



MEMO

CITY OF FITCHBURG DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

5520 LACY ROAD
FITCHBURG WI 53711
(608) 270-4260
FAX: (608) 270-4275

To:	Plan Commission and Common Council
From:	Ahnaray Bizjak, P.E. – Transportation Project Engineer
Date:	March 15, 2010
Subject:	Ordinance No. 2010-O-02, An Ordinance to Adopt the Northeast Neighborhood Plan

On Thursday, March 11, TTC took action on Ordinance No. 2010-O-02, An Ordinance to Adopt the Northeast Neighborhood Plan as an Amendment to Appendix A of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Fitchburg in Dane County, Wisconsin and Amending Section 1.40(8)(A) of Chapter 1.

TTC unanimously approved the transportation aspects that are contained in Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Northeast Neighborhood Plan, dated December 15, 2009, with the following three (3) recommended amendments:

Amendment 1

Motion by Lobdell, second by Johnson, to amend the plan to show the dashed north-south road on the west side of CTH MM as a required road connection rather than possible.

Motion passed unanimously.

Planning Staff Comment: Planning staff believes this will conflict with wording on p. 4-19, and puts greater emphasis on the street than on the open space that was requested by Parks. It is shown as potential due to the requirement for a resource study and to balance the concerns between Parks, Resource Conservation and transportation issues. Showing the road way as required weakens the argument for open space in this portion of the plan area.

Planning Staff recommends that this amendment not be accepted, and that wording on p. 4-19 and p. 5-14 is adequate and notes the desire for the connection, but also balances the competing aspects posed.

Amendment 2

Motion by Johnson, second by Winkel, to amend the plan to include a statement that the 2008 City of Fitchburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan identifies a proposed overpass of USH 14 to connect Green Tech Campus to NEN and subsequently, the NEN plan should include appropriate text and map additions to identify this proposed overpass. *Motion passed unanimously.*

Planning Staff Comment: Planning staff believes recommendation 29(B) in the 3/9/10 correction sheet with a side detail map showing a possible path location for the overpass would

suffice to meet this recommendation. The Bike and Pedestrian plan showed the overpass at the location of the proposed interchange, and to avoid conflict with that interchange, the crossing will need to be further north, and hence its location on a detail map as provided in the note to 29B is best method to accomplish this request.

Amendment 3

Motion by Johnson, second by Winkel, to amend the plan to include a statement that as the NEN plan is further developed, consideration of circular routes should be explored to support direct and convenient transit service to the neighborhood. The Public Transportation System section that is contained in Chapter Four: Systems Analysis should be amended to include the following language:

Transit route efficiency should be designed into the new neighborhood by utilizing the following design considerations:

- a. Ingress and egress from neighborhoods should not negatively impact directness of service. Loops that enter and exit at one location should be avoided.
- b. Ingress and egress from neighborhoods should not require left-turns onto thoroughfares or collectors.
- c. Walking distances within a neighborhood should be reasonable without forcing the creation of a circuitous bus route to maintain a quarter mile standard and avoid an excessive amount of turning movements.
- d. Streets with planned bus routes should be constructed with appropriate asphalt mix and (perhaps) should be slightly wider if on-street vehicle parking is anticipated.
- e. High density dwellings should front on streets that are planned for bus routes.
- f. Bus stop locations should be anticipated along with shelter locations.
- g. Bus layover locations should be planned and anticipated in residential areas.

Motion passed unanimously.

Planning Staff Comment: The above language should be added to p. 4-19 as a second paragraph under the Public Transportation heading. There is no need, given this wording, for what Planning Staff had suggested in 29(A) of the 3/9/10 dated document.