

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 11, 2012

TITLE: 502 South Park Street – PUD, New Construction (The Ideal) in UDD No. 7, Mixed-Use Development. 13th Ald. Dist. (25508)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: July 11, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 11, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item and the request of the applicant and Alder. Appearing on behalf of the project were Craig Enzenroth, representing the Gallina Companies; Ron Trachtenberg, Scott Davis, representing Plunkett Raysich Architects; James Bleifuls, Constantine Choles and Duane Steinhauer. Appearing and speaking in opposition were Kate MacCrimmon, Stuart Eckes, Caitlin Seifert, Susan Antonie, Zaccai Lewis and Amy Moran. Appearing in opposition but not wishing to speak were Charles Lohmann and Helen Kitchel. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition was Don MacCrimmon. Enzenroth stated that there have been changes to the plans that need to be reviewed by Planning staff as well as the area’s Alder, Sue Ellingson. Scott Davis then began reviewing changes to the plans, which include the overall building height as it steps back to Drake Street, and the Drake Street elevation as it goes back into the neighborhood. Six units have been removed from the 4th and 5th floors (3 from each floor), moving the 5-story mass of the building 44-feet to the east on the north elevation and 50-feet to the east on the south elevation. Some units have been introduced on the first floor elevation to engage the neighborhood, some of which are walk-down units because of the grade. The redesign features more residential character begins to appear and move towards the east. Some of the material changes include different brick to separate it from the rest of the building and factory fenestration has been added as an homage to The Ideal Body Shop. The unit count is now at 60, with 74 parking stalls. An extensive landscape buffer and brick banding dresses up the elevation along the parking area and Drake Street elevation.

Amy Moran spoke in opposition and distributed a petition from the neighborhood. The height and mass are of concern, as well as the density for the neighborhood.

James Bleifuls expressed his support of the project.

Zaccai Lewis spoke about other developments in the neighborhood that are four stories in height and have been successful. He also read a letter from neighborhood resident Patricia Murphy in opposition.

Constantine Choles spoke in support as a neighborhood business owner. They have waited a long time for the development to change on Park Street and he sees it as moving in the right direction. It's a natural area for the density Madison is looking for and needs these developments to add to the residents and businesses that are there. He feels with the number of trees in front of residential homes blocks some of the views of a taller building. This project could continue to lift Park Street and have pedestrian interactions. Between the two hospitals that are 13-story bookends, and the six lanes across Park Street with the boulevard he sees this as good mass and density.

Caitlin Seifert spoke in opposition as the President of the Greenbush Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood in general is concerned with 5-stories and the character of the residential neighborhood. They would like the building to be no more than 4-stories and retain the neighborhood's historic aesthetic.

Susan Antonie spoke to her concern for provisions to monitor the management of the building. She is afraid it will become a place for gangbangers and drug dealers. She thinks it should be less intrusive to the neighborhood.

Stuart Eckes spoke in opposition to the height, mass and design. It looks like it should be broken up into two buildings and does not look uniform in its structure. The materials look cheap and does not look like anything else in the neighborhood. He'd like to see a smaller, less massive design that is not so modern.

Because the Commission did not have the revised plans in their packets and by agreement with the applicant, this was considered an informational presentation. Tim Parks, Planning Division spoke to the Commission about the revised plans. Staff is comfortable with the land use proposal, the height adjacent to Park Street while acknowledging there is disagreement within the neighborhood, including the demolition of the residences on the westerly part of the site. They continue to be concerned about the bulk and mass of the building as it has been presented since last fall. Those concerns have continued to be about the length along Drake Street, some of the architectural expression, and the way the building interacts with Drake Street. Staff noted the applicant's efforts to try to address some of their concerns, staff would characterize their concerns as more fundamental, and the project not jiving with the residential along Drake Street.

Continued discussion was as follows:

- Huggins inquired as to the Commission's ability to grant bonus stories and if this project could potentially include six stories along Park Street while cascading down into the neighborhood along Drake Street. Parks replied that this site could need a two building solution. Most of the depth is at the center of the block with the smallest portion being along Drake Street; how would a six-story building work, what would the transition from taller to less tall be?
 - Trachtenberg asked if they would have the chance to respond to these concerns. Huggins further stated that this is a major transportation corridor and as such it is the responsible thing for this Commission to approve as much density as possible. The community has transportation, mixed-use and pedestrian goals that won't be achieved without this density. The developer should take and understand that. She also recognizes the concerns of the neighborhood and staff of how this building translates to the neighborhood. Six stories on Park Street is appropriate; find a way to make the numbers work and deal with the concerns of the neighborhood as well as staff. Rummel inquired about building materials and if going above four-stories continues to require more than a wood frame; Parks replied yes but it's where the four-stories start. Four stories could be above two-stories of concrete construction but project costs have to be weighed.
- The Commission discussed the light spilling out onto the neighborhood from the stairwell/parking area.

- Rummel asked if the developer was willing to revisit the townhome ideas, as well as looking at splitting the building into two.
 - Trachtenberg responded that changing the building from 5 to 6 stories increases the cost. In terms of two buildings, the groundwater table does not allow the parking to go any lower, and if you have two distinct buildings without the connectedness of the parking you have problems with having adequate parking due to turning radii. They are willing to look at all of these ideas but remind the Commission of their constraints.
- Slayton asked what type of residents they are looking for.
 - Enzenroth answered most likely young professionals and students with market leases to avoid August leases.
- O’Kroley stated that there are architectural ways to successfully articulate this to look like a neighborhood of buildings regardless of if they are connected or not. Another issue in it being one building is that you are creating your own challenges along Drake Street by the elevation of the house as a half level, not being engaged with the street. Your choice of a floor level impacts the design, whether it’s one building or two buildings.
 - Davis responded that he thinks they have made changes that look like two buildings in the mass and how it is sited. Splitting the building would be very difficult with their parking configuration. Cutting a gap in the building adds density to the area but he doesn’t see that as a significant enough change.
- O’Kroley suggested articulation along the ground floor plane on Drake Street to break up the wall. She is having difficulty with a strong one-story read on the corner and the articulation of creating a place; is it going industrial or is it going very different?
 - Davis replied that they are going for the pedestrian scale and have medallions and articulation to help accomplish that.

She replied that you can achieve that pedestrian scale on a window-by-window or bay-by-bay basis, not in one long wall.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).

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 5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 502 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- Proposed changes are in good direction. More needs to be done with building’s mass, especially along Drake Street.
- Work on appearance of a two building solution.
- Thanks for continued efforts on this project.
- Six stories might be appropriate for a design of excellence; this is not it! Southwest and southeast perspective show a building not deserving of Park Street.