

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 18, 2013

TITLE: 722 Williamson Street – PD for Construction of a New Mixed-Use Development Containing 220 Apartments, 6,000 Square Feet of Commercial Space. 6th Ald. Dist. (31651)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 18, 2013

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 18, 2013, the Urban Design Commission received an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PD for construction of a new mixed-use development containing 220 apartments, 6,000 square feet of commercial space.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Tom Bergamini and Jim Bower. Neither support nor oppose: John Sumi, Michael Soref and Glenn Roby. Bower explained that there was a preliminary presentation in September and they are now back for another informational presentation. They have had 11 neighborhood meetings and 11 meetings with committees, and 2 neighborhood meetings with another tomorrow night. The modifications to the project include revised articulation of the building, mid-block site incorporating portions of John Martin’s parking lot into the project. They have two versions to show, one with 10 stories with a 4-story element at Williamson Street, and 9 stories with a 5-story element at Williamson Street. There has been a lot of feedback on this project. They had positive feedback from the neighborhood. We have reoriented the building, resulting from Commission comments in September, with the concern on the massing on the back side.

Roby presented details of both options on each board. One shows the 4-story option coming up to 10 stories then coming down toward bike path and then you have the similar massing on the 9 story option but a 5 stories massing on Williamson Street. Some of the feedback they received was that while Willy Street façade was very successful, it was a bit too much of a drop off from the 10 stories mass back toward the bike path. They tried to concentrate the mass to the height. On Willy Street it reaches highest mass at central portion of the site and then starts to break up and step down back toward the path in back. The plan shows parking, parking level and then apartments above that.

There were alot of comments on element out to bike path and relieve this corner and the massing on this side. They switched the massing around. Staff was concerned out stepping building too far back. Should have some portion of the building projected out. There was a question about balconies. They want the Commission to look at merits of both options. Give feedback and then they can come back again. Two massing options one is the 4 story view with 10 story mass coming from the corner and 5 and 9 directly beneath it. The balconies on Wilson Street are recessed. They have the building façade about 2 to 3 feet off of the back off the property line. Pushing

and pulling the units a bit. There are recessed balconies and projecting balconies and still under development and turning the massing looking at a play on both of them directly. This is all under development.

We have two cantilevered portions of the project on Williamson. The desire is to create as much massing on Williamson as possible. This was a compromise with John Martin, the property owner adjacent. This was as far over as they could bring the building. They have a loading dock issue they have to design for. Egress.

This site plan has not been modified since September. The shading no longer relevant. The rest of the site and activity with vehicles in for service, bikes and pedestrians to have access to and through this site and on the Capitol City Trail. Access on both sides.

Michael Soref, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association, registering neither in support or opposition wishing to speak. Soref clarified that they neither endorses nor rejects the project. Soref, who lives in the neighborhood, stated that he read the letter from the Marquette Neighborhood Association and the association felt the bonus criteria from the build plan had not been met. Soref stated it exceeds the height limit on that block in stories, including the bonus. The neighborhood plan supports five stories with 2-story bonus; and if it met the neighborhood plan standards such the provision of as low income housing.

Many massing issues. 5 story 7 story massing is just financially enviable. The challenge is to park the current uses. A floor and $\frac{3}{4}$ to 2 floors of parking before can get to this project. Part on Martin's property. Don't want to be outside the build guidelines the financial requirements of site require it if they want to development on the site.

John Sumi, representing MGE, spoke noting issues with the proposed residential development of the property in conflict with the effecting neighborhood plans in support of employment land use as contained in a memo distributed to the Commission. .

Ald. Rummel noted the ongoing process of working with neighborhood and developers. Ald. Rummel has pushed for the relief on the Livingston side and they have adjusted to that. Ald. Rummel thinks that fundamental the contradiction with the project as proposed and the neighborhood plan is that they are replacing someone else's parking. She wants to look at underground parking and get to 8 stories which requires a building height and mass inconsistent with the Plan. They could meet the standard if they didn't have to park other people's cars but because of this unusual condition they are accommodating this parking. The Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) provided the memo noting the outstanding issues. The Developer has been working really hard to listen to people who have concerns.

My question, most of the larger projects of this scale in Dane County have that underground parking. More costly, but to address your equation on that issue.

Ald. Rummel noted that there is an issued with residential compatibility, as stated in the MG&E letter that is fairly clear. She also questioned is there a way to design buildings that accommodate noise and those impacts, extra super-duper insulated? What's the strategy?

Comments by the Commission were as followings:

- You just mentioned Orpheum site. What happens if you leave the parking in the back for the existing users and just develop the front site?
- You have 2 property owners.

- Wagner, so it's part of their... they can't sell it off.
- This was essentially the project in play. The limitation of that structured parking will drive this to the ultimate conclusion. The other options are orphaned this frontage. The Build Plan itself is trying to address is the big gaps on Williamson Street. This site in mind in particular in tracking development. This particular gap in development is where they are trying to go.
- Orphaned site. Leaving parking in back and just developing the front site.
- John Martin property. Marty Rifkin manages the ownership of these buildings. Drove them to come up with the addition of Martin's property. He has always said no. The Adjacent property owner is a reluctant partner and is now an enthusiastic partner. It will be a real challenge. Its lifeline is the extension.
- Staff questioned the status of the increased use and maintenance of the cross access easement across the back that is still city right-of-way.
- It would kill the project is the access was lost. Wilson Street right-of-way.
- Expanding the use of that right-of-way. That is still dedicated and hasn't been vacated, needs to be resolved. If the City maintains the access as right-of-way; there will be a need to have a building face to address this was beyond a ramp façade.
- Preference between 5-9 and 4-10? I have no problem with the 5-9.
- Upon return of this item for review staff should provide applicable materials relevant to the neighborhood plan provisions as they affect this project including a staff report.
- Need massing studies that are consistent with adopted neighborhood plans.
- I don't have a problem with 5-stories, this is a very difficult project.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken.