AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 27, 2016

TITLE: 702 North Midvale Boulevard – Redevelopment of the South Side of Hilldale Mall (Between Macy's and Sundance) in UDD No. 6. 11th Ald. Dist. (42708)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED: **POF:**

DATED: July 27, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Sheri Carter, Cliff Goodhart*, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Dawn O'Kroley and Michael Rosenblum.

*Goodhart recused himself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 27, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the redevelopment of the south side of Hilldale Mall located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard in Urban Design District No. 6.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, representing WS Development; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Alexandra Patterson and Katherine Wetherbee, both representing Hilldale Shopping Center, LLC; Paul Raisleger. Appearing in support and available to answer questions was Ald. Tim Gruber, District 11.

The architecture for the new development is taken from the "town square" concept with several different buildings fronting the street as unified buildings. They made a calculated decision to lose 10,000 square feet of rentable area for the sake of a pocket park. They looked at the corridors coming out of the south parking garage and traveling from north to south and how would that feel for a pedestrian and for a vehicle. They brought elements of the park to the streetscape to maintain the intimacy of the pocket park, while allowing them to energize and activate the streetscape and creating a much better pedestrian-vehicular environment. Trees, islands and plantings have been added.

Raisleger discussed the architectural elements of the development. Board form concrete with metal accents, such as on Café Hollander are being brought through into the second phase. Similar to phase 1, tenants will address the storefronts and go through an administrative process with the Secretary. The pocket park is an enhancement of the retail environment, intended to be supporting the retailers and the shoppers. The space is currently inside, which allows them to do things with the sub-grade and soil preparation and will accommodate the 6-7" caliper trees proposed. Low growing grass-like plantings, perennials and perennial grasses are also proposed. As far as the parking arrangement, they realigned them with the accessible stall in the middle to open the view of the park and retail area, as well as enlarged the crossing island space so you have a clear view coming out of the south ramp. The greenspace has also been enlarged by taking out some previously presented

pavement area. Benches along the sidewalk space doubles as seating and headlight shielding, and create a layering effect of security.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Last time we asked you to either eliminate those parking spaces or to make them parallel parking. I'd like to understand your rationale for keeping them.
    - We met with our leasing team, marketing team, development team and the partners, and we studied with them how this parking interacts with the streetscape, the park and what do we do with that. We did reduce the parking by sacrificing for landscaping. We're trying to embrace the landscaping of the park to soften the streetscape. We also created the idea of nodes of parking, so it is in a continuous line of many parking spaces. It was also a mechanism in terms of safety because the cars are being forced to slow down for raised crosswalks on either side and cars coming in and out of here. We like the idea of cars that aren't moving constantly being another buffer to the park as a calculated safety measure. We needed to maintain some spaces for the viability of those tenant spaces.
    - We talked about the parallel parking combination and we felt that 90 degree on one side and parallel on the other would be less convenient and not as safe.
- How many parking spaces did you eliminate?
    - One space and added the ADA space.
    - The parking is that perception of availability from tenants that are looking at spaces. We're trying to find a common ground to acknowledge what the tenants are saying while also trying to create a good space. We recognize the comment about the parking, it's unfortunately what the tenants are saying loud and clear that they need that visibility and presence of parking.
- The materials are nice.
- I get tired of all these national tenant demands. This is a very strong market, it's a very unique shopping space and the park will make it even more unique and attractive; if they can't see that they're shortsighted and don't belong there.
- It is a PD but it is also in an Urban Design District. The UDC is a recommending body, with actions amendable at the Plan Commission level.
- This will go to Plan Commission?
- You can make a recommendation on the PD, at the same time you have to make a finding that it meets the UDD standards, and if you have an issue with it we'll have to talk to the City Attorney about it, it being in both arenas.
- PD is our highest standard of approval. The bar is supposed to be the upper echelon of our process, so the expectation there is high.
    - Would it make you more comfortable if we lost one or two more parking spaces, so the nodes become smaller. Would you be amenable to that?
- It's not just bringing the park out to the street. The arguments for safety, for every argument about kids running out into the street where the cars are a buffer, let's talk about them running between the cars where you don't see the child running into the street. That's just a debate. One thing that's successful about the parking now is you only have to worry about cars coming out from one side. Having them come from both sides makes it more like a parking lot, it makes it a little bit more dangerous, so there are traffic issues that I have with this. The tenants need to understand the value of the greenspace they're getting. This is a more pedestrian space so let's not compromise the beauty of what this pocket park could be by parking a car in it. Other issues with the layout of the trees is all secondary to the parking issue and I don't see being able to vote for it unless maybe there were two ADA stalls there. But even that becomes a deterrent to this beautiful greenspace.

- What I hear is the Commission is not going to approve this with those parking spaces. Then our choices are to refer the matter until it comes back with no parking spaces in front of the park, or to recommend it on to the Plan Commission with the elimination of the parking, and that the expansion of the greenspace into the former parking spaces come back to staff for review at that point.
    - I'd like to request a third option, which is yours for parallel parking. That is something in the middle, we'd be more than happy to go back and make our strongest case that parallel parking is a viable option that you all are supportive of.
- We did discuss that last time. I cannot fathom having people back out at me like that.
- The comment was made that having parallel parking rather than head-in it would be a real street rather than "this is a shopping center."
- (Staff) In conversations with Traffic Engineering, having two types of movements if very confusing. If that was part of your motion it should be subject to review by Traffic Engineering. On previous projects they have told us no.
- There was a discussion of letting it be a drop-off. That I think takes it out of the parallel parking realm, but that's a different idea. That could be the third option.
    - What about doing parallel parking both sides, for the whole street?
- I think it's an alternative that helps but it does lose more stalls.

ACTION:

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL.** The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1) with Carter voting no. The motion provided for the removal of the parking spaces.

From: Kurtz, Abbie
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 1:49 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: comments re Hilldale 702 Midvale

Hi Tim,

The city website was temporarily down when Grace Bartel called with comments on the development, so I wasn't sure who to transfer her to.
I took down her info – [redacted]
She's advocating to keep the roof over the south end of the mall, not the north end.
She loves that area – it gives comfort when you move from store to store, concerts are held there, it's lovely at Christmas. It's one reason she moved to the area.

Thanks,
Abbie

Abbie Kurtz
Administrative Clerk
Planning & Community & Economic Development
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Ste. LL-100
PO Box 2985
Madison, WI 53701-2985
608.266.9013
akurtz@cityofmadison.com