



Department of Public Works
City Engineering Division

Robert F. Phillips, P.E.
City Engineer

City-County Building, Room 115
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
FAX 608 264 9275
www.cityofmadison.com

608 266 4751

Assistant City Engineer
Michael R. Dalley, P.E.

Principal Engineers
Christina M. Bachmann, P.E.
John S. Fahrney, P.E.
Gregory T. Fries, P.E.
Christopher J. Petykowski, P.E.

Facilities & Sustainability
Jeanne E. Hoffman, Manager
James C. Whitney, A.I.A.

Operations Manager
Kathleen M. Cryan

GIS Manager
David A. Davis, R.L.S.

Financial Officer
Steven B. Danner-Rivers

Hydrogeologist
Brynn Bemis

September 26, 2012

To: Brad Murphy
Planning Director
City of Madison
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Suite LL100
Madison, WI 53703

Re: 502 S. Park St.

The Engineering Division would like to retract comment #2.5^{*} regarding the conditional use approval at 502 S. Park St. The Division believes that the proposed development will provide more pedestrian activity along Park St. and a wider terrace would be appropriate. However, we realize that the Planning Dept. has been working with the applicant for over a year and that the comment will cause significant issues with the building design that may not be workable. Therefore, we are willing to retract the comment.

There still remains a desire on the part of the Engineering Division to improve pedestrian amenities on Parks Street including providing adequate space for street trees. The Engineering Division would like to work with the Planning Dept. to resolve this issue as it may arise in the future along the Park St. Corridor.

Please call me at if you have any questions concerning this issue.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Phillips, P.E. City Engineer

RFP:cjp

enc: as stated

cc: Tim Parks, City Planning

* RE: CONDITION #8 OF SEPT. 12 REPORT

**CITY OF MADISON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: September 12, 2012

To: Plan Commission

From: Patrick Anderson, Assistant Zoning Administrator

Subject: 502 S Park Street & 917-925 Drake Street

Present Zoning District: R3 & C-2

Proposed Use: Demolish existing auto body shop and three residences to allow construction of a mixed-use bldg. with 62 apartment units (8 efficiencies, 22 one-bedroom, 17 one-bedroom with den, 15 two bedroom, 3 two bedroom units), approx. 4,300 sq. ft. commercial/retail space.

Requested Zoning District: PUD (GDP-SIP)

Plan Commission Review: 28.12(12) Demolition of a principal building requires Plan Commission approval.

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project). None.

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Show addresses of tenant spaces on the building of the final site plan pursuant to City of Madison General Ordinances Section 10.34 (2). Place addresses of the buildings and number of units in each building on the final plan sets. Address information can be obtained from Lori Zenchenko of City Engineering at (608) 266-5952.
2. Provide a reuse/recycling plan, to be reviewed and approved by The City's Recycling Coordinator, Mr. George Dreckmann, prior to a demolition permit being issued.
3. Sec 28.12(12)(e) of the Madison Zoning Ordinance requires the submittal of documentation demonstrating compliance with the approved reuse and recycling plan. Please note, the owner must submit documentation of recycling and reuse within 60 days of completion of demolition.
4. The final plans shall show the setback dimensions shall be from the nearest portion of the building. Any deck/canopy/balcony/porch, if projecting from the principal building, shall show the dimension to the property line.

502 S Park Street & 917-925 Drake Street

September 12, 2012

Page 2

5. Lighting is required and shall be in accordance with City of Madison General Ordinances Section 10.085. Provide a lighting photometric plan, including cut sheets for fixture, with the final plan submittal.
6. Provide a detailed landscape plan. Show species and sizes of landscape elements. Within 10' from a driveway crossing of a street lot line, any landscaping/screening shall not exceed 2' in height for vision clearance. No landscape elements shall be maintained between the heights of 30 inches and 10 feet above the curb level within the 25' vision triangle of a street corner.
7. Bike parking shall comply with City of Madison General Ordinances Section 28.11. Provide a minimum of 62 bike parking stalls for the residential use and an additional 2 bike parking stalls for the commercial space, placed in a safe and convenient location on an impervious surface, to be shown on the final plans. NOTE: A bike-parking stall is two feet by six feet with a five-foot access area, with 5' of vertical clearance. Provide a detail of bike rack to be installed.
8. Meet all applicable State accessible requirements, including but not limited to:
 - a. Provide the minimum required number of accessible stalls per ADA, striped per State requirements. One of these stalls shall be a van accessible stall 8' wide with an 8' striped out area adjacent to and on the passenger side.
 - b. Show signage at the head of the stalls.
9. Regarding loading spaces, the submitted plans show two 10' x 35' loading zone in the parking structure, but it is not clear that these zones meet the minimum clearance height of 14'. Given the delivery and move in/out needs for the development, these loading zones shall be required to meet minimum vertical clearance height.
10. Signage approvals are not granted by the Plan Commission. Signage must be reviewed for compliance with Chapter 31 of the Madison General Ordinances. This is in an Urban Design District. Signage must be approved by the Urban Design Commission and Zoning. Sign permits must be issued by the Zoning Section of the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development prior to sign installations.

C2 ZONING CRITERIA

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area (required for DU's)	700 sq. ft. per efficiency 1,000 sq. ft. per 1br apt 1,300 sq. ft. per 2br apt 1,600 sq. ft. per 3br apt	33,309 sq. ft.
Lot width	50'	Adequate
Usable open space	5,040 sq. ft./ 70 sq. ft. /bdm.	TBD/not clearly shown on plans
Front yard	0'	As shown on approved plans
Side yards	0' commercial 1st story 11' each side 2nd story	As shown on approved plans
Rear yard	30' or 55% of bldg height	As shown on approved plans
Floor area ratio	3.0	As shown on approved plans
Building height	n/a	As shown on approved plans

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	1 stall per 300 sq. ft. retail (15) 62 for apartments.	73
Accessible stalls	3	2 (8)
Loading	1 - 10' x 35'	TBD (9)
Number bike parking stalls	62 plus 2 for commercial space	74 plus 9 for retail (7)
Landscaping	Yes	As shown on approved plans (6)
Lighting	Yes	As shown on approved plans (5)

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes (Design Dist. #7, PUD)
Historic District	No
Landmark building	No
Floodplain	No
Utility easements	Yes
Barrier free (ILHR 69)	Yes

With the above conditions, the proposed project **does** comply with all of the above requirements.

Since this project is being rezoned to the **(PUD)** district, and there are no predetermined bulk requirements, we are reviewing it based on the criteria for the C2 district, because of the surrounding land uses.

**CITY OF MADISON
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: May 16, 2012
To: Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission
From: Landmarks Commission
Re: Report of the Landmarks Commission
HISTORIC INTEREST of Buildings proposed for demolition

It is the consensus of the Landmarks Commission to forward the following discussions related to the historic interest of buildings proposed for demolition to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission.

At its meeting on February 27, 2012, the Landmarks Commission discussed the following:

305 & 309 West Johnson Street – It was noted that this area of West Johnson was known as “automobile row” and while not certain how the building at 305 fits in with that designation, the Mautz building on the corner was a car dealership and 309 was a garage. It was also noted that the architect for 305 is Claude and Starck and that there is a concern for the loss of historic buildings in relation to the State Street commercial district. The design of the buildings that replace them should strive to be future landmarks.

704, 714, 720, 728 and 734 University Avenue – It was noted the architect for 704 is Claude and Starck.

For the buildings proposed for demolition on West Johnson and University Avenue, the Landmarks Commission finds that some buildings have historic value. The Landmarks Commission is concerned about the continued loss of historic building stock of this type and requests that the design teams for the replacement buildings strive to create future landmarks.

At its meeting on April 16, 2012, the Landmarks Commission discussed the following:

502 South Park Street - The Landmarks Commission finds that the Ideal Body Building has historic interest as noted below and requests that the existing building be incorporated into the proposed design.

The building was built on the site of a long-term blacksmith shop operated by Joseph Dottl who served as President of the Dottl Manufacturing Company and later served as President of the Ideal Body Company. The Dottl Manufacturing Company manufactured spring and frame supports for Ford and it is possible that the manufacturing occurred in this building. This building is historically interesting for its association with the transition from horse-and-buggy to the automobile era. It is one of two such non-residential structures remaining in the City (the other is the Wisconsin Wagon Co at 602 Railroad, a designated landmark).

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION**PRESENTED:** September 19, 2012**TITLE:** 502 South Park Street – PUD, New Construction (The Ideal) in UDD No. 7, Mixed-Use Development. 13th Ald. Dist. (25508)**REFERRED:****REREFERRED:****REPORTED BACK:****AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary**ADOPTED:****POF:****DATED:** September 19, 2012**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 19, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD with new construction located at 502 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Scott Davis, representing Plunkett Raysich Architects; Craig Enzenroth, representing The Gallina Corporation; and Rich Strohmenger, representing The Bruce Company. Davis presented updated plans which include changes to the window articulation, and the addition of a canopy covering of the doorway, which is now recessed to the street. Wood grain hardi-panels have been replaced by a smooth panel which should give a cleaner, more industrial look. A silver metal reveal was added between panels. The prior look had the windows flush with the new detailing seen as more revealing. Davis showed fenestration patterning on the transom windows on the first floor to the tower. The courtyard view and entries, as well as Park and Drake Street entry were shown, with two retail entries on Park Street. The fifth floor being open to the sky, as replicated on the southeast corner was seen as unifying the top of the building and giving the element prominence. Davis noted they would like to keep the wood grain fiber cement on the 3-story building. Strohmenger noted the water feature was changed from rounded to square with planters on the outside, giving a wider opening to the street. The planting scheme was changed to add more flowers for color and inviting entry. Along the Drake Street entries, the park benches have been eliminated to allow for more planting space, which will incorporate more unifying elements and more plants. The green roof was discussed. The west will be kept as fenced and grassed with two gates on the side and a promenade courtyard look, which they see as a buffer that will be seen by tenants. Birch trees will line up with building, with some trees needing to be removed. Screening and service berries will be installed under the second floor deck, with flowering shrubs used to soften the building where there are no windows. Along the back no changes have been made.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- On the corner at Park and Drake Streets the wall for mopeds is already there; no need for plants there (won’t survive).

Why a fence at all (wall)? Let it be open; issue with cars opening up into it, no need to screen moped area.

- Area in front of porches OK but some of these plants in between are too delicate and too much for the building; needs something more solid such as a “Boxwood hedge,” something that is more of a statement.
- Along west elevation restrict repetition of new trees to those trees that relate to double sections of windows and continue planting bed through fence on northwest corner. The south face is fine.
- On the west side replace three arborvitaes with something stronger. Let the building be your guide. Use a line of lower shrub deciduous plants. Substitute out the “Gro-low Fragrant Sumac and Viburnum Lantana Mohican.”
- Tuck full bay in front rather than duo.
- Need more detail and refinement at the grand plane.
- Need more integration with landscaping; more intent with indoor/outdoor connection at corner.
- Front façade at Park Street should read as three separate pieces.
- Window issue; need more of an industrial feel.
- Issue with symmetry on the front lower levels of the Park Street façade.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for staff approval of address of landscape comments as noted and the following:

- Aluminum storefront windows with casement operation and applied muntins require redesign to achieve the industrial character or feel.
- Refine the ground floor recesses of the tenant entry door on Park Street (study setback of the entire window opening within the bay or detail the storefront system corner). Integrate the landscaping and floor plan at the setback area of the corner entry to create an indoor/outdoor connection at the corner.
- The Park Street façade articulation as three bays requires definition beyond a control joint between masonry piers of the same material and plane; it should read as three separate pieces. The recessed bay adds interest, however, the coining is then applied without relationship to the asymmetrical composition.
- The Park Street corner masonry balcony column requires modification in material/termination/connection to the building; study how to terminate the column.
- Revise the wood grain texture to smooth on the residential portion of the building as well.

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 6, 6, 6.5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 502 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	5.5	6	-	-	-	7	6
	6	7	5	-	-	6	7	6
	6	6	7	6	7	6	7	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

General Comments:

- Mass and scale of project appropriate for Park Street. Thanks for sticking with it.

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 5, 2012

TITLE: 502 South Park Street – PUD, New Construction (The Ideal) in UDD No. 7, Mixed-Use Development. 13th Ald. Dist. (25508)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 5, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, John Harrington and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 5, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD for new construction located at 502 South Park Street in UDD No. 7. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ben Gottlieb, representing University Audio; Scott Davis, representing Plunkett Raysich Architects; Ron Trachtenberg and Craig Enzenroth, both representing The Gallina Companies; Sue Ellingson, District 13 Alder; Duane Steinhauer, Constantine Choles, Mike Pudelwitts, Doug Carlson, Christopher Reynolds, Peter Taglia and Peter Dottl. Appearing in support but not wishing to speak were Virginia Choles, Randy Pfeifer and Mary Dottl. Appearing in support and available to answer questions was George F. Choles. Appearing and speaking in opposition were Daina Zemliauskas-Judzevicius, Amy Moran, Sue Hoffenberg, Steven Hoffenberg and Cynthia Williams. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak was Helen Kitchel. Enzenroth stated that they respectfully decline incorporating the front façade because of the aesthetic, historic, structural and cost reasons. The density has been reduced and the Planning Division is recommending approval. He named the Sequoia Commons and Depot developments as projects that neighbors initially did not support but came to realize the value they brought to their neighborhoods. The Ideal is scheduled to close on September 14, 2012 with the applicants ready to begin construction immediately. Davis then summarized the amenities of the building, including the retail component and two levels of parking. The building is split into two, one at 5-stories and one at 3-stories in height. There is now a tower element on the corner, the stairs have been pulled back into the building. The building steps back as you move along Drake Street to transition from a commercial district into a residential district. The walk-out garden units are now along Drake Street and engages the street and pedestrian activity. A courtyard has also been introduced to help transition between the 5-stories and 3-stories and incorporates plantings and a small water feature, as well as provides a second lobby area. A green rooftop terrace is proposed for residents. More glass and fenestration has been added to the building. Material samples were distributed. Detailed elements used to honor The Ideal include the old lettering, lighter brick color, medallions along the Park Street elevation.

Att. Ron Trachtenberg spoke to the changes the project has gone through and that Park Street could use something of this density and height.

Sue Hoffenberg spoke to the fact that the Greenbush Neighborhood Association has come out in opposition to this project because of its 5-story height. Up until now, the neighborhood's Alder Sue Ellingson has never come out in support of 5-stories at this location. Park Street is designated as a traditional shopping street and when compared to Monroe Street or Williamson Street, these have limits of 3-stories. Five-stories at this location would change the character of Park Street. The current zoning code, the code in the process of being adopted, the Park Street Design Guidelines, the Urban Design District 7 ordinance, the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan and the Park Street Corridor Urban Design Guidelines do not support 5-stories at this location. The large number of neighbors signing petitions, writing letters and testifying before the Commission opposing the building to be built; shows that this is not right for this location due to its height and density. This would have long-term impacts on these neighbors.

Doug Carlson spoke in support as a resident of the Vilas Neighborhood. Reasons include supporting urban infill development, it supports strong local businesses and a vibrant business community, the proposed project is within the scale of nearby buildings, and it's consistent with the current Park Street plan.

Steve Hoffenberg spoke in favor of infill where neighborhood can accommodate bicycling and pedestrians. However, this isn't the best type of infill. The bedroom counts for this project would cater mostly to students. He questioned the purpose of the City's code if they are so easy to get around. The character of this neighborhood will change forever.

Cynthia Williams spoke to the issues of density and light. Buildings of this height are creating canyons and the area in which she lives will be walled off. She urged the Commission to think about how this will forever change the character of this 100+ year old neighborhood.

Christopher Reynolds spoke in favor. Blighted and underused properties along Park Street does not help the City. He also did not consider The Ideal to be in the heart of the Greenbush Neighborhood. The step down from 5 to 3-stories as you enter the neighborhood works well and is more appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood.

Amy Moran spoke in opposition and distributed petitions of neighbors opposing 5-stories at this site (approximately 200 signatures). They do not object to the development or the infill, simply the magnitude. She read part of the ordinance and argued that this development is not contributing to the character of the neighborhood and that 3-4 stories is called for in this area. With Drake Street being the gateway to the Vilas Neighborhood and the Henry Vilas Zoo this project does not fit with that character.

Mike Pudelwitts spoke in support of the project, as well as density in general. Part of the reason he moved to this neighborhood is because things were going to be improved and developed.

Constantine Choles spoke as a Park Street business owner and is excited about the project. He pointed out that in order to provide the amenities people want and have asked for, such as underground parking to keep cars off the street, an extra floor is necessary to make the project work financially. Madison's plan includes infill development and higher density in these areas and for those reasons this project works.

Daina Zemliauskas-Judzevicius spoke to concerns with permeable surface and water run-off into the bay. She also spoke about aesthetics and pleaded with the Commission to pay closer attention to uniqueness.

Duane Steinhauer listed some of the 3+ story buildings in the neighborhood and the fact that Park Street is so close to downtown that the infill and density makes sense. He would like to see this project move forward and not have an empty building sit for years.

Pete Dotl spoke as the third generation owner of The Ideal Body Shop. He lauded The Gallina Companies and their management of rental properties.

Peter Taglia spoke to his concerns about the slow economic growth in Madison. He pointed out that sometimes the economics just don't work for a project in a smaller magnitude. Good construction like this is what Madison needs to keep our City sustainable both economically and environmentally.

Ben Gottlieb spoke as a small business owner in the neighborhood. They've considered moving many times and have found that Park Street is really not the best neighborhood for them to be selling high end stereo and home theater equipment, but they don't want to. He sees that the quality of people this project will bring to the neighborhood will only enhance the area.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke in support of the project. She is generally in favor of 5-stories and talked about the number of cars using Drake Street every day. To have this investment in the future to bring density and people to the neighborhood is going to be good for everyone. She named several surrounding buildings and businesses that are at least 5 stories.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I was struck by the comment that Drake Street is a gateway to the Vilas Neighborhood. Have you thought about that kind of linkage to the zoo?
 - Ald. Sue Ellingson: No. No one has ever talked about this being a gateway to the zoo. I agree with not having 5-stories on Drake Street. Even though this isn't perfect I think we should accept this proposal.
- Does the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan have Park Street in it?
 - Tim Parks, Planner II it does include the west side of Park Street and recommends mixed-use buildings between 2-4 stories in height with residential above the first floor and neighborhood-oriented services and uses on the ground floor.
- I like the brick but I'm struggling with the use of fiber cement that looks like wood. Examine an industrial look on the former blacksmith shop site, use something more urban; there are some incredible materials you could use to honor this building's past.
- I like how the tower is not expressed at the corner. As a neighborhood who turns left on that street all the time I think that's a much improved entryway into the neighborhood than what you've got now.
- The Planning Division report commented on the cornice overhang at the 5th floor. Is there any concern about the cornice or canopy at the ground floor?
 - Parks noted that the lower canopy overhangs the sidewalk more than the cornice at the top of the 5th floor on the tower. However, we're a little more comfortable with the proposal at the ground floor because it's more in keeping with the pedestrian scale, whereas we feel it's disproportionate at the top of the building.
- It sounds like they meet the standards for setbacks and stepbacks. Is that a fair assessment? And do you think the parking ratios are too low as one neighbor expressed concern about?
 - Parks noted that yes and no, we're generally very comfortable with the parking provided. There is not a recommendation from the Traffic Engineering Division that the project not be eligible for permits, because they are providing a 1:1 automobile stall and a sufficient amount of parking for the retail.
- The massing has been much more nestled into the neighborhood. The increase in height is appropriate and in context. You've made your case that the building is not salvageable. I think the character of the site and adjacent buildings is kind of industrial. The nature of your window openings should be more

industrial; architecture should be more industrial. The choice of your infill material between your bricks should be more industrial. Your second story fenestration could be larger in some areas.

- Relative to the setbacks on your first floor plans versus your renderings on Park Street, would like to see where you pull back and have alcoves. Where you have canopies it would make sense to be up to the street, but you may want to recess back a bit where you don't have those. The benches on Drake on the public side, I don't know that those will be successful as places where the public will sit; study how benches work at public street.
- Overall I think your team has been very receptive to comments and has made those adjustments.
- The landscape needs a complete reworking. This is pretty bland and this building deserves much more than your giving it. You need a strong theme that matches what the building is doing. You've got the nooks and crannies to make it happen.
- Little details in the courtyard, the water feature doesn't relate to the building. Look at those forms too and maybe planted areas need to be larger. The courtyard is a great feature but it's just not handled properly.
- Along with people using the benches along Drake Street, those spaces to the south are for people to use as their front courtyard? If people were sitting on a bench with their back to me...it's become too park-like and I don't think it would be used for people to sit there. Concentrate on how private spaces relate to the street and use of public space.
- In general, the side yard to the west, I don't know what the program is for that but it looks somewhat arbitrary. Look at the rhythm of that landscaping. Question the use of the western barrier; how would it be used if you lived there? Plantings questionable if it is just a buffer; reexamine.
- Next time you come back the green roof should be more detailed about what's going on up there.
- Don't use vinyl edging, use steel or something more permanent.
- The landscape should reflect the care you put into the building.
- How will that western barrier be used? It looks like just a green viewshed and not a usable green.
 - We talked about a number of different ways that could be used. It is serving as a greenspace right now.

If it's grass that no one is using why not plant there? Make it more interesting to look at.

- No renderings of entries and door treatments, garages, etc.; provide details in elevation. Need to see more street views of buildings, that would be very helpful.
- I wonder what your thoughts are on addressing the cornice issue that was brought up.
 - Davis noted that the tower, being a strong anchor element to the building, needed a stronger top than the rest of the building, so it's raise up a couple of feet and hast that element of the extended cornice. We continued to explore the comments and suggestions that were made. We felt like it diminished the strength of the tower element. We like it better with the extension. In deference to staff we did the revised drawings.

Address staff concerns about the cornice treatment.

- These balconies would benefit from some protection. A recessed look is nicer than a hung look.
- I've struggled with this. I've done some research on the heights of buildings on Park Street. St. Mary's is already at 70-feet with two more floors approved. This issue of 4 or 5 stories is actually a height issue. That precedent has been set. I can accept the density.
- Park Street today is not a residential street. This combined with what is proposed at Lane's, this is 134 new bedrooms in an area that is not residential at all. This has an impact on cars, which I think this has successfully addressed, but the impact on crossing Park Street is huge. People are not going to walk down to the existing light at Vilas, they're going to want to cross right in front of the building and that is a horrid situation. This has me more concerned. It is a watershed moment and I like the direction but we are going to incur some big new issues.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated comments relative to the building architectural design elements, in regards to fenestration, articulation, detailing and building materials, landscaping and outdoor space 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 6, 6, 7, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 502 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	6	4	6	7	7	7	7
	6	6	6	-	-	-	-	6
	7	7	5	-	-	7	8	7
	6	7	4	-	-	6	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	7	3	-	-	5	7	7

General Comments:

- Big improvement. Please give serious consideration to staff and Commission comments.
- Much improved; responding to Urban Design Commission's and Planning's input.
- Lots of improvement. No fake wood cement panel please. Five story on Park Street appropriate with articulation and stepbacks, plus hospital uses have set precedent for height.
- Restudy courtyard forms: Plant beds, water. Landscape must better relate to building.
- Landscape is a poor reflection of the architecture. Liven it up.

Parks, Timothy

From: Kate and Todd [kateandtodd@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 4:11 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Letter of Opposition to Ideal Body Development

Dear Mr. Parks and The Plan Commission,

I have been a resident of Greenbush Neighborhood for over a decade, and have been actively participating and following the process of the Ideal Body Proposal for the past year. I joined the committee designated by the Greenbush Neighborhood Council to make a determination on this issue on behalf of the neighborhood. The committee's final decision is that five stories is simply too high in accordance with the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan, the Park Street Revitalization Plan, and the governing ordinance for the Urban Design District 7, which all call for ***no more than three or four stories*** in this development area. ***The only request the committee has made, is to make this development four stories or less.***

Further concerns of the neighbors are the fact that renters will be allowed parking permits for street parking. This is a neighborhood that already has dire parking issues, and if Ideal is allowed parking permits, then the Lane's Bakery development will also be allowed the same. This neighborhood simply can not accommodate an increase of this magnitude of both parking and traffic issues.

As a neighbor who lives on the same block as this proposed development, I am also extremely concerned about the difference in height. Whereas most of the houses on this whole block are single and two story, it's simply out of proportion to the character of the neighborhood and unfair to subject neighbors such as my elderly neighbors to a project this size. They are unaware and/or unable to participate in this process and voice their concerns. We are well aware of and support the decision to give both hospitals the exception to the height difference, however, because the neighborhood received sizable compensation in return by way of health services, and the possibility to build Arboretum Cohousing. In this case, the neighbors are receiving no such benefit.

Further, I take issue with Alder Sue Ellingson in her remarks that this area is blighted. My home is not blighted, and neither are the majority of neighbors around me. Sue's decision to go against the wishes of the neighborhood is disappointing and perplexing.

I personally fully support infill development, but it needs to be ***quality*** development, one that supports ***what our neighborhood wants***, and what three design guidelines have indicated.

Thank-you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Kate MacCrimmon

Parks, Timothy

From: Barbara MacCrimmon [barbara.maccrimmon@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 2:24 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Ideal Body Proposed Redevelopment

MacCrimmon, 1110-B Mound Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53715, (608) 260-9363, Wednesday, 11 July 2012

Memorandum, southwest corner of Drake and Park Streets, Madison, Wisconsin.

A five-storied 62-unit multi-living-unit structure recently has been proposed for the site now occupied by Ideal Auto Body on the southwest corner of Park and Drake streets on Madison's near west side. Residents of the Greenbush neighborhood have encouraged the developer of this site to improve his design.

A colored architectural painting of the proposed structure has been furnished for public inspection. My comments are based on this, perhaps-preliminary, colored architectural painting, and I have complaints about what I see :

- 1) Five stories are too many stories.
- 2) Sixty-two living units are too many living units.
- 3) The proposed structure looks like a poorly designed motel. It has the architectural attractiveness of a 55-foot-high shoebox. Its impersonal façades purport a kind of modernity, but reveal a dismal architectural banality. It is comparable in size and mediocrity to a nearby, recently erected, 'tip-up' structure, the one at 30 North Mills Street.
- 4) The proposed five storey structure appears to extend west along Drake Street, a distance of about 100 yards, to a point halfway between Park and Brooks Streets, where it would meet too-abruptly with an existing neighborhood of one and two-story single family homes – mostly frame homes.
- 5) The proposed five storey structure negates the current Greenbush Neighborhood Plan, published in 2008, and approved by the City of Madison the same year, which recommends that 'new buildings [along the Park Street corridor] should generally be limited to four (4) stories in height.'

Additional specific criticisms :

- 6) The façades proposed along Drake and Park Streets, and along the south side, but especially Drake Street, ought have 'set-backs'.
- 7) All flat, 'built-up' roofs of the proposed structure ought be green roofs and ought be planted in suitable gardens.
- 8) The tower-like structure that faces Park Street, the part that is surmounted by a noticeably-pitched flat roof, ought be changed to conform to the otherwise horizontal quality of the design. That is, the so-called tower is ugly; it doesn't fit the rest of the scheme and ought be eliminated.
- aa9) The entire building is 'too thick' from front to rear and from side to side. It needs an interior courtyard(s), one(s) that will be visible to pedestrians walking along both Park and Drake Streets, and also from the south.

- 10) The horizontality of all façades ought be emphasized with pentroofs and narrow overhangs.
- 11) The height of the entire building ought be gradated from east to west, such that that the façade along Park street be two or three stories taller than that of the west-facing façade.
- 12) The colored architectural painting of the proposed structure obscures the nature of the nearly 100-yard-long ground floor along Drake Street. Are retail shops planned there for Drake Street? Or alternatively are ground-floor apartments planned for Drake Street? Will there be a garage entry somewhere along Drake Street?, etc., etc.
- 13) Also, the colored architectural painting of the proposed structure seems to show on its west side an already-existing, directly-abutting three or four story building on Drake Street, where now there is no such structure. Since this non-existent neighboring structure seems directly to abut the proposed five-story, 62-apartment structure, does the developer of the planned 62-apartment structure intend to insert another structure as depicted, one that directly-abuts the west side of the proposed five-story structure? If this is the case, ought there not be a separation, such as an alley way between the two?
- 14) The colored architectural painting of the proposed structure doesn't show us where vehicular entrances are planned. Will they be somewhere on Drake Street, and if so, how far west along Drake Street? and how will increased vehicular traffic affect current neighborhood residents? It seems likely that traffic volumes on all nearby street will become more dangerous; and increased traffic on Drake and Mills Street will diminish the safety of the many elementary-age children, two of whom are my own grandchildren, who live nearby.
- 15) And speaking of vehicular traffic, if a garage entry is to be located on Park Street, it could safely accommodate only south-bound traffic, whether entering or exiting the proposed structure. But what would be the vehicular solution for north-bound Park Street traffic – both for entrance and exit?
- 16) Further, if a garage vehicular entry is to be located on Drake Street, would this not make the intersection at Drake and Park Streets – now guarded merely by two-way stop signs – even more dangerous than it is now?

Respectfully submitted,

Don MacCrimmon

For the Urban Design Commission and City Staff working on the Ideal Development:

I have been a resident of the 110 block of Emerald st. in the Greenbush neighborhood for about 17 yrs, and would like to consider myself active in the neighborhood. I would like to register my opposition to the Idea development as it is presently proposed.

From the my perspective, the primary issue is the height along Drake St. Many other people, in testimony and letters, have referenced UDD 7 and the Park St. Revitalization Plan in their opposition to the 5th story, and I would agree. I also find it just a bit bizarre that there is a large step-back on Park in the latest design, the one place that a large, flat, imposing façade might be considered appropriate. Had that same negative volume been used to reduce a portion of the Drake St. frontage to 4 stories, I think that the design might be more acceptable.

The new design also features large overhangs (cornices?) at the roof line. Overhanging, in visual language, is usually used in the same breath as “jutting”, “overbearing”, and “imposing”. I think that it would be better if we could find some design solutions to allow the building to recede along the Drake St. frontage.

There are plenty of examples of nearby, profitable, high quality development going up right now that haven't needed the 5th floor to make the numbers work: Monroe St. across from Trader Joes, Monroe St. at Glenway, the apartment building behind Michael's Custard, the Wingra Clinic. Why are their neighborhoods' concerns responded to and ours are not?

Respectfully submitted,

Zaccai Lewis

To All Whom it May Concern,

I have been a resident of the 1000 block of Drake Street for two decades and am a member of the Greenbush Neighborhood Council. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed 5 story Ideal building.

The height and mass of this building are very intrusive on the adjoining neighborhood and will loom over the wood frame single family homes in the area. Since only 80 feet of this lot is on Park Street and 270 feet extends into residential Drake Street, the bulk of its 5 stories intrudes far into the neighborhood. The additional height of a 5th story increases the loss of sunlight, and adds more noise, congestion, and parking problems, multiplying the adverse impact on quality of life of those whose homes are adjacent to the Ideal. I would like to see a vibrant Park Street commercial district and appropriate infill in our neighborhood, but do not feel the current design of this development meets those objectives.

The Greenbush Neighborhood Plan, developed with substantial neighborhood input and passed by the City Council, highlights its diversity of styles, character and pedestrian friendly nature as traits that should be preserved. It specifically recommends development of the Park Street corridor stating that it "should include mixed use development with buildings between 2 and 4 stories in height." (p.32). The UDD7 guidelines also state the new buildings should be limited to 4 stories in height. It offers additional bonus height for quality of design, affect on adjoining neighborhood, and character of the street, "The bonus stories serve as a bonus for creative design and should not be viewed as the permitted height." (UDD7-3.b.i) I do not believe this building exhibits extraordinary design meriting such a bonus .

There have been claims that the extra height and mass are necessary to make the project economically viable, but there are several examples of 4 story buildings with underground parking, such as new developments on Monroe Street, where four stories appears to be profitable.

Given that a four story building would be taller than any other neighborhood structure (except the hospital) and that 4 stories is specified in both the neighborhood plan and UDD7, it seems reasonable to ask the developer to limit building to this standard on Park Street with a lower height as it extends into Drake Street.

A building of this scale will have a permanent negative impact on the character of the Greenbush neighborhood that we have been working hard to preserve and revitalize, and for this reason I am not in favor of approval of the current design.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Williams

From: Sue & Steve Hoffenberg [mailto:hoffenbergs@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 8:45 AM
To: Martin, Al
Cc: Parks, Timothy; Ellingson, Susan
Subject: Document for distribution to the UDC Staff for the July 11 meeting

Thank you for continuing to take input from the current neighbors as well as the developers for the final design of the new building at the current site of the Ideal Body Shop.

I am aware of the need for change to more density in this neighborhood. I am just requesting that the change be guided with respect to the current neighborhood. I am here to urge the city of Madison to restrict the height of the apartments at the Ideal Body Shop to no more than 4 stories, as is called for by its guidelines in the Urban Design District 7 Ordinance. I would like the city of Madison to guide development in our neighborhood so that the character of our neighborhood is protected. Old stable neighborhoods take generations to create. Once they are gone, they are gone forever.

Staff from the city of Madison and neighborhood business owners and volunteers put countless hours into writing the Park Street Revitalization Guidelines, and the Greenbush Neighborhood Revitalization Plan in addition to the Urban District Design Ordinance. These documents were professionally and thoughtfully crafted by impartial staff. Such guidelines are invaluable in situations such as the one in which we find ourselves. Government standards allow developers and residents to express and understand what is, and is not, appropriate in different locations in the city. Although impressive proposals may come along, the guidelines give stability which can protect the City for the future.

According to Urban Design District 7, a building here must be proportional to its neighboring buildings. However, this proposed five story will dwarf its one and two story neighbors. This building will be 5 stories, taking up the space of 5 current properties. The neighboring buildings are either one or two stories tall and have one or two units. The Ideal will have 62 apartments. This building will contain apartments, not condominiums. Only 15 of these will have two bedroom apartments. The other apartments will be smaller. The only planned community room will be the size of a one bedroom apartment. This building will be facing Park Street with its heavy traffic. To me, that indicates that these apartments will attract students who want easy access to campus or young single people who are starting their careers. The influence of their 62 apartments on the rest of the neighborhood that is mostly homes or one and two unit apartments will be huge. I expect the amount of partying, and the problems that go with it, to significantly increase. Some consultants and developers would like to promote more Chicago style living in Madison. That style is good for people who want to focus less on where they live and more on their jobs and going out for entertainment, but that is not currently the character of this neighborhood.

The city of Madison experienced negative unintended consequences when it implemented its urban renewal project in the Greenbush in the 1970's. Madison's only Italian neighborhood is forever gone. Each year, those families still share their pride and loss for their former neighborhood at events such as the Triangle Fest and the Wisconsin Book Festival.

To write guidelines and plans and then make the conscious decision to disregard them when a controversial project comes along is a total waste of time and effort. This is precisely the time the guidelines and plans are needed.

I urge the city of Madison to restrict the height of the building at the current Ideal Body Shop to no more than 4 stories as was clearly written by the city's own staff in the Urban Design District 7 Ordinance.

Sue Hoffenberg

512 West Shore Drive

Madison, WI 53715

Parks, Timothy

From: Amy Moran [kaplanmoranlaw@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2012 3:23 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Fwd: Ideal Development
Attachments: Ideal Letter GNA.docx; Ideal redevelopment Property Opposition Letter (1).doc; ideal ltr - CARPENTER.docx; ideal ltr hamel.docx

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Attached are four letters regarding the proposal to build five stories on Park and Drake street: including the Greenbush Neighborhood Association opposition to the proposed height.

Most letters were written for the UDC consideration of the development plan. We thank you for reading through the attached and considering them during your deliberations.

We are hoping that the Plan Commission and the City Council will give attention to them and weigh the concerns of the majority of the neighbors about the negative impact of a 5-story building at this site, the underlying zoning, (3 stories) and the two neighborhood plans that surround this site (4 stories or no more than one story higher than adjacent buildings).

I will forward more letters under separate cover so as to not exceed your e-mail limits.

Thank you.

Regards,

Amy Moran

July 5, 2012

Dear Alder Ellingson and members of the Urban Design Commission,

The Greenbush Neighborhood Association (GNA) has closely followed the plans for the demolition of the historic Ideal Body Shop and three houses on Drake Street to make way for a proposed apartment building. After careful consideration the GNA feels that the proposed five story building is too tall, and does not fit with the character of the residential neighborhood.

It is the position of the GNA that a lower building height is called for, in keeping with both the UDD7 and Park Street Design Guidelines. The UDD7 ordinance specifically states that "new buildings should generally be limited to four (4) stories in height," and

"New infill buildings should not vary by more than one (1) story from the average building height in the block when that block exhibits a concentration of existing buildings and a well-defined blockface." (See guideline 2.5, pg. 15)

The average building height in the 500 block of Park Street is two stories and we believe a four story building will present less visual dissonance, less light pollution, cast a smaller shadow on neighboring homes, be more appropriate to the character of the neighborhood, and make a more positive contribution to the long-term goals of the Greenbush Neighborhood revitalization strategy.

The lot on which this apartment building is proposed is anomalous in that only 80 feet is on Park Street while 270 feet extends in to the primarily single home neighborhood, composed of largely single homes averaging two stories in height. Although the proposed building height steps down further along Drake Street, the five story portion of the building at the east end of the block will have an adverse impact on the character of both Park Street, with its pedestrian-scaled one to two story businesses, and on the residential character of the Greenbush neighborhood, whose homes are generally one to two stories. It should also be noted that neighbors located outside Greenbush on West Shore Drive have attended GNA meetings to express their concerns about the adverse impact of a five story building on the character of their adjoining neighborhood as well.

The GNA hopes that you will consider our request to limit the building height to no more than four stories in keeping with the Park Street Urban Design Guidelines referenced by UDD7. Finally, we would like to note that with the exception of this height issue, we have found the developer largely responsive to the neighborhood and we hope to continue a dialogue as this project moves forward. We thank you for considering the views of the Greenbush Neighborhood Association.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Seifert
President, Greenbush Neighborhood Association

Dear Mr. Martin --

Please add my voice to the many opposing the construction of a five-story apartment building near the corner of Park Street and Drake Street.

I support the recommendations by the Greenbush Neighborhood Association to consider a shorter building that is more consistent with the scale of this neighborhood. Although I have long welcomed a revitalization of the Park Street corridor, I do not believe that this will be accomplished through looming facades that dominate and alter the character of one of Madison's most charming neighborhoods.

I lived on Emerald Street for a decade, and am a sixth-generation resident of this city.

Many thanks for your service to Madison,

Meg Hamel
118 Ohio Ave.
Madison, WI 53704

July 10, 2012

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing you today to express my strong opposition to the Ideal property redevelopment plan. I have been a resident of 520 South Brooks Street for 17 years, and I am a member of the Greenbush Neighborhood Council.

I bought my home in this neighborhood because I appreciated the diversity, style and character of a pedestrian friendly neighborhood. I also noticed a growing trend in the neighborhood of the small homes that were once occupied with student rentals changing back into single family, owner occupied housing. My home was also a student rental before I bought it and raised my 2 children here. I was also aware of the Greenbush Neighborhood plan that called for smart growth that would preserve the unique characteristics of the Greenbush neighborhood and it is the reason I chose to purchase my home.

In particular, "The Greenbush Neighborhood Plan (approved by the City in 2008), highlights the diversity of styles, character, and pedestrian friendly nature of the Greenbush neighborhood as traits that should be preserved. It specifically recommends development of the Park Street corridor stating that it "should include mixed use development with buildings between TWO & FOUR STORIES in height" (p.32). The UDD7 guidelines also state that "new buildings should generally be limited to FOUR (4) stories in height."

Therefore, I am NOT in support of the Ideal property redevelopment of 5-stories. This project is extremely out of scale with the surrounding and existing neighborhood and is not in accordance with the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan that was approved by the City of Madison in 2008. I fear that by allowing this project to move forward as is, that the City of Madison will be setting precedence for future multi-story rental properties. Based on the Greenbush neighborhood plan, this project is in total opposition of the City of Madison's approved plan for our neighborhood. The Ideal property redevelopment is NOT smart growth and I ask that you would vote against the redevelopment of the Ideal property plan.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to express my concerns.

Best regards,

Patricia Murphy
520 South Brooks Street
Madison, WI 53715

2012 Sept 5 Madison City Council Meeting ref. Ideal Auto Body & Lane's Bakery Proposals:

Ruth Carpenter

501 South Mills St

608/256-4161

I've lived in the City of Madison most of my life and in my current home since 1985. Our home was built by my husband's grandparents. Our connection to the Greenbush neighbourhood began when they emigrated in the early 1930s so our roots are deep in the area.

I oppose the planned five-story building that is proposed for both the Ideal Body Shop and Lane's Bakery development. There are three main reasons I opposed this project:

1. The size of the buildings is too tall. Five stories does not fit with the scale of the neighbourhood and the other commercial buildings on Park St. Buildings these sizes will dramatically alter the character of the Greenbush neighbourhood.
2. Parking for the proposed amount of apartments is not adequate. Currently, there is barely enough parking for the residents in this area. Even with the amount of parking stalls proposed in the developments, some tenants will have more than one vehicle (which will have to be parked on the neighbourhood streets) and other tenants will choose to purchase a residential parking permit instead of renting stalls in the building. Either way, the concentration of vehicles from these two building will spill over into the neighbourhood.
3. The Greenbush Neighborhood Plan (approved by the City in 2008), highlights the diversity of styles, character, and pedestrian friendly nature of the Greenbush neighborhood as traits that should be preserved. It specifically recommends development of the Park Street corridor stating that it "should include mixed use development with buildings between two and four stories in height" (p.32). The UDD7 guidelines also state that "new buildings should generally be limited to four (4) stories in height." Given that a four story apartment building would still be much larger in height and mass than any existing neighborhood structure (except the hospital) and that 4 stories is specified in both the neighborhood plan and UDD7, it seems reasonable to ask the developer to limit the building height to this standard on Park Street, with a lower height as it extends into Drake Street.

If the City Council chooses to disregard the recommendations for the Greenbush Neighborhood Association and the Urban Design, as well as all the Greenbush residents who have a long standing interest in maintaining and preserving this neighbourhood, then shame on the Council for making a sham out the entire input process.

Sincerely,

Ruth Carpenter

Sue & Steve
Hoffenberg hoffenbergs@gmail.com
to amartin, TParks, Susan, bcc: me

Jul 4 (13 days ago)

I've lived at 512 West Shore Drive for 21 years, and have enjoyed the neighborhood very much. When we moved in, I realized that this was an urban and residential neighborhood that was meant to serve both residents and business owners. When La Hacienda restaurant (behind our back yard) wanted to make some changes, the neighbors were consulted, and a plan that included their (and our) input was implemented. We were asked to sit down and explain what would be acceptable for us, and they told us what was economically feasible for them.

The Ideal project has been handled in a very different manner. Gallina Corporation came up with a plan for a project that really is unacceptable to most neighbors I've talked to. The residents in our neighborhood are used to the "hustle-bustle" of Park St, and to the occasional bit of noise that comes with living adjacent to businesses that sell alcohol and food. But, the proposed project completely changes the nature of the residential part of these blocks. There are no huge apartment buildings within two blocks of Ideal. There are no 5 story buildings anywhere in this area. Furthermore, The Urban Design District 7 guidelines that govern this development call for no more than a 4 story building. And even the larger buildings that are in this area are not adjacent to single family houses. This project will dwarf the neighboring properties, and change this area into a very different place.

What kind of place will it become? Although it's been said that this will attract "young professionals", I believe it will become primarily additional student housing. It's proximity to campus and bus lines will encourage students to move in. The project has a very large percentage of studio and one-bedroom apartments (47 of the 62 units have only one bedroom or are studios)- again the kind of places that students will want. The location on Park Street, as well as the tacky plan for this building will discourage young professionals from living there. The proximity to bars and restaurants will encourage "late night commerce", not an atmosphere that people with children or the emerging baby-boomer elders will find desirable. Although Gallina can try to attract whatever tenants they wish, the plan will radically change the feel of neighborhood, and will go against the wishes of so many neighbors.

I'm not against progress at this site. I would welcome a project that would fit in well with the current neighborhood. But this does not do such thing.

Steve Hoffenberg
512 West Shore Drive
Madison, WI 53715

My husband and I (retired couple 68 & 70) have lived at 1002 Emerald Street for 14 years and are within a block and a half from the new proposed multi purpose building to be erected on the corner of Park and Drake streets. Our neighborhood is encroached upon by two very large hospitals and multiple student housing units which already challenge the relatively peaceful and quiet quality of living we enjoy. Realizing the importance of revitalizing the Park Street Corridor, we are not in opposition to the new building. However, the height of proposed structure - 5 stories - is of concern. Instead of fitting and blending in, the building will loom above and disrupt the look and feel of the existing homes and businesses. Keeping the height to **4 stories** will eliminate not only the esthetic problem but equally or more importantly the higher population density, increased traffic flow etc. The new medical building soon to be erected very close to our neighborhood on the former Bancroft Dairy property will be only **4 stories**. The Bayfield neighborhood residents had many of our same concerns and were heard. Please hear us as well and keep your building to **4 stories**.

Respectfully,
Barbara and Michael
Guenther
1002 Emerald Street

From: **stuart eckes** <stuart.eckes@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 10, 2012 at 8:47 PM
Subject: Ideal property redevelopment
To: amartin@cityofmadison.com
Cc: TParks@cityofmadison.com, district13@cityofmadison.com

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing as a resident of the 400 block of South Brooks Street for over 19 years. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed design for the Ideal property redevelopment.

I am concerned about the height, mass and design of this development. Five stories will tower over the other buildings around it. The building will certainly be out of place in comparison to anything around it. The drawings of the building show this dramatic difference, and I fear it will be even starker in comparison when built.

The mass of this project concerns me as well. The Greenbush neighborhood is already a congested part of the city. I feel this building is too massive for a single structure. I don't know if breaking it up into two buildings would help, but again, the drawing that I have seen shows a design that looks like two buildings stuck together. It appears to have no balance or uniformity.

Finally, I find the modern, cube-like design appalling. There are no buildings in the area that are of this type of design. It complements none of the buildings in the area, and will stick out sorely. The building materials are not in keeping with the area, and the colors are inappropriate. I have seen several drawings of this building and I can't help but feel that it looks "big and cheap." I feel more conventional design and building materials would help this situation.

Other examples of architecture that matches their surroundings are all over the city. The Settlement Place of Main and Blair streets is an example of a new building that matches its environment. Williamson St. and Johnson St., in fact, much of the isthmus, have been infilled with buildings that preserve and enhance the buildings around them. This building does not. It stands out sorely.

The Park Street guidelines, as well as the UDD7 guidelines indicate that building should be limited to four stories in height. I feel this would be more appropriate for this neighborhood. With all of its mass extending almost a whole block into the neighborhood, it will be a very large addition to the area. I only wish it were a more sympathetic addition to the area.

A building of less height, more broken-up mass, and of a design that is more typical for an old established neighborhood would have less impact and would be welcomed to the neighborhood. I feel this building incorporates too much height, too much unbroken mass, and is of a modern pigeon-coop-like design. For these reasons, I oppose the current design.

Respectfully Submitted

Stuart Eckes
417 S. Brooks St.

Eric W. Thiede thiedeeric@yahoo.com

Jul 11 (6 days ago)

to Tim, Al, Alder, me

To All Whom It May Concern:

I have been a resident and property owner in the 1000 block of Drake St. since 1976, my wife since 1994. Shortly after I arrived here the zoning was changed to a more restrictive R3 at the request of residents to prevent projects such as the Ideal from being built. Apparently zoning is a very fluid thing, subject to change as soon as sufficiently big money requests it.

As realists, we can see that this project will go forward in some form, but if it must, it should be smaller than five stories, which is very out of character for this neighborhood. Four stories on Park St. and three for the westward extension into the neighborhood is still too tall in our opinion, but it would at least be tolerable.

We also question the need for so many more new apartments in this area. So much overbuilding has occurred already that the older units in this area are getting harder to rent. This could ultimately lead to a degradation rather than an enhancement of this neighborhood.

Putting more than 100 people into a space now occupied by perhaps a dozen is going to generate more traffic, noise, and congestion, regardless of the rosy picture to the contrary painted by the Ideal's proponents. We who live here will have to deal with that every day.

The people who live on Emerald St. across the alley from this development would be especially hard hit. Their once private back yards would be subjected to the view of residents of many apartments, and bathed in stray light at night. To the north, instead of trees and the sky they would see a wall full of people towering over them. If we were in their position we would be very, very apprehensive. The massive scale of the thing would be offensive enough even from our location.

If this is going to be inflicted upon those of us who actually live here, please reduce its scale to something easier for us to live with.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric W. Thiede
Angela C. Spindler

Laurie S laswimm@gmail.com

Jul 11 (6 days ago)

to district13, amartin, TParks, bcc: me

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed design of the Ideal property redevelopment. Unfortunately we cannot attend the meeting taking up this proposal this evening.

My husband and I have been residents of the Greenbush Neighborhood for 20 years come September. We have raised 2 kids here, and have eagerly watched as the city of Madison has shown support for trying to make our neighborhood more viable and attractive for families. We have also been encouraged by the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan and the UDD7 guidelines limiting (generally, in the latter document) new development height to four stories along Park Street. We believe these two plans give plenty of room for increased development in the area while maintaining the pedestrian friendly feel to the neighborhood.

So it is with dismay that we find the current Ideal Body site proposal to reach to five stories on Park Street and three stories in the adjoining residential portion of the area. There are no other buildings of this size on Park Street between St Mary's and Meriter (except for the hospitals) and it will spoil the current small business scale of that part of the street and neighborhood. The building will loom over the surrounding area and will serve to reduce its current pedestrian friendly nature.

We are very much in favor of infill development, both in our neighborhood and others nearby. The Depot at West Washington and the two developments currently being built on Monroe St. come to mind as attractive, and fitting the scale of their surrounding blocks. They also maintain the pedestrian friendly nature of the vicinity immediately surrounding each building. I believe the two new developments on Monroe Street also have underground parking and have managed to remain economically viable with only four stories.

The Ideal redevelopment as it currently exists, will permanently alter the character of the Greenbush neighborhood and does not support or fall in line with the city efforts to make our neighborhood more appealing and attractive to families. For this reason we oppose the current design and hope that a design that blends into the neighborhood less obtrusively will be proposed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Peter and Laurie Swimm

Dawn Perkins karnerd@hotmail.com

Jul 10 (7 days ago)

to amartin, tparks, district13

To all whom it may concern,

I have been a resident of the 1100 block of Emerald Street for more than 6 years after moving in with my husband who purchased our single-family house in 1998. Today I am writing to express my concerns about the Ideal property redevelopment (502 South Park Street & 917-925 Drake Street). My concerns are 2 fold: 1) height of the proposed project and 2) the parking plan for this project.

1. 5 Stories is Too High

I am very concerned about the proposed 5 story height of the Ideal property development along BOTH Park Street and Drake Street. Five stories is too tall for both Park and Drake Streets. The 5 stories proposed for this site will loom and be intrusive over the existing adjacent buildings (including owner occupied, single-family houses). I feel this project will be out of scale with the rest of the Greenbush Neighborhood and Park Street; thus will negatively impact the quality of life for the current residents.

The proposed 5 story height is also contrary with the Greenbush Neighborhood Plan (approved by the city in 2008) which states on Page 32 that redevelopment on Park Street should be, "...pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use corridors. The corridors should include mixed-use developments with buildings between two- and four-stories in height." The Ideal property redevelopment will also be located in Urban Design District # 7 (UDD7) and falls under the Park Street Corridor Urban Design Guidelines which states (on Page 13), "...that new buildings along Park Street should not be less than two stories high or taller than four stories."

In summary, The Greenbush Neighborhood Plan, the Park Street Revitalization Plan and the governing ordinance for UDD7 all call for 2 to 4 stories for this development area. The Greenbush Neighborhood Association has also expressed its opposition to 5 stories at this site. Given the current plan by the developer for a 5 story structure, I am currently opposed to this project. However, I would be in favor of the developer creating a 3 or 4 story structure along Park Street and a lower height as it extends onto Drake Street. I believe this would be more in scale with both the Greenbush Neighborhood and the Park Street corridor.

2. Parking – Issue No Residential Parking Permits

The current plan for this development includes 75 off-street parking stalls (42 in the lower level and 33 surface stalls) for the 62 apartment units, an average of 1.2 parking stalls/unit. I am concerned about the high density of apartment units in this development versus the high demand for tenant parking in this area of Madison (both off-street and on-street in the Greenbush Neighborhood). Due to the high demand for on-street parking, the City of Madison issues residential parking permits as part of their Residential Parking Permit Program. The Ideal development will be located in residential parking program Area 8.

I do not think there are enough planned off-street parking stalls in the Ideal development to accommodate the needs/demands of the tenants; thus there will be spill-over onto the already crowded on-street parking in the Greenbush Neighborhood, Area 8. Due to the already high demand for on-street parking in Area 8, I feel NO City of Madison residential parking permits should be issued for tenants of the Ideal development project. If a tenant has a car, they should utilize the off-street parking this development

provides, thus ensuring all 75 off-street parking stalls will be filled at all times. Many other residences/developments/buildings in the City of Madison have this same type of parking permit restriction placed on their conditional use approval, thus this would be consistent with other projects. Examples include the 83 units at 309-323 N. Blair Street, 609-625 E. Gorham Street and 604-630 E. Johnson Street.

Thank you for considering my comments. Please share them with the rest of the City of Madison's Urban Design Commission members.

Sincerely,
Dawn Perkins
1153 Emerald Street
Madison

John Perkins john@cs.wisc.edu

Jul 10 (7 days ago)

to amartin, TParks, Sue

Although I do not wish to speak at the upcoming Urban Design Commission meeting, I would like to go on record on opposition to the overall height of the proposed building being proposed for the current Ideal Body Shop height. Even with the grade change on Drake St. heading west away from S. Park St., I feel permitting this building to remain 5 stories tall as far west from Park St. as the current design calls for is too high to fit in with the surrounding buildings in the neighborhood and sets a dangerous precedent for future development in the area.

I feel a four story cap and/or faster drop to a three story structure at the west end of the building would fit into the neighborhood much better than the current (and previous) designs proposed. This would conform with UDD7 guidelines recommending heights up to one story higher than most of the surrounding structures (mainly 2- and 3-story buildings).