

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** December 9, 2015

TITLE:    2230 West Broadway – New Development,  
          Three-Story Building with Residential  
          Units with Non-Residential Space in UDD  
          No.1. 14<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (40784)

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**                      **POF:**

DATED: December 9, 2015                      **ID NUMBER:**

---

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

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 9, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of new development of a 3-story building with residential units and non-residential space in UDD No. 1 located at 2230 West Broadway. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jim Glueck and Dave Porterfield, representing Movin’ Out, Inc.

Registered and speaking in support were Tom McMahan, Pauline Jones, Tom Solyst and Judy Cooper. Registered in support but not wishing to speak were Alesia C. Jackson, Arturo Ambriz and Jacquesia Jackson. Registered and speaking in opposition were Diane C. Small, Joseph Hennessy and Ken Sherman. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak was Mike Schmidtke. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Sue Byram and Erin O’Brien. Registered neither in support nor opposition but not wishing to speak was Chauncey Hunker.

The following people were registered in support of the project as non-attending, via downloaded registration forms given to the Secretary: Jim Kellerman, Tonoka Deloney, Geronimo Miranda, Tatiana Clacks, Jovenus P. Price Pierce, Jennifer Johnson, Aureola Deloney, Stephanie Lee, May Benham, Portia Y. Vaughn, Deborah Marlowe, JoAnn Gosda, Vera Jones, Tina Osuocha, Sandra Sykes, Daylena Sykes, Colbernet Jackson, Katrice Sykes and Shawnee Deloney.

Natalie Erdman, Director, Department of Planning and Community & Economic Development, gave a brief background on the affordable housing programs that the City of Madison is supporting to help the Commissioners in their decision-making. The recommendations included leveraging resources to get affordable housing, one of which is the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority tax credit, a federal tax credit used to support housing for households that make less than 60% of the area median income. It’s very competitive and pays for about 80% of the cost of developing the housing. The decision was made and supported by the Mayor and Common Council that the City of Madison would make a request for proposals to developers for affordable housing. Having their zoning in place means they can meet a readiness standard to get those points associated with the WHEDA tax credits. A significant number of renters in our community are

burdened by housing costs. The City is working in conjunction with developers to make the process smoother so they can get the tax credits necessary for the developments, while at the same time noting that these affordable housing programs are not a pass on good planning and good design. At the same time, the City expects, with their participation, that they still get high quality planning principles of high quality design. The goal is to build 250 units of affordable housing with 50 of those units being housing to serve people who have experienced homelessness with heavy supportive services.

Porterfield presented context for providing integrative affordable housing that includes families with disabilities and veterans. They were not able to get their zoning application in last year, so they reapplied with the possibility of a neighborhood center to help get the zoning in place and earn enough tax credits.

Glueck presented the conceptual plans. The goal is to have a neighborhood center and housing together in the growing tradition of mixed-use buildings. The building fronts on West Broadway with parking and other amenities in the back (north). The site has a slight grade change and a very important median cut on West Broadway to a shared driveway on the east edge of the property that is shared with the Antlers Bar next door. They have underground parking and surface parking with an entry to the residential portion on the back. There is a fair amount of greenspace in the center that is still open to discussion. Building materials will include metal siding, brick and block on the ground floor. Because this new development is not increasing the impervious area it doesn't trigger the regulations for stormwater management; they would have to build their whole lot up to keep the water on-site and that would kill the project. The landscape plan is subject to change after the development team meets with the neighborhood and staff again.

Tom McMahan spoke as the vice president of board of directors of both Vera Court and Bridge Lake Point neighborhood centers. He has not seen any final elevations, but he is sure it will be handsome and will fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. He is most excited about the space available to the neighborhood center. Vera Court is 10-12 years old, and Bridge Lake Point is a repurposed building. They have an opportunity to expand the services they provide to that neighborhood, which are substantial.

Joseph Hennessy spoke in opposition as an adjacent homeowner. The neighborhood is full of modest single-family homes on large lots. The site serves as a transition between the Beltline, Broadway Avenue and the apartment complexes to the west of the site, to the smaller residential homes, well-kept yards and Waunona Park. There is great value in this site as a transition between their neighborhood and all the development to the south. They knew the site would be developed, they expected it to mesh with the character of their neighborhood and would bring much needed small commercial amenities without being ostentatious. The development should fit in the area rather than radically change its lovely character. The height of the building proposed is of great concern. He recommends limiting the structure to a maximum of 2-stories with no conditional use permit, a great reduction in the bulk of the building to make it consistent with the view and aesthetics of Broadway as an entry to the City. He questioned the impervious surface as this is one block from Lake Monona. It is a great solar site as it's south-facing; the developer should include solar, and there are trees they would like to preserve. Changing drives will cause pedestrian and traffic issues on Fayette and Lake Point Drives. He also noted that the Vera Court Bridge Lake Point board of directors includes no members from the Bridge Lake Point or Waunona neighborhoods.

Tom Solyst spoke as the director of the neighborhood center. He is very much in support and believes it's consistent with the Broadway neighborhood and has a really nice focal point of first floor high ceilings and glass fronts. It will be a focal point for the neighborhood. It's a great opportunity to bring a gathering space into the neighborhood. The mixed-use of the space is a new way of looking at community spaces in commercial areas. This is an ideal partnership.

Diane Small spoke in opposition, noting that they have started a petition in the neighborhood. The process was done very fast and in a hurry. As a homeowner in this neighborhood she is unhappy about this being constructed. There are several other buildings in the area that are used by the neighborhood center for area children. There is a bar that would be in very close proximity to the children. A big building is not needed in this neighborhood; they need a standing neighborhood center but this plan is not the one that's right for the neighborhood.

Judy Cooper spoke in support as a 16 year area resident. She understands the need and want for a stand-alone neighborhood center, however, the chances of that happening are extremely low. This is a beautiful building and will serve the neighborhood well; you can't argue against progress. She trusts that the people in charge know what they're doing in terms of housing and parking. There are people who are really looking forward to this being in their neighborhood. This has been years in the making and needs to move forward.

Erin O'Brien spoke to the concerns about a neighborhood center being on the first floor of a housing complex and the proposed density of this development. The staff report failed to address the fact that the housing portion of this project is questionable if not inconsistent with their approved neighborhood plan. Many in the neighborhood would like to see this more flushed out. The proposed driveway to the community center is right across the street from and maybe bisecting two driveways in a high traffic area. The number of parking spaces is of concern; tripling the size of the current neighborhood center and only adding 6 additional parking spaces is not sufficient. She requested that collaboration with adjacent property owners be considered in dealing with the alleyway. There are no other 3-story buildings on the street, the use of metal is inconsistent with the code and the façade is large, heavy and monolithic.

Ken Sherman spoke to the issue of drainage, asking if bioretention would be hooked to the sewer system. Any time they get a heavy storm the alleyway floods. Where will that water go if they're going to put a fence and retaining wall here? He also raised concerns with the increase in traffic.

Tonoka Deloney spoke as a volunteer and user of the neighborhood center, in full support of the new center.

Sue Byram spoke as a nearby homeowner of 30 years. She feels very strongly that there has been very little input from the neighborhood into this radical change. Over a year ago a neighborhood meeting showed that this project would be market-rate apartments in one building. Now the radical changes made have not reflected any input from the residents of the neighborhood. The increased density is not a good idea in this area. Having some of these units become owner-occupied would help stabilize the neighborhood.

Jim Kellerman spoke as a 32 year neighborhood resident. The neighborhood had higher density 32 years ago than it does today. It was a peaceful and enjoyable neighborhood; then there were problems in the Broadway area. The solution was to rip down a bunch of apartments and decrease the density. The solution that did solve the problem was to put a police officer in the neighborhood center and require landlords to get rid of drug dealers. He is very much in support of the project. This neighborhood doesn't have any other kind of community-building other than the neighborhood center.

The Secretary noted that the City Engineering is the department handling any stormwater management/runoff issues. It will have to meet City of Madison and DNR standards. Jay Wendt pointed out that the staff report identified that the UDD No. 1 standards can be met. Initial approval would approve the building placement, mass, scale, orientation, access and that UDD No. 1 can be met or is met. Additionally there is also the conditional use aspect because of the size and use of the building in a commercial corridor transition.

Glueck clarified that the grade will not be much different from what it is now, they're not raising the height of the backyard for the retaining walls.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- One end seems stronger than the other.
  - The comments I received indicated that this being a corner should be a focal point. That's why that end is a little stronger than the other end. We're totally open.
- If it's a four-sided building it needs to look good on all four sides; the building architecture needs more balance.
- This is a step in the right direction (less monolithic). More balance perhaps, finding some ways to incorporate exceptional design.
- Maybe not such a narrow roof element. The community center, that entire mass to the left can have a stronger read as itself, you don't need to just focus on that small entry. But look at getting your eye to focus on the community center with apartments, that's first. Make the first floor read as a community center.
- I prefer the original. It had a nice residential scale, more delicate rhythm and a simpler use of materials. Maybe go back and look at some of those elements and the rhythm it makes, it's simplicity is nice.
- Traffic and parking needs to be resolved; especially the use of Fayette Avenue. Overall there's a lot of pavement for the amount of parking here. The play area could be more interesting rather than having it sandwiched up to a parking lot. Because we have residents here, let's see if we can't break a few of these stalls with trees in there for more greenery. Look at parking along the shared drive and add tree islands to stalls adjacent to the alley.
- The stormwater management is important. Dialogue with the neighbors is important. Resolve issues with the flooding in the adjacent alley.
- Once the building is resolved, the landscape plan should relate more to the building. Right now it's not making a statement, it's trying to soften the architecture. Have your architecture be strong enough to celebrate that, rather than try to just diminish it.
- Resolve issues with driveway access and parking with Fayette Avenue.
- I would echo that. You need to work on parking; back off parking on the alley. I don't know about there are things you can do with the shared lot. You need stronger landscape massing to break that lot down. You don't want a moat around the building. When you come back I'd like to see the trees you are planning to take out, and why. I need to hear a lot more input of interaction with the neighborhood before I can give final approval.
  - We need to get an arborist in there to see which trees can be saved; identify large trees and have reasons for their removal.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Carter, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Harrington voting no.

The motion provided for address of the Commission's comments and the following:

- The massing of the building can be more integral with the site.
- The design of the residential end of the building needs adjustment.
- The actual configuration of the building needs to be adjusted for better integration with the site.
- Rework the entry on West Broadway.

- Strengthen the appearance of the neighborhood center on the exterior and lighten the scale of the residential component.
- Work with Traffic and City Engineering on traffic/access issues.

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 and 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2230 West Broadway**

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

General Comments:

- Needs lots of resolution of issues!
- Integrate building and site.
- Innovative approach to site/parking layout needed.
- Tree survey needed.