

**AGENDA # 13**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** April 23, 2008

**TITLE:** 515 South Midvale Boulevard - PUD-SIP, Phase 2, Sequoya Commons, 99 Residential Units. 11th Ald. Dist. (10043)  
**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**DATED:** April 23, 2008      **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Bonnie Cosgrove, John Harrington, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton and Richard Wagner.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 23, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bruce Simonson, representing Midvale Joint Venture, LLC. Appearing in opposition was Bonnie McMullin-Lawton. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Anna Strenski, Brett Darrow, and Chris Schmidt, representing Westmoreland Neighborhood Association. The project under consideration provides for the development of “Sequoya Commons – Phase II.” The overall PUD-GDP for the redevelopment of the former “Midvale Plaza” envisions the creation of 99 residential units as part of the Phase II development. The PUD-GDP and First Phase PUD-SIP provided for the development of a new Sequoya Branch Library, 7,000 square feet of grade level retail/commercial space, in combination with 45 residential condominium units. The plans as submitted provide for the development of 100 units of rental housing with the reconfiguration of portions of the building as approved under the PUD-GDP, in combination with the development of 10,000 square feet of grade level retail/commercial space. The plans as presented provided for the following:

- A change in access to lower level parking from Midvale Boulevard to Caromar Drive, featuring a mix of one and two-bedroom units of rental housing.
- The center courtyard features a covered hydrotech green roof overlying lower level parking.
- The 10,000 square feet of commercial/retail space faces the shared parking area with Phase I and provides for the flexibility for an additional 3,000 square feet of retail/commercial space.
- At Caromar Drive the building was originally proposed for two stories with an additional two stories at a building stepback has now been modified to feature a straight three stories with removal of the fourth story, combined with addition of a walkway provided off of Caromar Street to the front of the Phase I building (parking lot side).
- The change in access from Midvale to Caromar was noted as a response to a 6-foot drop grade issue, in combination to limits to the northbound access on Midvale.

Following the presentation testimony from members of the public was as noted:

- Concern with garage entry change, should be on Midvale.

- Need to limit traffic on Caromar for seniors and children due to proximity of dangerous curve on Caromar Drive.
- Concern with the reconfigured building's closeness to the sidewalk now proposed at less than 21-feet, previously 30-feet in the originally approved PUD-GDP.
- The revised three-story version reflects a loss of the setback, concern with not enough parking for Phase II, as well as already approved Phase I.
- Garage entry from Midvale not consistent with UDC's recommendation to locate it on Caromar. If approved, will force traffic to use Caromar Drive as an alternative and will require the need for hardscape improvements to discourage and prevent left turns into the neighborhood.
- In favor of maintaining the previous version of the building featuring a setback along Caromar.
- Support a 30-foot setback with a 3-stories adjacent to Caromar Drive.
- Problem with relocation of parking entrance on Caromar, traffic conflicts.
- Concern with overflow parking for the development on Caromar Drive, already exists with construction parking.

Following testimony by the public, the Commission noted the following:

- Although this project provides for the development of Phase II, don't know what Phase I looks like and how it relates to Phase II, need more context.
- Concern with entry on Caromar; want to see response to neighborhood concerns.
- The neighborhood suffers; places burden on neighborhood with location on Caromar Drive.
- Surprised the Urban Design Commission's original motion was changed by subsequent action of the Plan Commission and Common Council; agree with other Commissioners on the driveway issue.
- In terms of setback, OK with original project or as proposed to be modified; respect neighborhood request to pull back to match existing rhythm of the street along Caromar Drive.
- Massing of stair tower on Midvale Boulevard is too much, rotate so as tail of stairs sticks out; allowing more windows on adjacent façade.
- Issue with signage on stair tower on Midvale Boulevard for commercial/retail tenant; not on Midvale Boulevard but off of Caromar Drive.
- Need to see other options to get to underground lower level parking aside from relocating the drive to Midvale Boulevard; look at reconfiguring the adjacent surface parking lot.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Wagner, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns and:

- Address the massing and signage issues associated with the stair tower, such as consider rotating it to minimize its width parallel to the street, break up its blank façade with fenestration, and minimize its use for signage especially off of Caromar Drive.
- Address issues with the screening of windows with disproportionately sized landscape elements such as arborvitae and juniper.
- Address the setback issues relevant to the proposed 3-story version abutting Caromar Drive. If three stories is to be provided, setback is to be maintained as originally proposed.
- Look at alternatives to providing driveway entry in the modified location off of Caromar Drive. Investigate the feasibility of other potential driveway entries including on Midvale Boulevard as originally proposed, as well as from the shared surface parking lot abutting the building.

- Provide context as to project's location in the neighborhood across the street utilizing photographs, aerials and other resources.
- Provide a plant list which corresponds/coordinates plant quantities and species and planting types.
- Staff is to provide details of the overall PUD-GDP and PUD-SIP established as part of the record of approval process and recorded with further consideration by the Urban Design Commission, especially any previous or current written comments by the Traffic Engineer regarding the driveway access issue.
- Relative to the landscape plan the quantity on the plan doesn't match the species list, plant types don't match use areas. Consider alternatives to the use of arborvitae in front of windows as well as the use of oak, juniper based on issues with their size and proposed location of use.
- Consider moving building to provide building setback on Caromar consistent with adjacent building setbacks.

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, 5, 5, 5, 6 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 515 South Midvale Boulevard**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	6	5	-	-	4	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	6	5	5	-	5	7	6
	-	6	-	-	-	4	5.5	5
	4	7	5	-	-	4	6	6
	5	7	6	-	-	5	6	5

General Comments:

- Address stair tower, setback from Caromar if 3-story building is pursued. Like courtyard design and “hydrotech” spill. Reconsider driveway entrance. Next time bring site map with street connections. Address plant list.
- Basic thinking of this building and site, and traffic circulation needs reconsideration.
- More attention to neighborhood concerns by developer are needed.
- Rotate stair towers; move drive back to Midvale.
- Really nice design generally. Needs to step back from Caromar more if 3 stories along the street. Please consider options for access to parking that affects neighbors less.