

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: November 9, 2016

TITLE: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street – Three Buildings of 3-5 Stories Containing Residential with First Floor Commercial and a Landscaped Courtyard in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (43556)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: November 9, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Sheri Carter, Lois Braun-Oddo, Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, and Michael Rosenblum.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 9, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of three 3-5 story buildings containing residential with first floor commercial and a landscaped courtyard located at 1004 and 1032 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Steve Harms, representing the Tri-North Building; Jeff Davis and Emily Mader-Holvic, representing Angus-Young Associates; and John Hepner, representing T. Wall Enterprises.

Harms began the presentation by giving some history about the project. Tri-North was involved in the bidding process in the previous design project. Most of the bidding came in over budget, so they were asked to make it work within the necessary budget. What they are presenting tonight is the result of that process/request. While they understand what the City’s vision and build plan in the area is for, they do not think the previous project (which was approved) would work. They are aiming to simplify the structure and make it more cost-effective & less complicated. They looked at the grades, traffic, and what the goals of the project were. Their goal now is to allow enough room for street access to units, allow for some commercial space, have more landscaping, etc. They contacted Traffic Engineering for a review of the plan, and TE provided some constructive criticism.

Jeff Davis addressed the Commission’s concerns from the previous informational presentation.

- They discussed the trash pickup location and the garage entry location with Traffic Engineering (Eric Halvorson).
- Parking ramp, bike/pedestrian traffic, etc. potential for congestion: they have created a separate door with a 4’ wide bike lane next to the drive. In the lower level, they will provide convex mirrors and a half-height wall to increase visibility.
- Parking ramp: they widened the entry by 6’ to allow room for a proper turning radius. The mirrors mentioned previously will help visibility.
- Landscaping around perimeter of building: they have created little pockets of landscaping (planters) at the walk-in entrances to the units. They have pushed back the live-work units and put patios (that will

contain chairs and planters) in front of them. They have also added landscaping beds along the entire Park Street & Fish Hatchery sides of the building.

- Lack of commercial space: main entry lobby is access to both residences and commercial on both sides (Park & Fish Hatchery). The leasing office would also be in the main lobby. The commercial space would be out on the prow. The ground level patios is also an effort to activate the street front (meetings could be held outside; people could eat their lunches out there).
- Bike parking: 225 underground bike parking stalls (1.4 stalls per unit). They also have the potential to do some decorative stalls in front of the live-work units and the prow.
- Tight sidewalks on Park Street: the landscaping and added patios are an attempt to buffer that.

Hepner met with the neighborhood association and Alder Eskrich. They were pleased to see a reduced building height and reduced commercial space. They also liked that the developer had removed access on Park Street and moved it into the drive between the site and the UW clinic. Overall, their major concern is the traffic. Davis added that the plaza that was on the second level is now on the first and is at grade, making it visible from the street.

Tim Parks of the Planning Department discussed staff's position on the project. Planning does not support the revisions to the development and is not supporting approval.

- A five story version of the project was approved in 2015 that aligned with recommendations. The new four story version does not measure up, nor is it consistent with plan recommendations for this site that date back to 2002.
- Adopted city plans since 2002 have called for higher density development for an iconic development of the intersection at Park and Fish Hatchery.
- What is being proposed now is a smaller project in both size and character. In this location, more – rather than less – height and development is desired. Even the five story building proposed in 2015 was smaller than the ideal. This one, again, is even smaller.
- Planning Department has concerns regarding the loss of commercial both in design and land use. In particular, Tim would submit that the 6,000 square feet proposed in 2015 were even a bit diminutive. The current proposal reduces that to less than a third of the original 6,000 square feet. This will not create a genuine opportunity for work spaces.
- Traffic Engineering has expressed significant concerns regarding access to the underground parking (sharp turns, grade, buffer, exposure to elements like ice, etc.). Their larger concern is that there is very little landing for the building. There is very marginal sidewalk (maybe 3 or 4 feet wide).

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What is the setback from the street to the prow?
  - 6 feet from the prow to the property line.
- Why was the commercial taken out?
  - Based on a study of many vacant commercial spaces in the area.
  - It is not very accessible for pedestrians.
  - Design change contributes as well. Commercial space had previously existed on top of the parking garage.
  - Residents of the surrounding neighborhood do not want a large amount of commercial space.
  - The St. Mary's complex has 6,000 square feet of vacant commercial.
  - Crossing Park Street is difficult.
- Applicant: they have only decreased the density by 3 units compared to 2015 design.

- The door on the corner has been eliminated, which hurt the pedestrian access.
- Request for what Phase 1 of development would look like on the site plan.
  - Phase 1 would be all the parking, the back piece on top of the parking deck.
- Entrance of the parking would be a temporary garage?
  - Yes.
- While some of the issues addressed during this presentation can be resolved (particularly the parking and the access), reduced scale of the building is not appropriate – should be larger and contain more commercial space. The live-work units are not accessible from the primary entrance. The accessible entrance is also inappropriately placed.
- If this project was rethought to limit units, based on the number of stalls they can create, perhaps the Commission could amend its expectations with regard to the various buildings.
- All of Phase 1 should be at least the 5 story height. Remaining buildings could conceivably be 3 or 4 stories.
- Parking may not be a big concern, given the location.
- Putting the doors off to the side kills the corner and there is no pedestrian amenity.
  - We can change the door.

You need to do more than change the door.

  - We can go back to what it looked like in the approved 2015 plan.
- Applicant has had two previous informational meetings. They attempted to comply with the requested changes (other than increasing commercial space).
- Applicant indicated neighborhood will not support a higher building.
  - Staff: plan for a taller building was approved in 2015 with neighborhood input. The applicant is effecting the change by requesting something that was smaller than what was approved in 2015.
- Clarification requested regarding which parts of the building are commercial space.
  - The prow is commercial, and the leasing office is in the lobby.
- Having outdoor space seems like a bad choice, given the amount of traffic.
  - It's like that in Chicago, and people get used to it and use the outdoor space.
    - Chicago is very different than Madison.
- Barriques does have a patio that is set back from the road.
- In order to simplify the structure, the entry grade must be the same throughout the first floor.
- Planters are nice, but are also barriers to opening up pedestrian activity.
- 164 tenants would definitely contribute to whatever commercial space might exist there (ex. sandwich/food).
  - Developers that have tried that approach and indicate that people eventually get tired of it. Additionally, one of the conditions from Plan Commission indicated that commercial space could not be food.
- Is there street parking near the site?
  - Not much, if any.
- First floor apartments on Park and Fish Hatchery do not contribute to the façade. Could that be converted to parking (which would allow you to add another floor)?
  - Adding another floor would be 24 additional units.

**ACTION:**

Based on discussion of the item, on a motion by O’Kroley, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0). The motion noted support for comments by staff and the Commission to be further addressed.