-Bedroom w/ Den	0	0%	0	0%
Building Total Units	33	100%	40	100%
<i>Phase II – Jupiter Building (29 Unit Building)</i>				
Efficiency Units	7	19%	5	17%
One-Bedroom Units	12	33%	5	17%
Two-Bedroom Units	17	47%	14	48%
Two-Bedroom w/ Den	0	0%	5	17%
Building Total Units	36	100%	29	100%
Total (Both Buildings)	69	--	69	--

*Note some of the percentages don't add to 100% due to rounding.

Project Analysis

Planned Unit Developments are intended to promote improved environmental and aesthetic design by allowing for greater freedom, imagination, and flexibility compared to conventional zoning districts. Staff note that this amended Planned Unit Development request is very similar to the one approved in 2004.

Considering the general zoning map amendment standards, if the Plan Commission approves this PUD amendment, it would need to make a finding that its adoption is in public interest and is not solely for the interest of the applicant. In making their recommendation to the Council, the Commission will also need to give due recognition of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The Planned Unit Development approval criteria include the character and intensity of land use, economic impact, maintenance of open space, and the implementation schedule.

Conformance with the Adopted Plans

The proposed alteration appears generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the more specific Sprecher Neighborhood Development Plan. These plans recommend medium density residential uses for the subject site.

The subject site is comprised of Lots 443 and 444 of the Grandview Common subdivision. The approved Grandview Commons PUD anticipated a net density for apartment and townhouse development for the subject and surrounding lots at 28.5 units per acre. The proposed project has a density of 31.9 du/ac, identical to the previously-approved density. An adjacent lot was approved with a smaller density and the other lot is yet undeveloped. Thus, the proposed project complies with the underlying approved net-density. Finally, the placement of the two buildings also comports to the massing envisioned in the general development plan.

Design and Character Considerations

The applicant has proposed some modifications to the interior and exterior of both buildings, though staff believes the overall design and character would be very similar to what was originally approved. The primary facades and materials remain largely the same, with the exceptions summarized below. For the partially constructed “Gemini” building, the most significant exterior modification is the proposed third-story addition that eliminates an existing setback. On the “Jupiter” building, a modest reduction in the footprint of the structure is proposed, resulting in a partial redesign of the eastern façade. Other changes include the removal of some of the architectural details, some of which were already approved as a minor alteration to the original SIP. Staff note that the Urban Design Commission recommended final approval of this proposal on December 16, 2009.

Implementation, Phasing, and Financing Considerations

Staff believes the most significant issue with this proposal is ensuring that if approved, all aspects of this proposal will be completed in a timely manner. This includes the completion of the unfinished building, construction of the second building, and installation of the associated site plan amenities.

In regards to the project timing and implementation, staff recommend that further detail be provided in the “timetable for construction” narrative. This information should be provided in a clearly labeled zoning text. The current submittal provides little phasing detail and indicates work would be completed within three years. The zoning code specifies that Planned Unit Developments shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner which would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point (Sec 28.07(6)(f)(4)). The applicant should specify completion targets for both buildings and associated site plan amenities. Additionally, staff recommend that an interim landscape plan be provided for Planning Division staff approval, should construction of the second building not commence within one year of the date of Common Council approval.

Applicants of Planned Unit Developments are also required to provide proof of financing capability as part of the information reviewed for the approval of Specific Implementation Plans (Sec 28.07(6)(g)(3)(a)(x)) unless waived. For this proposal, staff believes such information should be provided prior to the applicant starting construction of the second building. Along with this information, staff recommends that the applicant also submits an executed contract with a construction firm, providing assurances that the project will be completed once started. This should be provided in a form acceptable to the Director of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development.

From a timing standpoint, staff believe that if approved, the zoning map amendment could be recorded prior to the proof of financing being provided for the second building. This may allow for more timely completion of the unfinished building. To memorialize this phasing component, staff recommend that a deed restriction be recorded along with the final plans, specifying that proof of financing will be provided prior to permits being issued for construction of the second building. This document shall be in a form approved by the Planning Division and City Attorney’s Office.

Conclusion

The applicant proposes to modify an approved and recorded PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development – Specific Implementation Plan) to allow site and building changes needed to reallocate dwelling units between two buildings. Construction of one of those buildings has commenced, but was never completed. Approval of this PUD amendment would allow the applicant to complete construction of that building and move forward with a modified two-building plan.

The total number of dwelling units would remain at 69 under the revised proposal. The 33-unit “Gemini” building, now under construction, would be converted into a 40-unit structure. The number of dwelling units in the “Phase II Jupiter” building would be reduced from 36 to 29. Overall, there would be a modest decrease in the number of one-bedroom units and an increase in the number of two-bedroom units with dens. The number of efficiency units will be increased in the existing building and reduced in the future building, resulting in a net increase of one (1) additional efficiency unit across the project site.

While some architectural details have been removed to reduce building costs, the design character of the proposed buildings is consistent with what was originally approved. The most significant building alterations include a third story addition on the unfinished building and reduction in the building footprint on the other structure. Notwithstanding these changes, the primary building materials and their orientation on the facades would not change. The site and landscape plan include only minor modifications. Final approval of this proposal was recommended by the Urban Design Commission at their December 16, 2009 meeting.

Staff is supportive of efforts to complete the unfinished building and does not object to the applicant’s proposed modifications. This proposal is substantially similar in character and density to the original approval and therefore, staff believes the applicable standards could be met. In regards to the “implementation schedule” standard, proof-of-financing information should be provided prior to starting construction of the second building. Staff also recommends the applicant amends the zoning text to specify the construction timing for the second building. Should work on that building not begin within one-year of this approval, the applicant shall have an interim landscape plan prepared for this site.

Recommendations and Proposed Conditions of Approval

Major/Non-Standard Conditions are Shaded
--

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

The Planning Division recommends that the Plan Commission find that the standards for zoning map amendments and planned unit developments are met and forward Zoning Map Amendment 3462, rezoning 5801 Gemini Drive and 825 Jupiter Drive from PUD-SIP (Planned Unit Development – Specific Implementation Plan) to amended PUD-SIP, with a recommendation of **approval**, subject to input at the public hearing and the conditions recommended by reviewing agencies.

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That the applicant provides a clearly labeled zoning text, for approval by Planning Division staff. This zoning text should include details on project phasing specify completion targets for both buildings and associated site plan amenities. |
|---|

2. That the applicant prepares an interim site and landscape plan for Planning Division staff approval, should construction of the second building (or other approved site improvements) not be commenced by the issuance of a building permit within one year of the Common Council approval. A deed restriction shall be recorded along with the final plans noting this requirement.
3. That the applicant submit proof of financing and an executed contract with a construction firm, 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.
4. That a deed restriction shall be recorded along with the final plans, specifying that proof of financing will be provided prior to permits being issued for construction of the second building. This document shall be in a form approved by the Planning Division and City Attorney's Office.

The following conditions have been submitted by reviewing agencies:

City Engineering Division (Contact Janet Dailey, 261-9688)

5. As a result of the proposed development layout by the owner/applicant, the address of 5801 Gemini Drive does not conform to addressing standards as established by 10.34 Madison General Ordinances and cannot be used. The 40-unit building address is 801 Jupiter Drive and the 29-unit building address is 825 Jupiter Drive.
6. The apartment numbers identified on the plan set do not conform to city addressing standards. In accordance with 10.34 MGO – STREET NUMBERS: Submit a PDF of each floor plan to Engineering Mapping Lori Zenchenko (addressing@cityofmadison.com) so that a preliminary interior addressing plan can be developed. If there are any changes pertaining to the location of a unit, the deletion or addition of a unit, or to the location of the entrance into any unit, (before, during or after construction) the addresses may need to be changed. The interior address plan is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Marshal.
7. This site shares initial construction and maintenance costs for the joint driveway with the property adjacent on the east per recorded easement Document No. 4052014. In compliance with 28.11(2)(f) Madison General Ordinances, make reference of this joint driveway easement location and recording information on the plan set to memorialize the easement with the approved plan set for the benefit of both private parties as well as the city.
8. Revise plan to label the existing City sanitary, storm and water laterals and existing public utilities. Clearly indicate the new laterals that are being proposed.
9. Any damage to the street pavement shall be restored in accordance with the City's Pavement Patching Criteria.
10. Submit a PDF of all floor plans to addressing@cityofmadison.com so that a preliminary interior addressing plan can be developed. If there are any changes pertaining to the location of a unit, the deletion or addition of a unit, or to the location of the entrance into any unit, (before, during, or after construction) the addresses may need to be changed. The interior address plan is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Marshal.

11. The plan set shall be revised to show a proposed private internal drainage system on the site. This information shall include the depths and locations of structures and the type of pipe to be used. POLICY AND MGO 10.29
12. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 37.07 and 37.08 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding permissible soil loss rates. The erosion control plan shall include Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) computations for the construction period. Measures shall be implemented in order to maintain a soil loss rate below 7.5-tons per acre per year.
13. The City of Madison is an approved agent of the Department of Commerce. This proposal contains a commercial building and as such, the City of Madison is authorized to review infiltration, stormwater management, and erosion control on behalf of the Department of Commerce. No separate submittal to Commerce or the WDNR is required. (NOTIFICATION)
14. Prior to approval, this project shall comply with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances regarding stormwater management. Specifically, this development is required to a) Control 80% TSS (5 micron particle) off of new paved surfaces; b) Provide infiltration in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances; and c) Complete an erosion control plan and complete weekly self-inspection of the erosion control practices and post these inspections to the City of Madison website – as required by Chapter 37 of the Madison General Ordinances.
15. The plan set shall be revised to show more information on proposed drainage for the site. This shall be accomplished by using spot elevations and drainage arrows or through the use of proposed contours. It is necessary to show the location of drainage leaving the site to the public right-of-way. It may be necessary to provide information off the site to fully meet this requirement. (POLICY)
16. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, a digital CAD file (single file) to the Engineering Program Specialist in the Engineering Division (Lori Zenchenko). The digital CAD file shall be to scale and represent final construction. The single CAD file submittal can be either AutoCAD (dwg) Version 2001 or older, MicroStation (dgn) Version J or older, or Universal (dxf) format and contain only the following data, each on a separate layer name/level number: a) building footprints, b) internal walkway areas, c) internal site parking areas, d) other miscellaneous impervious areas (i.e. gravel, crushed stone, bituminous/asphalt, concrete, etc.), e) right-of-way lines (public and private), f) all underlying lot lines or parcel lines if unplatted, g) lot numbers or the words “unplatted”, h) lot/plat dimensions, i) street names, and all other levels (contours, elevations, etc) are not to be included with this file submittal.

NOTE: Email file transmissions preferred addressing@cityofmadison.com. Include the site address in the subject line of this transmittal. Any changes or additions to the location of the building, sidewalks, parking/pavement during construction will require a new CAD file. (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2) & 37.05(4))

17. The applicant shall submit, prior to plan sign-off, digital PDF files to the Engineering Division (Jeff Benedict or Tim Troester). The digital copies shall be to scale, and shall have a scale bar on the plan set. (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2)) PDF submittals shall contain the following information: a) building footprints, b) internal walkway areas, c) internal site parking areas, d) lot lines and right-of-way lines, e) street names, f) stormwater management facilities, g) detail drawings associated with stormwater management facilities (including if applicable planting plans).
18. The Applicant shall submit prior to plan sign-off, electronic copies of any Stormwater Management Files including: a) SLAMM DAT files, b) RECARGA files, c) TR-55/HYDROCAD/Etc, and d)

Sediment loading calculations. If calculations are done by hand or are not available electronically the hand copies or printed output shall be scanned to a PDF file and provided. (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2))

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. (POLICY and MGO 37.09(2))

19. All proposed and existing utilities including gas, electric, phone, steam, chilled water, etc shall be shown on the plan. (POLICY)
20. The applicant's utility contractor shall obtain a connection permit and excavation permit prior to commencing the storm sewer construction. MGO 37.05(7) This permit application is available on line at <http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/permits.cfm>.
21. The site plans shall be revised to show the location of existing utilities, including depth, type, and size in the adjacent right-of-way. (POLICY)
22. 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. (POLICY)

Traffic Engineering Division (Contact John Leach, 267-8755)

23. When the applicant submits final plans of one contiguous plan for approval, the applicant shall show the following: items in the terrace as existing (e.g., signs and street light poles), type of surfaces, existing property lines, addresses, showing all easements, all pavement markings, building placement, and stalls, adjacent driveway approaches to lots on either side and across the street, signage, percent of slope, vehicle routes, dimensions of radii, aisles, driveways, stalls including the two (2) feet overhang, and a scaled drawing at 1" = 20'.
24. The Developer shall post a deposit and reimburse the City for all costs associated with any modifications to Traffic Signals, Street Lighting, Signing and Pavement Marking, and conduit and handholes, including labor, engineering and materials for both temporary and permanent installations.
25. Public signing and marking related to the development may be required by the City Traffic Engineer for which the developer shall be financially responsible.

Zoning Administrator (Contact Pat Anderson, 266-5978)

26. The final Plans shall show addresses on the buildings. Address information can be obtained from Lori Zenchenko of City Engineering at (608)266-5952.
27. Lighting is required for this project. Provide a plan showing at least .25 footcandle on any surface of the lot and an average of .75 footcandles. The max. light trespass shall be 0.5 fc at 10 ft from the adjacent lot line. (See City of Madison lighting ordinance)

28. There appears to be a lot line running thru a proposed building. This issue will need to be resolved before any building permits are issued pursuant to these plans as well as meeting applicable State building and setback codes.
29. Parking lot plans with greater than twenty (20) stalls shall comply with City of Madison General Ordinances Section 28.04 (12). Landscape plans must be stamped by a registered landscape architect. Provide a landscape worksheet with the final plans that shows that the landscaping provided meets the point and required tree ordinances. In order to count toward required points, the landscaping shall be within 15' and 20' of the parking lot depending on the type of landscape element. (Note: The required trees do not count toward the landscape point total.) Within 10' from a driveway crossing of a street lot line, any landscaping/screening shall not exceed 2' in height for vision clearance. No landscape elements shall be maintained between the heights of 30 inches and 10 feet above the curb level within the 25' vision triangle of a street corner.

Fire Department (Contact Scott Strassburg, 261-9843)

This agency did not submit a response for this request. Please contact the department on questions regarding compliance with applicable building and fire codes.

Parks Division (Contact Tom Maglio, 266-6518)

30. Park development fees have not been paid for approximately the last half of all units in the original plat. Before signoff, the developer shall provide a tally showing the number of single family, duplex and multifamily units built to date, and the number remaining to be built for the entire plat. Payment of the remaining park fees will then be allocated to the remaining units. '

Water Utility (Contact Dennis Cawley, 261-9243)

31. All wells located on this property shall be abandoned if no valid well operation permit has been obtained from the Madison Water Utility. This property is not in a Wellhead Protection District. The Water Utility will need to sign off the final plans, but not need a copy of the approved plans.

Metro Transit (Contact Tim Sobota, 261-4289)

This agency did not submit a response for this request.