AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** July 9, 2014
TITLE: 330 East Wilson Street – 6-Story, 35-Unit Residential Apartment with 878 Square Feet of Commercial Space. 6th Ald. Dist. (33110)	**REFERRED:**
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Jay Wendt, Acting Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: July 9, 2014	**ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 9, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a 6-story, 35-unit residential apartment with 878 square feet of commercial space located at 330 East Wilson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bill White, representing Kothe & Page; Kevin Page, Josh Wilcox, Mark Landgraf, and AJ Robitschek, representing Palladia, LLC; Robert Rubin and Neil Densmore. Wilcox explained the alterations they have made to the plans. The base has been flattened to reinforce the angle of the building, which also gives more circulation through the commercial space. The planes have been reinforced by setting the area back and adding a recessed "peek-a-boo" blue color to strengthen the corner. The tower element now has vision glass all the way up through the stairway element with a clean square cap on top. The metal panel color has been darkened while maintaining the other building materials. Five parking stalls are proposed with vision glass storefront style screening. Rubin spoke in favor of the project and sees it as an exciting opportunity for Hancock Street.

Heather Stouder, Planning Division noted the applicants' innovation with regard to the parking area. Planning Division staff still feel that it falls short of not only the Urban Design Guidelines but also they are unsure if it meets the Zoning Code. They still recommend to the Plan Commission that that area become an active area by removing some or all of the parking. She cautioned the Commission that it is their purview to look at the Zoning requirements for downtown, as well as the Urban Design Guidelines. This is better than frosted glass or vision glass with parking behind it, but it's not as good as what a commercial space or ground floor residential units in that area could do. She noted that the light gray material color is better than the white previously proposed.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator spoke to the Zoning Code regarding this project. Putting parking behind a vision glass window is not something they had anticipated, and the code doesn't really relate to it, which is why this issue is moving forward slowly. He also noted that bicycle parking needs to be worked out. The biggest concern about this new concept is that the sign code doesn't allow video boards. It regulates signs specifically in proximity to windows coverage limits. There is a code allowance to have rooftop access that is the minimum

necessary in order to achieve that access, but this is larger than that; they are allowed a landing, not an actual room.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I like the building, it's coming along nicely.
- What does that wall look like from the street?
- I am concerned with the commercial. Do you feel like you have prospects?
    - We do, for the 1,300 square foot space.
- Your drawing shows a tree in front of the building but your landscape plan has no tree in front of the building. Did the City take it out?
    - It's a City tree. Forestry was not looking for that tree to be replaced.

  The tree species that you're using here really are pretty insignificant. I know your setbacks are different. I'd rather see you go with another variety. A building of this size needs larger trees.
    - Ultimately, Forestry will tell us what to plant there.

  If you saw what this last winter did to Boxwood, you wouldn't plant it. If there is any street salt in there your grass varieties aren't going to make it.
- I do have concerns with the metal panel. I can see the issue that staff has. In thinking about how we want these buildings to look in the future we want to make sure the materials hold up. While I do love metal panels my concern is that it's not going to stand the test of time.
- (Alder Rummel) My concern is the viewshed down Hancock Street and I'm not hearing that there's any wiggle room. I think it's important to protect the public view on the public sidewalk. Aside from the Zoning Code issue I am fine with some parking or no parking. The neighborhood was mixed on that issue. It tends to meet the spirit of the Downtown Plan.
- I think it's an improvement from last time, but I still think there's something that could be done with that elevator tower. I'm not sure the stair tower needs to be the full height of the overrun next to it. Your first version was nice and clean. That might resolve itself as you work through the zoning issues. I also agree and am concerned about that window, if nobody takes ownership of that display window area what it's going to look like. It's really not going to be interactive.
- Is there a reason on the stair tower that you couldn't run the glazing down below to where it is now?
    - It would have to stay up about 48" above grade.
- I'm not sure the stepback and the front width totally work for me.
    - If we were to take the stair tower mass and the space next to it, we could bring that down into two separate masses. Based on the feedback the last time we were here, this seemed like the direction everybody felt more comfortable with.
- How are the seams handled on the metal panels?
    - They're just reveals. We do not want oil-canning in the systems we're looking at. They're smooth in a matte finish. They won't reflect the light as much.
- I think the building is playful enough that's it's actually quite interesting.
- This could work really well with the First Settlement Neighborhood. You've got a very active gardening community in this neighborhood and I'm sure you could find some historic preservation folks who would be interested in this. All that could be written into the conditions of approval and a management plan. I would suggest that as part of that list of conditions, you work with the neighborhood and neighbors and people who are engaged in that.
- Maybe it's something more, 3-D with art pieces. Like a museum kind of display with texture.
- Obviously there's some risk with this, but this is a lot better than some of the other walls we've okayed. This has some excitement to it.

- You could make that sidewalk be a much stronger public space. Is there parking along that side? Could you check with the City on bump-outs? Then those trees would have room to grow and you actually have sidewalk space that creates more of a place. It could also work as a stormwater management system and starts to give you a space.
- I feel some real push back from staff. Can you talk to me about activation of that space? When you say activation do you think we need in our Downtown Plan to say that we really meant that the interior of it is activated, or are we looking for pedestrians or passersby to become activated by paying attention to it, or interacting with it in some way?
    - (Stouder) I think that the plan intent was actual usable interior spaces with entries that people could go in and out of. But, it's being interpreted differently with this proposal, and we're not sure whether it can actually meet the Zoning Code which is one of the more important pieces. It's not an active office or retail or usable space at all, and the Zoning Code requires that any parking has that liner element in the downtown that's a real usable space. It'll be a first interpretation and if it's approved this way, which I would not think it would be at the Plan Commission level, then what do we think about that precedent? I think what they're proposing could work really well, if it's managed well. I just don't know that policy-wise if it's going to be possible.
- Who would be responsible for, let's say the light bulbs are burned out and the pictures are faded. Who gets to enforce that?
    - (Tucker) The Zoning staff would get to enforce that. We don't tend to go inside buildings, we tend to push back pretty strongly when the Plan Commission puts us in a position of very weird conditions. We try to be efficient with our resources, which is why we don't want to have something put into place that has a lot of promises and has a lot of heavy staff burden to be managed. We still have to resolve how this works with the Zoning Code. We have these laws that can't be adjusted based on recommendations.
- What if the glazing were removable, and if in the summer you could sneak tables and chairs in there and the market could serve coffee in there? And in winter enclose it. We don't know exactly how that will be used and it might have to be flexible to let a tenant figure that out. What if it's at the sidewalk level and it could be either, inside or outside?
    - It does slope down quite a bit through there. For tables and chairs to work we'd have to push it up and accessibility would be an issue.
- The stair tower, the remainder of the dialogue of your building is these floating bent planes, so that glass and brick being forward of that is almost counter-intuitive to me, that it wants to recess behind those planes and you see the thickness of those planes continue. That might help set it back.
- The sub-soffit piece may be stronger, that blue band that's sitting below the metal planes might be stronger if that were recessed back to the plane of brick so it really looks like the metal panel is really hanging and projecting, rather than looking like it's being helped by the sub-soffit. Otherwise I think you've made some nice changes.
- (Alder) I know the neighborhood sent a letter requesting the top story be stepped back more. Is there an option to go back to residential, or a community space that was in their last report? Is there some trade-off we could do here?
    - We've explored a lot of those. Stepping the upper level back impacts the efficiency of the units too much. We're trying to hit a price point that works. The first floor of the building, my read of the Zoning Code is that we're activating that space. It doesn't say you have to have occupiable space on the first floor. The commercial user we're working with on the other side of the building has to have some parking; we won't get that commercial use unless we have those parking spaces. We don't see first floor residential really working here. We looked at a community space but it's just not enough room.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL.** The motion was passed on a unanimous 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 rating for this project is 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 330 East Wilson Street

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

General Comments:

- First version stair tower much better. Street solution innovative – needs good management.
- Landscape plan does not have quality of building.

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: Fwd: Concerns regarding 330 E. Wilson Street
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 11:19:05 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Michael Harrison [redacted]
> **Date:** June 10, 2014 at 11:08:54 AM CDT
> **To:** <district6@cityofmadison.com>
> **Cc:** Mark Kueppers [redacted] "Prof. Elizabeth B. Bearden" [redacted]
> **Subject: Concerns regarding 330 E. Wilson Street**
>
> Dear City Alder Rummel,
>
> As a resident of the First Settlement Neighborhood (132 S. Hancock St.), it is important to me that any proposed development takes into consideration the context of the neighborhood and the needs of the community.
>
> As my wife Elizabeth and other Hancock Court homeowners have pointed out, the view coming down S. Hancock Street towards the lake will be radically compromised if approval is granted for the 330 E. Wilson Street development proposal. Additionally, the proposal doesn't protect the historic view-shed down S. Hancock Street (towards Lake Monona) as the building would be built without any setback off of the street (inconsistent with the historic Kleuter Building next door).
>
> Furthermore, I am very concerned about the congestion of the sidewalks around the proposed building. Like Elizabeth, I am worried about the visibility of pedestrians as they enter

the crosswalks at the intersection of Hancock and Wilson or cross the entrance to the building's parking. At a minimum the developers should be willing to provide a 5-10 foot setback to help preserve the historic nature and natural urban beauty of our neighborhood and to insure the safety of pedestrians on Hancock and Wilson Streets.

If the development team is unwilling to add to the setback off of Hancock Street, I'd ask you to oppose this project.

Sincerely Yours,
Michael Harrison

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: Fwd: 330 E. Wilson Development
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 11:15:31 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Michael Cella [redacted]
> **Date:** June 10, 2014 at 10:47:44 AM CDT
> **To:** <district6@cityofmadison.com>
> **Subject: 330 E. Wilson Development**
>
> City Alder Rummel,
>
> My partner sent you a letter this morning. We recently moved into the
> Kleuter House, which is on Hancock street directly adjacent to the
> proposed development.
>
> I can see ways in which this development would be an improvement to
> the First Settlement Neighborhood. But I do think the developers
> should compromise on the proposed building's current lack of setback
> from the sidewalk.
>
> A balance must be struck between providing a boost to the neighborhood's vitality, and not compromising the wonderful views of
> Lake Monona that Hancock street currently provides.
>
> Preserving the neighborhood's vistas is of incalculable value. Yes,
> 5-10 feet of setback from the sidewalk would decrease the square
> footage in the building and cut into profits. However as my

partner
said in her letter, Madison is a progressive city. We must build our
future progressively in a way that integrates new developments into
old, historic neighborhoods.

In the First Settlement Neighborhood, especially on Hancock street,
all buildings have a front yard. The proposed development at 330 E.
Wilson is inconsistent with that pattern, and due to that, it will partially block a very charming aspect of our neighborhood.

If the developers of 330 E. Wilson are unwilling to compromise and set
the building back off the sidewalk, then I would ask you to not support this project.

Sincerely,
Michael Cella
[redacted]
Madison, WI 53703

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: FW: 330 E. Wilson Street Development Proposal
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 10:18:42 AM

From: Mark Kueppers [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 9:19 AM
To: Rummel, Marsha
Cc: Verveer, Mike
Subject: 330 E. Wilson Street Development Proposal

City Alder Rummel,

Hope you are well. It was good spending time with you last Wednesday following the neighborhood informational meeting on the proposed site of 330 E. Wilson Street. I appreciate your efforts in trying to find opportunities to add vibrancy to our neighborhood while maintaining a respect for its rich history. That is a delicate balance to strike.

I am planning on attending the UDC meeting tomorrow evening to share a statement from the Hancock Court Homeowners Association. It is clear that our members are concerned about the size and scope of the building. The proposed 6 story complex - as currently outlined - will significantly impact our community. While the architecture has improved, the developers haven't made any adjustments to address concerns about the building height or the historic view-shed (from Main Street towards the Lake) that would be sacrificed. As a result I am unable to support the project at this time. This stance is also consistent with our association.

We are interested in working with the developers to add a development that builds off the improved architecture and takes into consideration the historic nature of our neighborhood. If the development team would address the height of the building (by

reducing the number of floors) or add a step-back off S. Hancock Street this would seem like more of a complimentary development. Based on these concerns I'd ask you to not support this project.

Thanks again for your service to the city and our great neighborhood.

Let me know if you have any questions of concerns. (Note - I've copied Alder Verveer as well so that he is aware of my concerns).

Take care,
Mark Kueppers
[redacted]
Hancock Court Homeowners Association Board President

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: FW: Concerns regarding 330 E. Wilson Street
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 10:17:24 AM

From: Elizabeth Bearden [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 10:03 AM
To: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Concerns regarding 330 E. Wilson Street

Dear City Alder Rummel,

As a resident of the First Settlement Neighborhood (132 S. Hancock St.), it is important to me that any proposed development takes into consideration the context of the neighborhood and the needs of the community. The view coming down S. Hancock Street towards the lake will be radically compromised if approval is granted for the 330 E. Wilson Street development proposal, and pedestrian safety will be reduced. The developers have seemed unwilling to yield on the height of the building – even though six stories is out of context with this section of downtown.

Additionally, the proposal doesn't protect the historic view-shed down S. Hancock Street (towards Lake Monona) as the building would be built without any setback off of the street (inconsistent with the historic Kleuter Building next door).

As a pedestrian who uses a guide dog (I am visually impaired), I am particularly concerned about reducing the already narrow sidewalks on this corner further and adding a turn in for parking for this building, making for potentially less visibility of pedestrians on the part of cars and less room for pedestrians to travel safely. At a minimum the developers should be willing to provide a 5-10 foot setback to help preserve the historic nature and natural urban beauty of our neighborhood and to insure the safety of pedestrians on Hancock and Wilson Streets.

If the development team is unwilling to make any of these changes (reduce height of building or addition of setback off of Hancock Street) I'd ask you to not support this project.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bearden

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: FW: 330 E. Wilson
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 9:41:00 AM

Will you also share emails with UDC?

From: Lily Turner [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2014 8:34 AM
To: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 330 E. Wilson

City Alder Rummel,

I'm a young adult who, along with my partner, is moving in to our first condo. We recently purchased a unit in the historic Kleuter building. Recently, we were e-mailed by our condo board to get us up to speed on the proposed development at 330 E. Wilson. While I value and appreciate the need for growth and the City of Madison's ability to keep up with the demands for growth, I can't agree with any attempts to do so at the expense of Madison's historic past. The Kleuter building is a historic gem, representing Wisconsin's strong ties to working class families, cream city brick, and a treasured architectural style.

We chose to be a part of the First Settlement Neighborhood because of its strong ties to the traditions of Wisconsin. We believe that the 330 E. Wilson building can be a part of that too, but not without some compromise from the developers. The developers thus far have been unwilling to budge on the six-story height of the building, even though it will be completely out of sync with its surrounding neighborhood. The development will also infringe upon the aesthetics of the whole neighborhood by blocking the historic view down S. Hancock toward Lake Monona. For these reasons we ask that the developers provide, at a minimum, a 10 foot setback to help preserve the aesthetics of the neighborhood.

If the development team will not make any of the changes to reduce the height of the development and add a setback off of Hancock Street, we ask you not to support this project. While this city is one that supports growth, it can not be growth for it's own sake - it must be progress. To progress is to

include the needs of all impacted - a goal I think we can all achieve together.

Sincerely,

Lily Turner

[redacted]

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: RE: 330 E Wilson development project
Date: Monday, June 09, 2014 12:44:16 PM

---

yes

From: Stouder, Heather
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2014 12:43 PM
To: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: RE: 330 E Wilson development project

Thank you. Is this meant for the Plan Commission as well?

Heather

From: Rummel, Marsha
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2014 12:41 PM
To: Stouder, Heather
Subject: FW: 330 E Wilson development project

fyi

From: Phil DeSantis [redacted]
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2014 10:16 AM
To: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 330 E Wilson development project

City Alder Rummel,

As a resident of the First Settlement Neighborhood, it is important that any proposed development takes into consideration the context of the neighborhood and the needs of the community. The view coming down S. Hancock Street towards the lake will be radically comprised if approval is granted for the 330 E. Wilson Street development proposal. The developers have seemed unwilling to yield on the height of the building – even though six stories is out of context with this section of downtown. Additionally, the proposal doesn't protect the historic view-shed down S. Hancock Street (towards Lake Monona) as the building would be built without any setback off of the street (inconsistent with the historic Kleuter Building next door that

I live in). At a minimum the developers should be willing to provide a 5-10 foot setback to help preserve the historic nature and natural urban beauty of our neighborhood.

If the development team is unwilling to make any of these changes (reduce height of building or addition of setback off of Hancock Street) I'd ask you to not support this project.

Sincerely,
Phil DeSantis
[redacted]
Madison, WI 53703

10

From: Rummel, Marsha
To: Stouder, Heather;
Subject: FW: 330 E Wilson development project
Date: Monday, June 09, 2014 12:40:50 PM

---

fyi

From: Phil DeSantis [redacted]
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2014 10:16 AM
To: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: 330 E Wilson development project

City Alder Rummel,

As a resident of the First Settlement Neighborhood, it is important that any proposed development takes into consideration the context of the neighborhood and the needs of the community. The view coming down S. Hancock Street towards the lake will be radically comprised if approval is granted for the 330 E. Wilson Street development proposal. The developers have seemed unwilling to yield on the height of the building – even though six stories is out of context with this section of downtown. Additionally, the proposal doesn't protect the historic view-shed down S. Hancock Street (towards Lake Monona) as the building would be built without any setback off of the street (inconsistent with the historic Kleuter Building next door that I live in). At a minimum the developers should be willing to provide a 5-10 foot setback to help preserve the historic nature and natural urban beauty of our neighborhood.

If the development team is unwilling to make any of these changes (reduce height of building or addition of setback off of Hancock Street) I'd ask you to not support this project.

Sincerely,
Phil DeSantis
[redacted]
Madison, WI 53703