

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 12, 2006
TITLE: 505-550 Midvale Boulevard, Midvale Plaza Redevelopment, PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 11 th Ald. Dist. (02988)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: July 12, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Lisa Geer, Cathleen Feland and Robert March. Ald. Noel Radomski was excused during discussion of this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 12, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** and provided feedback only, relative to issues associated with the Commission's initial approval of the Midvale Plaza redevelopment (May 24, 2006) located at 505-550 Midvale Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joe Krupp, Bruce Simonson and Paul Cuta, architect representing the Madison Public Library Board. Appearing in opposition to the project were Pamela Mather, Bonnie McMullin-Lawton, Paul Haskew, Ann Strenski, Brandon Casto, Steven Weloh, Jeff Eaton, Heidi Fatland and Dan Sebald.

Krupp noted to the Commission that the basis for the request for initial approval was to allow for the Urban Design Commission's review of modified elevational details for the Phase I building component of the project, consisting of the mixed-use retail/library building containing 43-units on the upper three stories of the four-story building. Krupp noted that the Urban Design Commission's concerns relevant to the architecture of the buildings with initial approval of the project were also an issue with the Plan Commission consideration of the now more detailed building elevations; yet to be presented to the Urban Design Commission. Following Krupp's summary, Simon provided an overview of building elevational details for the Phase I portion of the development; against the requirements established with the previous initial approval of the project by the Urban Design Commission. The plans as presented featured the following:

- The first floor façade of the Midvale Boulevard elevation of the library features the pronounced use of a cast stone veneer, in combination with deep set windows and covered colonnade to distinguish it from the overlying architecture of the residential component of the upper three floors that feature a variation in façade coverings that range from stucco with fiber cement trim, brick veneer and horizontal siding.
- The Midvale elevation distinguishes lower level retail with aluminum storefront elements with brick veneer, in combination with cast stone with brick veneer integrated within elements of the second and third floor areas of upper story residential units, in combination with stucco and horizontal siding.
- The Tokay Boulevard elevation features the application of cast stone veneer consistent with its recognition of the library level, combined with the application of brick veneer on the second and third story levels, including portions of the first floor level containing proposed retail with the fourth level featuring the use of stucco in combination with horizontal siding.

- The Caromar Drive elevation maintains the identity of the first floor library level with the application of cast stone veneer with portions of the second and third story residential levels featuring the use of brick veneer, along with portions of the third and fourth stories utilizing horizontal siding and stucco.
- The window treatment for the library features the fenestration of windows with deep set openings; differentiated from upper story residential window treatment that incorporates the use of fixed picture windows, in combination with double hung windows.
- The conceptual material color palette will differentiate library and retail/commercial first floor façades with a distinct color for each type of use; specific colors are yet to be determined.

Following a review of the plans, area residents spoke to their concerns with the project as proposed. Following the presentation, representatives of the Midvale Plaza Neighborhood Steering Committee spoke in coordination relating to an informational packet provided to the Commission citing their opposition to the project, elaborating on issues with the project's negative impact on the neighborhood relevant to density, building height, bulk and mass, and drainage issues. The various presentations emphasized incompatibility with new urbanist principles, the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Madison, retail traffic and design issues with the project. The Steering Committee utilized a large scale model of the redevelopment proposal and the surrounding existing neighborhood to illustrate their concerns. Following the presentation the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Like the different treatment of the Phase I building façade, especially the library portion.
- The library features identifiable architecture that ties well to upper stories.
- Simplify railings on upper story residential unit balconies with the elimination of the star emblem.
- Like the depth of window openings on the library level; adds strength to the base, but still have reservation about the lack of activation of the corner with no major use, entrance or feature.
- Like the direction of the architecture; clarifies the role of the building and provides organization but still need a 3-dimensional model. The concept of organization and colors and fenestration around uses does help.
- The lack of a corner treatment is still an issue; look at providing a pocket park at the corner or alternative feature.
- The corner treatment needs more work; should be more than a meeting area and not just a landscaped space.

A discussion relevant to the coordination of the final plans of the library with its architect, Paul Cuta yielded that the developer's responsibility was primarily to develop the exterior façade of the library tenant space with the interior the responsibility of the Madison Public Library Board's architect, Cuta. Cuta spoke on the issue of activation of the corner with of a formal entry not being appropriate with potential alternatives for development of the corner area yet to be developed. Discussion amongst the Commission relevant to the request to reapply initial approval of the more detailed plans for Phase I emphasized that this presentation provided more information on the direction of the architecture to the applicant and did not require any formal action since initial approval of the project had already been provided with the Commission's previous review. The Acting Chair, Lou Host-Jablonski noted that its previous initial approval had already provided for the acceptance of the project's bulk, area, mass, as well as its basic site design relationships. Host-Jablonski noted that the updated building elevations did not appear to merit any further consideration based on their conceptual nature and that sufficient plan details required for final approval appeared yet to be evolved as well as full address of the Commission's requirements established for initial approval, especially the corner issue. Discussion on this issue directed the applicant to provide for the above stated concerns with further consideration of the project, as well as full address of its previous stated requirements established with initial approval and the following:

- Although the library/retail level of the building provides a more distinctive architecture than the upper residential levels, sufficient civic presence was still questioned.
- The architecture of the Phase I building is not done but headed in the right direction.
- The overall styling of the buildings as previously proposed was wrong, the current modifications are headed in the right direction.
- The library could still be more prominent, especially at the corner.
- Concern with the lack of diversity of units.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

Although the applicant requested initial approval of the modified plans as an extension of the Commission's previous initial approval of the project, the Commission didn't take any formal action and provided feedback to the applicant on the modified elevations for the Phase I building. The Commission noted its previous initial approval of the project as validation for the development proposal with comments contained within this report to provide a basis for further development of the proposed plans. Krupp noted to the Commission that its comments were a sufficient basis for providing the necessary modifications to the proposed architecture of the buildings as requested.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6, 6, 7, 7 and 8.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 505-550 Midvale Boulevard

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	7	8	6	-	9	7	7
	6	8	5	-	-	6	5	6
	8	9	9	-	-	6	9	8.5
	6	7	-	-	-	6	7	7

General Comments:

- Architecture is on the right track.
- Some improvements to the architecture, may not entirely please the neighborhood, library should read as civic space.
- Everything about this project is excellent except the corner of Tokay and Midvale. Lack of major civic/grand entrance here is a travesty.
- Architectural lines and details are much cleaner and fitting to the surrounding architecture. Provide landscape plan legend, lighting plan, stormwater. Potential pocket park at corner of Midvale and Tokay. Eliminate phase 2 entry off Caromar, traffic calming on adjacent residential streets. More pervious pavers and filtering of parking lot stormwater. Maintenance program for rain gardens will be necessary.
- Nice job – design more unified. Library clearly delineated.
- Much improved! Look forward to further development.