

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: September 22, 2010 |
| TITLE: 677 South Segoe Road – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Mixed-Use Building with 77 Apartments and Approximately 4,300 Square Feet of Commercial Space. 20 th Ald. Dist. (19952) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: September 22, 2010 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 22, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 677 South Segoe Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build. Speaking in opposition was Denise Lamb, representing Midvale Heights Community Association. Bieno presented plans for an underutilized site containing a 1960s era single-story office building with some underground loading dock/maintenance areas. The exterior structure is just not able to be an adaptive reuse of the site at this prominent location. The project includes a mixed-use development with about 4,300 commercial space, and 77 apartment units (mix of efficiencies, one and two-bedrooms). The neighborhood has asked for a 3-story structure but would be willing to look at a 4-story structure. Bieno noted that they are proposing a 4-story structure based on the Comprehensive Plan. They are looking at this site to step down the zoning, proposing to put the residential as a step down with the commercial on the busier Odana Road side, putting the parking off of Odana so street access on Segoe is more of the residential access. Pedestrian links have been added along the western border, as well as a community access link off the intersection, creating energy at the intersection with a nice sweeping staircase to the entry for the facility as well as a community room at that intersection. Commercial access will be off of the parking lot, as well as off the same entry at the corner. The architecture is a mix of materials to be sympathetic with the neighborhood, using softer materials with splashes of color. Their engineer is working on the grading, and a landscape architect has been hired to begin working on those aspects. The site currently naturally drains to a certain location; there will be either in-ground stormwater or infiltration in between with tiers within the surface parking areas. Because this is informational they don’t have the stormwater needs completely mapped out.

Registrant Denise Lamb spoke in opposition as President of the Midvale Heights Community Association. While the neighborhood is open to development in this area, they feel this is not the best version. She expressed the neighborhood’s disappointment with a lack of a public meeting. She stated that when the Comprehensive Plan and a neighborhood plan disagree, the neighborhood plan takes precedence, and this development is calling for far more units per acre than are mentioned in either the Comprehensive Plan or the neighborhood plan. She stated they have repeatedly asked the developer to reduce the project from 4-stories to 3-stories; she disagrees with the developer’s statement that the neighborhood is OK with 4-stories. She stated that unless the

developers speak directly with those neighbors most affected by this proposed development, it is unlikely the board will approve a project here. Secondly, they expect them to abide with anything in the neighborhood plan, since that takes precedent over the Comprehensive Plan, which would require 3-stories and a maximum of 16 units per acre.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I agree that this location is underutilized.
- You could move the commercial space to the corner making your accessible route available right from the corner.
- Putting the commercial space on the backside makes it more of a suburban approach. It doesn't encourage pedestrian activity.
- I feel more comfortable waiting until the neighborhood has an opportunity to meet with you.
 - There was a notice sent out to the neighborhood and we heard from neighbors directly across the street and adjacent to this site.
- Can you tell us how the notification went out?
 - We notified the Chair, she sent out an email maybe.
 - The Chair stated she did not remember, they do not have a listserv, she doesn't know how long the lead time was.
 - Staff noted that typically notifications go through the Alderperson, or the responsibility is on the developer to notify all affected parties within a certain number of feet.
- The Comprehensive Plan has a statutory weight; neighborhood plans are advisory within that context.
- Is the commercial space something that is viable in this neighborhood?
- Please talk about why the parking lot layout is the way it is.
 - Bieno noted that the long-term plan for Segoe is to "T" into Odana. A second exit for people who live in this facility would be ideal when Odana is heavily used. Not wanting to have a straight shot to be used as a shortcut, my approach has been to create a serpentine approach so it naturally slows down traffic, meeting the requirements of the Fire Department. This pushes the building back to the intersection to allow access away from Segoe, away from a median cut for development across the street. We've balanced that by creating a buffer space between residential further to the east.
- Please talk about the elevation of the first floor relative to Segoe Road.
 - Bieno noted that Segoe Road falls off about 8-feet, 11-feet in other locations. Going into the hill 2-3 feet will push us out 6-feet. There will be access at grade entry for the apartments. Exterior patio areas for all apartments on that side will have small retaining walls, 12" or so.
- Please discuss why the elevators are on one extreme end of the building.
 - We felt this was the main traffic pattern that will be coming through the site. Instead of having one here and one here, we've widened out the corridor and put both elevators at this location.
 - Have you looked at possibly locating those on the northeast side of that "T" that you just described? Just a suggestion. It would be close to what you're currently describing, but I think on a daily basis for residents they would enjoy that more.
 - What we're looking to do, the commercial space floor-to-floor is different than the residential. We have to deal with the underground parking and the slope to get to that; putting it here allows more underground parking, easy access.
- Strongly urge you to meet with the Alderperson and formally with the neighborhood association.
- I think 4-stories at this location is appropriate.
- It would be nice to have some sort of urban statement at this location.
- Maybe look at having only underground access off of Segoe.

- The main access off the corner, look to see if you can perch a commercial space at the first floor level, other commercial spaces with lower ceiling areas.
- Look at accessing parking from somewhere other than the extreme end. That might help your grading.
- Who are you marketing this for?
 - Bieno noted that market-rate apartments. A large portion of these units are being used by professional people who work on the west side or just out of town and don't want to live in Verona. There's opportunities for the elderly, professional/technical people, students/non-professionals.
- Look at winter conditions in the parking lot. Maybe that means you should look at other ways to get in and out.
- This is a transitional parcel on the edge of residential and commercial. Looking at the different heights could be something interesting.
- Look at taking some of the mass from the top and putting it on the commercial on the corner. It might help resolve the corner and give you some more corner/end units that would be more desirable.
- Consider breaking the building into two.
- Relocate commercial to corner to allow for direct accessibility and connectivity to the street and put entry directly on the corner.
- Look at relocating elevator on northeast side at the center of the building.
- Look at commercial space's massing on Odana Road, need to be more urban.

ACTION:

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

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 4, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 677 South Segoe Road

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 6 | 5 | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| | 5 | - | - | - | - | 5 | 7 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Much mass with little break for neighborhood context.
- Very important to have site, grading and final floor issues all resolved.
- Good infill location. Important corner to design – consider breaking up massing – either by stepping down or two connected buildings.
- Continue to use topography to reduce scale of parking and benefit commercial space.
- Better linkage of commercial to corner; step massing to respond to topography; softer materials were mentioned in presentation, where are they?
- Grading of parking and drive is the challenge.