

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 5, 2012

TITLE: 448 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP),
Six-Story Mixed-Use Building Including
Retail and Residential in UDD No. 7. 13th
Ald. Dist. (27550)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 5, 2012

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 5, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joe Lee, representing JLA Architects; Joseph McCormick and Constantine Choles. Appearing in opposition was Stuart Eckes. Lee presented updates to the project addressing the residential entry by installing a canopy from the residential entry out towards Drake Street, along with some signage and planters to signify that entry and give it a presence on Drake Street. A landscape island at the entry also helps give more of a presence on Drake Street while giving contiguous retail space for the entire building. The fenestration has changed with the addition of windows. The programming of these units, as well as the zero lot line, does not allow for a lot of windows. The loft space has changed to a metal roof. Constantine Choles spoke in support of the project and the revitalization it will bring to the neighborhood. The Secretary noted the memo from Tim Parks of the Planning Division working out details of the rights-of-way. Signage was discussed and determined the Commission would not need to see the final signage package because the current plans show signage locations and it will meet the code. It was recommended that trees Amelanchers be swapped out for Columnar European Hornbeam. It was also suggested to look at the possibility to provide three compact stalls (which would reduce the depth) and use that extra space (3-feet) to provide a greenspace between the cars and the sidewalks which will also make it feel like more than an entry. The ADA ramps should be looked at also. Building materials were discussed; fiber cement panels were discouraged over metal panels.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for the use of smooth fiber cement panel with strong encouragement for the use of metal when possible, especially in the key spot as corner treatment with the use of aluminum frame awning or hopper/windows.

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, 6, 7 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 448 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	6	-	-	6	7	6
	7	8	7	7	-	6	8	7.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	5	6	5	-	-	5	6	5

General Comments:

- More trees out of planters into turf. Rethink tree species to more robust or upright forms.
- Very nice proposal. Appreciate stronger resolution of residential entry. Attractive design. Good infill.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 17, 2012

TITLE: 448 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP),
Urban Mixed-Use Development Including
Retail and Residential in UDD No. 7. 13th
Ald. Dist. (27550)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 17, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Henry Lufler, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

*Rummel was excused at 5:45 p.m. during consideration of this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 17, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee, representing JLA Architects; and Ald. Sue Ellingson, District 13. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Cynthia Williams. Staff noted concerns with the setback, the systematic window pattern, consideration for operable windows, a different roof form for the loft and the treatment of the corner element at Park Street. Lee presented contextual images of the site and surrounding context. The project is a mixed-use, 5-story building with loft. The building is tight along Park Street with a zero lot line condition. The first floor will house retail along Park and Drake Streets, with a ramp goes down to underground parking for 40 spaces. The residential entrance is towards the back of the site; the developer does not want the entrance on Park Street due to the retail aspect maximizing the ground floor space along Park Street. There will be ten units per floor with the fifth floor having loft space in each unit. The guidelines suggest that there be a 15-foot stepback along Park Street after the third floor; the applicant is proposing an 8-foot after the fourth floor, and 13-feet at the fifth floor. They feel it’s important to keep the building mass at Park Street where they have the right-of-way and a lot of vehicular traffic where the height is not as much of an impact. Masonry and either metal panels or fiber cement panels will be used, with a recessed orange fiber cement being used above the third floor. As you go around the building, the entire Park Street elevation is activated with windows, with some maybe becoming doors depending on the retail tenant. Prior to discussion by the Commission, staff noted that this item as posted on the agenda was for “Initial Approval;” where a public hearing notice had been mistakenly not provided as required by ordinance for properties in UDD No. 7. Therefore, this presentation could not be for a formal approval but for informational purposes only. Staff apologized for any inconvenience to the applicant, Ald. Ellingson and neighbors.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- The relative lack of windows on the alley is of concern. Look at more windows as possible under the building code; the elevation is of high visibility going down Park Street.
 - We are restricted in number of windows allowed. Some of those are closets and bathrooms.
- What's your change in plane between your change in materials?
 - The thickness of materials.

That's an awfully big gesture for no change in depth. As you're coming down Park Street you'll perceive it's just a façade treatment and not a change in massing.

- In a modern aesthetic that's a little more acceptable.

Need more depth.

- I'm not understanding the change in materials and I'm concerned about the blankness of the wall. Need to relieve blank wall façade with its high visibility.
- That notch seems interesting but it doesn't carry through as much as it could. It comes down further on the other side; it needs to go down more or up, beyond what is designed.
- I would look at putting canopy trees on the side that doesn't have utility wires. I would look at something other than Serviceberry.
- I like many things about this building but you haven't persuaded me that we shouldn't have a main residential entrance on Drake Street. I'm also concerned about the north elevation; that will be very visible.
 - For the retail the developer is courting users that may take up to that amount of contiguous square feet. Market-wise it's pretty important to have that. And it has to work with the lower level parking.

If you had a lobby from Drake Street back in to where the stairs are you would still have a very large retail space; still need a residential entry on Drake Street.

- Eliminate the column at the corner of Drake and Park Streets, it may be just the perspective but it looks very cramped in there. If it could be cantilevered so you don't need the column; it's real tight getting in there with little planters under the canopy and I don't know what's going to grow in there. Think about that some more.
- You're proposing outdoor seating on Drake Street. If you do that, understand that the little strip of turf grass is going to be a bunch of stones and weeds. I would put a decent hedge of ornamental grass between the curve and the seating area. I'd also like to see more soft space around those trees so you may not need as much seating.
- You have more than 12 stalls in the back so you're going to need a planting island. I'd like you to give up a stall or two and work out a proper entrance to the residences off that parking lot so they're not squeezing between stalls. Make it its own special little entrance. Give it the dignity that the rest of the building has.
- The planting to the west along the screening fence looks like an attempt to soften it. It's urban, make it bold.
- The use of asphaltic roof materials on the pitched roof on the sixth floor do not go with the warehouse scale of the building, the Commission and staff noted the need for a metal roof type. As to the form of the roof flat versus gabled, loft or no loft, it generally accepted that the gable roof form was OK with a metal roof.
- In terms of feedback relative to the provisions of UDD No. 7, the Commission felt that the setback, building height and form was acceptable as proposed.
- You have a chance for secondary subtle reads from one bay to the next. That might bring some richness and make each bay feel different in scale. If they opened in different ways it would bring more life to it.
- The 45° is a very weak entry.

- We did raise that up and made a more substantial column.
I like the idea of exposed steel; I don't know if that bracing is giving the same girth of what really that column would be holding. Look at how that could be stronger.
- If you end up with one retail tenant, I'm concerned about this whole entire Park Street having no activity, and with just one door. Even if it is one tenant, the bay areas that are set back, they should read differently.
 - It's designed for flexibility depending on what the tenant needs are.
I would show it that way versus without. Even if you end up with one tenant at least it looks like a more active façade. I would redevelop your landscape plan along Park Street to strengthen those nodes.

Cynthia Williams spoke in opposition to the project being more than four stories. She stated that the neighborhood has generally felt that this is an attractive building in many ways than the previous one; it's busier looking now where they prefer the elegance and simplicity of the first iteration. She asked that they take into account the combined impact of these two buildings in such close proximity. It's going to be an enormous change for the neighborhood.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke in support. The density is appropriate for the area and for Park Street. It does need some windows on the north side.

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 6, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 448 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	7	6	-	-	-	7	7
	6	8	6	7	-	8	10	8
	7	7	-	-	-	7	8	7
	6	7	6	-	-	-	6	6

General Comments:

- Rear of building as residential front door needs more thought. Make front door stronger if it stays in parking lot. Like industrial design approach. Relook north façade – viewshed from Park Street.
- With UDC suggestions, especially entrance on Drake Street, could be an 8.
- More windows on north. Very nice project.
- Drake entry?

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 5, 2012

TITLE: 448 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP)
Urban Mixed-Use Development Including
Retail and Residential in UDD No. 7. 13th
Ald. Dist. (27550)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 5, 2012

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 5, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Duane Steinhauer, Joseph Lee, representing JLA Architects; and Sue Ellingson, District 13 Alder. Registered and speaking in opposition was Amy Moran. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Helen Kitchel, Steve Hoffenberg and Sue Hoffenberg. Plans were presented for a mixed-use 5-story building with retail on the ground floor and 40-units of residential above. Parking would be below ground with some parking along the back of the building off of Park Street for the retail uses. They have been watching the progression of The Ideal building and their intent is to not impede on the neighborhood to the west, keeping the entire mass of the building on Park Street. Architecturally the building is contemporary/modern/industrial in aesthetic. The corner of Park and Drake Streets is the major architectural element of the building with the rest of the site in simple massing and forms. After four stories the building steps back 6-feet with a potential of stepping back even more if they shift everything over, which brings the mass closer to the residences. This keeps the building as close to Park Street as possible. Planning Division issues raised include the fact that this development (versus The Ideal) does not encroach into the neighborhood beyond the original commercial core; this maintains the existing commercial core while benefitting from the backside setback that acts as a physical buffer. Staff noted that issues in regards to the design guidelines range from the setback rationale (beyond the programming), what are the obstacles and what does it do to the design? The corner element could be stronger, and the post at the corner needs to be strong enough to carry that load. The strong masonry building is appreciated, but should there be more of a difference with the brick or should they be the same? A strong masonry form like this should have lintels and sills somewhere. A stronger address of the criteria is needed relative to the required stepback. Playing with the stepbacks would give stronger balcony elements. Lee responded that they would be willing to shift the whole mass but it’s counterintuitive to what they were wanting to do (moving closer to the existing residential). A number of the details need some looking at, in addition to the corner element. They respectfully disagree with the lintels and sills suggestion; a steel lintel with brick on a building like this is great, a precast sill could work.

Amy Moran spoke in opposition. She mentioned the petition of 200 signatures for The Ideal project, which also applies to this project in terms of the 5-stories on Park Street. The scale is so large and out of proportion to what the neighborhood is used to. The neighborhood prefers smaller scale businesses/retail with small commercial strips. The big concern is the replacement of an attainable level of height for the commercial strip with very large faces on the building so that the residences are now facing a different streetscape. The neighborhood in general sees the taller buildings as serving a public purpose (St. Mary's, the new health clinic) while these apartment buildings benefit the developers.

Duane Steinhauer spoke in support, asking if the City allows buildings to come out over the sidewalk for the use of arcades. If they could set the building back another 5-feet that could work, depending on how the building addresses the street.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke in support of the project. She thinks 5-stories is called for in this location and this is a very nice building. The stepback overall is a bad idea and they should do away with that requirement. This is nice to keep it tight to Park Street, out of the neighborhood, a great design and investment. Staff noted that the stepback is a provision of the UDD ordinance that requires address.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- I'm very concerned with having the entryway to the residential area in the rear. This is a really beautiful building that deserves a front entrance; need a strong entry at streetside, a grand front entry (on Park or Drake Streets). I agree with staff comments in terms of the corner element but overall it's a very good project.
- Strengthen corner entry, make it not necessarily a symmetrical entry.
- The two-story reads are nice that are kind of reminiscent of Movin' Shoes. It makes the whole neighborhood fit together. The canopy being continuous along all of Park Street may be adding too strong of a one-story read from a distance; needs variation and undulate setback of façade at the street.
- This has a nice warehouse aesthetic.
- Need to look at signage as it relates to the building's architecture.
- Look at solar impacts on neighboring properties.
- Need to make a strong case relative to stepback issues.
- Look at repeating upper roof corner treatment at the north end.
- Look at different roof form on loft.
- Provide details on alley parking in relation to neighboring properties.

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 rating for this project is 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 448 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- Suggest a simple, elegant iconic building as a counterpoint to The Ideal.
- Love this building, right for Park Street.
- Put the door on Drake Street. Make case for no stepback. Very attractive building, good start.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ellingson, Susan

Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 10:04 AM

To: Martin, Al

Subject: Lane's

Hi Al--

Unfortunately, I can't attend UDC tonight.

I support the Lane's proposal. I have expressed this to the Commission before. My position has not changed. I hope it will be approved.

Thanks.

Sue

.....
Sue Ellingson
district13@cityofmadison.com
sue@sueellingson.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Golden [<mailto:kengofpluto@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 4:04 PM

To: Martin, Al

Cc: Ellingson, Susan

Subject: Lanes Project

I offer comments as a former alder and plan commissioner and as a current member of the transit Parking commission, REgional Plan commission and the Transportation Planning board. I speak only for myself and am not being paid to represent anyone in this matter.

My first impressions of the proposed project for the lane's bakery site on park St. are quite positive. I believe that both Park St. and East Wash need to become radial arms that serve to extend the downtown. they should therefore be built higher and at a higher density than new buildings on streets like Willie or Monroe. the latter streets may have some larger buildings but should maintain the intimate feel of a neighborhood serving retail district. These streets seem to be such retail districts supporting what should be a denser neighborhood in both cases. The proposed Lane's building needs to reflect a higher level of land use. It seems consistent with St. Mary's in mass and appearance and is, in my opinion appropriate for this steet.

I am not going to comment on other details of the building. Whether the building should have more visual variability due to additional setbacks, or step-backs or might benefit from more varied colors or materials are issues that could be raised and dealt with differently. I do not have enough information to make specific suggestions on these subjects or even criticize the proposal. On the issue of height, bulk and density, the proposal seems to be me to be modest for a street that should support both employment and retail uses.

Finally, Park St. has always been one of my personal candidates for high or higher capacity transit. The current BRT study is giving it serious consideration as a corridor for this kind of transit. This kind of density and development is both suportive of this transit and would be supported by it. If we want to reduce the rate of growth of our carbon footprint and our city's footprint, we need to make decisions like building higher and bigger. To do otherwise is to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the values I believe this community holds dear.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments. I can be reached at this e-mail or at 608.238-4370.

From: Doug Carlson [<mailto:dcarlson5dc@aim.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2012 5:42 AM
To: Martin, Al
Cc: Ellingson, Susan
Subject: Support for Lane's Proposal

Dear Mr. Martin:

I would like to express my support for the proposed development on Park Street at the Lane's Bakery location. I believe that the proposed project has several beneficial attributes, including:

- The scale and scope of the proposed building are consistent with the Park Street Plan
- The height will be less than the nearby Meriter and St. Mary's buildings
- The design is aesthetically pleasing and will help "shield" the neighborhood from traffic noise on Park Street
- It will add urban infill and residential density, creating a more vibrant neighborhood and potential customers for local businesses
- It will add retail/office space for existing or new businesses in the Park Street gateway corridor

For these reasons, I support the proposed project in its current form or with minor modifications.

Regards,
-Doug Carlson
1018 Oakland Ave.

From: Kate and Todd [<mailto:kateandtodd@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 9:12 AM

To: Martin, Al

Cc: Cynthia Williams; Moran Amy; stuart eckes; Zaccai Lewis; Sue Ellingson

Subject: Letter of opposition regarding Ideal Proposal and Lane's Bakery Proposal

To the Urban Design Commission:

I have been a resident of Greenbush Neighborhood for over a decade, and

have been actively participating and following the grueling process of

the Ideal Body Proposal for the past year. I have had ample time to

reflect on many aspects and to wonder what impact this will have on our

neighborhood and it's character. I joined the committee designated

by the Greenbush Neighborhood Council to make a determination on this

issue on behalf of the neighborhood. The committee's final decision

is that five stories is simply too high in accordance with the Greenbush

Neighborhood Plan, the Park Street Revitalization Plan, and the

governing ordinance for the Urban Design District 7, which all call for

no more than three or four stories in this development area. **The only**

request the committee has made repeatedly is to make this development four stories or

less. In spite of this request, Joe Gallina returns to each meeting

with yet a different version of five stories, as he will at tonight's

meeting at 4:30 p.m. which I am unable to attend due to another commitment at Hamilton Middle School. Joe

Gallina, insists that this proposal just "isn't economically

viable" if he doesn't build the development in this way with the

60+ units. I find it puzzling that the recent developments on Monroe

Street have many fewer units, and somehow they have made it

"economically viable".

Another aspect of this process that I am confused about is that our

Alder, Sue Ellingson, to my knowledge, has not taken a stance on this

issue, in spite of the special committee and the entire Greenbush

Neighborhood Council's support for four or less stories. By not taking a stance, isn't she essentially supporting the developer by not standing up for her constituency?

Upon reflection about this development, another concern I have is that in combination with the proposed Lane's Bakery development (another 50+ units?), we will see the sucking of the student population out of Greenbush, Vilas, and Baycreek neighborhoods into these units. There are already issues with problem tenants, and the potential is to further exacerbate problems with absentee landlords, and deteriorating properties. This will affect the entire neighborhood's quality of life.

I conclude by reiterating that I *fully support* infill development, but it needs to be *quality* development, ***one that supports what our neighborhood wants***, and what three design guidelines have indicated is reasonable. So I end by asking; Is Greenbush Neighborhood for Sale? Will Alder Sue Ellingson stand up for Greenbush Neighborhood?

Respectfully submitted,

Kate MacCrimmon

-----Original Message-----

From: John Perkins [<mailto:perkinsj71@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 2:58 PM

To: Martin, Al; Ellingson, Susan

Subject: Comments regarding S. Park St. development proposals

Some comments I have regarding the new development proposals for the corner of S. Park and Drake Streets:

Ideal Body Shop property:

Although the developers have reworked this design (several times now), the 5-story extension to the west strikes me as the most objectionable aspect of this design. I'd much rather see the western edge of the 5-story section of building be moved another 20' east and make the building a flat 5 stories tall abutting Park St. if the 5 story section can't be brought down to 4 floors.

Although the 3-story section to the west is taller than most of the buildings around it, I like the desk insets and varied roofline around the outer edge, and I think some green space on the west side of the building is a good thing, to maintain a sort of buffer zone (albeit *small* buffer) to the homes along Drake and S. Brooks. Likewise, the small courtyard along Drake St. (where roofline drops) does help to visually break up the building's presence along Drake St., which I think is a good thing.

There is an incline along Drake St. heading west from Park St., which I do not think is accurately depicted in the renderings I've seen so far. I think it would be good for the architects to verify this detail in their renderings, so we all have a better picture of the end result, and if there are going to be any significant changes in heights of the building during the construction process.

Lane's Bakery property:

The current design strikes me as massive for the size of lot it is to be built on. The relatively flat 5 story exposure on all sides with more glass than other buildings along Park St. stick out to me in a negative way. I might be willing accept it if there were set-backs higher up on the east or west side (west side would help lessen its presence to neighboring homes, east side would improve the fascade along Park St.

The developer was asked about his expected use of the alley to the north of this development. The developer told us traffic in and out of the underground parking would not use the alley, yet the entrance/exit to said parking is on the north side of the building (into the alley).

This makes me question how well the developer has thought out the current designs.

Both developments:

The type of development proposed sounds like it will bring in a number of living arrangements that would end up in 2-car households while the landlord would only be willing to provide space for one car per unit.

This parking situation strikes me as unacceptable in an area where on-street parking is already at a premium when alternate-side parking rules are in effect.

The developer for the Lane's Bakery site told the neighborhood most units would only have one car each because he is aiming for a "young professional" crowd and not a "student" clientele. A recent interview with the Isthmus newspaper has the developer quoted as including students in his expected target market.

If both developers are going to get 1-car households as they try to suggest to the neighborhood they will, they should have no objection to being exempted from applying for residential parking permit applications. Although these permits do not apply during the overnight hours, the fact that the permits are not available at all would assist in reducing the number of cars owned by residents in the units.

Unfortunately, current criteria within planning and development do not automatically flag these developments as needing such parking permit exemptions.

John Perkins
1153 Emerald St.

From: Chris Benish [mailto:benish@uwalumni.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 2:07 PM
To: Martin, Al; Ellingson, Susan
Subject: Re: [Bay Creek] My thoughts on Ideal and 5 stories on Park

Sue,

I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of this proposal. I lived in Vilas for 3 years as a student, lived other places in between and am now going on my 7th year in the Bay Creek neighborhood. Our family is looking to move and we anticipate ending up somewhere in the Franklin/Randall elementary zone. So, we are very interested in this neighborhood and its future. I won't be able to attend the meeting tonight, but I am supportive of the Ideal and the Lane proposals. I think they will add nicely to the density of these neighborhoods and are in-line with other developments we are seeing along the Park St. corridor. We can all agree that Park Street is on the cusp of truly being revitalized. I think that the early movers should be given some leeway in bringing projects that will hopefully spark future projects in the area. I don't think either proposal is unreasonable in scope/scale and I hope you support both.

Sincerely,
Chris Benish
921 O'Sheridan St.

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Swimm [mailto:plswimm@facstaff.wisc.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 3:00 PM

To: Sue Ellingson

Cc: Martin, Al

Subject: Re: [greenbushneighborhood] My thoughts on Ideal and 5 stories on Park

Hi Sue,

Thank you for letting us know your thoughts on the Ideal proposal and the issue of how many stories is appropriate on Park St. We are out of town but wish to let you know our thoughts on these subjects.

Yes, we share a vision for Park St. of building a place that people come to and not just drive to. And yes, we agree that increasing density and motivating landlords/owners to fix up rundown and vacant buildings will add to the vitality of our neighborhood. But for us, building more buildings that are 5 stories and over will make the area far less appealing for pedestrians than if buildings are kept to 4 stories and under. 5 stories on Park Street do not respect the character and vitality of the single and 2 & 3 unit housing in the neighborhood that is directly west of it. You use Monroe St as an example, and we agree it is a good example. But we feel that if developments on the east side of Monroe would have been allowed to all go as high as Monroe St Commons, Monroe street AND the abutting neighborhoods would have lost a lot of appeal as pedestrian friendly areas. And quite frankly, it's rare that I choose to walk on the Monroe Commons side of Monroe St because of the looming nature of the building, compared to the more pedestrian friendly nature of the east side of the street (ie lower buildings).

We also wonder why, and are a bit frustrated by the fact that so many developers feel they should propose buildings that are taller than city planning documents recommend for various neighborhoods. Many people have spent a lot of time and thought coming up with these documents so that Madison neighborhoods could remain and develop as places where people want to live. It seems quite disrespectful when developers want to continually override these planning documents.

Thank you for listening. We appreciate the fact that you seem to listen to all sides. And also that you keep the neighborhood informed of what is going on.

Laurie and Lee Swimm

----- Original Message -----

From: Leslie Fields & Jeff Lindholm

To: Sue Ellingson;greenbushneighborhood

Sent: 9/5/2012 4:09:23 PM

Subject: RE: [greenbushneighborhood] My thoughts on Ideal and 5 stories on Park

Hi Alder Sue,

Thank you for your thoughtful comments.

Here is why I think five stories are more "offensive" than four:

As a neighbor I desire a vibrant Park Street commercial district, and as I business owner (although not on Park Street) I appreciate the need for investors and owners to realize a reasonable profit.

However, there are residents with two story frame homes that immediately abut the proposed development site or are located close enough to be significantly impacted by increased height. The need to minimize impacts on these property owners was largely the impetus for the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan and the Park Street Plan planks that call for building heights of four or fewer stories. Not only will these homeowners face immediate negative impacts - - foundation cracks during construction, reduced sunlight, and the feeling of being overwhelmed by a looming large building -- but they will also suffer economically because these impacts will make their homes less attractive to future buyers.

The two hospitals do not have residential neighbors immediately adjacent to their tall buildings. With respect to St. Marys, the neighborhood worked very hard to ensure that increased height was limited to the Park Street side of this expansion, with as little additional height as possible where the development meets the residential part of the neighborhood.

Neighbors have pointed to recent development on Monroe Street where four or fewer stories appears to be economically viable and provide an attractive return to investors. Monroe Street is a model specifically because the street's commercial development backs up to older residential neighborhoods, both on the east and west ends.

The issue for me is how the proposed Park Street developments transition into the adjacent residential neighborhood. Five stories (or higher) may be possible along Park Street where there is no adjacent residential neighborhood. Where commercial parcels are immediately next to homes, the development needs to step down to meet the scale of the homes, and the developers need to minimize or mitigate adverse impacts on these homes in areas like lighting, traffic flow, parking, etc. Developers should also be liable for damage to homes that occurs during construction. The owners of a nearby commercial property would certainly expect such accountability and might have the financial resources to force accountability if necessary. Homeowners are much less able to do so.

Thanks for considering my viewpoint.

Leslie Fields
Erin Street