

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** August 6, 2014

TITLE: 2504 Winnebago Street (East Washington Avenue and Milwaukee Street) – PD(GDP) for the Union Corners Development. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (32837)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: August 6, 2014

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 6, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PD(GDP) located at 2504 Winnebago Street for the Union Corners Development. Appearing on behalf of the project were Michael Brush, representing Plunkett Raysich Architects; Marc Ott, representing Gorman Co.; Joe Schwenker, Susan Oshman and Susan Coffin. Brush addressed changes to the plans based on the Commission’s previous review of the project. The gateway feature has been made much more prominent that is much more of a beacon into the site. They have also made changes to the landscape plan. The triangle area has been brought down to be the entrance to the site from the path. There could be a feature at this location; that will be dealt with at the SIP level. The main change in that area is the alignment up the two-story buildings with the two-story buildings in the neighborhood. As you’re coming down the street it will continue the massing and height of the existing neighborhood, then you reorient to Winnebago Street with the two larger structures that would be oriented directly to the path.

Susan Oshman spoke as part of the co-housing group. They hope for other co-housing in the future. They are supportive of the plan and the changes that have been made.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The walkway from East Washington Avenue down through the site seems to have gotten narrower (between clinic site and Building #2).
  - There was an expansion of the stall widths at this location. We thought there was still plenty of room and we’re confident that once this is a retail establishment, this won’t be a greenspace but there will be patios and other things along here.
  - The other thing that necessitated that change is we were advised to create more distance from the roundabout from a pedestrian safety standpoint.
- What is your stormwater management plan?

- We have created these bioswales on the interior that will handle much of the surface water, and it goes all the way through the site.
- When you traded out for more parking you lost a good amount of landscaping. You need to provide those canopy trees as was previously proposed. You've got this linear corridor but here you've got this branching out.
  - We lost four trees in exchange. With the double trees on the end if I move one to the middle I lose one. I do that in four places I've lost four trees.

It's not just the number of trees, it's the arrangement as modified that needs attention. As modified you start creating these bays that are kind of like bookends, which creates an option to put trees all the way through the center in double length tree islands.

- Bring back landscaping scheme and canopy trees on clinic site as was previously proposed, or widen central tree island spine 8-9 feet to provide more canopy trees.
- Your plant species list was fine. I'm wondering why you're using small lower trees here.
  - That is an SIP issue. What we're indicating is that there would be green of some kind here.
- I'd like to have larger trees all through the plan area. Need more canopy trees interspersed through the site outside of the central spine.
 

I'd like to see a lot more canopy trees throughout the plan. It's so stark in here right now. Staff noted that the GDP at hand could clarify that larger canopy trees are required with future approvals.
- I would recommend you look into porous asphalt and see what the difference is. You can see it on campus.
- The parking lot for the clinic, is that shared?
  - It's just for the clinic. 40% of the parking for the clinic is underneath. There was concern for the safety of both the staff and patients; they basically wanted to separate them and not have it crossed over.
- What is the size of the parking spaces?
  - It is exactly 9' x 18'.

On the stalls adjacent to the green central pathway, you could make those 16-feet instead of 18-feet which help to make the green area larger. I agree that all trees should be larger. For retail you'd want a taller tree rather than something small that would block the windows. Then the trees that you're putting closer to the building, if you can get them to hang over the parking lot a little bit and start to shade that. I'm not crazy that we don't close the ends with islands (on the clinic side). These greenspaces down the middle could have trees in them, to help break them up and cool the asphalt. The easy thing to say is let's lose 6 stalls and move this over. As long as you can get trees closer to covering the parking areas that'll help. They should be major trees, not understory trees.

- We talked quite a bit last time about the fact that the clinic building does not allow access from East Washington Avenue or Winnebago Street, this is very much an internalized development. Future developments, especially at the corner of East Washington Avenue and Milwaukee Street should not at all emulate what's being shown at the corner. You need to have pedestrian access off of East Washington Avenue.
- The tucking of the two-story housing along the geometry of the existing housing does seem to resolve anything, but their front yard I'm concerned about what type of space that's going to be, it does not feel comfortable. I'm also concerned about how tight they are against the property lines in the backyard; you've essentially put their windows in their backyards so now you don't have a backyard space that can actually be claimed by the new property and taken care of by the new property. This is very uncomfortable, I don't know how that's going to feel, and how that's going to feel safe.
- At some point you're going to need parking for those buildings and it's going to become a problem (Buildings #8 and #9).
- Now you have no way to walk in from that corner.

- We don't know exactly what this is but it doesn't have to be entrenched there. We could pull that back and create more space.
- What about how this court is going to change (Azinger Court)? By having more development at the end you'll have to acknowledge that that court's use will change, whether it's pedestrians walking through or people finding a place to park.
- I am concerned about those lower two buildings adjacent to the existing single-family lots of "Azinger Court." The rest of the site I think works well.
- With the angled parking plus the on-street parking, plus the greenspace in front of Buildings #6 and #7, that street section really isn't creating connectivity. I wonder if you start lining your orientation along the bike path and celebrating that bike path, and arriving at greenspace along Winnebago. Creating a secondary space behind this space to get more is uncomfortable.
  - We did a series of neighborhood meetings and one of the themes was to celebrate Winnebago and activate it and put buildings on Winnebago, so that's what we tried to accomplish there.
  - The Planning Unit asked us to urbanize this site in general, and this was one of those efforts.
- Right now this is just so uncomfortable. You're in their backyard (of single-family residences).
  - There will be pedestrians going through there and there will be greenspace. I don't share the concern that this isn't viable or shared space.
  - Our original plan showed a park here but people did not like that, they wanted more activity.
  - We've been working with a co-housing group and they really enjoy this orientation because what we're planning on doing is to create an outdoor space for that building, they get some connectivity to the path and the street. That's kind of where some of this concept came from.
- I don't think those two buildings need their own greenspace because the greenspaces in this development are public spaces rather than private (Buildings #8 and #9). You can bring them closer to that other L-shaped building but the question is their relationship to the other backyards.
- It doesn't have to be two buildings. I think the use for that area just isn't thought out.
- And the kinds of buildings and how they're going to work. The fact that they're aligned in that way is a good solution.
  - I was trying to show that it's broken up.
- That whole Winnebago Street should be lined with trees.
- How come those two buildings have to be there?
  - The agreement that we entered into with the City, we're making guarantee payments over the life of the TIF, which expires in 2033. In order for the City to agree that we're doing a feasible project we have to have some level of density here. We know we have the clinic building, but the rest of this is really conceptual depending on how much density we get from these buildings. Our goal was to represent that it's residential and it's two-stories. The condos might be rental, but we're not going higher and we're not going with any other type of use. We didn't think it out to that degree. It's two-stories and it's residential.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Address of the planting and landscape comments as stated.
- Reconfigure the placement of the residential structures abutting the existing neighborhood. The two buildings #8 and #9 in the southeast corner are not approved as shown. Only two-story land use type with further study of their relationship with Buildings #6 and #7 and adjoining existing single-family residences.

- Address the parking stall sizes on the clinic site to enhance the width of the adjacent pathway and provide for more canopy tree plantings as stated, as well as more canopy trees along Winnebago Street and throughout the GDP plan area.

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 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2504 Winnebago Street**

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

General Comments:

- Increase the use of canopy throughout and in the parking surface lots.
- Landscape needs to be more generous, especially at parking and roadways.