

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 21, 2011
TITLE: 2048-2100 Winnebago Street – PUD-GDP for a Four-Story, Mixed-Use Building. 6 th Ald. Dist. (24851)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 21, 2011	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Melissa Huggins and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 21, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-GDP located at 2048-2100 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dave Porterfield, Jim Glueck and Adam Chern, representing Accipiter Properties/Movin’ Out, Inc. Appearing in opposition to the project was Bruce Luecke.

Glueck began by presenting photographic context for the development site. He noted that they were looking for GDP approval. The idea is we have a site plan that is fairly solidified in terms of general concept; create a streetscape along Winnebago St. and fairly hard edge along Sutherland Court. which creates a potential for greenspace. We did stagger back portion of the building, moved whole building back. Don’t know who tenants are for commercial part with the three upper stories residential units. We may have some live/work units. There is a large parking demand with a surface lot providing for 85 stalls with approximately 60 spots under the building. There is a potential for a daycare tenant which might take away some surface parking for greenspace; potential for shifting and redesigning. Still need to know who tenants are and deal with open space for the daycare, but there is little to loose right now.

Glueck provided a review of a high tech vapor massing model which has been revised to better make it look more like a building. He noted that the fourth story would step in and out, in contrast to the building on the adjacent corner down which is fairly tall, just 2 stories.

Luecke noted his support for disabled housing and lives across the street. He stated that going to be looking at the Great Wall of China. Looks like a 3-story building. Building’s going to be tall, is set so closely to street, about 7 feet off the curb, unacceptable in this neighborhood. This is the only 4-story building on the entire street all the way over to Milwaukee Street. Compared it to other buildings that are 14-feet back. He felt that his prairie garden is going to be shaded in the afternoon by the structure. Adjacent to his home, each of the lots has a greenspace between the structures, something like that needs to be implemented here to fit neighborhood. There is nothing like the proposal on the street here, not appropriate. He stated that his property value is going to suffer. There were two meetings with the neighborhood, there was a meeting in between that the neighbors were not invited to, e.g. that is dishonest.

Porterfield noted the goal to provide housing for workforce/disability. We're really excited about having this on a mixed-use setting. He further noted their offices would move there too (Movin Out, Inc.) on site with social service and daycare center with meeting rooms, business equipment also proposed including technical assistance, grow business in Capital neighborhood. He felt that there is general support for the whole thing, definitely a lot of questions. Right now we're asking for the GDP.

- It was questioned that it looks like you're proposing 60-65 units? Do you have a sense of distribution of studios, one bedrooms, two bedrooms, etc.
 - Yeah, it will probably be 60-61 units, we'd probably have about 17 ones, 27 twos and 17 threes. Emphasis: live in home and have home offices. Business center with meeting rooms, business equipment. Technical assistance, grow business in Capital neighborhood. Going to make partnerships with groups such as Commonwealth and community based organizations who provides assistance for that sort of thing.

The Chair noted that there's a registration from Adam Chern with the Scheck-Atwood-Starkweather-Yahara Neighborhood Association (SASY) able to answer some questions. Questions for Mr. Chern?

- Can you give us a clarification on the neighborhood?
 - So there was a neighborhood meeting, the first one was a different plan presented as Bruce mentioned and then the SASY Neighborhood has a preservation and development committee and they asked to meet with the team and I thought when this was presented, it wasn't as if SASY came and said, "don't do this, do this instead," it was this was the latest iteration, they had revisited a two building solution for a one building and the SASY team which included Lou Host-Jablonski, who's the neighborhood chair, association chair and others, it's kind of one of those normal things you'd see in my neighborhood where the neighborhood association activists have pretty strong ideas about parking counts and neighbors who live across the street have different ideas about parking. Pretty much the neighbors wanted to make sure there was enough off-street parking to accommodate retail and the proposed new residential and the neighborhood association types are like, "no, no, no, push that back", so they're kind of caught between different legitimate concerns about how you do these things. At the meeting, there was overall support for the concept, but there were concerns and I think Bruce (Luecke) points out, he didn't really point out the grade change on his side of the street is such that all those houses are elevated, so you're pretty much looking into the top of this building, but if there was a way to break the mass or rearrange the mass so that the whole row of single family or small lots wouldn't look into this really long wall. We sort of asked if they'd look into a T-shape, U-shape – I think what's happening is there's a push because of the trying to get WHEDA tax credits, deadlines to try and get, something to them that the City has done. I do feel there, general support, but definitely concerns about too close to street. That the corner was too close to the street for sure, kind of did a little cut-out, I personally thought maybe we do something where we have a mid-section to sneak through property. Or how do you take Sutherland Court and make that more of a, instead of a driveway entrance, more of a kind of space that's a neighborhood space? But I think timing is running into refinements.
- Struggling to see where various entrances are.
 - We intend to have multiple entries, but one large commercial tenant, certain way, more tenants' different ways. Entrance points off parking... Anticipating a lot of entry points. Daycare going to have entry and walkway into playground. Grading. Upper levels to have entry level. We have

discussed an open slot where you can walk or see through for the common entry point. Building to be stretched to accommodate the condo from office. Commercial tenants to be long term.

A residential from Winnebago Street would be important. Definitely. Surface parking and underground parking. Space for canopy trees to come from street. Bike racks. Bike parking. Outdoor seating for a café. When Winnebago Street is redone they are going to narrow the street so have bigger terrace.

- Architecturally, you have many diverse elements, day care, residential, desire for more commercial. I would look at those 2-3 program elements and architecturally bring the building up based on, there's a lot of energy here. Because there's a court, corner entry not appropriate; not at an intersection of two or three streets. Think about Winnebago as your commercial side and the court less so. For parking purposes, is it possible to use the court as your drive aisle and is it possible to get angle parking off the court?
 - There's two courts, Sutherland Court and Linden Court
- Sutherland, particularly.
 - No. Can't slide the whole building down. Need L shape to make program work for square footage. Need whole coverage. No possible parking there. Narrow street. If you have diagonal parking, square footage lost.
 - We always see projects where things have to be massaged. That was a reasonable question.
- May be more efficient for your site to use back end parking stall off of Williamson Street on Livingston Street.
 - We can look at everything.
- Look at site's relationship to Railroad; architecture elsewhere furthers angle of rail corridor.
- Agree with all those comments. Commercial edge here. The L-shape makes sense. Natural footprint with sprinkling of commercial buildings. The offsets of 3 or 4 feet are more harmful than keeping it flush because they ultimately don't do anything. Not deep enough to put landscape – another 4 feet of concrete; make room for tables, street trees on your side, terrace.
 - Insets are meant to be entries. One bigger than several little ones.
- Argument for zero lot line or 8 or 9 feet. What does this little strip of green do?
 - Seating for café, bike parking, and couple of benches? Roman Candle does it.
- I think comments about the sunlight are reasonable, zoning? What's the building height? Staff noted that the properties existing zoning supports a FAR of 2.0
- So you could go 4 stories. Not a manufacturing site. 4 story and drop down to 3 stories. Volume defines the edge. Grade wise is even but does slope down 2 or 3 feet. Parallel parking loop back around edge and circulate back.
 - Circles, I don't think its turnable. Total rebuild of Sutherland Court.
- You could park here and come back through, if this is designated as parking for the site. Bring building edge closer to the building. Question about green space placement.
 - Not hanging hat on greenspace as shown, more or less quantity. Focused on GDP. Very tempting to do something with Linden Court.
- Can move parking and greenspace, but massing is locked. That's a concern.
- Density is all locked in.
- Come down a story. Green space is needed.
- Parking is a challenge but there is a better way to avoid middle island and improve circulation.
- Building massive. Look breaking up into three pieces, step back corner, commercial node, provide residential scale with less blocking and address neighborhood edge.
 - That's possible. Suggestion of 4-story set-back. This is only generally. Did not define yet at SIP level. Not the final perimeter of the 4 floors.

- On a GDP, we just need to know the set-backs? Staff noted that a GDP is basic site-plan approval.
 - Setback can be revised, but need to see design.
- Need to see modified design.
- Don't have total building program. Only square footage. Final number of units, size. Needs to be in the GDP language.
- Sounds like normally we would refer this.
 - Does anyone have a problem saying that the entire Winnebago 4-story is setback a minimum of X? from other 3 stories?
- Staff noted that approval of rezoning related general plan shall establish the right of use with the area when in conformity of plan. Need to know what we are approving addresses suggested modifications to the proposal.
 - Doesn't feel like we have the approval to build the square footage they need. Can't commit to cutting half the 4-story off. Tight schedule for Section 42. Product people will enjoy. We need Zoning at GDP level – will redo and come back. City has entire SIP approval of the level. Redo GDP.
- Rearrange the L?
- We shouldn't be designing this. Turn this piece. Come up with 3, 4, 5 stories. Lots of possibilities. Massing is an issue and we need to approve massing. WHEDA approval for something that isn't viable.
- Come down to 3-stories on part of Winnebago? Can you extend that back to railroad? Push back green space. Might lose parking. Shifting mass to make building work?
- The surface parking lot as designed provides for very inefficient turning. Lose a lot.
- Go into parking area to get more building and less height?
- Not going to get 4 levels approved tonight as designed, referral or need adjustment to get approval? Consider a 5th story with reallocation on building mass along Winnebago Street.
- Suggest an initial approval with no less than 1/3 of Winnebago is 3 stories tall. Go to 5 stories to make up square footage elsewhere, including that corner.
- Maybe too big of a building for neighborhood.
- Support the general concept.
- Tight timeline. Graphic information, grades. Look into parking suggestions.
- Bring back several different Variations on the setback issue along Winnebago Street.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion required address of the above-stated concerns.

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 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2048-2100 Winnebago Street

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

General Comments:

- Massing not there yet.
- Not soup yet.
- Lowering building height of east wing will help compositionally and with goodwill.