

AGENDA # 1a.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** February 1, 2012

TITLE: Amending Sections 33.24(15)(c),
33.24(15)(e)3., 33.24(15)(e)12.a., and
33.24(15)(e)12.b.i. of the Madison
General Ordinances to Change the
Maximum Height for a Portion of a
Block in Urban Design District No. 8.
(24386)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 1, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 1, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF THE ORDINANCE**. Ald. Maniaci proposed dividing East Washington Avenue frontage on the 700 Block (aka Block 2b. of UDD No. 8) to allow for 10 stories plus two bonus stories utilizing existing criteria within the UDD No. 89 provisions for one lot consistent with the proposal for 741 East Mifflin/754 East Washington Avenue as proposed. The current provisions allow for eight stories of development with the potential for two bonus stories. The neighborhood is very interested in this project and has given positive feedback. Buildings across the street were approved at 12 stories with two bonus stories; but the neighborhood side has been approved at eight stories. They are finding that when it comes to the commercial side of the line you need a lot of parking for office workers compared to if that same space were for residential. To get those densities envisioned the plan is a bit flipped. The residential component is what is able to be built and in terms of people, it’s a less dense use requiring less parking. The project meets all the requirements of the district except for the height. With the realities of the market they are not capable of doing a shorter building. This is very tailored specifically for this site and not the entire corridor.

Richard Linster spoke for the Tenney Lapham Neighborhood Association which supports the project, particularly exceeding the height limit. People are mostly concerned with the issue of traffic. They believe the project will be a boon for the area, the corridor and the City of Madison.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Can you explain why you thought dividing that frontage was the best way to go?
 - Because the planning process was quite clear about wanting that setback to the Mifflin Street façade. I thought it was important to respect the Mifflin Street side where there is more residential. All the support documents in terms of the plan have been consistent in that. Additionally, the proposal coming to us is such that they are within the guidelines and

boundaries. To try to be as narrow and tailored to the project in front of you. I would be interested in expanding that if the Commission wanted to discuss that. I didn't want to open up the entire thing. That's where I told them to draw the line.

- We need to be conscious about the height relative to the story dimensions. If you have a 10-story building that's 9-foot floor-to-floor. I think we need to talk a little bit about what the real height of the building is.
- We often see projects that start out quite tall and get scaled back. That's the normal process. Was there discussion about this being a precedent and the next developer comes in and needs 13 stories. You all know it's a precedent.
 - I had discussions with staff about this. Then I thought why not just ask for what we need. By doing this as site-specific, future developers will have to make their case for what they want to build. Given the current dynamics of the site this is what I thought was the simplest to bring to you.
- If you look at the heights across the other side of the avenue are set at 12 (according to UDD No. 8 provisions). If the neighborhood no longer has any concerns it may not be that big of a deal.
 - If you look at the surrounding uses: a truck storage facility, surface parking, a Water Utility building, height is not a concern.
- The development proposal respects the 30 degree angle and that steps down dramatically to the Tenney Lapham side and I think that is a big success for the neighborhood.
- What defines a story?
 - (Stouder) From a zoning perspective a story is broader with the zoning definition than what you would think of it. They can include mezzanines within a single story as defined so long as 50% is open below. The zoning definition of a story allows for greater height than we typically think of as a story.

Often times in larger buildings an entire floor can be dedicated to mechanicals. I'm sure they're not proposing that but that would not be considered a floor and automatically your building becomes 13 stories.

Staff noted that the ordinance provisions for UDD No. 8 define that "Height is based on an average story height of 5'-12' (11'-15' for the ground floor). Buildings with greater floor heights shall have fewer stories accordingly."

This is not approving the project this is simply making way for it to be possible.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **APPROVED** the ordinance change. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

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 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: UDD No. 8

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

General Comments:

- Sets potential precedent.