

**CITY OF MADISON  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL  
CORRESPONDENCE**

**Date:**

**To:** Plan Commission  
**From:** Jenny Kirchgatter, Assistant Zoning Administrator  
**Subject:** 510 University Avenue and 435 West Gilman Street

---

**Present Zoning District:** UMX (Urban Mixed Use)

**Proposed Use:** Demolish an existing mixed-use building to construct a new mixed-use building with 8,740 sq. ft. of commercial space and 367 apartments.

**Conditional Use:** Section 28.076(4)(c) All new buildings and additions greater than 20,000 sq. ft. or that have more than 4 stories shall obtain conditional use approval.

**Plan Commission Review:** Section 28.185 Demolition of a principal building requires Plan Commission approval.

**MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS** (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project): None.

**GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

1. Sec. 28.185 (7)(a)5. requires that if a demolition or removal permit is approved, it shall not be issued until the reuse and recycling plan is approved by the Recycling Coordinator, Mr. George Dreckmann. (608-267-2626).
2. Sec. 28.185 (10) Every person who is required to submit a reuse and recycling plan pursuant to Sec. 28.185(7) (a) 5. shall submit documents showing compliance with the plan within sixty (60) days of completion of demolition.
3. Section 28.185 (9)(a) A demolition or removal permit is valid for one (1) year from the date of the Plan Commission approval.
4. With the final plans, submit a fully dimensioned site plan showing the building distance from the property lines. Clearly identify canopy and building projections and their relationship to property lines.
5. Provide an exhibit and detailed calculation of the lot coverage as defined in section 28.211. The maximum lot coverage is 90%. Note that lot coverage is the total area of all buildings, measured at grade and all paved areas as a percentage of the total area of the

lot, with the exceptions of sidewalks or paved paths no wider than five (5) feet, pervious pavement, green roofs and decks.

6. Provide an exhibit and detailed calculation of the Useable Open Space with the final plans per section 28.140. Usable open space may take the form of at-grade open space, porches, balconies, roof decks, green roofs or other above-ground amenities.
7. Per Sec. 28.141(11), required bicycle parking shall comply with short and long-term bike parking requirements for both residential and non-residential uses, to be clearly identified and dimensioned on the final plan sets. Up to 25% of bike parking may be structured parking, vertical parking or wall mount parking, provided there is a 5 foot access aisle for wall mount parking. Provide a detail of the proposed bike facilities, including non-structured and structured or wall mounted bike racks and bike storage lockers.
8. Provide a rooftop plan with the final plan submittal. Per section 28.071(3)(h), all rooftop equipment shall be screened from view from adjacent streets and public rights-of-way within an enclosure. The enclosure shall be set back a distance of one and one-half (1 ½) times its height from any primary façade fronting a public street.
9. Provide the overall height of the building and mechanical equipment relative to the Capitol View Height limitation. The overall height of the building, including all mechanical equipment projections, shall not exceed the Capitol View Preservation limitation, 187.2' City Datum, per section 28.134(3).
10. If outdoor lighting is provided, it must comply with City of Madison General Ordinances Section 10.085 outdoor lighting standards. Final plan sets shall include a lighting plan and lighting fixture cut-sheets.
11. Signage approvals are not granted by the Plan Commission. Signage must be reviewed for compliance with Chapter 31 Sign Codes of the Madison General Ordinances prior to sign installations.

### **UMX ZONING CRITERIA**

<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Required</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Lot Area (sq. ft.)	3,000 sq. ft.	42,196.4 sq. ft.
Lot Width	30'	Adequate
Front Yard Setback	0: Nonresidential or mixed-use buildings	Adequate
Max. Front Yard Setback	10' See (a) below	Adequate
Side Yard Setback	0	0
Rear Yard Setback	10' See (b) below	Adequate
Usable Open Space	10 sq. ft. per bedroom. See (c) below. (7,680 sq. ft.)	Information not provided (6)
Maximum Lot Coverage	90% (37,976.76 sq. ft.)	Information not provided (5)

Minimum Building Height	2 stories	
Maximum Building Height	12 stories per Downtown Height Map	12 stories (9)
Stepback	15' stepback above 4 stories-adjacent University Ave and Gorham St 15' stepback above 4 stories-adjacent Gilman St	Adequate stepback is provided

- a) Specific front yard setbacks may be designated on the zoning map and may be designated as a specific location (build to line), a minimum, or a range.
- b) Underground parking may extend into the rear yard setback if located completely below grade.
- c) Usable open space may take the form of at-grade open space, porches, balconies, roof decks, green roofs or other above-ground amenities.

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number Parking Stalls	No minimum	152 automobile spaces within building 66 moped spaces within building
Accessible Stalls	Yes	Yes
Loading	Yes	Yes
Number Bike Parking Stalls	1 per unit up to 2-bedrooms (367) ½ space per add'l bedroom (100) 1 guest space per 10 units (37) General retail 1 per 2,000 sq. ft. floor area (4) (508 total)	408 structured and non-structured stalls within the building. (7)
Landscaping	Yes	Yes
Lighting	Yes	No (10)
Building Forms	Yes	Yes

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes, Downtown Urban Mixed Use district
Barrier Free (ILHR 69)	Yes
Utility Easements	Yes

## Firchow, Kevin

**From:** Martin, Alan  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2015 1:47 PM  
**To:** Firchow, Kevin; Cleveland, Julie  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on The Hub

**From:** Si Widstrand [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2015 12:18 PM

To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]; Zellers, Leckel; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED];

[REDACTED]

**Cc:** Verveer, Michael; Cornwell, Katherine; Martin, Alan

**Subject:** Comments on The Hub

To Members of the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission

Dear Commissioners:

I'd like to comment on one aspect of "The Hub" design - its appearance from Gorham Street. I cannot attend the Plan Commission tonight, so here are my concerns.

I am opposed to the protrusions from the east half of the south facade. A continuation of the west balcony would be much better.

I've been watching this area for 47 years, first as a nearby resident then continuing as a frequent driver and cyclist through the area. I think the Gorham Street approach here is one of the iconic gateways in Madison, and I like to bring my visitors through here. This is the East Gateway to UW. It is also the view that most Madison residents and UW visitors will see of The Hub.

Approaching from State Street, you can see the campus high rise housing. As a Madisonian, I'm proud of these developments that prevent student housing from eating into all the Downtown neighborhoods.

As you enter the corner toward University Avenue you now start to see the procession of UW buildings, which have been well developed over the past 40 years. This view will become obstructed by the proposed building until you actually round the curve.

I regret that the full view across the curve will be lost, but I support high density at this location. Because it is located at the apex of the curve, I believe that the proposed building will seem much more massive than those to the south on the circumference.

I am opposed to the 2-4 story building protrusions, which I understand were added to break up the massive south elevation. To me, they give it the appearance of a commercial building, while the west balcony reflects residential use. As viewed approaching from Gorham, the protrusion extends beyond this facade and the adjacent facade, giving the impression that the high density has bulged into the street space.

Due to the one way traffic on Gorham and Bassett, and the tall buildings to the south, there is little opportunity for anyone to view the full facade. Most of the pedestrian views will be from within 200' of the building, and

they will usually not be looking up at the facade. Most of the viewers will be Gorham Street travelers. I appreciate all the work you're doing on the Gilman facade, but the appearance to Gorham travelers should not be neglected.

I would prefer to have the west balcony extended across the entire front of the building to relate better to people at street level. Landscaping on the balcony adds to the street level experience. The balcony should also be accessible from the amenity areas, and from the adjoining apartments, as a place where people can sit in the sun.

The corner protrusions at the top also seem to emphasize the looming mass of the building compared to the buildings to the south and east.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint on this.

-Simon Widstrand, [REDACTED] Branford Lane East, Madison [REDACTED]

cc: Alder Mike Verveer  
Katherine Cornwell, Planning Director  
Alan Martin, UDC staff

**ADVISORY STATEMENT**  
**CAPITOL NEIGHBORHOODS, INC. / HUB 2 STEERING COMMITTEE**  
**Review of Hub^2 Development Proposal**  
**Submitted to the Plan Commission on June 5, 2015**

The Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. (CNI) Steering Committee appreciates the opportunity to provide the following advisory statement on the Hub^2 Development Proposal to the Plan Commission. Overall, we appreciate the project team of Core Campus, Vandewalle & Associates and the Mullins Group for approaching the neighborhood early in the approval process and for proposing a project that generally is consistent with the Zoning Code and the Downtown Plan.

This project falls within the State-Langdon Neighborhood. As it has in the past, CNI stepped in to facilitate the neighborhood development process as the State-Langdon Neighborhood does not have an active presence. The Hub^2 project team approached CNI and held two neighborhood-wide meetings in collaboration with Alder Verveer and met with the steering committee twice as the proposal evolved.

Overall, the proposal has been well-received. While this proposal would add another very large building in an already-densely built-up area, it is within zoning and Downtown Plan limitations.

The architecture received mixed reviews from the committee. While some appreciated the dark colors and contrast from neighboring buildings, others were concerned with the top floor extensions and looming nature along the Gorham and University face. On the Gilman side, the committee respects the preservation of the Smart Motors facade.

This is a difficult site for incorporating parking connections with the street grid. But the committee feels that the ingress point on Gorham is the best solution of all those considered. We are glad to see that no more traffic will be put onto Gilman St., as the impact of the original Hub is yet to be seen. There are some concerns at how large moving trucks will be able to navigate the internal parking structure. Even with staggered moving dates, more than a couple trucks at once may create a problem and parking along Gorham / University will be impossible. However the Hub^2 project team has assured us of their management capabilities.

The proposal contains a good amount of bike parking, however we did not feel that there was sufficient outdoor bike parking for visitors and patrons of the commercial spaces. While we would prefer that the project team find space on site for this, we recognize that some parts of the downtown successfully include bike parking in the terrace area.

Although there are concerns about the rapid increase of density in this part of the downtown, we cautiously welcome it as it adheres to the vision of the Downtown Plan.

Since the last meeting with the steering committee, the project team has continued to work on the Gilman facade with the city. We are satisfied that their combined efforts will be satisfactory. Accordingly, the steering committee is generally pleased with the development proposal and appreciates the effort of the project team to present a good project design and to work with the neighborhood throughout the process.

Respectfully submitted,

CNI / Hub 2 Steering Committee:   Davy Mayer, Chair  
  Adam Brabender  
  Peggy LeMahieu  
  Pete Ostlind  
  Larry Warman